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ABSTRACT

The current study aims to contribute to the body of research on variation in the speech of bilinguals in language contact situations, as well as the ongoing discussions of creoles in contact with languages other than their lexifiers. Bilingual production of lone lexical Spanish insertions and multiword Spanish insertions in otherwise Limonese Creole (Limonese) speech are analyzed, and both linguistic and extralinguistic factors are considered. Previous studies have measured lone word integration in bilingual corpora and have shown that lone lexical insertions are integrated into the recipient language as borrowings almost categorically regardless of frequency (nonce or more frequent than nonce) (Poplack 2012; Poplack and Dion 2012; Poplack and Meechan 1998). Furthermore, research on variation in code-switching types has shown that one code-switching pattern generally emerges as a dominant pattern in a corpus. The dominant pattern (insertion, alternation, or congruent lexicalization) provides insight regarding language use within a bilingual community (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007; Muysken 2000, 2013, 2015).

The present investigation examines the morphosyntactic integration of lone Spanish lexical items into otherwise Limonese speech using five conflict sites between the grammars of Limonese and Spanish: verbal inflection, plural marking, determiner realization, adjective placement, and attributive (adnominal) possession. In this way, lone lexical items are determined to be borrowings or code-switches. All multiword Spanish insertions and lone lexical item code-switches are then analyzed to determine the code-switching typology most frequently found in the corpus. Participants in this study are Limonese-Spanish bilinguals living in Puerto Limón, Costa Rica. Data are elicited through formal sociolinguistic interviews with the researcher and informal natural conversations in peer groups.
Results show that lone lexical Spanish insertions were almost categorically integrated into Limonese morphosyntax and code-switches were found to follow predominantly an alternational pattern. Although there is inter-speaker variation in the number of tokens produced, the most frequently produced type of contact phenomena remains fairly consistent across speakers. Contact phenomena beyond lexical borrowing and code-switching, such as phonological borrowing and relexification, was observed in the corpus. Overall, the types of contact phenomena found in bilingual speech reflect speakers’ bilingual competence and high proficiency in both Spanish and Limonese.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The current study investigates contact phenomena present in the speech of Limonese Creole (Limonese)-Spanish bilinguals in Puerto Limón, Costa Rica. Two contexts are used for data collection: a formal context in the form of sociolinguistic interviews, and an informal context in the form of natural conversations. The data show that Spanish insertions are frequent in naturalistic speech, however the type and frequency of insertion is influenced by linguistic and extralinguistic factors, such as grammatical category, gender, age, contextual style of data collection, occupation, and exposure to Standard English.

By taking a comparative variationist approach in my analysis, I determine whether lone Spanish lexical insertions in otherwise Limonese speech are code-switches or borrowings. The current investigation of Limonese is distinct from others in that it uses morphological criteria (conflict sites), chosen from areas in which the grammars of Limonese and Spanish differ, in order to determine borrowing or code-switching status. This comparative variationist method developed by Poplack and others has established a foundation for measuring variation and possible contact-induced language change. The framework combines the use of conflict sites with monolingual or unmixed speech to determine whether a change is internally or externally motivated (Poplack and Dion 2012; Poplack and Levy 2010; Poplack and Meechan 1998).

Several studies have found that bilinguals, regardless of language pair, consistently yield similar results in terms of incorporation of lone lexical items in bilingual speech (Adalar and Tagliamonte 1998; Budzhak-Jones 1998; Eze 1998; Samar and Meechan 1998; Torres Cacoullos and Aaron 2003; Turpin 1998).

After determining borrowing or code-switching status, I analyze the frequency and diffusion of borrowings and also analyze multiword code-switches to determine a dominant
code-switching pattern in the corpus. Variation in code-switching patterns can be accounted for by using the Mixing Typology Model (MTM) (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007; Muysken 2000, 2013, 2015). A small corpus of research employing this framework has shown that in bilingual speech one code-switching pattern will emerge as dominant in both frequency and as scored by the MTM. In addition to linguistic factors, dominant code-switching type depends upon typological distance, history of language use, and degree of bilingualism in the community. Determining the dominant pattern in a corpus can lead to informed inferences regarding future language use.

The majority of research on creoles in contact examines cases of creoles in contact with they lexifying languages. This research, which has laid a foundation for this study, is discussed in Chapter Two. It has been shown that contact with a lexifier can result in a variety of outcomes, ranging from decreolization and the emergence of a spectrum of lects, such as in the case of Jamaican Creole (Patrick 1999), to prolonged maintenance, such as the case of Haitian Creole, which, along with French is an official language and spoken by the majority of the Haitian population (DeGraff 2007). The case of Limonese in contact with Spanish presents the opportunity to examine creoles in contact from a different perspective. Limonese is in intense contact with a language other than its lexifier, therefore it is unlikely to decreolize. Creole has been maintained in Limón for over a century and an increase in contact with Spanish and bilingualism since the 1950s has led to the notion of contact-induced language change (Winkler 1998). This study aims to contribute to the literature on creoles in contact by examining the contact phenomena present in Limonese-Spanish bilingual speech.

The principal research questions of this investigation are the following:
1) What types of Spanish insertions are found in naturalistic bilingual speech? Of these types of Spanish insertions, which ones are most frequent in the corpus and what is the rate of diffusion of each type? As far as lone Spanish insertions are concerned, can morphological integration into Limonese be attested?

2) How do linguistic and extralinguistic factors influence the use of contact phenomena, in particular Spanish lone insertions and multiword code-switches?

3) What types of language contact phenomena are evidenced in the speech of Limonese-Spanish bilinguals beyond lexical borrowing and code-switching? Considering Limonese is in contact with a language that is not its lexifier, what processes of language contact are in progress? Is there evidence of relexification or structural borrowing from Spanish?

4) What are speaker attitudes toward code-switching and language use in Puerto Limón?

In order to assess the Limonese-Spanish contact situation in Limón, it is first necessary to examine possible outcomes of language contact as a whole. Chapter Two begins by reviewing a portion of the large body of literature on borrowing and code-switching, the two principal contact phenomena examined in this study. Language maintenance, shift, and genesis are also discussed in this chapter, and contextualized with different cases of Spanish in contact. In addition, much research has emerged that explores concepts of language maintenance, shift, and genesis in cases of creoles in contact. Sections 2.6 and 2.7 present some of these previous findings with particular focus on Spanish (Iberian)-based creoles and restructured varieties. These studies provide explanations and applications of mechanisms and processes of language contact to consider with regards to Limonese in contact with Spanish.

Chapter Three provides frame of reference for the contact situation under study. A historical overview of the Afro-Costa Rican population is given, and the social and linguistic
factors that contributed to the formation of Limonese Creole are considered within this context. The second half of the chapter classifies the linguistic varieties present in Puerto Limón. The model presented in Section 3.7 accounts for both different varieties of Limonese English and different varieties of Spanish found in Puerto Limón. This section also considers how language contact and bilingualism have influenced the presence of several varieties in a speech event.

The research questions and objectives of this study are presented in Chapter Four, which also reviews the linguistic and extralinguistic factors examined in the analysis. Furthermore, Chapter Four summarizes observations on lexical borrowing and code-switching from previous studies. The chapter also describes the methods of data collection and details the diagnostics used for the analysis of lone lexical insertions and multiword code-switches. In addition, examples from the data of the conflict sites used to measure lone item morphological integration and the diagnostics used to classify multiword code-switches are provided.

Chapter Five presents a quantitative analysis of all lone and multiword Spanish insertions in otherwise Limonese speech in the corpus. I recount the results of each conflict site used for analyzing lone Spanish insertions, assert the dominant code-switching pattern in the corpus, and summarize the implications that the dominant pattern may have on language use among Limonese-Spanish bilinguals. In addition to discussing the distribution and diffusion of borrowings and code-switches overall in the corpus, factors that influence production of borrowings and code-switching types are described.

In Chapter Six, I discuss contact phenomena found in the data beyond borrowing and code-switching. It is shown that language contact is evidenced in the phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics of Limonese-Spanish bilingual speech. I also present speaker-reported
attitudes on language use and code-switching, and summarize the findings and contributions of the study.
CHAPTER TWO: LANGUAGE IN CONTACT AND CREOLES IN CONTACT

2.1 Introduction

Thomason (1995) notes that some linguistic results of language contact seem so extreme and bizarre that the only possible explanation for arriving at these outcomes would be that the languages had first passed through equally extreme or bizarre processes. Yet, while the results of language contact are at times “extraordinary” the processes themselves are actually quite “ordinary”. Although Thomason (1995) refers specifically to language mixing, this principle can surely be applied to the study of language contact as a whole. This chapter explores the various “ordinary” processes of language contact and their outcomes. The chapter first discusses processes of language contact such as types of borrowing and code-switching, and then discusses the differences between the two phenomena. Following is a discussion of possible outcomes of language contact such as language maintenance, language shift, and language genesis (Winford 2003). Finally, the chapter examines how the concepts of language maintenance, language shift, and language genesis can also be observed in contact situations involving creoles.

2.2 Mechanisms of language contact

The main emphasis of this dissertation is borrowing and code-switching in Limonese-Spanish bilinguals; therefore, this section presents some of the theories behind these contact phenomena and discusses previous findings concerning borrowing and code-switching in Limonese speech.

2.2.1 Borrowing

Borrowing at its most basic definition is “the incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers’ native language” (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:21). However, depending on the intensity of contact and the typological distance between the languages in question, there are
several different types of borrowing that may emerge (Thomason and Kaufman 1988).

Thomason and Kaufman (1988:74-76) present a borrowing scale, which consists of five stages ranging from “casual contact” that results in only lexical borrowing to “very strong cultural pressure” that results in “heavy structural borrowing”. Heavy structural borrowing moves beyond borrowing at the lexical level and may include the incorporation of foreign phonological, morphological, and/or syntactic elements into L1 speech. In order for heavy structural borrowing to occur, Thomason and Kaufman (1988:37) state that it is necessary to have lexical borrowing and extensive bilingualism over a “considerable” period of time in a community. Some question the plausibility of heavy structural borrowing (Winford 2002:29-30; Poplack and Levy 2010), arguing that it is extremely difficult to be certain that structural changes in a language are borrowed or are contact induced, rather than changes that are internally motivated.

One of the main areas of exploration in this study is the type of lexical borrowing that occurs in Limonese Creole-Spanish bilingual speech. Lexical borrowing can result in a variety of forms, ranging from lexical items similar to the foreign counterpart, to new lexical creations based on foreign concepts. Winford (2003) presents a summary of types of lexical borrowings based on Haugen’s (1953) classifications. Lexical borrowings are first divided into two categories: “borrowings” which are “modeled on the donor language”, and “native creations” (Winford 2003:45). Borrowings are categorized further as either loanwords or loanshifts. There are two types of loanwords: “pure” loanwords, which will be the focus of this study, and loanblends. There are also two types of loanshifts, either (semantic) extensions or loan translations (calques). As far as native creations are concerned, there are three categories: native words used to express foreign concepts, foreign words used to express new concepts, and hybrid creations, or the use of native and foreign elements to express foreign concepts (Winford
In addition to what Winford (2003) calls “pure” loanwords, several other types of lexical borrowings are found in Limonese-Spanish bilingual speech, and will be discussed in Chapter 6.

This study also examines the integration of lone Spanish lexical borrowings in otherwise Limonese speech and aims to determine if there is evidence of and integration at both the morphosyntactic and phonological levels. In previous studies on lexical borrowing, Poplack (2012:644) concludes that morphosyntactic integration of lexemes is abrupt and categorical while phonological integration is gradual and highly variable. For this reason, she considers phonological integration a poor gauge of borrowing status. Additionally, Poplack (2012) and Poplack and Dion (2012) distinguish lexical borrowing as either “nonce” or “more frequent” (also “established”), stating that they are not “linguistically distinct” from each other (Poplack 2012:647). The two types of borrowing are similar, the difference being distribution (diffusion) and phonological integration. Nonce borrowing is defined as a lone lexical item that is “uttered once by a single speaker in a given corpus” (Poplack and Dion 2012:286), while established borrowings are more widespread in both the number of occurrences of the lexical item and number of speakers that use it. Poplack (2012) also asserts that established borrowings are eventually integrated at the phonological level because phonological integration increases with frequency (647).

Winkler (1998) provides the most recent analysis of Spanish lexical borrowings in Limonese. In this study, she discusses the type and quantity of lexical borrowings (loanwords) found in her corpus. Lexical borrowings were found to be either nouns, verbs or discourse markers. Borrowing status was based on frequency (occurring in the speech of at least three different participants) and phonetic integration. Using these criteria, it was found that 30 lexemes
in her corpus are borrowed, although Winker (1998:143) notes that these findings should be considered “conservative” due to the exclusion of many lone insertions that did not fit the frequency requirement. In her work, Winkler (1998:165; 2000:195) also addresses possible morphosyntactic (structural) borrowing in Limonese, as noun-adjective instead of the expected adjective-noun word order is observed in some noun phrases, such as in the example: ‘And [they were] very religious; that’s another thing very important’ (Winkler 1998:199)

2.2.2 Code-Switching

Definitions of code-switching are numerous, however it can be generally defined broadly as “the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation” (Grosjean 1982:145) or “the use of two language varieties in the same conversation” (Myers-Scotton 2006:239). More specifically, Winford (2003:103) defines code-switching as “cases where bilingual speakers alternate between codes within the same speech event, switch codes within a single turn, or mix elements from two codes within the same utterance”. Use of code-switching varies and depends on several social factors involving the situation and the speaker(s). Some of the major factors include domain of the conversation, topic of the conversation, identity portrayal, and the interlocutors’ level of bilingualism (Winford 2003; Myers-Scotton 2002).

Several theories aim to explain the linguistic structure of code-switches in hopes of determining and/or predicting which types of code-switches are permissible, and which types are not. Winford (2003:165-166) categorizes the two major code-switching frameworks as those “involving alternation of structures from two languages” as opposed to those involving “insertion of elements from one language into the morphosyntactic frame of the other”. Poplack’s extensive work on code-switching is an example of the former framework (Poplack 1980, 2012; Poplack and Sankoff 1988; Sankoff and Poplack 1981; Poplack and Levy 2010; Poplack and Dion 2012)

Poplack’s preliminary work proposed two constraints that govern code-switching: the free morpheme constraint and the equivalence constraint. The free morpheme constraint states that code-switching will not occur after a constituent unless the constituent is a free morpheme. The equivalence constraint limits switching to points where the two languages have similar structures. Winford (2003:131) points out that these constraints, in particular the equivalence constraint, have been contested. One of the principal arguments of Poplack’s framework, and also of this study, is that lone other language insertions are found not to be code-switches, but borrowings. Code-switches are almost always multiword elements that appear in either inter-sentential or intra-sentential environments (Poplack and Dion 2012).

Myers-Scotton’s Matrix Language Frame posits that in code-switched constituents, one of the languages (the matrix language) provides a frame into which elements from the other language (the embedded language) are incorporated. The Matrix Language Frame model has three premises. First, the Matrix Language and Embedded Language do not contribute equally to the constituent structure. Second, morpheme types are not derived equally from the Matrix Language and the Embedded Language. And third, both the Matrix Language and Embedded Language are activated when a speaker is engaged in code-switching (Myers-Scotton 2006:243). The Matrix Language is determined in part through the Morpheme Order Principle, which states that it is the Matrix Language that establishes the word and morpheme order of the code-switched constituent. Another important principle in the Matrix Language Frame is the System Morpheme Principle. This principle states that all system morphemes, such as affixes, determiners, and clitics, come from the Matrix Language (Myers-Scotton 2002:59). Myers-
Scotton (2006) admits that the Matrix Language Frame does not apply to all types of contact phenomena, however, she suggests that it “highlights the importance of asymmetry in characterizing bilingual speech” (242).

Muysken (2000) argues that code-switching is not a uniform contact phenomenon, but rather code-switching production is varied, and dependent on the languages and the speech community involved. In Muysken (2000) the Mixing Typology Model (MTM) is presented to account for the variation in code-switching outcomes. The MTM offers three types of code-switching strategies: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization, to describe the code-switching patterns in bilingual speech (Muysken 2000). Muysken (2013) later adds a fourth strategy, backflagging. Muysken (2013) defines each code-switching type in general terms. Insertion occurs when the speaker’s L1 is used as the base language of the switch, whereas backflagging uses the speaker’s L2 as the base language. Alternation combines independent structures from both the L1 and L2 grammars. Finally, congruent lexicalization “produces structures and words which share properties of L1 and L2” (Muysken 2013:214). Insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization, and the methods used to determine the category of a code-switch will be further discussed in Chapter Four.

Winkler (1998; 2000), and Zimmer (2011) both offer discussions of code-switching in Puerto Limón. Winkler’s analysis examines Spanish insertions in Limonese speech while Zimmer focuses on Limonese or English insertions in the Spanish of Afro-Costa Ricans. Inter-sentential, intra-sentential, and lone word code-switches were all attested in Winkler (1998:184-85). Nouns, verbs, and adjectives were the most frequently switched categories in that study. Limonese-Spanish code-switching tested the Matrix Language Frame in Winkler (2000) and it was found that code-switched constituents upheld both the Morpheme Order and System
Morpheme Principles (195). Zimmer (2011) found that younger speakers (16-29 years old) code-switched at higher rates than speakers in her 30-55 and 56+ age groups. She suggests that code-switching reflects the ethnolinguistic identities of the younger speakers and affords them the opportunity to express their biculturalism (Zimmer 2011:169).

This section concludes by highlighting the three main differences between code-switching and borrowing. First, borrowing does not require bilingualism; monolinguals may incorporate borrowed words in their speech. Code-switching, however, does require bilingualism as both grammars are engaged in code-switched constituents. Second, in accordance with Poplack’s framework, lone lexical insertions are almost always interpreted as borrowings, ranging from nonce borrowings occurring only once in one speaker’s speech to more frequent or established borrowings, which have a higher rate of distribution and diffusion. Code-switches are composed of multiword constituents and may be inter- or intra-sentential. Lastly, borrowing results in morphosyntactic integration and eventual phonological integration into the recipient language whereas code-switches are not morphologically integrated.

2.3 Language maintenance

Factors that contribute to the outcome of language contact include, but not limited to, population demographics, length of contact, community settings, ideologies and attitudes within a community, economic opportunity, social pressure, cultural pressure, and degree of bilingualism (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:66; Winford 2003:25; Myers-Scotton 2002:49-50, 2006:68). In contact situations, language maintenance is possible under two different circumstances (Myers-Scotton 2006). First, in some situations speakers retain their L1 and do not acquire L2 despite the contact. Second, speakers may learn L2 in addition to but not replacing L1, therefore retaining both languages (Myers-Scotton 2006:68). Generally, if a community still
retains L1 after the third generation of speakers has had contact with L2, it is said to be a successful case of language maintenance.

One notable case of language maintenance is the case of Spanish in contact in New Mexico and Southern Colorado. A Spanish-speaking population has existed in these regions since Juan de Oñate established the first settlement along the Río Grande in 1598. Santa Fe was founded in 1610 and all other settlements were located within approximately a fifty-mile radius. The population in the first settlements grew to almost 3,000 by 1690; however, uprisings from Pueblo Indians killed many of the colonists or forced them to move southward (Lipski 2008:194). By the 18th century, Spanish settlers had pacified the Indians and settlements expanded throughout the 1800s, extending from the San Luis Valley, Colorado to the north and Albuquerque, New Mexico to the south. Throughout this colonial period, Spanish was maintained due to isolation and lack of contact with speakers of other languages (195). New Mexico was annexed to the United States in 1846, however there were not any public schools in the territory until 1871 (203). Even after gaining statehood in 1912, Spanish continued to be the primary language in the region. English-speaking Americans began to move to the area and in the 1930s New Mexico state senator Dennis Chávez insisted on the use of English in schools and in “public life” (203). In their linguistic atlas of New Mexico and Southern Colorado, Bills and Vigil (2008) estimate that Spanish and English have been in contact for over 150 years. They describe the current linguistic situation as Spanish shifting to English as a dominant or only language in the region (Bills and Vigil 2008:165). However, barring a sudden shift, it appears that Spanish will be maintained in the region for several years to come. A 2011 report from the U.S. Census bureau estimates that in Albuquerque, New Mexico’s largest city, 214,162 people or 26% of the population speak Spanish in the home. In the state capital, Santa Fe, 45,075 people or
33% of the population speak Spanish in the home. Although the variety of Spanish that is spoken today may differ from the variety spoken in colonial times (Bills and Vigil 2008), the fact remains that despite contact with English, Spanish has been maintained in the region for over 100 years, and continues to be the language of choice in the home for hundreds of thousands of residents.

Cases of language maintenance differ, as maintenance is not a formulaic process or determined by a specific set of factors. Factors that lead to language maintenance in some cases may not yield the same result in other situations. It is impossible to predict the outcome of contact situations and important to remember that language maintenance is not permanent; under the right conditions factors contributing to language maintenance could also result in language shift (Winford 2003:28).

2.4 Language Shift

Language shift occurs in contact situations where speakers acquire L2 as an additional language, and subsequently L2 replaces L1 as the main variety spoken by a community. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) note “a completed shift results in the disappearance of the shifting group’s original language in the community” (111). Typically the shift from L1 to the dominant L2 occurs by the third generation of speakers, however in some cases a shift may take place within one or two generations (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:119; Myers-Scotton 2002:48; 2006:68). Winford (2003) describes language shift as “when stable bilingualism collapses, through either the erosion of ethnolinguistic boundaries or the resolution of diglossia or some other cause” (27). Winford (2003) also refers to language shift as “group second language acquisition” (group SLA). Language shift often occurs in one of two situations. First, a minority group may shift to the language of the majority in a community. In this instance, there
may be a brief period of bilingualism, however the shift often occurs within the third generation. The second situation is language shift as a result of colonization. Colonizers, although a minority, impose their language on indigenous communities, who then replace their indigenous language with the language of the colonizers (Winford 2003:237).

In the case of Limonese, Costa Ricans clearly did not colonize Limón Province. However, Limonese speakers were not always a minority group in Limón. Census data shows that in 1883 approximately 48% of Limón province’s population was of Jamaican origin. The Afro-Caribbean population continued to increase until its peak in 1927 at 56% of the population. At this time, Hispanics consisted of 31% of the population making Afro-Carribbeans the majority population (Chomsky 1996:47). However, the Hispanic population began to increase and twenty-three years later, at the time of the 1950 census, Afro-Costa Ricans were no longer a majority and consisted of only 33% of the population (Chomsky 1996:47; Phillip Baboolal 2011:49; Winkler 2000:190). Contact between Limonese and Spanish increased as the demographics changed throughout the twentieth century, leaving Limonese today a case susceptible to language shift.

Lipski (1987, 2008) provides a case of language shift that is near completion with his account of Louisiana Isleño Spanish of St. Bernard Parish. The Isleño dialect was maintained in the swamps of eastern Louisiana for more than 200 years, principally due to its extreme isolation. There were limited roads and movement from the Tierra de los Bueyes until the mid-twentieth century. Isleño speakers were descendants of Spaniards who retained their Spanish heritage despite falling under French territory and later being annexed by the United States (Lipski 2008:210). Until the 1940s most members of the St. Bernard Parish community were monolingual Spanish speakers, however, a series of events since the 1940s has resulted in a rapid language shift from Spanish to English. Hurricanes throughout the region forced Isleños to leave
their isolated community; some left permanently, contributing to the loss of speakers. During World War II, young men left the community for military service. Eventually infrastructure throughout the swamp area improved, and contact with English speakers increased as St. Bernard Parish became structurally connected with greater Louisiana.

Perhaps the biggest factor influencing language shift was the transition of the language in the educational system from Spanish to English (Lipski 2008:211). Myers-Scotton (2006:90) notes the importance of using L1 as a medium of instruction in order to promote language maintenance. This was certainly an influential factor in the case of language shift in Louisiana Isleño Spanish, and we will see the importance of this factor again in the description of Limonese’s socio-historic background provided in Chapter Three. Moreover, there are few people under the age of 65 who are speakers of the Isleño dialect. Given the fact that the two most recent generations of St. Bernard Parish inhabitants are not Spanish speaking, language death in this community is expected within the next generation (Lipski 2008:211).

Furthermore, it is important to note that language shift may pass through various stages, especially in cases where the shift occurs throughout several generations. Winford (2003:258-60) mentions several authors (Batibo 1992, Rickford 1987, Sasse 1992) who summarize the different stages of language shift or attrition and give the following general observations. First, language shift is not predictable, nor are its stages. Speakers, although from the same community, do not transition from L1 to L2 uniformly, therefore it may be difficult to assess language shift until after the shift has occurred. Second, just as with language maintenance, factors that contribute to language shift and attrition vary on a case-by-case basis. In addition, some of the most linguistically interesting stages of language shift occur at the stage when there is still bilingualism in the community and more speakers are adopting L2 as their primary language.
This stage is particularly interesting because speakers often incorporate L2 lexical and structural items into L1. These in-between stages will be of the most interest to the study of Limonese and Spanish in contact. What’s more, the fact that Limonese is a creole language adds a new dimension to the processes of language shift mentioned thus far.

2.5 Language Genesis

Unlike cases of language maintenance and language shift, there are also situations in which speakers do not acquire fully the dominant language as a L2 and a new contact variety emerges. The third outcome of language contact noted in the literature is language genesis and it encompasses the formation of mixed languages, creoles, and new radical vernacular varieties (Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Myers-Scotton 2002; Winford 2003). The following section focuses on language genesis as the product of intense contact between two or more varieties. Motivations behind language genesis are almost purely social, and can arise in a variety of settings. Historically, these contexts have included plantations (with slaves or immigrant workers), former-slave settlements, and trade areas (Thomason 1995:15). It is in these environments that new varieties have emerged as lingua francas in order to satisfy a communicative need among people with different L1s.

2.5.1 Mixed languages

First, it is important to define what is meant by the term ‘mixed languages’. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Thomason (1995) distinguish mixed languages as the result of “abnormal transmission”, where the structure of the language cannot be traced to one particular language that was spoken by a previous generation. The term ‘mixed language’ is inclusive of but not restricted to, pidgins and creoles and languages that emerged in two-language contact situations where full or extensive bilingualism is present (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:3;
Thomason 1995:16). According to this definition, pidgins and creoles are considered mixed languages created with simplification processes in the absence of bilingualism. However, in the current study, pidgins and creoles will be considered distinct from mixed languages, as seen in Matras (2009:288). The definition that will be used for the term ‘mixed languages’ is taken from Winford (2003)\(^1\). A mixed language is one that draws its grammatical and lexical elements from two different source languages, yet it is not mutually intelligible with either. In addition, a mixed language is a “new autonomous creation” and although components of the mixed language may be identifiable from the sources, the language as a whole is distinct from the source languages (Winford 2003:170-175).

Thomason (1995) categorizes mixed languages according to the different groups of speakers that create them, indicating different social motivations behind their creation. The first type of mixed language belongs to “persistent” ethnic groups. These languages develop gradually and represent the long process of language change. The second type of mixed language develops in “new” ethnic groups and emerges quickly, at times within one generation (Thomason 1995:16). There are two contact mechanisms that lead to the emergence of mixed languages: borrowing interference and interference thought imperfect learning. The main distinction between these two processes is that borrowing interference begins with lexical items whereas interference through imperfect learning begins with phonology and syntax (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:3, 36-7). It should also be noted that extensive bilingualism in at least one of the two speaker groups involved is required for the creation of a mixed language (Thomason 1995). Extensive bilingualism also accounts for the lack of simplification seen in the lexicons and

---

\(^1\) It is recognized that Winford (2003) draws from Thomason (1995, 1997) to summarize the characteristics of a mixed language. However in his definition Winford also draws on Bakker (1994) and emphasizes the new autonomy of the mixed language from its source language rather than the different classifications of mixed languages.
grammars of mixed languages that might be expected when two systems converge (Winford 2003:169-171).

Myers-Scotton (2002) also summarizes certain factors that contribute to the creation of new varieties. These factors are specified to promote the creation of mixed (her split) languages, however it will be shown that these social factors are not unlike those at play in the creation of creoles. One issue at hand is to examine the factors that promote languages genesis, as opposed to language maintenance or language shift. While language maintenance and language shift are also produced by a variety of social factors, language genesis arises under dramatic sociopolitical conditions in combination with socio-psychological factors (Myers-Scotton 2002:252-3). Four situations are listed by Myers-Scotton (2002) to describe what might be considered dramatic sociopolitical conditions. 

1) invasion and subsequent subjugation of an indigenous group and its colonization by a foreign power

2) migration and a new life that requires regular use of a dominant L2

3) long term employment in an alien culture, using the L1 of that culture

4) indigenous but minority status under totalitarian rule

It is true that these conditions may also lead to language shift, however in cases of language genesis it is found that speakers create a new language as a way of signaling an independent identity. Speakers see themselves as unique and distinct from both their original ethnic group and the dominant group, and therefore express this identity linguistically with the new language. This is exemplified in the case of Media Lengua.

Media Lengua is an example of a mixed language where there is a clear division of the two source languages, Spanish and Quechua. It is also an example of the second class of mixed
languages described by Thomason (1995), those that develop rapidly in “emerging social groups” (20). The language is comprised of a primarily Quechua grammar with heavy lexical borrowing from Spanish and is spoken in Ecuadorian highlands communities situated between Quechua-speaking mountain towns and the Spanish-speaking city of Quito (Muysken 1981, 1997). The circumstances surrounding Media Lenga exemplify how a combination of dramatic sociopolitical condition and socio-psychological factors can lead to the emergence of a new variety. The first speakers of Media Lenga were craftsmen, weavers, construction workers, and other industry workers living in the highlands yet migrating to work in Quito. This migration yielded a need for Quechua speakers to use a dominant L2, Spanish. Media Lenga has now extended beyond workers commuting to Quito and is observed in the speech of other young adults and children living in the highland communities (Muysken 1981, 1997). The sociopolitical aspect of Media Lenga’s formation comes from the idea that although speakers are Quechua, they do not belong to the traditional rural Quechua culture, nor can they completely identify with the mainstream Hispanic culture of Quito (Muysken 1981, 1997). Muysken (1981, 1997) also posits that Media Lenga was formed through relexification as a result of language contact, extensive bilingualism, and need for a new linguistic identity. Media Lenga is used only as an in-group language, and is unintelligible to monolingual Spanish or Quechua speakers (Muysken 1981:53). Media Lenga therefore serves as an identity marker for this unique group of people in the Ecuadorian highlands as they are “both culturally and linguistically half-way between Quechua and Spanish” (Winford 2003:176).

2.5.2 Creoles

There is undoubtedly much to discuss in the field of creole genesis, however this section focuses on creoles as an outcome of language contact, rather than the origins of creoles as a
“language-type”\(^2\). The section also highlights features that distinguish creole formation from mixed language formation.

Several factors, both linguistic and extralinguistic, are central to creole formation. The first factor, environment, emphasizes the fact that creoles were primarily formed among enslaved or otherwise subordinated groups of people using different native tongues. One way in which creole creation is distinguished from the formation of mixed languages is that there are many source languages involved in creole formation as opposed to two main source languages in the case of mixed languages. Social conditions during the formation of many creoles demanded the many native languages in a speech community be replaced with a shared language (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:148, 150).

Another factor that distinguishes creole formation from other types of language genesis is that creoles are formed when there is an extreme imbalance of power; an oppressive environment leads to the need for a common vernacular. Slaves or workers are unable to adopt one of their several L1s as a lingua franca because no one particular L1 carries enough power and prestige to merit group acquisition (Myers-Scotton 2002:272). Furthermore, there is a need to acquire at least some of the dominant language in the speech community, that is, the language of the slave masters or plantation owners. The severe imbalance of power prevents speakers from gaining sufficient access to the language of prestige and therefore prohibits full acquisition (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:153). For this reason, duration and quality of contact between the dominant language and the L1s of the slaves/workers is another factor in creole genesis. Contact with the language of power occurs long enough to influence any inter-language (or pidgin) the

\(^2\) The term “language-type” is used in a general sense. Creole genesis is often distinguished from non-creole language genesis, however it is not my intent to imply that pidgins and creoles should be classified as a language group in the sense of a “Romance language” or “Germanic language”.
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slaves/workers have formed, yet at the same time, the short duration and poor quality of contact does not allow for full acquisition. In short, there is a lack of widespread bilingualism in these settings and preventing “normal” methods of language transmission and/or acquisition from taking place. Instead, an inter-language is adopted as the native language of the speech community, thus “creolizing” the variety, which will then function as a language in its own right (Holm 1988:6).

Some observations can be made that are common to the creation of mixed languages and creole formation. Both mixed languages and creoles borrow and intertwine the lexicons and grammars from two or more source languages. Yet, mixed languages involve two languages as the main sources of the new variety, whereas creoles can have more than two languages that contribute to creole formation. As Myers-Scotton (2002) notes, a trend among new contact varieties is that there is often a split, although fractured, between the lexical and morphosyntactic systems of these varieties. For mixed languages, the split is polarized. Myers-Scotton (2002) notes, “a split language shows all – or almost all – of its morphosyntactic frame from a different source language from large portion of its lexicon” (249). Winford (2003) also notes that the grammar and the lexicon of the mixed language come from two distinct sources. Although the lexical-morphosyntactic split is not uniform in all cases, mixed languages generally source around 90% of their lexical inventory from one of the source languages (Winford 2003:173). Similar trends can be observed in creoles, given the influence of substrate and lexifying languages in the formation. For example, the language of power and prestige often has the largest contribution to the lexicon of the creole (Holm 2000:69). In the case of creoles, the split between the lexical and grammatical systems is not as obvious as in many mixed languages. Finally, in cases of mixed language creation there is always a bilingual portion of the population
In creole formation, on the other hand, there is no widespread bilingualism or mutual intelligibility of languages. This is precisely why the creole is formed: to fill the need for a common language among a population with no lingua franca.

2.6 Creoles in Contact

The following section focuses on creoles in contact and the processes that may occur as a result of contact. Consideration is given as to whether the processes described could result in the maintenance of the creole, loss of the creole, or the creation of a new contact variety.

2.6.1 Relexification

One possible outcome of a creole in contact is relexification. The concept of relexification originated as a component of the monogenesis hypothesis, however it is more commonly used to describe a vocabulary shift that occurs when creoles are maintained in a contact situation. Muysken (1981:61) defines relexification as “the process of vocabulary substitution in which the only information adopted from the target language in the lexical entry is the phonological representation”. That is, throughout the relexification process the syntactic, semantic, and morphological features associated with a lexical entry remain the same. If the phonological form is borrowed along with syntactic, semantic and morphological forms, it is referred to as translexification (Muysken 1981:61). Relexification begins as a borrowing process; there must be strong, persistent contact between two languages in order for the majority of one language’s vocabulary to be borrowed and incorporated into the lexicon of another. Often cases of relexification result in language maintenance, particularly in creoles, however relexification

---

3 It is recognized that relexification is exclusive to creoles in contact.
4 Monogenesis refers to the idea that most pidgins and creoles could be traced to one Portuguese-based pidgin prototype, which has been subsequently relexified into the pidgins and creoles of other European languages (Holm 1988:46).
may also result in the creation of a new variety. Media Lengua exemplifies a case of language creation through the relexification of a Quechua variety.

The relexification of Papiamento, spoken on the islands of Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao (ABC islands), demonstrates that language maintenance may occur despite strong influence from a non-creole dominant language. It may be most accurate to describe Papiamento as an Iberian-based creole, because it is estimated more that two-thirds of Papiamento’s lexicon is of Spanish or Portuguese origin. However its lexicon has most recently experienced considerable influence from Spanish (Holm 1989:315). Most theories on the origins of Papiamento point to Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch influence; power on the ABC islands shifted between the Spanish, Dutch, and Portuguese at several points from 1499 through the 1700s. The islands were first sighted by the Spanish in 1499 and in 1527 the Spanish first settled the island of Curaçao. It is suspected that at that time the native Arawak population acquired some Spanish from settlers and later from missionaries who lived on the island (Holm 1989:313). In 1634 the Dutch took over both Curaçao and Bonaire and in 1688 they seized Aruba. Along with the Dutch, Sephardic Jews settled on the islands after fleeing the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. The Dutch used the islands as centers for the trade of African slaves, and it is reported that by the 1680s there were (approximately) equal numbers of Europeans and slaves on the islands (Holm 1989:314). A contact language emerged during this time and was acquired by not only the slave population, but also by the Dutch and Sephardic Jews, beginning what Holm (1989) calls a “long tradition of bilingualism” (314).

At the beginning of the eighteenth century contact with Spanish increased through trade and contact with Spanish missionaries. Papiamento began to stabilize, and contact with Spanish led to expanding and replacing vocabulary of previous Dutch, Portuguese or African origin with

Today the “hispanization” of Papiamento reaches beyond relexification and can also been seen in structural elements of Papiamento, introduced through morphological and syntactic borrowing from Spanish. For example, traditional Papiamento does not have a passive construction. The passive voice is expressed by using the indefinite plural pronoun nan ‘they’; therefore the sentence ‘he is hit’ is expressed nan ta dal e⁵. However, constructions using an auxiliary verb ser, borrowed from Spanish are found in urban speech, e.g. papyamentu ta ser papyá ‘Papiamento is spoken’ (Wood 1972:859). Another example of the morphological and syntactic hispanization of Papiamento is the borrowing of the present progressive –ndo (Wood 1972:859-860; Holm 1989: 314-15). Traditional Papiamento does not distinguish between a simple and continuous present tense i.e. e ta papya glosses as ‘he speaks’ or ‘he is speaking’. However, Papiamento speakers borrow the morpheme ‘-ndo’ to form a present participle. Now, the phrase ‘he is speaking’ is expressed in Papiamento as el ta papyando (Wood 1972:860).

2.6.2 Decreolization

Decreolization describes the language shift that occurs when a creole is in prolonged contact with its lexifying language. Holm (1988:9) defines decreolization as a process where the creole loses “its most noticeable non-European features” and replaces them with European ones. The loss of creole features and replacement or acquisition of European features (in cases of European language-lexified creoles) is a gradual transition and often results in distinct varieties. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) posit that decreolization is actually borrowing that is favored

₅ Literally ‘they hit him’ where ‘they’ is indefinite.
because of typological similarities between the structures of the source (lexifying) language and the borrowing (creole) language (97-99). Depending on the degree of contact with the lexifying language, decreolization may result in a continuum oflects ranging from basilects (the most “creole-like” varieties, or those farthest from the lexifying language) to acrolects (the varieties closest to the lexifying language). Varieties between the basilect and acrolect are referred to as mesolects, although it is often difficult to distinguish between the different lects.

Still, others argue that decreolization inaccurately describes the language change that may occur when a creole is in contact with a non-creole language (Mufwene 1994, 2004, 2008; DeGraff 2005). DeGraff (2005:553) states that all languages undergo change, however, the prefix “de-” is characteristic of only creoles. He continues, noting that the term decreolization implies an inadequacy or “abnormality” on the part of the creole and argues that the term suggests that creoles must “improve” and further evolve to be a “normal” language. DeGraff (2005) also notes that it’s unclear as to what structural elements (lexical, phonological, morphological, etc.) of a language are “inverted” to make a language no longer creole. Finally, it is pointed out that a decreolized variety is defined as the variety structurally closest to the lexifying language, however, in many cases there is evidence that this variety does not exist due to contact, but rather it has existed from the beginning of the contact situation (DeGraff 2005:553). In some cases these acrolectal varieties actually precede basilectal varieties. Mufwene (1994), therefore, offers the term debasilectalization to more accurately reflect this process of language change. Debasilectalization refers to the systematic departure from

---

6 DeGraff argues that the terms “de-Latinization”, “de-Romancization”, “de-Frenchification”, “de-Germanicization”, or “de-Anglicization” are not used to describe language change in the corresponding languages (DeGraff 2005:553).
stigmatized basilectal forms, yet does not imply that these forms are lost or replaced solely due to contact with a non-creole language.

Motivations behind decreolization or debasilectalization are often social in nature. Because creoles are often associated with disadvantaged groups, or seen as illegitimate or broken even by their own speakers, in some cases there is not much incentive to maintain them. In other cases, speaking creole is a point of cultural identity and pride. Kouwenberg and her associates (2011) describe a contradictory situation in Jamaica. Although Jamaican Creole is favored among speakers in almost all conversational domains, it is not officially recognized in any public institution and considered “broken” or “unacceptable”, particularly when it comes to use in educational domains.

Yet still, as Mufwene (2004) affirms, despite having cultural value, if a language (creole or otherwise) ceases to have economic value in a society, it often results in language shift. In many societies where the lexifying language exists as the standard dialect, creole speakers are motivated to acquire the lexifier in order to make social and economic advancements in society. A prime example of the formation of a continuum of lects, (part of the decreolization/debasilectalization process) is again the case of Jamaican Creole. Basilect varieties of Jamaican exist in rural areas whereas urban speakers tend to exhibit the acrolect or use Standard English altogether. There is an overwhelming sentiment from some Jamaicans that if one is to have success in society “patwa” must not be used (Holm 1988:53, Kouwenberg et al. 2011). Overall, however, several varieties of Jamaican Creole continue to thrive, including a more recent divergent variety, “Dread Talk” which has developed vis-à-vis Rastafarianism (Pollard 2000; Mufwene 2004:208). Nonetheless, decreolization, debasilectalization or relexification is not inevitable when a creole is in contact with its lexifying language. It has been
argued that in Haiti for example, both French and Haitian coexist in society, yet are used in different domains (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015:93-94). Although there has been and continues to be contact between the creole and the lexifier, this situation has lead to diglossia rather than decreolization.

Previous studies have suggested that Limonese is in danger of decreolizing (Winkler 1998, Herzfeld 2002). However, decreolization and the formation of a continuum of lects can only occur in creole-lexifier contact situations. Herzfeld (2002) posits that there are already distinct basilectal, mesolectal and acrolectal forms of Limonese due to recent contact with Standard English via cruise ships, tourism, and English language or bilingual education programs. Although a continuum exists, contact with Standard English has not yet caused full convergence. It must be jointly considered that influence from Spanish is the principal driving force in Limonese language change. Language shift in Limón cannot be ignored; however, because Spanish is not Limonese’s lexifying language, decreolization cannot solely account for language change in this contact situation. For this reason, other processes must be explored in order to explain the changes that have been observed in Limonese.

In sum, both decreolization and relexification involve replacing elements from a creole with elements from a non-creole language, however, there are some key distinctions between the two processes. Decreolization often results in language loss, as the community shifts to using the lexifying language, whereas a creole can still be maintained through relexification. This has been demonstrated though the case of Papiamento. Although in the case of Papiamento a creole is in fact acquiring non-creole features, this contact-induced change does not result in a continuum of lects as observed in cases of decreolization. But rather, Papiamento’s autonomy, high social prestige, and symbolism of national cultural identity have undoubtedly contributed to the
language’s maintenance despite its intense contact situation and importation of Spanish lexica and morphology (Appel and Verhoeven, 1995:70).

2.7 Restructured Varieties

Studies on creoles in contact with non-creole dominant languages (lexifying or otherwise) have brought attention to the various processes that may be at work during the formation of new contact varieties. In the following section it will be shown that observations have been made from two points of view: how contact has affected the creole language, and, how contact has affected the non-creole dominant language. These contact situations do not always result in the genesis of a new contact variety; nonetheless, the ongoing processes due to contact result in notable changes in the language(s) in question.

2.7.1 Creation of an In-Group Vernacular

In many situations, especially those where there is an imbalance of power, it is not only the “lower” variety that is affected by language contact. In cases of creoles in contact with non-creoles, the non-creole may also experience language change. The case of Palenquero is of particular interest because despite prolonged contact with Spanish, its lexifying language, Palenquero has avoided decreolization and significant restructuring (Schwegler 2001, 2011). There is an absence of distinct basilect, mesolect and acrolect varieties that might be expected in such a contact situation, and instead use of both Palenquero and Spanish (the Costeño/Caribbean dialect) in the Palenque community can be observed. Schwegler (2011) also describes vernacular Palenquero Spanish, a local variety used in casual speech. Palenquero Spanish is not frequent, consistent, or stable enough to be considered a dialectal variety; nonetheless, it exhibits features characteristic of Palenquero that are not present in the Costeño variety of Spanish (Schwegler 2011:457). Some of the most notable features divergent from Costeño Spanish, yet present in
Palenquero Spanish include: lateralization of the intervocalic flap [r] (caro → calo ‘expensive’), flapping of the intervocalic /d/ (es de él → e re é ‘it’s his’), raising of the medial stressed vowel [o] (como → kumo ‘how’), omission of gender agreement in adjectives (cosas importantísimas → cosa importantísimo ‘very important matters’) and omission of Spanish reflexives (me voy a lavar → o voy a lava yo mimo ‘I am going to wash myself’) (Schwegler 2011:457). Schwegler (2011) emphasizes that these structures undoubtedly have Palenquero roots and, furthermore, this variety has only been observed in Palenquero-Spanish bilingual speech. It is also noted that the Palenquero Spanish vernacular is used as an in-group variety and identity marker representing local values and activities (Schwegler 2011:455).

2.7.2 Re-creolization

Observations originating from a different point of view have been noted by Lipski (2012) in his discussion of the “new” Palenquero. Instead of focusing on the L2 Spanish spoken by Spanish-Palenquero bilinguals, Lipski observes the L2 Palenquero of Spanish-Palenquero speakers. Due to recent revitalization efforts such as highlighting Palenquero as an ethnic identity marker and introducing the formal instruction of Palenquero in community schools, a new younger generation of Palenquero speakers is emerging. The title of Lipski’s (2012) work suggests another process: re-creolization (his term). Re-creolization is indicative of the efforts of a younger generation to “purify” Palenquero of recent Spanish “intrusions” by (re)introducing more creole-like elements to the language. These re-creolization efforts have resulted in what Lipski refers to as a “new” Palenquero, a variety heavily influenced by the fact that its speakers are L1 Spanish speakers with limited exposure to Palenquero before attending school.

Lipski’s (2012) study shows that re-creolization has aided in the reintroduction of many lexical entries that had previously been displaced by Spanish equivalents, and it has also resulted
in linguistic innovations that reflect morphosyntactic transfer or influence from Spanish. One such example is the plural marker *ma*. In traditional Palenquero speech *ma* is used prenominally to indicate a plurality, whether the referenced noun is definite or generic (*ma ngombe* ‘the cows, *ma pelo asé ndrumí mucho* ‘(the) dogs sleep a lot’). Traditionally, *ma* is not used with singular nouns, nor is there a singular (definite or generic) article used in Palenquero. However, younger speakers in Lipski’s study have extended the use of *ma* to include singular references and use it as an “unambiguously singular marker” (Lipski 2012:31). This extension mirrors the use of Spanish singular definite articles *el* and *la*, which have no equivalent in traditional Palenquero.

Another innovation includes the extension of the second person singular subject pronoun *bo* to indicate possession instead of the traditional *si*. This regularizes the second person singular form, making the possessor similar (in this case identical) to the subject pronoun form, which is also seen in other persons. Additionally, there has been an increase in use of the copula *sendá* in the present tense as opposed to another copula *hue* (derived from the past tense of the Spanish *ser* ‘to be’) because *sendá* does not “sound like” a past tense form (unlike *hue*) according to younger speakers (Lipski 2012:38).

One final comment on the concept of re-creolization noted by Lipski is that although it may appear as though re-creolization does not differ much from decreolization, since both processes can result in the creole acquiring more lexifying-like features, the two are actually quite different. Results of re-creolization are innovations in the creole and although modeled after or influenced by the lexifier, they are distinct. Decreolization, however, results in a convergence with or replacement of creole forms by those found in the lexifier (Lipski 2012:35).
2.7.3 Translinguistic Influence

The following case study, language contact between a creole and a dominant non-creole language, other than the creole’s lexifier is discussed. In his study on Spanish in contact with Haitian Creole on the border between the Dominican Republic and Haiti, Ortiz López (2011) focuses on the question of “translinguistic influence” in the speech of Spanish-Haitian Creole bilinguals. Specifically, Ortiz López addresses the distribution of subject pronouns in the Spanish of Spanish-Haitian Creole bilinguals. It was found that Spanish-Haitian Creole bilinguals are more likely to use an explicit subject pronoun in Spanish than their monolingual counterparts; there is a 66% distribution of overt pronoun use by bilingual adults vs. 49% by monolingual adults (Ortiz López 2011:424). Ortiz López attributes such unusually high rates of explicit pronoun use to translinguistic influence from Haitian Creole.

It is suggested that translinguistic influence can only occur under certain circumstances, namely when the structures in question have an overlap of usage in the two languages. In the case of subject pronouns, Haitian Creole is a non-pro-drop language whereas Spanish is a pro-drop language; however, there are situations in Spanish where the pronoun must occur, such as when a reference is switched or to show contrast. Therefore, Spanish and Haitian Creole share a partial overlap in that there are non-pro-drop circumstances in both languages. In bilingual speech where Haitian Creole is the L1, the “syntactic-pragmatic complexity” found in Spanish subject pronouns is not realized due to the overlapping, yet seemingly contradictory pro-drop vs. non-pro-drop input received by said bilinguals (Ortiz López 2011:421). A key point to highlight from Ortiz López’ (2011) study is that the languages in question must be typologically similar in areas that are affected by translinguistic influence. Although Limonese is an English-based
creole (not a Romance-based creole), it may be the case that Spanish and Limonese Creole are
typologically similar enough where the same type of translinguistic influence may occur.

2.7.4 Hybridization

The studies discussed in Sections 2.7.1, 2.7.2, and 2.7.3 provide information from contact
situations involving creoles and other dominant languages. Two studies on Palenquero involve
the case of a creole in contact with its lexifying language (Schwegler 2011; Lipski 2012).
Schwegler discussed the effect of contact on Spanish, the lexifying language by discussing the
in-group Palenquero Spanish variety. Lipski on the other hand, discusses the effects of contact on
the creole with his discussion of re-creolization and the “new” Palenquero. As far as a study
involving contact between a creole and a non-creole other than its lexifying language, Ortiz
López (2011) shows how translinguistic influence has attributed to features found in the Spanish
of Haitian-Spanish bilinguals. The following paragraphs consider the effects on a creole in
contact with a non-creole other than its lexifying language through another approach,
hybridization, as presented by Heath (1984).

Heath mentions two aspects of hybridization that indicate that the process may be
relevant to a creole in contact with a non-creole other than its lexifier. First, hybridization takes
into account the effect a third language may have on elements that have been previously affected
by a second language. Second, hybridization credits the fact that the typological similarity of
major European languages can facilitate borrowing or eventual hybridization (1984:377).

Although hybridization is also seen in non-creole contact situations, it has particular
relevance to creoles, especially those that have experienced extensive relexification, such as in
the case of Papiamento discussed in Section 2.6.1. Hybridization assumes that relexification does
not occur instantaneously and therefore the creole must have existed as an intermediate variety
containing hybrids. A hybrid is defined as a borrowing from a previous contact language that is reshaped to reflect a potential borrowing from the new contact language (Heath 1984:37). The case of Limonese Creole may be susceptible to this process as it was in contact with Standard English, its lexifying language, until 1948. Limonese has already exhibited several lexical elements from Standard English (Herzfeld 1978, 2002; Winkler 1998) and is now in intense contact with a third language, Spanish. Similarly, Heath also mentions “false” adaptations where a borrowing is treated as though it were a lexical element from a previous contact language. The word kumplinar ‘to complain’ in Cebuano, a language of the Philippines, is used to illustrate this concept. Although the word kumplinar is borrowed from a new contact language, English, it is adopted with the –ar ending from Spanish, the previous contact language (Heath 1984:378). Heath discusses both of these concepts at the lexical level; however future research could also explore the application of these processes at the morphosyntactic level.

2.8 Summary

This chapter has discussed several outcomes of language contact. First, language maintenance, language shift and the creation of new languages were discussed as results of language contact in general. Subsequently, this chapter examined how these outcomes of language contact are realized when creoles are in contact with non-creole languages. Language shift can occur through the process of decreolization, or debasilectalization. The relexification of a language may also occur due to contact, resulting in the maintenance of a variety with an altered lexicon. The creation (or possible creation) of new vernacular or in-group varieties is seen though re-creolization, translinguistic influence, and hybridization. Limonese brings an interesting case for the study of these processes, as it is a creole in contact with a non-creole
other than its lexifier. Linguistic change has previously been observed in Limonese, however it is not yet clear what processes is at work in this language contact situation today.
CHAPTER THREE: LIMONESE IN CONTACT: PAST AND PRESENT

3.1 Introduction

The Caribbean Coast of Costa Rica is one of the only places in Spanish-speaking Central and South America to experience large-scale immigration for work in an American plantation-style system (Purcell 1993). This immigration of thousands of Jamaicans and other West Indians has resulted in the distinct, highly bilingual community that is found in Limón. The aim of Chapter three is twofold. First, the chapter contextualizes the language contact situation in Limón by providing a socio-economic history of the Afro-descendant population in the region. The history of the Afro-descendant population is divided into three distinct periods (Herzfeld 2002; Purcell 1993; Winkler 1998): the Spanish colonial period (1570 – 1870), the arrival and development of the Jamaican population in Limón (1870 – 1948), and the post-revolution period (1948 – present day). This chapter focuses on the major historical events in the latter two of the three periods, with particular attention to the socio-economic factors that influenced language use.

Furthermore, this chapter discusses Limonese as a creole in contact and outlines the linguistic varieties that emerged from language use and contact during these time periods. Previous studies hypothesized that Limonese would shift, relexify, or decreolize due to prolonged contact with both Standard English and Spanish (Herzfeld 1978, 2002; Winkler 1998, 2000). However, this chapter will show that those results have not occurred, but rather Limonese, Standard English, and Spanish interact and result in a range of formal and informal varieties of Limonese that exhibit different levels of contact phenomena.
3.2 Geographic and demographic information

The majority of the Limonese-speaking population can be found in the province of Limón. The province of Limón substantiates the entire Caribbean Coast of Costa Rica and Puerto Limón is the capital city of the Limón Province and the Costa Rica’s largest port (see Figure 1).

Figure 3.1, Map of Costa Rica

The following table (Table 3.1) summarizes the distribution of the Afro-Costa Rican population according to the 2011 Costa Rican census (Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos, www.inec.go.cr). The table includes data for each province in Costa Rica as well as for Puerto Limón, which is the location of this study. The table shows that the highest percentage of people who identify themselves as negro/afro-descendiente or mulato reside in Limón, making Puerto Limón, its capital city, an ideal place to conduct this study.

7 Retrieved from www.state.gov/p/wha/ci/cs/
8 The terms negro, afro-descendiente, and mulato are used in the 2011 Costa Rican census to describe people of West Indian descent. Those who self-identify as negro and afro-descendiente generally have two parents of West Indian descent while those who self-identify as mulato have only one parent of West Indian descent.
The following sections focus on the establishment of the Afro-descendant population in Limón between the years 1872 and 1948 and then again from 1948 to the present day. In discussion of the 1872-1948 time period, the Afro-descendant population is also referred to as Jamaican, or Afro-Caribbean. After 1948, the Afro-descendant population is also referred to as Afro-Costa Rican, or Afro-Limonese, to reflect Costa Rican citizenship. An emphasis is placed on the living conditions under the United Fruit Company (UFC) and the policies implemented by the Costa Rican government during these periods in order to demonstrate how these two entities have affected the socio-economic and linguistic development of the region. A timeline summarizing the key historical events discussed in the following section can be found in Appendix One.

### 3.3 The Spanish Colonial Period (1570 – 1870)

Approximately 200 African slaves were brought to Costa Rica to work on cacao plantations throughout the Spanish colonial period (Meléndez 1977). The Spanish, however, never developed a large-scale plantation system in Costa Rica (McWhorter 2000). The African population did not dramatically increase during this time for two main reasons. First, there was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Afro-descendant or mulato population</th>
<th>Percentage of Afro-descendant or mulato population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Limón</td>
<td>61,072</td>
<td>12,887</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limón</td>
<td>386,862</td>
<td>51,344</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alajuela</td>
<td>848,146</td>
<td>52,617</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartago</td>
<td>490,903</td>
<td>27,908</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heredia</td>
<td>433,677</td>
<td>32,337</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanacaste</td>
<td>326,953</td>
<td>25,950</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntarenas</td>
<td>410,929</td>
<td>38,300</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San José</td>
<td>1,404,242</td>
<td>105,981</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>4,301,712</td>
<td>334,437</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1, Distribution of Afro-Costa Rican population in Puerto Limón, Costa Rican provinces, and overall in Costa Rica
not a constant influx of slaves brought to Costa Rica and second, there were very few women included among those brought by the Spaniards, limiting reproduction and population growth. Additionally, throughout this period many slaves bought their freedom or were emancipated. When slavery was abolished in 1824, there were approximately 100 Africans left in the plantation system. Many former slaves either integrated into Costa Rican society by marrying indigenous women or migrated to Nicaragua to settle on the Miskito Coast where there was another African population. It is not believed that a creole language developed at this time, but rather it is thought that most Africans acquired Spanish. Subsequently, Africans from this time period had little, if any, impact on the development of Limonese English (Herzfeld 2002:10; Winkler 1998:41).

3.4 The Arrival of the Jamaican Population and the Standard Railroad: Puerto Limón from 1872 to 1948

On December 20, 1872 the first group of Jamaicans arrived in Puerto Limón. They were the first of many groups of West Indians 9 contracted for the construction of a railroad connecting Puerto Limón and the Caribbean Coast with Costa Rica’s capital, San José. The Costa Rican government delegated the construction of the Standard Railroad to a U.S. citizen, Minor Cooper Keith. Keith needed a labor force to complete the lines and therefore, turned to the growing labor force from the British West Indies, particularly those from Jamaica (Winkler 1998:42).

At the end of the 19th century Jamaicans were eager to immigrate to Costa Rica because of the social disorganization, economic insecurity, and political uprisings that accompanied Jamaica’s emancipation from Great Britain in 1838 (Herzfeld 2002:14). Recruitment and

9 Although immigrant groups were predominately from Jamaica, other groups proceeded from Barbados, Trinidad, Haiti and even New Orleans (Herzfeld 2002:14). From 1850 – 1910, it is estimated that 200,000 British West Indians migrated to Costa Rica and Panama to work on the French Canal, U.S. Canal, and Costa Rican banana plantations. (Putnam 2002:234)
employment of Jamaicans was favored for several reasons, but mainly due to their ability to withstand the heat of the region, disease, and overall poor circumstances along the rail lines. The Jamaicans’ ability to be productive laborers despite poor working conditions was recognized by the Costa Rican government, which resulted in policies that encouraged Jamaican immigration and consequently population growth in Limón. In 1884 the Minister of Development reported efforts to facilitate the process of acquiring property in order to “attract the Atlantic Coast African immigrants, the only ones who can bear the elevated temperatures of those localities” (Putnam 2002:49). Furthermore, middle and lower class Jamaicans who immigrated to Costa Rica spoke Jamaica Creole, and some spoke both Jamaican Creole and Standard English (Purcell 1993:106). Knowledge of these English varieties facilitated communication between laborers and their American supervisors. At the peak of the Standard Railroad’s construction, Keith’s company employed 2,500 workers, mainly Jamaicans. The company favored hiring Jamaicans not only for railroad construction but also later for labor in the banana fields (Purcell 1993; Winkler 1998:46).

In addition to recruitment from the Caribbean islands for work on the Standard Railroad, the French Panama Canal project was also essential in establishing the Afro-descendant population in Limón. In 1884 the Compagnie Universelle du Canal Intéroceánique de Panama employed approximately 16,000 West Indian workers, again, primarily Jamaican. Political unrest in 1885 and then bankruptcy of the Compagnie Universelle in 1888 caused thousands of workers to migrate northward to Limón to complete the last miles of the Standard Railroad tracks. (Putnam 2002:45)

Although the Standard Railroad was built to facilitate the coffee trade, it ultimately was contributed to the growth of the banana as a globally exported product. The railroad was finished
in 1890, however many Jamaicans decided to stay and work in Limón after the railroad was complete. Throughout the near-twenty year duration of railroad construction Keith simultaneously supervised the development of banana plantations along the Atlantic Coast and the railroad line. The plantations served as a food source for the Jamaican workers and cultivation of the plant thrived because the workers had previous experience growing bananas in Jamaica (Herzfeld 2002:15). In 1899, Keith founded the United Fruit Company, and by 1904 the UFC employed 5,600 workers in Limón, of which approximately 4,000 were Jamaican (Putnam 2002:59).

3.4.1 Socio-economic conditions and language use during the construction of the Standard Railroad and under the United Fruit Company

Throughout the construction of the Standard Railroad and during the UFC’s occupation of Limón, Jamaicans were able to maintain their language and culture for several reasons. First, they were immigrating to largely unoccupied land. Other regions of Costa Rica were settled and primarily Spanish-speaking, however Limón was largely unsettled, with the exception of autonomous indigenous groups inhabiting the southern, mountainous regions (Putnam 2002:42). Limón was also geographically isolated and largely inaccessible from the rest of Costa Rica due to the lack of infrastructure at that time. Therefore, contact with Spanish was limited from the beginning of the Jamaican migration and upon arrival in Limón, Jamaicans formed their own communities separate from any indigenous groups. Additionally, because they were subjects of the British Crown, Jamaicans were protected from the systematic abuse that indigenous Costa Ricans and Chinese indentured laborers suffered while working on the Standard Railroad. It was typical for Jamaicans to petition British diplomats and navy officers to intervene on harassment.

10 The United Fruit Company is now Chiquita Brands International.
accusations, and local officials also worked to improve conditions for Jamaicans for fear of laborers migrating to Panama (Putnam 2002:40).

Another factor contributing to cultural and linguistic maintenance during this time was the limited geographic mobility of Jamaicans. Although the completion of the Standard Railroad facilitated transportation to other regions of Costa Rica, Jamaican immigrants and their children were not permitted to work or live in regions other than Limón. This restriction was due to a law passed in 1862\footnote{This law was reiterated in 1891, 1893, 1893, 1904, and 1942.} prohibiting “la colonización de razas africanas y chinas” (Fernández 2008:181). Therefore, Jamaicans generally remained in Limón and lived under the de facto government of the UFC, where life was controlled by the Company, or as it was known colloquially, Mamita Yunái (Mother United). The UFC operated colonial-style plantation systems and although Jamaicans were not slaves, they were fairly bound to the community the UFC had created. There was limited economic mobility under the UFC’s system, as the Company restricted workers to middle or low positions. Workers did not own land or housing, but rather squatted on UFC-owned land or lived in UFC-owned housing. Goods and supplies were bought at UFC-owned stores and commissaries, and the UFC sponsored all schools. The UFC was essentially the “monopolizing, totalitarian, imperialistic” force of the region at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries (Herzfeld 2002:15).

The first decline of the UFC began in 1910 as banana production decreased. By 1915 the UFC had “reduced its operations” in Limón leaving 3,000 men unemployed. Workers who were still employed suffered drastic pay cuts and eventually went on strike to demand higher wages, which were negotiated by British diplomats (Putnam 2002:64). In 1920, when the banana industry began to boom again, the UFC recruited Costa Rican instead of Jamaican and West
Indian workers. Before 1920, only 6 percent of the population of Limón was Spanish-speaking, however 90 percent of the workers hired by the UFC from 1920 – 1921 were Hispanic Costa Ricans. Several factors explain the shift in hiring practices. One factor is the rapid influx of Hispanic Costa Ricans from the highlands. Coffee production was down, however the banana boom created a need for workers. Wages in Limón were five to six times higher than those in the highlands and Hispanics were eager to migrate for work (Purcell 1993:43). Another possible reason for the shift in hiring practices is to replace unionized Jamaican workers with more “docile” Hispanic workers (Angulo 2011:39; Putnam 2008:64). Still yet, an additional cause for the change in hiring practices is pressure from disgruntled Hispanic Costa Ricans. Many were unhappy with the fact that Jamaicans held higher positions and salaries and protested this as a “national problem” (Angulo 2011:40; Fernández 2008:185). In sum, hiring practices were quite different than the efforts made in 1884 to attract “Atlantic Coast African immigrants”; this period marks the beginning of both a demographic and linguistic shift in Limón (Putnam 2002:65).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, language was one of the factors that contributed to the establishment of a Jamaican-Limonese identity among UFC workers. Many Jamaicans had dreams of returning to Jamaica one day, however few were able to do so. Jamaicans formed their own neighborhoods and although other groups of immigrants12 arrived to work for the UFC, Jamaicans primarily lived in the same neighborhoods, which were founded on three principles: family, church, and school (Fernández 2008:184). Additionally, the UFC worked to encourage the existing racial animosity between Hispanic and Jamaican workers. While this achieved the Company’s goal of preventing worker unification, it also contributed to the formation of solidarity among Jamaicans. The UFC continually held Jamaicans in higher

---

12 Hindu, Chinese, Syrian, European, North American and Central American immigrants also arrived after the completion of the Standard Railroad to work for the UFC (Herzfeld 2002:16).
regard than other immigrant groups, and preferred them as workers for their experience with banana cultivation and ability to communicate in (a variety of) English. During this time period a new variety of Jamaican Creole native to Limón began to develop. Children born to Jamaican immigrants, although technically Jamaican citizens, had never lived in Jamaica, which lessened their exposure to Jamaican Creole. At the same time, children attended UFC-sponsored schools and were exposed to Standard English. Furthermore, immigration from Jamaica slowed, and, just as Jamaicans in Limón formed a distinct Jamaican-Limonese identity, they also formed a variety of their language unique to Jamaicans living in Limón. (Herzfeld 2002; Putnam 2002; Winkler 1998)

Language use during this time period was a marker of identity, race, and culture. According to the 1927 census, 55 percent of Limón’s residents spoke English as a first language and 37 percent spoke Spanish as a first language. The census describes the following dichotomy in the relationship between race and language use: black people spoke English, white people spoke Spanish and neither group is highly bilingual. On one hand, 96 percent of black people spoke English and 95 percent of all English speakers were black. On the other hand, 96 percent of white people spoke Spanish and 90 percent of Spanish speakers were white (Putnam 2002:65). In addition, Putnam (2002) notes the following police report that further emphasizes the connection between language, race, and culture. Regarding the discovery of a dead body in Siquirres, Limón, the report reads:

13 The census does not distinguish between Standard English, Jamaican Creole or Limonese Creole English.
14 The remaining 8 percent spoke indigenous languages.
15 The census uses the term “black” to refer to anyone of African descent (mostly Jamaicans). The terms “white” encompasses North Americans and also Hispanics (mostly Costa Ricans or Nicaraguans) in the region.
“Due to the dead man’s color the witness believes that he belongs to the black race. The witness believed, but he could not be sure. For that he would need to hear the man speak, or know where he lived, or see him among friends.”

The fact that American English and Jamaican Creole were the majority languages of the community during the time of the UFC’s occupation is of great social, economic, and linguistic significance. Other regions of Costa Rica were and still are Spanish-speaking. Therefore, the use of English in Limón established a social separation between the people of Limón and other Costa Ricans. This social separation emphasized the physical separation that already existed due to laws restricting migration and the lack of infrastructure in the region. The social separation caused by language use became more evident throughout the years of the UFC’s dominance, in particular when Hispanic Costa Ricans began to migrate to Limón for work. As migration of Hispanic Costa Ricans increased, Jamaicans kept their distance believing they were superior to Hispanic Costa Ricans and other UFC workers because of their British heritage (Winkler 1998:44). Jamaicans hesitated to send their children to school with Hispanic Costa Rican children and the two groups had separate places of worship\textsuperscript{16}. During this time there was not a high rate of inter-marriage between the two groups and Jamaicans were encouraged to see themselves as distinctly Jamaican, as opposed to Costa Rican. Language differences undoubtedly reinforced these sentiments.

Likewise, use of English varieties was of great economic significance under UFC rule. All UFC business was conducted in English and many of the UFC personnel were English monolinguals who made few efforts to learn Spanish (Winkler 1998:46). As previously mentioned, not only was employment preference given to Jamaican Creole speakers, but also

\textsuperscript{16} Hispanic Costa Ricans practiced Catholicism, however Jamaicans kept their Protestant traditions (Winkler 1998:44).
higher wages, which further divided Afro-Caribbeans\textsuperscript{17} and Hispanic Costa Ricans socially and economically. The UFC had constructed a hierarchy, where white North Americans enjoyed the highest social and economic status, followed by Jamaicans, and then Hispanic Costa Ricans (Purcell 1993:127).

Furthermore, the use of American English and Jamaican Creole in Limón undoubtedly contributed to the formation of Limonese Creole as a variety distinct from Jamaican. There was a dichotomy in the use of the two English varieties: Standard English was used at work with the UFC and Jamaican English was used at home (Purcell 1993:106). The constant use of English in every aspect of the society was key in the formation of a distinct Limonese variety. In addition to the social prestige that speaking English brought, English use also received institutional support from not only the UFC but also from Protestant churches that sponsored schools. In 1927 Limón had 33 private schools with 15,000 students, who were mostly Jamaican. Teachers were Jamaican, the British \textit{Royal Reader} was widely used, and students received instruction in English (Fernández 2008:184, Winkler 1998:46). Afro-Caribbeans in Limón also had access to written English in the form of newspapers that were brought from Jamaica. Presumably, if Limón had continued in this direction with English as a majority language, it would not have the linguistic richness found today. The institutional support of English along with the scarcity of Spanish input allowed Limonese Creole to develop and flourish for several decades. However in the late 1930s into the early 1940s conditions in Limón changed drastically as the UFC left the region.

\textsuperscript{17}The term Afro-Caribbean is used to describe the Jamaican and West Indian population in Limón who had united in solidarity during the occupation of the UFC in order to form a distinct Limonese-Jamaican or Limonese-West Indian identity.
3.4.2 Departure of the United Fruit Company: The 1930s-1940s in Limón

The 1930s are marked by severe racial tension not only in Limón, but also in all of Costa Rica. In the 1940s a plague destroyed the banana crops and the UFC moved its operations to the Pacific Coast. The departure of the UFC took a severe social and economic toll on the Afro-Caribbean population in Limón since most Afro-Caribbeans depended solely on the company for income. Additionally, the stores and schools the UFC had opened began to close. Most notably to the development of Limonese Creole, the use of Standard English in the workplace and in UFC sponsored schools diminished. During this time, the Afro-Caribbean population of the region decreased as many people moved to the United States to find work. The others that remained survived off the land that the UFC had left behind (Herzfeld 2002:18). Despite the misfortune of the period, this time also served to further unite the remaining Afro-Caribbean population in Limón.

As the banana industry on the Caribbean Coast declined, anti-black sentiments in the rest of Costa Rica started to rise. Although immigration was promoted during the construction of the Standard Railroad, during the banana booms Jamaican immigration was tolerated as a “necessary evil” in Costa Rica (Fernández 2008:187). Companies needed the labor force and as previously mentioned, Jamaicans were the most capable workers. The Costa Rican government hoped that the migration was temporary and workers would return to Jamaica as soon as the labor market decreased. In 1933 Hispanic Costa Ricans pressured the government to deal with what they called the “black problem” in their country. A law was passed in 1934 that prohibited “colored people” from being employed in the banana industry along the Pacific coast (Putnam 2002:73). This type of anti-black rhetoric continued into the early 1940s. The Afro-Caribbean population was labeled as “undesirable” in articles 41 and 42 of the Migratory Regulations document issued
by the Ministry of Exterior Relations in 1942, and in 1943 a law was passed that required 90 percent of workers in businesses to be Hispanic Costa Ricans (Fernández 2008:186).

By the 1930s the banana industry had declined and many workers who were born in Costa Rica had never visited Jamaica nor had a desire to visit or migrate to the country despite their Jamaican citizenship. Records from the General Registrar’s office in Kingston, Jamaica report no arrivals from Costa Rica between 1935 and 1945 (Purcell 1993:44). Jamaican immigration to Costa Rica continued throughout the 1930s, although at drastically slower rates. The same records from the General Registrar’s office also show only fifty-one departures from Kingston to Costa Rica. Lower rates of immigration reflect action taken by the Costa Rican government where entrance visas were not issued to anyone of color beginning in April of 1934 (Purcell 1993:43, 44).

These discriminatory efforts were successful in limiting the Jamaican influence on and integration into Costa Rican society. Laws were passed that incentivized the migration of the Hispanic community to less populated areas, such as Limón, therefore increasing the Spanish influence in areas that had been previously dominated by Afro-Caribbean culture. Simultaneously, many Afro-Caribbeans migrated to Panama or the United States during the 1930s and 1940s because of the lack of jobs in post-banana-boom Limón. Even as the Limonese economy recovered in the 1940s, additional laws were passed that made it more difficult for Afro-Caribbeans to have the jobs they once had. In 1942 when the last shipment of bananas left Limón Hispanics were already climbing the Limonese social ladder, gaining highly sought after positions in law enforcement, transportation, and local government (Purcell 1993:44). The 1927
census reported 18,003 Afro-descendants living in Limón, however due to migration, by 1950 the population had reduced to 13,749\textsuperscript{18}.

### 3.5 The Revolution of 1948 – Present Day: Citizenship and Socio-Economic Changes

Several changes occurred in Limón after the departure of the UFC and Revolution of 1948. In the months leading up to the Civil War of 1948\textsuperscript{19}, Limón found itself destitute and depressed. Trains had stopped running, piers had closed, shootings took place in the streets, and rumors of war were brewing. The following section discusses the nature of the socio-economic and political changes that occurred since 1948 and have shaped the region into what it is today.

In 1948 President José Figueres Ferrer granted citizenship to Afro-Caribbeans who were born in Costa Rica. In addition, on November 4, 1949 Figueres nullified previous laws that prevented Afro-Caribbeans from working and traveling beyond the Limón Province. It is thought that Figueres identified in solidarity on some level with the Afro-Caribbean population since he was the son of Catalanian immigrants and had to navigate through the naturalization process himself (Fernández 2008:188). However naturalization and citizenship came with a price. Although this new “Afro-Costa Rican” population had been legally incorporated into Costa Rican society, social, political, and economic integration proved to be more difficult. As evidenced by the lobbying for discriminatory laws not even a decade earlier, the Hispanic Costa

\textsuperscript{18} Data retrieved from www.inec.go.cr.

\textsuperscript{19} The Costa Rican Civil War occurred as a result of political tensions that existed throughout the 1940s between Costa Rica’s National Liberation (Social Democratic) Party and the National Republican Party. In February of 1948 Otilio Ulate Blanco was elected president over the National Republican Party’s candidate, former president Rafael Ángel Calderón. Calderón contested the election and Congress, comprised of a calderonista majority, annulled the election. This opened an opportunity for José Figueres Ferrer, a leader in the National Liberation Movement, to lead an uprising to ratify Ulate’s presidency. The war lasted for 44 days and resulted in Figueres’ presidency. After a year and a half of leading a provisional government, Figueres stepped down and handed power to Ulate. A full account of the Costa Rican Civil War and the circumstances leading to it can be found in Bell (1971).
Rican population was hesitant to embrace the differences the Afro-Costa Ricans brought to their country and the two groups remained socially segregated. Because they lacked full social integration into society, it was difficult for Afro-Costa Ricans to assimilate culturally and linguistically. Angulo (2011) defines assimilation as the reduction of cultural distance between two groups, governed by two parameters: the willingness of the immigrant group to adapt to society, and the willingness of the existing group to adopt the immigrant group into society. The case of the Afro-Costa Rican was not fully successful, especially in terms of the latter parameter.

The aforementioned family, church, and school were, and still are for many, fixtures in Afro-Costa Rican culture. As Afro-Costa Ricans attempted to adapt to mainstream society, some changes occurred within these cultural elements. Initially, family life remained relatively stable as marriage between Afro-Costa Ricans and Hispanic Costa Ricans was not yet common, even throughout the 1950s. Nevertheless, interracial marriage slowly increased; a 1978 sample of 218 households in Limón showed 6.5 percent of marriages to be racially mixed (Purcell 1993:47).

Church and school saw almost immediate effects of Afro-Costa Rican integration into mainstream society. Before the 1950s, the Afro-Caribbean population was predominately Protestant, however, because Costa Rica was a Catholic nation it did not support or protect the rights of the Protestant Church. Afro-Costa Ricans began to attend Catholic Church in an effort to assimilate, resulting in a decrease in Protestant attendance in the 1950s\(^20\).

One of the most notable changes in terms of language use after 1948 occurred in the educational system. The educational system in Limón had already suffered changes throughout the 1930s and 1940s as many of the private schools sponsored by the UFC were closed due to the Company’s departure. In the 1950s government funding in Limón expanded and resources were

\(^{20}\) Another reason Afro-Costa Ricans left the Protestant church is that marriage was only officially recognized by the Catholic Church.
dedicated to restore the educational system. Between 1954 and 1958, forty-seven schools were built throughout the province and the region’s first library was constructed in the city of Puerto Limón (Angulo 2011:212). Because the new public schools were government-sponsored, many Afro-Costa Ricans who had previously resisted sending their children to Spanish schools were now compelled to do so. Use of English in public schools was prohibited and thus it began to lose power as the language of prestige. Children were punished for speaking English in class; they were fined, pinched or forced to kneel for hours during lessons. It was not until the 1970s that bilingualism was recognized as an asset and encouraged in some schools (Angulo 2011; Purcell 1993).

Afro-Costa Ricans in Limón took various paths to social and economic assimilation after gaining citizenship in 1948. Many sought upward mobility and white-collared jobs through acquiring an education, while others migrated to San José in search of jobs unrelated to agriculture. Others still migrated internationally to Panama, the United States or Canada where English skills facilitated job acquisition (Angulo 2011; Purcell 1993:94, 100-103). Despite Afro-Costa Ricans’ efforts to assimilate into mainstream society, their presence was not always welcomed or even acknowledged by the hosting Hispanic population. Instead of embracing the racial diversity that now officially existed in Costa Rica, it was in several ways suppressed. For example, Afro-Costa Ricans were subject to racism in the workplace and were not permitted in some hotels and certain places of entertainment. In response to these issues, a law was passed in 1963 that prohibited discrimination in the workplace on the basis of race and created the Junta de Administración Portuaria y de Desarrollo Económico de la Vertiente Atlántica (JAPDEVA) whose job is to “velar por el buen cumplimento de los contratos con la Compañía logrará que todo desafuero o abuso se elimine”. Additionally, in 1967 a law was passed that prohibited the
restriction of entrance to the aforementioned establishments based on race (Angulo 2011:215; Fernández 2008:191)\textsuperscript{21}.

Finally, Afro-Costa Ricans assimilated by means of linguistic accommodation. Since the 1950s there has been a large increase of the acquisition of Spanish by the Afro-Costa Rican population. Aguilar-Sánchez (2005:163) states that today “eighty percent of the entire population of Afro-Costa Ricans speak and read Spanish, even when communicating with their parents, because of the great influence of Spanish as a prestige language”.

\textbf{3.6 Literature on Limonese Creole in Contact}

The historical background outlined in the previous sections provides a context for the presence of Standard English, Limonese Creole, and Spanish in current day Limón. As noted in several studies (Herzfeld 1978, 2002; Purcell 1993; Winkler 1998; Aguilar-Sánchez and Hartford, forthcoming) the history of prolonged intense contact between these varieties along with high levels of community bilingualism have resulted in the incorporation of contact phenomena and the use of different contact varieties in Puerto Limón. This section will provide a brief overview of the literature that discusses the use of Standard English, Limonese Creole, and Spanish in Limón.

Limonese Creole, also known as Limonese English or Mekaytelyu, is spoken by 73 percent of Afro-Costa Ricans (Aguilar-Sánchez 2005). As discussed in the previous sections, it first developed in the early twentieth century as the variety of Jamaican Creole particular to the region of Limón, and has been in contact with Standard English for over a century. This contact

\textsuperscript{21} Though not direct discrimination, it is also notable that the Afro-Costa Rican population was not accounted for in censuses taken in the latter half of the twentieth century. Censuses taken after 1950 did not contain questions regarding ethnicity, race, or language and it was not until the 2000 census that this information was once again included in the survey. The exclusion of enumerating Afro-descendants was not uncommon throughout Latin America during this time and served to diminish the presence of the Afro population in society.
has resulted in similar lexicons and typologies that can facilitate the acquisition of Standard English for Limonese English speakers. However, since the 1950s Limonese has suffered from a low social status; the number of monolingual speakers has decreased as Spanish became the prestige language in Limón. Nevertheless, Limonese still has a strong presence in the home and in social situations among the Afro-Costa Rican population. Aguilar-Sánchez (2005) found that Limonese speakers have become aware of the importance of formal English education in addition to Spanish acquisition, and have started to favor bilingual English-Spanish education. Afro-Costa Rican children are encouraged to speak Limonese to each other, and it is common to hear Limonese spoken on the streets, in restaurants, bars, and dance clubs (Aguilar-Sánchez and Hartford, forthcoming)\(^\text{22}\).

Much of the previous research on Limonese in contact with Spanish has focused on influence on the Limonese lexicon. Portilla (2000) discusses the growing quantity of words of Spanish origin present in Limonese and the challenge that comes with including these words as lexical entries in a standard dictionary. Winkler (1998, 2000) discusses lexical borrowing and code-switching and suggests that partial relexification may account for the increasing incorporation of Spanish lexical and morphosyntactic elements into Limonese. However, some of contact phenomena observed cannot be explained lexical borrowing, code-switching or by the traditional definition of relexification, where there is a substitution of the phonological representation, while semantic, syntactic and morphological representations remain stable (Muysken 1981:61). For this reason, Winkler (1998) also introduces the notion of structural borrowing as another contact mechanism. Nonetheless, it is not clear at this point how much

\(^{22}\) This was also the case found in my personal observations.
Spanish morphosyntactic influence is present in Limonese or how stable these structures are in regards to permanence in the language.

### 3.7 Current language use: Standard English, Limonese Creole, and Spanish in contact

The number of varieties used by speakers in Puerto Limón, ranging from an informal inner-group creole variety to a more formal outer-group variety targeting Standard English, makes the case of Limonese today difficult to assess. Herzfeld (2002) uses a continuum to describe the linguistic situation in Puerto Limón. In addition, Aguilar-Sánchez and Hartford’s (forthcoming) model, based on Kachru’s (1986) model of World Englishes, offers an alternative approach to analyzing the contact situation in Puerto Limón. The model not only considers the range of Englishes spoken in the region, but also reflects how Spanish interacts with the English varieties. This section examines the use of the varieties presented in Figure 3.2.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3.2**, Varieties found in Puerto Limón as a result of language contact

---

23 This is not to say that the model in Figure 3.2 should replace the notion of a continuum of features in Puerto Limón.
3.7.1 Standard English in Limón

Standard English refers to the formal variety of English that is spoken by Afro-Costa Ricans as a second language (L2). Many speakers acquire Standard English through English instruction in English immersion schools, English as a foreign language classes, or in one of the several bilingual language schools located in Limón. English as a Foreign Language courses are compulsory in Costa Rican public schools from grades one through nine. At grade ten, students may choose between English and French, although 90 percent of students choose to study English (Aguilar-Sánchez and Hartford, forthcoming). Others acquire Standard English through contact with American or British English, most often in the workplace. Use of Standard English is generally reserved for the workplace, particularly in the tourism industry and call centers, or in conversations with the many American or European tourists that pass through the region (Purcell 1993:114). Still yet, exposure to Standard English is gained through television; even the most basic cable packages include English programming. Standard English was often encountered during the data collection for this study, and from personal observation it appears as though Afro-Costa Ricans who speak Standard English are eager to practice their linguistic skills with other Standard English speakers as often as possible (also see Purcell 1993:116).

3.7.2 Costa Rican Spanish

The large majority of Costa Ricans, including the Afro-Costa Rican population of Limón, speaks Spanish. Costa Ricans often pride themselves in speaking a proper, “standard” variety of Spanish much like the Spanish of Lima, Peru or Bogotá, Colombia. Standard Costa Rican Spanish is considered to be the Spanish spoken in the Central Valley, particularly in the provinces of San José, Heredia, Alajuela, and Cartago. Its most notable characteristics are the assibilation of the trilled /r/, /tr/, and final /r/, velarization of the final /n/, weakening of the
intervocalic /j/ and /d/, weakening of unstressed vowels, retention of the /s/, and the lack of *tuteo* (Canfield 1981:39-41; Quesada Pacheco 2009:512).

### 3.7.3 Contact Varieties

It was found that Standard English, Limonese Creole, and Spanish are rarely used exclusively, but rather, because the majority of the Afro-Limonese population is bilingual and these varieties have been in constant, prolonged contact, they are often intertwined resulting in the contact varieties described below. The following sections give a brief introduction to the varieties that have developed due to contact between the principal varieties in Limón: the Inner Circle Variety, the Outer Circle Variety, Limonese Spanish.

Although the varieties do not correspond directly to the terms Inner Circle and Outer Circle in Kachru’s (1986) proposal, these terms convey the notion that those who speak the Inner Circle Variety must be members of the Afro-Costa Rican community, while those who speak the Outer Circle Variety may belong to the Afro-Costa Rican community, although it is not necessary.

#### 3.7.3.1 Limonese Spanish

The first contact variety is Limonese Spanish, a variety of Costa Rican Spanish spoken in Limón Province. Limonese Spanish is spoken by both Afro- and Non-Afro-Costa Ricans and is used in almost all public domains. This variety is notable for its features influenced from Limonese Creole not found in other varieties of Costa Rican Spanish. Zimmer (2011) gives the most recent and perhaps most comprehensive treatment of the Spanish spoken by Afro-Costa Ricans. Her sociolinguistic analysis evaluates phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical features of Afro-Costa Rican Spanish. These include the realization of the velar fricative [x], the realization of the alveolar trill [ʁ] and alveolar flap [ɾ], the realization of the [s], the use of the glottal fricative [h], the [ð], the velarization of the [n], vowel quality, use of flectional
morphology (gender and number agreement), the syntax of constituents (nominal, prepositional and verbal), syntax of the sentence, and the lexicon (borrowings and calques).

It was found that the speech of Afro-Costa Ricans does in fact exhibit characteristics unique to Limonese-Spanish bilinguals. On the phonological level, one example of such features is the realization of the velar fricative [x] as [ø], or [ʔ], as in the word *gente* ‘people’ [ʔente] (Zimmer 2011:194). Afro-Costa Ricans also had a tendency to produce both [r] and [ɾ] with a high degree of retroflection undoubtedly attributed to influence from Limonese (Zimmer 2011:200, 207). Another feature examined is the pronunciation of the glottal fricative [h] not only in words where there is an orthographic *h* but also in words where no orthographic *h* is found, such as in the word *África* ‘Africa’. Zimmer (2011) attributes this to the variable pronunciation of the glottal fricative in vowel initial words as in [hiyt] ‘eat’ in Limonese. It is also suspected that the vowel system of Spanish spoken by Afro-Costa Ricans is influenced by Limonese, however no conclusions could be drawn at the time of Zimmer’s study due to the lack of data on the vocalic and suprasegmental systems of Limonese (228). This is clearly an idea that merits further investigation.

Although not the topic of the current study, some of these features were also observed in the data for this investigation. For example, in one case, participants commented on a mutual friend who exhibited features of Afro-Costa Rican Spanish in the pronunciation of [r] or [ɾ] as the alveolar or postalveolar approximant [ɹ]24. Interestingly, in the first case of the word ‘rosa’ where the speaker intends to contrast the Standard Spanish pronunciation with Afro-Costa Rican

---

24 Zimmer (2011) indicates that the Afro-Costa Ricans in her study pronounce the ‘r’ with a high degree of retroflection. In the examples from the data the ‘r’ does not appear to have a high degree of retroflection, but rather speakers exhibit retroflection to a lesser extent. In this case [ɹ] is found to best describe the approximant. The point remains that this pronunciation of ‘r’ greatly differs from the Spanish flap [ɾ] and trill [ɾ].
pronunciation, she herself uses the postalveolar approximant [ɹ]. All examples come from my own data\(^\text{25}\).

(1) M: her pronunciation was difficult too, she didn used to say rosa [ɹosa] she said rosa [ɹosa], remember what other ting dem?  
D: rama [ɹama], arbol [ɹabol]  
M: ‘she had difficulty in pronunciation too, she didn’t say rosa (‘rose’) she said rosa, what other things?’  
D: ‘rama (‘frog’), arbol (‘tree’)’

It was also found that the in some cases the suprasegmental system in Spanish spoken by Afro-Costa Ricans was differed from Costa Rican Spanish. In the following example the speaker stresses the vowel ‘a’ instead of ‘i’ in the word ‘teníamos’, ‘we used to have’. This example also exhibits the generalization of singular forms of nouns, which is a morphological feature found in the Spanish of Afro-Costa Rican. Actividad, ‘activity’ appears in its singular form instead of the plural form actividades. Interestingly, the singularity is actividad is also reflected in the conjugation of consumir ‘to consume’, which appears in the third person singular form.

(2) Entonces en el tiempo libre de la escuela, teníamos actividad que nos consumía  
‘So in our free time from school we had activit[ies] that consumed us’

Morphological and syntactic features of Spanish spoken by Afro-Costa Ricans can also be characterized by the abundance of hyper-generalization, which includes the generalization of the masculine form of nouns, the generalization of verbs in the infinitive or the third person singular present indicative, and the neutralizing of irregular forms. Although some of these features could also be attributed to the inter-language of speakers, it should be noted that they are not present in other local varieties of Spanish (Zimmer 2011). Additionally, it should be

\(^{25}\) All examples are from the corpus of data collected for the current study. The orthography used in the examples is a “modified standard orthography” based on Cassidy and LePage’s (1967) description of Jamaican Creole (also used by Winkler, 1998). Words are written according to Standard English orthography, except when the Limonese pronunciation “diverges significantly from Standard English pronunciation” (Winkler 1998:79).
mentioned that other features such as the preposition of adjectives, adjective repetition, and the lack of inversion in interrogative constructions (¿A dónde uno va? ‘Where are you all going?’) are attributed to influence from Limonese (279). The following example is taken from the speech of a Spanish-monolingual Hispanic Costa Rican woman and demonstrates the repetition of an adjective to intensify or emphasize it.

(3) *Es negra negra su mamá, negra negra.*
   ‘Her mother is very dark.’

Adjective repetition is also found in colloquial speech characterized by frequent code-switching between Limonese and Spanish. In the following example, the speaker incorporates adjective repetition in a Spanish code-switch.

(4) *ova der look solitario solitario*
   ‘over there looks really deserted’

Lack of gender and/or number agreement in adjectives was also found in the current study.

(5) *han sido posiciones neta, netamente personalizado*
   ‘they have been clearly personalized positions’

Zimmer (2011) notes that it is quite difficult to comment on the features of Afro-Costa Rican Spanish at the lexical level, since the speakers are in fact bilingual and engage in code-switching and instant-borrowing practices like any other group of bilinguals. At the time of Zimmer’s study no lexical elements had been found to be incorporated uniformly in Afro-Costa Rica Spanish (293).

Just as Schwegler (2001) concluded that Palenquero Spanish did not comprise a separate dialect of Spanish, Zimmer (2011) also concludes that Limonese Spanish is not systematic.

---

26 Here ‘uno’ is a calque of the second person plural Limonese pronoun ‘unu’ (Zimmer 2011:273).
27 It was found that Hispanic Costa Ricans are colloquially described as *paña* by Afro-Costa Ricans, i.e. ‘paña man’ or ‘paña ouman’. The person is often, although not necessarily, a Spanish monolingual.
enough to be considered a dialect variety of Costa Rican Spanish. The variants present in Limonese Spanish, although unique to Limonese-Spanish bilinguals, should not be considered a dialectal norm. That is, there is too much variation in the frequency of use of these features in individual speech, and the features are not diffused throughout the Afro-Costa Rican speech community (Zimmer 2011:295). Zimmer (2011) also concludes that the features described in Afro-Costa Rican Spanish are due to differing levels of individual and/or idiosyncratic interlanguages. It is not denied, however, that if these features continue to be used by speakers in the future, at a higher, more systematic rate, an Afro-Costa Rican or Limonese variety of Spanish could develop and stand on its own as a dialect or sociolect. Some of the features described in Zimmer (2011) also are also observed in non-Afro-Costa Rican monolingual speech, as demonstrated in example (3), perhaps as a result of contact from Afro-Costa Rican Spanish speakers. Therefore, in the event that the features described above become systematic, it seems likely that the dialect could extend beyond the Afro-Costa Rican population to characterize Limonese Spanish in general.

3.7.3.2 The Outer Circle Variety

The variety referred to as the Outer Circle Variety emerges among Afro-Costa Ricans who speak both Standard English and Costa Rican Spanish. These speakers are native Limonese Creole-Spanish bilinguals, who have also had access to Standard English through work or formal education. This variety is used in formal domains, such as in churches, international business, and also for communication with tourists and other English speakers who are not Limonese Creole speakers. The following example of the Outer Circle Variety shows that although Standard English and Spanish are largest contributors to this variety, elements from Limonese Creole may be found in this type of speech as well.
(6) I heard a little boy the other day ... an when I said to him ‘Buenas Papi’ him say ‘Hi, are you tired’?

It should also be noted that the Standard English in this example differs from Standard English in pronunciation and also verb tense agreement. Although in this example the use of Spanish is brief and inserted for quotative purposes, it nevertheless demonstrates how the varieties interact in a conversation.

3.7.3.3 The Inner Circle Variety

Next is the case of the Inner Circle Variety, which emerges as a result of Limonese Creole in contact with Standard English. This variety is akin to the mesolect variety described by Winkler (1998) and Herzfeld (2002). It is spoken by Afro-Costa Ricans who have access or exposure to Standard English through education or work. Although the Inner Circle Variety is frequently used among Afro-Costa Ricans in the home, at social gatherings and in other informal domains, some speakers still considered this variety to be “bad” or “broken” due to its phonological and syntactic differences from Standard English. Because there is some mutual intelligibility between the Inner Circle Variety and Standard English, this variety may also be used for communication with Standard English speakers. The following is an example of the Inner Circle Variety.

(7) When di makin di chicharron – di di dis chicharron dis marnin di marnin boil it up with di season, so dem have a fry it

‘When you are making chicharrones, in the morning boil it with the seasoning and then fry it’

In this example, much of the lexicon is similar to Standard English with the exception of the Spanish borrowed word chicharron, or pork rinds. However the distinct influence from

---

28 This variety is often referred to as English by its speakers.
Limonese Creole in syntax, morphology, and phonology (lack of the interdental fricative /θ/, for example) mark the phrase as the Inner Circle Variety.

3.7.4 Hybridization: The use of code-switching and lexical insertions

Finally, the type of speech that Aguilar-Sánchez and Hartford (forthcoming) refer to as “hybridized” is characterized by frequent lexical insertions and inter- and intra-sentential code-switching between Standard English, Limonese Creole, and Spanish. Speakers who exhibit these contact phenomena, Afro-Costa Rican Limonese-Spanish bilinguals, vernacularly call this type of speech “Creole”. While this speech is not characterized as a stabilized variety, due to the variational nature of code-switching, it is nonetheless commonly used for communication in informal domains: on the street, among co-workers, at home, and at social gatherings, and is especially common among younger generations in social situations. Furthermore, the use of code-switching and lexical insertions reflects the importance of the three principal varieties in Limón. Although Spanish is considered the variety that provides socio-economic advancement in society, the maintenance, transmission, and daily use of Limonese Creole celebrates the heritage of the Afro-Costa Rican population and serves as a cultural identity marker. Standard English, which has been promoted in recent years through an emphasis on bilingual education in both public and private schools, is indicative of advancement in the global economy, especially in the international business and tourism industries. The following is an example of speech that contains features from several varieties.

(8)  \textit{di yestanigh I a tellin’ Britney about dat beer, each one cuesta dos cientos cincuenta}  
\textit{‘Last night I was telling Britney about that beer, each one costs two hundred and fifty (colones)’}

\footnote{Additionally, elements of the Inner Circle Variety, Outer Circle Variety, and Limonese Spanish may also appear in code-switched phrases.}
In this example, the beginning of the phrase *di yestanigh I a tellin’* reflects Limonese Creole. As the phrase continues, the lexical elements *about, beer, each one*, reflect influence from Standard English. Lastly, the phrase *cuesta dos cientos cincuenta* is a clear code-switch to Spanish. The use of lexical insertions as well as multiword code-switches will be the focus of the analysis in the chapters to follow.

### 3.8 Conclusion

Chapter three has set the context for this study by outlining key historical events and socio-economic factors that shaped present day Limón. The chapter focuses on two main periods: the arrival of the Jamaican population in Limón from the years 1872 – 1948, and the transition of the Afro-Caribbean population to the Afro-Costa Rican population from 1948 – present day. This chapter has highlighted how certain historical events during these periods such as the construction of the Standard Railroad, the arrival and departure of the UFC, and the revolution of 1948 influenced language use and change among Afro-Costa Ricans in Limón. Furthermore, this chapter has discussed the several laws and policies implemented since 1948 caused a demographic shift in the region from a previous Afro-descendant majority to the current Hispanic majority. This shift has resulted in a highly bilingual community that has access to different varieties of English and Spanish. Finally, the varieties and contact phenomena that have resulted from this unique historical background and several years of intense language contact are outlined to provide a description of language use in present day Limón.
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODS

4.1 Introduction

The following chapter addresses the research questions that motivate this study and describes the process of data collection. After describing the participants and the contexts in which data was collected, the chapter concludes with an explanation of how the data is extracted for analysis and how the analysis is conducted.

4.1.1 Objectives

The goal of this study is to:

1) Gather data in a natural setting in order to better understand what contact phenomena are found in the spontaneous speech of Limonese Creole-Spanish bilinguals. How does the context of a conversation (sociolinguistic interview vs. natural conversation) affect the type and frequency of these mixing strategies?

2) Investigate the outcome of a creole in intense contact with a language other than its lexifier. How do the frequency, distribution, and degree of integration of mixing strategies compare to other cases of language contact? Does the contact-variety nature of a creole affect the propensity of speakers to incorporate other-language items in speech or, encourage mechanisms akin to intense contact situations such as structural borrowing?

4.1.2 Research Questions

The current study will address the following research questions:

1) What are the type, frequency, and distribution of contact phenomena such as lexical borrowings and code-switches in the data?

   - What linguistic factors influence frequency and distribution of lexical borrowings and code-switches?
-What social factors influence frequency and distribution of lexical borrowings and code-switches?

2) How are lone lexical insertions incorporated into spontaneous bilingual speech, i.e., should lone Spanish lexical insertions be interpreted as lexical borrowings (nonce or more frequent) or lone word code-switches? How does this compare to multiword insertions?

-What is the level of morphosyntactic integration of lone lexical insertions?

-What is the rate of diffusion of lone lexical items?

-What code-switching pattern (insertion, alternation, or congruent lexicalization) best describes the overall corpus?

3) Is there evidence of contact-induced language change beyond code-switching and lexical borrowing in Limonese Creole?

-Can structural borrowing be attested as suggested by Winkler (1998)?

By addressing these research questions this study aims to provide insight on the processes of code-switching and borrowing within the context of a creole in contact with a language other than its lexifier, as well as determine any implications these processes may have on the future of Limonese.

4.2 Participants and Data Collection

4.2.1 Participants

Participants in this study are Limonese-Spanish bilinguals who live in Puerto Limón, Costa Rica. All participants with the exception of one are balanced bilinguals. That is, they have fully acquired both Limonese and Spanish and use both languages daily, although in different contexts. All participants reported acquisition of Limonese Creole in the home as a child. The one exception is a passive bilingual. This participant can understand Limonese, but grew up a in
a primarily Spanish-speaking household. She reported speaking some Limonese with her monolingual grandmother and with her father’s side of her family. This participant spoke only Spanish in a sociolinguistic interview context. All participants completed a level of education of at least high school, with the exception of one, who was still in high school at the time of the interview. Two participants obtained degrees from a university and four participants were enrolled in university classes at the time of the study. There are 10 participants for the sociolinguistic interview and 13 participants for the natural conversations. Two people participated in both the sociolinguistic interview and the natural conversation, making a total of 21 participants. The following table shows the distribution of the age and gender of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual style</th>
<th>Age: 18 – 30</th>
<th>Age: 31 – 72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural conversation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1, Distribution of participants’ age and gender according to contextual style of data collection

4.2.2 Procedure

Participants for both the sociolinguistic interviews and natural conversations were elicited through “friend-of-a-friend” connections during the researcher’s six-week stay in Puerto Limón. A demographic information sheet was given to participants to collect basic information. The questionnaire included the following information: age, gender, birthplace, previous residence outside of Limón, occupation, level of education, and previous schooling in English. The process

30 It is recognized that there is an uneven representation of participants with regard to gender in this study. I was unable to elicit data from males in the 18-30 age group, with the exception of one sociolinguistic interview. This is a demographic that should be included in future investigations.
of data collection began with the intention of including only sociolinguistic interviews in the corpus. Arrangements were made to conduct interviews with participants at their homes, the Mayor Thomas B. Lynch public library, or in Parque Vargas the largest park in Puerto Limón and a popular communal meeting place.

It was hypothesized that in the interviews, participants would often choose to speak a variety of English (either Limonese or Standard), and incorporate Spanish elements (or vice versa) and more natural speech patterns as the interview progressed. This assumption is based on both previous studies with Afro-Costa Ricans and personal experience. The Afro-Costa Rican community is highly bilingual and all speakers were aware of the researcher’s bilingualism. Furthermore, Purcell (1993:116-7, 122) states, “Between Spanish and English, then, Blacks do have access to a range of codes, and the code used in any context is determined not by the given context alone” and also asserts “those who can speak Standard English display a proud willingness to use it in situations where others would opt for Spanish” (Spanish is often used in formal contexts, including interviews). Additionally, 67% of participants in Aguilar-Sánchez and Hartford’s (forthcoming) study report positive attitudes toward the use of English (Limonese or Standard). They found that approximately 25% of Afro-Costa Ricans surveyed report using Limonese English with “everybody” and 10% report using it with “foreigners/relatives”. Moreover, switching between Spanish and English is extremely common in conversations with and among the researcher’s Afro-Costa Rican host family. Code-switching was also frequently observed on the bus, in the streets, and at the market.

Labov (1972:209) presents the notion of the observer’s paradox, stating:

“the aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain this data by systematic observation”.

67
After several interviews and discussions with participants, it was found that the free movement between Spanish and English that I had observed in casual encounters with speakers was not attainable in the interview context. Participants regarded the interview context as a formal situation, where one of two outcomes occurred. First, many speakers responded to questions in a variety of Limonese approximating Standard English. While this type of discourse contains some creole-like features, it does not exhibit as many creole-like features as conversations between two native Limonese speakers, nor does it exhibit free movement between Limonese and Spanish. The second outcome encountered during sociolinguistic-style interviews was that speakers would respond to questions only in Spanish. However, all-Spanish discourse does not provide the linguistic context for Spanish insertions in otherwise Limonese speech. In addition, some participants noted that they would only use Limonese with family or friends.

After hearing that as a researcher, I was interested in learning more about how participants use both Spanish and (Limonese) English together in a conversation, participants explained that it would be best to elicit this type of speech in a “larger group” or where “there are a few of us [Afro-Costa Ricans]” and at times when they are accustomed to speaking both languages. Therefore, it was decided that a second context for data collection was needed and a “natural conversation” would provide a better context for spontaneous speech that incorporates Spanish and Limonese English varieties. Some participants offered to allow me to observe natural conversations in their social groups, which took place in the participants’ homes and outside of a café. A consent form was used to obtain permission to record oral data and both the sociolinguistic interviews and natural conversations were recorded using a Zoom H4N digital
voice recorder. Recordings were transcribed for analysis. The corpus, including interviews in English and Spanish as well as natural conversations, consists of approximately 61,963 words.

4.2.3 Data elicitation

Sociolinguistic interviews ranged from 15 – 50 minutes and were performed in Spanish, Limonese or Standard English. Each interview began in Spanish with a question from the researcher, however it was explained that participants were free to answer in the language of their choice. If a participant responded to a question in English, the following question was prompted in English. Likewise if a participant responded in Spanish, the next question was also asked in Spanish. Interviews included topics such as Afro-Costa Rican history and culture, daily life in Limón, family life, and attitudes toward language use.

Natural conversations ranged from 10 – 50 minutes and contained speech in Spanish and Limonese Creole. The primary topics of the natural conversation were daily life in Limón, happenings in the participants’ social groups, and gossip. The researcher did not participate as an interlocutor in the natural conversations.

4.3 Variables under study

4.3.1 Extralinguistic Factors

The data for the following extralinguistic factors were collected through the demographic information sheet or obtained through direct questioning in the sociolinguistic interviews. Gender: There were 13 female and 8 male participants in the study. Table 2 provides the distribution of the participants’ gender according to contextual style.

Age: The participants’ age ranged from 18 to 72. Age is divided into two categories, 18 – 30 (6 participants) and 31 – 72 (15 participants). These categories were chosen based on the point in

---

31 Thank you to Kemar Small for his help in transcribing conversations in Limonese.
which English instruction became obligatory in public schools. During his term (1994 – 1998) President Figueres introduced mandatory English instruction in public schools. Participants born 1983 or later (30 years old at the time of the study or younger) would have had at least four years (the equivalent of high school) of English education according to this requirement. Table 2 provides the distribution of participants’ age according to contextual style.

**Contextual Style:** There were two contexts in which data was collected: the sociolinguistic interview and the natural conversation, as described in sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3. As previously mentioned, 10 people participated in the sociolinguistic interview, 13 people participated in the natural conversations, and 2 people participated in both.

**Occupation:** Participants’ occupation is divided into four categories: student, professional, service, and retired. There were 4 university students and 1 high school student. Professionals included a lawyer, call center specialist/former policeman, security guard, teachers, and a librarian. Service employees were vendors, child caretakers, and housekeepers.

**Exposure to Standard or American English:** This factor is divided into two categories: high and low. Participants with high exposure to Standard or American English are those who have taken English classes, attended English school, or lived in the United States. Those considered to have low exposure have had no formal English training, however are exposed to Standard or American English through other outlets, primarily the media\(^{32}\) or through travel to the United States for shorter periods of time.

---

\(^{32}\) As previously mentioned, all basic cable packages include stations with English programming. In July 2014 61,816 households (48.2%) in the Región Huetar Atlántica, the socioeconomic region that encompasses Puerto Limón, paid for at least basic cable in the home (www.inec.go.cr). Also, the public library in Puerto Limón has a ‘Maker Space’ (formerly the American Corner), sponsored by the United States government. The space contains an English book collection, English magazines and DVDs, and educational resources for English language learning.
Table 4.2 presents the number of participants for each extralinguistic factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18 – 30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 72</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual style of data</td>
<td>sociolinguistic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collection</td>
<td>natural conversation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retired</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to Standard or</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2, Extralinguistic factors and participants

4.3.2 Linguistic Variables

Lone noun and verb insertions were coded according to their grammatical category, degree of integration into the recipient language, and frequency (Table 4.3). Coding of multiword insertions and lone insertions other than nouns and verbs will be discussed in Section 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish lone insertions</td>
<td>Grammatical category</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of integration</td>
<td>morphological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phonological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency(^{33})</td>
<td>both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nonce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more than nonce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3, Factor groups for Spanish lone lexical insertions

4.4 Measuring integration of lone lexical items

Poplack and Dion (2012) note that distinguishing the difference between code-switching and borrowing is “perhaps the thorniest issue in the field of contact linguistics today” (311). To

\(^{33}\) A nonce lone word is uttered only once in the corpus, more than nonce items have two or more tokens.
my knowledge, there is only one other study that addresses this issue in Limonese Creole (Winkler 1998). In that study, Winkler uses frequency and phonetic alteration to determine if a lexical item is borrowed or code-switched. If a lexical item appears in three conversations by three different people, it is considered a borrowing (loanword). Out of the 880 Spanish lone word insertions in Winkler’s corpus, only 336 were classified as borrowings (loanwords) by her analysis. While Winkler attests the morphosyntactic integration of twelve verbs in her corpus, only two pass her frequency analysis. An analysis of morphosyntactic integration for all lone word insertions was not performed in the (1998) study, therefore, at this point a systematic analysis using morphosyntactic criteria to determine degree of integration of lone Spanish insertions into Limonese Creole grammar has not been performed.

Two complementary frameworks were used to conduct a comprehensive analysis of all lone Spanish lexical insertions in the corpus. To analyze the insertion of lone nouns and verbs, the current study applies a variationist comparative method based on the work of Poplack and Meechan (1998) and Poplack and Dion (2012). As Adalar and Tagliamonte (1998) note, “the variationist method is essentially comparative”; this method requires a systematic evaluation of the data under investigation and a comparison of the data in unmixed and mixed vernacular speech. An assumption made by Poplack and Meechan (1998) regarding the application of the variationist method to language contact is that “the conditioning of linguistic variability [is] language specific”. Analyzing the linguistic variability of the data under study will help determine the grammar (in this case, Limonese or Spanish) by which the inserted item is constrained. In this study, linguistic variability of nouns and verbs is measured in three contexts: Limonese nouns and verbs in Limonese discourse, Spanish nouns and verbs in Spanish discourse, and Spanish nouns and verbs in Spanish discourse.
In order to determine if foreign lone lexical items are integrated into the recipient language as borrowings it is first necessary to examine how words pattern in unmixed bilingual speech. Poplack and Meechan (1998) note that this is based on Labov’s principle of accountability, which underlines the importance of defining environments where variability occurs (Labov 1972:72). Therefore, nouns and verbs from unambiguous Limonese Creole speech are extracted from the corpus and their patterns are analyzed according to five diagnostic features. Variation in Spanish insertions (mixed bilingual speech) may then be examined by comparing the patterns of the Spanish insertions to the patterns identified in unmixed speech.

The following diagnostics will be used as criteria for measuring morphosyntactic integration of lone noun and verb insertions: verb inflection, plural marking, determiner realization, adjective placement and attributive possession expression. These criteria are chosen because they represent conflict sites where the grammars of Spanish and Limonese Creole differ (Poplack and Dion 2012:284). In a study of French in contact with English, Poplack and Dion (2012) established that nonce forms are categorically integrated into recipient-language grammar in all of the above categories. Several other studies (Adalar and Tagliamonte 1998; Budzhak-Jones 1998; Eze 1998; Samar and Meechan 1998; Torres Cacoullos and Aaron 2003; Turpin 1998) are cited that also affirm the same findings in other language pairs, however to the best of my knowledge this methodology has not been used with a creole.

---

34 Gender assignment and agreement were also tested in Poplack and Dion (2012), and it was found that English lexical items were assigned gender as a means of being incorporated into French grammar as borrowings. This conflict site was not analyzed in the current study because Limonese Creole does not express gender, therefore does not provide a system into which a borrowing could be incorporated.
4.4.1 Verb inflection

One of the biggest conflict sites between Spanish and Limonese is verbal morphology. Spanish has a rich inflectional TMA system, whereas like Standard English, Limonese has limited inflectional morphology. Verbs generally surface in the base form and express TMA with preverbal markers, adverbial phrases, or simply by context.

(9)  *she sen di plait an di food an give me, she call me Monday marnin early*
     ‘She sent the plate and the food and gave them to me, she called me early Monday morning.’

Like most aspects of Limonese grammar, usage of base forms and forms approaching Standard English vary, often within the same conversation and even within the same speaker and the same utterance, such as in example (10). It is extremely rare for verbs to be inflected for the present tense third person singular form (-s), however the morpheme –*in* (which varies with Standard English –*ing*) appears in the corpus in both interviews and natural conversations to express the imperfective aspect\(^{35}\) (examples (11) and (12)).

(10)  *she give me money front of everybody, mi was drunk mi sit down*
     ‘she gave me the money in front of everybody, I was drunk and I sat down’

(11)  *everyday she drinkin*
     ‘she drinks everyday’

(12)  *you go to some places, dey speak to you like dey singin*
     ‘you go to some places, they speak to you like they’re singing’

4.4.2 Plural marking

The plural form of a Spanish noun is marked by affixing –*s* to a noun ending in a vowel and –*es* to nouns ending in a consonant. In Limonese, the plural marker *dem* may be used in post-nominal position, as in example (13). Pluralization may also be null [ø], and inferred by context, such as in example (14). The conflict in plural marking, however, is only partial because

\(^{35}\) The –*in*/–*ing* form of a verb generally appears without a copula in the present, but with the copula (usually ‘was’) in the past.
the Standard English plural marker [s] may be affixed to nouns as well. Variation in the use of plural markers can be observed in individual speech and speakers may vary between the markers even within the same sentence (15). Furthermore, as Winkler (1998) also notes, plural marking may occur with words that are inherently plural in Standard English, attesting to borrowing from Standard English (also seen in (15)).

(13) \textit{wit di pikni dem} \\
\textquote{with the children’}

(14) \textit{dem is student[ø]} \\
\textquote{they are students’}

(15) \textit{di yout, many of di people dem, dey parents doun try to help di yout} \\
\textquote{the youth, many people’s parents don’t try to help the youth’}

4.4.3 Determiner realization

There are both definite and indefinite articles in Limonese, although the use is variable and not categorical as in Spanish or Standard English. \textit{Di} and \textit{da} are definite articles found in the corpus and are also attested by Winkler (1998). The use of a definite article primarily follows the Jamaican Creole pattern where the definite article precedes every noun in a definite noun phrase (Bailey 1966:29), however at times the definite article is also null (16). Definite articles are often used in noun phrases that would not require a determiner in Spanish or Standard English (17).

(16) \textit{Mami I see you eat [ø] ciek!} \\
\textquote{Mami I see you eating the cake!’}

(17) \textit{only di chicken dey had} \\
\textquote{they only had chicken’}
The Limonese indefinite article a also varies with a null article (18). In Spanish the indefinite article is null when another determiner is used (e.g. otro/a) or when referring to professions, nationalities or political/religious affiliations (unless modified by an adjective).

(18) I pass like one year an six month workin at dem same ting just drivin [œ] car like operation, but dey neva send me to anoda level

‘I spent like one year and six months working on the same things, just driving a car like operations, but they never promoted me’

(19) he made a accident der so dey give a lot a money

‘he had an accident there so they gave him a lot of money’

4.4.4 Adjective placement

In Spanish, adjectives generally follow the head noun and are restrictive in meaning. In this way, the adjective delineates or specifies the group of the noun being modified. For example, the sentence mi amiga amable viene a mi casa indicates that it is only my nice friend who is coming to my house, not my unpleasant friend. Spanish adjectives may precede the noun and in such cases they convey nonrestrictive meaning. The adjective serves to add commentary or emphasize a certain quality of the modified noun. In the example mi amable amiga viene a mi casa, it is conveyed that my friend is coming to my house and she happens to be nice.

Additionally, certain adjectives undergo a change in meaning when used prenominally (eg. Tengo un viejo amigo vs. Tengo un amigo viejo). Adjectives in Limonese Creole occur in prenominal position categorically (Winkler 1998:83).

(20) Britson doun like at food

‘Britson doesn’t like hot food’

36 Winkler (1998:81) also mentions the indefinite article an however an was not found in this corpus, even in environments where it would be required by Standard English (see example (19)).
4.4.5 Attributive Possession

Attributive, or adnominal possession is possession between noun phrases and expressed in Limonese through the use of two constructions. First, Limonese uses a variety of possessive pronouns to express attributive possession. Possessive pronouns only appear before the head noun and unlike Spanish, there is no stressed postnominal form (i.e. *la casa mía*, ‘my house’). Rather, possessive pronouns range from *my, your, his, ar, der, and owa* in the Outer Circle Variety to *mi, your, im, shi, dey, and wi* in the Inner Circle Variety. In addition to possessive pronouns, Limonese also expresses attributive possession by juxtaposing the possessor and the possessed noun.\(^\text{37}\)

(21) \(\text{My fada mada die a hundred an nine years}\)  
\(\text{‘my father’s mother died when she was one hundred and nine years old’}\)

4.4.6 Phonological adaptation

Phonological adaptation cannot solely determine the borrowing status of a lexical item. Poplack and Dion (2012) assert, due to recipient language phonology, “phonological criteria are not reliable indicators of loanword integration”. However, it is recognized that some degree of phonological integration (albeit variable) is key to the social integration of the lexical item, and also to be expected, particularly if a borrowing is more established or widespread (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller 1988; Poplack and Dion 2012, Poplack 2012). Phonological transcriptions of will be provided in examples where phonological adaptation to Limonese is coupled with morphological integration of the borrowing.

4.5 Analysis of multiword insertions

There have been several approaches to analyzing code-switching among Spanish-English bilinguals throughout the past 35 years. Poplack (1980) analyzes intra-sentential code-switches

\(^{37}\) This is also seen in Jamaican Creole.
in bilingual Puerto Rican speech according to constituent category, and Sankoff and Poplack (1981) examine the likelihood of switches at different syntactic boundaries. Zentella and Duran (1981) and Zentella (1997) give an account of code-switching and intergenerational bilingual speech in New York Puerto Ricans. Linguistic attitudes along with quantity and quality of code-switching usage are the focus of Toribio’s (2003) study on Spanish-English bilinguals of Mexican heritage. The overarching theme of these studies, among others, is to incorporate “the intersection of sociolinguistics and variationist models” along with “syntactic theory, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, and literary and cultural studies” (Lipski 2005).

4.5.1 The Mixing Typology Model

The current study adopts the Mixing Typology Model (MTM) as a framework for analyzing variation in bilingual code-mixing strategies (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007; Muysken 2000, 2013, 2015). The MTM proposes that multiword code-switches may be interpreted as either insertions, alternations or congruent lexicalization, with one pattern emerging as dominant (although not exclusive) in a bilingual corpus. Insertion occurs when an element (most often a lone word or constituent) from one language is introduced into a recipient language (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007:299). Alternation refers to when speakers vacillate between languages after stretches of words, akin to Poplack’s inter- and intra-sentential code-switching. Congruent lexicalization occurs when languages share structures. Switches analyzed as congruent lexicalization are more or less “random” and do not necessarily conform to constituent boundaries (Muysken 2000:8; Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007:304; Lipski 2009:2, 2014:27). The distinction between insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization accounts

38 It is recognized that Muysken (2013, 2015) also suggests a fourth mixing typology, backflagging, which considers the use of the L2 as a base language. The current study only considers Spanish insertions in otherwise Limonese speech, not vice-versa, therefore backflagging will not be considered in this study.
for the variation in the type of multiword code-switches that can be found in a corpus. Table 4.4 summarizes the linguistic and extralinguistic criteria that favor insertion, alternation or congruent lexicalization (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007:309).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Multiword insertion</th>
<th>Linguistic factors favoring this type</th>
<th>Extralinguistic factors favoring this type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td>Typological distance</td>
<td>Colonial settings; recent migrant communities; asymmetry in speaker’s proficiency in two languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternation</td>
<td>Typological distance</td>
<td>Stable bilingual communities; tradition of language separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent lexicalization</td>
<td>Typologically similar languages</td>
<td>Two languages have roughly equal prestige; no history of overt language separation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4, Types of multiword insertions according to Deuchar, Muysken and Wang (2007)

Deuchar, Muysken, and Wang’s (2007) predictions for identifying dominant code-mixing patterns, as described in Table 4.4, make Limonese-Spanish bilingual speech an interesting case for an analysis within this framework. On one hand, based on extralinguistic factors, the Limonese-Spanish corpus favors alternation as a dominant pattern. As described in detail in Chapter Three, there is a tradition of language separation in Limón and bilingualism is fairly stable. On the other hand, although Limonese and Spanish are not so typologically similar that they are mutually intelligible, such as the case of Spanish and Portuguese, or even cognate languages such as Spanish and Italian (both described in Lipski 2009), yet they are still typologically similar in some structures, such as SVO word order. These typological similarities may favor congruent lexicalization.

Along with Poplack and Meechan’s (1998) framework, Muysken’s MTM will also examine the integration of lone Spanish insertions. The MTM addresses patterns of code-
switching, not borrowing. A limitation in Deuchar, Muysken and Wang’s (2007) study with Tsou-Mandarin Chinese bilingual speech is the lack of a reliable dictionary available to attest established borrowings. Because lexical items were unable to be dictionary tested to determine borrowing or code-switching status, they were eliminated from a portion of the analysis. The case of Limonese also faces this lack of dictionary limitation, as the language is predominantly oral. By first determining whether a lone Spanish insertion is a borrowing or code-switch using the conflict sites described in section 4.4, lone insertions (including grammatical categories other than nouns and verbs) can be included in the analysis despite the lack of a reliable Limonese dictionary.

4.5.2 Selection of multiword code-switches

All Spanish multiword switches in otherwise Limonese speech were extracted for analysis. Determining Spanish switches in otherwise Limonese speech did not prove too difficult for this analysis, due to the fact that the corpus is comprised of primarily Limonese or the Outer-Circle Variety of Limonese. Clause-based and sequential approaches were used for selecting Spanish multiword switches, as seen in Deuchar, Muysken and Wang (2007) and Lipski (2009, 2014). First, Limonese was identified as the ‘matrix’ language when possible, based on word order and subject-verb agreement. In cases where the utterance is brief or lacking a verb, a matrix language is not easily determined, and the sequential approach is also used to identify a switch. The following example is considered a switch because the first word in the utterance is Limonese.

(22)  \textit{di ensalada ¿qué?}  
‘the salad, what?’

The sequential approach also extends over multiple turns, which makes it possible to include inter-sentential Spanish insertions that would otherwise be excluded from the analysis. If the first
speaker ends an utterance in Limonese and second speaker begins a turn in Spanish, the second speaker’s utterance would be considered a switch.

(23)  

A: *yesterday I call ar so she carry it by dat Monday if anything*  
B: *¿para el consejo municipal?*

A: ‘yesterday I called her so she’ll bring it by that Monday if anything’  
B: ‘by the municipal (town) council?’

Excluded from the analysis are mixed switches containing stretches of Spanish discourse preceded by a previous stretch of Spanish discourse, as demonstrated by participant ‘M’ in the following example.

(24)  

S: *Y cuando ella fue al hospital la doctora le dio acetaminofén*  
M: *No puede tomar nada antibióticos ni acetaminofén so me no know*

S: ‘and when she went to the hospital the doctor gave her acetaminophen’  
M: ‘she can’t take any antibiotics or acetaminophen so I don’t know’

In this example although participant M’s speech is mixed, the Spanish portion of the utterance is not considered a switch because the previous speech (participant ‘S’) is also in Spanish.

4.5.3 Diagnostic Features

The MTM consists of a series of diagnostic features used to determine if a mixed pattern is an insertion, alternation or congruent lexicalization. Each feature is associated with one or two of the three patterns. A score of +1 is given when the token exhibits a particular feature of a pattern, a score of −1 is given if the token contradicts the feature of the pattern, and a score of 0 is given if the feature does not apply to the pattern. Table 6, based on Muysken (2000:230) and Deuchar, Muysken and Wang (2007:306-7), presents the criteria for identifying a multiword insertion as either insertion, alternation congruent lexicalization. The criteria ‘direction of switch’ was not included because this analysis only considers switches from Limonese to Spanish. In this study all Spanish multiword insertions in otherwise Limonese dominant speech are scored
according to the diagnostic features in Table 4.5 in order to determine the code-switching pattern.

After each code-switch is analyzed, the results of each pattern are summed to identify the dominant pattern in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muysken’s features</th>
<th>Insertion</th>
<th>Alternation</th>
<th>Congruent Lexicalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single constituent</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several constituents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-constituent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aba, nested</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aba, not-nested</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Element switched</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse switches*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long constituent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex constituent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content word</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function word</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverb, conjunction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selected element</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emblematic or tag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switch site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major clause boundary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peripheral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embedding in discourse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flagging</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dummy word insertion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Properties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear equivalence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telegraphic mixing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphological integration</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doubling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homophonous diamorphs*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triggering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed collocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-corrections</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*applies to corpus as a whole, score of individual switch not calculated

Table 4.5, Diagnostic features of alternation and congruent lexicalization
4.5.4 Examples and definitions of diagnostic features

The following section defines the diagnostic features applied in this study according to Muysken (2000) and Deuchar, Muysken and Wang (2007) and provides examples of each feature as found in the corpus.

**Single constituent** is when a word or a group of words form a single phrase.

(25)  
No becah **el sábado** is Cecilia birthday  
‘No because Saturday is Cecilia’s birthday’

**Several constituents** refers to two or more words that string together forming two or more groups, such as a verb phrase and adverbial phrase, as in example (26).

(26)  
*Vicky she come and to tell you good marnin vienes a las cinco de la tarde*  
‘Vicky comes to say good morning to you she comes a five in the afternoon’

**Non-constituent** mixing is a type of mixing that involves “words within a shared structure” (Muysken 2000:129). It is indicative of congruent lexicalization because it accounts for insertions at sites that are at not syntactic boundaries.

(27)  
*you can go and do a camarón de vez en cuando*  
‘you can go and do a gig from time to time’

**Nested a b a** refers to switches that have material from the other language both a) before and after the insertion and b) belonging to the same clause.

(28)  
*an you see like in di um la noticia you see like yestaday day before yestaday dey kill a guy right der in Ninety-nine*  
‘and you see in the um the news you see like yesterday or the day before yesterday they killed a guy right there in Ninety-nine (a restaurant)’

**Not-nested a b a** refers to when other-language elements preceding and following the switch belong to different clauses.

(29)  
*an I say *deme un segundito* and I go outside*  
‘and I said ’give me a second’ and I went outside’
Long constituent refers to constituents that are longer than one word. This encompasses the majority of switches analyzed in this study.

Complex constituents are defined as “constituents with hierarchical internal structures involving several lexical heads” (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007:315). The first switch in the following example *me dice cuando viene* is a complex constituent.

(30)  *me dice cuando viene* because *in di anything if I have to be in* **San José nos topamos** beca *in di vacation so I may go two days up der*

‘tell me when you’re coming because if by any chance I have to be in San José we’ll get in touch because I’m on vacation so I might go there for two days’

Content word, Function word, and Adverb, conjunction are not always applied, because they pertain to lone rather than multiword switches39.

Selected element is a diagnostic feature that will apply to all insertions. The insertion will receive a positive score if it is an object or complement as in example (31).

(31)  *alright givin you* **dos mil más bien**

‘alright, I’ll give you two thousand (colones) better yet’

Emblematic or tag refers to the insertion of tag phrases or interjections.

(32)  *es que I not goin di* Monday

‘well I’m not going on Monday’

Major clause boundary indicates an interclausal switch.

(33)  *Yo we have to leave right now. Mae, vamanos ya para la casa.*

‘Yo we have to leave right now. Dude, let’s go home now.’

Peripheral insertions occur at the outer boundary of a clause,

(34)  *Yeah but dat why I tellin’ you say* **sabia muy bien**

‘yeah but that’s why I’m telling you that it tasted very good’

39 Unless the entire switched constituent belongs to the category, such as the example “apple trees” (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007:315).
Embedding in discourse is applied to insertions that appear at the end of a turn. If the next turn beings with the language of the insertion, it receives a positive score (35). If the next turn does not begin with the language of the insertion it receives a negative score (36).

(35)  
  S: *but she cyan drink* di vitamina *C eso no es nada malo*  
  M: *no la vitamina C no le hace nada malo*  
  S: ‘but she can take vitamin C that’s not anything bad’  
  M: ‘no vitamin C won’t do her any harm’

(36)  
  D: *we need to slow down* wit di salt dough, beca *yo usé demasiada sal*  
  Bs: *na so fast*  
  D: ‘we need to slow down with the salt though because I used too much salt’  
  Bs: ‘not so fast’

Flagging occurs when insertions are initiated by a discourse marker, pause, or when the speaker repairs him/herself.

(37)  
  *but him say no, no man, you killin yourself too, but der you killin yourself um, fisical, fisical, fisical, fisical, fisica—fisicalmente no mentalmente ¿ya me entiende?*  
  ‘but he said no, no man, you’re killing yourself too, but there you’re killin yourself physically, not mentally, you understand?’

Dummy word insertion refers to the insertion of words that are semantically empty. There were no cases dummy word insertions for multiword switches, however the following example shows a dummy word insertion that is a lone word.

(38)  
  *dey sell dis spot, dey rent di spot for big plenty money and den *este*, you all hearin di big noise*  
  ‘they sell this spot, they rent the spot for a lot of money and then *este*, everyone hears loud noises’

Linear equivalence refers to when the switched element appears in the same position as it would have appeared if it were uttered in the other language.
(39) *she put it into una cosa de agua*  
‘she put it into a thing of water’

Telegraphic mixing occurs when elements that are required in one or both of the languages are omitted. In example (40) the complementizer *que* ‘that’ is required in Spanish, yet it is omitted by the speaker at the switch boundary.

(40) *Ruben seh nosotros los grandes compramos la comida*  
‘Ruben says (that) the adults will buy the food’

Morphological integration refers to when one language determines the grammatical framework of the phrase and the inserted elements are morphologically integrated into that grammatical structure. In this corpus multiword switches retained Spanish morphology.

Doubling occurs when the insertion carries the same semantic value of a morpheme in the original language that also occurs elsewhere in the utterance.

(41)  
M: *Ella lo hace muy aguado*  
S: *Yes. La agua too much wata, mucha agua.*  
M: ‘She makes it very watery’  
S: ‘Yes, Water, too much water, a lot of water.’

Triggering refers to when an insertion of a word, often a proper noun, triggers a longer phrase or string of switched elements. In the following example mentioning the name of a hotel, *(Hotel Maribu Caribe)* initiated a longer string of words in Spanish.

(42)  
*Mamba wen we pass it wen time we see Maribu. Maribu es la parte de arriba, sí, la parte de arriba.*  
‘Remember when it went by it one time and we saw Maribu. Maribu is the part upstairs, yes the part upstairs.’

Mixed collocations refers to idiomatic expressions that are derived from one language, yet include elements from both languages. There were no cases of multiword mixed collocations,
however a mixed collocation occurred with a lone Spanish insertion. The idiomatic expression in this example is from Spanish, *un pedazo de aguacero*, meaning ‘a strong downpour’.

(43)  
*an di rain, becah you see di piece a aguacero wooi!*  
‘and the rain, because did you see that downpour, wooi!’

**Self-correction** refers to when the information in the insertion is repeated, or corrected from material in the other language.

(44)  
*my car would have rims, seventeen di rims, los aros de lujo seventeen*  
‘my car used to have rims, seventeen inch rims, seventeen inch rims’

### 4.6 Summary

This chapter has presented the objectives of this study and the research questions that will be answered by the data analysis. I have also described the methods used to collect the data and the extralinguistic and linguistic factors under consideration. The nature of the Limonese as a primarily oral language with no reliable or standardized dictionary necessitates that a combination of two methods of analysis to best account for both lone and multiword Spanish insertions. Explanations of the points of conflict used for lone Spanish insertions and diagnostics used for multiword insertions are provided along with relevant examples from the corpus. The following chapters focus on the analysis of the extracted data and also discuss other evidence of language contact observed in the corpus.
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS OF SPANISH LONE AND MULTIWORD INSERTIONS IN OTHERWISE LIMONESE SPEECH

5.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to present a complete description and analysis of Spanish insertions found in the Limonese-Spanish corpus under study. All cases of Spanish insertions in otherwise Limonese speech produced in both interviews and natural conversation are accounted for in the analysis. The chapter first presents an overview of Spanish insertions found in the data. Then Spanish lone lexical insertions are analyzed according to conflict site (Poplack and Meechan 1998) in order to determine code-switching or borrowing status. An analysis of multiword code-switches follows, which presents the findings from the code-switching analysis performed according to Muysken’s (2000) diagnostics. Results are partitioned by code-switching typology: insertion, alternation or congruent lexicalization. An analysis of extralinguistic factors contributing to production of both borrowings and code-switches is also included throughout the chapter. Influence of extralinguistic factors on contact phenomena production is also analyzed for the corpus as a whole, at which point a hierarchy of factors contributing to contact phenomena production is proposed. The final section discusses the implications that the most frequent contact phenomena types found in the corpus may have on language use in the Limonese-Spanish speaking community.

5.2 Overview of Spanish insertions

Table 5.1 presents the overall frequency of lone and multiword Spanish insertions in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lone insertions</th>
<th>Multiword insertions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122/384</td>
<td>122/384</td>
<td>122/384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1, Lone vs. multiword Spanish insertions
Multiword insertions appear in the data more than twice as frequently as lone lexical insertions. In this investigation all 262 multiword insertions are considered code-switches and are analyzed in Section 5.5. The high percentage of multiword code-switches in the corpus attests to the bilingual competence of the interlocutors. A speaker’s ability to insert multiword utterances within the immediate context of a conversation requires “high proficiency” and demands “full competence in both languages” (Matras 2009:112). It is the case that some participants in the current study are more prolific inserters than others, however, fewer insertions by some participants in a natural conversation, for example, do not necessarily correlate to lower bilingual competence. It is also pointed out that multiword insertion are not only a reflection of the speaker’s linguistic self-confidence, but also the speaker’s confidence in the interlocutor, as it requires greater attention for the listener when the language of an interaction is renegotiated, even for an instance (Matras 2009:112).

5.3 Grammatical category of lone lexical insertions

Nouns are the most frequent lone lexical insertions in the corpus, consisting of a total of 86/122 (70.5%) insertions. A total of 11/122 (9.0%) verbs are inserted, making it the second most frequent grammatical category of Spanish insertions found in the corpus. Therefore a total of 97/122 (79.5%) lone insertions extracted from the data were nouns or verbs and analyzed according to the criteria described in Section 4.4. The remaining 25/122 (20.5%) lone insertions that fell into a grammatical category other than noun or verb were analyzed according to Muysken’s (2000) diagnostics, and are included in the analysis in Section 5.5. Table 5.2 shows the distribution of all lone insertions according to grammatical category.
The predominance of noun insertion is consistent with hierarchies of borrowability proposed by Haugen (1950) and Muysken (1981). The high proportion of inserted nouns is attributed to the fact that they are governed by fewer morphosyntactic constraints, and are also more frequent in speech (Winford 2003:51). Furthermore, nouns also fill specific lexical gaps. For example, it was found that Limonese borrows *microonda*, ‘microwave’ from the Spanish *microondas*, most likely because the microwave was not invented until after Spanish became the dominant language in Limón. According to the hierarchies of borrowability, adjectives would be expected to appear more frequently than verbs. However a higher number of verbs is not necessarily unexpected, and is consistent with findings in previous studies such as Poplack, Sankoff and Miller’s (1988) study of English and French in contact. Additionally, verbs accounted for 11% of lone word code-switches in Winkler’s (1998) study of Limonese.

**5.4 Degree of integration of lone lexical insertions**

Using the diagnostics outlined in Section 4.4 it was determined that 95/97 (97.9%) Spanish lone nouns and verbs are incorporated into Limonese speech as lexical borrowings. The following sections present the results of the analysis at conflict sites between Limonese and Spanish grammars.

**5.4.1 Verb inflection**

It was found that 10/11 (90.9%) Spanish verbs are integrated into Limonese grammar as borrowings. Seven of the 11 (63.6%) verbs were borrowed in the infinitive form and interpreted as the base form of the verb. The base form interpretation is evidenced by the use of Spanish...
infinitives where the base form of a Limonese verb would normally be found, such as before Limonese to and affi/affa ‘have to’. It is worth noting that in the following example the word deletrer<Sp. deletrear ‘to spell’ is not only morphologically integrated into Limonese but phonologically integrated as well; the /a/ is elided and resolves the hiatus.

\[ (45) \text{di } \text{teecha work dem to-deletrer in learn-in English}^{40} \]
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ART} & \text{teacher work[IPFV.1SG]} & \text{OBJ.3PL spell-INF in learn-IPFV English} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘the teacher works with them to learn how to spell in English’

Example (46) shows a case where a reflexive verb is morphologically integrated into Limonese. The verb peinarse ‘to comb or style one’s hair’ appears to retain its reflexive meaning yet the reflexive pronoun is expressed in Limonese.

\[ (46) \text{Shirloni af-fi- peinar ar dis fin de semana} \]

Shirloni AUX-comb-INF REFL DEM end of week

‘Shirloni has to get her hair done this weekend’

Of the lone verbs inserted, 3/11 (27.3%) were inflected in the Spanish third person singular present tense form. These verbs appear in contexts where a verb in the past tense is required; however, the verbs did not express any Spanish morphology marking tense, and are therefore interpreted as borrowings. In the following example the Spanish verb faltar ‘to lack’ is morphologically integrated into Limonese in two ways. First, there is a lack of Spanish past tense verbal morphology despite reference to a past event. Second, whereas in Spanish the subject of the verb would be black people ting and di parti would be the indirect object, in this example the opposite is true.

\[ (47) \text{A: I enjoy di parti it was good} \]
\[ \text{B: a di parti it falta more black people ting} \]

A: ‘I enjoyed the party, it was good’
B: ‘The party needed more black people things’

\[^{40}\text{Glosses follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Comrie, Haspelmath, and Bickel 2015) See Appendix Two for a list of abbreviations.} \]
Finally, 1/11 (9.0%) lone verb insertion was found to not integrate morphologically into Limonese grammar. The verb is inserted in the following exchange:

(48) D: Britney, undastan  
B: beta you no say nothin  
D: Britney entiéndame, Britney  
B: you don say already I is a big ouman

D: ‘Britney, understand’  
B: ‘it’s better not to say anything’  
D: ‘Britney understand me, Britney’  
B: ‘you’ve already said that I’m a grown woman’

In this case, the verb entender ‘to understand’ retains its Spanish morphology and is interpreted as a code-switch. It was analyzed according to Muysken’s diagnostics and was found to be an example of insertional code-switching.

5.4.2 Plural marking

There were 15 nouns in the corpus to which the plural marking diagnostic could be applied. Of these nouns, 10/15 (66.6%) did not appear with the overt plural marker [s] from Spanish, and were integrated into Limonese grammar by the use of the plural marker dem in postnominal position or by plural context\(^{41}\). In 4/10 of these cases plurality is evidenced by the marker dem. In the remaining 6/10 cases the plural marker dem is null and the singular form of the noun is used within a plural context.

(49) she av ar compañera -dem  
SBJ.3SG have POSS.3SG friend-PL  
‘she has her friends’

(50) A -wat all di preparativo-o good fi di parti?  
Q all ART preparation-[PL] good PREP ART party  
‘Are all of the preparations ready for the party?’

\(^{41}\) See Section 4.4.2.
The overt Spanish plural marker [s] was found on 5/15 (33.3%) nouns. All five cases of overt [s] are one of two words: *caracolitos* ‘small (pasta) shells’ and *pasas* ‘raisins’.

(51) *dat caracolitos deys nice if dey get dem hot*
    ‘the little shells are nice if you heat them up’

(52) Br: *I ben tellin Britney yestaday you see da ting where dem put, where dem put di–*
    B: *–di peanuts and di pasas*
    Br: ‘I was saying to Britney yesterday, you see the thing where they put, where they put the–’
    B: ‘–the peanuts and the raisins’

Given the context of these examples, I argue that the [s] in both *caracolitos* and *pasas* is lexicalized and not a plural marker. When these words are excluded from calculations based on plural markings it is found that in 10/10 (100%) cases Spanish words are integrated into Limonese grammar and can therefore be interpreted as borrowings.

### 5.4.3 Determiner realization

This diagnostic involves partial conflict between Limonese and Spanish. Although both Limonese and Spanish allow both overt and null determiners, null determiners occur more often in Limonese than in Spanish. There are eleven cases in which full conflict in determiner use attests borrowing status for lone insertions. That is, whereas in Spanish the inserted nouns require a determiner, the null determiner is acceptable in Limonese grammar, as seen in example (53).

(53) *dem deh -deh di wol day an dem play in o-piscina*
    SBJ.3PL there ART whole day and SBJ.3PL play.3PL.IPFV PREP [ART]-pool
    ‘they’ll be there the whole day and they’ll play in the pool’

---

Cases of lexicalized plural markers were also found in Poplack and Dion’s (2012) study of English-origin insertions in Quebec French.
Cases of partial conflict are seen when Spanish nouns with overt determiners occur in contexts where an overt determiner is also permitted or required in Limonese. There are 32 cases of this type of partial conflict.

(54) You don see ar man wan join di conversación?  
SBJ.2SG COMPL see POSS.3SG boyfriend want[3SG] join[INF] ART conversation  
‘Did you see if her boyfriend wants to join the conversation?’

In a second type of partial conflict, a determiner is not required neither in Spanish nor Limonese. There are 13 cases of this type.

(55) dey trow basura on di beach  
SBJ.3PL throw[3PL] trash PREP ART beach  
‘they throw trash on the beach’

Poplack and Dion (2012) encountered the same problem with partial conflict in their study of English-origin nouns in Quebec French speech. They call attention to the fact that although there is only partial conflict with this diagnostic, determiner usage is consistent with the grammar of the recipient language “immediately at the first introduction of the nonce form”. This was also found to be true in the current analysis of determiner realization. In 56/56 (100%) of the cases determiner usage is consistent with Limonese grammar.

5.4.4 Adjective placement

In cases where a lone Spanish noun is inserted and modified by an adjective, the colocation of the adjective is used as a diagnostic to evaluate borrowing vs. code-switching status. In all (10/10, 100%) cases of lone Spanish nouns modified by Limonese adjectives, the adjective precedes the noun. That is, there are no cases where the adjective is postposed, as would be expected if the nouns were not integrated into Limonese grammar as borrowings. It should be noted that there are five cases that involve adjectives that are also permitted in the prenominal position, as seen in examples (56) and (57).
(56) she betta come di **nex quincena**
‘she better come the next pay period’

(57) [we] make a parade wit mostly **different vestimenta** dat dey use representing mostly African culcha
‘[we] have a parade where they mostly wear different types of clothing representing African culture’

The following example is interesting because although the incorporated word, **grupito** ‘small group’ retains Spanish morphology in the diminutive –**ito**, it is still modified by the Limonese adjective **likkle** ‘little’ and therefore interpreted as a borrowing.

(58) **she av ar likkle grup-ito**
SBJ.3SG have[3SG] POSS.3SG little.Adj group-small
‘she has her little group [of friends]’

One possible interpretation of this example is that **grupito** is borrowed as a lexicalized form. Another interpretation is that borrowing the derived form and then modifying it with the adjective **likkle** is more economical. It allows the speaker to express both the size and the closeness of the group of friends in question that would not be expressed in the Limonese equivalent **she av ar likkle frien dem**.

**5.4.5 Attributive (adnominal) possession**

The attributive possession diagnostic was applied to eight nouns in the corpus. In all (8/8, 100%) cases the nouns patterned for attributive possession constructions consistent with Limonese grammar, and are therefore interpreted as borrowings. Nouns were either found juxtaposed to their possessor (59) or marked with a Limonese possessive adjective in prenominal position (60). There were zero cases where nouns followed distinctly Spanish constructions; neither the **possessed of possessor** nor the postnominal possessive adjective constructions appeared among lone noun insertions.
(59) Ruben wa plan-in Shirloni-ø fiesta
Ruben was[PST] plan-PROG Shirloni-POSS party
‘Ruben was planning Shirloni’s party’

(60) owa billete-ø
POSS.1PL ticket-PL
‘our tickets’

5.4.6 Lone lexical item code-switching and lexico-syntactic calquing

All Spanish lone nominal insertions are evaluated using the diagnostics discussed above, with the exception of two. The first case is an insertion that does not lend itself to evaluation by diagnostics, however its context suggests that it is a code-switch.

(61) J: You need to win three, three course, okay three, how you call materia?
A: yeah courses
J: okay three courses fi im ave im degree

J: ‘You [he] needed three, three courses, okay three, how you do say materia’
A: ‘yeah courses’
J: ‘okay three courses in order for him to get his degree’

In this example the speaker consciously inserts a Spanish word because he is uncertain of the word in Limonese (or Standard English). There is no indication of integration into Limonese grammar, therefore this token is considered a code-switch and evaluated with Muysken’s (2000) diagnostics.

The second case a noun is inserted into a Limonese phrase that has been calqued from Spanish. In this example two women in a natural conversation are discussing a recent downpour.

(62) W1: An di rain, becah you see di piece a aguacero, woo!
W2: Wat a piece a rain did drop!

W1: ‘And the rain, because did you see the burst of rain, woo!’
W2: ‘What a burst of rain it was!’

Aguacero ‘downpour’ is inserted into the idiomatic expression piece a rain, which has been calqued from the Costa Rican Spanish colloquial phrase pedazo de aguacero. Silva-Corvalán
argues that typological similarities between languages can lead to “lexico-syntactic calquing” (1998:225), where the structure of the phrase isn’t borrowed, but rather, lexical items are adopted to the semantics of a foreign expression. Aguacero, therefore, is considered a borrowing in this case because it is an element of a borrowed phrase.

**5.4.7 Phonology**

All lone lexical borrowings were also examined to determine if phonological adaption occurred in addition to morphological integration. It was found that 23/95 (24.2%) lone lexical items were integrated into Limonese phonologically. In some cases such as example (45) in Section 5.4.1 and example (63) below, elements are elided completely.

(63)  
*I don drink no rum, a soda, or a fresco, no kind of rum*  
*I don’t drink any rum, a soda or a soft drink, but not any kind of rum*

In example (63) *fresco* ‘soft drink’ is modified from the Spanish *refresco*. It may be that *fresco* is an example of an established borrowing; there were two tokens found in the present study and the same form was also seen in Winkler’s (1998) corpus.

In other cases, speakers clearly apply Limonese phonology to a borrowing and considerably change the pronunciation of the word. In the following example (64) the speaker modifies the word *chaparrita* ‘girlfriend’ (colloquial) by changing both the stress pattern and the pronunciation of the ‘rr’.

(64)  
*I have two rings on my hand, my *chaparrita* [ʨаpaˈjitaÌ] an my um, […] mi *cadena*  
*I have two rings on my hand, my girlfriend, and my um, my chain (necklace)*

**5.5 Frequency and diffusion of lone word insertions**

Frequency of lone word insertions was examined to determine if a lexical item was a nonce (used once in the corpus) or a more frequent than nonce insertion. It was found that the majority of lone word insertions were in fact more frequent than nonce insertions; that is, the
A lexical item occurred more than once in the corpus. This outcome, according to Poplack and Dion (2012:284) is consistent with patterns found in “other datasets and language pairs”. Table 5.3 presents the frequency category of lone word insertions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nonce</th>
<th>more frequent than nonce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>43/122</td>
<td>79/122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3, Frequency category of lone word insertions

There are 26 distinct words that make up the 79 more frequent than nonce insertions. Frequencies of these words range from two to six. Table 5.4 shows the distribution of these 26 distinct more frequent than nonce insertions by number of occurrences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of occurrences</th>
<th>more frequent than nonce insertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4, Distribution of distinct more frequent than nonce insertions by number of occurrences

Table 5.4 confirms a trend that is expected among more frequent than nonce insertions. That is, as the number of occurrences increases, the number of distinct lexical items decreases (Poplack and Dion 2012).

As far as diffusion is concerned, there is a low rate of inter-speaker diffusion. There is no lone word insertion that occurs in the speech of more than three participants. Table 5.5 illustrates the rate of diffusion of the more frequent than nonce insertions.
Table 5.5. Diffusion of distinct more frequent than nonce lexical items among speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of speakers</th>
<th>more frequent than nonce insertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 12 words, which comprised 32/79 more frequent than nonce insertions did not spread beyond one speaker. Ten words accounted for 33/79 more frequent than nonce insertions did not diffuse beyond two speakers while only four words (14/79 more frequent than nonce insertions) spread to three speakers. Therefore it is concluded that lone insertions tend to be nonce or near-nonce. Sixty-nine of all 122 (56.6%) lone insertions occur as either nonce insertions (produced by one speaker one time), are inserted by one speaker two times, or are inserted by two speakers one time each.

In sum, examination of Spanish lone verbs and nouns in otherwise Limonese speech confirms findings previously reported regarding the immediate incorporation of lone lexical items into recipient grammar as borrowings (Adalar and Tagliamonte 1998; Budzhak-Jones 1998; Eze 1998; Samar and Meechan 1998; Poplack and Dion 2012; Poplack and Meechan 1998; Torres Cacoulllos and Aaron 2003; Turpin 1998).

As far as extralinguistic factors are concerned, Table 5.6 presents the extralinguistic factors that contribute to the incorporation of lone Spanish lexical items as borrowings into otherwise Limonese speech.

---

43 The lack of diffusion could be attributed to the nature of each interview or conversation. In both contexts speakers were free to discuss topics of their choice. For example, most participants spoke about Limonese culture, however only one participant chose to talk about the clothing worn in the parades for the Día de la Persona Negra y la Cultura Afrocostarricense and the word vestimenta appeared only once in the corpus.
From Table 5.6 we can see that gender and context are the two factors with the strongest influence on borrowing. With regard to gender, 88% (84/95) of the tokens were produced by females. Similarly, when looking at context, 88% (84/95) of the cases realized occurred in a natural conversation. The tokens in these two categories are, in fact, the same cases, suggesting a near categorical distribution of borrowings. There were zero cases of Spanish lone insertions in natural conversations involving men. That is, the only instance in which a male participant incorporated a Spanish borrowing in speech was in the interview context. In contrast, there

---

44 The contrast in the number of borrowings and code-switches (discussed in Section 5.7) in male speech versus female speech is striking because the corpus contains more Limonese speech produced by males than females. When considering context, females do in fact account for more
were zero cases of Spanish borrowings produced by females in an interview context. Language choice in the interview context undoubtedly contributed to this result. Interviews with 3/5 females were conducted in Spanish, as the speakers expressed their discomfort using an English variety. The other two participants prided themselves on speaking the “British” English that they had acquired. One speaker using the Outer Circle Variety in an interview commented on the use of more creole-like Inner Circle features:

“For instance you would say dey have words to say um, dis is, dis is de pon di table. We don’t use that, at least in my home we never use those words… I have a sister she work in di call centers, you have sometimes when she use dose kind of words. She says ‘yes it is fi mi maada, it is fi dis, it is fi dat’ I say ‘Recia, for.’”

Table 5.6 also shows that with regard to occupation, those in service produced the highest number of borrowings at a rate of 47/95 cases. However, further examination reveals that these tokens were produced by two female speakers during a natural conversation. Chi-square tests confirm a significant correlation between gender, context, and occupation and the production and incorporation of lone Spanish insertions as borrowings ($p<.001$).

Results also show that the 15 speakers in the 31-72 age group produced the majority of borrowings compared to the six speakers in the 18-31 category (63/95, 66.3% vs. 32/95, 33.7%). However, age was not a significant factor in borrowing production. Speakers who reported low exposure to Standard English produced more Spanish lone insertions, accounting for 57/95 (60.0%) tokens. Chi-square tests revealed that exposure to Standard English was not a significant

of the natural conversation in the corpus. Females produced 56.1% of the total duration of natural conversation whereas males produced 43.9% of the total duration. Despite this imbalance in the natural conversation context, it is still worth comparing gender given that males produced more Limonese speech overall and females are far more productive borrowers and code-switchers.  

45 It should be stated that although these two speakers used the Outer Circle Variety during their interview, their speech still contained features that were notably creole in nature, particularly in phonology, morphology, and syntax.
factor in the production and incorporation of Spanish borrowings either. The fact that age is not a significant factor in borrowing production could be an indicator of language maintenance, or at the very least maintenance of certain speech patterns in younger generations.

5.6 Multiword insertions

There were 262 Spanish multiword Spanish insertions extracted from the corpus. In addition to these 262 Spanish multiword insertions, 27 lone insertions were also analyzed along with the code-switches making a total of 289 insertions analyzed according to the diagnostic features described in Section 4.5.3 and Section 4.5.4. These tokens were analyzed to determine whether the code-switch is an insertion, alternation, or congruent lexicalization. The following are examples of each code-switch type, and Table 5.7 shows how the examples are scored using Muysken’s (2000) set of diagnostic features.

(65) \textit{no becah el sábado} is Cecilia birthday
\textit{‘no because Saturday is Cecilia’s birthday’}

(66) She mussi wa’ah fi go back. \textit{Tiene que volver.} Or she mussi ga’an ga’an buy a San José
\textit{‘She must have wanted to go back. She has to go back. Or she might have left to go buy [things] in San José.’}

(67) I didn like fi di shoes \textit{porque yo no sé} dey look beta fi mi dey pair nice with di dress
\textit{‘I didn’t like her shoes because I don’t know, they look better on me they pair nice with my dress’}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>el sábado</th>
<th>tiene que volver</th>
<th>porque yo no sé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single constituent</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several constituents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-constituent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aba, nested</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aba, not-nested</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Element switched</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse switches*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
<td>phrase</td>
<td>phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long constituent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex constituent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content word</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function word</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverb, conjunction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selected element</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emblematic or tag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switch site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major clause boundary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peripheral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embedding in discourse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flagging</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dummy word insertion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Properties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear equivalence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telegraphic mixing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphological</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doubling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homophonous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diamorphs*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triggering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed collocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-corrections</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insertion score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternation score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congruent lexicalization score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant pattern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insertion</td>
<td>alternation</td>
<td>congruent lexicalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7, Analysis and scores of Spanish code-switching examples

The results of the scores of each type of code-switching pattern are shown in Table 5.8.
Table 5.8, Scores of switching patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores on switching patterns</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td>-182</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternation</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent lexicalization</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dominant pattern**: Alternation

Deuchar, Muysken, and Wang (2007) suggest that all three switching patterns will appear in bilingual speech communities, however one pattern will typically dominate. This was found to be true in the case of the Limonese-Spanish corpus under study. Table 5.8 shows that alternation is the highest scoring pattern in the corpus with congruent lexicalization as a secondary pattern.

In addition to scoring the highest, alternation was also the most frequent pattern in the corpus.

Table 5.9 presents the distribution of Spanish code-switches according to switching pattern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of multiword switch</th>
<th>Number of tokens</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternation</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent lexicalization</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie, insertion and alternation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie, insertion and congruent lexicalization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie, alternation and congruent lexicalization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9, Distribution of Spanish multiword switches according to switch pattern

The frequency of the patterns is consistent with the results of the scoring; most of the multiword switches were cases of alternation (157/289, 54.3%). Congruent lexicalization was found to be a secondary pattern in terms of both scoring and frequency. Almost all (273/289, 94.5%) code-switches scored distinctly for insertion, alternation or congruent lexicalization. However, 16/289 or 5.5% of switches had scores that tied between two switch categories. The majority of the ties (11/16, 68.7%) were ties between the alternation and congruent lexicalization patterns, which are the two dominant switching patterns in the corpus.
5.7 Influence of extralinguistic factors on code-switching types and overall insertions

This section takes a closer look at the extralinguistic factors that influence speakers’ production of the three code-switching types found in the data, as well as how the extralinguistic factors under study influence Spanish insertions overall. Insertion is the first code-switching type examined. Table 5.10 presents the extralinguistic factors contributing to insertion production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extralinguistic factor</th>
<th>Insertion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural conversation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure to Standard English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10, Extralinguistic factors contributing to insertion production

Results show that the greatest difference in insertion production occurs within gender and context. Females favor insertion production when compared to males (43/46 vs. 3/46 tokens) and speakers in natural conversation favor insertion when compared to those participating in interviews (42/46 vs. 4/46 tokens). Chi-square tests confirm gender and context to be significant
factors, along with occupation ($p<.001$). A closer look at the data shows that all (42/42) of the tokens realized in natural conversation were produced by women. There were zero realizations of insertional code-switches produced by men in natural conversation. Speakers in the 31-72 age group accounted for more insertion tokens than younger speakers (29/46, 63.0% vs. 17/46, 37.0%). Speakers reporting low exposure to Standard English produced more insertions than those with high exposure to Standard English. Neither age nor exposure to Standard English was found to be a significant factor in insertion production.

Insertional code-switching, although less frequent than borrowings, followed similar patterns in all factor groups. Speakers who were female, in the 31-72 age group, participating in natural conversation, in a service occupation, and reporting low exposure to Standard English produced the most insertional code-switches and borrowings. Additionally, all factors were found to be significant for both insertional code-switching and borrowing use with the exception of age and exposure to Standard English. Furthermore, when comparing insertional code-switching and borrowings, results from age, context, occupation, and exposure to Standard English fell within a range of four percentage points, while gender fell within a range of six percentage points.

Results of the influence of extralinguistic factors on congruent lexicalization production are presented in Table 5.11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extralinguistic factor</th>
<th>Congruent lexicalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-72</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural conversation</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure to Standard English</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11, Extralinguistic factors contributing to congruent lexicalization production

Almost all (66/70, 94.3%) cases of congruent lexicalization were produced by females. Also, congruent lexicalization had the tendency to occur within the natural conversation context.

Similar to insertional code-switching, a closer look reveals that females in natural conversation produced 61/62 (98.4%) congruent lexicalizations; only one case of congruent lexicalization was produced by males during natural conversation. In the occupation category, speakers producing the highest number of congruent lexicalization code-switches were in service. Chi-square test confirmed the significance of gender, context, and occupation for congruent lexicalization production ($p<.001$). Neither age nor exposure to Standard English was found to be a significant factor in congruent lexicalization production. Speakers in the 31-72 age group produced the
majority (46/70, 65.7%) of congruent lexicalization cases, as compared to 24/70 tokens (34.3%) produced by speakers in the 18-31 age group. Unlike results of borrowing and insertion production, speakers reporting high exposure to Standard English produced more congruent lexicalizations than those reporting low exposure. Muysken (2000) suggests that congruent lexicalization is indicative of higher fluency and balanced bilingualism, which is one explanation for the higher use of this pattern in speakers reporting high exposure to Standard English.

Alternation was found to be the most frequent code-switching type produced by speakers. Table 5.12 shows the extralinguistic factor contributing to alternation production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extralinguistic factor</th>
<th>Alternation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-72</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural conversation</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to Standard English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12, Extralinguistic factors contributing to alternation production.
Chi-square tests reveal that all extralinguistic factors are significant for this switching pattern. Gender, context, occupation and exposure to Standard English are significant at $p<.001$, while age is significant at $p<.01$. Upon further examination, it was found that two speakers account for 64.2% (98/157) of all alternation tokens\(^{46}\). Both of these speakers fall into the categories with the highest number of alternation tokens (female, 31-72, natural conversation, service, low exposure to Standard English). If these speakers are removed from the analysis, alternation is still the dominant code-switching pattern in the corpus, however, context is no longer a significant factor in alternation production. Gender, occupation, and exposure to Standard English are still significant at $p<.05$ and age is significant at $p<.01$. With the omission of the two most prolific alternators, it is now found that speakers in the 18-30 age group favor alternation, as well as speakers with a professional occupation and high exposure to Standard English. Given the anomalistic nature of the two most productive users of alternation, it is difficult to determine which factors contribute to this code-switching pattern.

Table 5.13 summarizes how the extralinguistic factors under study contribute to speakers’ overall production of the contact phenomena previously discussed. This section will discuss how each extralinguistic factor affects not only the frequency, but also overall type of Spanish insertion. All Spanish insertions, both borrowings and code-switches found in the corpus are represented in the table below.

\(^{46}\) One of these speakers is the most productive speaker overall in terms of both lone and multiword Spanish insertions. She produced 1.90 times as many borrowings, 2.14 times as many insertions, and 2.25 times as many congruent lexicalizations as the next highest speaker. The other speaker was only outstanding in alternation production. That is, she produced borrowings, insertions, and congruent lexicalizations at frequencies similar to other speakers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extralinguistic factor</th>
<th>All Spanish insertions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-72</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural conversation</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure to Standard English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13, Extralinguistic factors contributing to the production of all Spanish insertions

Overall females produced more contact phenomena than males. This is true for all factor groups except for context, where males produced more Spanish insertions than females in the interview context. A striking result when looking at gender and context, is the difference in insertion production in natural conversation. All natural conversations involving women included frequent Spanish insertions of all types. However, males in natural conversation produced only one alternation and one congruent lexicalization. Despite greatly varied

---

47 It should be noted that natural conversations took place in gender homogenous groups. At a few different points during the natural conversations among men, women walked by, at which point the men and women engaged in conversation involving code-switching. These Spanish insertions, however, were not included in the analysis for methodological reasons. An interesting
frequency and context of Spanish insertions, the type of Spanish insertion produced from most frequent to least frequent is the same in both males and females. The types are as follows: alternation > borrowing > congruent lexicalization > insertion. Chi-square tests confirmed the significance of gender on the overall production of Spanish insertions ($p<.001$).

Age was the only factor found to be not significant in the overall production of Spanish insertions in the corpus. Six speakers produced 107 Spanish insertions while 15 speakers from the 31-72 age group produced 277 Spanish insertions. In addition to incorporating Spanish insertions at a similar rate, it was found that the two age groups also produced similar types of contact phenomena. Results of pattern frequency for the 18-30 age group fell in the following order: borrowing > alternation > congruent lexicalization > insertion. The 31-72 age group resulted in alternation > borrowing > congruent lexicalization > insertion.

For context it was found that overall, speakers produce more Spanish insertions in a natural conversation. It should be kept in mind that this is primarily a result of the frequent use of contact phenomena by women in natural conversation. In all cases of natural conversation, speakers used the Inner Circle Variety. Therefore, although the Inner Circle Variety can be characterized by frequent Spanish lone lexical borrowings and code-switches, it is not absolute; speakers choose whether or not they will code-switch. Although Limonese is in intense contact with Spanish, contact has not yet resulted in language use where speakers are not aware that they are code-switching, such as the cases of abundant congruent lexicalization (Lipski 2014:41).

Context is a significant factor ($p<.001$) when considering the frequency of Spanish insertions, however when looking at the dominant type of contact phenomena in each context, it was found that interviews and natural conversations are actually the same. Both contexts resulted in

topic for further investigation would be the use of contact phenomena in mixed gender natural conversations.
alternation > borrowing > congruent lexicalization > insertion as most frequent to least frequent code-switching patterns.

Results show occupation is significant ($p<.001$) in overall production of Spanish insertions. Those in service incorporated Spanish into Limonese speech at the highest rate; however, this could be due to the two most prolific switchers, as mentioned in the previous discussion on alternation. Dominant contact phenomena type varied according to occupation. Alternation was the most frequent type for professionals, those in service, and retirees, whereas borrowing was the most frequent type produced by students. Borrowing was the second most frequent type of contact phenomena for professionals and service people, and congruent lexicalization was the second most frequent type for students and retirees. Each occupation had a different type for the third most frequent pattern: alternation for students, insertion for professionals, congruent lexicalization for service people, and borrowing for retirees. Insertion was the least favored contact phenomena type by all occupations with the exception of professionals, for whom congruent lexicalization scored the lowest.

Speakers with low exposure to Standard English produced more Spanish insertions overall than speakers reporting high exposure to Standard English. The type of contact phenomena also varied between those with high and low exposure to Standard English. Speakers with high exposure produced the order: congruent lexicalization > alternation > borrowing > insertion, however, there is only a two token difference between congruent lexicalization and borrowing. Results of code-switching type for speakers reporting low exposure to Standard English show: alternation > borrowing > congruent lexicalization > insertion as dominant code-switching types.
Finally, given the results of extralinguistic factors on the production of individual types of contact phenomena, as well as considering the corpus as a whole, I hypothesize a hierarchy of factors influencing Spanish lone and multiword insertions in otherwise Limonese speech. Chi-square values for occupation indicate that this factor has the greatest influence on Spanish insertion production, however this factor is not included in the hierarchy due to sample size. Dividing occupation into four groups results in only four to six speakers per group. The other factor groups under study include more participants since there are only two groups per factor, allowing for a larger sample in each group. Results for occupation appear to be skewed by two speakers in the service group that are the most prolific producers of contact phenomena. Together they produced 206/222 (92.8%) tokens in the service category.

From the remaining factors (gender, age, context, and exposure to Standard English), context is the most significant factor, followed by gender, exposure to Standard English, and age. Both context and gender are significant factors for all contact phenomena types, however context always resulted with a higher chi-square value. Neither exposure to Standard English nor age is a significant factor in borrowing, insertion, or congruent lexicalization production. Both factors are significant for alternation production, however, exposure to Standard English is significant at \( p < .001 \) whereas age is significant at \( p < .01 \). Furthermore, age was the only insignificant factor in the overall analysis of both borrowings and code-switches.

5.8 Discussion and implications of switching patterns

The previous sections focus on how Spanish insertions are integrated into otherwise Limonese speech and how extralinguistic factors impact the use of different contact phenomena. The following considers what speakers’ tendency toward the use of one contact phenomena over another can reveal about bilingualism and language use in the Limonese-Spanish speech
community. First, I will discuss the implications of alternation as the dominant code-switching pattern, then congruent lexicalization as a secondary pattern.

Muysken (2000) asserts that type of language contact phenomena in a speech community begins with insertion, and will shift to either alternation or congruent lexicalization over time. Communities that shift to alternation tend to encompass languages with more typological distance and political competition between languages (Muysken 2000:249; Muysken 2013:714). Limonese and Spanish in Limón fit both of the criteria in the sense that they are not cognate languages, and the languages have shared a complicated socio-historic background (see Chapter 3 for discussion). One of the greatest implications of alternation as the dominant switch pattern is the speakers’ fluent bilingualism and high proficiency in both languages involved (Muysken 2013:714). Lipski notes, “alternation is the hallmark of fluent bilingualism” because it involves primarily intrasentential code-switching at the constituent level, and also suggests that the process is under speakers’ control (Lipski 2009:31; Lipski 2014:39, 41). Of the 17 speakers in this study who produced multiword Spanish insertions, ten (58.8%) resulted in alternation as the dominant code-switching pattern. This demonstrates that fluent bilingualism is characteristic of a range of speakers, not only a few with high alternation production. In contrast, no speakers produced predominantly the insertion pattern, which is associated with nonfluency and interference (Lipski 2009:32). Alternation also indicates stable bilingualism, which could point to language maintenance in the Limonese-Spanish speaking community (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007:308).

---

48 Five speakers produced congruent lexicalization as a dominant pattern, two speakers tied for a dominant pattern; one tied between alternation and congruent lexicalization, the other tied between alternation and insertion.
Furthermore, dominance of the alternation pattern indicates “a greater separateness of the
two languages” (Muysken 2000:249). High alternation rates support the hypothesis of separate
Inner and Outer Circle varieties, which may or may not incorporate borrowings or code-
switching, depending on speaker preference. Speakers who did not alternate or had low
alternation rates participated in interviews, which were conducted either in Spanish or the Outer
Circle Variety of Limonese, approaching Standard English. Additionally, one speaker who did
not produce any alternations (nor any other code-switching patterns, or borrowings) participated
in a natural conversation where the Inner Circle Variety was used almost exclusively. In this way,
the language contact situation in Puerto Limón can be described as diglossic49, where speakers
control the amount of code-switching employed in speech depending on the context,
interlocutors, and personal preference. One speaker, who was in high school at the time of data
collection, explains the diglossic nature of language use at school. Although she has “four or five”
classmates who also speak English, she reported Spanish as the primary language used both
inside and outside of the classroom. When asked about language use with her classmates she
commented:

“Sometimes dey don like speakin much dat English so anytime I get crazy an yell at dem
an tell em ‘Please speak in English!’ like dat, but not a lot of dem speak English an if dey
do, dey don speak it like right way. Dey speak like, dem mix Spanish with English, so not
all da time dey pronounciation is good.”

This speaker’s aversion to code-switching and preference for language separation was also
demonstrated in her interview, where she produced only one Spanish insertion: a multiword
code-switch.

Finally, alternation as a dominant pattern in the Limonese-Spanish corpus points to the
effectiveness of Muysken’s (2000) quantitative method as a framework for evaluating code-

49 Or, triglossic, for speakers who distinguish between Inner and Outer varieties of Limonese.
switching typology in bilingual corpora. An issue raised in Deuchar, Muysken and Wang’s (2007) study was that alternation could not be easily identified using this framework. Another question proposed regarding this method is whether the numerical distance (if the distance between + and − is 1) between the diagnostic specifications favors or disfavors a particular switching type (Muysken 2014:247). Lipski specifically posits the negative scores for alternation in all three cases studied in Deuchar, Muysken and Wang (2007) may indicate that the diagnostic criteria inherently “disfavor alternation” (Lipski 2009:31). The Limonese-Spanish corpus, however, heavily favors alternation, which again confirms that Muysken’s (2000) framework does in fact identify alternation patterns (that are not restricted to interclausal insertions) and code-switching typology is influenced by data set type.

Congruent lexicalization is also a pattern indicative of high proficiency in both languages. As previously mentioned, it is perhaps for this reason that congruent lexicalization was the dominant pattern for speakers reporting high exposure to Standard English. Congruent lexicalization production is also influenced by the typological similarity of the language pair in question (Muysken 2013:714). Languages that have similar lexicons and morphological structures, such as Spanish and Portuguese or Spanish and Italian favor congruent lexicalization as a dominant code-switching pattern (Lipski 2014). Therefore, it is notable that congruent lexicalization is a secondary pattern in the present study, given that Limonese and Spanish are neither cognate languages nor even members of the same language family. It is possible that Limonese and Spanish share enough structures to allow the process to occur naturally. This is

---

50 Results from Deuchar, Muysken and Wang’s (2007) case studies reported insertion as the dominant pattern for the Welsh-English corpus and congruent lexicalization as dominant switching patterns in the case of Mandarin-Tsou and Mandarin-Taiwanese.

51 Alternation was also found to be a dominant pattern in Lipski’s (2014) analysis of Texas Spanish-English bilingual speech.
seen in the following example, which demonstrates how Limonese and Spanish share some morphological structures that facilitate congruent lexicalization:\(^{52}\).

(68) So hear Ruben no, “vamos a hacer el veintiuno para no hacerlo después.” becah if you, becah Shirloni cumple el veintidós an if I wait di wol a da week para hacerlo, es muy—

‘So Ruben said “we’ll do (the party) the twenty-first so we don’t do it afterwards” because if you, because Shirloni’s birthday is the twenty-second and if I wait the whole week to do it, it’s very—’

In this example, the name Shirloni functions in the same capacity as a cognate; it could conceivably belong either language, therefore giving the speaker freedom to oscillate between Limonese and Spanish. The second switch in this example occurs at a point in which the grammars of Limonese and Spanish align.

Congruent lexicalization also occurs in typologically distant languages in cases of intense, prolonged contact (Lipski 2014:42). In cases of typologically distant languages, the literature proposes two possible explanations for the emergence of congruent lexicalization. First, it is possible that intense prolonged contact leads to structural convergence, which reduces the typological distance between the two languages (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007:324; Lipski 2014:42). Another possibility is that alternation leads to congruent lexicalization, given certain structural similarities (Muysken 2000:247). The following example of a congruent lexicalization shows a point where the structures of Spanish and Limonese could converge.

(69) Hi Barbie, dis, disfrutando tus vacaciones?
‘Hi Barbie, are you enjoying your vacation?’

This example comes from a natural conversation in which speakers were using the Inner Circle Variety. In this context, a form of ‘to be’ would generally not be used in Limonese, whereas in Spanish a form of estar ‘to be’ is expected. However, omitting estar in this structure decreases

---

\(^{52}\) Congruent lexicalizations are in bold and underlined.
the typological distance between Limonese and Spanish, and facilitates the switch between the two languages. Structural convergence is a process that takes place over several generations. In the present study, three of the five speakers who produced congruent lexicalizations as their dominant switching patterns were in the 18-30 age group. Additionally, two of the three most prolific congruent lexicalization producers fell into the same 18-30 age group. Higher use of congruent lexicalizations among younger speakers could be a preliminary indicator of a stylistic shift from alternation to congruent lexicalization as a dominant pattern in future generations; this is something that should be researched in further studies.

This chapter provides new findings regarding language contact and the incorporation and distribution of language contact phenomena in naturalistic bilingual speech. It also contributes to the ongoing discussion of the use of variationist frameworks in evaluating contact phenomena. The data show that the use of contact phenomena is widespread in Limonese-Spanish bilingual speech and is influenced by certain extralinguistic factors. Speakers choose to employ contact phenomena depending on the context and interlocutors of the conversation, demonstrating the diglossic nature of language use in Puerto Limón. Although the rate at which contact phenomena are produced is subject to inter-speaker variation, the degree of incorporation of lone lexical items and type of code-switch employed remains fairly constant throughout the corpus.
6.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to complement the quantitative results of borrowing and code-switching presented in the previous chapter by discussing additional types of contact phenomena observed in Limonese-Spanish bilingual speech. In conjunction with the aforementioned Spanish insertions presented in Chapter 5, evidence of language contact and change is also seen in purely Limonese speech, that is, speech that does not contain Spanish insertions. The following sections examine several examples where Limonese lexica, phonology and morphology, and syntax have been influenced by contact with Spanish. Furthermore, this chapter discusses participant-reported attitudes toward Limonese and code-switching, and also explores participant commentary on race as it relates to language use. All qualitative data was collected from speakers who participated in interviews with the researcher.

6.2 Lexical loanshifts

While most borrowings retain their meaning upon integration into the recipient language, loanshifts undergo a change in semantics. In his classification of lexical contact phenomena, Winford (2003:43-45) categorizes two types of loanshifts: semantic extensions and loan translations or calques. A semantic extension occurs when the meaning of a native word is extended to include the meaning of an equivalent word in another language. The word *aplicar* can be considered a semantic extension in some dialects of Spanish in the United States. The verb’s original meaning ‘to apply’ as in ‘to put a sustenance on something’ or ‘to make use of’ is

53 Examples were discussed with a native Jamaican Creole speaker to confirm the forms are not used in a non-Spanish-contact variety.
54 All translations from interviews conducted in Spanish are mine.
extended to also be understood as ‘to apply’ as in the English ‘to apply for a job’. Loan translations or calques occur when native morphemes are used to replicate a pattern found in another language (Winford 2003:44). For example, the Spanish rascacielos is a calque of the English skyscraper. Both semantic extensions and calques can be observed in Limonese, and are discussed in the following sections.

6.2.1 Semantic extensions

The following table shows the semantic extensions that appear in the corpus along with the Spanish derivative of the word and Standard English translation. Examples of each semantic extension follow Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limonese</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Standard English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>assist</td>
<td>asistir</td>
<td>attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td>colegio</td>
<td>high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moles</td>
<td>molestar</td>
<td>bother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1, Semantic extensions in Limonese

(70) *if you don’t have money they just have to assist the Spanish school*
‘if you don’t have money, they just have to attend the Spanish (public) school’

(71) *dat help me in da college*
‘that helps me in (high) school’

(72) *an I moles her with that an so it’s just like a joke it’s very funny*
‘and I tease her about that, and so it’s just like a joke, it’s very funny’

These semantic extensions were also noted by Winkler (1998); moles was also mentioned in Masis Morales and Mora Lobo (1985).

6.2.2 Calques

The most prevalent calque found in the corpus is ‘have + years/months and is a direct translation of Spanish tener años (or tener meses). This calque is also previously attested in Winkler’s (1998) study, however at that time it was found that ‘have + years’ expressions varied at almost the same rate as ‘be + years’ expressions. The current study found that the expression
‘have + years’ is used almost exclusively. Expressions of ‘be + years’ were only found in interviews, not natural conversations. Even then, ‘be + years’ was only used in instances where a speaker was switching to or using a more Standard variety. Variation within the ‘have + years’ construction was also observed, demonstrating once again the spectrum of Limonese varieties, even within a single individual’s speech. Example (73) shows the use of this construction in the present tense. Examples (74), (75) and (76) come from the same speaker, exhibiting the range of constructions that may be used to express age in the past.

(73)  she say she have money but she have a buncha years  ‘she says she has money but she’s old’

(74)  like when I have maybe thirteen years  ‘like when I was maybe thirteen years old’

(75)  maybe like when I used to have twenty one years old  ‘maybe like when I was twenty one years old’

(76)  I was maybe twenty, twenty three, yeah like twenty three, yeah

The construction ‘ø + years’ also appeared in the corpus, although to a lesser extent. This form is also expected since the copula is often null in Limonese (Winkler 1998:100).

(77)  he [ø] forty five years old  ‘he was forty five years old’

The fact that the construction ‘have + years’ is the most prevalent in natural conversation may suggest that this structure is converging to the structure more similar to Spanish.

Another calque that was found in the corpus is ‘to take a drink’ from the Spanish tomar un trago meaning ‘to have a drink’.

(78)  we can go out maybe and take a drink  ‘we can go out and maybe get a drink’

The calque ‘to win (earn credit for) the course’ from ganar el curso was found in the present study and also noted in a previous study (Winker 1998:164).
you need to win three course
‘you need to earn credit for three more courses’

The verb ‘handle’ (in Limonese, pronounced without the initial ‘h’ from Standard English) is used to describe a person’s ability to speak a language and appears to be a calque of Spanish manejar la lengua, manejar inglés/español.

whenever da mother is a Spanish woman an she don andle the language I do undastan
‘whenever the mother is a Spanish woman and she doesn’t speak the language I understand’

she speak in Spanish to us but she andle di English
‘she speaks Spanish to us but she also knows English’

The Limonese phrase ‘I have it abandon’ is also a calque from the Spanish lo tengo abandonado, meaning ‘I don’t take care of it’.

really I have it [my mother’s house] abandon
‘really I don’t take care of it [my mother’s house]’

Another example is the verb ‘put’ meaning ‘to turn on’ as seen in the following example calqued from the Spanish poner la television ‘to turn on the television’.

I put di television
‘I turn on the television’

Finally, the verb ‘maintain’ is calqued from Spanish mantener, which can translate to ‘keep’ or ‘stay’.

di best ting fa dem is to maintain busy
‘the best thing for them to do is to stay busy’

6.3 Clipping

Clipping is another process by which foreign lexical items may be morphologically integrated into a recipient language. Also known as shortening, this process is the “suppression of some phonetic material of an existing word, sometimes traceable to a morphological boundary”
In the context of contact linguistics, clipping simplifies pronunciation by shortening or reducing affixes of borrowed words, allowing for easier integration into the recipient language’s morphological and phonological systems (Winford 2003:44,50). The meaning of the word is retained throughout the process. Some examples of clippings in Spanish are tele < television ‘television’, bici < bicicleta ‘bicycle’, and foto < fotografía ‘photograph’. The following examples demonstrate clipping of Spanish lexemes for easier integration into Limonese speech.

(85) *em get together often an make activities and to reyune di family*  
‘they get together often to do activities and to get the family together’  
*reyune < reunir*, ‘reunite’

(86) *I was officer, yeah, but I renunce from dat*  
‘I was an office, yeah, but I resigned from that’  
*renunce < renunciar*, ‘renounce/resign’

(87) *dat is one of di factors too of di house dat she is supposed to read and comprend*  
‘that is also one of the factors of the house, that she is supposed to read and comprehend’  
*comprend < comprender*, ‘comprehend’

(88) *when I like you know pronounce the words good*  
‘when I like, you know, pronounce the words well’  
*pronunce < pronunciar*, ‘pronounce’

In each of these examples the Spanish infinitive markers *-ir/-iar/-er* are reduced, easing the integration into Limonese speech. Alternatively, it may be that these words are derived from the corresponding Spanish third person singular form of the verb, which is another likely form to be borrowed. In either case, the suppression of phonetic material and shortening at a morphological boundary (Varela 2012:225) result in an unmarked form common to Limonese. Furthermore, in
these examples clipping may be facilitated by the phonological and semantic similarities between these lexemes in Spanish and Standard English.\footnote{These examples are taken from interviews where the speakers are using the Outer Circle Variety of Limonese, approximating Standard English.}

6.4 Derivational blend

The corpus also exhibited one case of a derivational blend. A derivational blend is a type of borrowing that is composed of either an imported stem + native affix or a native stem + imported affix (Winford 2003:45). An example of imported stem + native affix derivational blending in Spanish is the case of the borrowed English word ‘surf’ which results in words such as *surfear*, ‘to surf’ (and its derivatives) and *surfista*, ‘surfer’. The following example is a case of an imported Spanish prefix blended with a Limonese stem.

(89) our pronunciation or what you call da malpronunciation

‘our pronunciation or what you call mispronunciation’

In this case the Spanish prefix *mal-* replaces options such as the prefix *mis-* or using the adjective *bad/poor*. This example is drawn from an interview where the speaker is using an Outer Circle Variety of Limonese, approximating Standard English.

6.5 Vocabulary substitution: relexification and phonological mapping

The following two examples both involve different cases of vocabulary substitution\footnote{Also see Section 2.6.1 for discussion on relexification.}.

Although the relexification process is not widespread in Limonese, it is observed in example (90).

(90) no becah I affa patrocinar Shirloni compañera dem becah memba la fiesta es Shirloni and if I mek it in Maribu...

‘no because I have to pay for Shirloni’s friends, because remember it’s Shirloni’s party and if I have it in [Hotel] Maribu…’
In this example *patrocinar* ‘to sponsor, pay for’ and *compañera* ‘friend’ replace Limonese lexical entries in phonological form, yet, Limonese syntax and morphology is still followed. In addition, this example also has a Spanish code-switch (*la fiesta es*, ‘the party is’), however, the switch ends before the Spanish *de* ‘of’ is included, which would be expected to express possession in this context. The omission of *de* could be an example of convergence, which would facilitate congruent lexicalization and the switch back to Limonese. Or, this could be another example of relexification, because again, the phonological representation is in Spanish, yet the phrase *la fiesta es Shirloni* follows Limonese syntax.

Example (91) demonstrates the innovation that can also occur in language contact situations in the form of phonological mapping triggered by partial congruence between Spanish, Limonese, and Standard English\(^\text{57}\).  

\begin{center}
\begin{equation}
\text{di best ting fa dem is to maintain busy, maintain busy, study, an practice sport, an approach of di time dat you have to do good}
\end{equation}
\end{center}

\text{‘the best thing for them is to stay busy, stay busy, study, practice sports, and take advantage of the time that you have to do good’}

The form *approach of* is derived from Spanish *aprovechar de*, meaning ‘to take advantage of’. Although ‘to take advantage of (something)’ is a phrase used in Standard English and Spanish, a conversation with a native Jamaican Creole speaker indicated that this phrase would not be used in Jamaican Creole. The speaker who produced this phrase also studied Standard English at the university level. It is hypothesized then, that *approach of* is created from the phonological congruence between the Standard English and Spanish forms and then adapted into Limonese grammar. This could also be an example of hybridization, as discussed in Section 2.7.4, as this speaker used contact with two languages to incorporate an element into a third language.

\(^{57}\) Thank you to J. Clancy Clements for comments on the processes at work in this particular example.
6.6 Phonological evidence of contact

Phonological borrowing and interference can often be witnessed in situations of intense language contact where heavy lexical borrowing has already been observed (Winford 2003:54). The following two cases are examples that show how Limonese phonology may have been influenced by contact with Spanish. The first example is widespread throughout the corpus while the second example exhibits phonological interference in an individual’s speech.

6.6.1 Introduction of new phones: emergence of [β]

A characteristic of Limonese phonology is the emergence of the bilabial voiced approximant [β], particularly in intervocalic position. On the whole, Limonese phonology has been described uniformly with the exception of [v]58 (Herzfeld 1978, 2002; Winkler 1998). It is likely that [v] entered Limonese phonology through both Jamaican Creole and Standard English phonology where /b/ and /v/ are separate phonemes. However, in Limonese phonology [v] has been analyzed both as an allophone of /b/ in free variation (Herzfeld 1978:136) and also as a separate phoneme (Winkler 1998:76). In the current study, it was found that speakers favor [b] as the dominant pronunciation in environments where [v] would be expected in Standard English.

The substitution of [b] for [v] is not uncommon in English based creoles, and is thought to have its roots in regional dialects of English and/or nautical English, which is likely reinforced by the lack of /v/ in Spanish (Winford 2003:320). Additionally a third allophone, the bilabial approximant [β], also appeared in the corpus. It is recognized that the addition of [β] could be a case of internal language change, however given the existence and high frequency of [β] in Spanish phonology it is also possible that this addition is contact induced. The addition of [β] to

58 In addition, the distribution of [h] in word initial position can have different interpretations (Portilla 1993; Herzfeld 1978, 2002; Zimmer 2011).
Limonese phonology would be an example of the second constraint of phonological borrowing proposed by Winford (2003:56), which states:

“Borrowing of phonological rules is facilitated when such changes do not affect the basic phonemic inventory, and are restricted to patterns of allophonic distribution”

In the following example the speaker demonstrates the difference in pronunciation between Limonese and Standard English, which includes the contrast between [β] and [v].

(92) todos nos empezamos a reír porque ella dijo ‘mi neva [neβa] know’ y es ‘I never [nεvɪ] know entonces…

‘we all began to laugh because she said ‘mi neva know’ and it’s ‘I never know’ so…’

The following spectrograms were generated\(^{59}\) in order to show the difference in pronunciation between neva [neβa] (Figure 6.1) and never [nεvɪ] (Figure 6.2).

![Spectrogram of neva [neβa]](image)

Figure 6.1, neva [neβa]

\(^{59}\) Spectrograms were generated using Praat version 6.0.
The pronunciation of *neva* in Figure 6.1 is characterized by the lack a period of silence that would be expected if *neva* were pronounced with the plosive [b] instead of the approximant [β]. The ‘[β]’ portion of the spectrogram in Figure 6.1 marked with friction similar to the friction seen in Figure 6.2 where the ‘[v]’ is articulated.

### 6.6.2 Native adoption of a foreign feature

Another example of Spanish’s influence on Limonese phonology is word initial vowel epenthesis in words such as *Espaniard*, ‘Spaniard’.

(93) *and his wife even if Espaniard he make sure dat di kids learn di language*  
‘he makes sure that his kids learn the language even if his wife is Hispanic’

Consonant clusters in word initial position are allowed in Limonese, however the addition of /e/ may be influenced from a similar phonological pattern in Spanish, which does not permit the word initial consonant cluster ‘sp’. It is possible that this speaker transferred this phonological feature from Spanish for this word in particular due to congruence with Spanish *española* ‘Spaniard’.
6.7 Syntactic borrowing

Syntactic borrowing does not take place in all contact situations however it can and does occur under certain social and linguistic contexts. The two primary contexts that promote syntactic borrowing are structural congruence and cultural pressure exerted from a dominant group on a minority population (Thomason and Kauffman 1988:67; Winford 2003:93). Since both of these contexts apply to the contact situation under study, it is possible for structural congruence to occur in Limonese. Borrowing of Spanish word order in a NP was observed in “a number of examples” in Winkler’s (1998) study. However, only one possible case of structural borrowing was found in this corpus. The following example extracted from a speaker using the Outer Circle Variety in a sociolinguistic interview exhibits Spanish noun-adjective word order in an NP.

(94) he’s a (h)indian very famous
‘he’s a very famous indian’

6.8 Attitudes and language use

Previous studies have reported varying, and at times conflicting attitudes toward use of Limonese. Several researchers have found that speakers residing in rural areas report more positive feelings toward Limonese than speakers living in urban areas, such as Puerto Limón (Bryce Laporte 1962; Herzfeld 1978, 2004; Purcell 1993). Limonese speakers in Sharpe’s (1998) study on linguistic attitudes reported that Limonese should be bettered or “improved”. 73% of participants in her study reported that Limonese is a “beautiful language” and 86% of participants disagreed with the statement “Limon Creole is an ugly and useless language” (Sharpe 1998:107). Speakers also reported the importance of maintaining Limonese, however when asked the question “Do you want your children to learn Limón Creole?” 86% of participants replied negatively. Speakers recognized the importance of bilingualism, but
preferred to have their children learn Standard English (Sharpe 1998:110). More recently, Aguilar-Sánchez and Hartford (forthcoming) reported overall positive responses from qualitative essays on attitude toward Limonese (67.0% positive attitudes, N=109). They also suggest the revitalization of Limonese as a native tongue due to the perceived economic benefits, such as an advantage in job placement.

Speakers in the current study also reported varying attitudes regarding Limonese. Speakers did not express negative attitudes toward using Limonese, and admitted to speaking it with family and friends; however, at the same time the variety was also described as “broken” or “bad” 60.

*People put that name Mekaytelyu, it’s like di English, but it’s a broken English*

Younger speakers did not report Limonese as being “bad” or “broken” but rather said it is a difference in pronunciation that distinguishes Limonese from Standard English.

> Es el acento, es diferente. Como le había hecho anteriormente, decimos ‘wata’ y no ‘water’ y decimos ‘ouse’ y no ‘house’ y cosas así. Pero a la parte de escribir los escribe igual.

> ‘It’s the accent, it’s different. Like I had done for you before, we say ‘wata’ and not ‘water’ and we say ‘ouse’ and not ‘house’ and things like that. But when it comes to writing, you write them the same way.’

Consistent with the studies previously mentioned, others view Limonese as part of Afro-Costa Rican culture that should be preserved.

*Al nivel de cultura, se trata de conservar y mantener el idioma.*

> ‘On a cultural level, we try to conserve and maintain the language.’

Yet still, speakers noted that although they speak Limonese with family and friends, Standard English is important to learn, especially for the job market.

*Now it seem to be dat English is one of di most important language to learn.*

---

60 See also Section 5.8.
En Limón también hay algo con que uno tiene que trabajar que son los idiomas porque como es un puerto y recibimos muchos turistas

‘In Limón there is also something one needs to work with and that’s languages because it’s a port, and we have a lot of tourists.’

Nos contratan en Call Center y hablamos como con americanos no podemos hablar Criol porque usted lo entienden pero puede ser que no lo entienden completamente

‘They hire us in the Call Center and we speak like, with Americans, we can’t speak Creole because you understand it, but it might be that you don’t understand it completely.’

One speaker who is studying to teach English as a second language emphasized that it is possible to maintain both Limonese and Standard English\(^{61}\).

La directora de la biblioteca habla los dos idiomas […] Igual yo, uso los dos, con mi mamá y mis hermanos yo hablo Criol, con mis compañeros de la universidad, como es muy poco lo que podemos hablar español entonces hablamos inglés americano o sea lo que hemos aprendido

‘The director of the library speaks the two languages […] So do I, I use both, with my mom and siblings I speak Creole, with my classmates from the university, since we are rarely able to speak Spanish, we speak American English, that is, what we have learned.’

Overall, when asked to comment on domains of use, speakers reported using Limonese predominantly in the home, with family, or with Limonese speaking friends. Two participants also reported attending church services in English. Speakers reported using Spanish in school almost all of time\(^{62}\). Exceptions of speakers using Limonese in school include during a free period and for gossiping, particularly when speakers want to say something that they do not want others to understand.

In addition to discussing attitudes toward Limonese, the current study also explores speakers’ attitudes on code-switching. Muysken (2000) found that speaker attitude on code-

\(^{61}\) This speaker also commented that knowing Limonese facilitated her acquisition of Standard English, although at times it is hard for Limonese speakers to separate the two varieties.

\(^{62}\) With the exception of one of the speakers who attended an American school in Limón.
switching can relate to the types of code-switching patterns used in the speech community. Alternation occurs in communities regardless of positive or negative attitudes toward code-switching, however, insertion and congruent lexicalization patterns are present in intense language contact situations where there are no strong negative attitudes toward code-switching. When asked about using both Limonese and Spanish in the same speech act, speakers did not display any strong negative sentiments, but rather code-switching is considered “normal”. A particularly interesting finding is that speakers used the terms “Creole” or “Patwa” to describe this way of speaking.

K: People come from other country or even di same Spaniard come from di capital whenever dey come here di first thing they says to us um, you speak in Patwa. No, we do not speak in Patwa we are speakin our language. Patwa is di mix of two language. We are not speakin Patwa.
A: Do you ever mix the two?
K: Normally like, whenever you are speaking sometimes it’s like you know, we talk a little Spanish, or sometimes we talk a little English. You know, it’s normally because my mother raise us dat kind of way dat you know. You use both language sometimes but you speaking something in English, and sometimes and all of a sudden you just come and put something in Spanish, but it’s normal.

I think Patwa is maybe like when you talking to me in English and you use, you um, you put in some Spanish. Like I speaking to you in English right now, sí, entonces le digo a usted you see like, dat is what I tink is Patwa, like you talk in English, and after you talk Spanish

Generalmente el Criol es, es como empezamos en inglés y terminamos en español o viceversa comenzamos en español y ahora inglés

‘Generally, Creole is, it’s like we start in English and we end in Spanish o vice versa, we can say [something] in Spanish and then in English’

Participants also commented on language use as related to race. Speakers explained that traditionally Afro-Costa Ricans spoke both Limonese and Spanish, and Hispanic Costa Ricans spoke only Spanish. However, this is no longer always the case; some participants mentioned many “Spanish” people speak Limonese, which was also noticed in my personal observations.
Okay, if you see a Spanish one, and he lives around, around us, and if you hear him speakin, like how I speak English with him, you will never believe he’s a Spanish guy. And he speak di same English what I speak. Di Mekaytelyu.

You know nowadays its not like before because now practically everybody speak English now ... once I remember... when she little baby an dis Spanish came over and right over me and put his hand right under di baby now, so I was so angry I said, ‘dis man put his god damn hand over my baby head!’ and I start yellin in English and he turn to me and say, ‘what, you think I don’t understand English’.

Others discussed the fact that overall in Limón, societal perceptions expect a black person to speak Limonese. Nevertheless, some black families have not maintained the language. This lack of transmission has resulted in a passive bilingualism for some in the younger generation.

‘There is also the case where people are black and they only speak Spanish. So, you grow up and you’re black and they say to you ‘but you’re black and you don’t know how to speak English’ and the thing is, that from childhood no, or rather, they only spoke Spanish so they grew up with Spanish. Or, there’s the case where they speak in English but the learn in Spanish and... you would say that she’s black so she must know English but it might be that she can understand things perfectly but can’t speak.’

One speaker, who often provides childcare for members of the community, had strong opinions regarding families who do not maintain Limonese.

Whenever the mother is a black woman she come and speakin to a black girl and first thing she [the girl] says to me ‘ay no entiendo’ and dem like, you know, I feel like something heating up in my body and I just look at her ... ‘su mamá es negra, su papá también’ ... Please! An you know her mother, den whenever you met her father they’re talkin to you in English. Why dem speakin to di child? Why not doin it?

The third example of commentary about race in relation to language use is the case of the mestizo who speaks Limonese due to transmission from an Afro-Costa Rican parent.
La mamá es una muchacha negra, tiene una hija mestiza, pero le exigió a la hija, la hija tiene 12 años, que ella debía hablar inglés ... es una niña en cuanto al color, se ve mestiza, pero tiene su raíz negra. [...] los mestizos de acá hay gente que habla bastante [inglés]

‘The mother is a black woman, she has a mestiza daughter, but she requires the daughter, the daughter is 12 years old, to speak English ... she is a girl who, in color looks mestizo but she has her black roots. [...] mestizos here, there are people who speak plenty [English]’

6.9 Conclusion

This study has aimed to contribute to the study of variation in language contact phenomena found in bilingual speech. The case of Limonese-Spanish bilinguals in Puerto Limón is of particular interest given that Limonese Creole is in intense contact with Spanish, a language other than its lexifying language. Two contact phenomena are of principal interest: lexical borrowing and code-switching. An innovation in this study is that in order to evaluate borrowing and code-switching in Limonese-Spanish bilingual speech a combination of two methodologies is used. After evaluating borrowing versus code-switching status of lone word insertions, I am then able to evaluate all code-switches, both lone and multiword, and determine the code-switching pattern most frequently found in the corpus. In this way, it is assured that lone words are not analyzed as code-switches, when they are in fact borrowings. The methodologies used in this study to evaluate variation in lone and multiword Spanish insertions, to the best of my knowledge, have not been previously applied to a case of contact involving a creole language.

The analysis portion of this study has shown that Limonese exhibits contact phenomena similar to those observed in other language contact situations. It was found that the majority (95/97, 97.9%) of lone Spanish nouns and verbs produced in otherwise Limonese speech are fully adapted to the morphological, syntactic, and at times phonological structure of Limonese, and therefore integrated into Limonese grammar and interpreted as borrowings. These results
confirm findings in previous studies of lone word insertions in other language pairs (Adalar and Tagliamonte 1998; Budzhak-Jones 1998; Eze 1998; Samar and Meechan 1998; Torres Cacoullos and Aaron 2003; Turpin 1998), and validate the application of the employed methodologies to cases of creoles in contact.

With regard to code-switching typology, it was found that alternation is the dominant pattern in the corpus, with congruent lexicalization emerging as a secondary pattern. Alternation as a primary code-switching pattern is an index of speakers’ high bilingual competence and stable bilingual communities (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007). In addition, alternation signifies a greater separateness of languages; this was also confirmed by the data. Speakers choose to employ contact phenomena depending on the context and interlocutors of the conversation, suggesting a diglossic situation in Puerto Limón. High rates of bilingualism, stability of language use, as well as the separateness of the languages are all factors indicating the future maintenance of Limonese. Furthermore, speakers did not predominantly exhibit contact phenomena associated with language shift, such as insertional code-switching, which is indicative of nonfluency (Muysken 2000). The insertion pattern was the least prevalent pattern overall in the corpus, and not a dominant pattern for any individual participants.

This study has also shown that contact phenomena in bilingual speech extends beyond lexical borrowings and code-switches to include processes that reflect that intensity of language contact in the region, such as relexification and syntactic borrowing. However, these processes are not yet widespread or systematic. Nonetheless, coupled with other mechanisms of language contact, they represent a portion of the language change that has been ongoing since Jamaicans first arrived in Costa Rica in 1872.
In addition to the linguistic factors mentioned above, there are also social factors that indicate the future maintenance of Limonese in a bilingual context. Speakers indicated Limonese has cultural significance and it should be preserved. During sociolinguistic interviews speakers reported using an Inner Circle Variety characterized by frequent alternational code-switching with family and friends in informal contexts. These remarks regarding context and participating interlocutors are supported by the type of speech found in the interview context with the researcher, a non-community member, versus the type of speech found in natural conversations between native Limonese speakers.

One of the most exciting things about this study is the use of Limonese by speakers in the 18-30 age group. Younger speakers, did not express negative attitudes toward Limonese, however, the recognition that Standard English holds a higher economic value may indicate that younger speakers could favor use of Standard English over Limonese in the future. However, it was also noted that it is possible to maintain both Standard English and Limonese. It is possible that decreolization could be seen particularly among speakers who continue to study and use Standard English beyond high school. This, along with the fact that some households, especially those with one Afro-Costa Rican parent and one Hispanic parent, do not transmit Limonese to their children are factors that could lead to language shift in future generations. It is hypothesized, however, that unless there is a complete loss of transmission of Limonese to future generations, several varieties of English in Limón will continue to exist, exhibiting a range of creole-like features and influences from Spanish. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that speakers in this study report the common use Limonese with friends and freely incorporate borrowings and code-switches into natural speech. Overall, this investigation contributes to the
ongoing discussion contact-induced language change by examining contact phenomena found in a creole in contact with its non-lexifier language from comparative variationist perspective.
APPENDIX ONE: TIMELINE OF IMPORTANT EVENTS IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AFRO-LIMONESE POPULATION IN LIMÓN, COSTA RICA

December 20, 1872 – First group of Jamaicans arrive in Limón to work on the Standard Railroad.

1890 – Standard Railroad is completed. Workers remain in Limón to work for the United Fruit Company (UFC).

1910-1915 – Decline of the first banana boom, 3,000 Jamaicans are left unemployed from UFC layoffs.

1888 – Compagnie Universelle du Canal Intérocéanique de Panama goes bankrupt and West Indian canal workers migrate north to Limón.

1904 – Approximately 4,000 of 5,600 UFC workers are Jamaican.

1920 – Beginning of the second banana boom. UFC hires mainly Hispanic Costa Rican workers.

1927 – Census reports 18,000 Jamaicans in Limón.

1934 – Law passed prohibiting the employment of people of color on the Pacific Coast. Costa Rican government stops issuing visas to people of color.


1963 – Law passed prohibiting discrimination in the workplace based on race.

1942 – Last shipment of bananas leaves Limón.


2005 – 73 percent of Afro-Costa Ricans speak Limonese Creole.

2011 – Census reports 13,886 people identifying as afro-descendiente or mulato residing in Puerto Limón.
APPENDIX TWO: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1 – first person
2 – second person
3 – third person
ADJ – adjective
ART – article
AUX – auxiliary
COMPL – completive
DEM – demonstrative
INF – infinitive
IPFV – imperfective
OBJ – object
PL – plural
POSS – possessive
PREP – preposition
PROG – progressive
PST – past
Q – question particle/marker
REFL – reflexive
SBJ – subject
SG – singular
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