## Florida International University FIU Digital Commons

FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations

University Graduate School

3-20-2015

# Perceiving Spanish in Miami: The Interaction of Dialect and National Labeling

Salvatore Callesano Florida International University, scall020@fiu.edu

DOI: 10.25148/etd.FI15032188
Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd
Part of the <u>Anthropological Linguistics and Sociolinguistics Commons</u>

**Recommended** Citation

Callesano, Salvatore, "Perceiving Spanish in Miami: The Interaction of Dialect and National Labeling" (2015). *FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1802. https://digitalcommons.fu.edu/etd/1802

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the University Graduate School at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcc@fu.edu.

## FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Miami, Florida

# PERCEIVING SPANISH IN MIAMI: THE INTERACTION OF DIALECT AND NATIONAL LABELING

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

## MASTER OF ARTS

in

## LINGUISTICS

by

Salvatore Callesano

To: Dean Michael R. Heithaus College of Arts and Sciences

This thesis, written by Salvatore Callesano, and entitled Perceiving Spanish in Miami: The Interaction of Dialect and National Labeling, having been approved in respect to style and intellectual content, is referred to you for judgment.

We have read this thesis and recommend that it be approved.

Andrew Lynch

Ellen Thompson

Melissa Baralt

Phillip M. Carter, Major Professor

Date of Defense: March 20, 2015

The thesis of Salvatore Callesano is approved.

Dean Michael R. Heithaus College of Arts and Sciences

Dean Lakshmi N. Reddi University Graduate School

Florida International University, 2015

© Copyright 2015 by Salvatore Callesano

All rights reserved.

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my number one support team, my family.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I extend my deepest gratitude to Dr. Phillip M. Carter, whose consistent, constructive, and motivating suggestions throughout this research has taught me to always take one more step. Furthermore, I cannot express enough gratitude for Dr. Carter's advisement throughout this Master's program; his dedicated and diligent work towards his career has truly been an example to follow.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Andrew Lynch, Dr. Melissa Baralt, and Dr. Ellen Thompson for their continued support and advice as I carried out this research project. Without their words of wisdom before every conference or every class, I would not have made it as far in this program as I have. Additionally, I extend special gratitude for David Neal for his expertise is experimental design and statistical analyses.

Lastly, I want to send a warm thank you to my fellow graduate students and Teaching Assistants, especially Lilian Oliveira, Kristen Mullen, Lydda López, Kelly Millard, and Ana Paula Freire. Their consistent support, friendship, and never-ending humor have helped me to stay positive throughout this research process.

## ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

## PERCEIVING SPANISH IN MIAMI: THE INTERACTION OF DIALECT AND NATIONAL LABELING

by

Salvatore Callesano

Florida International University, 2015

Miami, Florida

#### Professor Phillip M. Carter, Major Professor

The current study implements a speech perception experiment that interrogates local perceptions of Spanish varieties in Miami. Participants (N=292) listened to recordings of three Spanish varieties (Peninsular, Highland Colombian, and Post-Castro Cuban) and were given background information about the speakers, including the parents' country of origin. In certain cases, the parents' national-origin label matched the country of origin of the speaker, but otherwise the background information and voices were mismatched. The manipulation distinguishes perceptions determined by bottom-up cues (dialect) from top-down ones (social information). Participants then rated each voice for a range of personal characteristics and answered hypothetical questions about the speakers' employment, family, and income. Results show clear top-down effects of the social information that often drive perceptions up or down depending on the traits themselves. Additionally, the data suggest differences in perceptions between Hispanic/non-Hispanic and Cuban/non-Cuban participants, although the Cuban participants do not drive the Hispanic participants' perceptions.

CHAPTER	PAGE
1 Introduction	1
2 Research in perception	
2.1 Approaches to perceptual dialectology	
2 1 1 The sociolinguistic approach	3
2.1.2 Folk dialectology	6
2.1.3 Social psychological components of language perception	9
2.1.3.1 Matched guise technique	
2 1 3 2 Social psychological themes	14
2 2 The Miami context	19
2 3 Spanish language variation (Cuba Colombia Spain)	20
2.3.1 Peninsular Spanish	
2.3.2 Highland Colombian Spanish	
2 3 3 Cuban Spanish	25
3 Methodology	
3.1 Introduction	
3.2 Research questions and hypotheses	
3.2.1 Research question #1	
3.2.2 Research question #2	
3.2.3 Research question #3	
3.3 Experimental methodology	
3.3.1 Experimental manipulation	
3.3.2 Stimuli	
3.3.2.1 Bottom-up stimuli	
3.3.2.2 Top-down stimuli	
3.4 Survey questions	
3.4.1 Warmth/competence questions	
3.4.2 Blue-collar/white-collar and annual income questions	
3.4.3 Language maintenance and usage questions	
3.4.4 Family value questions	
3.5 Participants	
3.6 Procedure	
4 Results	40
4.1 Introduction	40
4.2 Methods of analysis	40
4.3 Interpreting the results	41
4.4 Results	42
4.4.1 Warmth traits	42
4.4.1.1 Friendly aggregate	42

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.4.1.2 Friendly by ethnicity	43
4.4.1.3 Kind aggregate	44
4.4.2 Competence traits	46
4.4.2.1 Intelligent aggregate	46
4.4.2.2 Self-confident aggregate	48
4.4.3 Blue-collar jobs	49
4.4.3.1 Coffee shop aggregate	50
4.4.3.2 Cell phone store aggregate	51
4.4.3.3 Cell phone store by ethnicity	53
4.4.4 White-collar jobs	55
4.4.4.1 Marketing executive aggregate	55
4.4.4.2 Marketing executive by ethnicity	57
4.4.4.3 Attorney aggregate	58
4.4.5 Annual income	59
4.4.5.1 Current annual income aggregate	59
4.4.5.2 Current annual income by ethnicity	61
4.4.5.3 Projected income aggregate	62
4.4.6 Language Use	63
4.4.6.1 Watches TV mostly in English aggregate	63
4.4.6.2 Watches TV mostly in English by ethnicity	64
4.4.6.3 Successful in learning English aggregate	65
4.4.6.4 Successful in learning English by ethnicity	66
4.4.6.5 Chooses Spanish in bilingual settings aggregate	68
4.4.6.6 Chooses Spanish in bilingual settings by ethnicity	69
4.4.7 Family Values	71
4.4.7.1 Opportunities to get ahead aggregate	71
4.4.7.2 Opportunities to get ahead by ethnicity	72
4.4.7.3 Poor family aggregate	73
4.4.7.4 Poor family by ethnicity	75
4.4.8 Cuban versus non-Cuban participants	76
4.4.8.1 Cuban ratings of friendliness	76
4.4.8.2 Cuban ratings of family that values education	77
5 Discussion and Conclusions	80
5 1 Introduction	80
5 2 Discussion	80
5.2.1 Research questions and hypotheses revisited	80
5 3 Conclusions	86
5.4 Limitations and future research	
REFERENCES	90
ADDENIDICES	05
AFFENDICES	

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 1. Dialect and social information permutations	
Table 2. Likert scale for ratings	34
Table 3. Information about speakers	
Table 4. Example of top-down stimulus	
Table 5. How to read x-axes	41
Table 6. Friendly for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba	42
Table 7. Friendly by ethnicity for Colombia-Colombia	44
Table 8. Friendly by ethnicity for Cuba-No Label	44
Table 9. Kind for Colombia-Cuba vs. Spain-No Label	45
Table 10. Kind for Colombia-No Label vs. Cuba-Colombia	45
Table 11. Intelligent for Spain-Spain vs. Cuba-Spain	47
Table 12. Intelligent for Spain-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba	47
Table 13. Self-confident for Spain-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba	48
Table 14. Coffee shop for Spain-No Label vs. Colombia-No Label	50
Table 15. Coffee shop for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label	50
Table 16. Cell phone store for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label	51
Table 17. Cell phone store for Colombia-Spain vs. Colombia-Colombia	
Table 18. Cell phone store by ethnicity for Spain-Cuba	53
Table 19. Cell phone store by ethnicity for Spain-Spain	54
Table 20. Cell phone store by ethnicity for Colombia-Colombia	54

Table 21. Marketing executive for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label	55
Table 22. Marketing executive for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba	56
Table 23. Marketing executive by ethnicity for Spain-Cuba	57
Table 24. Attorney for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label	58
Table 25. Attorney for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba	58
Table 26. Current income for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label	60
Table 27. Current income by ethnicity for Spain-Cuba	61
Table 28. Project annual income for Spain-Colombia vs. Spain-Cuba	62
Table 29. Watches TV mostly in English for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-No Label	63
Table 30. Watches TV mostly in English for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba	64
Table 31. Watches TV mostly in English for Spain-Spain	65
Table 32. Successful in learning English for Spain-Spain vs. Spain-No Label	66
Table 33. Successful in learning English for Spain-Spain	67
Table 34. Successful in learning English for non-Hispanics	67
Table 35. Chooses Spanish with bilinguals for Colombia-Colombia vs. Colombia-No Label	68
Table 36. Chooses Spanish in bilingual settings for Spain-Spain	70
Table 37. Opportunities to get ahead for Spain-Spain vs. Spain-Cuba	71
Table 38. Opportunities to get ahead for Spain-Cuba	72
Table 39. Opportunities to get ahead for Cuba-Colombia	73
Table 40. Family is poor for Colombia-Spain vs. Colombia-Cuba	74
Table 41. Family is poor for Spain-Spain vs. Spain-Cuba	74
Table 42. Family is poor for Hispanics	75

Table 43. Friendly for Cuba-No Label	77
Table 44. Family that values education for Spain-Cuba	78
Table 55. Ideological tropes about Spanish	86

FIGURE	PAGE
Figure 1. Mean ratings for friendly	42
Figure 2. Friendly by ethnicity	43
Figure 3. Mean ratings for kind	44
Figure 4. Mean ratings for intelligent	46
Figure 5. Mean ratings for self-confident	48
Figure 6. Mean ratings for coffee shop employee	50
Figure 7. Mean ratings for cell phone store employee	51
Figure 8. Cell phone store by ethnicity	53
Figure 9. Mean ratings for marketing executive	55
Figure 10. Marketing executive by ethnicity	57
Figure 11. Mean ratings for attorney	58
Figure 12. Mean ratings for current annual income	59
Figure 13. Current annual income by ethnicity	61
Figure 14. Mean ratings for projected annual income	
Figure 15. Mean ratings for watches TV mostly in English	63
Figure 16. Watches TV mostly in English by ethnicity	64
Figure 17. Mean ratings for successful in learning English	65
Figure 18. Successful in learning English by ethnicity	66
Figure 19. Mean ratings for chooses Spanish in bilingual settings	
Figure 20. Chooses Spanish in bilingual settings by ethnicity	69
Figure 21. Mean ratings for opportunities to get ahead	71

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 22. Opportunities to get ahead by ethnicity	72
Figure 23. Mean ratings for poor family	73
Figure 24. Poor family by ethnicity	75
Figure 25. Cuban vs. non-Cuban for friendly	77
Figure 26. Cuban vs. non-Cuban for family that values education	78

## **1** Introduction

Upon arrival in Miami in August 2013, one of the first things that I noticed was not only the vibrant Hispanic<sup>1</sup> communities, but also the immense Spanish dialect diversity. Only after interacting with my local community in "Doralzuela" – a neighborhood named Doral but given this nickname as a consequence of its large Venezuelan population – and consistently noticing that language was the topic of conversation, where people on the radio were constantly identifying with their nationalorigins, did I begin to realize that language perceptions seem to have certain social consequences.

The current study stems from these impressionistic observations and was fully carried out as part of a larger study on language in Miami currently being overseen by Dr. Phillip M. Carter of Florida International University and Dr. Andrew Lynch at the University of Miami. Sociolinguistic research is scarce in South Florida and this larger project is now in the process of taking the first steps at documenting and analyzing the complex linguistic situations currently at play in Miami and other parts of South Florida. A number of research projects have been carried out and are currently in the process of being developed. For example, Carter, López, and Sims (2014) have completed the first steps in analyzing the vocalic and prosodic properties of Miami Latino English, Fernández-Parera (2014) studied lexical transferences between Cuban Spanish and other varieties, Mullen (2014) conducted a cross-generational analysis of lexical calques in Miami English, such as *put me the light* (turn on the light) and *get down from the car* (get out of the car), and Carter and Lynch (2013) conducted a study of local perceptions of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The terms 'Hispanic' and 'Latino' are use interchangeably in this thesis.

Spanish and English in Miami using the matched-guise technique (Lambert et al. 1960). That study provided the impetus for the current one. Sociolinguistic research on Miami is now in full swing, and complements earlier work conducted over the years by scholars such as Otheguy, Garcia, and Roca (2000) and Lynch (2009).

The current research puts into question the perceptions of three Spanish language varieties that are spoken in Miami (Peninsular Spanish, Highland Colombian, and Post-Castro Cuban). This thesis takes an experimental approach to perceptual dialectology and aims to describe the interaction of two types of stimuli that influence language perceptions: the acoustic signal and the dialect information it conveys as well as social information about the speakers of these dialects.

The thesis contains five chapters. The current chapter provides a brief overview of the work and sets forth the structure of the thesis. Chapter 2 will provide a description of the perceptual dialectology literature, themes in social psychology that are useful in the current analysis, and an overview Spanish dialect variation. Chapter 3 presents the experimental methods implemented in this study as well as the research questions and hypotheses. Chapter 4 presents the results of this research, which are followed by a discussion of the data and conclusions regarding the sociological consequences of language perception in Chapter 5.

## 2 Research in perception

Within the sociolinguistic landscape of Spanish speaking Miami, it is possible to hear someone identify as *un cubano-español* (a Cuban national of Spanish descent). At first blush, this may not seem out of the ordinary. But as we have observed informally, this identification may mark heritage by several generations removed and may mean that this person's great-grandfather emigrated from Spain to Cuba decades earlier. This vignette is of course anecdotal, but we have observed marking of Peninsular heritage by Cuban nationals in our fieldwork and in informal interaction time and time again. The phenomenon deserves exploration and explanation, specifically because language perceptions and attitudes may mediate the decision to foreground European heritage in this way.

In the sections that follow, I will outline three approaches to the study of perceptual dialectology, the sociolinguistic context of Miami, the features of Spanish language variation, and social psychological aspects of perception.

## 2.1 Approaches to perceptual dialectology

To attend to questions about language perceptions, sociolinguists move their work into the field of perceptual dialectology. Methods in this line of work vary and researchers often choose from a number of different approaches to perceptual dialectology, as outlined in the following sections.

#### 2.1.1 The "sociolinguistic approach"

This approach to studies in the field of language perception finds its inspiration in variationist sociolinguistic traditions, particularly in the methods developed by William Labov (1966, 2011). Research following this method implements recordings of languages

or language varieties that are played as participants are asked to either identify them, rank them, or assess them according to various social criteria. Labov refers to these tasks as 'subject reaction tests'. In these tests, utilized in Labov's description of New York City English, participants listened to sentences of a previously recorded reading passage that focused on distinctive New York City English variables (i.e.  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}, \frac{1$ key component of this type of research and the research carried out in this current study is that the variants used by New Yorkers in the Labovian 'formal style' tend to be the same variants used systematically by high socioeconomic status speakers. The concept of sociolinguistic variation is based in a question of production, however it also speaks to researchers interested in language perception because it suggests that people feel that particular variants (mostly phonetic) are better, more correct, or endowed with superior status. For example, syllable-final rhotic productions (r-1 in traditional Labovian terms) are considered a prestige marker in New York City English, which then patterns with people who are employed in high status positions. In line with this notion, Labov (1966) also reports on a judgment task he designed in which participants were asked to imagine themselves as employers for a large corporation. They were asked to listen to recordings of various New York City English speakers and rate what type of position they thought the speaker could hold (as opposed to ranking their actual profession). The professional occupations used in the rating scale were: television personality, executive secretary, receptionist, switchboard, operator, salesgirl, factory worker, or none of the provided options (Labov 1966, 270). That perception of sociolinguistic variation can, in part, play a role in a speaker's occupational prospects is a crucial aspect of the following study and will be considered further below.

The sociolinguistic evaluation of speakers is a marker of attitudes towards language as opposed to statements about the cognitive representations of language or language varieties. This is to say that the sociolinguistic approach does not utilize direct methods, which incorporate explicit discourses about language varieties. Labov writes about the stigmatization of New York City English and how some of the sentiments towards the dialect are described as 'terrible, distorted, sloppy, etc.' [ADD PAGE #]. In continuation, when New York City English speakers themselves describe these perceptions that outsiders have towards their speech they are essentially describing their own perceptions. In Labov's terms, this can be described as a 'linguistic self-hatred' and we will be able to return to this idea when we arrive at a discussion of Cuban Spanish speakers in Miami rejecting the variety of Cuban Spanish spoken on the island (Alfaraz 2002, 2014).

The sociolinguistic approach to the study of language perception also gives researchers a clear insight into ethnic differences in perceptions. In Labov's (1966) findings, African American participants show a reversal of the perceptual patterns demonstrated by the Italian and Jewish participants. For example, Italian and Jewish subjects believe that outsiders dislike their New York City English variety however the African American participants feel that outsiders do not dislike New York City English. The sharpest pattern opposition manifested when the participants were asked to compare their attitudes towards their own speech with their attitudes towards Southern U.S. English speech. Labov writes, "... the African-Americans of New York City react primarily against features of southern English ... The white New Yorkers react against their own speech, and their image of it: to many of them, southern speech appears as

attractively remote and not with glamour as compared to the everyday sound of New York City speech" (Labov, 1966, 337). Labov's (1966) work shows that ethnic differences play a role in situations of language perceptions, where perceptions of the languages or language varieties may actually be about the speakers themselves.

Finally, Labov discusses the notion of the 'sociolinguistic monitor' (2011). The role of the 'sociolinguistic monitor' is to track, store, and process information on linguistic variation and these monitors seem to be sensitive to variant frequencies of the variable (ING in Labov's 2011 study). The participants in the current study, as part of the process of forming their linguistic attitudes, must essentially track and monitor features of Spanish language variation. By consistently coming in contact with either the dialect itself or public discourses about the language variety, participants internalize the sociolinguistic information below the level of consciousness, to which they attach certain attitudes and perceptions. While people listen to different language varieties and encounter the multitude of public discourses on language variation, they are in a way, preparing their folk linguistic repertoire.

#### 2.1.2 Folk dialectology

In the folk dialectology approach, the names of languages, language varieties, or geographic locations on maps are used to elicit explicit language attitudes. These different representations of language refer to the different aspects that influence folk dialectology – imitation, maps, and discourse (Preston 1993, Niedzielski and Preston 2009). There is a very complex relationship between linguistic forms and cultural stereotypes, where the stereotypes may be strong enough to overcome linguistic evidence or the linguistic evidence may be so strong as to preclude accurate person identification.

One key feature of folk dialectology is its imitation or performance value. For example, African American Vernacular English has 'folk value' where Anglo-White English does not (Preston 1993). This is to say that when a researcher asks Anglo-White participants to imitate African American Vernacular English speaker, the amount of roles (i.e. basketball player, comedian, thief, etc.) is much greater than when an African American Vernacular English speaker. In addition, the perceptions towards the folk varieties, which can usually be attributed to the stigmatized variety, show a belief that speaking said dialect can actually be avoided (Preston 1993).

In addition to questions of imitation, folk linguistics uses maps to elicit perceptions and attitudes towards different language varieties and what Preston finds is that the participants tend to be more prescriptive than descriptive in their folk linguistic accounts. One crucial methodological point to make here and in general with a discussion on folk dialectology is that no audio stimuli are used. For the mapping tasks, participants are provided with a map (e.g. of the United States) and asked to either draw the dialect boundaries or rate marked dialect regions on various scales. Overall, there are two admired varieties shown by mapping task participants – the standard, educated, and prescribed variety and the participants' own, home dialect. Finally, mapping tasks often illustrate that participants assess those varieties considered to be 'pleasant' and those varieties considered to be 'correct' in inverse ways (Preston 1993). This is demonstrated in Preston (1999), with a perceptual experiment on Southeastern Michigan and Southern Indiana speakers, where the assignments of pleasantness and correctness are reversed depending on who is prescribing the label. Considering Labov's notion of 'linguistic insecurity' (1966), Preston and other perceptual dialectologists have stated that speakers

of regional varieties find their own language variety to be warm, friendly, and trustworthy, and at the same time unintelligent and slow. Furthermore, they regard speakers of more standard varieties as cold and unsympathetic, while intelligent and ambitious (Preston 2002, Garret 2010, Tucker and Lambert 1975).

Despite the fact that folk dialectology methods are not implemented in this current research, the concepts of the pattern reversals and the effect of discourse will be very beneficial to the coming analysis. To attend to the question of linguistic discourse, that is tropes about language, Preston (1993) implements the interview method where language is the topic of conversation. He writes, "folk belief reflects dynamic processes which allow non-specialists to provide an account of their worlds" (1993, 195). From these interviews, Preston derived two general themes. First, interviewees often discuss social and distributional facts about language varieties, where lexicon functions as the primary distinguisher between language varieties. Secondly, the conversation usually leans towards language acquisition and use, where participants say that language forms just one part of the general cultural environment, that local language varieties are naturally acquired in said environment, and that when a newcomer arrives in a new local landscape, they are motivated to accommodate (Preston 1993).

Discourses carry heavy ideological weight when it comes to questions of language perception and this is a central idea to the current study. Public and national discourses about language create social psychological indexes from which people create fluctuating perceptions and attitudes towards language variation. The current research aims to bridge the gap between sociolinguistic variation and perception, folk dialectology and discourse, and the social psychological components of language perception.

#### 2.1.3 Social psychological approaches to language perception

The experimental approaches to the social psychological study of language, pioneered by Lambert et. al. (1960), form the primary influence of this project. Research in this line of work is essentially interdisciplinary in that it combines linguistic variation, sociolinguistic perception, and social psychological components of attitudes and categorizations. This section will start with a discussion of past research that utilized the Matched Guise technique and end with a discussion of important social psychological themes (i.e. warmth and competence) that will continue throughout the thesis.

### 2.1.3.1 Matched guise technique

This technique to the study of language perception and attitudes towards language varieties attempts to attend to those perceptions that are below the level of conscious awareness than those perceptions provided in folk dialectology and sociolinguistic perception research. One might want to call matched-guise perceptions 'implicit' though this term should be taken with some degree of caution because perceptions research in social psychology claims that 'implicit' perceptions are those attitudes and biases that people are unaware that they have (i.e. below the level of conscious awareness). In the matched guise methodology, a participant hears a voice speaking a language or a language variety and then he or she ranks the speaker on any number of scales that answer hypothetical questions about personality types, job positions, bilingual ability, etc. (Garret 2010). The participants of these studies are not limited by time restrictions and therefore they may take extra time to cognitively process the voice they are hearing in choosing their perception. An 'implicit' perception, in social psychological terms is one

that people are not aware of and thus, the perceptions that arise from a matched guise experiment may, in fact, be more explicit.

The key to the matched guise method is that the guises come from the same speaker, rather than from separate speakers. Using the same speaker holds properties of voice, such as pitch, vocal tract length, and speaking rate, constant while isolating the difference in language as the dependent variable.

Nevertheless, a matched guise experiment is extremely sophisticated in its capability to manipulate the perceptions of its participants. Lambert et al. (1960) implemented a matched-guise study in Quebec, where French-English bilingualism has been at the forefront of many social and linguistic issues. Four bilingual (French and English) speakers read a passage aloud in order to create the audio stimuli. Participants listened to these recordings, in English and in French, and responded to a number of questions about the ostensibly different speakers they had just heard. The respondents were divided into two groups: Canadian French-speaking and English-speaking. The participants were asked to evaluate the English-speaking guise and the French-speaking guise according to fourteen different traits: height, good looks, leadership, sense of humor, intelligence, religiousness, self-confidence, dependability, entertainingness, kindness, sociability, ambition, character, and likeability. Results from this experiment are striking in that the English speakers more favorably perceive the English guise, which for the researchers was expected. However, the French-speaking respondents rated the English guises also more favorably and their responses to the French guises were much less favorable than the English speaker responses. Lambert et al. noted that "French speaking and English speaking people are so widely accepted in the Montreal community

that even those English Ss [speakers] with positive attitudes towards French may still perceive them as inferior on many traits" (Lambert et. al. 1960, 50). This is to say that even though a French speaker may overtly have negative feelings towards his/her English speaker neighbor, he/she may also perceive this neighbor more favorably for certain traits. As I shall demonstrate below, this is also the case in bilingual (Spanish – English) Miami; Latino respondents and non-Latino respondents perceive different varieties of Spanish differently, depending on the trait itself. This follows from Labov's discussion of ethnic differences in perception (1966).

A number of other studies have followed the matched-guised methods set forth by Lambert et al. For example, Tucker and Lambert (1975) ran a matched-guise perception experiment on various English dialects in order to show how Anglo-Whites and African American respondents perceive their respective ethnolinguistic varieties differently. Following the same methodology, their results show clear perceptual divisions between these two ethnic groups. For example, the African American judges rated the 'Educated White Southern' speakers least favorably on all traits, while both the northern and southern White judges rated the 'Mississippi group' least favorably. Additionally, three participant groups (Northern White, Southern African American, and Southern White) rated 'network' speech as the most favorable. Again, here we can clearly pattern shifts around which participants are providing the rating.

Research conducted using matched-guise techniques in Catalonia, Spain shows significant perception differences between local Spanish and immigrant Latino participants (Newman 2011). Immigrant Latino participants show negative feelings towards Barcelona and Catalán, which they perceive to be an obstacle upon arrival. One

of the Cuban respondents said in the interview portion of the research that she usually goes out with other Latinos, suggesting a choice of cultural solidarity. Ultimately, the perceptions of the Latino immigrants towards Peninsular Spanish are explained by Newman (2011) where the Latino participants feel that Peninsular Spanish is less polite and Newman attributes these attitudes to the idea that Peninsular Spanish as a linguistic system less frequently uses markers of politeness, such as *por favor* (please), and more commonly uses the informal personal pronoun system *tú* as opposed to the more formal *usted*.

There are a number of studies that do not implement the matched guise methodology but pertain specifically to perceptions of Spanish in the United States (Alfaraz 2002, 2014; Diaz-Campos and Navarro-Galisteo 2009; and Carter and Lynch 2014).

The research carried about by Diaz-Campos and Navarro-Galisteo (2009) shows the categorization of a number of Spanish language varieties by speakers of these varieties and found that "linguistic experience" is a significant factor in dialect recognition. Additionally, the authors claim that "naïve listeners of different Spanish dialect varieties can make judgments about an unfamiliar talker's country of origin without being trained on what to listen for..." (193). Their major claim is that contact with language varieties encodes memories, or cognitive associations, that are connected with immediate perceptions and judgments about such varieties.

Alfaraz (2002) investigated the Spanish language scene present in Miami and discusses two distinct language contact situations. First, Cuban Spanish is in contact with other Spanish language varieties. Second, Cuban Spanish is in contact with two varieties

of itself: Cuba-Pre (prior to the 1959 revolution) and Cuba-Post (post the 1959 revolution). She notes two important findings that are relevant to the current study. There appears to be a political ideology interacting with the perception of Cuban Spanish in which the Cubans themselves are enacting a separatist function from the Spanish currently spoken on the island by rating the Cuba-Pre variety as significantly more pleasant than the Cuba-Post variety. Furthermore, Alfaraz discusses the notion "Cuban self-exemption", where the speakers of this variety are aware of the stigmatization towards Caribbean Spanish varieties, yet they do not recognize that their language variety belongs to that dialect group. This pattern of self-exemption is found in some of the original perceptual dialectology work conducted by Preston (see for example 1993 and 1996). Alfaraz (2014) conducted a restudy of her prior (Alfaraz 2002) work on Spanish language perceptions in Miami and she found that the perceptual distinction between the Cuba-Pre and Cuba-Post varieties increased. For example, when participants ranked the varieties in terms of correctness, Cuba-Pre maintained its position as the second highest overall just behind Spain. However, the perceptions of the Cuban-Post variety were "heavily downgraded because it is on the opposite side of the ideological divide separating Miami-Cubans from their homeland" (Alfaraz, 2014, 83). Her results show the continual perceived prestige of the Miami Cuban diaspora as compared to the variety of Spanish spoken on the island.

Carter and Lynch (2013) conducted the preface to the current study by analyzing the perceptions of Spanish and English by Miami bilinguals. Using matched-guise techniques, their results show that the same voice reading a passage once in English and once in Spanish can elicit distinct perceptions and attitudes. For example, when the

passage was read in English, the speaker was rated in the aggregate, that is by all study participants, as significantly more intelligent and assumed to earn a higher salary then when read in Spanish. These divisions demonstrate the attitudes that people, especially the bilingual population of Miami, have towards other languages or language varieties. They also show variant perceptions elicited from the Latina/o and the non-Latina/o participants, suggesting that the Latina/o participants perceive Spanish more negatively in some cases, for example.

Although the studies outlined here differ in methodological approaches, they are united in showing, as Ryan et al. (1982, 2) say, that "attitudes towards particular varieties are then taken to be attitudes towards speakers of those varieties." This echoes Carranza (1982), who writes that social structure and cultural values determine levels of prestige assigned to language varieties, which in turn affect perception. In the context of Spanish speaking Miami, this idea is key given the remarkable Spanish language dialect diversity.

Finally, much of the research reviewed here calls for the collaboration of dialectologists and social psychologists if researchers want to better understand how languages are perceived (Tucker and Lambert 1975, Goeman 1999, Ryan et. al. 1982, Carranza 1982, Giles and Ryan 1982). As an attempt at unifying the two areas of academic study, the experimental design of this thesis implements social psychological themes, which are outlined in the following section.

## 2.1.3.2 Social psychological themes

This research takes as its core social psychological theme Massey's (2007) idea that social categorization is central to social cognition, that social categories are the basis for social judgment, and these judgments entail sociological consequences. With this is

mind, the experiment presented below will explore how perceptions towards different Spanish language varieties show real world material stratification. In order to better understand the cognitive processes that help in determining perceptions towards language or the groups of speakers, researchers, sociolinguists in particular, should understand a few key social psychological concepts.

First, humans, as the result of general principles of human cognition endowed by evolution, are programmed for social categorization and to use these categorizations for social judgments (Massey 2007, Tetel Andresen and Carter 2015). Furthermore, "over hundreds of human generations, linguistic terms have been coined to express finer and finer cognitive distinctions, but language has been used to socialize the communicable part of human intelligence" (Fiedler and Semin 1992). This is to say that the attitudes and perceptions that will be detailed below are the result of complex cognitive processes in which people encounter different language varieties, speakers of these varieties, and discourses about the dialects and from these encounters develop and engrain a number of perceptions and stereotypes. Continuing in this line of thought, Maas and Arcuri (1992) illustrate the "maintenance and interpersonal transmission of stereotypic beliefs in real life settings" (141). For example, one may envision subtle language biases in the legal system where the style of language used to describe an event is more abstract. The study presented by Mass and Arcuri (1992) demonstrates how abstract language is used to describe undesirable out-groups and desirable in-groups and how these descriptions tend to support negative perceptions of the out-group and positive perceptions towards the ingroup. For the purposes of this study, I will not discuss any participant's explicit attitudes

towards language; however, the resulting perceptions are, in part, a result of abstract national discourses about language.

Everyday experience and interaction with public opinion about Spanish language variation serve as the basis for how people (i.e. Miami area students) form perceptions of a largely-spoken language in Miami. One particularly important notion is the 'immigrant as threat' ideology (Chavez 2008, Santa Ana 2002, Stephen et. al. 2005). Hostile attitudes towards immigrant populations, specifically the Hispanic population in the United States, stem in part from perceived threat from immigration. In concert with Santa Ana's (2002) description of the metaphors used to describe Latinos in the United States (i.e. immigrant as animal), the majority population often finds it challenging, in rather uninformed fashions, to interact with immigrants due to differences in cultural values and language (Stephen et. al. 2005). These discussions of the angst that non-Latinos, Anglo-Whites in particular, feel towards immigrant populations, specifically U.S. Latinos as opposed to Asians or Indians (Lee and Fiske 2006) are generally based on cities with different historical backgrounds. Our understanding about how non-Latinos perceive Latinos in cultural terms is based primarily on cities with very different historical backgrounds and socio-demographic profiles than Miami.

The last social psychological notion vital to this thesis is the Stereotype Content Model (SCM) and the dimensions of warmth and competence (Fiske, Glick, and Xu 2002, Fiske, Cuddy, and Glick 2007). The SCM states that there are two primary dimensions universal to all perceptions: warmth and competence. There is an inverse relationship between warmth and competence traits, such that those who are perceived as highly competent are not perceived as highly warm, and vice versa. Traits that are

considered 'warm' are those most related to intent, friendliness, trustworthiness, sincerity, etc. 'Competence' traits relate to perceived ability, skill, intelligence, etc. In everyday interactions, 82% of the variance in perceptions is comprised of warmth and competence (Fiske, Cuddy, and Glick 2007). When it comes to the interaction of these two dimensions, it is common to find results where the warmth traits are high and the competence traits are low, or vice-versa, which shows negative correlations (Fiske et. al. 2002).

These two dimensions of the SCM are constantly in concert with one another. Here I want to emphasize two points, based on the literature on this topic. First, high warmth perceptions and low competence perceptions correlate with paternalistic mindsets, while low warmth and high competence with envious mindsets (Fiske et. al. 2002). Second, for subordinate and noncompetitive groups (e.g. elderly people) positive warmth stereotypes complement the low competent perceptions to maintain their privilege and for high status out-groups, such as Asians in the United States, high competence perceptions and low warmth perceptions explain in-group resentment towards these groups (Fiske et. al. 2002). Additionally, the social psychology literature states that the warmth dimension carries more weight in affective reactions (Fiske et. al. 2007), meaning that initial perceptions of language varieties are more focused on warmth traits. This idea is explained as an effect of the human evolution process, where a person encountering another person needs to first (and rather quickly) assess the other's intentions (i.e. their warmth) and secondary to that, they assess their ability to carry out their intentions (i.e. their competence). This can also be explained by stating that the warmth attributes predict the valence of interpersonal judgment, which is either positive

or negative, and those attributes considered to mark competence predict *how* positive or how negative the intentions are of the other. What is also important to consider is how the dimension of competence can extend to notions such as blue-collar and white-collar occupations.

Returning to the topic of perceiving immigrant groups, Lee and Fiske (2006) write that immigrants' nationality plays a role in determining stereotypes, as a function of social structure. Lee and Fiske (2006) provide three levels on which people conceptualize immigrants: 1) the generic immigrant who receives low warmth and competence perceptions, 2) immigrant clusters which are uniquely defined by one attribute (i.e. low warmth or competence or solely high warmth), and 3) immigrants defined by specific origins. I will primarily consider level number three in the coming analysis, as the specific national-origin labels will play a critical role in the formation of perceptions and attitudes. As I will illustrate below, perceptions of these immigrant groups are not consistently low on warmth and low on competence, as is suggested in Lee and Fiske (2002).

The people who encounter these immigrant groups and their languages and language varieties on a daily basis have preconceived notions about the countries of origin, including the economic status of nationals immigrating from that country. These preconceived notions about certain national origins (e.g. Spain, Colombia, Cuba, etc.) interact with the specific language varieties of the countries in creating and maintain sociolinguistic perceptions.

#### 2.2 The Miami context

Among major U.S. metropolitan areas, Miami has the largest Latino population proportionally speaking, although Los Angeles has more Spanish speakers in total. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 65% of the residents of Miami-Dade County identified as Hispanic or Latino. In Miami city, the figure increases to 70% and in Miami-area municipalities such as Doral and Hialeah, 80% and 95% of the population identify has Hispanic or Latino, respectively. The only other major U.S. metropolitan area with a Latino population above 50% is San Antonio (Brown & Lopez 2013). Additionally, Miami differs from other U.S. cities with large Latino populations in at least two other respects: first, Miami's Latino population is characterized by a nationalorigin diversity unseen in other U.S. cities. Cuban-Americans still constitute the largest group, but their share has decreased to just over half (54%) in the past two decades as Miami has become a hub for Latin Americans, attracting not only political and economic exiles, but also entrepreneurs from a variety of industries (Carter and Lynch 2015). For example, Colombia's economic crisis of the 1990s, Venezuela's crisis in the era of Chavismo, and Spain's current economic crisis have resulted in the expansion of those groups. Miami is also home to sizeable and growing communities of Peruvians, Chileans, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Ecuadorans, Argentines, and Hondurans, among others. In short, Miami is now home to every large national-origin group in the Spanish-speaking world, perhaps making it the most dialectally diverse Spanish-speaking city in the world (Carter and Lynch, forthcoming). Finally, Miami's Latino population differs from that of other major U.S. cities in that it is remarkably foreign-born -65% of Miami Latinos were born abroad. This dense national-origin diversity sets the stage for a "vibrant Miami

enclave offering the highest levels of economic, social, and cultural support" (McHugh, Miyares, and Skop 1997).

Attendant to Miami's Spanish dialect diversity are ideologies about nationalorigin varieties, which have found traction in Spanish-speaking Miami. Ideological tropes in high-circulation include: Colombian Spanish is the clearest and most elegant, Spanish from Spain is the prettiest and the best overall, and Cuban Spanish is the most vulgar. But these ideologies are complicated by the sociolinguistic and sociological reality in which these national-origin groups are actually deeply connected in the Miami context. The Miami-born increasingly do not come from Cuban families, but families comprised of one Cuban parent and one Colombian parent, a Spaniard and a Colombian, a Venezuelan and a Nicaraguan, and so forth. We have also noticed a phenomenon in which Miami Cubans highlight Spanish heritage, such as our example of the man who is *cubano*español. The highlighting of Spanish heritage gives us the first clue that language perceptions not arise solely from linguistic variation, but also from ideologies about *national origins*. All of this is to say that national-original labels – and the family background stories they invoke – potentially carry a great deal of ideological and sociological weight in Spanish-speaking Miami.

#### 2.3 Spanish language variation (Cuba, Colombia, Spain)

Studies within the field of Hispanic Dialectology are abundant and have played an important role in distinguishing social and geographical varieties of Spanish. Within the context of Miami, Spanish dialect variation plays a crucial role when it comes to questions of language perception, identity association, and cultural solidarity. As noted in the previous section on the Miami context, the city is a hub for all major national origin

varieties of Spanish. For the purposes of the current paper, I will now focus on a discussion of the principal dialect differences between the three Spanish language varieties in question: Peninsular Spanish (specifically the central and northern variety), Highland Colombian, and Post-Castro Cuban. These distinguishing dialect features will be important in later sections of this paper because they are essentially the driving forces behind the bottom-up stimulus used in the experiment (i.e. audio recordings of the dialects).

All of the varieties used as stimuli in this study have been described thoroughly in the dialectology literature. As I am not interested in testing the perception of specific dialect features as such, the following description will be general in nature and focus on the major phonetic, morphosyntactic, syntactic, lexical, and suprasegmental features characterizing each variety (Alvar 1996, Lipski, 1996, 2011 Quilis 2010, *inter alia*).

### 2.3.1 Peninsular Spanish

A profile of the speaker who represents this variety of Spanish will be provided in a later section. Here, I will outline the general dialect features of the Peninsular Spanish variety. However, the Peninsular Spanish variety is in no way a singular dialect variety. For example, within Spain there are the following varieties: el español castellano (Castilan Spanish), el español andaluz (a southern Spanish variety), and el español canario (Canary Island Spanish) (Fernández 2009), among others. However, this list of dialects can be further subdivided. For example, we may consider that the northeastern part of Spain, which includes the autonomous regions of Aragon and Catalonia to be a separate dialect region from Castille, which has as its epicenter around the capital city of

Madrid (see Alvar 1996 for an overview of the Peninsular varieties). For the purpose of this research, I will focus on a description of Castilian.

Perhaps the most salient feature of this variety of Peninsular Spanish is a part of the dialect's phonological inventory – the phenomenon known as distinction of the voiceless alveolar fricative /s/ and the voiceless interdental fricative / $\theta$ /, i.e. the orthographic representations of 'z' and 'c + i, e' are rendered as / $\theta$ / and all 's' as /s/. For example, this feature would apply to the following words in Peninsular Spanish: *ciudad*, *zumo*, and, *nación* ([ $\theta$ iuðáð], [ $\theta$ úmo], [na $\theta$ ión], respectively). In addition, as shown in the transcription of *ciudad*, this feature can also apply to /d/ when found in syllable and word-final positions, if it does not undergo a process of elision (Alvar 1996). Crucially, this feature only applies to the northern and central regions of Spain; if we consider the southern and eastern most areas of the country, we then come across ceceo, which is described as the neutralization of /s/ and / $\theta$ /, where all orthographic 's' and 'c/z' are rendered as / $\theta$ /. Lastly, some regions of Spain neutralize these sounds as /s/ and this is known as seseo. (Fernández 2009).

The next feature of Castilian Spanish that is considered to be unique to the region is the articulation of the phoneme /s/ as an apical sound, where the tip of the tongue, as opposed to the tongue blade, creates its occlusion at the alveolar ridge. This articulatory difference results in a clear perceptual difference between Peninsular and other varieties of Spanish. Fernández describes this notion by stating that when native English speakers attempt to imitate Spanish from Spain, they will often exaggerate this apical pronunciation and produce a palato-alveolar fricative - /esh/ (2009). The overall region of central and northern Spain is considered to be linguistically conservative. That is to
say that, for example, speakers of this variety will maintain, as opposed to weakening or deleting, consonants in syllable final position. This is a common feature of central or highland varieties of Spanish and we will return to this idea when we arrive at our discussion of Spanish in Colombia. One final phonetic feature of Castilian Spanish is the tense production of the voiceless velar fricative [x] (Fernández 2009) - examples.

In addition to phonetic variation, Peninsular Spanish is also characterized by a number of morphosyntactic and lexical features. The most distinctive morphosyntactic feature related to the current student is the use of the second person plural subject, vosotros, instead of the more widely used outside of Spanish, ustedes. This region makes a distinction between these two subjects where *vosotros* refers to 'you all'and *ustedes* refers to 'they'. Other regions of the Spanish speaking world, as we will see below, do not make such a distinction and use *ustedes* to refer to both 'you all' and 'they'. The verb to speak (hablar), for example, conjugated in the vosotros form will be realized as vosotros habláis. Another morphosyntactic feature that distinguishes Peninsular Spanish is *leísmo*, where the indirect object pronoun *le* is used in place of the direct object pronouns lo and la, especially when referring to other humans (i.e. esta noche voy a *verles* – I'm going to see *them* tonight). Another distinguishable feature of Peninsular Spanish is the variable use of the *-se* suffix attached to verbs conjugated in the past subjunctive, rather than the -ra suffix. For example, the verb *cantar* (to sing) may be conjugated as cantase instead of cantara (Fernández 2009, Alvar 1996). To provide a more transparent comparison between the three dialects in question for this study, I will provide the lexical variations between the varieties at the end of this section and I will

now present the phonetic and morphosyntactic properties of Highland Colombian Spanish.

#### 2.3.2 Highland Colombian Spanish

Much like the context of Spain, Colombian Spanish cannot be described as a singular, unique unit. Due to its own insular dialect variation, where the coastal regions of Colombia reflect dialect features similar to Caribbean varieties of Spanish and the more inland and highland zones are more linguistically conservative, I will only discuss here the common features of Highland Colombian Spanish. This geographic region has as its center the capital city of Bogotá and forms a part of what is considered to be Andean Spanish, a macro-dialect region formed by Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and northeastern Brazil.

Firstly, the conservation of syllable final /s/ is a common feature of highland zones across the Spanish-speaking world and it is what typically marks linguistically conservative dialects. The non-weakening of syllable final /s/ to [h] or even to deletion is a marker not only of highland geographic location, but also a marker of more prestigious varieties, such as Mexican Spanish and Castilian Spanish. However, one feature related to syllable final /s/ retention, is the realization of syllable initial /s/ as [h], in Highland Colombian zones (Lipski 1996). The speaker used to create the stimuli for this variety of Spanish does not realize any syllable initial /s/ as [h], however it is worthwhile to note this is a distinctive features of the dialect. In addition to consistently maintaining sibilant productions of /s/, Highland Colombian Spanish speakers also have a much weaker production of /x/, the voiceless velar fricative, when compared to Castilian Spanish. Fernández (2009) states that Highland Colombian Spanish is a variety that distinguishes

between the following phonemes -  $/\Lambda$ / and /j/ (the palatal lateral approximant and the voiced palatal fricative, respectively). Colombia as a country is that does practice *yeísmo*, but specifically the area around Bogotá still maintains the distinction, in part due to consistent immigration from the more rural areas to the urban center (Fernández 2009, Lipski 1996).

Colombian Spanish also has a number of distinctive morphosyntactic features. First, Colombian Spanish speakers will often use what is considered to be the formal subject pronoun *usted* in informal and personal situations (i.e. among family members), where typically a Colombian Spanish speaker might use informal subject pronoun *tú*. In addition, Colombian Spanish maintains, however preferentially and variably, the use of *vos*, yet another informal second person subject pronoun. Highland Colombian Spanish is also described as a region that utilizes both *leísmo* and the *loísmo*. Although it is known a feature of costal Colombian Spanish and generally Caribbean Spanish as well, Lipski (1996) claims that even in the central areas of Bogotá, one may hear a speaker produce infinitival pronominal subjects, such as *para él sacar mejores notas* (so that he gets better grades). Here again, my intention is not to provide an extensive list of features of each variety, but rather a general overview of the dialects, via contrastive analysis.

#### 2.3.3 Cuban Spanish

Within the Spanish-speaking world, Cuban Spanish (and more generally speaking Caribbean Spanish) has been studied in sociolinguistic contexts both on the island and in the United States (Alfaraz 2012, Alvord 2010, Lynch 2009, *inter alia*) and also in Spanish second language acquisition (i.e. Lamboy 2008). Cuban Spanish plays an important role in the sociolinguistic variations and language perceptions that are at play

currently in Miami. Cuban Spanish does have a number of unique phonetic and morphosyntactic features.

First, syllable final /s/ weakening is probably the most salient feature of this variety of Spanish. Of course, the aspiration and deletion of /s/ is not unique to Cuba; instead, it is common among many, if not all, coastal varieties of Spanish (i.e. Alba 1990, Callesano 2014, Erker 2010, *inter alia*). Another feature of Cuban Spanish that is different from Highland Colombian and Peninsular Spanish is the articulatory realization of word and phrase final /n/ as velar - [ŋ] - instead of alveolar. Cuban Spanish has two phonetic features that are related: lateralization of /r/ and rhotacism of /l/. The lateralization of /l/ is the process of the realization syllable final /r/ as [1], as in *amor* [amól] and *parque* [pálke]. The second process, although less common than lateralization, turns /l/ into the rhotic [r], such as *alma* [árma] and *pincel* [pinsér] (Lamboy 2008). Lipski extends his discussion of this specific feature to the context of the United States by stating:

... la pronunciación de /r/ en posición final de sintagma es un diferenciador sociolingüístico fundamental entre los primeros grupos de inmigrantes, que representaban a las clases profesionales de La Habana, y los que llegaron durante y después del conflicto del Mariel en 1980, entre los cuales hay una proporción mayoritaria de hablantes de las clases trabajadoras y de habitantes de las provincias rurales y centrales" (1996, 257).

Another important feature of Cuban Spanish is one that is also shared with Peninsular Spanish – the weakening of intervocalic /d/. For example, when speaking in the past perfect, a Cuban Spanish speaker may weaken the intervocalic approximant so much that it is essentially deleted – *he hablado* [e aβláðo]  $\rightarrow$  [e aβláo] (Lamboy 2008).

The morphosyntactic features of Cuban Spanish are also abundant. First, the suffix, which marks the diminutive in Cuban Spanish, is different compared to Peninsular Spanish, however it is similar to Colombian Spanish. Peninsular Spanish will utilize the suffix -ito, as in dedito, however Caribbean varieties of Spanish may also utilize the suffix *–ico*, as in *momentico*, however this distinction is phonological motivated. Another example of a morphosyntactic variant of Cuban Spanish is found in the process of question inversion. Most varieties of Spanish will invert the subject and the verb, when the subject is overtly realized, such as ¿Cómo se llama usted? (What is your (formal) name?). However, Cuban Spanish speakers may keep the subject pronoun in its preverbal positon, such as ¿Qué tú quieres? (What do you want)? Similarly to the Colombian Spanish dialect, Cuban Spanish speakers are likely to use infinitival subjects. Lastly, the Cuban Spanish variety, much like other Caribbean varieties, is known for its higher rates of overt subject pronouns. Since Spanish provides its information on the subject of an event as a part of the fusional verbal morphology, the subject pronouns are often omitted. However, Caribbean Spanish is known for its speakers to use subject pronouns, especially yo, tú, and usted, even after the subject is initially introduced at the beginning of the discourse (Lamboy 2008, Lipski 1996).

To complete this section on Spanish dialect variation, I will provide a few examples of the lexical variations among the three dialects of interest to this study.

The descriptions of the phonetic and morphosyntactic features of Peninsular, Colombian, and Cuban Spanish provided above are not exhaustive, however they do help to set the stage for the of this research – the perception experiment.

## 3. Methodology

## **3.1 Introduction**

The project presented below is a social psychological experiment nestled within a perceptual dialectology study and thus the data speak to both sociologists and sociolinguists. We conduct this research under the notion that language is always catching up to social conditions (Giles and Ryan 1982 and Andresen and Carter in press). From a language variation point of view, a change in the social strata (Massey 2007) will be a cause for linguistic change and from a social psychological view a social change will lead to variable social perceptions, adaptions, and categorizations. Both the social and linguistic variations will affect the overall social and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986) that guide Miami residents in the formation of their language perceptions. One particular feature of social categorization that is essential to our study is the dichotomy of warmth and competence traits (Fiske et. al. 2007). "Human social cognition and stereotyping involve the cognitive placement of groups and individuals in a two-dimensional social space defined by the intersection of independent axes of warmth and competence" (Fiske, et. al. 2007). To this regard, Carter and Lynch (2013) found significant differences between their Spanish and English guises and for the community of Spanish speaking Miami at large this attribute distinction can lead to significant effects of identity choice/prescription, language choice/attrition, and cultural capital.

The main idea is that place-based labels convey certain social information to which interloctors are sensitive. Thus, in the context of Spanish speaking Miami, in the phrase "español cubano" the word 'Cuba' serves as a proxy for the acoustic signal itself. In other words, stereotypes, attitudes, perceptions, and representations are linked to *both* 

the acoustic signal – what I will call a "bottom-up" stimulus – and at the same time to sociopolitical and socio-geographic labels that index that variety of speech – what I will call a "top-down" stimulus. It has been noted that listeners are sensitive to both top-down and bottom-up stimuli separately, but the present study ties them together by simultaneously implementing two methodologies (see Lambert 1960, Preston 1993, and Goeman 1999).

## 3.2 Research questions and hypotheses

The studies mentioned above have furthered our understandings of the cognitive representations of language varieties and crucially, the formation of patterns of social categorization and social biases. What sociolinguists do not yet fully understand, however, is what factors contribute the most weight to mental representations of language varieties. What contributions to mental representations about Spanish language varieties are made by hearing the varieties themselves, and what contributions are made by hearing some kind of story about them? The larger question at play here is how these two stimuli interact with one another to form perceptions and attitudes as far as Spanish language varieties in Miami are concerned. By fusing approaches to perceptual dialectology we are able to see which element - the speech stream or the national-origin label - plays a more crucial role in eliciting language perceptions. Below I separate the three research questions this research attempts to answer as well as the respective hypotheses.

### **3.2.1 Research question #1**

Question: How do the bottom-up and top-down stimuli interact to shape perceptions about Spanish language varieties in dialect-rich Miami?

Hypothesis: The addition of the top-down stimulus (i.e. the family background information) will influence perceptions, both positively and negatively. This is to say that a variety that is often stigmatized may receive more positive perceptions when the family background information indexes a more favorable variety of Spanish.

### 3.2.2 Research question #2

Question: How do the language perceptions differ based on the ethnicity of the listener (Tucker and Lambert 1975)?

Hypothesis: Non-Latino participants in Miami will show more critical and negative perceptions towards all of the varieties when compared to the Latino participants.

## 3.2.3 Research question #3

Question: Do the participants who identify with Cuba as their national origin significantly influence the perceptions of the general Hispanic/Latino subgroup? The demographic presence of Cubans in Miami may be driving the perceptual ratings provided by the Hispanic participant, although the majority Cuban population has fallen to just over half in recent years.

Hypothesis: Within the Latino subgroup, those of Cuban national-origin will show solidarity with their stigmatized variety by rating it higher than those participants who come from countries other than Cuba.

## **3.3 Experimental methodology**

### **3.3.1 Experimental manipulation**

This study is interested in two types of perceptions: first in the perceptions of the Spanish dialects themselves and, second, in the interaction of these dialects with the

given social information. As described above, traditional matched-guise methodologies derive perceptions by using one speaker – a bilingual – to represent two languages. However, the manipulation in this study is found in the matching (or mismatching) of the Spanish dialect and the respective national-origin label. This is not to say that the current study follows the matched-guise method, but that it takes as its major influence the experimental design of such studies. This method allows researchers to see the interaction of the dialect features, the bottom-up stimulus, and the family background information, the top-down stimulus. In other words, rather than listening to audio recordings of different dialects of Spanish and making judgments based solely on the acoustic signal, participants in this study listened to recordings, which were accompanied by information about the speaker on the screen. One of these pieces of information was the country of origin the speaker's parents. The following two sections will describe the two types of stimuli.

#### 3.3.2 Stimuli

#### 3.3.2.1 "Bottom-up" stimuli: The Dialects

The voices used as the instrument in the study come from recordings made with three male residents of Miami who are originally from Barcelona (Spain), Bogotá (Colombia), and La Habana (Cuba). All speakers were college educated in their country of origin, were between the ages of 25 and 35, are currently professionally employed in Miami, and have lived in the United States for at least one year. Each of the three speakers was given a brief passage to read aloud, which were digitally recorded using a ZOOM H1 handheld audio recorder. Sound files were edited in PRAAT to remove pauses and other disfluencies. Finally, each recording was cut down to a similar length

(25 seconds). The passage each speaker read aloud to create the audio stimuli (Carter and Lynch 2013) was designed to include phonetic features of each of the Spanish dialects, such as  $/\theta$ / for Peninsular Spanish,  $/\eta$ / for Cuban Spanish, and retention of syllable-final /s/ for Highland Colombian (see Appendix). The content topic was controlled and pertained to the health risks of smoking, which I feel to be a fairly neutral topic that would not be a potential factor driving participant perceptions either up or down (Campbell-Kibler 2013). Throughout this research, these stimuli are referred to as the "bottom-up" stimuli; this is to say that they represent the linguistic features of the dialect, specifically the phonetic features that distinguish each dialect. Questions of morphosyntactic and lexical variation were controlled by the preparation of the reading passage. Relating to one of the research questions of this investigation, the bottom-up stimulus refers to hearing the varieties themselves (i.e. the sociolinguistic approach to perceptual dialectology) as opposed to hearing something about the speaker, which represents the top-down stimulus portion of this study.

#### 3.3.2.2 "Top-down" stimuli: National Origin Family Background Labels

The novel aspect of this research, which adds to the current literature in sociolinguistic and perceptual dialectology, lies in what I am calling the "top-down" stimulus. This stimulus represents, in part, the folk dialectology method of eliciting perceptions and attitudes from the names of language varieties. As stated earlier, this type of stimulus has been implemented in prior research, however never in concert with bottom-up stimuli. The top-down stimuli in this study were presented to the participants in the form of national-origin labels about the speaker. More specifically, these labels do not refer to the country of origin of the speaker himself, but rather of his parents. For this

reason, I refer to this stimulus more commonly as "family background" or "social" information. Crucially, this stimulus represents a sociological reality in Miami – the continually mobile population of very diverse heritages (McHugh, Miyares, and Skop 1997). This is to say that due to the current demographics of Miami and the general South Florida region, it is very believable that Spanish-speakers' parents may originate from a different country, be it Spain, Colombia, Cuba, or a number of other countries. Finally, a key factor of the top-down stimuli is the combination with the bottom-up stimulus. In some cases, the family background information matched the dialect and in others the two stimuli were mismatched (i.e. Speaker of Cuban Spanish with parents from Highland Colombia). In just one case, the top-down stimulus was omitted, but this will be discussed in section 3.5 below. All possible voice-profile presentations in the study were randomized in order to control for ordering effects. In table 4 below I present all of the possible bottom-up and top down permutations.

Bottom-up	Matching top-	Mismatching	Mismatching	No top-down
dialect	down	top-down	top-down	information
	information	information (1)	information (2)	
Peninsular	Parents are	Parents are from	Parents are from	N/A
Spanish	from Spain	Colombia	Cuba	
Highland	Parents are	Parents are from	Parents are from	N/A
Colombian	from Colombia	Spain	Cuba	
Post-Castro	Parents are	Parents are from	Parents are from	N/A
Cuban	from Cuba	Spain	Colombia	

Table 1. Dialect and social information permutations

In the sections that follow, I will discuss the types of questions implemented in this perceptual study. These questions pertain to the warmth/competence split, described in section 2.1.3.2 above, material sociological consequences such as annual income and blue-collar and white-collar occupations, language maintenance and usage, and family values.

## 3.4 Survey questions

In this section, I will describe the questions the participants responded to in the Qualtrics survey. The design of this survey mostly implements Likert scale rating questions, however some questions are presented in the form of a list where participants chose one of the provided options (i.e. annual income of the speaker). All questions were randomized differently for each participant in the online survey. See Appendix for the full list of survey questions.

### 3.4.1 Warmth/competence questions

This set consisted of rating tasks regarding the commonly documented competence/warmth split (i.e. Carter and Lynch 2013, Fiske et. al. 2002 and 2007, Lambert 1960, *inter alia*). These questions were implemented in the survey to attend to the hypothesis that the national-origin labels will interact with the dialects in that less prestigious varieties may receive higher warmth/competence ratings if the national-original label reflects a prestigious dialect. For each trait, participants had to choose one of the following Likert scale options:

Table 2. Likert scale for ratings

The traits that represented the "competence" dimension refer to those traits that reflect the speakers' abilities and skills. These are: *intelligent, self-confident*, and *trustworthy*. In contrast, the three traits used to represent the "warmth" dimension are

those that reflect the speakers' perceived intentions. These are: *friendly, kind*, and, *outgoing*. In addition, a seventh characteristic was included in the same rating task, although it does not necessarily fit into the Stereotype Content Model's warmth/competence dimensions (Fiske et. al. 2002, Fiske, Cuddy, and Glick 2007). That trait is *physical attractiveness*, included due to its significance in the results of Carter and Lynch (2013) and Lambert (1960).

#### 3.4.2 Blue-collar/white-collar and annual income questions

These questions were presented to the participants in two different styles in order to test the effect of the top-down stimuli and also to test how language perceptions can entail sociological consequences. First, the annual income questions were shown as a list of a multitude of annual income ranges (i.e. 60.1 - 70k). Participants were asked to rate both the speakers' current annual income and their income five years from now. Additionally, the questions that attended to the popular blue-collar/white-collar occupational divide were presented as ranking tasks with the same 5-point Likert scale shown in section 3.4.1 above. The blue-collar occupations represented in this study are *someone who works behind the counter in a coffee shop* and *a salesperson in a cellphone store*, whereas the white-collar occupations are *a marketing executive* and *an attorney*. These rating tasks fort the blue-collar/white-collar split asked participants to rate the likelihood that the speakers' have either one of the aforementioned jobs.

### **3.4.3 Language maintenance and usage questions**

The questions provided to the participants in this section were abundant, however they all relate to issues of language maintenance and language use, which has been a topic of conversation in recent Hispanic/Latino studies (i.e. Lopez and González Barrera

2013). They were designed to test how the classic warmth/competence patterns could be extended to topics more commonly discussed in sociolinguistics. This survey also asks questions about whether or not the speakers will speak Spanish to their sons and daughters, their future success in learning English, how much TV the speakers watch in English, whether or not the speakers' use Spanish in bilingual settings, and if the speakers will still speak Spanish at home in the next decade. All of these questions were answered using the 5-point Likert scale.

## 3.4.4 Family value questions

The final set of questions focuses on the perceived family history of the speakers. Again, these questions are designed to tell us about how the interactions of top-down and bottom-up stimuli affect perceptual notions other than warmth/competence. The topdown stimuli only tell the participants the country of origin of the speakers' parents. This set of questions is designed to elicit perceptions about the family values of the speakers; this is to ask, for example, do the speakers come from a family that was poor, values hard work, provided them with opportunities to get ahead, was invested in their education, and where the previous generation did not have much of choice when it came to finding a job. All of these questions were also presented with the 5-point Likert scale.

#### 3.5 Participants

A total of 292 participants took the survey. 67% of the participants in the study identified as Hispanic/Latino and 33% were non-Latino, a group that includes African Americans, Anglo Whites, and other ethnicities. All participants were undergraduate students currently enrolled at Florida International University. Results that follow will be

discussed in terms of the above demographic information – in the aggregate and by participant ethnicity.

# **3.6 Procedure**

Participants were recruited during a two-week period to take part in this study,

which was programmed and administered online using Qualtrics survey software.

Participants were told they would be participating in a study titled "Intuitions about

Strangers" and a fictional introductory prompt informed them that:

"Recent scientific studies have shown that people can be amazingly good at guessing a stranger's occupation, even by something as simple as seeing a photograph of the stranger's bedroom, or seeing a sample of their handwriting. One study recently published in the journal *Psychological Science* found that people were about 65% accurate in judging a stranger's occupation from a list of four options, just after hearing the person speak for 30 seconds."

The fictitious introductory prompt allowed the participants to become familiar with the

general premise of the experiment. Additionally, it aims to cue the participants into

thinking about language, but not so much that they become overly critical of the language

they hear.

Giving participants the following pieces of information set up the experimental

manipulation.

Table 3. Information about speakers

1	All of the people live in Miami
2	All of them will speak Spanish
3	Don't worry if you don't speak Spanish yourself. Past scientific research shows you
	can make accurate intuitive judgments about people from hearing them speak even if
	you don't know the language
4	Each person you here will be between the ages of 30-32

Miami was listed as the current place of residence for all speakers in order to ground the study and listener perceptions in the local sociolinguistic environment. The age of the speakers was kept consistent (24-30 years old). Participants were asked to read a brief profile containing this background information to which I added one irrelevant piece of information – the subject's birthday – as well as the primary manipulation, which was the parents' country of origin. The irrelevant birthday information was included as a constant independent variable, which could contrast with the modified manipulation. I chose parents' country of origin for two reasons: first, in recognition of the sociological reality in Miami in which people are both mobile and of diverse heritage and second, it allows the experimental design to test the top-down dimension of the study with a believable story, where a Cuban Spanish speaker with parents from Colombia may not be out of the ordinary for Miami based participants, for example. Four versions of the speaker profile were created, including three versions in which the speaker's parents were said to have come from Spain, Colombia, or Cuba, plus one null-version where family background information was not provided. Table 9 below demonstrates one example of this set-up, which participants saw simultaneously as they heard the bottomup stimuli.

Table 4. Example of top-down stimulus

Speaker lives in Miami Born on July 9 Parents are from Cuba

\*Last line of this table was not bolded in the survey

It is important to remember that the voice behind the label is consistent throughout the experiment; the only change comes from the third line of the above table - the parents' country of origin. These profiles were randomly assigned to three separate speaker voices representing three dialect groups: Peninsular Spanish, Highland Colombian, and Cuban. Thus, participants might hear a Colombian voice, but believe the speaker's parents were Cuban; a Cuban voice with Spanish parents, and so on. Each participant only heard three voices with randomly assigned profiles, and no participant heard the same voice more than once. All voice-profile permutations were evenly distributed throughout the 292 participants, providing a robust number of responses per cell. Top-down and bottom-up stimuli were tested together in those permutations in which a participant heard a voice and received family background information. The condition in which a participant heard a voice but received no background information represents a "pure" bottom-up, or perceptual dialectology condition. Since each dialect was tested using only one voice, it is possible that significant results in the pure bottomup condition are due to individual speaker effects rather than so-called attributes of the dialect (Campbell-Kibler 2013). However, as stated earlier, the primary research question explored in this thesis has to do with the interaction of the two types of stimuli and the following discussion will pertain to answering this question.

### 4 Results

## 4.1 Introduction

This chapter will present the result of the experiment outline in Chapter 3. I will present data on all dependent variables analyzed primarily in two fashions. First, data will be presented in the aggregate form; that is to say these data consider the perceptual ratings given by all study participants (N=292). Second, the aggregate data will be further analyzed by ethnicity of the participants, specifically between Hispanic (N=89) versus non-Hispanic (N=203) participants. Finally, at the end of the chapter, I will explore possible intra-Latino differences by analyzing the Cuban subgroup separately from other national-origin groups. The idea behind this analysis method is to test whether or not the Cuban participants, which reflect the larger Cuban population in Miami as a whole, are driving the perceptions provided by the overall Hispanic participants.

### 4.2 Method of analysis

Although the data show some attrition throughout the survey, 292 participants started the survey. Precise N values for each question were used for statistical analysis and per-question means will be reported throughout this thesis. Data were analyzed in SPSS, in which I obtained mean rating values and the corresponding standard errors of mean. Using these values and the total number of participants per question, traditional ttest were run to determine statistical significance, which will represented by both p and t values. In the sections that follow, only significant results will be shown because the vast number of statistical comparisions makes reporting insignificant findings untenable. Each analysis shown in this section will include a graphical figure in which standard errors bars are shown and in addition, an accompanying table will show statistical significance values.

## **4.3 Interpreting the results**

In the sections that follow, figures and tables will illustrate the results of this study, which attempt to answer the research questions given in Chapter 3. The y-axis of each graph represents the Likert scale answers used in the study while the x-axis represents all the possible bottom-up and top-down combinations. The x-axes should be read as shown in table 10 below, where 'Col' represents Colombia, 'Spain' represents Spain, 'Cuba' represents Cuba, 'D' means dialect, and 'L' means label. In the graphs that divide the responses by ethnicity (i.e. Hispanics versus non-Hispanic), bars in blue represent Hispanic participants and bars in red represent non-Hispanic participants. Significance is show in the p-value results of two-tailed t tests. Any p-value less than 0.05 is considered to be significant.

x-axis abbreviation	labels
ColD-ColL	Colombian voice with Colombian parents
ColD-SpainL	Colombian voice with Spanish parents
ColD-CubaL	Colombian voice with Cuban parents
ColD-NoL	Colombian voice with no national-origin information given about the parents
SpainD-SpainL	Spanish voice with Spanish parents
SpainD-CubaL	Spanish voice with Cuban parents
SpainD-ColL	Spanish voice with Colombian parents
SpainD-NoL	Spanish voice with no national-origin information given about the parents
CubaD-CubaL	Cuban voice with Cuban parents
CubaD-SpainL	Cuban voice with Spanish parents
CubaD-ColL	Cuban voice with Colombian parents
CubaD-NoL	Cuban voice with no national-origin information given about the parents

Table 5. X-axis labels

## 4.4 Results

## 4.4.1 Warmth traits

## **4.4.1.1 Friendly aggregate**

The first graph depicts the mean aggregate data for the warmth trait 'friendly'. These results show the ratings provided by all participants.

Figure 1. Mean ratings for friendly



Table 6. Friendly for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba

	N	Mean	SEM	р	t
CubaD-SpainL	292	3.91	0.07	0.0143	2.4558
CubaD-CubaL	292	3.63	0.09		

When comparing the Cuban speaker with Spanish parents to the correctly matched Cuban speaker with Cuban parents, the data show a significant difference in perception of overall friendliness. Participants perceive the Cuban speaker with Spanish parents to be friendlier than if his parents were from Cuba. Here we see an effect of the top-down stimulus, where the peninsular label promotes perceptions of friendliness.

# 4.4.1.2 Friendly by ethnicity

The next graph reflects the same data as above, however this time it is separated by ethnicity of the participants (i.e. Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic). Bars in blue represent Hispanic participants and bars in red reflect the non-Hispanic participants.





\*Blue bars represent Hispanic participants and red bars represent non-Hispanic

participants

Table 7. Friendly by ethnicity for Colombia-Colombia

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	3.91	0.10	0.0377	2.0878
Non-Hispanic	89	3.55	0.14		

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	3.90	0.12		
_				0.0415	2.0480
Non-Hispanic	89	3.47	0.16		
1					

Table 8. Friendly by ethnicity for Cuba-No Label

By ethnicity, the data in Figure 2 above show that the Hispanic participants rate the Colombian speaker with Colombian parents and the unlabeled Cuban speaker as significantly friendlier than the non-Hispanic participants. Both p-values in Tables 7 and 8 are below 0.05 and are considered to show significant differences in perception.

## 4.4.1.3 Kind aggregate

The following graph shows the overall aggregate data for the next warmth trait 'kind. Again, the aggregate data shows the mean perception ratings of all study participants. Figure 3. Mean ratings for kind



	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
ColD-CubaL	292	3.87	0.10	0 0020	3 1113
SpainD-NoL	292	3.43	0.10	0.0020	5.1115

Table 9. Kind for Colombia-Cuba vs. Spain-No Label

Table 10. Kind for Colombia-No Label vs. Cuba-Colombia

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
ColD-NoL	292	3.88	0.07	0.0039	2.8943
CubaD-ColL	292	3.55	0.09		

Figure 3 above shows the results for the warmth trait, kind. The data show two significant results. First, the Colombian speaker whose ostensible parents come from Cuba is more likely to be kind than the Peninsular Spanish voice with no family background information provided. Also, the Colombian speaker with no label is perceived to be more kind than the Cuban speaker with no top-down stimulus attached. These results, shown above in table 10, need to taken with some degree of caution as they represent the pure bottom-up or perceptual dialectology dimension where one speaker only represents the dialect. For this reason, significant differences could be due to individual speaker effects as opposed to actual attributes of the dialects. However, it is interesting to note that the Colombian Spanish speaker received the highest rating for the kindness trait, as opposed to the Cuban Spanish speaker; this may show a relative prestige of the Colombian Spanish variety.

By ethnicity, the data show no significant results. The overall data representing the 'warmth' dimension of the classic competence/warmth split show that the Spanish (Peninsular) voice is never significantly rated as more warm (either friendly or kind). In fact, the Spanish voice is rated significantly less kind than the Colombian speaker with Cuban parents and the Colombian speaker with no parental information. These are mostly effects of the bottom-up stimuli. The only example, so far, of a top-down effect is found in Figure 1 above, where the Spanish label raises friendliness perceptions. This specific example will be further discussed in Chapter 5. The next section will present the results for the 'competence' traits.

### **4.4.2** Competence traits

The data below will illustrate the results of the competence dimension with significant differences found in two traits: intelligence and self-confidence.

#### **4.4.2.1 Intelligent aggregate**



Figure 4. Mean ratings for intelligent

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
a . Da . I	202	4 1 0	0.00		
SpainD-SpainL	292	4.18	0.08	0.0024	2 0 4 5 4
				0.0024	2.0454
CubaD-SpainL	292	3.79	0.10		

Table 11. Intelligent for Spain-Spain vs. Cuba-Spain

Table 12. Intelligent for Spain-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-SpainL	292	4.18	0.08	< 0.0001	4.1907
CubaD-CubaL	292	3.61	0.11		

The two significant differences shown above in Tables 11 and 12 illustrate that for this trait – intelligence – the Spanish voice group, that is all permutation containing the Peninsular Spanish voice, is rated significantly higher than the Cuban voice group. These perceptions seem to be primarily driven by the bottom-up stimuli – the dialects.

### 4.4.2.2 Self-confident aggregate

Figure 5. Mean ratings for self-confident



Table 13. Self-confident for Spain-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-SpainL	292	4.09	0.08	0.0024	3.0509
CubaD-CubaL	292	3.65	0.12		

Figure 5 and Table 13 above illustrate the effect of bottom-up Peninsular Spanish stimulus. Regardless of top-down national origin label, the Spanish voice group is perceived to be significantly more then Colombian and Cuban voice groups. When the data is separated by ethnicity, however, they show no significant differences in perception.

Overall, the data for the warmth/competence split do show many significant results. The bottom-up stimuli raise competences perceptions when the voice is Spanish;

this is to say that the Peninsular Spanish speaker is perceived to be more competent (i.e. intelligent and self-confident) than the Cuban and the Colombian speakers. Additionally, the data in this section show that for warmth traits, the opposite occurs; the Spanish voice is perceived to be less warm, where the Colombian speaker is thought to be warmer (i.e. kind). This pattern shows a clear, yet of course subtle and not consistent across all warmth and competence traits, effect of the bottom-up stimuli. However, again, I exercise caution with these findings as they may be due to individual speaker effects. Next, I will show the results from the occupational data to show the blue-collar/white-collar split, which mirrors the warmth/competence split.

# 4.4.3 Blue-collar jobs

The data below will illustrate the likelihood that the voices heard by the participants work in the following blue-collar positions – a coffee shop and a cell phone store. The hypotheses of the current study state that the top-down stimuli will interact with the bottom-up stimuli to elicit variant perceptions and that these perceptions will differ based on the ethnicity of the listener. The data that follow not only reflect these hypotheses but also that the result of language perceptions can manifest if real-world outcomes.

## **4.4.3.1** Coffee shop aggregate

Figure 6. Mean ratings for coffee shop employee



Table 14. Coffee shop for Spain-No Label vs. Colombia-No Label

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-NoL	292	2.34	0.12		
_				< 0.0001	4.11065
ColD-NoL	292	3.04	0.11		

Table 15. Coffee shop for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-NoL	292	2.34	0.12	0.0026	3.0194
CubaD-NoL	292	2.92	0.15		

These data show only a bottom-up effect, however they do illustrate the highly significant perceptions that the Spanish voice does not work in the blue-collar position. By

comparing the non-labeled speakers in Tables 14 and 15 above, I show that this difference is highly significant; this is to say that a Cuban Spanish speaker and even a Colombia Spanish speaker is more likely to work in a coffee shop when compared to a Peninsular Spanish speaker.

## 4.4.3.2 Cell phone store aggregate

Figure 7. Mean ratings for cell phone store employee



The following t-test tables will show effects of both the bottom-up and the top-down stimuli.

Table 16. Cell phone store for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-NoL	292	2.60	0.14	0.0436	2.0225
CubaD-NoL	292	3.03	0.16		

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
ColD-SpainL	292	2.97	0.13	0.0118	2.525
ColD-ColL	292	3.40	0.11		

Table 17. Cell phone store for Colombia-Spain vs. Colombia-Colombia

Table 16 represents one of the significant bottom-up effects. By comparing the nonlabeled voice, the data show the Cuban voice is perceived as more likely to be employed in cell phone store, which is considered to be a blue-collar position. Figure 7 above also reflects a clear top-down effect of social information on language perception. As shown in Table 17, the difference between the Colombian-Spain and Colombian-Colombian permutation lies in the social information. In one version, the speaker's supposed parents come from Colombia and in the other they are said to come from Spain. Crucially, between the two dialect-social information combinations, the actual speaker himself remains the same. For this reason, the significant difference shown in Table 22 is driven by the top-down stimulus where the Colombian speaker with Spanish parents is significantly less likely to hold this blue-collar position.

## 4.4.3.3 Cell phone store by ethnicity

Figure 8. Cell phone store by ethnicity



*Blue bars represe	ent Hispanic	participants a	nd red bars re	present non-Hispanic

Table 18. Cell	phone store	by ethnicity	for Spain-C	Ľuba
	1	J J		

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	2.56	0.17	0.0211	2 2196
				0.0211	2.3180
Non-Hispanic	89	3.23	0.20		

The data provided in Table 18, which is shown graphically in Figure 8 above, show a significant difference in perception based on ethnicity of the participants. Non-Hispanic participants, a group that includes Anglo-White, African Americans, and other ethnicities, perceive the Peninsular Spanish speaker with Cuban parents as significantly more likely to be employed in the cell phone store. This is likely to be an effect of the top-down label marking Cuban identity. To illustrate this point further, the next set of data will illustrate the top-down effect of the social information by noting the lack of

significance, or the leveling of perceptions, among the Hispanic and non-Hispanic participants for the same voice with a different top-down label.

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	2.55	0.17	*0 5652	0 5758
Non-Hispanic	89	2.38	0.22	0.0002	0.0700

Table 19. Cell phone store by ethnicity for Spain-Spain

\*p-value is insignificant

Tables 18 and 19 above illustrate the effect of the top-down stimulus for the non-Hispanic participants. This suggests that the non-Hispanic population in Miami is more sensitive to the top-down social information about speakers when making social perceptions than to the bottom-up features of the dialects, perhaps due to lower proficiency levels in Spanish. This is not to say that the top-down social labels carry no socio-cognitive weight for Miami Latinos. For example, the following table will show a top-down effect for the Hispanic participants within the Colombian-Colombian voiceprofile permutation.

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	3.56	0.13	0.02889	2.1958
Non-Hispanic	89	3.04	0.20		

Table 20. Cell phone store by ethnicity for Colombia-Colombia

The table above shows a significant difference based on ethnicity of the participants with regards to the Colombian-Colombian combination for the blue-collar position as a cell

phone store employee. For the Hispanic participants, the Colombian parental label appears to carry significant weight when it comes to forming perceptions.

The next section on white-collar occupations will contrast the perceptions of bluecollar occupations, where the Spanish bottom-up stimulus will promote employment in higher status positions, for example.

## 4.4.4 White-Collar jobs

## **4.4.4.1** Marketing executive aggregate



Figure 9. Mean ratings for marketing executive

Table 21. Marketing executive for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-NoL	292	3.51	0.14	< 0.0001	4.0921
CubaD-NoL	292	2.64	0.16		

Table 21, along with Figure 9, demonstrates the significant effect of the bottom-up stimulus (i.e. the dialect). The Spanish voice significantly raises perceptions of white-collar employment as compared to the Colombian and Cuban voices. Table 22. Marketing executive for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
CubaD-SpainL	292	3.00	0.13		
				0.0367	2.0937
CubaD-CubaL	292	2.60	0.14		

The significant difference (p = 0.0367) shown above in Table 27 represents the top-down effect of the Spanish label. Figure 9 and Table 22 show that the Cuban voice is not likely to work as a marketing executive. However, when the experimental manipulation tells the participants that the Cuban Spanish speaker's parents are from Spain, the likelihood that he works in this white-collar position is raised significantly as compared to when the family background information indexes Cuban heritage association.

## 4.4.4 Marketing executive by ethnicity

Figure 10. Marketing executive by ethnicity



\*Blue bars represent Hispanic participants and red bars represent non-Hispanic

Table 23.	Marketing	executive	by	ethnicity	for \$	Spain-	Cuba
	U U		~				

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	3.59	0.14	0.0283	2.2044
Non-Hispanic	89	3.04	0.20		

The data within the Peninsular Spanish voice set, that is the four middle bars in Figure 10 above, the only significant difference between Hispanic and non-Hispanic participants is when that voice is said to have parents from Cuba. This label demotes the perception of white-collar employment and that is only the case for the non-Latino participants. This also suggests that Miami non-Hispanics are more sensitive to top-down social information about languages and language varieties than the Miami Latinos. Finally, the last of the white-collar positions will be discussed below.

## 4.4.4.3 Attorney aggregate

Figure 11. Mean ratings for attorney



Table 24. Attorney for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-NoL	292	3.38	0.14	0.0003	3.6218
CubaD-NoL	292	2.61	0.16		

Table 25. Attorney for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
CubaD-SpainL	292	3.02	0.13	0.0078	2.6695
CubaD-NoL	292	2.51	0.14		

Tables 24 and 25 represent the effects of the bottom-up stimuli and the top-down stimuli illustrated in Figure 11, respectively. The bottom-up Peninsular Spanish voice promotes
perceptions of this white-collar occupation. As for the top-down stimulus, the same pattern as in Figure 9 is shown. When the speaker is the Cuban and receives a Peninsular Spanish label, he sis perceived as more likely to work as an attorney, according to all study participants. Data for this white-collar position do not show significant effects when divided by ethnicity.

# 4.4.5 Annual income

This section will present the results of the questions pertaining the annual income of the speakers both in the present day and in the next five years. Annual incomes are presented on the y-axes in tens of thousands of dollars. Participants were allowed to assign any annual incomes they wanted in whole dollars.

#### **4.4.5.1** Current annual income aggregate



Figure 12. Mean ratings for current annual income

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-NoL	292	5.85	0.28		
-				0.0071	2.6994
CubaD-NoL	292	4.80	0.27		

Table 26. Current income for Spain-No Label vs. Cuba-No Label

The data presented above in Figure 12 and Table 26 illustrate another clear bottom-up effect, where the Spanish voice without a label receives a significantly higher annual salary than the Cuban voice with no social information coming down from above. This difference in annual income between these two speakers is approximately \$10,000 per year. Although not analyzed statistically, the data in Figure 12 above point to another example of the relative prestige of the Colombian Spanish variety. The highest annual income was attributed to the Peninsular Spanish speaker whose ostensible parents come from Colombia, with the Peninsular Spanish parents coming in second.

## 4.4.5.2 Current annual income by ethnicity

Figure 13. Current annual income by ethnicity



\*Blue bars represent Hispanic participants and red bars represent non-Hispanic

Table 27.	Current	income	by	ethnic	citv	for	Sp	ain-	Cuba
			~		~				

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	6.36	0.30	0.0043	2.8768
Non-Hispanic	89	4.85	0.40		

When the voice representing the Peninsular Spanish dialect receives a top-down label indexing Cuba, the non-Hispanics attribute significantly less money per year to him. The difference in the annual income attributed to this speaker between the Hispanics and non-Hispanics is approximately \$15,000 per year. This is another example of how non-Hispanic participants seem to be more sensitive to the top-down stimuli than the Hispanic participants.

The next sections will outline the projected annual incomes for five years from the current time.

### 4.4.5.3 Projected income aggregate



Figure 14. Mean ratings for projected annual income

Table 28. Projected annual income for Spain-Colombia vs. Spain-Cuba

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-ColL	292	8.57	0.34	0.0035	2.9314
SpainD-CubaL	292	7.26	0.29		

The data presented above with regards to annual incomes illustrates clear top-down effects. For example, table 28 above shows how the Colombian label significantly raises perceptions of annual income when compared to the Cuban top-down label. This type of statistical significance tells a deeper story than the Peninsular Spanish speaker whose ostensible parents come from Colombia are attributed approximately \$14,000 more per

year than if his parents were said to come from Cuba. The potential for sociological stratification and unequal realities are really at the outcome of these perceptions; however this will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

# 4.4.6 Language Use

# 4.4.6.1 Watches TV mostly in English aggregate

Figure 15. Mean ratings for watches TV mostly in English



Table 29. Watches TV mostly in English for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-No Label

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
CubaD-SpainL	292	3.91	0.18	0.0282	2.2000
CubaD-NoL	292	3.25	0.24		

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
CubaD-SpainL	292	3.91	0.18	0.0315	2.1556
CubaD-NoL	292	3.33	0.20		

Table 30. Watches TV mostly in English for Cuba-Spain vs. Cuba-Cuba

Table 29 and Figure 15 above illustrate a top-down effect of the Spanish family background label. The Cuban Spanish speaker whose ostensible parents come from Spain is perceived as more likely to watch TV mostly in English, as opposed to Spanish. The top-down effect is also proven by the statistical difference between the Spanish voice with a Spanish label and the same voice with a Cuban label (p = 0.0315).

## 4.4.6.2 Watches TV mostly in English by ethnicity



Figure 16. Watches TV mostly in English by ethnicity

# \*Blue bars represent Hispanic participants and red bars represent non-Hispanic

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	3.50	0.25	0.0435	2.0277
Non-Hispanic	89	4.42	0.38		

Table 31. Watches TV mostly in English for Spain-Spain

The information above shows a significant difference between Hispanic and non-

Hispanic perceptions of the Spanish voice with parents who supposedly come from Spain. For the non-Hispanics, this voice-profile permutation is significantly more likely to watch TV mostly in English. Focusing on the Spanish voice set, the Hispanic and non-Hispanic participants agree in their perceptions, except when the label is Spanish, which suggests that the non-Hispanics are more sensitive to the top-down portion of the stimuli.

## 4.4.6.3 Successful in learning English aggregate



Figure 17. Mean ratings for successful in learning English

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-SpainL	292	5.15	0.19		
				0.0003	3.6017
SpainD-NoL	292	4.13	0.21		
I					

Table 32. Successful in learning English for Spain-Spain vs. Spain-No Label

Figure 17 above shows a significant effect of the top-down Spanish label, however only when it is paired with the Peninsular Spanish dialect. In the aggregate, the Spain-Spain permutation is rated as significantly more likely to learn English within the next year. However, this difference is not found when the same voice receives either the Colombian or the Cuban family background label. This suggests that the Spanish top-down stimulus does have an effect, although it may not be strong enough to outweigh the other possible stimuli. The follow figure will illustrate the same trait separated by ethnicity.

## 4.4.6.4 Successful in learning English by ethnicity





\*Blue bars represent Hispanic participants and red bars represent non-Hispanic

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	4.76	0.25	0.0100	2.5943
Non-Hispanic	89	5.83	0.25		

Table 33. Successful in learning English for Spain-Spain

Figure 18 and Table 33 above illustrate a clear top-down stimulus effect. When looking at the Peninsular Spanish voice whose parents supposedly come from Spain, non-Latinos and Latinos provided significantly different perceptions. The non-Latinos rated this speaker as more likely to be successful in learning English within the next year. The bar graph in Figure 18 shows that for all other top-down stimuli tied to the peninsular bottom-up stimulus, the non-Latinos and Latinos agree, except for when the top-down stimulus drives non-Latino perceptions upward. The following table will illustrate the significance of the Peninsular Spanish social label for non-Latino participants. Table 34. Successful in learning English for non-Hispanics

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-SpainL	89	5.83	0.25	0.0353	2.1212
ColD-ColL	89	5.08	0.25		

The data in Table 34 above analyzes the difference in ratings provided by only non-Hispanic participants between the Spain-Spain and Colombia-Colombia permutations. The resulting statistical significance shows the sensitivity that the non-Latinos have to the top-down stimuli in this study, and more specifically in this example, to the peninsular top-down social information. The non-Latinos do not demonstrate this sensitivity to the top-down stimuli.

# 4.4.6.5 Chooses Spanish in bilingual settings aggregate

Figure 19. Mean ratings for chooses Spanish in bilingual settings



Table 35. Chooses Spanish with bilinguals for Colombia-Colombia vs. Colombia-No

Label

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
ColD-ColL	292	6.21	0.21	0.0003	3.6517
ColD-ColNoL	292	5.20	0.18		

The above data represent mean responses in the aggregate for the likelihood the speakers choose to speak Spanish when in the presence of bilingual (Spanish – English) speakers. Figure 19 and table 35 above work together to show the overwhelming preference for the Colombian speakers whose attached social information says his parents are from Colombia. This dialect-social information permutation is perceived as more likely to choose to speak Spanish in front of others who are fluent in both English and Spanish. The next section will show a significant perceptual difference by ethnicity of the participants.

### 4.4.6.6 Chooses Spanish in bilingual settings by ethnicity



Figure 20. Chooses Spanish in bilingual settings by ethnicity

\*Blue bars represent Hispanic participants and red bars represent non-Hispanic

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	5.60	0.20	0.0165	2 4124
Non-Hispanic	89	4.71	0.32	0.0102	2.1121

Table 36. Chooses Spanish in bilingual settings for Spain-Spain

When the data for this question is split by the ethnicity of the participants, only one significant difference is found. The Hispanic participants feel that this speaker is more likely to choose to speak Spanish when he encounters himself with Spanish-English bilinguals. This is in contrast of this speaker choosing to speak English. It should be known that the experimental design did not specify to the participants whether or not these speakers are Spanish-English bilinguals. The data the follow attend to the last set of questions asked in the survey – the family values.

### 4.4.7 Family Values

# **4.4.7.1** Opportunities to get ahead aggregate



Figure 21. Mean ratings for opportunities to get ahead

Table 37. Opportunities to get ahead for Spain-Spain vs. Spain-Cuba

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-SpainL	292	3.86	0.10	0.0482	1.9799
SpainD-CubaL	292	3.58	0.10		

The data in Figure 21 above and Figure 22 below represent the perceptions in response to the question about the likelihood that the speakers come from a family that gave them lots of opportunities to get ahead. The aggregate data in Figure 21 and Table 37 show a significant effect of the top-down Peninsular Spanish stimulus. When the Peninsular voice is said to have parents from Spain, he is more likely to come from a family that

provided with opportunities to get ahead than if his parents were from Cuba and this result holds for the aggregate of the participants.

## 4.4.7.2 Opportunities to get ahead by ethnicity

Figure 22. Opportunities to get ahead by ethnicity



\*Blue bars represent Hispanic participants and red bars represent non-Hispanic

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	3.76	0.11	0.000	2 0 1 2 2
				0.0028	3.0132
Non-Hispanic	89	3.12	0.20		

Table 38. Opportunities to get ahead for Spain-Cuba

The data shown in Table 38, which statistically represents the Spain-Cuba permutation in Figure 22, illustrates a significant top-down stimulus effect for the non-Hispanics. These participants perceive this speaker to be significantly less likely to come from a family that gave him opportunities to get ahead if his ostensible parents are Cuban. However, if his parents are said to be from Spain, then this family values increase.

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Hispanic	203	3.51	0.12	0.0120	2 5272
Non-Hispanic	89	2.89	0.25	0.0120	2.3212

Table 39. Opportunities to get ahead for Cuba-Colombia

In addition, the Hispanic participants are subtly affected by the top-down social information implemented in this study, although much less so than the non-Hispanic participants. The data in Table 39 correspond to Figure 22 and they show that for the Cuban Spanish speaker with Colombian parents, the Hispanics perceive him to come from a family that gave him opportunities to get ahead. The non-Latinos in this case are less likely to agree.

### 4.4.7.3 Poor family aggregate



Figure 23. Mean ratings for poor family

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
ColD-SpainL	292	2.92	0.11		
Ĩ				0.0164	2.4076
ColD-CubaL	292	3.33	0.13		

Table 40. Family is poor for Colombia-Spain vs. Colombia-Cuba

Table 41. Family is poor for Spain-Spain vs. Spain-Cuba

	N	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-SpainL	292	2.55	0.12		
				0.0089	2.6248
SpainD-CubaL	292	2.96	0.10		

The aggregate data in Tables 40 and 41 and Figure 23 demonstrate the top-down effect of the Peninsular Spanish label. In these cases, this label demotes the perception that these speakers come from a family that is poor. This is true when the bottom-up dialect stimulus is either Colombian or Spanish. However, when the Cuban speaker is said to hae parents from Spain, this difference is no longer significant. This shows that for the Cuban Spanish variety, the bottom-up stimulus carries greater perceptual weight than the top-down stimulus for this question.

### **4.4.7.4** Poor family by ethnicity

Figure 24. Poor family by ethnicity



\*Blue bars represent Hispanic participants and red bars represent non-Hispanic

Table 42. Family is poor for Hispanics

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
SpainD-SpainL	203	2.43	0.15	0.000	2 (020
				0.0096	2.6029
SpainD-CubaL	203	2.93	0.12		

When this data is separated by ethnicity of the participants there no significant differences. However, by analyzing Figure 24 solely in terms of the Hispanic participants (blue bars), a telling finding arises. The data compare the ratings for the Spanish voice with Spanish parents and the same voice with Cuban parents. The top-down peninsular label demotes the likelihood that the Peninsular Spanish speaker comes from a family that is poor according to the Hispanic participants. This is another example of how the top-down stimulus does have a socio-cognitive effect for Hispanic participants as well as non-Hispanic participants.

#### 4.4.8 Cuban versus non-Cuban participants

The final portion of this chapter attempts to further analyze the Hispanic participant responses. Study participants reflect a number of national-origin groups, however for the purposes of the analysis, all non-Cuban Hispanic national-origin groups were collapsed and the figures below will show data for the Cuban participants and those participants who identify as Hispanic but not Cuban. The number of participants in the following figures and tables vary and this is due to survey attrition.

These data are useful in responding to the third research question of this study – do Cuban perceptions drive the perceptions of the Hispanic group? The first analysis will show the ratings provided by these participants in response to the warmth characteristic – friendly.

#### 4.4.8.1 Cuban ratings of friendliness

The following data illustrate an extension of the analyses above where the data are separated by ethnicity. Here, I further separate the Hispanic participant group into Cuban versus non-Cuban participants and this is in response to the research question about whether or not the Cuban participants are driving the general Hispanic perceptions. I will report significant data for one voice-profile permutation at a time. Thus, each graph reflects the perceptions to only one voice and one national-origin combination. Reports on all possible ratings are not provided because very few results in the following analysis were significant.



Figure 25. Cuban vs. non-Cuban perceptions for friendly for Cuba-No-Label

Table 43. Friendly for Cuba-No Label

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Non-Cuban	40	3.60	0.118		
				0.0169	2.4596
Cuban	21	4.10	0.168		

The data above show a significant difference in perception between the Cuban and non-Cuban participants within the Hispanic group. These perceptions are effects of solely the bottom-up stimuli (the Cuban voice) because in this permutation the voice receives no social label. However, these data do suggest that the Cuban participants are driving the positive perception provided by the Hispanic group, which can be seen in Figure 2 above.

# 4.4.8.2 Cuban ratings of family that values education

The follow data is in response to a question regarding family values – what is the likelihood that this speaker comes from a family that values education?



Figure 26. Cuban vs. non-Cuban for family that values education

Table 43. Family that values education for Spain-Cuba

	Ν	Mean	Standard Error Means	р	t
Non-Cuban	68	3.57	0.110	0.0087	2.6779
Cuban	28	4.14	0.197		

Figure 26 and table 44 above show a significant difference in perceptions between the Cuban and non-Cuban participants (p = 0.0087). The Cuban participants feel this speaker, who receives the Cuban background label, is more likely to come from a family that values education. This shows the effect of the top-down stimuli on language perception, specifically with regards to the Cuban/non-Cuban dichotomy.

Out of all the significant findings between Hispanics and non-Hispanics, the results show only the two significant results presented above. In general, across all of the questions asked of the participants, the majority do not show significant differences

between Cuban and non-Cuban perceptions. Cuban participants only occasionally seem to drive the general perceptions of Hispanic population, however this may depend on the traits themselves. Due to the overall lack of significance of Cuban versus non-Cuban perceptions, the claim becomes that Cuban and non-Cuban participants commonly agree when it comes to their perceptions of Spanish language varieties.

The following chapter will further discuss the results presented above. The chapter will conclude with a discussion on how the data attend to the research questions in Chapter3 and whether or not the hypotheses hold. Finally, the sociological consequences linked to these perceptions of Spanish language varieties in Miami will be considered.

#### **5** Discussion and Conclusions

### **5.1 Introduction**

In this final chapter, results of the analyses presented in chapter 4 will be discussed in terms of the research questions and hypotheses outlined in chapter 3. Additionally, this chapter will present conclusions attendant to larger theoretical questions and will conclude with suggestions for future research based on the limitations of this current study.

#### 5.2 Discussion

The results, presented in chapter 4, point to a number of complex interactions between the bottom-up and top-down stimuli, which are, again, the dialects and the family background information, respectively.

#### 5.2.1 Research questions and hypotheses revisited

In response to research question 1 - how do the bottom-up and top-down stimuli interact to shape perceptions about Spanish language varieties in dialect-rich Miami? – the data suggest that the perceptions of the Cuban, Peninsular, and Colombian varieties of Spanish are a result of an interaction of the bottom-up and top-down cues. As for describing this interaction, what the data show is that both dimensions of the sociocognitive stimuli play a role in the formation of language perception and that the specific role that the stimuli have depends on either a) the trait being perceived and/or b) the ethnic background of the participant. For example, the results of this experimental approach show two important and remarkably similar patterns: the competence/warmth split and the blue-collar/white-collar split.

In the case of the competence/warmth split, competence traits such as intelligence and self-confidence are rated higher both for speakers whose parents supposedly come from Spain and also for the Peninsular Spanish speaker himself. The reversal is found when we look at the warmth traits such as outgoing and kind, where the Cuban nationalorigin label and the Cuban dialect will promote these characteristics. In fact, the results from this study confirm the findings from Fiske et. al. (2002), where a group perceived high on the warmth dimension is frequently perceived low on the competence dimension and vice-versa. However, it is important to note the relative prestige of the Highland Colombian dialect as well, where the Colombian speaker with no label and with ostensible Cuban parents receive the highest ratings for the kindness trait. The same pattern shift occurs for the blue-collar/white-collar occupations as well. The speakers whose parents are said to come from Spain or the speaker who speaks Peninsular Spanish are perceived as more likely to hold a white-collar position, such as a marketing executive or an attorney. The opposite is true for the blue-collar positions; those speakers whose family come from Cuba or speak Cuban Spanish are believed to hold a position in a coffee shop or a cellphone store.

The hypothesis for this question was that the addition of the top-down stimulus (i.e. the family background information) would influence perceptions, both positively and negatively. This is to say that a variety that is often stigmatized may receive more positive perceptions when the family background information indexes a more favorable variety of Spanish. After analysis of the results, this hypothesis holds true for the participant population. Although the top-down effects are not categorical, they do suggest

some level of saliency when it comes to the social psychological process of language perception.

This is all not to say that only the Cuba-Cuba and Spain-Spain permutations allow for this pattern. Rather, on the one hand, it is the case that a Cuban voice with ostensible parents from Spain may be perceived as friendlier. However, on the other hand the bottom-up dialect stimulus may play a role in conditioning the effectiveness of the topdown stimulus. The data in table 16, visualized in figure 4, illustrate the strength of the Peninsular Spanish background label. The higher rating goes to the Peninsular Spanish speaker whose parents come from Spain and this rating is significantly higher than the Cuban Spanish speaker whose parents also come from Spain. Participants seem to be sensitive to both the top-down and bottom-up portions, yet in this example the Cuban dialect stimulus weakens the effectiveness of the Peninsular label, thus leaving the Peninsular Spanish speaker to be perceived as more intelligent.

To conclude on the response to research question 1, it should be clear that it is not the case that these patterns and the interaction of the two types of stimuli are only manifest in the blue-collar/white-collar and warmth/competence dichotomies. Instead, when considering questions of language use and family values, similar patterns can be derived. For example, questions that relate to using English, whether it's learning English or watching TV in English, are more favored for speakers of Peninsular Spanish as well as those speakers whose parents are said to come from Spain. As a result, it seems to be the case that Spanish in Miami, as is the story across the United States, is under the discursive pressures of English (Lippi-Green 1997, Porcel 2011, Santa Ana 2002, Schwartz 2011, Valdés 2001). This narrative attends to the diverse socio-demographic

situation in Miami, in which Latinos and non-Latinos are constantly in concert with one another.

Continuing with the notion that Hispanics and non-Hispanics in Miami consistently interact and that from these interactions arise a multitude of social and linguistic perceptions, data in response to research question 2 - how do the language perceptions differ based on the ethnicity of the listener (Tucker and Lambert 1975)? shed some light on this discussion. The hypothesis for this question states that non-Latino participants in Miami will show more critical and negative perceptions towards all of the Spanish varieties when compared to the Latino participants. The answer to this question, based on the data presented in chapter 4, is simple in that the perceptions from the non-Latinos are not categorically negative towards all dialects of Spanish. In contrast, what the data allows as a conclusion is that the non-Latinos and Latinos occasionally agree and disagree when it comes to their perceptions of Spanish and this can be clearly illustrated using the data from the question set regarding the family values of the speakers. Lastly, a crucial finding is that non-Latinos, who may or may not speak Spanish themselves, are cognitively aware of the global discourses and consequent attitudes about Spanish language dialects. This is to say that, because the non-Latino participants occasionally agree with the Latino participants, they are somehow learning about the ideological discourses about Spanish. Perhaps it is the sociolinguistic landscape of Miami, which is extremely mobile and multilingual, that allows Miami non-Latinos to internalize Spanish dialect perceptions that mirror those of Miami Latinos.

In the survey, participants responded to a number of questions pertaining to the family values of the speaker they had just heard. One question asked participants to rate

the likelihood that the speaker's family provided him with opportunities to get ahead. Although the semantic content of that statement is rather null, Latino and non-Latino participants demonstrated significantly different perceptions to this regard. When considering the Peninsular Spanish speaker with alleged parents from Cuba, the non-Latino participants rate him lower than the Latinos. This suggests that the non-Latinos are perceiving the social information about the speaker in such a way that even though his dialect is considered "prestigious", his family probably did not provide him with many opportunities to get ahead in life. In contrast to the difference in perceptions by ethnicity of the participants, when asked whether or not the speaker's family is poor, there are no significant differences. This is to say that the Latino and non-Latino participants agree in their perceptions of this trait. Furthermore, the data also show how Latino participants can also be influenced by the top-down stimuli. For the same trait (family is poor) and for the Peninsular Spanish speaker, the Latino participant responses are level, except when this speaker's parents are said to be Spanish. For this permutation, the Latino participants rate the speaker as significantly less likely to come from a poor family.

To this regard, one claim is that the non-Latino participants are more sensitive to the top-down dimension of the study, where the Latinos are more sensitive to the bottomup stimuli. Although this is not true across the board, as described above, it can be seen in the data. For example, when looking at the results for the question regarding the speakers' annual income, Latino participants demonstrate sensitivity to the bottom-up stimuli and vice-versa for the non-Latinos. The non-Latino participants attribute the Peninsular Spanish speaker with Cuban parents significantly less money per year than the Latinos, approximately \$15,000. For every other voice-profile permutation within the

Peninsular Spanish voice set, that is the Peninsular Spanish speaker with parents from Spain, Colombia, and the null version, the Latinos and non-Latinos agree on their salary attributions. This demonstrates how the non-Latinos in Miami may in fact be more sensitive to the top-down portion (i.e. the Cuban family background information) than the Latinos. Again, however, the Latinos can also be influenced by the top-down stimuli. When the voice-profile permutation is flipped to the Cuban Spanish speaker with parents from Spain, the Latino participants attribute this speaker significantly more money, about \$10,000, than the non-Latinos. For every other voice-profile combination in the Cuban Spanish voice set, the non-Latinos and Latinos agree.

Based on these analyses, the discussion of the third and final research question will shed a faint light onto the perceptions from the Latino participants, specifically separated by country of origin.

The third research question of this study pertains to whether or not the participants who identify with Cuba as their national-origin significantly influence the perceptions of the general Hispanic/Latino subgroup and the results point to a false hypothesis. It was suggested that within the Latino subgroup, those participants of Cuban national-origin would show solidarity with their stigmatized variety by rating it more positively than those participants who come from countries other than Cuba. This is only the case for two perceptual responses. First, as seen in figure 25, when perceiving the Cuban Spanish speaker who receives no top-down social information, the Cuban participants rate him as significantly friendlier than the non-Cubans, a collapsed group that includes a wide-range of Hispanic national-origin groups. Although for this example, the data do not comment on the interaction of the bottom-up and top-down stimuli, they

do suggest perhaps a question of solidarity where the Cuban participants more positively rate their own variety of Spanish. This can also be seen when the participants rated the speakers on whether or not their families value education. Looking at the Spain-Cuba group in figure 26, the results again show the Cuban participants reacting more positively to a Cuban stimulus. However, in this case the stimulus is the top-down social information about the Peninsular Spanish speaker. Here again the data suggest that languages perceptions arise, in part, from the interaction of the bottom-up (dialect) and top-down (social information), however subtle it may be. Finally, the hypothesis here should be considered false because of the lack of significant findings; thus the Cuban participants do not seem to drive the ratings provided by the general Hispanic participant group.

#### **5.3 Conclusions**

To conclude on this research, it will be beneficial to review the ideological tropes that are very commonly and continually circulating.

Table 45. Ideological tropes about Spanish

Colombian Spanish	is the clearest and most elegant
Spanish from Spain	is the prettiest and the best overall
Cuban Spanish	is the most vulgar

There is a key idea that can be derived from the above table and it is that these discursive tropes function as a scale with polar ends. We may find Peninsular Spanish one end of the Spanish language spectrum – the positive end – where it remains as the "best". On the other pole, however, we may find the Cuban varieties placed in a negative light. In the

middle this metaphorical perception scale lays Colombian Spanish along with the rest of the varieties of Spanish spoken throughout the world.

A perceptual scale like the once described above manifests from a complex interaction of language ideologies that enforce social pressures upon speakers of a language. Lippi-Green's (1997) notion of the standard language ideology is a central factor here; languages are imagined to have a standard variety that all of their speakers should speak. It commonly known that this idea is merely a construct, however what is more interesting is the effect of this construct.

Before entering a discussion of the sociological consequences of language perception, it is important to understand that linguistic perception is never truly about the language or language variety itself, but rather about its speakers (Lippi-Green 1997, Santa Ana 2002, Kubarth 1986, Carter and Lynch 2013). This notion stems from the basic sociolinguistic concept of indexicality (Eckert 2008) where linguistic features carry social meanings and that perception of these features unlocks their inner meanings. The process of linguistic perception is complex, where linguistic features serve as proxies for social meanings. What the current research attempts to claim is that linguistic features do not index social meaning by themselves and this idea has been previously attested in other contexts (i.e. Niedzielski 1999). Social information and linguistic features interact in the process of forming language perceptions, which first would not exist without the persistent pressure of language ideologies. This study has shown that although Hispanic participants may perceive Spanish dialects differently than non-Latinos, both groups are socially and cognitively aware of the discursive tropes that encompass the language

varieties and for this reason, the traits themselves determine whether or not the two participant groups perceive the voice-profile combinations differently.

To conclude, dialectal variation in society often leads to social consequence. In response to the survey questions about language use, participants were asked to state the likelihood that the speakers watched TV mostly in English. A recent study by the Pew Hispanic Research Center (Lopez and Gonzalez-Barrera 2013) illustrates how Latinos in the United States are in the process of switching from watching their news in Spanish to receiving their news input in English, in spite of the idea that Spanish-language media is more effective in covering news stories relevant to U.S. Latinos.

The data from this study not only show that these perceptions are a result of the interaction of two, and probably more, types of stimuli, but also that dialect differences cause social consequences (Wolfram 2009). This can be most clearly seen in the attributions of annual salary in the current survey study, where the Peninsular Spanish speaker is said to earn the most money per year and the other varieties only earn more money when the top-down stimulus is peninsular. Fought writes, "it seems that the more 'ethnically different' a speaker is perceived to be by the hearer, the more likely the hearer is to perceive an accent where none is present" (2006, 189) and so the final conclusion is that the top-down social information about the speakers carries significant weight for the question of language perception. For this reason, it might seem plausible that a Miami Latino would hold on very tightly to his great-grandmothers emigration from Spain to Cuba so much so that he would introduce himself as *cubano-español*, which in essentially the interaction of dialect and social information in itself.

#### 5.4 Limitations and future research

The primary limitation to this study is the participant population. The data do not yet suggest overall perceptions of the Miami community as a whole, but rather they present a snapshot of the languages perception as they manifest in the context of language and dialect-rich Miami.

Secondly, future research that aims to implement top-down and bottom-up stimuli must find a way to represent each language variety with more than one speaker. Perceptions in this study based on bottom-up stimuli alone may in fact be results of individual speaker effects as opposed to actual attributes of the dialect. However, using multiple voices to represent each dialect will cause the researcher to create a very long survey, in which he or she will experience high rates of survey attrition.

Lastly, future research investigating language perceptions will benefit from deeper linguistic analyses of the dialects. That is to say, as is shown in Niedzielski (1999), that specific phonetic features alongside top-down social information interact in creating language perceptions. The current study uses the dialects as whole units to attend to this question, however a future analysis could investigate which phonetic features of the Spanish language varieties actually index certain perceptions and how these phonetic variants interact with the top-down social information.

#### REFERENCES

- Alba, O. (1990). Variación fonética y diversidad social en el español dominicano de Santiago. Santiago, República Dominicana: Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra.
- Alfaraz, G. (2002). Miami Cuban Perception of Varieties of Spanish. *Handbook* of Perceptual Dialectology, Eds. Dennis Preston and Daniel Long. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Alfaraz, G. G. (2012). Cuban Spanish in the US context: linguistic and social constraints on the variation of syllable-final (r) among Cuban newcomers. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 5(2), 291-320.
- Alfaraz, G. (2014). Dialect perceptions in real time: A restudy of Miami-Cuban perceptions. *Journal of Linguistic Geography*, 2(02), 74-86.
- Alvar, M. (1996). *Manual de dialectología hispánica: el español de España*. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta.
- Alvord, S.M. (2010). Disambiguating declarative and interrogative meaning with intonation in Miami Cuban Spanish. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*. Vol. 28 No. 2: 21-66.
- Andresen, J.A. and Carter, P.M. (in press). *Languages in the world: How history, culture, and politics shape language*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Bourdieu, P. (2011). The forms of capital (1986). Cultural theory: An anthology, 81-93.
- Brown, A. and Lopez, M.H. (2013). Mapping the Latino population, by state, county, and city. *Pew Research Center Hispanic Trends*.
- Callesano, S. (2013). Dos naranjas or doh naranjah: A study of coda-/s/ variation in Buenos Aires Spanish. Poster presented at NWAV42. October. Pittsburgh, PA.
- Campbell-Kibler, K. (2013). Language attitudes surveys. In C. Mallinson, B. Childs, and G. Van Herk (Eds). *Data collection in sociolinguistics: Methods and applications*. New York: Routledge.
- Carranza, Miguel A. (1982) Attitudinal research on Hispanic language varieties. *Attitudes towards language variation: social and applied contexts*. Eds. Ellen Bouchard Ryan and Howard Giles. London: Edward Arnold.
- Carter, P. M., López L., and Sims, N. (2015). *Spanish substrate influence on Miami Latino English.* Paper presented at American Dialect Society. January. Portland, OR.

- Carter, P.M. and Lynch, A. (2013). *Implicit inferiority, explicit pride: Mapping the sociolinguistic perception of Spanish and English in Miami*. Paper presented at Spanish in the U.S. March. McAlen, TX.
- Carter, P.M. and Lynch, A. (2015). *Multilingual Miami: Current trends in sociolinguistic research*. Language and Linguisitcs Compass. Web.
- Díaz-Campos, M., & Navarro-Galisteo, I. (2009). Perceptual categorization of dialect variation in Spanish. In Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium (pp. 179-195).
- Eckert, P. (2008) Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of sociolinguistics*,12(4), 453-476.
- Erker, D. G. (2010). A subsegmental approach to coda/s/weakening in Dominican Spanish. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (203), 9-26.
- Fernández, F.M. (2009). La lengua española en su geografía. Madrid: Arco.
- Fernández-Parera, A. (2014). Percepciones e influencias del español cubano en el habla bilingue de Miami. Paper presented at XLIII Meeting of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest. September. San Diego, CA.
- Fiedler, K. and Semin G.R. (1992). Attribution and language as a socio-cognitive environment. In G.R. Semin and K. Fiedler (Eds.), *Language, interaction and social cognition* (79-101). London: SAGE Publications.
- Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J.C., Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: warmth and competence. *TRENDS in Cognitive Science*. Vol. 11, No. 2, 77-83.
- Fiske, S.T., Glick, P., Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: competence and warmth follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 82, No. 6, 878-902.
- Fought, C. (2006). Language and ethnicity. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Garret, P. (2010). Attitudes to language. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H. and Ryan, E.B. (1982). Prolegomena for developing a social psychological theory of language attitudes. In E.B. Ryan and H. Giles (Eds). *Attitudes towards language variation: social and applied contexts*. London: Edward Arnold. 224-272.

- Goeman, A.C.M. (1999). Dialects and the subjective judgments of speakers: Remarks on controversial methods (B.E. Evans, Trans). *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology, Vol. I.* Ed.Dennis R. Preston. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kubarth, H. (1986). El idioma como juego social. *Thesaurus: Boletín del instituto Caro y Cuervo*, *41*(1), 187-210.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington: CAL.
- Labov, W., Ash S., Ravindranath, M., Weldon, T., Baranowski M., and Nagy N. 2011. Properties of the sociolinguistic monitor. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15 (4): 431-463.
- Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60(1), 44.
- Lamboy, E.M. (2008). Me cuesta entender el español de mis amigos caribeños. ¿por qué será? In J. D. Ewald and A. Edstrom (Eds). *El español a través de la lingüística*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Lee, T.L. and Fiske, S.T. (2006). Not an outgroup, not yet an ingroup: Immigrants in the Stereotype Content Model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 30*, 751-768.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States. New York: Routledge.
- Lipski, J.M. (1996). *El español de América*. 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Lipski, J.M. (2011). Socio-phonological variation in Latin American Spanish. In M. Días-Campos (Ed.) *The handbook of Hispanic sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lopez, M.H. and Gonzalez-Barrera, A. (2013). A growing share of Latinos get their news in English. *Pew Research Center Hispanic Trends*.
- Lynch, A. (2009). A sociolinguistic analysis of final /s/ in Miami Cuban Spanish. *Language Science 31*. 766-790.
- Newman, M. (2011). Different ways to hate a language in Catalonia: Interpreting low solidarity scores in language attitude studies. In *Selected proceedings of the 5th workshop on Spanish sociolinguistics* (pp. 40-49).

- Niedzielski, N. (1999). The effect of social information on the perception of sociolinguistic variables. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology 18*(1), 62-85.
- Niedzielski, N. and Preston, D. (2009). Folk linguistics. In Coupland, N. and Jaworski, A. Eds. (2009) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. pp. 356-73.
- Maas, A. and Arcuri L. (1992). The role of language in the persistence of stereotypes. In G.R. Semin and K. Fiedler (Eds.), *Language, interaction, and social cognition* (79-101). London: SAGE Publications.
- Massey, D. S. (2007). *Categorically unequal: The American stratification system*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McHugh, K.E., Miyares, I.M., Skop, E.H. (1997). The magnetism of Miami: segmented paths in Cuban migration. *The Geographical Review* 87 (4): 504-519.
- Mullen, K. (2014). A cross-generational analysis of Spanish-to-English calques in emerging Miami English. Paper presented at XLIII Meeting of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest. September. San Diego, CA.
- Porcel, J. (2011). Language maintenance and language shift among US Latinos. In M. Díaz-Campos (Ed). *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Preston, D. R. (1993). Folk dialectology. American dialect research, 333-77.
- Preston, Dennis R. (1999). A Language Attitude Approach to the Perception of Regional Variety. *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology Vol. I.* Ed. Dennis R. Preston. Translated by Betsy E. Evans. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Preston, D. R. (2002). Perceptual dialectology: Aims, methods, findings. *Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs*, 137, 57-104.
- Quilis, A. (2010). Principios de fonología y fonética españolas. 10<sup>th</sup> Ed. Madrid: Arco.
- Ryan, E. B., Giles, H. Sebastian, R.J. (1982). An integrative perspective for the study of attitudes toward language variation. *Attitudes towards language variation: social* and applied contexts. Eds. Ellen Bouchard Ryan and Howard Giles. London: Edward Arnold.
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Schwartz, A. (2011). Mockery and appropriation of Spanish in White spaces: Perceptions of Latinos in the United States. In M. Díaz-Campos (Ed). *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Stephen, W.G., Renfro, C.L., Esses, V.M., Stephan C.W., Martin, T. (2005). The effects of feeling threatened on attitudes towards immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 29, 1-19.
- Tucker, R. G. and Lambert, W. E. (1975) White and Negro Listeners' Reactions to Various American-English Dialects. In J. Dillard (Ed.) *Perspective on Black English*. The Netherlands: Mouton & Co.
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wolfram, W. (2009). Dialect in society. In Coupland, N. and Jaworski, A. Eds. (2009) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. pp. 35-48.
### **APPENDIX 1**

# **Reading passage**

... es increíble como todavía las compañías de cigarrillos gastan billones de dólares cada año para promover el consumo de este producto. Es de conocimiento general que el fumar y usar tabaco causan cáncer y enfermedades del corazón, pero en el caso de los niños es más difícil que tomen conciencia acerca de este riesgo, ya que no entienden que hay enfermedades que pueden contraer al largo plazo.

### **APPENDIX 2**

#### **Full survey**

What is your best guess about this person's current annual income?

- **O** under 10k (1)
- **O** 10.01-20k (2)
- **O** 20.01-30k (3)
- **O** 30.01-40k (4)
- **O** 40.01-50k (5)
- **O** 50.01-60k (6)
- **O** 60.01-70k (7)
- **O** 70.01-80k (8)
- **O** 80.01-90k (9)
- **O** 90.01-100k (10)
- **O** 100.01 or more (11)
- **O** 100.01-110k (12)
- **O** 110.1-120k (13)
- **O** 120.1-130k (14)

What is your best guess about this person's annual income 5 years from now.

- **O** under 10k (1)
- **O** 10.01-20k (2)
- **O** 20.01-30k (3)
- **O** 30.01-40k (4)
- **O** 40.01-50k (5)
- **O** 50.01-60k (6)
- **O** 60.01-70k (7)
- **O** 70.01-80k (8)
- **O** 80.01-90k (9)
- **O** 90.01-100k (10)
- **O** 100.01-110k (11)
- **O** 110.1-120k (12)
- **O** 120.1-130k (13)

What is the likelihood that this person will be successful in learning English within the next year?

- Very Unlikely (1)
- **O** Unlikely (2)
- O Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- O Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- **O** Very Likely (7)

What is the likelihood that this person watches television mostly in English?

- **O** Very Unlikely (1)
- **O** Unlikely (2)
- **O** Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- O Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- **O** Very Likely (7)

	Very Unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Undecided (3)	Likely (4)	Very Likely (5)
trustworthy (1)	0	О	0	О	О
physically attractive (2) kind (3)	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
self-confident (4) friendly (5)	<b>O</b> <b>O</b>	0 0	<b>O</b> <b>O</b>	<b>O</b>	0 0
intelligent (6)	О	О	О	О	О
outgoing (7)	О	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο

Should this person still be living in Miami ten years from now, what is the likelihood that he will use only Spanish in the home?

- Very Unlikely (1)
- **O** Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- O Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- O Very Likely (7)

Should this person still be living in Miami ten years from now, what is the likelihood that he worries about losing Spanish in the home?

- O Very Unlikely (1)
- O Unlikely (2)
- **O** Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- O Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- O Very Likely (7)

Should this person still be living in Miami ten years from now, what is the likelihood that he will consciously/purposely maintain Spanish in the home?

- Very Unlikely (1)
- O Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- O Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- **O** Very Likely (7)

What is the likelihood that this person is worried about losing Spanish over time?

- Very Unlikely (1)
- O Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- O Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- O Very Likely (7)

What is the likelihood that this person will speak mostly Spanish to his son?

- Very Unlikely (1)
- **O** Unlikely (2)
- **O** Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- **O** Very Likely (7)

What is the likelihood that this person will speak mostly Spanish to his daughter?

- Very Unlikely (1)
- **O** Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- **O** Very Likely (7)

What is the likelihood that this person tries to avoid speaking Spanish in front of non-Spanish speakers?

- Very Unlikely (1)
- Unlikely (2)
- **O** Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- **O** Very Likely (7)

What is the likelihood that this person chooses to speak Spanish rather than English with other people who speak both languages?

- **O** Very Unlikely (1)
- **O** Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- **O** Undecided (4)
- O Somewhat Likely (5)
- O Likely (6)
- **O** Very Likely (7)

	Very Unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Undecided (3)	Likely (4)	Very Likely (5)
They come from a family that values hard work (1)	О	Ο	О	0	О
They come from a family that gave them lots of opportunities to get ahead in life (2)	О	0	0	О	О
They come from a family that invested a lot in their education (3)	О	О	0	0	О
They come from a family that was pretty poor (4)	О	0	0	0	0
They come from a family where the previous generation didn't have much choice about what they would do for a job (5)	0	0	0	0	0

Now we want you to make a few "best guesses" about the person's family. Using your intuition, please tell us how likely it is that each of the following is true.

## How likely is it that the person has each of the following jobs?

·	Very Unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Undecided (3)	Likely (4)	Very Likely (5)
Works behind the counter at a local coffee shop (1)	О	О	О	О	О
Is a salesperson at cell phone store (2)	О	0	О	О	О
Is the office manager at a medical supplies business (3)	0	О	0	0	о
Is an executive at a marketing firm (4)	О	0	О	О	О
An attorney $(5)$	Ο	О	Ο	Ο	О

Q1	0.1 Great – you're	О	1955 (36)
aln	nost done! Just a few	Ο	1956 (37)
fina	al questions about	0	1957 (38)
yoı	1 What year were	0	1958 (39)
you	1020(1)	0	1959 (40)
	1920(1) 1021(2)	0	1960 (41)
	1921(2) 1022(2)	0	1961 (42)
	1922(3) 1022(4)	0	1962 (43)
	1923 (4)	0	1963 (44)
	1924 (3)	0	1964 (45)
	1925(0) 1026(7)	0	1965 (46)
	1920 (7)	0	1966 (47)
	1927(6)	0	1967 (48)
	1928(9) 1020(10)	0	1968 (49)
	1929(10) 1020(11)	0	1969 (50)
	1930(11) 1021(12)	0	1970 (51)
	1931(12) 1932(13)	0	1971 (52)
	1932(13) 1022(14)	0	1972 (53)
	1933(14) 1034(15)	0	1973 (54)
	1934 (15)	0	1974 (55)
	1935 (10)	0	1975 (56)
	1937 (18)	Ο	1976 (57)
	1938 (19)	0	1977 (58)
$\overline{\mathbf{O}}$	1939 (20)	0	1978 (59)
$\mathbf{O}$	1940 (21)	Ο	1979 (60)
õ	1941 (22)	Ο	1980 (61)
Ō	1942 (23)	0	1981 (62)
Ō	1943 (24)	О	1982 (63)
Ō	1944 (25)	0	1983 (64)
0	1945 (26)	0	1984 (65)
0	1946 (27)	О	1985 (66)
0	1947 (28)	0	1986 (67)
0	1948 (29)	0	1987 (68)
0	1949 (30)	0	1988 (69)
0	1950 (31)	0	1989 (70)
0	1951 (32)	0	1990 (71)
0	1952 (33)	0	1991 (72)
0	1953 (34)	0	1992 (73)
0	1954 (35)	0	1993 (74)

- O 1994 (75)
  O 1995 (76)
  O 1996 (77)
  O 1997 (78)
  O 1998 (79)
- **O** 1999 (80)
- **O** 2000 (81)

Q10.2 What is your combined annual household income?

- O under \$20,000 (1)
- **O** 20,000-29,999 (2)
- **O** 30,000-39,999 (3)
- **O** 40,000-49,999 (4)
- **O** 50,000-59,999 (5)
- **O** 60,000-69,999 (6)
- **O** 70,000-79,999 (7)
- **O** 80,000-89,999 (8)
- **O** 90,000-99,999 (9)
- **O** 100,000-109,999 (10)
- **O** 110,000-119,999 (11)
- **O** 120,000-129,999 (12)
- **O** 130,000-139,999 (13)
- **O** 140,000-149,999 (14)
- **O** 150,000+ (15)

Q10.3 What is your gender?

- **O** Male (1)
- O Female (2)

Q10.4 Where were you born?

- In South Florida (1)
- In the United States, but outside of South Florida (2)
- In a predominantly Spanish-speaking country, outside of the United States (3)
- In a predominantly NON-Spanish-speaking country, outside of the United States (4)

Q10.5 How old were you when you moved to the U.S.?

- **O** Less than 5 years old (1)
- 5-12 years old (2)
- **O** 13-17 years old (3)
- **O** 18 or older (4)

Q10.6 How many years have you lived in Miami?

- **O** 1(1)
- **O** 2 (2)
- **O** 3 (3)
- **O** 4 (4)
- **O** 5(5)
- **O** 6(6)
- **O** 7(7)
- **O** 8 (8)
- **O** 9(9)
- **O** 10 (10)
- **O** 11 (11)
- **O** 12 (12)
- O 13 (13)
- **O** 14 (14)
- O 15 (15)
- **O** 16 (16)
- **O** 17 (17)
- O 18 (18)
- O 19 (19)
- **O** 20 (20)
- O 21 years or more (21)

Q10.7 Do you consider yourself 'Hispanic' or 'Latino/a'?

- **O** Yes (1)
- **O** No (2)

Q10.8 Which term below best describes your family's origins?

- O Central American (1)
- O Colombian (2)
- O Cuban (3)
- **O** Dominican (4)
- O Mexican (5)
- O Puerto Rican (6)
- **O** Venezuelan (7)
- **O** South American (other than Colombian or Venezuelan) (8)
- **O** Spanish (from Spain) (9)

Q10.9 And what do you consider to be your race?

- O Caucasian/white (1)
- **O** African American (2)
- **O** Asian/Pacific Islander (3)
- **O** Hispanic/Latino (4)
- **O** Other (5)

### Q10.10 Are you currently a student?

- **O** Yes (1)
- **O** No (2)
- Q10.11 At which institution?
- **O** FIU (1)
- **O** University of Miami (2)
- **O** Other (3)

Q10.12 Do you consider yourself a native speaker of English?

- **O** Yes (1)
- **O** No (2)

Q10.13 How would you rate your own abilities to speak English?

- None I don't speak English (1)
- **O** Poor (2)
- **O** Fair (3)
- **O** Good (4)
- Very good (5)
- O Excellent (6)

Q10.14 Do you consider yourself to be a native speaker of Spanish?

- **O** Yes (1)
- **O** No (2)

Q10.15 How would you rate your own abilities to speak Spanish?

- None I don't speak Spanish (1)
- **O** Poor (2)
- **O** Fair (3)
- **O** Good (4)
- Very good (5)
- O Excellent (6)

Q10.16 Do you consider yourself to be a native speaker of a language other than English or Spanish?

- **O** Yes (1)
- **O** No (2)

Q10.17 How would you rate your own abilities to understand Spanish?

- Poor understand just few basic words and expressions (1)
- Fair understand enough to have a very simple conversation (2)
- Good understand enough to have pretty much any casual conversations (3)
- Very good understand enough to have complex conversations with advanced words and terms (e.g., a business meeting) (4)
- Excellent understanding at level of native speaker (5)

Q10.18 What do you estimate to be the percentage of your use of English and Spanish with your family?

- English almost always or always (1)
- Mostly English, but some Spanish (2)
- **O** Half English, half Spanish (3)
- Mostly Spanish, but some English (4)
- Spanish almost always or always (5)

Q10.19 What do you estimate to be the percentage of your use of English and Spanish with your friends?

- English almost always or always (1)
- Mostly English, but some Spanish (2)
- **O** Half English, half Spanish (3)
- Mostly Spanish, but some English (4)
- Spanish almost always or always (5)

Q10.20 What do you estimate to be the percentage of English and Spanish in television and movies that you watch?

- English almost always or always (1)
- Mostly English, but some Spanish (2)
- **O** Half English, half Spanish (3)
- Mostly Spanish, but some English (4)
- Spanish almost always or always (5)

Q10.21 What do you estimate to be the percentage of English and Spanish in the music you listen to?

- English almost always or always (1)
- Mostly English, but some Spanish (2)
- **O** Half English, half Spanish (3)
- **O** Mostly Spanish, but some English (4)
- **O** Spanish almost always or always (5)

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
In stores in Miami, staff shouldn't assume you speak Spanish and should try speaking English first (1)	0	0	0	0	0
Educated Hispanics in Miami should be fully competent in both Spanish and English. (2)	O	0	0	О	0
Educated Anglos and African-Americans in Miami should be fully competent in both English and Spanish. (3)	О	О	0	О	0
I feel good when I hear salespeople or restaurant servers in Miami speak to customers in Spanish. (4)	О	О	0	О	0
Hispanic teenagers in Miami who refuse to speak Spanish are 'sell-outs'. (5)	О	О	0	О	О
Miami is a bilingual city (Spanish and English). (6)	Ο	О	О	О	О

C	10	.22	Ρ	lease	e ir	idicate	the	exte	nt to	) wh	ich	vou	agree	with	the	foll	lowing	sta	temen	ts:
•												J								

Q10.23 What percent of business in Miami do you think is done in each of the following languages? (Your response should sum to 100.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Spanish (1)

English (2)

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Bilingual education is a good thing. (1)	О	О	О	О	О
Spanish is a valuable economic resource in the United States. (2)	0	0	0	О	О
I think that too many tax dollars are spent on services for speakers of languages other than English in the United States. (3)	0	O	0	0	0
I think that Spanish is necessary to be truly successful in Miami. (4)	О	0	О	ο	О
I think that English should be the only official language in the United States. (5)	О	o	О	ο	О
I think that immigration from Latin America to the United States needs to be better controlled. (6)	O	O	O	О	0
Spanish speakers represent an important sector of the United States market economy. (7)	0	0	0	0	0
In Miami, people who speak both Spanish and English have a professional edge and are more likely to succeed (8)	0	O	Ο	O	0
In Miami, people who speak both Spanish and English probably earn higher incomes than people who speak Spanish only (9)	0	0	0	0	0
In Miami, people who speak	Ο	0	0	0	Ο

Q10.24 Please tell us if you personally agree or disagree with each of the following statements

both Spanish and English probably earn higher			
incomes than people who			
speak English only (10)			

Q10.25 And now here are some statements about what the "average American" thinks. Tell us if you agree or disagree that each of these statements describes the average American.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The average American would say that we need to more tightly secure the border between the United States and Mexico. (1)	0	0	0	0	0
The average American thinks English should be the only official language in the United States. (2)	0	0	0	О	•
The average American would say that Miami is as much a part of Latin America as it is the United States. (3)	0	0	0	0	0
The average American thinks that English is the only real language for professional advancement in this country (4)	0	0	0	0	0

Q10.26 Think back to the different recordings you heard. Did you notice anything unusual about them that you would like to share here? If not, just type "No". If yes, please briefly explain.