

English-Spanish contact in the United States and Central
America: sociolinguistic mirror images?¹

John M. Lipski

O. Of the many English-Spanish contact situations, perhaps the best known is that of Mexican Americans in the United States. In addition to speaking varieties of Spanish which may in certain cases be distinguished from more prestigious dialects of Mexican Spanish, many Mexican Americans speak English with a distinctive set of linguistic characteristics that set this group apart from non-Hispanic speakers of American English (AmE). Most research programs dealing with the comparatively new subject of Chicano English have attempted purely internal descriptions, comparing Mexican-American English (MAMe) with other varieties of United States English (USE) and perhaps considering the influence of certain dialects of Mexican Spanish. It is the purpose of the present article to broaden the perspective on English-Spanish contact by contrasting Mexican-American language behavior with less well-known bilingual configurations in Central America, which represent a quite different situation. Rather than focusing on specific linguistic details of the various English dialects themselves, I shall attempt to demonstrate the feasibility and importance of concurrently studying diverse sociolinguistic networks in order to achieve more complete descriptions of individual English dialects.

1. To fully characterize MAMe vis-à-vis its two logical counterparts, Mexican-American Spanish and USE, it is necessary to situate the language behavior of Mexican Americans within a complex network of sociolinguistic relations, attitudinal variables and political interactions with American society as a whole (cf. Metcalf (1979); Peñalosa (1980: ch.6.)). Many of the linguistically distinctive aspects of the English of Mexican Americans cannot be explained in purely linguistic terms, as the result of Spanish-English interference, but must also take into consideration the social structure of their communities, their access to high-quality public education, their acceptance into other social groups (with the possibility of upward mobility), and their ethnopolitical identifications as a member of a particular 'minority group' of Americans (cf. Sánchez 1983:ch.2.). All these factors converge in the specific linguistic and cultural configurations of the United States southwest to create a situation which could hardly be duplicated elsewhere.

This is an offprint from:

MANFRED GÖRLACH and JOHN A. HOLM (eds.)

FOCUS ON THE CARIBBEAN

John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

1986

(Published as Vol. 8 of the General Series of
VARIETIES OF ENGLISH AROUND THE WORLD)

ISSN 0172-7362 / ISBN 90 272 4866 4

© Copyright 1986 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by
print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without
written permission from the publisher.

Or could it? Investigators have long assumed a *sui generis* status for Mexican American language behavior, because it has been assumed that the situation cannot be readily compared with other language contact situations, except perhaps that of Puerto Ricans in the United States. Let us examine what seems to set Mexican Americans apart in linguistic terms, in order to determine whether it is possible to offer any external comparisons. The most obvious feature is that they live in an English-dominant society while they maintain certain ethnic identifications with Latin America, although they use a variety of Spanish which in many cases is not considered totally acceptable by speakers raised in Mexico or elsewhere in Latin America. This is largely due to the lack of viable educational opportunities in Spanish (and even in English) for many Mexican American children, which results in a linguistic proficiency picked up largely off the street, from peer-group interactions reinforced by parents and older relatives. The Mexican American is often made to feel that there are deficiencies in his use of the Spanish language, as anglophone children and teachers deal with a form of Spanish which seems foreign and overly rigid to the Mexican American. With respect to English usage, the Mexican American living in the southwest is faced with another phenomenon, which rarely passes unnoticed, namely the significant differences between southwestern varieties of AmE and what might be termed 'standard AmE', which is largely a northern and midwestern fantasy perpetrated throughout the rest of the country. Southwest 'Anglo' speakers are ambivalent in their reaction to the midwest standard as used on radio and television; many find it laughable and resent its status as a norm to be sought after, yet at the same time these very speakers may consciously or unconsciously seek to eliminate the 'drawl' or 'twang' from their own speech, feeling that it is socially disadvantageous.² Few exceptions to the rule are observable: in some small radio stations, particularly those specializing in country-western music or evangelistic presentations, the local standard may characterize the speech of the announcers, but in most instances the broadcast language stands out in sharp contrast to the speech outside the studio. This same distribution holds true for the English speech of radio personnel of other ethnic backgrounds; although an announcer may be found whose English carries traces of the ethnic accent on some programs (usually musical variety shows) directed specifically at the local ethnic community, all traces of accent disappear when such an announcer occupies a position in which broadcasts are made to the public at large, and it is impossible to detect the ethnic origin of the announcers by their speech patterns. This phenomenon is worthy of serious sociolinguistic investigation, since it is indicative of ethnic and linguistic attitudes in the United States.

In reality, the Mexican American living in the southwest is confronted with at least three distinct forms of English in the speech of his cohorts. The first is the distinctively 'Chicano-accented' English which is characterized by Spanish intonation and slight phonetic differences in certain segments, as well as by occasional syntactic markers. The second pattern is that of the Mexican American who has

perfectly mastered the regional variety of English; an increasingly large number of Mexican Americans speak English in a form indistinguishable from that of any other Texan, New Mexican, Californian, etc. The third variant is that of the artificially purified 'standard' AmE most often found in public broadcasting, but also heard at times in university environments, political campaigns, and in other circumstances where the speaker wishes to present an image of maximum respectability to the American public at large. Therefore when speaking of the English of Mexican Americans it should be borne in mind that this includes not only Spanish-accented English but also southwestern regional and standard AmE, since all three form part of the social network in which the Mexican American lives, works and studies.

2. In order to more accurately delineate the linguistic aspects of Mexican American language behavior and to separate them from those features which result from particular local interactions, it is useful to search for a parallel situation, or one in which the roles are reversed. Finding a completely parallel situation appears to be impossible, since no other country in which such a large segment speaks English has a significant resident Hispanic community originating in a neighboring country.³ Turning to other possibilities, namely the existence of a diametrically opposed sociolinguistic situation, we are more fortunate, for there exist, on the Caribbean coast of Central America, several regions whose situations may prove useful in analyzing language usage among United States Hispanics. With the exception of Belize all the Central American republics are officially Spanish speaking, but the Caribbean coast contains several enclaves where some form of West Indian English (WIE, usually creolized) is the predominant language, with native speakers of Spanish being in the minority, although retaining cultural and political superiority.⁴ Such English-speaking areas are the Bay Islands of Honduras, Nicaragua's Caribbean coast, particularly the port of Bluefields, and the Costa Rican port of Limón. There is also Guatemala's tiny port of Livingston and parts of Puerto Barrios, the Corn Islands off the coast of Nicaragua, nearby San Andrés and Providencia Islands belonging to Colombia, the Bocas del Toro and Colón region of Panama, and numerous small settlements along the Caribbean coast of Central America. For our purposes, the first three areas are of greatest significance, since in these regions English has achieved a certain social and political status, public and private education is at times available in that language, and English may be heard in radio broadcasting. Let us therefore briefly review the historical events that led to the formation of these bilingual communities.

Perhaps the best known of the English-speaking areas in Central America are the Bay Islands of Honduras (Roatan, Guanaja and Utila, with some tiny islands), since the islands are an attractive location for United States tourists. Historically the islands have a checkered history, having changed hands a number of times, and for most of their history the Bay Islands have only nominally been controlled by exter-

nal governments.⁵ As early as the seventeenth century, the Bay Islands were the site of frequent pirate attacks and pirates used the coves as hideaways. In later centuries, the Bay Islands, as much of the Caribbean coast of Nicaragua, was nominally under British control, and it was not until the middle of the last century that the islands passed permanently into Honduran hands. Today English is definitively the predominant language of the islands; it is spoken natively by a significant majority, both white and black. Most of the white islanders speak no Spanish or speak only a minimal variety with an accent that might be taken for that of the southern United States. When travelling to the mainland these islanders rarely use Spanish and rely on Hondurans' minimal knowledge of tourist English for communication. The black islanders, perhaps due to contact with the increasing population of migrant laborers from the mainland, tend to speak more Spanish and speak it better, although few native islanders speak Spanish with the fluency of mainland Hondurans. In recent decades the Bay Islands have been the scene of immigration from the mainland, due to increased job opportunities and higher wages; thus the *ladinos* (Spanish-speaking Hondurans, usually of mestizo origin) have made incursions in the islands. While on the surface intercultural relations are cordial, there is a perceptible separatism in patronizing stores, forming street corner groups and to a lesser extent (given the limited geographical extension) choosing neighborhood of residence. The islanders consider themselves Hondurans, but many have rarely or never been to the mainland, and when islanders with more money do travel, it is frequently to the United States or to the anglophone West Indies, including the Cayman Islands and Jamaica, whence came many of the islanders' ancestors.

Nicaragua's port of Bluefields is the capital of the large east-coast department of Zelaya, and provides a multicultural panorama, mixing British West Indian, Nicaraguan ladino, and some Miskito (Afro-Indian) influence. In Bluefields language usage is closely related to ethnic background: the creole (Afro-European) inhabitants speak English natively,⁶ although most speak Spanish with greater or lesser fluency. The *ladinos* speak Spanish nearly exclusively, although many speak at least enough English to engage in commercial transactions. Since Nicaragua's Caribbean coast was largely under British control until the middle of the last century, it is natural for the area to follow the same patterns as other British Caribbean possessions; indeed, most of the area's creole inhabitants are descended from Africans and Europeans who arrived via the West Indian islands once held by Britain. The English-speaking inhabitants are largely Protestant, and the Moravian Church has long been important in the area, providing not only religious instruction but also contact with more prestigious varieties of English. Traditionally the Caribbean coast of Nicaragua has been marginalized; it is accessible by air from Managua, but most make the journey by the combination of bus and river launch, at best a full day's trip. The current government is trying to encourage Nicaragua's English- and Miskito-speaking citizens to participate more fully in attaining the

goals of the Sandinista revolution, a difficult task given their traditional isolation and the fact that there were no insurrectionary battles fought in their region. As part of its emergency literacy campaign in 1981, the Nicaraguan government prepared materials in English and Miskito for Caribbean coast residents, typically using BrE patterns in the former case.⁷ It is premature to judge the success of this six-month program, which reportedly has been terminated. The linguistic situation of Bluefields is becoming muddled due to the large influx of ladino Sandinistas from western Nicaragua, who are attempting to establish the network of organizations, committees and control points that characterize the revolutionary regime in the nation's major cities.⁸ The relative proportion of English and Spanish speakers is perhaps more evenly divided in Bluefields now; English is less pervasive than in the Bay Islands, but there is no doubt that it is permanently ensconced. Most English-speaking residents do not have the money to travel, but those that do often go to the United States or former British possessions or occasionally to nearby San Andrés Island, politically part of Colombia but with a similar English-speaking West Indian population, now the object of a Nicaraguan territorial claim. Bluefields' black residents listen to Caribbean music in English (reggae being the most popular), and listen to other English-language broadcasts when they can be received, and those who are literate read books and newspapers in English.

The English-speaking residents of Costa Rica's Puerto Limón are of more recent arrival, being mostly descendants of black laborers imported from Jamaica in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to work on the construction of the United Fruit Company's railroads. These workers were brought in on a massive scale, but were culturally and socially cut off from the mainstream of Costa Rican life. Until 1949, a government decree forbade black Costa Ricans from leaving the general area of Puerto Limón.⁹ Today, Costa Rican's black citizens theoretically enjoy the full rights of citizenship, but in practice few leave the Caribbean coast, for reasons of compatibility, and even in Limón province there is noticeable discrimination based on race. Of the three areas under study, Limón probably has the lowest proportion of English-speaking inhabitants, but perhaps since they are of most recent arrival, the city boasts a significant educational attempt to keep English functioning as a viable language. Few of the white or ladino Costa Ricans in Limón speak English, except for a smattering of tourist English, since Puerto Limón is becoming a tourist attraction. Most of Limón's black inhabitants speak Spanish and all but the oldest speak it fluently, although English is generally chosen for intra-group communication. Limón's English-speaking community maintains cultural ties and identification with Jamaica and also imports English-language reading material from the United States and other countries. There appears to be a greater attempt to integrate the *limonenses* of all backgrounds into mainstream (i.e. Hispanic) Costa Rican life, but this implies assimilation, and the very fact that an individual from this area maintains West-Indian English and traditions automatically ensures a

certain degree of marginalization.

3. Turning to the question of linguistic attitudes, the sociolinguistic situation of CAmE speakers is as complicated as that presented by MAmE speakers in the United States. Both groups are placed in the position of speaking a non-standard and non-prestige variety of a language which enjoys world-wide prestige. The difference, of course, is that while English is the official and dominant language in the United States, Spanish is the official language in Hispanic Central America. Knowledge of standard AmE or even BrE is a mark of prestige among Hispanic natives of Central America, since fluency in English implies having received superior schooling and/or having enjoyed opportunities for travel and residence abroad. Most middle- and even upper-class Central Americans are not fluent in English, although knowledge of this language is relatively widespread in San José, Costa Rica and much of Panama and northern Honduras. As a result, the ability of Central American ladinos to judge the level of any given variety of spoken English is limited, and in reality most judgements are based solely on hearsay, prejudice, and mistaken impressions. Mainland Hondurans, questioned about the use of English on the Bay Islands, almost invariably remark that it is 'merely a dialect' and 'not really English,' sometimes excepting the case of British and American (i.e. 'white') citizens residing there. Moreover, there are definite racial overtones, since Spanish-speaking Hondurans more readily tolerate the English of white islanders than that of their black counterparts on the mainland. White islanders' English will often be met by a clumsy attempt at speaking English, while black islanders who speak English to a ladino will nearly always be answered in Spanish, with the implication that the English has not been understood and that the black islanders know Spanish and should use it. In Nicaragua as well most residents of the western regions have little direct knowledge of Caribbean coast linguistic conditions, but nearly all will assert that the English spoken in Bluefields is "only a dialect", in contrast to the usually defective Americanized English attempted by many Nicaraguan ladinos. The situation is substantially the same in Limón, Costa Rica, where Spanish-speaking Costa Ricans are generally of the opinion that what is spoken in Limón is not really English at all and are surprised to be told that it is comprehensible to a speaker of BrE or AmE after a relatively short period of adjustment.

In none of these areas do the English speakers themselves consistently repudiate their dialect of English and all speak it freely with English-speaking foreigners from other areas. It is not infrequent for parents and older relatives to insist that their children speak to them in English, while the latter, due to peer pressure, may prefer to speak Spanish. The actual quality of English spoken in each case varies widely, but many speakers are able to converse in some form of what in the creole continuum constitutes the mesolect (between the extremes of deep creole and standard language) or even the acrolect, closet to St E. This speech mode is used when speaking to foreigners and also when

English is used as a lingua franca for inter-ethnic communication, as in a conversation between a Garifuna (Black Carib) and a Belizean Creole, or between a Miskito and a creole Nicaraguan (cf. the discussion in Holm (1983b) and Escure (1983)). Some of the most noticeable divergencies of the CAmE creole lie in the verb phrase, the case-marking of personal pronouns, as well as intonational contours. However, most speakers readily comprehend spoken AmE and in turn may be understood by Americans without linguistic training. All CAmE speakers command a certain range of points on the continuum, from the already mentioned mesolect to the basilect or 'broad creole' most different from St E and effectively constituting a language in itself. This latter mode is the most stigmatized and is avoided by many speakers, but all have at least a passive knowledge of the basilect.

The varieties of CAmE most similar to St E are found in the Bay Islands, particularly Utila and Roatan, perhaps due to the large number of resident and transient Americans, Canadians and Britons. Of the three areas under study, the Bay Islands is the one place where lack of ability in English is a definite disadvantage. Despite the Honduran government's continued insistence on the use of Spanish as the sole instructional medium, school programs in English have traditionally existed on Roatan, and the Bay Islands boast the lowest illiteracy rate in Honduras, officially around 12% as opposed to the 50-60% illiteracy of the nation's rural areas.¹⁰ Bluefields traditionally had limited educational opportunities in English, but recently the Sandinista literacy campaign has made reading materials available in that language. For the most part, these materials are based on British/American models, but the occasional syntactic influence of creole English does creep in and the majority of the teachers employed in the literacy campaign were themselves Caribbean coast residents whose English therefore served as a model for the pupils; in the Bluefields schools, Spanish continues to be used as the medium of instruction. Puerto Limón maintains private schools for English-speaking children, although there is no noticeable support from the national government for such linguistic maintenance programs. Subjectively there appears to be a higher level of awareness of the desirability to speak and study English.

Regarding the public media, each of the three areas, while geographically remote from the respective cultural centers of each nation, is serviced by local radio stations, broadcasting materials in both Spanish and English, and in this respect some interesting observations may be made and correlated with available documentation for the United States. In addition, residents of the Caribbean coast of Central America listen to stations from other areas and countries, via short wave radio. The Bay Islands offer Radio Roatan, a small station that typically employs an English-speaking and a Spanish-speaking announcer on the same program (both speaking perfect Spanish). The musical offerings are from Latin America, the anglophone West Indies and the United States, and the announcers make comments and read advertisements in both Spanish and English. Spanish is more frequently used, but English is

also represented in the broadcasts. The English used is standardized in terms of grammar and vocabulary, although retaining the West Indian intonation to a greater extent than is found, for example, in radio broadcasting from nearby Belize. Bay Islanders also listen to the powerful Honduran mainland stations, which broadcast exclusively in Spanish, and also to stations in the United States.

Bluefields offers Radio Zinica, whose programming is nearly exclusively in Spanish, in sharp contrast to the cultural predominance of English in this area (cf. Wood 1983). Musical offerings are typical of both Hispanic and anglophone West Indian traditions, and English-language announcements do occur occasionally; the English used is grammatically quite standard and somewhat more British than that found in the Bay Islands, but the West Indian intonation is clearly discernible. The Spanish spoken by Bluefields announcers also gives evidence of their CA_mE background, in contrast to the ethnically unidentifiable Spanish of the Radio Roatan announcers. Since Bluefields is geographically remote, residents find it difficult to receive other Nicaraguan stations, but the station on San Andrés Island comes in clearly, occasionally with comments in English, and stations in Costa Rica are also heard. Many residents also listen to broadcasts from stations in the United States and South America. The situation may be changing, since as of 1982 all Nicaraguan radio stations are tied to the (all Spanish) national network for a significant portion of each day's programs, and government restrictions severely limit the content of local programming.

In Puerto Limón there are several radio stations, but only Radio Casino broadcasts in English, and only for 2-3 hours per day. The emphasis is on popular West Indian music with minimal commentary, but the English that does occur is decidedly influenced by creole elements. Residents of Limón can also receive other Costa Rican stations as well as those on San Andrés, and (on short wave) other areas.

In each of the three areas being discussed, English-speaking residents are able to hear at least some examples of English on local radio programming, but in each case the English used does not correspond exactly to the local vernacular; there is an attempt to elevate the standard of the local vernacular for purposes of broadcasting, although the results are still not St E. CA_mE speakers are placed in a situation similar to that of Mexican Americans in the United States with regard to the sociolinguistic matrix of language standards. Many anglophone Central Americans speak Spanish less than perfectly, while the English they speak, even in its least creolized varieties, is noticeably different from the styles considered acceptable for public use in broadcasting, literature and international programs from other English-speaking nations. At the same time, there is a significant lack of educational opportunities to increase proficiency in either of the two languages, with the result that bilingualism on the Caribbean coast of Central America may actually be felt to be undesirable, since it merely adds another stigma of non-standard language behavior, as has occurred among Mexican Americans in the United States.

4. Let us now mention some of the systematic similarities and differences between CA_mE and MA_mE, with respect to their embedding in sociocultural matrices. A significant issue concerns the amount of linguistic transference from Spanish to English. In the case of MA_mE speakers there is a noticeable transference of Spanish intonation, and of certain aspects of segmental phonology, whereas grammatical interference is minimized among fluent bilingual speakers. Lexical interference is not as common as incorporation of Spanish items in the midst of an English phrase, which frequently triggers a code-switch to Spanish.¹¹ In most cases it is felt, rightly or wrongly, that among MA_mE speakers it is English that more extensively influences Spanish, in terms of vocabulary and syntactic transfer. When a MA_mE speaker pronounces a Spanish word in the midst of an English discourse, it may receive either a Spanish or an English pronunciation, even if the interlocutor is a Spanish speaker. Proper names are more frequently given the Spanish pronunciation whereas common nouns are more variable. In the radio English of MA_mE speakers, nearly invariably there is no Hispanic accent, which may even include the pronunciation of Spanish names with English phonology. This is undoubtedly due to the highly competitive nature of commercial broadcasting in the United States, where minority groups have traditionally been excluded, and whose recent incursions into broadcasting media have only come about through sacrificing a considerable degree of ethnic or cultural marking (cf. Gutiérrez (1976), Sánchez (1983:ch.2.)). Exceptions to this general trend are programs of a cultural or social nature aimed at the Hispanic community, where Spanish phonology may occasionally be used in English discourse.

Among CA_mE speakers, it is in most cases not possible to discern any phonological influence from Spanish on English, which is not surprising since Spanish is a second language for these speakers. The intonation of CA_mE is that of WC_aE, as is the segmental phonology. Spanish words for which no ready English equivalent exists (particularly food and monetary terms) may be intercalated or adapted to English models, but are invariably given English pronunciation. This behavior is carried over to CA_mE radio English; that is, there are almost no words pronounced in Hispanic fashion, and there is even more of an attempt to avoid mixing Spanish words into the English discourse. However, the Spanish of CA_mE speakers may be more strongly influenced by CA_mE; this is frequently true in intonation and segmental phonology, where a detectable WIE accent may arise when Spanish is spoken. However, except in the Bluefields station, CA_mE speakers purge their radio Spanish of most traces of non-Spanish linguistic characteristics, and use the same type of standardized Spanish as ladino announcers. CA_mE radio personnel speaking English tend toward more standardization, and more often use exclusively English phonology when dealing with Spanish lexical items than do their bilingual counterparts in the United States. In both cases it may be that the radio announcers faithfully reflect the linguistic behavior of the local speech communities, since CA_mE speakers rarely give Spanish words a Hispanic pronunciation in English, regardless of the context, whereas MA_mE speakers frequently do so.

In partial summary, Table 1 outlines the sociolinguistic matrices in which CAmE and MAmE are embedded and demonstrates the extent to which the two groups of linguistic communities may be considered sociolinguistic mirror images. Since little work has been done on the embedding of CAmE in a Spanish matrix, this table serves more to indicate directions for future research than to summarize results already obtained.

Table 1: A comparison of MAmE and CAmE characteristics

	CAmE	MAmE
	English Spanish	English Spanish
1. national language	Spanish: little regional variation	English; considerable regional variation
2. prestige dialect	capital cities	midwest 'standard'
3. abilities in standard lang.	often limited fair-good	fair-good fair
4. range of non-standard varieties	creole continuum some colloq.	some colloquial wider range
5. self-perceived linguistic prestige	seldom adequate generally adequate	sometimes inadequate sometimes inadequate
6. cultural identification of language	West Indies/U.S. Spanish-speaking Central America	regional U.S. Mexico
7. standard aspired to	educated U.S. regional norms	regional/national educated Mexican
8. majority attitude toward minority lang. abilities	non-standard sometimes accented	sometimes accented non-standard
9. interference from other language	lexical+syntactic phonetic	phonetic lexical; some syntactic

cont'd

Table 1 continued

	CAmE	MAmE
10. national survival value	tourism; foreign trade high	high low outside groups
11. educational opportunities	few public schools (may be limited)	public schools (may be limited) few
12. radio broadcasts	few hours daily many	large number several in some areas
13. reading materials	small amounts imported locally available	locally available some local, some imported
14. intra-group language	English (some Spanish among youngest)	English (especially among younger generations) or Spanish
15. # of minority speakers	may be decreasing increasing	increasing decreasing within given cohorts
16. influx of new minority group speakers	little immigration	significant immigration
17. racial characteristics/stereotypes	creole black/white mestizo/white	Anglo-American (white or black) mestizo
18. reluctance in speaking with native speakers from other areas	little little	may be some may be some

cont'd

Table 1 continued

	CAMe	MAMe
19. radio standards	standardized West Indian	accent-free national
	accent-free national norm	standard Mexican
20. radio pronunciation of words in other language	English phonology	English/Span. phonology
	Spanish/Eng. phonology	English/Span. phonology

In particular, the following questions need to be addressed.

1. What is the variety of English consciously or unconsciously regarded as the 'standard' to be imitated in each case? In the case of MAMe this is clearly some dialect of USE, but in specific instances it may be the regional variety or some national standard. For CAMe speakers this choice is not as immediately clear, since there is less contact with any standardized form of English. While the spoken dialect is related to varieties found in the anglophone West Indies, much of the reading matter comes from the United States and U.S. radio broadcasts are heard throughout the region. Moreover, the highly non-standard creole varieties are used as separate codes of English, under appropriate circumstances, which has no ready counterpart among MAMe speakers, although it corresponds partially in function (as in indication of in-group status) but not in origin to Pachuco and other types of Hispanic jive talk in the United States (cf. Barker 1950).
2. What is the attitude of the English-speaking groups themselves with regard to their own linguistic performance vis-à-vis some form of 'standard' English? The MAMe speakers is in closer contact with USE varieties, and many MAMe speakers are aware of divergences between MAMe and other varieties of AmE. These differences may cause feelings of inferiority and may result in discrimination for certain jobs. CAMe speakers are less often beset by feelings of inferiority regarding their particular variety of English, although there is a certain stigma attached to the simple fact of speaking English in an essentially Spanish-speaking society. On the other hand, the CAMe speaker is generally aware of the range of varieties from creole to non-creole English in Central America, and of the stigma that attaches to the basilectal end of this continuum.
3. What is the attitude of the majority speakers of the respective areas as regards the language behavior of CAMe or MAMe speakers? Most Anglo-Americans perceive MAMe to be accented in those speakers who

have not totally acquired the regional variety, and this accent is invariably perceived to be non-prestigious. As for Spanish language abilities, most Anglo-Americans living in the southwest or in other areas with large Mexican populations are equally certain of the 'substandard' nature of Mexican American Spanish, giving it such derogatory names as pocho or Tex-Mex, again usually without empirical evidence to support such beliefs. Spanish-speaking residents of Central America are uniform in their condemnation of CAMe as an unacceptable 'dialect', but most have no objective criteria of knowledge to form such a judgment. Most Central American ladinos feel certain that CAMe speakers produce deficient Spanish as well, but objectively this is not always the case.

4. What is the amount of Spanish influence that may be discerned in the English of the groups in question? MAMe presents definite evidence of Spanish influence on its phonology and to a certain extent on its syntax (cf. Peñalosa 1980:ch.6.). On the other hand, CAMe contains comparatively little Spanish influence. Nonetheless, because of each group's original first language, the Spanish of CAMe speakers does give evidence of English phonology, and this is not generally true for the Spanish of MAMe speakers, which is, however, strongly influenced by English lexical and syntactic configurations.
5. What are the educational opportunities for the speakers in question? MAMe speakers in theory have access to the American public school system, hence the potential for achieving full competence in AmE, although those students beginning with little English ability in the absence of bilingual programs may find themselves at a severe disadvantage, and the children of migrant workers or 'undocumented' immigrants often attend no schools at all. The CAMe speakers, representing a socially marginalized group in Central American society, in many cases have fewer opportunities for education in either language than do Mexican Americans (Sánchez 1983:ch.2; Lipski 1982).
6. What are the societal pressures for speaking English as opposed to Spanish? The MAMe speaker will find activities outside of a limited sphere all but impossible without English. The CAMe speaker speaks English by inclination, but it is usually Spanish rather than English which is essential in Central America. Spanish, on the other hand, is not essential in the United States, outside of the large Spanish-speaking population nuclei.
7. What kind of linguistic and cultural identification is there with countries or regions other than the area in which the speakers live? MAMe speakers may identify with Mexico, particularly when speaking Spanish, but their use of English is identified with their actual area of residence in the United States. CAMe speakers often identify with the English-speaking West Indies or Belize in their English language usage, whereas their Spanish is identified with the regional varieties of each Central American country.
8. What is the language chosen for intragroup communication? MAMe speakers may speak to one another in English, Spanish or by switching

codes, depending upon a complex array of factors, not all of which are derived from actual linguistic abilities in each language.¹² CAMe speakers have traditionally spoken to one another in English, but among the youngest generations there is a tendency to employ Spanish even with CAMe peers. Code switching also occurs, but not as frequently as among MAMe speakers.

5. It is interesting to compare Table 1 with the typology recently proposed by Moag (1982). In offering a classification of societies where English is used, Moag suggests, in addition to the usual English as a native/second/foreign language, a new category: English as a Basal Language, defined for a society in which "English is the mother tongue of a minority group of a larger populace whose native tongue, often Spanish, is clearly the dominant language of the society as a whole." The CAMe areas are explicitly mentioned and a number of parameters are explored, some of which also figure in the present study. Moag's typology is undoubtedly useful and underlines the necessity for expanding the currently accepted typologies to accommodate such situations as the CAMe groups. One may take exception to certain specific points but this is largely the result of imperfect or insufficient information being available about the various CAMe groups. It is hoped that the preceding presentation, together with the material in Holm (1983a) will serve as a complement to Moag's typology, filling in some of the partially defined areas and offering independent justification for additional typologies. At the same time, it is evident, by comparing the sociolinguistic configurations of both MAMe and CAMe, that even Moag's typology must be further extended, since MAMe speakers do not clearly fall into any of the four categories, despite obvious similarities with several. English is the dominant language of many MAMe speakers, yet MAMe speakers are not truly part of the majority English-speaking society, as long as they retain characteristic MAMe features. The English as a Basal Language category does not apply either, since although the MAMe group does speak a variety of English natively, the majority language is also English and thus the questions of attitude, influences, official policies and the like do not apply. Nor does the English as a Second Language category apply to the MAMe speaker, at least as used by Moag to refer to certain African nations; among other things, the second language (Spanish) is not dominant in most MAMe speakers, nor does the use of MAMe add prestige to the speaker (Metcalf 1979; Peñalosa 1980:ch.6). This is not the appropriate forum to discuss possible extensions or modifications of the four-way taxonomy, but it is evident that global sociolinguistic typologies will have to include some means of categorizing xenolect varieties of native languages spoken within a country speaking the same language, and may even have to distinguish between non-standard varieties which result from bilingual interaction (e.g. MAMe) and those which, for all intents and purposes, arise in synchronically monolingual speech groups (e.g. Black AmE). The case of the MAMe speaker using English in the United States is essentially the same as that of the CAMe speaker using Spanish in Central America, and probably parallels other stable situations elsewhere in the world.

To a considerable extent, although not in every detail, the CAMe situation is a mirror image of the MAMe linguistic configuration. This fact is of theoretical interest, and should be taken into consideration in the design of research projects dealing with English-Spanish contact situations throughout the world. Comparing the Central American situation with that of Mexican Americans affords an excellent opportunity for separating out the variables specific to language, country and culture from general questions of language contact in the development of regional varieties and standards. English and Spanish have come together frequently in the course of the last several centuries, sometimes only long enough to form rudimentary contact vernaculars, but more often extensively enough to form stable bilingual communities. In order to fully understand and appreciate the linguistic and sociological dimensions, one must go beyond the common demonstration case of Hispanics in the United States, and seek out additional examples of English-Spanish diglossia or bilingualism. Particularly when addressing questions of standardization and educational policy, issues which are politically delicate and which have long-range effects on large segments of the population, the widest possible range of data must be taken into consideration, reviewing the trajectories of other groups and gaining insight from parallel experiences elsewhere in the hemisphere.

NOTES

- 1 Linguistic fieldwork in Central America was carried out in December, 1981, in January, March, April and December, 1982 and in March, 1983. For financial assistance to visit Honduras, thanks are due to the University of Houston, which provided a limited-grant-in-aid. Special thanks are due to John Holm for extensive help in revising the manuscript.
- 2 The area of most severe discrepancies between regional and national standard is the realm of public broadcasting, both radio and television, where no matter the region of the country, nearly all the announcers speak the same variety of English which, while perhaps quasi-native to some parts of the country, is really the product of broadcast schools, pushed forward by the weight of tradition. Cf. Gutiérrez (1976), Lipski (1983), Peñalosa (1981:9).

- 3 Such countries as Jamaica, Trinidad, Belize and Guayana have multi-cultural traditions radically different from those in the United States and therefore provide different profiles of attitudes and inter-ethnic relations. An area with a similar bilingual profile is Gibraltar, but despite the role of English as the sole official language, the native Spanish-speaking population so outnumbers the English-speaking Gibraltarians and Britons that for all practical purposes English is the second language of this enclave, spoken fluently by a small percentage of the residents.
- 4 This work was originally prepared before the volume by Holm (1983a) came out. It has been revised to include reference to these studies, and the reader is referred to these excellent individual presentations for a nearly exhaustive bibliography, as well as a linguistic evaluation of the various Central American English dialects.
- 5 Davidson (1974) offers the best historical panorama of the Bay Islands. For the linguistic dimension, see Warantz (1983).
- 6 See Holm (1983c) and the bibliography therein for the linguistic details of Bluefields English. Floyd (1967) provides historical details.
- 7 Thanks are due to the Ministry of Adult Education in Managua, which graciously provided me with copies of materials used in the literacy campaign.
- 8 Bourgois (1981) offers some remarks on the integration of the Nicaraguan Caribbean coast into the revolutionary government.
- 9 See Meléndez and Duncan (1979) for the historical perspective, and Herzfeld (1983) for linguistic details of Limón English.
- 10 Official census figures, interpreted by Castellanos García (1980). The latest available census figures are from 1974, and these figures have probably dropped somewhat.
- 11 For Mexican-American and Puerto-Rican American speakers, this behavior is reviewed and studied in Lipski (1982).
- 12 For some more global implications, see Kernan et al. (1977), Wurm (1977), Craig (1977, 1980), Ryan and Carranza (1976).

REFERENCES

- Barker, George. 1950. *Pachuco: An American-Spanish Argot and its Social Functions in Tucson, Arizona*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Blount, Ben & Mary Sanches. 1977. *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bourgois, Philippe. 1981. "Class, ethnicity and the state among the Miskitu Amerindians of Northern Nicaragua", *Latin American Perspectives* 8:2. 22-39.
- Castellanos García, J. Efraín. 1980. *Atlas geográfico de Honduras*. Tegucigalpa: Editores Servi Copex.
- Craig, Dennis. 1977. "Creole languages and primary education" in Valdman. 313-32.
- . 1980. "Models for educational policy in creole-speaking communities" in Valdman & Highfield. 245-65.
- Davidson, W. V. 1974. *Historical Geography of the Bay Islands, Honduras*. Birmingham, Alabama: Southern University Press.
- Dillard, J. L., ed. 1980. *Perspectives on American English*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Durán, Richard, ed. 1981. *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior*. Norwood, N. J.: ALEX.
- Escure, Geneviève. 1983. "Belizean Creole" in Holm, 1983a. 29-70.
- Floyd, Troy. 1967. *The Anglo-Spanish Struggle for Mosquitia*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Gutiérrez, Félix Frank. 1976. *Spanish Language Radio and Chicano Internal Colonialism*. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- Herzfeld, Anita. 1983. "The creoles of Costa Rica and Panama" in Holm, 1983a. 131-56.
- Holm, John. 1980. "The creole 'copula' that highlighted the world" in Dillard. 367-76.
- . 1983a. *Central American English*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.
- . 1983b. Introduction to Holm, 1983a. 7-28.
- . 1983c. "Nicaragua's Miskito Coast Creole English" in Holm, 1983a. 95-130.
- Kernan, Keith, John Sodergren & Robert French. (1977). "Speech and social prestige in the Belizean speech community" in Blount & Sanches. 35-50.
- Lipski, John. 1982. "Spanish-English language switching in speech and literature: models and methods", *Bilingual Review* 9. 191-212.

- . 1983. "Spanish in U.S. broadcasting: discovering and setting standards" in Elias-Olivares, L., ed., *Spanish in Public Life*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Meléndez, Carlos & Quince Duncan. 1979. *El Negro in Costa Rica*. San José: Editorial Costa Rica.
- Metcalf, Allan. 1979. *Chicano English*. Center for Applied Linguistics. Arlington, Virginia.
- Moag, Rodney. 1982. "English as a foreign, second, native and basal language" in Pride. 11-50.
- Peñalosa, Fernando. 1980. *Chicano Sociolinguistics*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- . 1981. "Some issues in Chicano sociolinguistics" in Durán. 3-18.
- Pride, John, ed. 1982. *New Englishes*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Ryan, Ellen Bouchard & Miguel Carranza. 1976. "Attitudes toward accented English" in Willcott & Ornstein. 52-8.
- Sánchez, Rosaura. 1983. *Chicano Discourse*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Warantz, Elissa. 1983. "Bay Islands English of Honduras" in Holm, 1983a. 71-94.
- Willcott, Paul & Jacob Ornstein, eds. 1976. *College English and the Mexican-American*. San Antonio: Trinity University.
- Wood, George. 1983. "Rock and revolution: radio in Nicaragua", *World Radio and TV Handbook* 37. 604-5.
- Wurm, Stephen. 1977. "Pidgins, creoles, lingue franche and national development" in Valdman. 333-57.
- Valdman, Albert, ed. 1977. *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- & Arnold Highfield, eds. 1980. *Theoretical Orientations in Creole Studies*. New York: Academic Press.