Waranqa waranqa kasiayku, huñusqa, llaqtan llaqtan huñusqa. Mat’isiayku kay runa cheqniq llaqtata, cawallupa akanta hina millakuwaqinchis llaqtata. ¡Qespichisaqkun! Runa llaqtan kanqa, tawantin suyu hatun takiq, manchay kusiq, allin llankaq, mana cheqniq ¡chuya! Apu ritin hina mana asnaq huchyoq

Somos miles de millares, aquí, ahora. Estamos juntos; nos hemos congregado pueblo por pueblo, nombre por nombre, y estamos apretando a esta inmensa ciudad que nos odiaba, que nos despreciaba como a excremento de caballos. Hemos de convertirla en pueblos de hombres que entonen los himnos de las cuatro regiones de nuestro mundo, en ciudad feliz, donde cada hombre trabaje, en inmenso pueblo que no odie y sea limpio como la nieve de los dioses montañas

We are thousands upon thousands, here, now. We are together; we have gathered village by village, name by name, and we are pressing against this enormous city that despised us, that scorned us like horse droppings. We must transform it into villages of men who sing the anthems of the four regions of our world, into a joyful city, where every man works, into an enormous village that is free of hatred and as clean as the snow of the god mountains.

José María Arguedas
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DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Daniela Claudia Salcedo Arnaiz, M.A.
Graduate Program in Spanish and Portuguese

The Ohio State University
2013

Dissertation Committee:
Terrell A. Morgan, Advisor
Donald Winford
Anna Babel
Abstract

Language attitudes and linguistic ideologies are an inherent aspect of every multilingual or multidialectal society, and this is no exception in Lima, where Limeño Spanish and Andean Spanish coexist due to an important phenomenon of internal migration from the Andes to Peru’s capital that has taken place during the last forty years. This dissertation presents a quantitative and qualitative approach to the attitudes and ideologies that the residents of Lima have towards Andean Spanish and their speakers in order to propose a definition for provinciano identity, a concept that I have labeled “Andeanness”. The present perception study provides an approach to the reactions that both Limeños and Andean migrants have towards a selection of (stigmatized) morphosyntactic features from Andean Spanish. Making use of the Matched-Guisé technique and a questionnaire, I collected data in two different and complementary fieldwork projects.

The findings show that there is no dialect awareness towards Andean Spanish since participants, when confronted with the selected morphosyntactic features of that dialect, did not associate them with a dialect per se, but with an ‘incorrect’ Spanish spoken mostly by Andean migrants, which allegedly share stereotypical characteristics such as a low level of education, indigenous race and poverty. Furthermore, I found that these stigmatized morphosyntactic features were not indexes of Andeanness each by itself but mostly only when combined. One of the recurring patterns found through the quantitative analysis is that it is more important to establish the difference between groups in terms of
power than in terms of solidarity. This is shown in the significantly greater distance between the two Limeño Spanish speaker guises and the ones by the AS speaker in terms of the characteristics related to status.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Introduction

The first time I realized I was ‘white’ was when I stopped being it, when I arrived to the United States and became ‘brown’ (or Hispanic), and both realizations shocked me deeply in ways I did not expect. It was only then that I understood I had been living a privileged life that I was not aware of in terms of socio-cultural status. Nobody discriminated against me on a regular basis, nobody told me that I could not attend certain places because of my physical appearance, nobody made fun of the way I spoke…And I believe that the main reason for my privileged status did not come as much from the fact of being white (because in reality, I am a dark-skinned person, at least compared to my actually white Peruvian friends), as from not being black, or Asian and, most of all, from not being indigenous. In other words, whiteness is such an abstract (and complex) idea, that I can be white one day in Lima and not be white the following, in Ohio. Therefore, coming to this country and becoming a minority helped me understand better who I am, and how identity is not a static concept but a very permeable one that can be modified and reshaped in every interaction: race, origin, place, ethnicity, religion are only some of the characteristics that contribute to this process of being who we are.
In Peru, like in many other Latin American countries, indigenous identities were forever changed because of the complexities of the colonial encounter. When Spaniards arrived in America, their Eurocentric worldview – predominance of white race, Spanish language, Catholic religion, among other characteristics – became the default or unmarked way of perceiving the world, even when white population was dramatically outnumbered by populations of other races, especially indigenous (and black) people\(^1\). Not even after these countries gained their independence from Spain during the nineteenth century did this situation change in any important fashion: racism and discrimination towards non-white populations are still today a terrible heritage we haven’t been able to get rid of. And Peru’s capital, Lima, is no exception, especially since internal migration waves from rural areas to the capital have taken place throughout the twentieth century and continue these days.

Internal migration to the capital has never been uncommon since Lima was founded in 1535 by Spaniards during colonial times. However, it became massive during the late 1980s and early 1990s: Andean immigrants started to arrive looking for better living standards and economic opportunities or as refugees of the country's internal conflict with the Shining Path\(^2\). These migrations produced an unprecedented demographic growth in the city, which nowadays has a population of 9’000,000 inhabitants, one-third

\(^1\) Cf. Casaús (1998) and Silvestre (1994) for a discussion of indigenous people in Guatemala and black people in the Dominican Republic, respectively.

\(^2\) The Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) is a Maoist terrorist group which emerged in the eighties in the heart of Peruvian Andes.
of Peru’s total population\(^3\); and they brought their culture, their history, their languages and their Spanish, the Spanish spoken in the Andes.

Andean Spanish is a contact variety of Spanish that emerged from the contact of Quechua and Aymara, with Spanish since the arrival of Spanish conquistadors in Andean countries. Rivarola (2000) defines it as a geographically limited variety that is spoken in the proper Andean areas (in opposition to the coastal or Amazonian areas) of Andean countries, areas where Spanish has coexisted with Quechua and Aymara for centuries. It started as a language spoken by second-language learners of Spanish of the Andes during the colonial period (Escobar 2000), but it now has a systematic set of complex features that lead linguists to consider it a variety in its own right (Cerrón Palomino 2003). These days, however, AS use is not restricted to Andean areas but can be found spread throughout all the Peruvian territory, including Lima\(^4\).

After decades of coexistence, contact has had sociolinguistic repercussions such as the construction of stereotypes, and the consequent emergence of stigmatization and discrimination among Lima’s inhabitants because of the way they speak (among other factors). Thus this city represents a unique environment for the study of AS. Lima, after the rural exodus from the Andes, has become an urban field in which convergences and confrontations are multiethnic and multicultural (Goddenzi, 2008).

---

\(^3\) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lima](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lima)

\(^4\) In this study, I am focusing on Peru’s sociolinguistic reality, but by no means denying its existence in other countries such as Ecuador, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, and even in the diaspora.
Limeño Spanish is not a monolithic variety; its variation is conditioned by different sociolinguistic factors. In the same way, there is not one single Andean Spanish, especially if we take into consideration that Andean migrants come from many different towns and cities. However, in terms of language attitudes and linguistic ideologies, perceptions are mostly black or white: any marked feature (i.e. not Limeño Spanish, the standard in Lima, which is considered the unmarked dialect), especially when combined with certain social cues such as ethnicity, origin or socioeconomic status, can index provinciano and, therefore Andean Spanish.

There is a fair amount of literature on (Peruvian) AS that ranges over grammatical descriptions, variationist studies of particular traits, and even peculiar pragmatic uses found in this variety when compared to the standard(s). Also, another matter of interest in Andean Linguistics is language attitudes, and even linguistic ideologies or linguistic policies, but mostly in relation to Spanish and Andean languages (Quechua and Aymara). However, there are still many missing gaps in the literature such as the study of the complex sociolinguistic situation of Lima, which tends to be simplified in the discourse into a binary opposition between Andean migrants and Limeños that does not represent all the different nuances actually involved in the reality of Peru’s capital. This complexity has been documented only in a few articles and almost always related to critical discourse analysis (Goddenzi, 2008; Smith, 2008; Mick, 2011).

It is true that important researchers such as Cerrón-Palomino (2003), De Granda (2001), Escobar (1990), and many others have made great strides in the study of different aspects of AS. However, there are still many missing gaps in the literature such as the study of...
the complex sociolinguistic situation of Lima, which tends to be simplified in the discourse into a binary opposition (Howard, 2007) between Andean migrants and Limeños that does not represent all the different sociolinguistic nuances actually involved in the reality of Peru’s capital. This complexity has been documented only in a few articles and almost always in relation to critical discourse analysis (Goddenzi, 2008; Smith, 2008; Mick, 2011). Therefore, I propose a perception study to investigate what links grammatical features, morphosyntactic ones in particular, with stereotypes and linguistic ideologies in the context of a coastal city restructured by Andean migration. In other words, I aim to determine the (sociolinguistic) definition of Andeanness in Lima, from the eyes of both Limeños and Andean migrants in this city.

1.2. Research objectives

The impetus for this dissertation is my interest in defining Andeanness in Lima, by observing that (Andean) identity is undeniably conditioned by location, as well as the processes, relationships and social interactions that take place in the Peruvian capital due to internal migration from the highlands. Being Andean in the Andes has completely different implications than being Andean in Peru’s capital; thus one of the questions raised by this study is how Andean identity(es) emerges and is shaped when Andean people migrate to Lima and become provincianos. This analysis will focus on the linguistic (morphosyntax in particular) features which contribute to define and shape the linguistic identity of Andean Spanish speakers.
Mine is a perception study based in the language attitudes and linguistic ideologies towards Andean Spanish according to both Limeños and migrants living in the city. I am interested in giving an account of how these perceptions may vary (or not) according to these two different groups. Furthermore, I am curious specifically about the role of morphosyntax in the perception of Andeanness in Lima. Is this grammatical component enough of a marker to consider a person using certain morphosyntactic features Andean or provinciano? The trigger of my curiosity is a previous study that I conducted about ethnic humor and the representations of provincondanos in Lima in comic skits\(^5\), where comedians selected certain AS features to imitate how provincianos speak. In that occasion, I was intrigued about the way in which comedians represented Andean migrants through language and how aware they were of the different components of grammar they were incorporating in order to sound provincianos. Finally, another reason for my interest in morphosyntax is that studies about attitudes usually focus on phonology or on the perception of a specific dialect or language in general (in a contact situation); thus I want to design a method to collect reactions towards AS morphosyntax to find out if other components of grammar can also motivate language attitudes in the same way phonology does.

To gather the data in situ, I have conducted field work in Lima in two stages (2011-2012) making use of an adaptation of the Matched Guise Technique\(^6\) (Lambert, 1967) specifically designed for participants to express their attitudes towards certain stigmatized morphosyntactic features of Andean Spanish. The main contribution of this kind of test is that it allows researchers to collect language attitudes and ideologies through access to unconscious ideas that would not show up easily in interviews or participant observation; it also provides a way in which participants can verbalize their impressions about the speaker solely based on their speech, so that other characteristics such as ethnicity do not play a role in their judgments.

Even though my starting point is Andean Spanish features, as described by linguists, I argue that this variety is sort of "imagined", that it doesn't really exist: Andean Spanish is the Spanish spoken by Quechua-Spanish bilinguals, but also spoken by Aymara-Spanish bilinguals. Furthermore, it is a monolingual variety of Spanish too, one riddled with contact features but spoken by Andean people who don't speak either Quechua or Aymara. Finally, it is a variety that is not only spoken in the Andes, or in rural areas, but also in Lima and many other important cities of the Peruvian coast. The theoretical approach to this dialect, for different reasons, tends to be simplistic for such a complex dialect contact situation.

---

\(^6\) In this test participants listen to apparently different speakers representing guises in two or more dialects and evaluate those speakers for impressions of their personality characteristics (Campbell-Kibler, 2007)
I believe is that this label is too encompassing and ambiguous, unable to describe particular situations such as the one which takes place in Lima, Peru. Thus I assume as one of my hypothesis that ‘Andean Spanish’ is a research construct that does not actually exist; in fact, I have never heard a person in Peru say something like ‘I speak Andean Spanish’. What I have heard, instead, is people saying ‘When I arrived in Lima, I didn’t know how to speak correctly’ or ‘Please, stop speaking like a serrana’!’. In other words, I think it is better to talk about Provinciano speech, a sub-set of what language researchers call Andean Spanish, which consists of very specific grammatical features that function as social indexes of being provinciano.

At first sight, this distinction might seem unnecessary, since scholars know there is always a distance between concepts and methodological classifications, and reality. However, I do believe it is extremely important to make it because it will contribute to a better understanding of what actually takes place in Lima in terms of attitudes towards the way Andean migrants speak: the language attitudes and the linguistic ideologies that I will describe and analyze are not constructed towards a particular language or dialect, i.e. Andean Spanish, but towards certain grammatical features of AS and their social implications. Furthermore, if we use that term, we will maintain the mistaken idea that Andean Spanish is one homogeneous variety, which does not vary according to where it is spoken or who is the listener.

7 A person from the highlands; pejorative term.
I agree in that the study of this contact dialect is still incipient and that labeling it makes our work easier; however, it is vital for us to remember that reality is much more complex, especially if we are talking about a perception study. It wouldn’t be accurate to say that I am collecting data on the attitudes and ideologies of Lima’s inhabitants towards Andean Spanish because not all AS features are perceived as provincianos and some of them, the least stigmatized in particular, are slowly and almost surreptitiously becoming part of Limeño Spanish. The attitudes and ideologies my participants will have to react to is a selection of morphosyntactic features that are highly stigmatized and associated with the way provincianos speak.

1.3. Significance of this dissertation

My dissertation will help shed light on the complexities of language contact and its sociolinguistic repercussions for the case of Lima, Peru; furthermore, I trust that this study will provide new insights for other fields of the social sciences and will also be a step towards a better understanding of the different groups which inhabit the city of Lima. In the following paragraphs, I will explain how this study, both my research questions and the answers I will come up for them, will contribute to the field of linguistics.

First of all, a perception study has never been conducted in Lima, especially not in this manner: a sociolinguistic research on attitudes from the perspective of both Andean Spanish and Limeño Spanish speakers. It is not common to address Lima’s sociolinguistic reality as multidialectal since regional dialects have an inferior social
status and, therefore, speakers do not consider them as actual varieties of Spanish, but as deviations from the standard (Limeño\textsuperscript{8} Spanish).

This study proves fundamental for examining AS in a contact situation where the standard is LS. I agree with Babel (2010) when she states that “the meaning of contact features is not fixed, but rather is accomplished through comparison to, and in contrast with, expected patterns of speech, both in terms of contexts of speech and in terms of individual speakers.” In the literature of contact linguistics in Peru, the focus is on bilingualism, the coexistence of Spanish and indigenous languages (mostly Andean but also from the Amazon). There are studies such as Klee and Caravedo’s (2005) work on clitics in Lima as a result of contact-induced language change but they are not combined with an in-depth analysis of the social context which has contributed to this change. Language attitudes and linguistic ideologies always play a central role in change spreads, because they can enable or block its occurrence. Language does not change without its speakers.

Another key contribution of my investigation is the inclusion of Andean migrants’ perspective towards their own speech once they become provincianos in Lima. I am not aware of any other study that looks at Andean Spanish with an insider’s perspective, especially in terms of attitudes towards their dialect. In fact, to my knowledge, there is no Peruvian scholar interested in Andean Spanish who is a native speaker of this variety and,\footnote{Also called Ribereño or Coastal Spanish, because it is spoken mostly in coastal areas as Lima. It is interesting to note how geography and geographic labels go hand in hand with linguistic divisions.}
therefore, many times research lacks of the support of native speakers’ intuitions. To overcome this problem, since I am not an Andean Spanish speaker either, the tasks I have designed to collect data include mostly fragments of sociolinguistic interviews with actual Andean Spanish speakers, collected in prior research.

The main purpose for the inclusion of Andean Spanish speakers, however, is to give an account of their own attitudes and ideologies towards the way they speak, another aspect that has rarely been taken into consideration in linguistic research. Discrimination is one of the first things that emerges from the contact between Limeños and the newcomers, and before long many Andean migrants not only feel it against them but sometimes also start discriminating against the ones who come after them, perpetuating the stigma probably in an attempt to belong. Also in an attempt to blend in, migrants try to erase any trace of Andeanness including the ones at the linguistic level. Thus it is no surprise that the most stigmatized grammatical features of Andean Spanish are the ones which tend to disappear first and some non-stigmatized have begun to transfer to Limeño Spanish (Caravedo, 1996).

1.4. Organization of chapters
The second chapter of my dissertation explains the sociolinguistic background in which my research questions and the whole study is embedded: my approach to Andean Spanish and provinciano identity or Andeanness is one that links language and place in a bidirectional relationship marked by history, culture, race, ethnicity, etc. First, I explain the phenomenon of internal migration of Andean people to Peru’s capital; then, I explain the general assumptions of what Andean Spanish (AS) is, based on previous works, and with a particular focus on the morphosyntactic component of this dialect. I end up discussing the relationship between language and place as a necessary element to take into consideration when talking about ethnic identity and ethnic relations.

In Chapter 3, I carry out a thorough review of the literature on the different subjects and theories that are central for the understanding of the phenomena under study. First, I explain the concepts of race and racism in the context of Lima. Second, based on concepts such as ‘indexicality’ and ‘enregisterment’, I contest the idea that Andean Spanish should be considered a dialect for the purpose of this study. Third, I claim that the language attitudes and linguistic ideologies towards Andean Spanish can be better addressed by using the ideas on correctness and dialect awareness. I then proceed to outline my own hypothesis about motoso or provinciano speech as a better way to describe the dialect contact between Limeño Spanish (LS) and AS. In this way, I can explain the disconnect between a variety portrayed in books and what Limeños and Andean migrants interpret as ‘incorrect’ Spanish. Finally, I will delve into the

---

9 First content chapter
relationship between language and identity or, in other words, the relationship between
different dialects and its social correlates. I propose that certain AS features (not all of
them and not all in the same way) can work as social indexes of Andeanness. And with
the term Andeanness, I refer to the group of linguistic and non-linguistic features which
contribute to shape the identity of AS speakers in Lima; an identity that is not fixed but in
constant change due to the daily interactions between Limeños and Andean migrants in
the city.

Chapter 4 lays out the methodology for my study. Applying an adapted version of the
Matched-Guise Test, I will make the connections between AS morphosyntax and
provincianos explicit. In order to achieve this goal, I will include a quantitative analysis
of the answers of the MGT’s semantic scales based on the dimensions of power/status
and solidarity and a qualitative analysis of the participants’ judgments of correctness as
well as their answers to a follow-up questionnaire.

In Chapter 5, I discuss the results of the two experiments that I designed for my study. I
report the language attitudes and linguistic ideologies underlying speakers' perceptions,
both Limeños and Andean migrants, on Andean Spanish. To achieve this goal, my
analysis is supported by both the existing literature on the topic as well as my findings
during fieldwork research. I invoke Limeños and Andean migrants’ perceptions on AS
and will report their attitudes towards this, to a certain extent, imagined variety. I utilize
statistical tests to measure the attitudes that Lima’s inhabitants show towards selected AS morphosyntactic features.
Chapter 2: Andean Spanish in Lima

2.1. Introduction

Peru’s capital, Lima, is the only capital city in South America that is located in a valley right next to the Pacific Ocean, at sea level. It was founded in 1535 by the Spanish conquistadors under the name ‘City of the Kings’, and became the capital of the Viceroyalty of Peru until the Peruvian War of Independence, when it became the capital of the Republic of Peru. Scholars speculate that its name, Lima, comes from the Quechua word *rimay* ‘to speak’, which was pronounced, in Coastal Quechua, as *limay*. Originally, there was an agentive suffix –q attached to the verb, so that the area was actually named *limaq* ‘the one who speaks’ because of the existence of an oracle in pre-Inca times. In the end, however, that sound was omitted due to Spanish phonotactics, since Spanish does not allow an occlusive consonant in final position. (Cerrón, 1997)

With its almost 9,000,000 inhabitants, Lima is today the most developed city in the country due to, among other reasons, the centralist\(^\text{10}\) government policies which are focused on the progress of this city and systematically exclude, most of the time, the

\(^{10}\text{Centralism: the concentration of power and control in the central authority of an organization (as a political or educational system). [www.merriam-webster.com]}\)
Andean and Amazonian regions of the country. As a consequence, it is not surprising to find that one-third of the country lives in this city because of its spontaneous growth and internal migration. Lima has been an important cultural and economic center since its foundation; therefore, it is not surprising to find people wanting to migrate to that area since the sixteenth century. However, it is in the twentieth century that waves of migration became more massive because of the industrialization and urbanization before 1961, the ‘Reforma Agraria’ (land reform 1962-1972), and the political violence that started in the Andes in the eighties. In 1975, there were 3.9 million people in the capital; forty years later, this number has almost tripled (Golte and Adams, 1987). According to Zavala and Zariquiey (2009), people from Andean regions have migrated over the last few decades, leaving rural areas and trying to assimilate themselves into the dominant culture of the cities, where they occupy marginal spaces.

I am focusing on the situation of Andean migrants in Lima, based on the importance of the link between language and space, on how the social history of a certain location can shape the ways in which speakers today use language to index complex interactions between local social meanings and broader regional membership. My curiosity in studying Andean Spanish away from the Andes arises from the fact that a person/group identity is affected when in contact with other groups. Identity is flexible in that sense, and so is language; therefore it is essential to adjust our theoretical approach when we are not studying a linguistic variety in situ. As a matter of fact, more than being interested in
Andean Spanish as a Peruvian dialect, I want to figure out what both Limeños and Andean migrants believe to be true about Andean Spanish: how they evaluate it.

2.2. Lima and the ‘invasores’: Migration from the Andes to the Coast during the last century

Due to a variety of sociohistorical and economic factors, a significant number of people from the Peruvian Andes have moved to urban areas, especially to the capital (Lima), looking for better opportunities. This type of migration (from the Andes to Lima) has been quite common since the city was founded in 1535 by Spaniards. However, the migrating waves that have taken place throughout the twentieth century—the so-called “invasion” of migrants from the provinces (Klee and Caravedo, 2005)—have completely re-shaped the capital of Peru. As a result of migration, this city grew from 645,000 inhabitants in 1940 to 6.5 million residents by the early 1990s (Golte, 1990); currently, Lima has a population of approximately 9 million inhabitants. Among the multiple consequences of this, a language (dialect) contact situation has emerged, involving at least two varieties of Spanish: Andean Spanish (AS) and Limeño Spanish (LS).

When massive migration occurs, the assimilation of the newcomers to the new culture (if possible) takes time and it usually generates social problems such as where migrants are going to settle down and how willing is the originary population to share their neighborhoods with the new group. The perception of the other will affect both social
and linguistic behavior through the tension of opposites such as poor/rich, uneducated/educated, white/indigenous, etc. As a result of this situation, non-linguistic and linguistic stereotypes emerge to represent the encounter of two (or more) worldviews. Moreover, this massive migration to Lima turns out to be of special interest given the situation of language contact in Peru. In 1940, when the invasiones started, over half of the population of Peru spoke an indigenous language, either Andean or Amazonian. However, forty years later, only one-fourth of the population had some proficiency in one of these languages. It was not surprising then that by 1989 approximately 60% of those who spoke indigenous languages in Peru also spoke Spanish (Escobar 2000: 30). Thus, there has been fairly rapid language shift in Peru over the past 75 years. Nevertheless, there is not only contact between languages but, much more prevalent, among Spanish dialects.

It is very hard to describe Lima’s sociolinguistic situation because of many factors. First of all, although there is a noticeable contrast between Limeño Spanish, considered the standard not only in Lima but in the whole country, and Andean Spanish, people do not seem to acknowledge that they are dealing with two very different dialects of Spanish. On the contrary, LS and AS have become opposites between right and wrong, correct and incorrect, both for Limeños as for migrants and their descendents. Also, it is hard to determine what sections of the population speak each variety because of the lack of recognition of AS as a regional contact dialect. For this reason, the closest we can get in terms of numbers is through people’s origins, assuming that because of being a
provinciano equals speaking Andean Spanish which is not necessarily true. Furthermore, if we make the previous assumption, we would have also to determine if these people speak Spanish as a second language or if they actually speak Andean Spanish. None of these efforts will be helpful, though, if the negative perception of Andean Spanish does not change in the eyes of Lima’s inhabitants and becomes accepted as a variety in its own right.

Arellano and Burgos (2004) describe contemporary Lima as a city of migrants and *informales*, who live mostly in the urban peripheries located north, east and south of central Lima. Furthermore, they describe the parallel existence of two Limas: the ‘classic Lima’, which dates from that historical city described as La Ciudad de los Reyes, an urban and organized center exclusive to aristocratic and colonial society; and the “New Lima”, constituted by migrants and their descendents, which is consolidating itself as a multicultural and cosmopolitan space. According to the authors, peripheral areas in Lima have been associated with the classic image of the rural, poor and marginalized migrant, while the classic or traditional Limeño is associated with economic success, sociopolitical power and national culture.

In that classic Lima mentioned above live those who Smith (2008) and Godenzzi (2008) call ‘traditional Limeños’\(^{11}\), whereas ‘new Limeños’\(^{12}\) are the descendents of migrants or

\(^{11}\) I will use ‘traditional’ and ‘classic’ indistinctively.
provincianos. Being born in Lima is not enough to be considered Limeño, as the data I collected shows. The descendents of many migrants who arrived in the capital looking for a brighter future have improved their economic status, have moved to better neighborhoods, and have access to better education. Nevertheless, new and classic Limeños still hold on to certain stereotypes, including linguistic ones, which remain in the social structure of the city.

From a linguistic perspective, over the last years, place has become more important within sociolinguistics because instead of assuming that dialects and varieties can be mapped onto places as a lot of dialectologists and variationists do, scholars such as Hall-Lew (2010) and Johnstone (2006, 2010) among others “have treated dialect and place as cultural constructs (Johnstone 2004) and explored how they shape each other in speakers’ imaginations (Johnstone, 2006: 99)”. According to Milroy (2002), Labov’s concept of speech community is conceived as a construct which fails to attend to “contact between communities or to the crosscutting influences entailed by mobility and access to knowledge of the local linguistic practices of others”. The author also claims that there is a huge “impact of language attitudes and ideologies on the outcome of dialect contact situations, particularly as a consequence of the activities of speakers in constructing linguistic distinctiveness from a contrasting other group.”

\[12\] In the second section of Chapter 2, I explain the differences between these three different groups living in Lima.
This approach to language, space, and the interactions between them is another accurate tool to describe the sociolinguistic situation of Andean migrants in Lima and all the consequences that arise from the encounter of these radically different groups in the same city. But despite its superficial image as a ‘multicultural’ and ‘mestizo’ city, Lima still puts a strong social pressure so that newcomers integrate and assimilate the hegemonic Limeño culture. Within the context of prosperity that is being experienced in the urban peripheries, considered before as the place of the poor, the way people speak Spanish has become an important element to identify and differentiate Limeños Arellano and Burgos (2004: 78). In other words, Lima’s inhabitants have found and reinterpreted traditional linguistic and spatial strategies to express difference among Classic Limeños, migrants and New Limeños.

Therefore, through a discourse of ‘social spacialization’\textsuperscript{13}, not only do Traditional Limeños continue to maintain a divide between their social sphere and that of New Limeños, but also the latter appropriate that same discourse in order to justify a socio-cultural separation from migrants. The New Limeños or descendants of migrants reproduce the discourse used against their predecessors, the Andean migrants or recién bajados, to refer to ‘them’, versus the ‘us’ that New Limeños now constitute. Arellano and Burgos (2004: 79). Although not a central research question in this dissertation, these claims were pretty obvious among my interviewees, as I show in Chapter 5, specifically

\textsuperscript{13} Words related to space are used in discourse with a social connotation. For example, in Aquí no se habla así ‘Here people don’t speak that way’.
during the second phase of fieldwork. As a traditional Limeña, I was unaware of the
different distinctions among provincianos and, therefore, was surprised to find out that a
person born in Lima might not consider herself a Limeña. It was interesting to see the
social, economic, historical and cultural characteristics entailed in classic Limeños’
identity from the perspective not only of Andean migrants but of New Limeños. There
was an enlightening moment when, while recording young Avelino, I asked him about
his origin and he said he was born in Lima. My reaction, which in retrospect sounds a
little naïve, was to say ‘Oh, Limeño, just like me’. Inexplicably for me at that moment,
Avelino laughed at me.

2.3. What is Andean Spanish?

To define AS is not an easy task. Literally, it means Spanish of the Andes but if we
consider that the Andes cross most of South America, that will become a very broad an
inaccurate definition. AS is not, in fact, the Spanish of Colombia, Ecuador, Chile,
Bolivia, Peru and Argentina and all their dialectal differences; it is, instead, a group of
varieties that results from the contact between the Spanish brought in the sixteenth
century during Colonial times and the Andean indigenous languages, especially Quechua
and Aymara. Five hundred years later, Spanish, Quechua and Aymara are still in contact
and Quechua-Spanish bilinguals constitute an important population, even though their
level of proficiency in one and/or other language may vary according to different factors.
In my opinion, it is not possible to classify AS (or any contact variety) without first defining the context in which it emerged because this is of great importance to understanding the history and social dynamics of the contact situation (Winford, 2003). After Spanish arrived in Peru with the conquistadors, its diffusion among indigenous population was very slow. Colonial documents show that, approximately 40 years after the arrival of Spaniards in the area, indigenous people were still mostly monolingual in their native languages, as was the case of Cuzco, the most important city of the Inca Empire. Of course, Spanish-Quechua contact was everything but uniform, as we might suppose considering the immense area\(^{14}\) of the Inca Empire that had been subjugated and the similarly large indigenous population, especially when compared to the small group of Spanish people that arrived in the territory.

Although Spanish input was not abundant at the beginning, there were certain areas of the Peruvian Central Andes that assimilated the impact of *castellanización* more rapidly. In the sixteenth century, at the same time that a small indigenous group was learning a precarious Spanish because of some contact with its speakers, there was another group who had access to the language through a somehow formal education because of their privileged position as part of the Inca royalty (Rivarola, 2000). Moreover, the presence of the Catholic Church made the linguistic landscape even more complex. Because of priests’ and missionaries’ failure to spread “the word of God” in Spanish to the

---

\(^{14}\) A large portion of South America including Peru, most parts of modern Ecuador, western and south central Bolivia, northwest Argentina, north and central Chile, and a small part of southern Colombia.
polytheistic indigenous groups during the first years\textsuperscript{15}, they tried a new strategy: they learnt the major indigenous languages, Quechua and Aymara, in order to make it easier for the indigenous people to understand the new faith of Catholicism (Cerrón-Palomino, 2003); this new strategy became mandatory during the first catholic council celebrated in Lima in 1551. But when years went by after the Spanish Crown transformed that territory into the Viceroyalty of Peru\textsuperscript{16}, the better organization of the Spanish political system in the colony ensured a wider spread of Spanish, at least in official contexts. However, in everyday life, legal statutes were not usually obeyed and thus the learning of Spanish was varied because of different factors (Rivarola, 2000).

Currently, it is generally agreed that AS is a contact variety that emerged because of the contact of Quechua and Aymara with Spanish after the arrival of Spanish conquistadors in Andean countries. Rivarola (2000) defines it as a geographically limited variety that is spoken in the Andean areas proper (as opposed to the coastal or Amazonian varieties of Spanish) of Andean countries, areas where Spanish has coexisted with Quechua and Aymara for centuries. Zavala (1999) affirms that the AS that is spoken today is very similar to the variety learnt by indigenous people during Colonial times; it is a linguistic variety characterized by a variation of the noun phrase due to the reduction of categories and the omission of connectives, as well as the reinterpretation and the extension of Spanish functions and categories through Quechua notions.

\textsuperscript{15} Spaniards arrived to the Peruvian area of the Inca Empire in 1521.

\textsuperscript{16} The Viceroyalty of Peru was created in 1542.
In other words, there is still a great number of speakers who keep learning Spanish with plenty of Quechua characteristics. The author also states that AS cannot be defined as one uniform and homogeneous variety, but a linguistic continuum explained by different social factors. Finally, Escobar (1994) makes a distinction between AS and Bilingual Spanish as two “varieties resulting from contact between Spanish and Quechua, although the former is a native variety and the latter is not”. The lack of this distinction “has led to confusion between the linguistic characteristics which distinguish Andean Spanish and Bilingual Spanish, and it often seems to be assumed that the two varieties are identical.”

The difficulty in defining AS resides, in a way, in the confusion between the AS of bilinguals and the AS of monolinguals. Escobar (1994) explains that “similarities between AS and Bilingual Spanish are due to the fact that both varieties of Spanish are products of a language contact situation, in this case of Quechua and Spanish”. However, she is convinced that it is possible to determine which grammatical constructions are characteristic of each variety. Furthermore, she argues that “constructions found in Andean Spanish are also found in Bilingual Spanish, but the inverse does not stand”. For example, de mi mamá su casa ‘of my mother her house’, that is analytical genitive constructions with the possessor + possessee order, is a structure that belongs to Bilingual Spanish but not to Andean Spanish. The author claims that the difference between the

---

17 This is not even considered Andean Spanish by many scholars such as Anna María Escobar herself, and therefore names it Bilingual Spanish (a series of interlanguages with more or less stability and systematicity).
Spanish of bilinguals and monolinguals is that they are different in the nature of their contact. “While Andean Spanish is the product of contact at the social level, Bilingual Spanish is the product of contact at the individual level”. According to Rivarola (1990), Andean Spanish became a monolingual variety as early as the end the 18th century, but not all researchers agree. For example, Escobar\textsuperscript{18} claims that Andean Spanish emerged in the 20th century as L1, and its emergence cannot be dissociated from the particular scenario which allowed its existence, which is migration.

Following Winford’s (2003: 24) table on the possible outcomes of contact situations and the types of cross-linguistic influence they involve, I would say that Andean Spanish is a case of language shift with moderate to heavy substratum interference; a result of group second language acquisition that started more than five hundred years ago and that is still a very vital process. Nevertheless, talking about the monolingual AS, we cannot talk about substratum influence in the same way because there are many areas of the Andes where Quechua has not been heard for centuries. It is the trace of its presence that remains in the shape of linguistic traits such as SOV word order; discursive markers like \textit{pues} and \textit{nomás}; and the evidential use of the present perfect and pluperfect. As a matter of fact, even the Spanish spoken in Lima (Coastal, Ribereño or Limeño Spanish), considered the most prestigious variety in this area, shows the influence of AS features (Cerrón Palomino, 2003) that have transcended the filters of stigmatization. For instance, the postposition of the verb in sentences like \textit{María linda es} ‘María beautiful is’ shows an

\textsuperscript{18} Personal communication
SOV order that, although not canonical, is grammatical in standard Spanish for certain pragmatic functions such as topicalization. I will dare to say, though, that if we collect data to conduct a quantitative analysis, we will find out that the frequency of the OV order would be much higher in Limeño Spanish than in dialects that historically have not been in contact with Quechua.

In fact, nowadays, there are many areas, Andean and non-Andean (due to waves of migration), where monolingual varieties of AS have been documented (Rivarola, 1986). In other words, AS can include not only the L2 variety of Spanish spoken by Quechua-Spanish bilinguals, but also a contact variety spoken by monolinguals. Therefore, we cannot speak of AS as a homogeneous and uniform dialect (Zavala, 1999); currently, it is a more of a linguistic continuum that includes Quechua monolinguals with some understanding of Spanish (a minority, in most places), Quechua and Spanish bilinguals (with a wide range of differences in their proficiency of each language), and Spanish monolinguals. And all the variation derived from this situation can be found not only among different Andean countries but even among different areas of the same country; this is the case of Peru, where the Quechua family presents the widest set of dialects. In Babel’s (2010) words referring to the Andean country of Bolivia, “it is prestigious to be a Spanish speaker. However, not all Spanish speakers speak alike, nor do they speak the same way in all situations”.
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Zavala (1999) states that if researchers want to understand AS in all its complexity, we should not define it as an individual psycholinguistic phenomenon, reduced to the characteristics of bilingualism, but as a widely extended variety that emerged because of the substratal effects of Quechua and Aymara in (Peruvian) Spanish. Another important fact that she claims is that according to the 1994 census, the tendency of the population that speaks vernacular varieties is to shift from being Quechua monolinguals to being Spanish monolinguals, without experiencing a mediating bilingualism. This assumption is by all means questionable, but can be interpreted as the reluctance to speak the L1 until some proficiency in the L2 has been achieved, i.e. the stages of bilingualism are probably more abrupt than in other processes of second language learning. In any case, as a result, new and particular varieties of AS are emerging among groups.

When compared to Limeño Spanish, Andean Spanish presents differences at every grammatical level. Nevertheless, in this study, I will only focus in the morphosyntactic features which make this contact variety different from the standard used in Lima, where my research is conducted. The reason for this decision is that, as stated before, the focus of my study is not a description or analysis of Andean Spanish per se but a perception study on how certain features of Andean Spanish morphosyntax might index Andeanness. Thus I will only mention and describe those features that were part of my fieldwork research as representative of stigmatized Andean Spanish or *motoso/provinciano* speech. The excerpts containing the morphosyntactic features that I have utilized in my research were obtained from different sources: prior work with AS speakers, the fieldwork I
conducted with bilinguals from an Andean region in Peru, the features I have collected in the speech of comedians imitating Andean ‘accent’, and my own intuitions as a LS speaker. Furthermore, I will base my explanation of these features on the work of Zavala (1999), Escobar (2000), Rivarola (2000), Granda (2001), and Cerrón-Palomino (2003).

It is important to note that not all morphosyntactic features of Andean Spanish are perceived in the same way or have the same social meaning; thus I have only selected a sub-set of features that are usually associated with Andean migrants. For instance, *leísmo*, the use of indirect object pronouns (le, les) where direct object pronouns are the norm in Limeño Spanish, is claimed to be an AS feature that does not necessarily index *provinciano* speech (Caravedo, 1996; Klee and Caravedo, 2005). This claim is based on the fact that, because of a lack of stigma, it is being spread in Lima, specifically by New Limeños. Cerrón Palomino (1990) proposes a tentative hierarchy of Andean Spanish features according to their degree of stigmatization. According to him, features such as monophthongization of diphthongs, vowel variability, omission of articles, and lack of grammatical concord are the most salient. However, there are other features that might not be perceived by LS speakers as ‘incorrect’ or ‘provinciano’ and that are being integrated into the standard and are reshaping it unnoticeably, what Cerrón Palomino calls “the revenge of Quechua against diglossic discrimination” (1990: 169).

The following are the selected morphosyntactic features that appeared in the scripts that I used in the Matched-Guise tasks:

---

19 For a thorough definition of *provinciano*, see Chapter 3.
a) Frequent use of diminutives, even with adverbs and gerunds (although in LS and other non-Andean varieties they can only be attached to nouns and adjectives):

AS: *Vente corriend-ito* (Caravedo, 1996)

LS: *Vente corriendo*

EN: ‘Come here running/really fast’

b) Present perfect in grammatical contexts where Limeño Spanish would prefer preterite; some scholars associate this feature to evidential features of Quechua:

AS: *[Mi mamá y mi papá] han muerto cuando yo estuve chiquito* (Zavala 1999)

LS: *[Mi mamá y mi papá] murieron cuando yo estaba chiquito*

EN: ‘My mother and father died when I was little’

c) Lack of articles when mandatory in standard varieties:

AS: *[Ø] chompa viejita yo quisiera* (Goddenzi, 2005)

LS: *Quisiera una chompa viejita*

EN: ‘I would like an old sweater’

d) Double possessive marking:
e) Neutral “lo” (third person, singular) direct object (DO) pronoun for feminine and plural forms:

AS: *A mis hijas lo he quemado* (Zavala, 1999)
LS: He quemado a mis hijas/las he quemado
EN: ‘I have burnt my daughters’

f) DO clitic doubling as a means to anticipate the object:

AS: *Lo visité a mi papá* (Escobar, 2000)
LS: Visité a mi papá
EN: ‘I visited my dad’

g) SOV order\(^{20}\):

AS: *Unas cuantas palabras entiendo* (Escobar, 2000)
LS: *Entiendo unas cuantas palabras*\(^{21}\)

\(^{20}\) Examples of this features are also found in (b), (c) and (d)
h) Reflexive pronoun omission or insertion, in grammatical contexts when the opposite is mandatory in standard varieties:

LS: *A las cuatro de la mañana nos levantamos*
EN: ‘We wake/woke up at 4am’

i) Adverbial reduplication for pragmatic reasons such as emphasis:

AS: *Ahorita ahorita mi chiquitín* (Escobar, 2000)
LS: *Ahorita mi chiquitín*22
EN: ‘Right now, my baby’

j) Redundant locative marker through the use of the preposition *en* ‘in’. According to Goddenzi (1990) and Granda (2002), this characteristic corresponds to a calque of locative structures in Quechua. For example: *kay* ‘here’ + ‘-pi’ = *kaypi*.

---

21 However, most varieties of Spanish use the non-mandatory OV order for pragmatic reasons such as topicalization.

22 This kind of reduplication can also be a pragmatic strategy in other varieties of Spanish but it is not that frequent
AS: Están bailando en ahí (Goddenzi, 2005)

LS: Están bailando ahí

EN: ‘They are dancing right there’

2.4. Language and Place: Redefining Andean Spanish in the context of Lima

Johnstone (2010: 14) questions “the assumption that speech features that can be heard in a particular place are necessarily meaningful indexes of the place”. For the author, researchers need to carefully attend to the details of how a linguistic form gets attached to a particular social meaning in order to connect it or not with the place where this form is used. Along the same line, the bidirectional relationship between language and place also calls into question that linguists use the term ‘Andean Spanish’ in a way that, for people who are not familiar with the sociolinguistic situation in Peru’s capital, might seem to be a common label for the dialect. However, in reality, it is very unlikely to hear a person, either Limeño or provinciano, refer to the speech of an Andean migrant as a variety in its own right. In other words, the set of features that configure Andean Spanish are interpreted as incorrect Spanish. Therefore, AS speakers tend to be very self-conscious of the way they speak and try to ‘hide’ their Andean origin as best they can.

I claim that there is a disconnect between Andean Spanish as the variety portrayed in books and what Limeños and Andean migrants interpret as ‘incorrect’ or ‘provinciano’ Spanish with no formal label for the dialect. A plausible explanation is that this
disconnect is due to the extralinguistic factors such as race/ethnicity, level of education
and origin that are usually associated to the linguistic construct. In fact, Limeños, and
many of the AS speakers who participated in my research, are not even able to make the
distinction that researchers claim exists between Andean Spanish as a monolingual
variety and as an L2; for them, both are considered “motoso speech”\(^\text{23}\). Unfortunately,
this is not a unique case but somehow a common practice. The following quote extracted
from Pullum (1997)\(^\text{24}\) shows a very similar situation in the case of the unfairly discredited
African American English (AAE) in the United States:

“The general public seems unaware that AAE is regular, stable and governed by rules of
grammar and pronunciation that are as consistent as those of any other spoken language.
It differs strikingly from the standard dialect, but there is no more reason for calling it
bad standard English than there is for dismissing western dialects of English as bad
eastern speech, or the reverse. Yet AAE is constantly described as if it were English with
mistakes and omissions.”

Thus I believe that the traditional approach to Andean Spanish tends to be very simplistic
and, in many cases, does not represent non-linguists’ reality. For example, as I mentioned
in a previous section, there are features such as leísmo that researchers, but not common
people, include in the AS grammatical repertoire. On the other hand, there might be
features such as the assibilated /r/ that index Andeanness even though their frequency of

\(^{23}\) It would be interesting to investigate if this is the case with Andean Spanish speakers: if they can
differentiate the monolingual variety from the result of a case of SLA.

\(^{24}\) Extracted from a commentary which appeared in the magazine Nature, March 1997
use in Lima is not as high as expected because of its high stigmatization (Klee and Caravedo, 2005: 13). For this reason, I disagree with scholars who claim that there is discrimination against Andean Spanish and its speakers; the actual stigmatization is against provinciano speaking, a subset of AS. In this sense, Andean Spanish is defined by its contact with more prestigious varieties and with the place where it is spoken. As Goddenzi (2008: 47) states, it is important to pay attention to those linguistic and discoursive traits that show novel ways in which the city actors build their connections within the dynamics of social integration and division.

2.5. Conclusion

The present chapter is a necessary contextualization for the reader to understand the characteristics of my study. Therefore, I made sure to explain, first of all, some facts about Lima and the Andean migration that has taken place during the twentieth century. This migration, due to different factors, helped to re-shape Lima in a deep and irreversible way and, at the same time, the identities and interactions of Lima’s inhabitants. Among these interactions, language plays a central role, because it is one of the main mechanisms by which we recognize a person as ‘the other’. The contact between migrants and traditional Limeños has resulted in the contact, also, of Limeño Spanish and Andean Spanish. However, as I have explained in previous sections and throughout this study in general, this is not necessarily a grammatical analysis of these dialects but a perception study that relies on the attitudes and ideologies attached to them in the specific context of Lima. In other words, we cannot expect to find the same
attitudes towards Andean Spanish (both from Limeños and migrants) in any other place and this is why I want to address these issues taking into consideration the relations between language and place for the emergence of Andeanness or a provinciano identity.
3.1. Introduction

The present investigation is a perception study of the language attitudes and linguistic ideologies underlying Andeanness in Lima, i.e. Andean identity away from the Andes, from the perspectives of both Limeños and Andean migrants who live in the city. One of the most important contributions of my work is that it represents the first detailed study on this area. Scholars have addressed related topics such as Andean Spanish features, discrimination towards this variety, Andean migrants in Lima and Quechua-Spanish contact, etc. For example, Klee and Caravedo (2006) discuss the negative image that migrants have of their dialect due to Limeños’ discrimination. However, they are more focused in analyzing how different degrees of stigmatization of features affect their spread and acceptance when in contact with Limeño Spanish. Goddenzi (2008) has another interesting study which focuses on similar topics: he interviewed three different inhabitants of different neighborhoods in Lima in order to analyze both their linguistic and discursive features. Each of the three neighborhoods selected are typical areas where either traditional Limeños, Andean migrants or New Limeños live; in this way, the author wants to find out each participant’s perception of themselves within Lima.

Chapter 2 presented the sociolinguistic context in which this study takes place. Even though internal migration was a common practice since colonial times, the huge migration waves that started to take place during the 20th century have reshaped the city
in every possible way. This reshaping involved both the linguistic landscape and its social ecology. People from the Andes arrived in Lima looking for better opportunities and, among their baggage, brought their language. According to the sociologist and historian Nelson Manrique\textsuperscript{25}, the biggest population of Quechua speakers is located in Lima; however, it is extremely uncommon to hear this language being spoken because “Quechua continues to be strongly linked with the rural, uneducated and poor, while Spanish remains the primary language of national and international communication, literacy and education, and professional and economic success” (Hornberger and King, 2001). Because of stigmatization, migrants from the Andes who are bilinguals (not all of them speak Quechua or Aymara), reject speaking their indigenous language and only use Spanish for communicating. Nevertheless, the Spanish they speak has somehow inherited the same negative perceptions that Quechua has because it differs from the standard varieties. The consequences of this dialect contact situation require a complex analysis since Peruvian society is diverse, multilingual and multicultural, with a high degree of segregation and inequalities that date back to colonial times. Having in mind the complexity of the phenomenon under study, I have come up with a combination of interdisciplinary concepts to create an adequate theoretical framework in order to give an accurate account of the linguistic phenomenon I have investigated.

\textsuperscript{25} \url{http://www.larepublica.pe/columnistas/en-construccion/anatomia-de-un-pais-desconocido-10-01-2012}
3.2. Race and Racism: indios, cholos, serranos y campesinos

In Peru, as Young (1995) and De la Cadena (2000) state, race was culturally constructed and, significantly, culture was racially defined. In this same line, Golash-Boza (2010: 320) claims that “cultural frames were the primary means by which racial inequality was justified throughout the 20th century. Nelson Manrique (1999) argues that racism in Peru naturalizes the inequalities produced by the Conquest that persist to this day”. An unfortunate consequence of this definition of race is that it has led to the widespread belief among Peruvians that they are not racist, a belief that has been supported by the official discourses. De la Cadena (2000) believes that these exculpations of racism are embedded in a definition of race rhetorically silenced by the historical subordination of phenotype to culture as a marker of difference. In other words, Peruvians think their discriminatory practices are not racist because they do not connote innate biological differences, but cultural ones.

Therefore, it is common to hear phrases such as el que no tiene de Inga26 tiene de mandinga27, which roughly means that, in this country, those who don’t have some indigenous ancestors, have African ancestors, i.e. we are all mixed and that makes as equal. Another popular saying that represents this perception is todos somos cholos28; the idea that Peruvians are a homogeneous group of people racially, culturally, historically and economically. This idea arbitrarily erases differences among different groups of

---

26 Inca

27 An ethnic group from Western Africa

28 We are all “cholos”
Peruvians and hardly depicts the racist reality that does exist in the country, although most of the time it is hidden or disguised (Golash-Boza 2010: 317). Interestingly, whenever I have heard this phrase, it has been said by white people, the privileged group, who have never been treated like cholos and, for that reason, are completely ignorant of what it actually means to be discriminated against because of the way you look or how you speak. But Limeños do recognize racism as a societal problem, only with a restrictive definition and thus use different strategies to express their racist viewpoints, such as “claiming they are not racist because they have a multiracial family” or “insisting that propagating negative cultural stereotypes about blacks and Indians is not racist but a description of reality” (Golash, 2010: 318).

Every day and without hesitating, people assume as truth certain ideas that only respond to stereotypes. For example, it is very common to hear that you should be careful when trusting indigenous Andean people, since they seem to be shy and obedient but in the end they will stab you in the back. Another common stereotype is that women from the Amazon region are promiscuous a trait that is often explained in terms of the influence that the tropical climate has on them. Not surprisingly, these stereotypes not only involve race but also link it to the country’s geography. Peruvians would hardly question the belief that the country is geographically divided into three natural regions: the coast, the highlands (the Andes) and the jungle (Amazon). Moreover, people think that there is a correlation between these three regions and the characteristics of their inhabitants, although this idea has changed throughout time. According to the geographer Orlove (1993: 302),
colonial orderings emphasized historicized racial differences among persons within a relatively balanced and homogeneous space, while postcolonial orderings stressed naturalized regional differences among places within a homogeneous, though covertly racialized population.

Currently, as the previous citation says, Peruvians attribute covertly racialized characteristics to people from specific regions such as the Andes. And this situation becomes exacerbated when internal migration takes place and different populations have to coexist in the same place. The most typical direction of internal migration in Peru is from the Andes and Amazonia to coastal areas where there are more and better opportunities; among these destinations, Lima is by far the favorite and therefore is home for almost one-third of this country’s population.

Peruvians have different ways to name Andean people, but they for the most part derogatory terms. The first notion I will mention is indio, an old term that was coined when Spanish conquistadors arrived in America\textsuperscript{29} and ended up becoming a new (and inferior) category with social, economic and legal dimensions. These days it is used as a very strong insult maybe comparable to the word “nigger” in the United States, although its strength might vary according to the context of use. Quijano (1980) argues that cholos are people of indigenous descent who no longer have close ties to highland indigenous communities- indios who move to the city. However, at this point, it can also be used as

\textsuperscript{29} Christopher Columbus did not realize at the beginning that he had arrived to a new continent (America) because his intended destination was East Indies; this is the origin of the term ‘indio’ to refer to the indigenous population throughout the Americas.
an alternative for indio and it is also an insult in most contexts. Another very pejorative
term commonly used is *serrano*, which literally means ‘from the Sierra’ of ‘from the
Andean mountains’ but that has very negative connotations such as ignorant, dirty,
uneducated, etc. *Campesino* ‘peasant’ is the word most people use to refer to people from
the Andes and it is considered neutral; in 1968, indigenous people were renamed in this
way as part of the progressive Agrarian Reform policies (Firestone, 2012). However,
Radcliffe and Westwood (1996) do not consider it “neutral” and define it as “a
subordinate political-economic class identity with the ethnic referent removed” (38).
Finally, the expression *provinciano* refers, in a broad sense, to any person who was born
in the provinces as opposed to being born in the city. Nevertheless, it is generally inferred
that provincianos are of Andean origin. Therefore, when I use the term Andeanness, I am
alluding to a provinciano identity or group of identities and, within it, a provinciano way
of speaking that might resemble Andean Spanish but, as I will explain later, it is not
exactly the same.

3.3. Enregisterment, Indexicality and Social Meaning: Is Andean Spanish a Spanish
dialect?

Enregisterment is a concept from linguistic anthropology that I find useful for explaining
the concept of Andeanness and also my assumption that Andean Spanish is a construct
created by researchers, more than a dialect with which its speakers want to identify
themselves. Agha (2005) defines enregisterment as the process by which distinct forms of
speaking become socially recognized (or enregistered) as indexical of speaker traits by a population of language users. For example, when studying Copper Country English, Remlinger (2009) affirms that what makes a dialect a dialect is to link language, people, and place (134). Thus due to historical, economic and social factors, this variety of English spoken in Michigan’s Keweenaw Peninsula has become an index of local identity. To use Remlinger’s words, “the dialect features do exist, but the perception that they exist for ‘everyone up here,’ and as a unique and unified dialect, is a result of enregisterment”. This case contrasts starkly with the situation of Andean Spanish in Lima, since migrants have not developed a sense of identity through their dialect; on the contrary, instead of dialect pride they have Andean Spanish in Lima is perceived just as an incorrect way of speaking.

In Lima, it will not be an easy task to find a person, other than a linguist or some other social sciences researcher, who would use the term Andean Spanish to refer to the group of linguistic traits used in Andean migrants’ speech. They do recognize many of these traits as used by the same group of people but, in their perception, the social meaning attached to them is not that of a regional variety. On the contrary, features such as the ones mentioned in the prior chapter (e.g. SOV order) are indexes of negative characteristics such as uneducated, ugly or indigenous. According to Silverstein (2003), there are different orders of indexicality by which speakers associate linguistic features with certain social categories in ascending levels of awareness. The first order relates a linguistic form to a social meaningful category like gender or age; the second-order is associated to a metapragmatic level where people are conscious of the association
between certain language features (the index) and related cultural values; lastly, the third-order indexicality corresponds to the assignment of additional social meanings to subsets of the indexed features. For this study, I am interested in second-order indexicality, a metapragmatic level where people associate language traits with cultural values, because “the second level is where indexical processes emerge as ideologies” (Milroy, 2004).

Along this line, I want to analyze the perceptions of Lima’s inhabitants, both traditional Limeños and Andean migrants, so that I can explain why there is no such a thing as “Andean Spanish” but a group of contact features with certain social meanings attached to them.

Eckert (2008) distinguishes two aspects of social meaning: the meaning that the speaker wants to convey through the choice of a particular style; and the meaning assigned to the speaker's choices by her/his interlocutor. I am interested in the second aspect because mine is a study of the perception of speakers’ choices. The author claims that listeners interpret different nuances of meaning, depending on the perspective they take, and each particular situation. Furthermore, both Eckert and Silverstein make it clear that such perceptions are closely bound up with a person's or community's ideology of language. For example, as Eckert claims when talking about the different meanings of postvocalic (r), the meaning of linguistic features varies according to the shared ideology of the community in which they are being used.

The role of perception is central when talking about language/dialect contact situations due to migration, especially in the case of the first migrating generations. When this
contact takes place in an environment of social conflict, it has repercussions for perception because there is an inequality between varieties, as is the case between Andean Spanish and Limeño Spanish. Caravedo (2010) proposes two different points of reference for new migrants in the city: analytic and synthetic perception. Analytic perception consists of identifying isolated features present in the target variety (e.g. the palatal lateral of Andean Spanish), while synthetic perception consists of recognizing a variety in a ‘general’ way; the speaker will perceive, even in a vague or imprecise way, characteristics that will be recognized as part of a certain dialect. Since every generalization is a consequence of analysis, synthetic perception presupposes the previous identification of some features through analytical perception, so that we can say that it is the former type of perception which determines the identification of a variety as a block.

The analytical perception concept is an accurate way of explaining how Andean Spanish is perceived as a representation of Andean identity, even though AS is not considered an actual variety but an incorrect Spanish spoken by people with a very specific profile. Caravedo agrees with many other researchers (Silverstein 1992, Le Page/Tabouret-Keller 1985, Eckert 1999, Milroy 2004, Ploog/Reich 2005) on that there are certain linguistic features that are associated with specific groups, the socio-indexical features.

3.4. Language Attitudes and Linguistic Ideologies: About (In)Correctness and Dialect Awareness
According to Milroy (2004: 161), language attitudes are “manifestations of locally constructed language ideologies”, that is to say that language attitudes are in a sense particular manifestations of language ideologies. I find this definition adequate because it shows the link between language attitudes and linguistic ideologies, two terms that are sometimes dissociated because of the different theoretical frameworks in which they are embedded: the study of language attitudes started in the field of social psychology and linguistic ideologies have been analyzed by linguistic anthropologists such as Kroskrity (2004). In fact, the combination of both is the best way I have found to outline Andeanness in Lima, as I explain in the following paragraphs.

A simple way to define language attitudes is as the reactions, beliefs, or values that people have about language and language use. Speakers and listeners have a host of attitudes that range from positive to negative, although they may “not always be simply positive or negative, but may subsume both positivity and negativity” (Haddock and Maio, 2004). Attitudes models, based on Plato, are generally held to have three components: affect (feelings towards an object, person or situation), cognition (thoughts and beliefs) and behavior (reactions) (Hernández-Campoy, 2004). As a result of the combination of these components, attitudes are fluid and even sometimes contradictory.

The field of social psychology has explored attitudes in depth, trying to develop a better understanding of the mental processes that are involved in human interaction, including language. Language attitudes have also been studied by those branches of sociolinguistics that focus on the structure of language and its relationship to social constructs and processes, such as language contact variationism, perceptual dialectology or discourse
analysis. According to Campbell-Kibler (2006), “although these two threads of research have slightly different perspectives, they share a great deal of common interest”. I have selected the concept of language attitudes, then, because it can be applied to the phenomena of dialect contact addressed in this dissertation. I am interested in understanding the coexistence of difference (rural vs. urban, indigenous vs. white, uneducated vs. educated, etc.) in the specific location of Lima and what language attitudes have developed due to the interaction of LS speakers and AS speakers.

We can find some examples of language attitudes towards Andean migrants in Lima in Klee and Caravedo’s (2006) article, “Andean Spanish and the Spanish of Lima”:

Andean groups exhibit distinguishing sociocultural and linguistic characteristics that receive subjective negative evaluation from native inhabitants of Lima, or Limeños. Specifically, they often speak Quechua or Aymara as a mother tongue and have learned Spanish as a second language, frequently without systematic instruction and often in adulthood. In addition, Andean migrants have a minimal level of schooling, and some have had no formal instruction and arrive in Lima in conditions of extreme poverty.

Interestingly, the authors seem to be reproducing the same attitudes and ideologies that lead to the stigmatization that Andean Spanish speakers suffer every day. In my opinion, their perspective is biased and it depicts only a group of Andean migrants. Not all Andean Spanish speakers who arrive in Lima are extremely poor or uneducated. People in the Andes can have a higher level of education too, just as in Lima, or they can be rich, and many of them do not speak an indigenous language. It is true that these cases are not as frequent, but I believe that researchers should be careful in order to avoid adopting as
their own the attitudes that pertain to the other groups they study or, in any case, make sure to describe our positionality\textsuperscript{30} in the study; Andean migrants are not one single and homogeneous group. Furthermore, we cannot ignore all the social and economic changes that the Peruvian capital is going through due to internal migration and the so called “emerging classes”.

On the other hand, linguistic ideologies can be described as the perceptions held by people about language and, more importantly, how those perceptions are projected onto speakers. In this way, it is not hard to find similarities between this theory and the language attitudes framework explained above. Irvine (1989) defines a language ideology as "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests". I do not entirely agree with this definition because it suggests that ideologies are shared culturally determined communal beliefs, while attitudes are more individual in nature and, as I stated before, I am more comfortable affirming that language attitudes one particular worldview of particular individuals in a particular context. An alternative is to understand language ideologies as "ingrained, unquestioned beliefs about the way the world is, the way it should be, and the way it has to be with respect to language"(Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 2006).

Due to the fact that linguistic ideologies are perceived as natural, they tend to be considered as unquestionable truths (Schieffelin,Woolard & Kroskrity 1998). In general

\footnote{A concept of cultural anthropology, which refers to one’s own social position in relation to the group under study. “There is no gaze that is not positioned (Irvine and Gal, 2000)”. For example, it is important to specify the fact that I am Limeña and that I speak Limeño Spanish.}
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terms, ideologies refer to relevant aspects of a group or a characteristic that makes it different from the others (Van Djik 2003). Furthermore, they belong to the social and collective memory of that group (Kroskrity 2004, Van Dijk 2003); thus, within any society, there are often ideologies in conflict (de los Heros 2007, 2008).

My interest in the notions of language attitudes and linguistic ideologies for addressing my research topic can be explained by the relationship that exists between linguistic ideologies and ontology (Howard, 2007). According to Howard (2007), the study of linguistic ideologies enlightens us about the role of language in ontology, in who we are. She claims that language is not a neutral communicative code, but a means to express our feelings uniquely linked to our sense of self. To recognize this emotional characteristic of language helps us to also recognize the ways in which linguistic matters are sensitive for language users. For example, this is the case of Andean migrants in Lima, who suffer discrimination because of the way they speak. As De los Heros (1999) claims, Limeños tend to consider AS as incorrect or inferior Spanish.

Rosaleen Howard (2007), when talking about linguistic ideologies in the Andes, claims that even though one can observe a hybrid culture in this area, the discourse about identity tends to be dichotomous. For instance, my informants from Andean origin would differentiate between an Ayacuchano person and a Cajamarquino\(^{31}\) in terms of race, beauty, and dialect, among others. Therefore, we cannot conceive Andean migrants as one homogeneous group nor can we think of Andean Spanish as a uniform variety shared throughout the Andes. The Andean Spanish- Limeño Spanish and Limeños-Provincianos

---

\(^{31}\) Ayacucho and Cajamarca are two different departments in the Andes
oppositions I refer to in this text are a mere investigative tool but, by no means, an exact description of Lima’s reality because both language and identity, are in reality much more complex and fluid, and should be understood as continua, not as well-defined entities. Therefore, I propose the term Andeanness as a group of linguistic features that index provinciano identity - a sub-group of what researchers call Andean Spanish. We can find an example of the dichotomy Howard refers to in Mick’s (2011) article about domestic workers\textsuperscript{32} in Lima, where participants use words such as acá ‘here’ vs. allá ‘there’ to represent the opposition between Lima (here) and the Andean provinces (there). My recordings present the same kind of oppositions, as if it didn’t matter how much effort you make to belong here, you will always be considered an outsider. According to Mick (2011), this transposition of spatial categorization into a social one can be explained by the semiotic process of ‘erasure’ (Irvine, 2001), a discursive simplification which reduces the complex sociolinguistic situation of ‘Peru’s capital to a binary opposition (Mick, 2011: 192).

Besides erasure, Irvine and Gal (2000) mention two other semiotic processes by means of which people construct ideological representations of linguistic differences: ‘iconization’ and ‘fractal recursivity’. Iconization is one of the possible connections between language and sociopolitical meaning: it is the ideological representation of a given linguistic feature or variety as formally congruent with the group with which it is associated. This process entails the attribution of cause and immediate necessity to a connection that may be only historical, contingent or conventional. By picking out qualities supposedly shared

\textsuperscript{32} Domestic workers in Lima are usually girls of Andean origin, but not necessarily.
by the social and the linguistic image, the ideological representation (itself a sign) binds them together in a linkage that appears to be inherent.

On the other hand, fractal recursivity is the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level. Thus the dichotomizing and partitioning process that was involved in some understood opposition (between groups or linguistic varieties, for example) recurs at other levels, creating either subcategories on each side of a contrast or supercategories that include both sides but oppose them to something else.

For instance, we can affirm that there is an opposition between Andean migrants and New Limeños (following generations of migrants); this contrast, nevertheless, recurs when we put together Andean migrants and New Limeños in opposition to classic Limeños. But the oppositions don’t define fixed or stable social groups, and the mimesis they suggest cannot be more than partial. Rather, they provide actors with the discursive or cultural resources to claim and thus attempt to create shifting ‘communities’, identities, selves, and roles. These concepts are especially of use to describe Lima’s reality.

According to Mick (2011: 192), we can see recursivity, when “the local and linguistic borders the domestic workers [or any Andean migrant] establish are also equated with ethnic or physical ones” such as white or mestiza for the here and chola or indía for the there.”

Within the framework of language attitudes and linguistic ideologies, I want to discuss two concepts that are central in this study: dialect awareness and linguistic correctness. Yiakoumetti et al (2005) conducted research in Cyprus, where Greek Cypriots are bidialectal: they speak the Cypriot Dialect (CD) and Standard Modern Greek (SMG). As
expected, the standard is spoken in public (more prestigious) domains while CD is
spoken in private domains and is usually their mother tongue. The latter is not officially
recognized at school and, as a consequence, the standard is the only variety used in
formal learning, and Cypriots are treated as if they were monolinguals. This situation,
which affects speakers’ attitudes and performance in the standard variety, is similar in
many ways to the one that takes place in Lima, between Limeño Spanish, the prestigious
variety, and Andean Spanish. The coexistence of these two seems to be patent only for
linguists and other researchers. In practical terms, however, Andean Spanish is not
recognized as a dialect, not even by its speakers. It is as if it did not exist other than as a
group of disconnected marked features in opposition to the standard (unmarked) features
of Limeño Spanish. These features are not perceived as constitutive pieces of a certain
variety but as manifestations of an incorrect usage of Spanish due to lack of proficiency
(Limeños generally assume that provincianos always speak either Quechua or Aymara
and thus they don’t speak ‘good’ Spanish, which is not true for all cases) or lack of
proper education. Here, linguistic correctness is associated with the prestige and status
that are usually attributed to standards.
One of the main claims of this work is that Andean Spanish only exists as a theoretical
construct for language researchers, not as a systematic regional dialect validated as so by
its speakers and Limeños. Although when exactly it was that Andean Spanish became a
monolingual variety is still arguable, there is no doubt about the existence of a set of
grammatical features that have emerged as a product of contact between Spanish and
Andean languages. But what makes a dialect a dialect? Through a semiotic process of
erasure (Irvine and Gal, 2000), explained in the following sections, Andean Spanish has only been defined in opposition to Limeño Spanish, the unmarked dialect. Therefore, I prefer to use the concept of ‘provinciano speech’, a sub-set of Andean Spanish features that index Andeanness in a non-Andean context.

3.5. Motoseo: Andean Spanish as a synonym of incorrect Spanish

There are different hypotheses on the origins of the term mote and the related terms motoso, motosear, motear and motosidad. Some attribute it to the Quechua word mutti ‘cooked kerneled corn’, typical dish among Andean peasants that, by extension, was applied to the way they speak. Other specialists like Cerrón Palomino (1975) believe that it derives from Vulgar Latin muttum ‘grunt’ and the Real Academia de la Lengua Española links it to medieval French mot ‘word’. In any case, the first time the word “motoso” was mentioned was in 1932, in the work of Pedro Benvenutto Murrieta, who also gives a linguistic definition of this concept and its main characteristics (such as the change of syllable stress in Spanish words) later in 1936 (Arrizabalaga, 2006). Since then, the term has been used by many as a pejorative synonym for Andean Spanish.

Motoseo or motosidad is a phenomenon closely related to perceptions of Andean Spanish and its speakers. According to Cerrón-Palomino (2003), the concept of motoseo/motosidad in Peru refers to every kind of influence, direct or indirect, that Quechua or Aymara have on the Spanish of Quechua/Aymara-Spanish bilinguals. However, this term
has a narrow and a broad meaning depending on its sociolinguistic impact. The narrow sense is exclusively related to the phenomenon of “neutralization” of mid vowels with high vowels (/e/ and /o/ are realized as [i] and [u], and vice versa, as hypercorrection), but I am more interested in the broad interpretation because I have worked with perceptions of morphosyntactic features, not phonetic ones.

Cerrón-Palomino (2003) also claims that the features that are attributable to AS depend on the degree of metalinguistic awareness of the phenomenon: these traits can become stereotypes (of an incorrect Spanish spoken by bilinguals) or they can be confused with local manifestations of Spanish, especially Andean Spanish. Since the seventies (Cerrón-Palomino 1972; 1976; 1981; 1990), has discussed the deep sociolinguistic connotation of motoseo as a mechanism of oppression and offered a historical account of how the phenomenon has been satirized since the seventeenth century. Many other researchers from different disciplines have also commented on this phenomenon and have acknowledged its ideological weight (Escobar, 1978; Hornberger, 1988; Godenzzi, 1992; Zavala, 1999; Howard, 2007; among others). They have used this term but from a scientific perspective to describe a contact phenomenon and its stigmatization. According to Arrizabalaga (2006), ‘motosidad’ is associated with a variety of Spanish that is highly influenced by Quechua, although the degree of interference (and intelligibility) varies according to different sociocultural factors”. This is a clear example of how a language contact phenomenon and the complex social meaning attached to it are mistakenly blended together and confused. Motoseo is not necessarily associated with the Spanish spoken as the L2 of Quechua speakers but also with an L1 variety of Spanish since both
are usually not recognized as different. In other words, this concept refers to the negative perception of certain features that index provinciano, not to the features themselves.

Although Arrizabalaga (2006) argues for the vitality of the term “mote” in Peru, I have found that, at least in Lima where I have conducted my research, many participants were not sure about its meaning or had never used it. I believe that it was the second generation of Andean migrants who were the most familiar with the word, and I dare to say that it has to do with their willingness to distance themselves from their Andean origins by distinguishing themselves from the first generations or recién bajados. In any case, when this concept is used, people refer to the way provincianos speak with expressions such as tiene su mote (‘this person has mote’) or habla con mote/ habla motoso (‘this person speaks with mote/ in a motoso way’). I have discussed this concept and related topics in the fourth chapter, specifically in the follow-up questions of the second phase of my fieldwork.

Zavala (2011), for instance, conducted research on “the ideological agenda of the racialized verbal hygiene practice based on motoseo in two universities of the Southern Peruvian Andes”. She looks at how students have internalized the ideology and negative perception associated with the phenomenon, and constantly discipline themselves to control it when speaking. Motoseo is linked to racial, ethnic and social categories, and thus serves to legitimize the discrimination toward students who come from rural areas. Although Zavala focuses on motoseo in urban areas of the Andes, I believe that the situation that takes place in Lima is very similar, since in both cases there is an indexical

33 “Fresh from the boat”
process that produces a link between linguistic characteristics and a social group, an essentialist approach that legitimizes discrimination and validates inequality between Limeños and Andean migrants as well as between Andean people from urban and rural areas. Moreover, in Cuzco and Ayacucho, as well as in Lima, motoseo “is a central aspect in the classification system that serves to differentiate members of these societies hierchically”.

What makes motoseo such an interesting concept is that it is not only an analytical category but also an empirical one because it is used in Lima’s everyday life to refer to certain linguistic traits and their users. When one says somebody speaks “motoso”, in some way this person is recognizing the grammatical features the speaker uses as an index of Andeanness: he/she attributes social meaning to that particular trait. And even though they are AS features, they acquire a social meaning which helps to shape migrants’ identity in the city, both from their own perspective (in the interaction) as well as from Limeños’ perspective. However, as I explain in the fifth chapter, it was a surprise to find out that the term was not familiar to all the participants and, if so, many of them claim not to use it or have heard it but didn’t know exactly what it meant.

3.6. Andeanness: Andean Identity in Lima

I propose that certain AS features (not all of them and not all in the same way) can work as linguistic indexes of Andeanness. And with the term Andeanness, I refer to the group
of linguistic and non-linguistic features which contribute to shape the identity of AS speakers in Lima; an identity that is not fixed but in constant change due to the daily interactions between Limeños and Andean migrants in the city, specifically through language. This definition goes in line with the one proposed by Bucholtz and Hall (2004), who define identity as the variety of culturally specific subjective positions that speakers enact through language. They discuss the concept of ‘markedness’ (non-normative categories) as a better way to talk about identity than the traditional concepts of sameness and difference, since it allows linguistic anthropologists to explain the hierarchy of similarities and differences in social contexts.

Although identity has been implicit in many studies, Bucholtz and Hall (2004) highlight the need to address this topic overtly, to clarify its analytic value and to fully theorize it as a concept. The problem with understanding identity as ‘sameness’ is that it is very difficult for an outside observer to determine when a group of people should be classified as alike and on what grounds that should be done, and this is a problem that even anthropologists that try to study their own communities should face. The concept of ‘alterity’ also plays an important role in defining identity, since we usually define ourselves in opposition to the other. It is interesting to see how heterogeneity in societies, rather than homogeneity, shows the most vigorous formation of socially significant identities due to the fact that when a group is homogeneous, its members cannot outline their identity based on what they are not, what they see in the others as different. This is because in many ways homogeneity implies the erasing of crucial differences in identity and this might be a sign of intolerance; in other words, the sameness found in
homogeneous groups can be artificially created in society, so that the other does not exist and is not valued. In Lima, the case of Andean Spanish would be an example of erasure, since it is perceived as an incorrect Spanish, a marked group of features in opposition to Limeño Spanish, the prestigious variety. Thus, for Limeños, speakers of Andean Spanish constitute the Other, defined as those who cannot speak correctly, i.e. like them. Bucholtz and Hall (2004) understand the concept of markedness as the process whereby some social categories gain a special, default status that contrasts with the identities of other groups, which are usually highly recognizable. This concept can be related to the abovementioned process of erasure in the sense that, being Limeño Spanish the unmarked dialect, any grammatical feature that is marked will not be conceived as a different dialect but as non-Limeño Spanish. The term ‘erasure’ is also used by Irvine and Gal (2000) and Irvine (2001): “When one category is elevated as an unmarked norm, its power is more pervasive because it is masked”. In Lima, for example, the prestigious variety is masked as the right way to speak and, therefore, Andean Spanish is not even considered a variety of its own but a deviant Spanish spoken by poor, uneducated, indigenous people who come from rural areas. For Bucholtz and Hall (2004), this view does not take into consideration that ‘deviant’ speakers are showing a resistance against the norm to challenge the impositions of what is considered ‘correct’ and to defend their own identity through their agency. However, I believe that it is hard for Andean migrants to show resistance, to show their agency in terms of the Spanish they speak because, to some extent, they reproduce the negative attitudes that Limeños have against the way they speak. In Zavala’s (2011) article, as well as in my recordings, we find that speakers
with mote are convinced that the problem is situated within themselves. This is the case of Alberto, a gardener from Central Andes, who explained how people like him, provincianos, don’t speak well when they arrive in Lima; therefore, in order to help his children overcome this ‘problem’, he had registered them in a private school, so that they can have access to a better education and, in that way, they would not sound like him. Furthermore, now they could help him because every time Alberto made a mistake, his daughter would tell him how to speak correctly.

Later in the article, the authors critique previous linguistic anthropology research because of the extended use of essentialism as a theoretical position to define identity: individuals that identify themselves with a certain group are similar to one another and separated from members of other groups. This definition of identity entails the assumption that identities are pre-existent attributes that people embrace passively. On the contrary, Bucholtz and Hall suggest a more agentive perspective; language should be interpreted as social semiotic action, because speakers may choose to engage in certain activities or to affiliate with social groupings when they speak on a certain way. Ambadiang et al (2009) also discuss agency in language, in terms of how much agency is possible in the creation of identity through linguistic traits; in other words, how conscious a speaker is when ‘selecting’ the use of a feature and rejecting another one.

According to Ambadiang et al (2009), many times, what speakers describe as a certain linguistic behavior coincides with what she/he actually does but sometimes she/he says she/he does things she/he does not do and vice versa. Thus it is hard to talk about agency
when the selection of some feature when speaking is not necessarily a conscious choice. This situation happens to be true in my study: I have noticed that when my informants of Andean origin express their attitudes towards Andean Spanish, they try to distance themselves from the stigmatized features even when they simultaneously recognize that they use them ‘sometimes’. Their negative value judgments inevitably made me think that they were telling me they did not produce those features, when what they were actually doing was just stating the incorrectness of a particular morphosyntactic feature. The questions that remained after this realization were: How come one can believe that certain feature is incorrect and still use it? Is it a form of subversion, a conscious decision when using a ‘neutral lo’ instead of the standard gender and number agreement? Are they using their agency in order to (re)create a certain identity in interaction? Andean migrants differentiate, though probably in different degrees, grammatical features found in their dialects from the ones found in Limeño Spanish. Therefore, I believe that agency for them consists of avoiding Andean Spanish features in order to sound (more) Limeños, to be accepted in the context of Lima. This has been my conclusion after conducting research and conversing with Andean migrants: they exercise their agency by trying to eradicate all those linguistic traits that give away their Andeanness.

Many provincianos think that to speak clearly or to express oneself adequately are inherent characteristics of Limeño Spanish and, thus, clear speech does not belong to them. As a consequence, it seems that they have assumed that they do not have a right to speak or to give an opinion since they feel in an inferior position. A somehow
‘schizophrenic’ discourse emerges when they accept their Andean/provinciano origin and, at the same time, distance themselves from their (linguistic) identity. Limeños feel comfortable discriminating against others because it works as a gatekeeping mechanism for them when confronted with the newcomers; the dilemma of provincianos, then, is that they have to embrace and reproduce that discrimination in an attempt to distance themselves from their own identity, their Andeannes; in an attempt to be considered Limeños.

3.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the theoretical framework and relevant literature for my perception study. The principal focus of this discussion has been to explain the different concepts and theories that I have found useful to answer my research questions. First, I briefly describe how Peruvians understand race and racism today, and I give a definition of some relevant discriminatory terms related to Andean migrants. Second, I explain the concepts of enregisterment, indexicality and social meaning, and how are they connected among them, as well as with some of my inquiries. Third, I discuss the concepts of dialect awareness and linguistic correctness, embedded in the theories of language attitudes and linguistic ideologies. In the following section, I explain what ‘motoseo’ is and how this concept has been mistakenly used as a synonym of Andean Spanish. Finally, I discuss my ideas on Andeanness or provinciano identity.
CHAPTER 4: Methodology: Design and description of both studies

4.1. Introduction

This dissertation, in contrast to much of the work that has been done in the past about Andean Spanish (AS) speakers and Quechua-Spanish bilinguals, has its focus in perception instead of production, which is one of its main contributions. This is especially meaningful because participants/listeners include not only speakers of Limeño Spanish (LS), the most prestigious variety spoken in Lima, but also AS speakers, both monolinguals and Quechua-Spanish bilinguals. Strand and Johnson (1996) and Niedzielski (1999) have demonstrated that speech perception does not depend only on physical factors, but also on listeners’ expectations based on sociological factors only indirectly related to language (Thomas, 2002). “Perception, in this sense, is the filter through which sensory data are strained, and it is obvious that the establishment and maintenance of this filter are culturally specific and—within social groupings—individualized to a greater or lesser extent” (Edwards, 1999).

When compared to production, perception studies have been neglected for a long time by most linguistic fields, except for experimental phonetics (Thomas, 2002) and, in some cases, sociolinguistics. However, it is currently acquiring more and more importance due to the findings of social psychologists, who have been working on perception studies in
order to address the complexity of attitudes and obtain a better understanding of the mental processes involved in human interactions. According to Campbell-Kibler (2006), “understanding the structure of sociolinguistic variation requires understanding what information it conveys to listeners and how. Variation not only correlates with social structures but carries social meaning, influencing listener perceptions and, through them, social structures”. This is clearly the case of Peru’s capital, a city which grows unstoppably, mostly due to internal migration from the Andes. Lima’s society is stratified in various ways, and “power and status are often able to translate social difference into social deficiency” (Edwards, 1999). As in other situations, such social inequalities are reinforced by or reflected in ideologies of language. Therefore, as I will show through the analysis of my collected data, when a participant listens to a given variety, this works as a trigger that evokes prejudices or stereotypes about the speech community in question, i.e. AS speakers: it evokes language attitudes and linguistic ideologies because it indexes that particular social meaning.

From the point of view of ‘social meaning’, a term coined by Silverstein (2003) later developed by Eckert (2008), meaning is not only what the speaker wants to convey through the choice of a particular style (linguistic features), but also the meaning assigned to the speaker’s stylistic choices by his/her interlocutor. In other words, speakers project and listeners interpret a specific social meaning determined by the perspective they take and the situation at hand. Throughout this dissertation, I show how this concept is relevant to my research in that I am investigating the perception of the social meaning of speakers' use of language. Moreover, both Eckert and Silverstein make it clear that
listeners’ perceptions are closely bound up with a person's or community's ideology of language. Eckert (2008), when talking about the various meanings of postvocalic (r), claims that the meaning of linguistic variants depends on the shared ideology of the community in which it is being evoked.

In sum, there is no doubt about the central role that perception studies should play not only in social psychology, a pioneer field in terms of perception and attitudes, but in different subfields of sociolinguistics. As I mentioned before, there is a lack of work on listeners’ perceptions, specifically in the topic that I am addressing in this dissertation: how the other, the Andean migrant, is perceived by Limeños through his/her dialect. In the following paragraphs, I will explain the different methods I used to explore the reactions and social consequences of listening, specifically, to certain AS morphosyntactic features used during field work.

4.2. Positionality: Who am I?

Positionality is a concept of cultural anthropology, which refers to one’s own social position in relation to the group under study. As (Irvine and Gal, 2000) state, “there is no gaze that is not positioned”. Therefore, I believe that it is important for my study to briefly address how my own identity has shaped my research. I am a 34-year-old limeña who speaks the prestige dialect of the area. I have had access to private education at a school for upper-middle class girls. I was raised Catholic, which is the predominant creed in the country. I attended (an also private) college at a very prestigious, and private,
university that was paid for by my parents so that I did not need to work, a situation that constitutes a luxury for the vast majority of Peruvians. These, among other characteristics, are part of my background and of who I am.

The first time I realized that I had belonged to a privileged group was after my arrival in the United States, where I came to pursue my doctoral degree. Not that I was not aware of the many social and economic problems of my country, of course, but I used to think of my favored situation as a consequence of luck and my parents’ hard work. This is somehow true too, but the inequalities that exist among Peruvians due to race, ethnicity, language, education, etc. clearly allowed me to access to opportunities that an Andean migrant, let’s say, would not even dream of. But it was only when I arrived in this country and people started to call me ‘Hispanic’, ‘Latino’, ‘woman of color’ or ‘brown’, that I realized that I had been a ‘white’ person back in Lima and, simultaneously, that I wasn’t anymore. In Peru, race is defined very differently than in this country. In my personal experience, more than an emphasis on what being white is and who is white, what really matters is who is not white; what De la Cadena (2000: 11) refers as ‘Peruvian colorlessness’.

During my fieldwork research, therefore, I needed to be especially careful in not only acknowledging my positionality but also accepting the fact that my own identity was going to shape the outcome of my study. The simple fact of carrying a recorder and asking questions put me in a position of power. Furthermore, in a perception study about attitudes towards a stigmatized variety that is somehow the opposite of the standard

---

34 Cf. the first section of Chapter 3, where this topic is elaborated in more depth.
variety, which I happen to speak, it was a hard task to make participants trust me enough to express their attitudes. For instance, when talking to Abel, a tailor from the Andean department of Cuzco, I found that whenever I asked him something about the correctness of an Andean Spanish feature, he would look at me and ask me how I would say it. Also, it was not uncommon to find participants laughing when finding a ‘mistake’ in a phrase and looking at me expecting to share that laugh; it gave me the impression that they wanted to distance themselves from ‘them’, the provincianos, and create an ‘us’ which included them and me. Some of them even asked me where was I from, as if I were a foreigner. I found this to be a little sad at the beginning, but then realized that being born in the same city or sharing the same spaces did not by any means make us equal, especially in a merciless social context society like Limeño society. Furthermore, part of my research was conducted in peripheral areas, where I did look foreign and, where it is not common to find ‘white’ people, especially a white person interested in what they had to say.

However, I consider that my personal background as Limeña has also given me great advantage for conducting this study. Living in Lima for most of my life has helped pin down many language attitudes and linguistic ideologies that I would have not been able to figure out as an outsider. Being an insider gives me an encompassing perspective on the different actors who participate in the city’s everyday life, interactions that many times entail Andean migrants, and makes me familiar with many details that, without a thorough observation can be missed or misunderstood; I believe that, to certain extent, it is as if I have been conducting ethnographic observation for years. Moreover, not having
lived in Lima for many years has contributed to my objectivity, especially since I came up with the topic of this dissertation.

4.3. Methodology

The central objective of this dissertation is to investigate the language attitudes and linguistic ideologies underlying the perceptions of Andean Spanish (AS) by Limeños and Andean migrants, in the context of Lima, Peru. For this purpose, I employed methodological tools such as the Matched-Guise Technique (MGT), and other fieldwork experiments, designed to measure speakers’ attitudes toward language differences. According to Campbell-Kibler (2006), “listener perceptions are perhaps most thoroughly studied within the covert study of language attitudes, using the Matched Guise Technique (MGT) developed by Lambert and his colleagues” (Lambert et al. 1965; Lambert 1967). This technique uses the perceptions of linguistic traits as a starting point for investigating covert attitudes toward different groups of people. These researchers believed that, since linguistic prejudice is many times more socially sanctioned than other forms, listeners would express their opinions more openly if the responses were triggered by linguistic performances.

Therefore, the main method I selected for collecting data, although slightly modified for this particular situation, was the MGT that motivates informants to compare speech samples and, consequently, elicit their attitudes and beliefs towards particular traits and also towards the people who use them. The researcher uses recordings created by the
same person speaking in different manners to investigate listeners’ perceptions regarding the categories of people commonly believed to speak in those ways (Campbell-Kibler, 2007). It has proven to be successful in identifying and eliciting stereotypes and attitudes toward particular sociolinguistic groups such as Appalachian people (Luhman, 1990) or, in this case, Andean migrants in Lima. Due to the characteristics of this test, I considered it the best option for the elicitation of informants’ perceptions and ideologies, and the measuring of attitudes: “The matched-guise technique offers scholars of language, particularly those who study language ideologies, a unique lens into those unconscious ideas that may not be apparent in interviews or participant observation” (Booth, 2009).

Also, as Kroskrity (2004: 505) states, “members may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies” and thus my research had to be able to gather evidence regarding these more or less unconscious ideas about language.

However, one of the issues of using exclusively the MGT is its artificial nature, since the researcher presents pre-recorded text rather than naturally occurring conversation. As Booth (2009) points out, “since the goal of the technique is to control for all variables (such as voice quality, topic, age, gender), a ‘pure’ test demands that each speaker read the same passage in each language” which is usually accomplished “by the researcher providing the text, ideally in consultation with a number of native speakers” (Booth 2009). As a consequence, this fact introduces a new variable while controlling another, because the speakers may be judged as performers of readings instead of actual speakers of the language (Fasold, 1984: 153). Therefore, Fasold suggests an alternative to scholars
to overcome this potential pitfall: to depart from a script structure, let speakers talk about a general topic such as weather.

When designing my study, I realized that this problem might arise, especially because I was dealing with different dialects of the same language, which makes it easier for participants to recognize that speakers are the same person than if different languages had been the case. Thus, in the first fieldwork stage, I chose a general topic which could be addressed by any inhabitant of Lima, and created four scripts based on internet opinion sites, as I will explain in the following section. The design of the second MGT was based on the findings obtained in the first study, thus it also has a somewhat different structure when compared to the most paradigmatic MGT tasks.

Just as important as the stimuli used in the tasks are the methods used to report and analyze participants’ answers. Following prior studies on language attitudes (Woolard, 1984; Ryan, Giles and Hewstone, 1988; Woolard and Gahng, 1990; Baker, 1992; Edwards, 1999; Yiakoumetti et al, 2005; Campbell-Kibler, 2006; Booth, 2009), I used the dimensions of status and solidarity, which are said to determine the condition of different linguistic varieties. Many language attitude studies have found a very useful measurement tool, the two dimensions along which listeners evaluate speech: one related to status, power and prestige, and the other linked to intra-group solidarity, equality and linguistic loyalty (Giles, Hewstone, Ryan & Johnson, 1988). Just to give an example, Giles (1971) studied the attitudes towards RP (Received Pronunciation) and regional
accents (South Welsh and Sommerset) in Great Britain utilizing the MGT for his experiment and measuring the participants’ attitudes with bipolar traits. These semantic scales, which helped Giles to conclude that RP had a higher score in terms of status and a lower one in terms of solidarity, would look like Tables 1 and 2 in an adapted version:

### Table 1. Speakers of RP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very intelligent (status dimension)</th>
<th>Not intelligent at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very honest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(solidarity dimension)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>…</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Speakers with regional accents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very intelligent (status dimension)</th>
<th>Not intelligent at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very honest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(solidarity dimension)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>…</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, based on the vertical axis of status and the horizontal axis of solidarity, I developed a set of evaluative scales, specifically semantic differential scales, which were developed by psychologist Charles Osgood and his associates to measure the meaning of concepts (Osgood, May, & Miron, 1957). The respondent is asked to rate an object or a concept, in
this case certain morphosyntactic features, along a series of bipolar scales defined with contrasting adjectives at each end.

Finally, I followed up the two different MGT tests with two different additional tasks, whose design depended on the nature of each of the MGT used. They will be explained in depth in the following sections, but they were usually follow-up questions regarding answers on the MGT, in order to corroborate if my subjects’ unconscious perceptions matched their conscious ones and, if not, what “explanations” they would come up with for those “mismatches”.

### 4.4. Preliminary survey

The Matched-Guise tasks that I elaborated in order to collect data for my dissertation went through a series of stages. My fieldwork research actually started with an informal survey in a southern district of Lima called San Juan de Miraflores\(^{35}\), an area where many Andean immigrants live. During the survey, the interviewer (a person from the neighborhood, not me) read the informants twelve sentences written in different varieties of Spanish including dialects from different countries. The ones written in Andean Spanish had only one distinctive feature each, which was a modification of the DO pronouns, such as pronoun elision or clitic doubling. After listening to each sentence, the participants had to answer two questions:

---

\(^{35}\) San Juan de Miraflores started as a shanty town in 1954, when many families from different areas informally moved to this arid area. It was officially established as a district in January 1965.
a) Is this a correct sentence? If your answer is “no”, how would you say it to make it sound correct?

b) Again, if your answer is “no”, do you think there are people who speak like that? How would you describe them?

What turned out to be the most interesting aspect was that the stereotypes I found were, in many cases, stated by AS speakers themselves. For example, Andean migrants considered AS features that they themselves used as a product of lack of education, or being *provincianos*[^36], a term which entails negative characteristics such as low-income, rural background, indigenous features, etc. This event triggered my curiosity as to how Andean Spanish is seen not only by LS speakers but also by people who speak the Andean variety of Spanish, which has become one of the central research questions; scholars tend to describe stereotypes and language discrimination from the perspective of those who discriminate but it is uncommon to study what stereotypes reside in the minds of those who suffer discrimination. I believe that a possible explanation for the lack of these kinds of studies is that, in general, linguists and other researchers often come from privileged situations and, therefore, feel more comfortable describing what they understand better. At least, this is the case in Peruvian society, where most scholars owe their education to their socioeconomic status and thus are the only ones with the means to pursue linguistic research in a poor country like Peru, since the government is not able to fund this type of investigation.

[^36]: “Provincial,” which is to say “from the Andes”
In any case, this preliminary survey functioned also as a source which provided me with most of the characteristics (adjectives) that I took into consideration when designing the Matched-Guise test. Although I based my design mostly on previous literature, it was very important to adjust the adjectives in the semantic scales to the particular phenomenon under study. For instance, the use of the opposition white-indigenous would have not made sense in a context where there is not indigenous population or, where the main contrast between groups takes place through, say, a white-black opposition.

4.5. Experiment I

4.5.1. MGT

This first study was originally designed to achieve two main goals. The first one was to find out the role of morphosyntax in the definition of Andean Spanish/identity: I wanted to test if the morphosyntactic component of grammar was as salient as phonology in terms of recognizing a person's speech as provinciano. The question rises from the fact that researchers interested in language attitudes towards Andean Spanish, and even ethnic humor performers, tend to focus their attention on phonological features as the most salient ones. Also, I wanted to find out if when compared to the highly salient phonological features of AS, morphosyntactic features were less salient in terms of stigmatization.

This first hypothesis, however, was contradicted by the study because, even though the participants recognized the selected morphosyntactic features as *provinciano* (Andean) when isolated, that didn't happen most of the times when the native speaker of LS would use them in her speech. In other words, it seems that when there are no other hints but language to determine somebody's (Andean) identity, morphology and syntax might not be enough to consider somebody as *provinciano* or indigenous. But perhaps, as Babel suggests\(^{38}\), this has to do with the fact that the phonology of the two women who read the scripts was their native phonology, while the AS morphosyntactic features were inserted in a somewhat arbitrary fashion. In any case, as Thomas (2002: 123) claims regarding studies on African American and European American English, “Taken together, these studies give the impression that, under certain circumstances, listeners are capable of accessing a wide variety of cues to determine whether a speaker is African American or European American. Nevertheless, it is not yet clear which ones listeners use in real-life situations or which ones are most important”.

The second goal of this first fieldwork was to collect language attitudes and linguistic ideologies linked to AS and migrants from the Andes. Using the MGT, the participants judged the speech samples they listened to in positive or negative ways. The main advantage of the use of a MGT task is that it ensures the researcher that participants are making their judgments only by what they hear, without any visual aids to help them determine if somebody is *provinciano* or even beautiful. Their answers, together with

\(^{38}\) Personal communication, [Fall 2012].
their recorded judgments of certain morphosyntactic features (they were asked about the "correctness" of certain phrases used in the speech samples they heard first) provided me with information about their linguistic ideologies on AS.

Each session with the participants was divided into three sections: first, after listening to each speech sample of the MGT, they had to fill in a table with the group of semantic differential scales. Second, I read the participants a list of phrases that I extracted from the AS scripts and asked them if they considered them correct or incorrect in order to get conscious grammatical judgments from them. If they considered them incorrect, they were asked to give an alternative sentence to express the same idea. Third, they had to answer a demographic survey with information such as age, gender, origin, level of education and occupation.

After designing the task, the next stage consisted of selecting the participants for my study: How many informants would I need and which characteristics should they have? I concluded that the best alternative was to interview a well balanced sample of participants based only on the following general criteria:

(i) age 18 or older

(ii) either born in Lima or living in the city for at least two years (to consider them actual immigrants, and not just visitors);

39 As I mentioned before, I was the one reading and completing each table to explain any potential misunderstanding and to ensure that I was obtaining the kind of information I was looking for.
(iii) other general characteristics: both sexes, different origins in Peru, different levels of education and various occupations.

Participants

Forty-nine people participated in my study. As I stated from the beginning, I wanted a variety of participants, as varied as the city where this study was conducted. The population interviewed had the following general characteristics:

- There were 21 women and 28 men.
- They were all adults (18 and older).
- Their ages ranged from 18 to 76 years old.
- There were 23 people born in Lima, and 26 born in other provinces
- All of them spoke Spanish, and 13 of them spoke Quechua with different degrees of proficiency, according to what they said.
- 11 were first-generation born in Lima and 2 were second-generation. I used this criterion even if only one of the parents was provinciano\(^{40}\).

Once my potential group of informants was defined, I made use of my personal contacts and social networks to recruit participants for my research. Fortunately, being a native of Lima facilitated this task for me. I started interviewing almost anybody who fit my general criteria of being adults and inhabitants of the city, so that they were immersed in

\(^{40}\) Even if only one parent was provinciano, I considered the child first-generation.
the dialect contact situation and, therefore, had an idea about certain linguistic attitudes. One of the strategies I followed in order to obtain more participants of Andean origin (since I am not of Andean origin) was to visit peripheral areas of the capital where Andean migrants tend to settle. I worked with informants of San Juan de Miraflores, since I had conducted research there before (the preliminary survey) and, moreover, I had contacts in that area who introduced me to their social networks.

First, based on randomly selected opinion sites from Lima, I came up with four brief scripts (less than a minute in length each) about car traffic in the city, a familiar topic to all the participants in one way or the other. The LS samples were only slightly modified from the originals found in the web sites, in order to create coherent paragraphs but I did manipulate the two other samples so that I could include some of the morphosyntactic features that are described in the second chapter, such as double-possesive marking (Mi casa de mí ‘My house of mine’) or DO doubling (Todos lo ven mi foto ‘Everybody it sees my picture’) and they could work as the AS counterparts. Unfortunately, it is uncommon to find the variety of AS features in the media, probably because of its negative perception, so I had to alter the scripts I found in order to introduce the (most stigmatized) morphosyntactic features that participants were going to evaluate. However, when these features were shown isolated, all the participants agreed that those were undoubtedly characteristics of a provinciano way of speaking.
Regarding the readers of the speech samples, at the beginning I thought it would be a good idea to have one person read them all, but I did not know anyone proficient enough in both dialects\(^\text{41}\), so that informants would not notice it was the same person. Therefore, I selected one speaker of Limeño Spanish and one Andean migrant from the Central Andes\(^\text{42}\) who spoke Andean Spanish. The gender of the readers was not important for my study, as long as they were both either women or men. About the Limeña, Teresa (T), she was a woman in her thirties, high-middle class school teacher with a degree in higher education. The woman from Apurímac, Elsa (E), was in her sixties and had arrived in the capital thirty-five years before; she worked as a domestic servant and had not finished primary school. Both of them had to read a fragment in Limeño Spanish (LLS, ALS) and one with Andean Spanish morphosyntactic features (LAS, AAS), as is shown in the following fragments (AS features are underlined):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a)] AS speech sample, read by an AS speaker (AAS)
  \begin{quote}
  Puro tráfico es Lima. Qué bonito sería Lima si tuviéramos subterráneos o si la gente tranquilita\(^\text{43}\) nomas\(^\text{44}\) esperara el micro, \textit{en allí} (1) en los paraderos y no en cualquier
  \end{quote}
\end{itemize}

\(^{41}\) I believe the person’s identity can be better hidden in the case of bilingual tasks, but at least in my experience with Limeño and Andean Spanish, there is not enough difference between the dialects and, as I stated above, it is hard to find a true bidialectal speaker who could reproduce all the characteristics of each dialect.

\(^{42}\) Abancay, Apurímac.

\(^{43}\) Diminutives are considered a very common feature of AS (to substitute certain affection suffixes) but in this case, there is overlapping in its use with LS and therefore it has not been underlined.

\(^{44}\) Discursive marker that tends to be considered an Andean feature but it is not exclusive to Andean countries
lado. Y combi no hacen más que empeorar las cosas. (2) Sus cobradores de la combi son lo peor y hasta maltratan a los que se suben al carro. Después también para cruzar las calles es un problema. Como un kilómetro hay que caminar también para cruzar. Lo hacen caminar a las personas mucho porque pocos puentes hay. A su mamá de mi esposo el otro día casi casiito casiito lo atropellan porque está viejita y no puede subir el puente.

(1) Sometimes, the preposition en ‘in’ precedes locative adverbs, a combination not allowed in SS

(2) Lack of article + Lack of subject-verb concord

(3) Possessive marker doubling

(4) DO clitic doubling + Neutral “lo”

(5) OV order

(6) Possessive marker doubling + Use of diminutives with adverbs, not allowed in LS + Neutral “lo”

‘Lima is nothing but traffic. Lima would be so beautiful if we had subways or if people calmly waited for the bus at the bus stops instead of anywhere they please. And combis just make things worse. The ‘cobradores’ of the ‘combi’ are the worst and they’ll even mistreat their customers. And then crossing the street is also a problem. You have to walk about a kilometer to cross. They make people walk a lot because there aren’t very many bridges. My husband’s mother was almost hit by a car the other day because she is elderly and she can’t climb the stairs on the bridge.’
b) LS speech sample read by an AS speaker (ALS)

Cuando pienso en algo que no funciona en el Perú pienso en el tráfico. Pucha, es terrible, especialmente el de Lima. La verdad es que estoy harta de la bulla de las bocinas, del humo que botan los autos y de las peleas entre los choferes de las combis. Llegar a mi trabajo antes me tomaba más o menos 35 minutos. Ahora eso me parece un sueño, y me siento la más suertuda si es que llego en menos de una hora. Creo que el problema no solo es de los choferes de las combis sino también del peatón que la para donde sea y se sube como sea y obvio también del poco planeamiento de la ciudad.

‘When I think of something that doesn’t work in Peru, I think of the traffic. Geez, it’s terrible, especially in Lima. The truth is that I am sick of the noise from the car horns, the smoke from the cars and the arguments between ‘combi’ drivers. Getting to work used to take me about 35 minutes. These days, that sounds like a dream, and I feel very lucky if I manage to get there in less than an hour. I think that the problem isn’t only the combi drivers, but also the pedestrians who stop the combis wherever they want and get on however they want, and of course the lack of city planning doesn’t help either.’

c) AS speech sample read by a LS speaker (LAS)

Cada vez que mi carro de mí (1) voy manejando, miedo me entra (2) porque todas las combis cruzándome nomás paran. Salvajes son los combistas, esos no creen en nada y lo asustan a la gente (3) que va tranquilo manejando. Otro también son los taxis. El otro día he querido cruzar la pista (4) en una esquina, pero todita una fila estaba ahí parada...
esperando clientes y no me han dejado pasar. Ahí yo he amargado y malas palabras diciendo (5) me he tenido que ir a la otra esquina para cruzar. Y pura bulla nomás hacen, toca y toca la bocina y lo molestan a las personas (6) que solo quieren llegar a sus casas de ellos (7) a descansar.

(1) Possessive marker doubling + OV order
(2) OV order, when not needed in standard varieties
(3) Neutral “lo” (lack of agreement with the referred object) + DO clitic doubling
(4) Use of present perfect instead of the standard preterite
(5) Use of present perfect instead of the standard preterite + lack of mandatory DO/Reflexive pronoun
(6) DO clitic doubling
(7) Possessive marking doubling

‘Every time that I drive my car, I get scared because all of the ‘combis’ cut me off. The combi drivers are crazy, they don’t believe in anything and scare people who are just driving along. Taxi drivers, too. The other day I wanted to cross the street at the corner, but there was a row of taxis stopped there waiting for clients and they wouldn’t let me through. So I got mad, and cursing, I had to go to another corner to cross. And they were making so much noise, honking and honking their horns, bothering people that just wanted to get to their homes to rest.’

d) LS speech simple read by a LS speaker (LLS)
Creo que debe haber alguna manera de hacer cambiar la actitud de aquellos choferes bestias, las tías malcriadas que llevan a nuestros hijos, o los chibolos que les apuesta la vida cuando manejan… Por ejemplo, se me ocurre, así como en los supermercados, poner fotos de los "indeseables". Que sientan vergüenza, que sientan que están siendo observados y que si hacen algo mal van a salir en el periódico. Usemos las cámaras de seguridad para algo más…Tengo una foto de un tipo que invade el carril contrario en la salida de Alipio Ponce en Chorrillos…¡¡¡¡y eso es normal !!! Publiquemos las fotos de las bestias para que tengan vergüenza.

‘I believe that there must be a way to change the stupid chauffeurs’ attitude, the rude women who transport our kids to school, or the guys that are all stressed out while they drive…For example, I have an idea: just like they do in the supermarket, we should put up pictures of the “undesirables”. Let them feel ashamed, like they are being watched and, that if they do something bad, they will end up in the newspaper. We should use the security cameras for something more…I have a picture of a guy who cuts into the lane going the wrong way at the exit of Alipio Ponce highway in Chorrillos…and that is considered normal!!!!!! Let’s publish the pictures of these stupid people so they feel ashamed.’

The fact that I am not a speaker of AS, but of LS, may have also contributed to my subjects’ negative perception of the AS features, maybe just as a way to accommodate to the interviewer or imagine the kind of linguistic judgment I was expecting from them.
Therefore, being aware of my positionality during the interview, I organized the speech samples in a way that the first one the participants would listen to was the one of the LS speaker speaking LS, so that they did not feel an abrupt contrast between the way I was speaking and the first script that they listened to.

The four fragments were read by the two female speakers. Both of them had to read two of the scripts: one written in LS and other that contained AS morphosyntactic features. Even though they had to read the fragment, so I could control the features involved, the idea was that it would seem as spontaneous as possible, in a way that it could be perceived as informal. The design of this task was not easy because as Campbell-Kibler (2006) points out, speakers are really sensitive to any kind of variation, either linguistic or extralinguistic (i.e. topic and style); therefore, I used two people (and four recordings) to balance the influence of intonation and other differences among the speech samples as much as possible.

Nevertheless, while designing the task, I concluded that it was better to use four different scripts (using the same topic, though) to conceal the readers’ identity. It was central for my study that the participants would be able to decide how many different people were speaking in the recordings because making that decision would have implications for the way they judged speakers. Since this wasn’t a case of bilingualism but bidialectalism, the recognition of the readers would have been very easy if they had read the same text with only some modifications in the morphosyntax.
The trickiest part of this kind of research is to select the right terms for the evaluative scales (see Table 3). Sometimes, one has to adjust the terms depending on how useful and clear informants' judgments are. It is always difficult to tell whether terms like "rich", “indigenous” or “trustworthy” mean the same thing to all informants. That is why I opted to fill in the scales myself instead of giving the participants a sheet so they can write down their evaluations; in that way, I could monitor what they were understanding by terms such as "educated" (in Spanish, it could refer not only to the level of education of a person but also to a well-mannered person). Also, to counterbalance the order of positive and negative adjectives, I began some scales with the positive term (nice-not nice) and others with the negative term (poor-rich). In this way, I prevented the respondent from falling into a fixed pattern of always checking to the right or left\(^45\).

According to the population I was interviewing, I selected a group of general traits associated with status and solidarity, appropriate to Lima society. For example, for the status dimension, I used the adjective “beautiful” and its counterpart “ugly”, which is not very common in this kind of study. The reason these seemed appropriate was that the stereotype of the person from the Andes is that she/he is of indigenous race (i.e. non-white), and indigenous people are almost always ugly from a westernized perspective of beauty, I thought it was important to include that pair since white people in Lima tend to be considered more beautiful\(^46\). Between each pair of adjectives, there was a 1 to 4 scale,

\(^{45}\) It is important to keep this information in mind when looking at the statistics results in the next chapter.

\(^{46}\) This is, of course, a subjective judgment conditioned by the dominant cultures.
and the participant needed to choose, for example, if the speaker was “very beautiful” (1), “a little beautiful” (2), “a little ugly” (3) or very “ugly” (4). The choice of an even number was made on purpose because relevant literature has shown that when the number is uneven the informants have the tendency to choose the number in the middle of the scale. In fact, just as an anecdote, many of the participants in my research asked me if there was not a 2.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SIMPÁTICA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>ANTIPÁTICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PROVINCIANA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CAPITALINA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 A fair translation for these terms will be: 1) Nice-Not nice; 2) From the province-Capital; 3) Poor-Rich; 4) Educated-Ignorant; 5) Indigenous-White; 6) Trustworthy-Not trustworthy; 7) Good-looking-Ugly; 8) Unsuccessful-Successful; 9) Good person – bad person; 10) Illiterate-Literate
Table 3. Differential evaluative scale, Experiment I

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>POBRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EDUCADA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>INDÍGENA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CONFIABLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BONITA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FRACASADA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BUENA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ANALFABETA</td>
<td>ALFABETA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 is an example of the differential evaluative scales I used in order to collect the participants’ judgments of the speech samples. The variables related to status were:

- Provinciana-capitalina

There is a geographical opposition between the capital and the province, especially since Peruvians usually use the word ‘provinciano’ to refer to Andean provincianos, while Lima is located, in some sense, in opposition to it because it is right next to the ocean, at sea level. Furthermore, this geographical opposition entails other oppositions that are rarely questioned in Peru: the contrast between urban (Lima) and rural (the Andes), and the contrast between modernity (Lima) and backwardness (the Andes).

- Pobre-rica

---

48 I incorporated a literate/illiterate section because most of the participants understood “educated” as well-mannered, instead of referred to the level of education. Thus I have to add this category.
Poverty is another characteristic that, although not exclusive of Andean migrants, is related to the Andes because of the stereotypical image of Andean people being poor peasants living in rural areas. That stereotype is reproduced in the city, since provincianos generally live in peripheral areas associated to people with a low income. These days, however, New Limeños, the descendents of provincianos, are considered an economically emergent group which is contributing enormously to Peru’s improvement. The city of Lima is being re-shaped by internal migration not only in terms of demographics, but also ethnically, socially, racially, and culturally, among other ways. Therefore, we can witness how some of the participants did not necessarily associated being migrant with being poor, especially the ones that belonged to the group of New Limeños.

- Educada-ignorante

Peruvian government discourse about education (in the sense of formal instruction) has always promoted it, as if it were the best (and only) antidote to backwardness, a synonym of progress. However, this discourse is hardly supported in pragmatic terms because public education in the country is of very low quality, especially the further the schools are from the capital and other main cities. Some of the participants in my study felt embarrassed to confess that they had not even finished primary school, as if it were some kind of sin or they were second-class citizens. They are discriminated against and socially penalized even though it is not their fault that they cannot have access to good and affordable education. Furthermore, as De la Cadena (2000) states, race is connected to
other dimensions and education is one of them, which makes it a category worth measuring in terms of attitudes.

- **Indígena-blanca**

Although an arbitrary opposition at first sight, the contrast between white (Lima) and indigenous (Andes) is the most salient one, even though Peru’s capital also has an important group of African descendents, Chinese, Japanese, and so on. Moreover, it was the one I was interested in because of the topic of my study. It was interesting to notice that participants almost automatically associate the indigenous characteristic with an Andean origin, even though we can also find indigenous population in the Amazon area.\(^4^9\)

- **Exitosa-fracasada**

Success is a category intrinsically connected to social acceptance, and therefore it was important to find out who sounded more or less successful in the perception of the participants. Furthermore, being successful in Lima usually entails having a good socioeconomic status, private education, light skin color, professional occupations, and all those characteristics that seem to be exclusive to Limeños.

- **Bonita-fea**

\(^4^9\)Indigenous people from the Amazonia are ethnically and culturally different when compared not only with people from the Andes but also among themselves. However, it is relevant to mention the relatively small impact of Amazonian peoples in the history, demographics, and mainstream culture of Peru. Thus in some sense we might say that white and Andean indigenous are considered poles.
I was particularly interested in reporting the attitudes that participants had towards Andean Spanish regarding the beauty of their speakers because, as a Limeña, I am convinced that Lima’s inhabitants directly relate beauty to whiteness (and ugliness to indigenousness). Furthermore, this situation is not unusual throughout Latin America after Spanish colonization: there, the association between beauty and whiteness is unconscious and barely contested; on the contrary, indigenous race is perceived as ugly (Silvestre, 1994; Casaús, 1998). It is interesting to see how persons, when judging somebody as ugly, rarely consider it a subjective perception but an objective fact. Many examples of this situation are shown in Chapter 5; such as the case of Borja, a butler from Andean origin who, when asked if he considered the woman speaking (Limeño Spanish guise) beautiful, his answer was: ‘Well, she must be beautiful because she sounds white’.

The semantic scales related to solidarity were:

- Simpática-antipática
- Buena-mala
- Confiable-no confiable

Solidarity categories were selected mostly following previous literature because likeability or trustworthiness are general characteristics that work in many groups such as in the case of the inhabitants of Lima.

The following is a table that summarizes the information explained above:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Values Positive</th>
<th>Values Negative</th>
<th>Approximate English gloss</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niceness</td>
<td>Simpático</td>
<td>Antipático</td>
<td>‘nice’-'not nice’</td>
<td>Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincialism</td>
<td>Capitalino</td>
<td>Provinciano</td>
<td>‘from the capital’-'from the province’</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty/Wealth</td>
<td>Rico</td>
<td>Pobre</td>
<td>‘rich’-'poor’</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educado</td>
<td>Ignorante</td>
<td>‘educated’-'ignorant’</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteness</td>
<td>Blanco</td>
<td>Indígena</td>
<td>‘white’-'indigenous’</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Confiable</td>
<td>No confiable</td>
<td>‘trustworthy’-'not trustworthy’</td>
<td>Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>Guapo/bonita</td>
<td>Feo</td>
<td>‘good-looking’-'ugly’</td>
<td>Status/(Solidarity?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Exitoso</td>
<td>Fracasado</td>
<td>‘successful’-'unsuccessful’</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Malo</td>
<td>‘kind’-'mean’</td>
<td>Solidarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Summary of features included in the Matched-Guise Tests

4.5.2. *Judgments of correctness*

After a first attempt to encourage participants to elicit the features that they had considered as coming from a provinciano, an indigenous person, a poor person and so on, I realized that it was extremely hard and usually impossible for them to point out which were exactly the features that had triggered their evaluations, even when I played the recordings once again for them to try to remember.

Therefore, I had to modify the task in order for them to reflect on their responses for the MGT test. I listed all the AS features that appeared both in the LS speaker and the AS speaker and told the participants I had randomly chosen some phrases from the recordings; then, I asked them the following questions:

a) Would you say a phrase like this?

b) How would you express this idea in your own words?
c) Do you know somebody who would speak like that?

4.6. Experiment II

The second experiment was meant to complement and improve upon the earlier MGT experimental study that I conducted in 2011. After conducting the first MGT study, I realized that the participants’ reactions to differences in phonology among the stimuli presented to them might have played a role in their evaluations of the scripts. Even though I recorded speakers of both dialects using both standard and Andean features on purpose in order to have a variety of inputs, in the end it was unclear if participants were also guided by phonological cues when expressing their attitudes towards the recorded speakers. For instance, participants who considered the LS speaker using Andean morphosyntax as “capitalina” would agree that the morphosyntax she used, when isolated, was mostly “provinciana”. In this second study, I did not use speakers of different Spanish dialects but only L(imeño) S(panish) speakers because I wanted to report how my informants perceived AS morphosyntactic variants when they were not combined with that variety’s characteristic phonological, suprasegmental or discursive elements. Moreover, I utilized similar semantic scales (with some necessary adjustments, as shown below), with a much smaller and simpler task in order to obtain a more precise control so as to exclude factors that are not related to the morphosyntactic variables I wished to investigate.
Furthermore, in order to go beyond the sphere of language attitudes and address other sociolinguistic aspects of AS in Lima, I designed an additional task which helped me connect concepts such as enregisterment, dialect awareness, and Andeanness throughout the study. The information obtained in this task is mostly qualitative, and sheds light on the factors underlying participants’ perceptions and evaluations of the dialect. With the data collected, I was able to elaborate on the concepts that I consider central when explaining Andeanness, such as massive migrations from rural to urban areas or the role of place in the construction of identities. Hence, after completing the Matched-Guise task, informants had to answer a set of relatively open questions on their language attitudes in the context of Lima, including the topic of motoseo, a notion that encompasses some of my research questions in its definition.

Again, while the MGT offers a unique lens into those unconscious ideas that may not be apparent in interviews or participant observation (Booth, 2009), I believe that important information can be missing if there are not direct follow-up questions about their evaluations, so that the researcher can understand in more depth the results in the scales and, furthermore, can clarify potential misunderstandings (Bernard, 1994: 258). Thus the second task of this project consisted of a short interview where participants would elaborate on the relationship between space and language, because AS linguistic traits in the Andes might be the same as the ones we can find in Lima, but it is obvious that perceptions about the dialect, both from migrants’ and Limeños’ view, change dramatically in this context. In this sense, to openly ask about a concept like ‘motoseo’
was a way of being able to elicit from them the features they associate with the idea of motosidad, which are not necessarily the ones that characterize Andean Spanish varieties.

My particular interest on the phenomenon of “motoseo” responds to my belief that this concept was going to help me support the hypothesis explained in Chapter 2: that there is a disconnect between what is known as Andean Spanish, a construct for research purposes, and what Limeños and migrants in Lima consider a provinciano, serrano or simply an incorrect way of speaking. In other words, Andean Spanish is a variety (or, more accurately, a group of varieties) which emerged from the contact between Spanish and Quechua or Aymara. Provinciano speech, on the other hand, is a sub-set of Andean Spanish traits that index Andeanness for reasons that are not necessarily linguistic ones. There are different degrees of markedness in Andean Spanish features in the context of Lima; therefore, not all of them may index a provinciano identity even when they are considered as part of the AS dialect.

4.6.1. MGT

In this section, participants had to listen to 16 sentences read by at least six Limeño Spanish speakers\(^50\) with similar backgrounds (gender, age, origin, education, etc.), and

---

\(^50\) To not make it “suspicious” for the listeners, I have to have different voices for each pair, at time repeating a couple, but mostly in the fillers.
had to evaluate them using a modified version of the semantic scales I used in my first experiment.\footnote{After the ANOVA results I obtained, I have discarded 3 of the 9 variables/characteristics I was using to rate the recordings because either the terms were misunderstood or because the results on them were not statistically significant.}

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SIMPÁTICO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PROVINCIANO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>POBRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>INDÍGENA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GUAPO/BONITA\footnote{In case I use men voices for my recordings, in Spanish it is unusual to say “bonito” to refer to a good looking man.}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BUENO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ANALFABETO</td>
<td>SABE LEER/ESCRIBIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Differential semantic scale, Experiment II

My goal was to improve upon the first MGT experiment because, since both AS phonology and morphosyntax were used, many times it was hard to determine whether my informants were expressing judgments of the selected morphosyntactic features or if phonology may have interfered with their evaluations. And even though the experiment allowed me to collect very interesting information in terms of attitudes, linguistic ideologies and identity, I believe that this second stage in my fieldwork allowed me to have a more precise perspective on what exactly participants were reacting to when they...
affirmed, for example, that somebody sounded less white or more educated than another speaker.

My strategy for selecting the participants for this second experiment was the same I had used in the prior year\textsuperscript{53}. However, this time I applied an extra criterion in the case of participants of Andean origin: being aware of the fact that there are different varieties of Andean Spanish, I decided to opt only for those from the same area, who share most of the morphosyntactic features being evaluated. Therefore, I disregarded speakers of Northern Andes varieties and focused instead on those from the Central and Southern Andes:

**Participants**

- 11 women and 12 men
- All adults (18 and older).
- Ages ranged from 21 to 70
- Origin: 16 people born in Lima, 7 born in different provinces (mostly from Central Peruvian Andes).
- All of them spoke Spanish, and 6 of them spoke Quechua with different degrees of proficiency.

\textsuperscript{53} See page 87
Six of the sentences contained morphosyntactic features attributed to AS (one feature per sentence) that I had extracted from natural speech recordings I collected for different research projects. The other six worked as a counterpart to the first ones: they were almost identical but the AS morphosyntactic features were substituted by more standard (i.e., non-Andean) morphosyntax. Finally, I added four filler sentences that worked as distracters.

Due to my Limeño origin, I count on a strong set of social networks, which allowed me to easily find speakers of Limeño Spanish willing to help me in preparing the task. I recorded 6 Limeñas between the ages of 23 and 55 to record a pair of sentences each. In this way, the same voice had to read both the Limeño and the Andean version of the sentence that was modified in one single morphosyntactic feature in the two guises. This strategy contributed to avoid the interference of other grammatical or suprasegmental features when participants were making their judgments about the speaker that could have been misleading.

**AS features**\(^{54}\)

a) Los pobres eso comen (GB) ‘Poor people eat that’ SOV

b) Poco plata debe tener (ASU) ‘She probably doesn’t have a lot of money’ NO

**GENDER AGREEMENT**\(^{55}\)

---

\(^{54}\) Even though all of these features usually work in Andean Spanish in particular contexts—especially in terms of emphasis, topic, evidentiality—their markedness make them indexes of Andeannes even when taken in isolation, for both Limeños speakers and speakers of this dialect.
c) La forma como lo trata a su hijo (ASU, modified) ‘The way he treats his son’

DO DOUBLING

d) Las peras lo ponía en su mandil (GB) ‘He put the pears on his apron’

NEUTRAL LO (agreement)

e) Yo me he nacido aquí en Lima56 ‘I (me) was born here in Lima’

EMOTIONAL COMMITMENT REFLEXIVE (Zavala 1999)/ REFLEXIVE PRONOUN REDUNDANCY IN NON-REFLEXIVE VERBS (Escobar 2000)

f) Me caí del tercer piso de su casa de mi tía (Godennzi, 2011) ‘I fell down from the third floor of my aunt’s house’

POSSESSIVE MARKER DOUBLING

Standard Spanish (SS) counterparts

a) Los pobres comen eso

b) Poca plata debe tener

c) La forma como trata a su hijo

d) Las peras las ponía en su mandil

e) Yo me he nacido aquí en Lima57

---

55 Sentences b) and d) present also SOV order associated with Andean Spanish but, in these two cases, standard Spanish varieties might favor this word order to express focus or topicalization.

56 In the case of the fifth sentence of the task, I was forced to change the phrase I selected from the sample of an AS speaker because it turned out that, out of context, the feature that I wanted participants to evaluate would have not been perceived (Están comiendo la palta o intentan comer). Therefore, and due to the limitation of time to find another natural speech sample, I was forced to come up with an alternative (Yo me he nacido aquí en Lima).

57 The present perfect here might also be an Andean feature, but one that is not unusual in Lima Spanish and, in the appropriate pragmatic context, acceptable in other standard varieties as well.
4.6.2. Questions on the perception of the dialects of Lima

A. Direct Questions about language attitudes and motosidad

In this second field study, in addition to the participants’ comments about the phrases heard in terms of correctness, I wanted to take more advantage of the questionnaires and ask supplementary questions. For instance, I wanted participants to indicate if a relationship between space and language was obvious for them because AS linguistic traits in the Andes might be the same that the ones we can find in Lima, but the perceptions about the dialect, both from migrants’ and Limeños’ view, change dramatically in this non-Andean context. Moreover, I was interested in finding out how the concept of motosidad was used in Lima, and if there was a coincidence between its scientific meaning and its ordinary meaning.

---

58 This is one of my claims, explained in Chapter 2.
1. Do you think all the inhabitants of Lima have the same way of speaking? If not, please tell me some differences that you find among them.

2. Can you give me some examples of different ways in which Lima’s inhabitants express themselves?

3. Based on the categories that you have given me, what are some (linguistic) characteristics that you associate with those people?

4. Now, going back to the recordings you heard, could you relate some of them to a group in particular? Do you think that all of them could have been said by people who live in Lima?

5. Have you ever heard the expression “motoso speaking” or “X person speaks with a mote”? If so, what do you think people mean by this concept?

B. Demographic questionnaire

1. Sex: F / M

2. How old are you?

3. Where are you from? What about your parents and grandparents?

4. In which places have you lived?

5. Where do you live currently?

6. What languages do you speak? What about your parents and grandparents?

7. What is your level of education?

8. What do you do for a living?
4.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have described the research methods for my perception study. The present dissertation is based in the analysis of the data I collected through field work in Lima in two consecutive summers. The first section explains my methodological choices, the Matched-Guise test and complementary questionnaires, and the following sections describe the design of the tasks as well as a detailed explanation of the data collection process. This methodology has been central for obtaining the information needed to answer my research questions in a coherent manner and to develop a thorough analysis of the results found and explained in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5: Analysis and results

5.1. Introduction

The central goal of this study is to explore Andeanness away from the Andes, i.e. how Andean identity is shaped through language when in contact with a more prestigious variety (Limeño Spanish) and their speakers. Therefore, my fieldwork research is designed to investigate the language attitudes and linguistic ideologies underlying the ways in which Limeños and Andean migrants perceive and evaluate features of Andean Spanish morphosyntax. My aim is to determine whether it is valid to talk about Andeanness, understanding the term as a homogeneous perception of the other as ‘provinciano’, ‘cholo’, non-white, etc. when this other uses certain morphosyntactic features that belong to the Andean Spanish inventory in the particular context of Lima. In the present chapter, I have analyzed the data collected during the two fieldwork phases in Lima to answer my research questions.

To gather the information I was looking for, I designed two Matched-Guise Technique Tasks (one for each phase of my research), where participants had to listen to two apparently different speakers representing two different guises with variations in the morphosyntax, and were then asked to report their attitudes towards the person by the way she/he speaks. I also designed a complementary questionnaire which referred to their answers to the MGT. In my first study, I designed a grammaticality/correctness judgment
task; I selected the AS morphosyntactic features found in the MGT recordings and asked participants if they would say something like that or, in other words, if they thought the phrase was correct. If their answer was ‘no’, I would proceed to ask them how would they say it to make it better, and if they knew somebody who would speak that way. In this way, they would be able to say if they related this way of speaking to a specific group. My main goal when asking these questions was to test my hypothesis that people in Lima don’t consider AS a (regional) variety of Spanish, but an incorrect way of speaking associated with provincianos, a speech that one needs to avoid because it shows a poor education among other negative characteristics. In fact, only linguists and other researchers use this term to refer to this Spanish; being born in Lima and having lived there most of my life, I never heard of the label ‘Andean Spanish’ before going to college to study Hispanic Linguistics; not even Andean Spanish speakers consider it an actual dialect. It seems that people are able to identify certain AS features and associate it to a provinciano identity but it does not go beyond that: the systematicity of Andean Spanish grammatical features doesn’t constitute enough proof for Lima’s inhabitants, not even for Andean migrants, in order for Andean Spanish to constitute an actual Spanish dialect.

In my second study, I also asked about the participants’ correctness judgments in the questionnaire, but this was not the only topic we discussed. In addition, I was interested in the perception of the relationship between language and place\textsuperscript{59} in the formation of

\textsuperscript{59} In the forth section of Chapter 2, I discuss relevant literature on language and place, and Andean Spanish
different identities, and therefore asked questions about the different ways in which different Lima’s inhabitants speak in order to determine how this city is not only the location for my study, but also an object of study by itself as a space of interaction:

“Language, therefore, is not an activity that is inside a space (environment, context), but rather an interconnecting practice that produces its spaces (environments, contexts) as it trudges along in a semiotic way” (Godenzzi, 2012: 1). In other words, the fact that Andean Spanish is being spoken in Lima (as opposed to anywhere else or, let’s say, the Andes) generates a unique situation because of its historical, cultural, and socioeconomic peculiarities, which have an influence on all the interactions between speakers and help shape the identity of ‘the other’. The last subject in the questionnaire was ‘motoseo’, a phenomenon closely related to the negative attitudes towards Andean Spanish and its speakers.

As explained in the prior chapter, the main questions that I wanted to answer in the first study were a) What is the role of morphosyntax in the definition of Andean Spanish/Andean identity when compared to phonology?; and b) What are the language attitudes and linguistic ideologies embedded in the participants’ perceptions of the recordings? In the second study, my main questions were a) What happens when an AS morphosyntactic feature is inserted in a non-AS grammatical context? b) What do these features inserted within the speech of a Limeño speaker mean? c) Do they still refer to provinciano/serrano/incorrect/etc.? d) Are the AS morphosyntactic features enough to mark speakers as Andean/provincianos/motosos?

See Chapter 2 for a thorough explanation of the term motoseo or motosidad.
In some ways, the second fieldwork study was meant to complement and improve upon the earlier MGT study that I conducted in 2011. When analyzing the results of the latter study, I realized that the participants’ reactions to differences in phonology among the stimuli presented to them might have played a role in their evaluations of the scripts. Even though I recorded speakers of both dialects using both standard and Andean features on purpose in order to have a variety of inputs, in the end it was somehow unclear if participants were also guided by phonological cues when expressing their attitudes towards the recorded speakers. For instance, participants who considered the LS speaker using Andean morphosyntax as ‘capitalina’ would agree that the morphosyntax she used, when isolated, was mostly ‘provinciana’. Therefore, the language attitudes that are shown in the statistical analysis of the first MGT might be reactions not only towards morphology but also towards phonology or even towards the interaction between the two grammatical components; in other words, I could give a precise account of their perceptions about Andean Spanish but cannot be sure of the trigger for those attitudes and underlying ideologies. In the second study, I used similar semantic scales (with some necessary adjustments), and I designed a much smaller and simpler task with a more precise control so as to exclude factors that are not related to the morphosyntactic variables I wished to investigate. I did not use speakers of different Spanish dialects but only LS speakers because I wanted to report how my informants perceive AS morphosyntactic variants when they are not combined with that variety’s characteristic phonological, suprasegmental or discursive elements.
Finally, there were differences between the two MGT studies regarding the selection and grouping of participants. In both studies, the same general criteria for recruitment were followed: they were all adult Peruvians who had lived in Lima for at least two years. However, the first time I interviewed an equal number of Limeños and migrants without identifying a specific place of origin for the latter group. And when organizing them in groups for the analysis, I considered all those who said they had been born in the capital to be Limeños. For the second study, however, due to my prior experience and to the new literature I read (Goddenzi, 2012; Escobar, conference), I decided that only traditional Limeños⁶¹, the ones who are born in Lima with no direct connection to internal migration from the Andes, would be considered Limeños. However, people who were born in Lima but were the children or grandchildren of Andean migrants were treated as belonging to the group of provincianos, with whom they share many characteristics.

When recruiting migrants for the first study, my only criterion was that they were not born in Lima and, even though I gave preference to Andean migrants, I was not very strict with that criterion since stereotypes seem to be spread out throughout the city; they are reproduced in the media, in TV shows and through ethnic humor. During the second study, though, I made sure that all of them were from either Central or Southern Andes, since they share similar cultural, historical and linguistic traits much more than, for example, people from Northern Andes, who have slightly different dialects as well as other characteristics (a segment of the population is not indigenous but white, which has

---

⁶¹ The concept of traditional Limeño is explained in depth in Chapter 2
led to different stereotypes about the inhabitants of the area). In this way, perceptions from and about them would be based on similar characteristics.

5.2. *Statistical tests*

Once I finished the data collection stage, I organized the results of the Matched-Guise tests in an Excell spreadsheet in order to find out whether my participants’ judgments and the different variables differ significantly when compared in groups. Then, I applied statistical tests to see if the differences in the ratings of the various guises, as well as the differences in the evaluations of Limeños and provincianos were significant.

For measuring the ratings of the variables obtained from these tasks, I have used two different statistical techniques: the t-Test, when only two samples were compared and the ANOVA (analysis of variance), when the comparison was between more than two samples. The goal of this kind of tests is to figure out if different groups differ significantly by comparing their means. The p-value I have taken into consideration to determine the significance of an analysis is \( p < 0.05 \). The results shown in the following figures are only the ones from the comparisons that turned out to be significant.

5.3. *Experiment I*

5.3.1. *Car traffic and language attitudes in Lima*

The participants in my study had to listen to four recordings about car traffic in Lima, a familiar topic (and problem) to which every city’s inhabitant can relate to, both Limeños and Andean migrants. Since I am a speaker of Limeño Spanish, I decided to organize the
recordings according to this fact, so that the participant did not feel a major contrast between my way of speaking and the first voice recorded. Therefore, the recordings were presented in the following order: First, I played the Limeño Spanish speaker using her own morphosyntactic features (LLS), followed by the Andean Spanish speaker using Andean Spanish morphosyntax (AAS), the LS speaker using AS morphosyntactic features (LAS) and the AS speaker using standard morphology (ALS).

After listening to each of the recordings, participants had to rate the speaker on a scale of 1 to 4 between two bipolar adjectives, like beautiful-ugly, where very beautiful was 1 on the scale and very ugly was a 4. When designing the task, I selected nine relevant pairs of adjectives that I considered adequate based on the literature and my expectations about people’s attitudes in Lima. However, while conducting research and afterwards when I started to analyze the data, there were three pairs that turned out to be problematic: educated-ignorant, trustworthy-not trustworthy, and successful-unsuccessful. When I asked for the participants’ evaluations, I had to explain that educado referred to level of education and not to being well-mannered, as a lot of them interpreted it; there were also misunderstandings with confiado, which means ‘a person you can trust’ but I noticed some of the participants were confused by the meaning of the word and many of them interpreted it as ‘a person who trusts’. Because of this and other problems with the statistical results, I finally decided to remove the mentioned three pairs of adjectives.

---

62 See Chapter 4, Table 3.

63 An explanation for these modifications can be found in Chapter 4.
from my study and work with the remaining 6 pairs. I will now present the results relating to these six scales from the first study.

It is important to say before starting with this statistical analysis that, in order to be considered either Limeño or provinciano, there is usually an interaction of different factors, a characteristic that cannot be separated from others. My conversation with Alonso, a salesman from the Andean area of the department of Lima, is evidence of how sometimes being indigenous is a synonym of being provinciano or not being educated: “Look, when I see a provinciano, I admit that he is somebody with my same race, he is a provinciano just like me, who has come to get an education, to fight…He is not white…the way he speaks…A person has to accept it, if you are indigenous you need to accept it.” Alonso uses provinciano, indigenous and uneducated almost indistinctively in his discourse, and this is a pattern that we will see throughout my analysis because Andeanness, provinciano identity, is not constituted by an isolated trait but by the interaction of many, such as the ones selected for this study about attitudes.

Another constant element found in my informants’ discourse is the sort of resignation with which many migrants deal with oppression as a natural, fateful and irrevocable condition (Mick, 2011): Alonso says that ‘if you are indigenous, you need to accept it’. I claim that the reason why we observe similar patterns in the responses of participants from different origin is because several provincianos “seem to have interiorized inferiority and embodied powerlessness (Mick, 2011: 197)”. As a consequence, they reproduce the same discourse that creates oppression in the first place.
Figure 1 illustrates the degree of niceness\textsuperscript{64} perceived in the different guises. I collapsed all my informants’ responses and separated them in four different groups according to the four recordings. The horizontal axis indicates how simpática (1) or antipática (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the four different recordings that participants had to listen to. What turns out to be significant in this figure ($p < 0.0001$) is the comparison between the perceptions that informants (both Limeños and migrants) have of each recording.

In this first figure, the woman from the AS scripts is considered nicer by participants, which fits in with the argument that lower scores in the status/power axis are usually correlated to higher ones in the solidarity axis (Hernández Campoy, 2004). For instance, non-standard dialects have a propensity to be considered friendlier than standard ones (Trudgill, 1983). Therefore, it is not surprising that the Limeño speaker using standard morphosyntax (LLS) is considered the least nice and the Andean Spanish speaker using Andean Spanish morphosyntax (AAS) is the nicest for my informants. In fact, when I asked Adriana, a girl originally from Cuzco\textsuperscript{65}, which of the women she liked better, she pointed at AAS and ALS, the two guises interpreted by the Andean Spanish speaker. And without being asked for clarification, she said: “It is not because they are provincianas, it’s just that I think they sound sweeter”. Even Aurelia, a Limeño secretary, states that “I

\textsuperscript{64}Simpatía is a term that doesn’t have a direct translation in English; it could mean niceness, pleasantness, friendliness or even physical attractiveness.

\textsuperscript{65}A Peruvian city in southern Andes
always think paisanas (synonym for provincianas) are nice because of the way they speak, they make me laugh, they have a different intonation”.

**Figure 1. Niceness ratings for each guise [F(3, 192) = 67.42, p < 0.0001]**

Although being provinciano literally means ‘to be born in a province, not in the capital’, when talking about provincianos in Lima that people generally refer to migrants from rural areas in the Andes, at least in my experience both as Limeña and as a researcher. Figure 1 shows a gradient where subjects considered LLS the most capitalina, followed by LAS, ALS and AAS, who was considered the most provinciana.
It is worthy of note, besides, that compared to the prior table (simpatía-antipatía), the distance between the two Limeño Spanish speaker guises and the ones by the AS speaker is significantly greater. This will become a pattern between the characteristics related to status like this one and the ones related to solidarity like the prior one, as we will notice in the following figures. It seems to be the case that it is more important to establish the difference between groups in terms of power than in terms of solidarity, which should not be surprising after all since human societies are generally organized based on who are the most and the least powerful, whatever the source of that power is.

When listening to AAS, Alberto, a provinciano gardener, affirmed that her pronunciation “is not correct, which means that the lady is from the province”. And then added: “Provincianos like me always have pronunciation errors, even when they have completed high school”. Andean migrants who speak Andean Spanish have internalized prejudices against their own variety to the extent that they themselves consider it as incorrect Spanish, not a regional dialect. And everyday experiences prove this belief to be true; “the Andean one is more motosa, it’s like she has that rshshesh\(^{66}\), as if she is grinding her teeth, I don’t know, those are things that for me indicate either A or B, black or white” (Ada, middle class Limeña)

Figure 2 illustrates how informants perceived speakers in terms of their origin and, therefore, their rural/urban background. Again, I collapsed all my informants’ responses and separated them in four different groups according to the four recordings. The

\(^{66}\) With this unintelligible sound, I believe she is trying to reproduce an assibilated vibrant \(J\), which is a highly stigmatized sound characteristic of Andean Spanish.
horizontal axis indicates how *provinciana* (1) or *capitalina* (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the four different recordings that participants had to listen to. What turns out to be significant in this figure (p < 0.0001) is the comparison between the perceptions that informants (both Limeños and migrants) have of each recording.

As stated before, Figure 2 also shows that the Limeño Spanish recordings, no matter the guise, received the highest scores in terms of being from the capital. And, as expected, there are also certain stereotypes related to this variety. For many subjects, the way they spoke was clearer, and some even said that Limeños did not have an accent, corroborating its value as the unmarked dialect. “It doesn’t sound like a provinciana, I mean…she expresses herself well”, thinks Adela, a provinciana maid. Both Limeños and migrants share positive attitudes towards Limeño Spanish but, surprisingly, I also found negative perceptions among provincianos: “She sounds very capitaliana because of her slang (laughs)…No, provincianos don’t speak like that…They are more polite”, definitely” (Abel, provinciano tailor) or “Limeños are high-handed when they speak, rude” (Alejo, artisan)

67 *Educados*
Figure 2. Provincialism ratings for each guise [F(3, 191) = 119.7, p < 0.0001]

The third figure gives an account of people’s perception of economic means by the way they speak. The informants’ answers for each recording’s voice were collapsed and organized in four groups. The horizontal axis indicates how pobre (1) or rica (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the four different recordings that participants had to listen to. What turns out to be significant in this figure (p < 0.0001) is the comparison between the perceptions that informants (both Limeños and migrants) have of each recording.

I have purposely avoided utilizing the commonly used concept of social class in sociolinguistic studies such as Labov’s because I believe that that model does not explain the social structures of societies such as Mexico City’s or Lima (Lastra and Butragueño, 2000). Nevertheless, in everyday life Peruvians do use related terminology such as lower
class to refer to poor people but actually income is not the only criterion by which a person can be considered poor. When talking to Alejo and without being asked, he said: “This person (LLS) is middle-class, this one is poor (AAS) and this one is middle class (LAS), right?” To avoid leading him in his answers, I told him that I had no clue, that these were only collected opinions about traffic, at which he laughed and continued: “You can tell from the way they speak…This is middle class, but upper middle class, this one is lower class (AAS) and this one is lower middle class (LAS)”. But how can you tell who’s richer only by listening to the recordings? I asked. “The way they speak, obviously, [the Limeña] uses words correctly. And she also uses what can be called “strong words” ‘swearwords’ that are usually used by that kind of people”. To clarify what he meant, I inquired: Are you saying that high class people commonly use course words? “Yes, to tell you the truth, yes”.

The results shown in Figure 3 are one of the reasons for which I believe that phonology was playing an important role in participants’ perceptions, even though the study was designed to address mainly the attitudes towards morphology: despite the use of different morphosyntax, both guises performed by the AS speaker got the same score, which is not the case for the LS guises, where there is a difference between LLS and LAS. On the same line, LAS could be considered less capitalina or less white than LLS, but she was still considered significantly whiter and more capitalina than ALS and AAS. One hypothesis I wanted to test was if phonology was a stronger marker than morphosyntax when indexing Andean Spanish, serrano, cholo, or provinciano. But clearly this was not the case for the facts just mentioned. However, when the AS morphosyntactic features
used in the guises were isolated, subjects agreed that they were provinciano or incorrect forms.

Figure 3. Poverty ratings for each guise [F(3, 192) = 32.06, p < 0.0001]

Figure 4 shows the ratings on the scale of indígena-blanca. I collapsed all my informants’ responses and separated them in four different groups according to their dialect and the morphosyntactic features used in each guise. The horizontal axis indicates how indígena (1) or blanca (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the four different recordings that participants had to listen to. The significance in this figure (p < 0.0001) consisted of the comparison between the perceptions that informants (both Limeños and migrants) have of each recording.
It confirms that language attitudes located on the status axis show a more significant difference than the ones on the solidarity axis. This is the case for the indígena-blanca pair, where the scores for LLS and LAS are almost twice those for AAS and ALS. Even though informants would sometimes complain about the blunt divisions proposed in the pairs, knowing that reality can be much more complex than a scale from 1 to 4, in the end they were still able to make choices probably because ideological discourses and attitudes tend to segment the continuum of reality into segments or categories. “[It’s] either A or B, black or white”, quoting Ada, the Limeña manager.

Amanda, a provinciana artisan, considers LLS white: “she seems to be white, because of the way she expresses herself”. And then adds, “you can tell she is beautiful, because of her voice”. Agusto, a provinciano that had lived in Europe for years, shows us how language attitudes are hard to change when I asked him if he imagined LLS to be white or indigenous: “No, capitalina…a little…very white, yes, because she is complaining, you can tell she is somehow racist”. In this quote, it is evident that being capitalina and being white can be the same in a variety of contexts. Again, this supports my claim that it is the interaction of different characteristics which define identity.
Figure 4. Whiteness ratings for each guise [F(3, 192) = 67.42, p < 0.0001]

Figure 5 describes Lima’s inhabitants’ perceptions of beauty by listening to their speech. After grouping all the informants’ responses and separating them in four different groups, I performed an analysis of variance in order to find out if there was a significant difference when comparing them. The horizontal axis demonstrates how bonita (1) or fea (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the different guises being evaluated.

The results obtained in the category of beauty are some of the most interesting so far. Although it might be relative to a specific culture to situate this characteristic on the axis of status or solidarity, in the case of Lima, it surely is related to power since prettiness goes hand in hand with whiteness. This association is not uncommon in Latin America, especially because of our history of European colonization. As part of that heritage,
countries like the Dominican Republic, for instance, have inherited racism towards the black population because of the banning of African culture during the conquest. This mechanism of oppression has resulted in (internalized) discrimination against a race that constitutes the vast majority of the country (Silvestre, 1994), in the same way that indigenous people are discriminated against despite being approximately 95% of Peru’s population according to a survey conducted in 2001. Therefore, people in this Caribbean country tend to think that white people have beautiful eyes, fine features, fine nose, good hair, and all the physical characteristics that are prototypical of (white) beauty, while they tend to think that black people are the exact opposite. Another case that depicts how white race is a synonym of beauty in contrast with indigenous is Guatemala. In a study conducted in 1998, one of the questions from a questionnaire directed to Guatemala’s oligarchic (white) group was: “Will you adopt an indigenous child?” 29% refrained from answering and, among 48% who answered that they wouldn’t, 9% stated that the reason was that indigenous people are ugly and they don’t like them. It seems hard to believe and maybe this is the reason for the scarcity of literature on this topic. For example, there is the myth that people from northern Andes, especially from the city of Cajamarca, are white. “It is possible to find good looking provincianos, like people from Cajamarca, you look at them and say: ‘How handsome’ but…wait until they speak (laughs, Azucena means that once they speak they sound as serranos as any indigenous

68 ENAHO (National Survey of Households, 2001). In this survey, 37% of the population considered themselves indigenous and 58.1%, mestizos.
person, which she finds disappointing). As I pointed out before, it is in the interaction of different traits that Andeanness takes place: Azucena was almost ‘fooled’ by the Cajamarquinos’ appearance, but when she heard the way they spoke, she knew they were provincianos. Limeñas like Ana, a wealthy housewife, explains that “what happens is that we (including me, apparently) always have in mind that provincianos are ugly, right?...When a person is indigenous, you don’t see them as beautiful…They can be beautiful but we usually think that they are not beautiful. They are not a beautiful race, they don’t have a beautiful body, not even a beautiful face. Maybe some beautiful features…(laughs). I bet you are going to think I’m a racist”. This is the point of view of a Limeña, but as I explain in Figure 14, this stereotype is reproduced by Andean migrants. It is unfortunate but not surprising, since media, TV shows and publicity work as a silent confirmation that whiteness, as opposed as being indigenous, is what makes someone beautiful, it is the default. Indigenous people usually appear on TV only as domestic servants or when commercials want to address their product to people with a low income.

The statistical results are mostly as expected, where AAS and ALS were the ugliest and the other two the most beautiful. However, it is surprising that the one with the highest score (the most beautiful) turns out to be the Limeño speaker using AS morphosyntax and not LS. The only explanation I can find for this outcome is the fact that most participants found LLS obnoxious (antipática), and this influenced in their perception of her beauty when compared with LAS. In this case, AS morphosyntax does not work as an index of Andeannes or, specifically, being ugly.
A potential bias that I did not foresee when selecting the women for the recordings was the different ages. The Andean Spanish speaker was a woman in her sixties while the Limeña was in her thirties and this age difference might have affected the reactions in the bonita-fea scale. For both Limeño and migrant informants it was hard to tell if AAS or ALS was beautiful because of her age. As a joke, I would ask them: “so older women cannot be beautiful?” And they would laugh and deny it but maybe if both women would have been of a similar age the statistical results would have changed in some way. In any case, Figure 5 shows the aforementioned correlation between being beautiful and being white and vice versa. Furthermore, I claim that the different characteristics that constitute the scale interact in a certain way so that Andeanness, provinciano identity in Lima, is a combination of different traits such as being ugly, poor, uneducated, and so on.
Figure 5. Beauty ratings for each guise [F(3, 191) = 4.715, p = 0.0034]

Figure 6 illustrates the degree of kindness perceived in the different guises. I collapsed all my informants’ responses and separated them in four different groups according to the four recordings. The horizontal axis indicates how buena (1) or mala (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the four different recordings that participants had to listen to. What turns out to be significant in this figure (p = 0.0012) is the comparison between the perceptions that informants (both Limeños and migrants) have of each recording.

Again in this figure, participants show more solidarity with the AS speaker, even when she is not using AS morphosyntax: therefore, AAS is considered the kindest and LLS is considered the least kind. Furthermore, this buena-mala chart does not show the difference in scores that we can see in the tables with characteristics related to status.
5.3.2. Comparing the ratings of Limeños and migrants

After reporting general perceptions towards the four recorded guises, the ratings were separated into those offered by Limeños and those by migrants. After all, it is one of the central goals of this study to determine similarities and differences in the attitudes and ideologies of those two different groups toward Andean Spanish. The most relevant finding in this section was the fact that, even though the averages for each guise were different between Limeños and provincianos, they have a tendency to repeat the average patterns; using as an example Figure 7, we can see that LLS was the most simpática for both Limeños and migrants, even though the positive perception from provincianos was slightly higher than the one from Limeños. This result can be somehow surprising...
because one might suppose that due to the tension embedded in any situation where two very different groups have to coexist, their perceptions of themselves and of each other can be antagonistic but this is not the case. Again, we observe how Andean migrants’ perceptions of themselves are influenced by the perceptions that ‘the others’, the most prestigious group, have of them. Some questions remain, though: Is this an accommodation strategy to survive and make their lives easier? Is there a lack of agency among Andean migrants or do they express their resistance in a different manner?

An element that cannot be perceived through a quantitative analysis but came up in the context of the follow-up questions, is a parallel provincianos discourse where they state that Limeños are not educados (‘polite, well-mannered’), they use bad words and slang that a provinciano would never use, according to the same provincianos interviewed. Even though I did not present the statistical results of the educado-no educado scale because the responses were affected by the ambiguity of the terms (I wanted my participants to talk about the level of education of the speaker, but many of them understood that I was asking them about good manners), many of the informants consider the Limeño speaker using Limeño morphosyntax as ‘ignorant’, ‘arrogant’ and ‘racist’.
Figure 7. Limeños and provincianos on niceness (*simpática* (1) – *antipática* (4)) for each guise \[F(7, 188) = 4.325, p = 0.0012\]

Figure 7 illustrates the degree of niceness\(^6^9\) perceived in the different guises. In this case, as well as in some of the following figures, I have divided the participants’ responses according to their origin and not only according to the guise because I wanted to find if their answers would vary in a significant way if they were Limeños or provincianos. The horizontal axis indicates how *simpática* (1) or *antipática* (4) the speaker is perceived: Limeños’ evaluations are shown in the lighter tone of gray and provincianos’ evaluations appear in dark gray. The four different guises are listed on the vertical axis, on the other

\(^6^9\) *Simpatía* is a term that doesn’t have a direct translation in English; it could mean niceness, pleasantness, friendliness or even physical attractiveness.
hand. What turns out to be significant in this figure (p = 0.0012) is the comparison between the perceptions that informants have of each recording, taking their different origin into consideration.

When looking at Figure 7, there are two facts that are important to notice. First, both Limeños and migrants find AAS the nicest, followed by her Limeño Spanish version (ALS), LAS and LLS; actually, Limeños find AAS and ALS nicer than migrants do although it would be expected that provincianos feel more empathy for people like them. Second, a trait that we will find throughout this chapter is that Limeños are more radical in their answers and the charts show that the distance between different elements is greater than in the case of Andean migrants.
Figure 8. Limeños and provincianos on provincialism (provinciana (1) – limeña (4)) for each guise [F(7,187) = 52.70, p < 0.0001]

Figure 8 shows the significance (p < 0.0001) of collapsing all the results collected in terms of provincialism and comparing them subsequently. I have separated the participants’ responses according to their origin and not only according to the guise because I wanted to find if their answers would vary in a significant way if they were Limeños or provincianos. The horizontal axis indicates how provinciana (1) or capitalina (4) they believe the speaker is.: Limeños’ evaluations are shown in the lighter tone of gray and provincianos’ evaluations appear in dark gray. The four different guises are listed on the vertical axis, on the other hand. What turns out to be significant in this figure
is the comparison between the perceptions that informants have of each recording, taking their different origin into consideration.

Why is it that in Figure 8 Limeños rate ALS as more *capitalina* than the migrants do, even when she uses Andean Spanish phonology? The same situation happens with LLS and a plausible explanation for this could be that Limeños want to emphasize the distance between Limeño Spanish and Andean Spanish, even if only in terms of morphology. Therefore they might be more susceptible to linguistic features that differentiate them from groups with less status. We can perceive this attitude even among provincianos’ children like Azucena: “Lima has been flooded with people from the provinces (using a mix of a fatalistic and resigned tone). For example, my house is full of them now. All my cousins have come from the Sierra (mountains/Andes).”

Language plays a central role in this “gatekeeping” process because it contributes to create and shape the image of “the other”, the danger that is threatening the established division of power. Due to different reasons but also to internal migration, Lima has changed dramatically in the last fifty years. Just as an example, let’s think of Andean migrants who arrived in Lima in the seventies, looking for better opportunities in the city. They settled down in the peripheral areas of the city, the so called *pueblos jóvenes* or *asentamientos humanos* (shanty towns): sandy and arid hills where access to the most basic needs was unimaginable. And yet, forty years later, one can find the sons and daughters of some of those migrants (the new Limeños) having enough money to pay for the same higher education that many white upper-middle class Limeños take for granted. Therefore, this “subversion” needs to be constrained so that social mobility is blocked. In
Githinji’s (2008) words, “language as one of the key markers of social categorization becomes a key target of subjective attitudes and stereotype towards the unlike others, or the out-group”.

![Figure 9](image.png)

Figure 9. Limeños and provincianos on poverty (pobre (1) – rica (4)) for each guise

[F(7,188) = 15.63, p < 0.0001]

Figure 9 shows the significance (p < 0.0001) of collapsing all the results collected in terms of poverty and comparing them subsequently. I divided the participants’ responses according to their origin and not only according to the guise because I wanted to find if their answers would vary in a significant way if they were Limeños or provincianos. The
horizontal axis indicates how *pobre* (1) or *rica* (4) they believe the speaker is.: Limeños’
evaluations are shown in the lighter tone of gray and *provincianos’* evaluations appear in
dark gray. The four different guises are listed on the vertical axis, on the other hand.

What turns out to be significant in this figure is the comparison between the perceptions
that informants have of each recording, taking their different origin into consideration.

There are opposite perceptions between Limeños and migrants in Figure 9. The Andean
Spanish speaker in both guises was judged to be richer in the perception of migrants than
in the perception of Limeños. And the opposite happens with LLS and LAS; the Limeño
Spanish speaker seems richer in the eyes of Limeños than of migrants. Since this is a
matter of status and power, I believe that these results respond to the empathy that
subjects feel for individuals like them. Another element worth mentioning as an

explanation for Figure 9 is that Lima’s society has been changing a lot in the past fifty
years, in the sense that *provincianos* enjoy a much better socioeconomic situation than
before, to the point that many call them the ‘emergent classes’\(^70\). Therefore, *provincianos*
do not see such a big gap between their purchasing power and the Limeños’, while
Limeños seem to be reluctant to accept the redistribution of wealth.

---

\(^70\) A sector of the population whose socioeconomic situation progressively improves to the extent that it
generates upward mobility and they achieve better status.
Figure 10. Limeños and provincianos on whiteness (indígena (1) – blanca (4)) for each guise [F(7,188) = 30.80, p < 0.0001]

Figure 10 shows the significance (p < 0.0001) of collapsing all the results collected in terms of whiteness and comparing them subsequently. I divided the participants’ responses according to their origin and not only according to the guise because I wanted to find if their answers would vary in a significant way if they were Limeños or provincianos. The horizontal axis indicates how indígena (1) or blanca (4) they believe the speaker is.: Limeños’ evaluations are shown in the lighter tone of gray and provincianos’ evaluations appear in dark gray. The four different guises are listed on the vertical axis, on the other hand. What turns out to be significant in this figure is the
comparison between the perceptions that informants have of each recording, taking their different origin into consideration.

Again in Figure 10, Limeños and provincianos perceptions on race are different. It is true that the word “indigenous” is not commonly used to refer to provincianos in everyday life; usually, they are called derogatory terms such as cholo, indio or serrano. I selected “indigenous” mostly as a counterpart to white that would not offend participants and would allow them to talk about such a sensitive topic in a detached manner. However, no matter what the term used, there are a lot of prejudices attached to being provinciano, deeply rooted even in the worldview of a Limeño college professor and psychologist: “LLS used correct forms. In the LAS recording, there were gender problems, number problems, you could tell there was not too much familiarity with Spanish. But I find it contradictory because if she is white she has to be familiar with Spanish, right? On the other hand, if she were indigenous there is no problem; it is believable because she speaks Quechua, that’s why”. Because of LAS’ use of AS morphosyntax, Adolfo thought that she was not a native speaker of Spanish (even though Andean Spanish is the native language of thousands of monolinguals). Therefore, he found it troubling because in his mind she was white and white people are always familiar with Spanish according to his ideology. Moreover, all indigenous people in Peru are supposed to speak Quechua according to him, which in reality is completely inaccurate.
Figure 11. Limeños and provincianos on beauty (*bonita* (1) – *fea* (4)) for each guise 

\[F(7,187) = 2.757, p = 0.0095\]

Figure 9 shows the significance (p = 0.0095) of collapsing all the results collected in terms of beauty and comparing them subsequently. I divided the participants’ responses according to their origin and not only according to the guise because I wanted to find if their answers would vary in a significant way if they were Limeños or provincianos. The horizontal axis indicates how *bonita* (1) or *fea* (4) they believe the speaker is.: Limeños’ evaluations are shown in the lighter tone of gray and provincianos’ evaluations appear in dark gray. The four different guises are listed on the vertical axis, on the other hand.

What turns out to be significant in this figure is the comparison between the perceptions that informants have of each recording, taking their different origin into consideration.
Beauty is a culturally constructed attribute, although most people believe it is an objective description of a person. It is no coincidence, therefore, that certain features are preferred over others and, in the case of Peru and other Latin American countries colonized by white Europeans, being white equals being beautiful, as I explained before in this same chapter. And Figure 11 shows us how this idea has been internalized also by non-white people. Nevertheless, it is possible to establish a difference between the perception of Limeños and of migrants, one that is not shown in the graphic but it is evident in the comments of Andean subjects. It is as if for Limeños, indigenous people are a homogeneous group whose shared characteristic is that they are not white. For provincianos, on the contrary, there are different physical characteristics which seem to be related to the region where they come from. For example, when I asked Andrea to select a number in the bonita-fea scale for AAS, she said that she “must be ugly because she sounds Ayacuchana”.

The last part of the MGT was a yes/no question about literacy, which is a characteristic tightly linked to education, income, etc. In fact, this element was not included when I first designed the MGT task, but since the educated-uneducated pair was constantly misinterpreted as (not) well-mannered, I was forced to insert the question about literacy in order to indirectly figure out if participants considered the women in the recordings to have at least a certain level of education. Since this is not a scale, Table 6 does not show the significance between different averages as all the figures show, but the percentages of
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71 From Ayacucho, a department in Central Andes.
affirmative or negative answers of the participants. This is also the case for Table 7, which can be found in section 5.4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>AAS</th>
<th>LAS</th>
<th>ALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>97.95</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>89.79</td>
<td>69.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Literacy indexes according to participants

This table shows a clear gradient in the perception of the participants about the literacy of the different voices. It starts with almost a 100% in the case of the Limeño speaker using Limeño Spanish to a 67.34% in the case of the migrant woman speaking Andean Spanish. The situation was similar when participants had to point out if the women in the recordings knew how to read and write. None of them thought LLS was illiterate.

However, we can observe some uncertainty regarding the Andean Spanish speaker in her two different guises. In fact, they determined that ALS (LS morphosyntax) had a better chance to be illiterate than AAS. I believe that this occurs because participants found it hard to attribute a specific social meaning to the guise, they were ‘confused’ by the mixed cues.

5.3.3. Judgments of correctness: Andean Spanish as an “incorrect” way of speaking
Throughout this work, I have used the term ‘incorrect’ to refer to the perception that Limeños have of certain features of Andean Spanish, the stigmatized ones in particular. However, it is important to make a distinction between this ‘incorrect’ Spanish and an incorrect Spanish, say, due to a grammatical error. For instance, if a Limeño person enunciates a phrase where an irregular participle has been ‘regularized’ as in He *escrito muchos poemas* instead of He *escrito muchos poemas* ‘I have written a lot of poems’ nobody is going to conclude that this person is a provinciano, and not only because this ‘mistake’ does not correspond strictly to a proviciano speech, but also because provinciano identity is not defined by a single characteristic: It is in the interaction, in the combination of traits such as being poor, indigenous and so on that Limeños recognize the incorrect Spanish that provinciano speech constitutes for them.

As explained in the methodology chapter, the session with each participant was divided into three parts: a) the MGT Task, b) a follow-up questionnaire with questions related to the MGT, and c) the demographic questionnaire. For the first study, b) consisted of a set of questions about the list of Andean Spanish sentences that appeared in the recordings. At the beginning, my intention was to re-play the recordings so that they could point out which were the cues that led them to think someone was white, or nice, or ugly. However, I soon realized that it was very hard for them to pin down specific features and, therefore, I created a written list\(^\text{72}\) with all the phrases said by both the Limeño Spanish

\[\text{\textsuperscript{72} I put the list in front of them but since the literacy levels of the participants varied, I read each feature myself.}\]
speaker using Andean Spanish morphosyntax (LAS) and the Andean Spanish speaker using her own morphosyntax (AAS).

A common reaction that I perceived when people listened to these morphosyntactic traits was that they would laugh when I showed them the most stigmatized features and they would give me a complicit look. I wouldn’t show any particular emotion at this point, but I asked them about the reason for their smiles or laughs. I interpreted those looks and laughs as a way of positioning themselves as part of the group of people who would never speak that way, let’s say, a Limeña like me. “The exposure to humiliation because of the origin forces people to migrate and to learn to reproduce a discourse that creates this kind of oppression. Implicitly, in order to excuse the powerless situation of migrants, Magdalena [a migrant herself] legitimizes a depreciatory treatment, through reference to ideologies of education and progress” (Mick, 2011). It is as if, in some way, AS speakers can “redeem” themselves “metalinguistically” and refer to AS speakers as part of a different group but when speaking, that distance is erased and they become the target of their own negative evaluations. And therefore we can witness AS speakers classifying a particular AS feature as “incorrect” while using it to express that same evaluation. “The thing is that in the provinces people speak a little…how can I put it…they don’t use Spanish well. People from the province have usually a way of speaking that is a little incorrect” says Andrea, a provinciana college student.

For instance, when talking to Abel, a Cuzqueño tailor, I showed him one of the sentences said by AAS, *A su mamá de mi esposo* casicito casicito *lo atropellan* ‘My husband’s
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73 Possessive marker doubling
mother was almost hit by a car’, and asked him if he found it weird. After laughing, he said “of course it’s incorrect, how come are you going to say that, ‘his mother’ only, what else will you say”. But when I asked him to tell me how he would have expressed the same idea in a more adequate way, he answered: *A la mamá de mi esposo casi LO atropellaron.* He corrected all the other Andean Spanish features except the pronoun *lo*, which should have been changed to *la* (feminine, singular) to follow standard gender concord. One explanation for him not noticing this feature can be the fact that this sentence was particularly loaded with Andean Spanish morphosyntax, so that Abel just could not keep track of all of them. This sounds a fair explanation, especially since he detected the *lo* in other sentences and got rid of it. However, another plausible explanation is that there are features that are less “incorrect” than others, i.e. less salient than others. Researchers such as Rodolfo Cerrón Palomino (2004) and Klee and Caravedo (2005) agree in that there are degrees to which Andean Spanish features index provinciano ways of speaking. In a paper by Klee and Caravedo (2005), the different level of markedness or stigmatization of AS features is exemplified by *leísmo*, a phenomenon that consists of the use of the indirect object pronoun *le* instead of the canonical *lo*. According to the authors, this feature has been spread in Lima by second generations of migrants because it is not overtly marked (and therefore, rejected) and is not subject to negative evaluation among both Limeños and migrants.
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74 Use of diminutives with adverbs, not allowed in Limeño Spanish

75 Neutral “lo”
Due to the fact that each of the 49 participants of the study had to judge the correctness of 13 different phrases and come up with better alternatives in case they considered them incorrect, it is impossible to give an account of all of them. For instance, given the phrase *sus cobradores de la combi*, participants who find it incorrect suggested different alternatives such as *el cobrador de la combi/ los cobradores de la combi/ sus cobradores del combi*. However, this situation should not prevent us from drawing some important conclusions from this task but rather the opposite. First of all, the conclusion that led me to conduct the second fieldwork is that, when expressing their attitudes towards LAS’ recordings, most of the participants, both Limeños and provincianos, considered her white and capitalina, among other characteristicas usually related to a Limeña; if anything, she was perceived a little less Limeña than LLS but in no way close to AAS. I was surprised by this outcome, which led me to conclude that phonology indexes provinciano much more than morphosyntax. This idea was confirmed when the subjects were confronted with the AS sentences on a piece of paper, where they themselves had to read them and express their correctness judgments. At this moment, nobody hesitated in affirming that the speakers of those phrases were provincianos, uneducated, *recién bajados*, poor, had Quechua as their first language, serranos, etc. When the LS phonology was suppressed as a cue, their perceptions changed.
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76 Double possessive marker is a typical trait of Andean Spanish morphosyntax. Its standard counterpart is *Los cobradores de la combi* (Chapter 4).

77 A derogatory phrase that can be translated as “fresh from the boat”
Second, among the provinciano informants, there was no consensus about which features they considered incorrect. For example, some of them considered the direct object pronoun in its different variants\textsuperscript{78} as unacceptable, while others would accept it as correct depending on the context. This can argue for the fact that Andean Spanish speakers don’t speak all the same variety and don’t perceive in the same way; it also confirms what I stated before: there is a hierarchy in Andean Spanish features related to their saliency when in contrast to Limeño Spanish.

Finally, the fact that Andean Spanish speakers can recognize the ‘incorrectness’ of certain features that they might use is a proof of their bidialectalism. In other words, the difference between Andean Spanish varieties and Limeño Spanish is not a radical dichotomy but a continuum, as generally happens in language contact situations, even if not all dialects are prestigious. However, prestige does play an important role in determining who needs to learn what. Limeños are less aware of the system of features that conform AS because as long as they identify them as incorrect, there is no need for them to become bidialectal since they do not want to use that dialect.

\textit{5.4. Experiment II}

\textit{5.4.1. Different morphosyntax, same phonology}

I already stated that, even though language attitudes towards Andean Spanish met my expectations, it is undeniable that phonology plays a more important role than

\textsuperscript{78} Neutral \textit{lo} and DO clitic doubling
morphosyntax when determining Andeanness, provinciano identity. Isolated morphosyntactic features were considered provincianos but when participants listened to the speech samples, the Limeño Spanish speaker using AS morphology was not considered provinciana. On the other hand, the Andean Spanish speaker, when reading the Limeño Spanish script, sounded “weird” or “charapa\textsuperscript{79},” but hardly Limeña. Nevertheless, these appreciations should not be considered shortcomings of my study; on the contrary, they show that Andean Spanish is not recognized as a regional dialect on its own. Andean Spanish speakers would not call their speech a regional variety but rather an incorrect set of Spanish features, used specifically by provincianos, which needs to be improved in order to approximate to the more prestigious standard. Therefore, I propose that what really triggers the attitudes embedded in certain linguistic ideologies are very specific features which index Andeanness, Andean identity in Lima.

In order to go deeper into these findings, I decided to go back to Lima in the summer of 2012. I found it puzzling that when the speaker of Limeño Spanish read the script with AS features, most of the informants reacted as if there was something wrong, something that didn't match but still considered her from the capital (Limeña) to different degrees. My conclusion was that, her LS phonology (intonation and phonetics) was much more salient or marked than the AS features. Only when they saw the features in paper, without a specific phonological context\textsuperscript{80}, informants recognized them as provincianas, incorrect, etc. On the other hand, when the AS speaker read the LS script, the informants reacted in

\textsuperscript{79} Colloquial term used in Peru to refer to the dialects spoken in certain areas of the Amazonia.

\textsuperscript{80} But also with a particular social context – of literacy practices and standard language ideologies.
a different way: many of them considered her "less provinciana" (not the highest number in the scale), but only a few considered her Limeña.

When the Andean Spanish woman performed the Limeño morphosyntax guise (ALS), she was considered less provinciana but still provinciana. The situation with the Limeña using AS morphosyntax (LAS), however, was completely different: it seemed as if her style was unintelligible in a social sense: as if participants could not make sense of those combinations because there were too “weird” to evaluate them. According to Amadeo, LAS was not answering naturally but she was reading a script. “I told you that you were tricking me because I am under the impression that she is reading a text in a motoso way, almost on purpose, just to pretend she is somebody that she is not”. Also migrant participants like Adriana found LAS’ speech weird: “She is speaking like backwards, provincianos do not always speak like that (…). She is basically speaking like in a movie where provincianos are represented but provincianos don’t speak like that. Finally, Amparo stated that “LAS has a nice voice, a voice which belongs to people like…(insinuating people with money). But the other ones are motosas. That is why I thought she might have a dyslexia problem, because she said something like “mi carro de mí"\(^{81}\), but still she has a nice voice…”. This is what prompted me to design a second study in which I could control for the features represented in the various guises. The main reason to conduct a second study was to determine language attitudes among Lima’s inhabitants in a much more controlled Task and compare them with the prior study. Therefore, as I explained in Chapter 4, this MGT consists of pairs of sentences,

\(^{81}\) AS feature: possessive marker doubling ('my car of mine')
each read by a different Limeño Spanish speaker. This allowed me to test informants’ language attitudes toward AS morphosyntax in a more controlled way, by keeping the phonology constant, and changing only the morphosyntactic features. Most of the Andean Spanish sentences I utilized in the design of this task were extracted from natural speech that I had recorded in prior research in order to make it as real as possible for participants. Unfortunately, at the moment, I did not consider the fact that the content of the sentences did affect the answers. For example, there was a sentence that said *Los pobres eso comen* ‘Poor people eat that’, which almost immediately generated negative reactions even when it was an AS structure. Since poverty is usually associated with non-Limeños, the woman received a very low score in terms of niceness and some assumed she was rich (and, therefore, Limeña?) because she was distancing herself from poor people. But on the positive side, since all the sentences were read by Limeño Spanish speakers, there was no contrast between different phonologies. Another phrase that was a little problematic was *Las peras lo pone en su mandil* ‘She/he puts the pears in her/his apron’; in people’s imaginary, this situation happened in a market and the mention of fruits and an apron unconsciously made them associate it with provincianos.\(^{82}\)

Furthermore, there were two other research questions that I believed it was important to answer. The first was whether the AS morphosyntactic features were sufficient basis on which to mark speakers as Andean/provincianos/motosos. My assumption was that this could be tested if the phonology was not modified. The second question was what these

\(^{82}\) It is very common in Lima that stands in markets are run by provincianos because many agricultural products come from Andean lands (and, therefore, Andean people are called *campesinos* ‘peasants’ as a euphemism).
features inserted within the speech of a Limeño speaker mean Do they still index a
speaker as provinciano/ serrano/ incorrect? The results of the second study seem to
indicate that this is the case. Figures 12 and 15 show how sentences with the Andean
Spanish morphosyntactic features are considered to be provinciano speech. The first one
shows how participants considered Limeño Spanish guises more “capitalinos” than the
Andean Spanish ones; the second compares the perceptions of both Limeños and
provincianos about both groups of sentences. I will first present the results of the second
MGT task, which reveal general attitudes toward the various guises among the
participants in the study. Then I will compare the ratings of those who were born in Lima
with those of Andean origin.

When playing the recordings to each participant, a fact that struck me as strange was that
many of the participants, no matter their origin, could not perceive the difference between
each element in the different pairs of sentences. At the beginning, I wondered if it had to
do with technological problems so I had to repeat the phrase, but afterwards I realized
that a more likely explanation was that people were unconsciously hearing what they
wanted to hear, neutralizing the slight differences between the pairs of sentences. As
Campbell-Kibler (2006) states: “listeners showed agency selecting what cues to attend to
and how to interpret them”.

83 I have considered second and third generations of migrants, people actually born in Lima, as migrants
or non-Limeños. However, I agree with other researchers such as Anna María Escobar that the children
and grandchildren of migrants have a different social and cultural profile, topics that I will discuss in my
qualitative analysis but not in the MGT responses because their identity is closer to migrants than to
traditional Limeños.
Figure 12 shows the degree of provincialism perceived in the two groups of sentences: the one with AS morphosyntactic features and the one which works as counterpart. I collapsed all my informants’ responses and separated them in two different groups according to the morphosyntax of one particular trait. The horizontal axis indicates how *provinciana* (1) or *capitalina* (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the two different groups of sentences from the recordings played. The comparison of the evaluations participants made of the two groups turns out to be significant (p = 0.0011).

This figure demonstrates how the LS sentences were perceived as said by a *capitalino* more than the AS sentences. The results of the first study lead us to think that phonology was more salient than morphology when indexing Andeanness. However, even though in this second study the (Limeño Spanish) phonology remained the same and only the morphosyntax changed, participants were able to determine which ones sounded more or less capitalino. This illustrates the fact that morphosyntax also index Andeanness, just not as definitively as phonology.
Figure 12. Perceptions on provincialism, AS and LS morphosyntax ($t=-3.3$, df=262, $p=0.0011$)

Figure 13 shows the significance ($p = 0.005$) of comparing the evaluations on the two groups of sentences in terms of poverty: the one with AS morphosyntactic features and the one which works as counterpart. I collapsed all my informants’ responses and separated them into two different groups according to the morphosyntax of one particular trait. The horizontal axis indicates how *pobre* (1) or *rica* (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the two different groups of sentences from the recordings played.
In terms of wealth, although we observe the same tendency shown in Figure 12, the difference between LS and AS sentences is smaller. Perhaps this has to do with the fact that these days the economic status is being challenged by new Limeños, the so-called ‘emergent classes’. While conducting fieldwork and a participant would qualify one of the AS guises as coming from a poor person, I would ask them if they thought that it was common to imagine a provinciano as poor. Their answers, especially the ones from the Andean migrants and new Limeños were varied, but many of them stated that they were talking about this specific case, not that they thought provincianos would necessarily be poor. In this sense, I believe that Limeño society is undergoing important changes. Unfortunately, an improvement in their income does not imply an improvement in their social status.
Figure 13. Perceptions on wealth, AS and LS morphosyntax (t=-3.52, df=262, p=0.0005)

Figure 14 indicates the significance (p < 0.0001) of comparing the evaluations on the two groups of sentences in terms of whiteness: the one with AS morphosyntactic features and the one which works as counterpart. I collapsed all my informants’ responses and separated them into two different groups according to the morphosyntax of one particular trait. The horizontal axis indicates how indígena (1) or blanca (4) the speaker is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the two different groups of sentences from the recordings played.

Being Peruvian myself, I had realized that, in my country, people (unconsciously, many times) tend to assume that if you are white, you have been born in the capital (or at least not in the Andes). More than once, when traveling throughout the country, people have
called me *gringa*, which is in a strict sense a disparaging term for a foreigner in Latin America, especially white Americans. In a broad sense, though, it entails being foreign and being white. Moreover, people have called me *gringa* in Lima while conducting research in the city’s periphery, a situation that caught me completely off guard, especially when a person asked me where was I from. I have experienced this situation throughout most Latin American countries I have traveled to, as a present burden from our colonial past. Unfortunately, stereotypes are so widespread that even outside Peru I have been told that ‘I don’t look Peruvian’, almost as a compliment I should be thankful for: ‘Peruvians are small and dark…ugly…But you are not’84.

In Latin America, the connection between whiteness and beauty seems almost natural and, therefore, barely contested. I believe that this is the reason why I have not been able to find much literature about it, a huge contrast if we review American literature on white/black comparisons. As I explained before regarding Figure 5, if you are beautiful it is because you are white. Unfortunately, this stereotype does not only come from white people but also from non-white people, a situation that might seem contradictory. Silvestre (1994), when discussing the analogous situation in the Dominican Republic, considers prejudice against blacks a ‘contradictory behavior’, since it is a country with a high percentage of blacks.

During my second fieldwork, I asked the participant Borja, an Andean migrant in his sixties, why he thought that the person in the guise was beautiful (Limeño Spanish sentence), to what he answered: ‘Well, she must be beautiful because she “sounds”
white’. I then asked him if non-white people could not be considered beautiful. He gave me a surprised look for a second, as if I were asking him a tricky question, followed by a smile: ‘Oh, of course, they can be beautiful too’.

**Figure 14.** Perceptions on whiteness, AS and LS morphosyntax ($t=-4.41$, df=262, $p < 0.0001$)

5.4.2. *Limeños vs. migrants, status vs. solidarity*

One of the most interesting findings in these results is the fact that all significant results come from the status dimension, not from the solidarity dimension. In other words, *Limeños* and *provincianos* have very similar perceptions about both dialects in terms of
solidarity. But what is it about the traits related to power that generates very different opinions? I believe that, as I claimed in the first section of this chapter, it has to do with the necessity of Limeños to distance them from “the other”, the one with less status. Migrants and new Limeños, however, tend to have the exact opposite behavior: they constantly try to assimilate to prestigious Limeño society in order to be accepted. While conducting fieldwork, provinciano informants constantly told me how, when they just arrived in the city, they had to learn many things. Migrants who had been in Lima before them were the ones who explained them how things worked, what could they say, how should they speak, what costumes should they forget and which new ones should they embrace, what should they wear, and so on because they had already experienced that first cultural shock.

The perceptions of Limeños and migrants are, with some exceptions, relatively the same. However, Limeños are more “radical” in the differences they perceive between Andean Spanish and Limeño Spanish sentences. Is it a “gatekeeping” strategy, where differences in solidarity do not play an important role but where status differences need to be highlighted in order to establish a “we” vs. “them”? Even Berta, a provinciana from Huánuco, uses the third person plural when talking about people just like her:

“Provincianas get confused with letters, even when they are literate they get confused”. In other words, also many provincianos kind of distance themselves from the social category of being provinciano in Lima. Even so, a valid question to ask, especially when talking about Andeaness, is if that distancing responds to the fact that they don’t
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85 Department in Central Andes
consider themselves provincianos. They are perceived as so, but as I have repeatedly stated, identity is not fixed but performed in each interaction. They meet most of the stereotypical characteristics selected for the attitudinal scales, it is true, but that not necessarily make them provincianos in their own perception.

Undoubtedly, the discussion about identity is always an extremely complex one; so complex, in fact, that the discriminated individuals internalize prejudices about provinciano inferiority to the extent of projecting them on others of similar background. When listening to them, one was under the impression that there was an internal struggle between who they were and who they wanted to be, a struggle shown in what I have labeled as a somehow ‘schizophrenic’ discourse. As an example of these frequent ‘contradictions’, the following is a fragment of my conversation with Alberto, a gardener from Central Andes: “The one you interviewed last, she shows a little lack of study…In any case, a provinciano/ (we) make(s) mistakes when vocalizing a word”86.

Figure 15 illustrates the degree of provincialism perceived according to the morphosyntactic feature under study. The horizontal axis indicates how provinciana (1) or capitalina (4) the speaker enunciating the sentence is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the two different group of sentences that participants had to listen to. What turns out to be significant in this figure (p < 0.0001) is the difference between Limeño and migrant responses for each group of features.

86 The English translation does not accurately show how the grammatical person “a provinciano” (3rd, singular) does not concord with the verb “make” (1st, plural): el que ha entrevistado última, le falta un poco del estudio...De todas maneras un provinciano tenemos errores en vocalización de una palabra.
In Figure 15, Limeños considered speakers uttering LS sentences more capitalinos than provinciano participants; in the same vein, speakers uttering AS sentences were considered more provincianos by Limeños than by provincianos. Again, this supports the idea that Limeños are more radical in their perceptions and that they detect AS more easily because they want to distance themselves from “the other”. Although still understudied, researchers such as Klee and Caravedo (2005) support the idea that many grammatical features, specifically the least stigmatized could have been incorporated in Limeño Spanish; therefore, it is an illusion to think that there is ONE incorruptible LS. Therefore, it is more adequate to think that the coexistence of Limeño, Andean and other Spanish varieties in Lima has resulted in a continuum that cannot be easily segmented in order to say who speaks what.
Figure 15. Perceptions on provincialism (provinciana (1) – capitalina (4)) according to Limeños and migrants, AS and LS morphosyntax \([F(3,260) = 8.132, p < 0.0001]\)

Figure 16 is another example of Limeños expressing more radical differences than provincianos between both groups in terms of wealth. It illustrates the degree of poverty perceived according to the morphosyntactic feature under study. The horizontal axis indicates how pobre (1) or rica (4) the speaker enunciating the sentence is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the two different groups of sentences that participants (divided into Limeños and migrants) had to listen to. What turns out to be significant in this figure \((p = 0.0013)\) is the difference between Limeño and migrant responses for each group of features.
The stereotype of *provincianos* being usually poor (peasants) still persists; however, the results shown in the following figure, where the distance between Limeños and provincianos is shorter, is supported by some of the testimonies from my recordings. For instance, Adán, a new Limeño cook son of Andean migrants, does not agree with this prejudice. According to him, there are many *provincianos* that are businessmen, which implicitly means that they have a good economic level.

Figure 16. Perceptions on poverty (*pobre* (1) – *rica* (4)) according to Limeños and migrants, AS and LS morphosyntax \[F(3,260) = 67.42, p = 0.0013\]
Figure 17 illustrates the degree of whiteness associated with the morphosyntactic feature under study. The horizontal axis indicates how indígena (1) or blanca (4) the speaker enunciating the sentence is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the two different groups of sentences that participants (divided into Limeños and migrants) had to listen to. What turns out to be significant in this figure (p < 0.0001) is the difference between Limeño and migrant responses for each group of features.
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Figure 17. Perceptions on whiteness (indígena (1) – blanca (4)) according to Limeños and migrants, AS and LS morphosyntax [F(3,260) = 8.532, p < 0.001]
While participants like Beto showed certain reluctance in using terms such as provinciano or indigenous, other Limeños like Barbara had no problem in expressing highly pejorative terms like serranaza\textsuperscript{87}. Maybe this relates to the fact that Beto is much whiter than Barbara, and that is why she feels the urge to distance herself as much as possible from a person who speaks in a provinciano fashion. In any case, Beto’s behavior is not very common among white, rich, educated Limeños, while Barbara’s behavior, unfortunately, tends to be the norm. Expressions such as \textit{Acá todos somos cholos} ‘We are all cholos here’ show how racism is usually erased from the discourse, but not from reality. Many Peruvians base the idea that we are a homogenous group (of cholos) in the fact that there has been a deep process of mestizaje since colonial times. Nevertheless, negative language attitudes towards non-Limeño varieties are only one way to prove that the country is far from eradicating prejudices against indigenous people.

\textsuperscript{87} It is as if calling somebody “Serrano” (from the Sierra/Andes and all the negative characteristics implicit in the term) is not enough and some people need to add the augmentative suffix –azo/-aza.
Figure 18. Perceptions on beauty (*bonita* (1) – *fea* (4)) according to Limeños and migrants, AS and LS morphosyntax [F(3,260) = 4.051, p = 0.0077]

Figure 18 illustrates the degree of beauty perceived according to the morphosyntactic feature under study. The horizontal axis indicates how *bonita* (1) or *fea* (4) the speaker enunciating the sentence is considered to be; the vertical axis indicates the two different groups of sentences that participants (divided into Limeños and migrants) had to listen to. What turns out to be significant in this figure (p = 0.0077) is the difference between Limeño and migrant responses for each group of features.

From the beginning, I found the pair *bonita-fea* somewhat troubling. I assigned the concept of beauty to the status dimension because I argue that, in Peru, it is highly associated with the concept of whiteness. For example, when playing one of the
recordings to Borja, a provinciano in his sixties, he said: “She must be beautiful because she sounds white”. However, in this second fieldwork, it did not turn out to be significant when subjects were not divided according to their origin, even when all the other status scales were significant. Moreover, Table 7 shows a very slight difference between the different scores attributed to the sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Literacy percentages according to participants

Informants had to determine the literacy of the person who uttered each recorded sentence. Looking at Table 7, it is very interesting to see how certain features indicate “illiterate” more than others. In this sense, AB1: *los pobres eso comen/los pobres comen eso* and AB3: *la forma como (lo) trata a su hijo* were perceived as a phrase only a literate, i.e. educated, person would say. However, a high percentage of participants considered that the people who uttered A5 *yo me he nacido aquí en Lima* and A2: *poco plata debe tener* were illiterate. I believe that there are two possible explanations for these percentages: first, that there is a different degree of markedness in terms of
Andeanness or, as I claimed before, that some features are more provincianos than others and, therefore, the speakers sound less educated. The other explanation is that these two particular features do not belong to Andean Spanish as a monolingual dialect but as a second language variety, whose features are only used in the first stages of the L2 learning. For example, lack of gender concord (as in poco plata) is not exclusive of Andean Spanish but a common feature found in L2 varieties (Escobar, 1994)

5.4.3. How “Limeño” are you?: Andean migrants, traditional Limeños and new Limeños

In Section 2.2. of the second chapter, based on the existing literature, I establish 3 different types of inhabitants in Lima relevant for this study: traditional Limeños, Andean migrants and new Limeños. Due to the specific goals of this study, I am not currently focusing on the difference between Andean migrants and new Limeños, their descendants. Moreover, in the second MGT I grouped them together in order to compare them to traditional Limeños. However, that does not mean that there are not many differences between them, and they are easily perceivable in my recordings of new Limeños, as is the case of Smith’s (2008: 76) study: “All the interviewees establish a difference between the cultural quality and level of Andean migrants and their children. The new Limeños interviewees […] distance themselves from their geographic origins (provincianos, peasants), racial (indigenous) and cultural (indigenous languages, traditional cultural practices)”. When filling in the demographic questionnaire, I asked Adán, the 26 year old new Limeño I mentioned before, if his father spoke other languages since he was born in the Andes. Adán said that he believed he spoke Quechua
and Aymara but was not sure. Furthermore, he described himself as not only Limeño, but ‘Liménísimo’.

After completing the MGT task, participants had to answer to the questionnaire described in Chapter 4, where one of the questions, just as in the first stage of fieldwork, was about the correctness of their sentences and their answers were mostly consistent with those of the first experiment. One of the only unexpected reactions worth noticing is that in sentence B4, *Las peras las ponía en su mandil* ‘the pears she/he put in her/his apron’, the subjects considered it incorrect even though this sentence is correct in normative terms. I believe that they were predisposed to associate any OV sentence with incorrectness. Also, this is one of the few cases where both the direct object and the direct object pronoun can be explicit in the sentence, when the object is in pre-verbal position. Therefore, after noticing this in the first interview, I began to contextualize the sentence with an adequate antecedent and subjects accepted it as correct. I think it is because OV order is used in standard Spanish to topicalize an object and, therefore, without enough information, some subjects saw it as incorrect.

The other unexpected reaction I found among the informants, specifically among Limeños, was the “confusion” they reported when they heard the voice of a typical Limeña using a morphosyntactic feature that didn’t match their expectations. Therefore, they found it hard to complete the semantic scales sometimes like Bernardo, who told me

---

88 Adán uses the superlative adjectives suffix to imply that he is like the quintessentially Limeño.
he was puzzled because his intuitions were under question: his perception led him to call provinciano somebody who sounded Limaño but had “something” that made him feel uneasy about categorizing her as a capitalina. Benito, a Limeño lawyer, also found it difficult to fill in the scales because he heard a Limeño accent with a grammatical structure that did not fit. This alleged “confusion” contributes to answer the question about the degree of markedness of Andean morphosyntax and if it is marked enough to attribute Andeanness to the speaker or does it only sound “weird”. It is possible that traditional Limeños’ confusion arises because they recognize that the AS morphosyntax is not their own, while Andean Spanish speakers did not notice the contrast in such a drastic way and thus they are able to associate social meaning to it in an easier way.

The last question I asked was about the concept of motosidad: if they had heard it before, what does it mean? Who uses it and to refer to whom? Is it a negative or a positive term? Some participants, especially “traditional” Limeños, were not familiar with the term *motoso*, or had heard it but didn’t know exactly what it meant. Many Andean migrants recognized they had been made fun of for how they speak and that they had been called “motosos”. However, they said they never used the term to refer to others. Only one person, a Limeña, recognized using it to refer to Andean migrants with an “incorrect” Spanish. A provinciana girl stated that, in her opinion, it was mostly second-generation migrants who use the term.
When I asked Adriana what does it mean to have mote, she answered: “Mote, what people say, that they don’t speak good Spanish, they speak *masticado*[^89]. People mix different vowels and also sound, they speak like singing. Sometimes I start to imitate them and suddenly it comes naturally for imitating it so much. My mote escapes from my mouth, as if I were talking upside down. For example, a provinciano speaks as if he comes from the country, country. In the cities, rich people don’t speak Quechua and have a better education”.

### 5.5. Conclusions

With so many different ideas on what AS actually is, I propose an alternative approach, one which connects those attitudes and ideologies to very specific grammatical features that function as social indexes of being provinciano, of Andeanness outside the Andes. In this chapter, I have described and analyzed the results of two MGT Tasks that took place in Lima between 2011 and 2012. I wanted to give an account of the perceptions that Lima’s inhabitants have of certain Andean Spanish morphosyntactic features, and I wanted to contrast those perceptions in terms of the origin of the participants to find out which similarities and which differences can be found between Limeños and migrants in a dialect contact situation.

[^89]: Chewed
CHAPTER 6: Conclusions

6.1. Introduction

This dissertation has presented a quantitative and qualitative approach to the attitudes and ideologies that the residents of Lima have towards Andean Spanish and their speakers in order to propose a definition of Andeanness, of provinciano identity. My claim is that, even though I do not think that Andeanness is simply a set of features which constitute a single identity for Andean migrants, provinciano identity has been portrayed in mainstream discourses in this impoverished and simplistic manner.

Being Andean in the Andes has completely different implications than being Andean in Lima and the attitudes shown toward language are a perfect example of this claim;\textsuperscript{90} thus both the relevant literature and my fieldwork research point to the fact that (Andean) identity is undeniably conditioned by location, ethnicity, level of education, and race, as well as all the processes, relationships and social interactions that take place in the Peruvian capital.

The present perception study provides an approach to the reactions that both Limeños and Andean migrants have towards a selection of (stigmatized) morphosyntactic

\textsuperscript{90} This assumption does not mean that Andean Spanish speakers are not discriminated against in the Andes; however, the dynamics change with the change of context. For a discussion on this topic, see Zavala 2011.
features from Andean Spanish. Making use of the Matched-Guise technique and a questionnaire, I collected data in two different and complementary fieldwork projects.

6.2. Findings and contributions to the field

The analysis of the data collected has several theoretical implications which constitute an important contribution to the field of linguistics. One of my central claims, that there is no dialect awareness towards Andean Spanish, was proven by the fact that participants, when confronted with the selected morphosyntactic features of that dialect, did not associate them with a dialect per se, but with an ‘incorrect’ Spanish spoken mostly by Andean migrants, which allegedly share stereotypical characteristics such as a low level of education, indigenous race and poverty. Interestingly, I found that these stigmatized morphosyntactic features were not indexes of Andeanness each by itself but mostly only when combined. Therefore, when a certain feature was interpreted as being said by an indigenous person, it was usually assumed that this person was also provinciana, had a low level of education, had a low income, and so on.

The concept of Andeanness, of provinciano identity as an interaction of different characteristics together also led to another finding. In the second phase of data collection, many Limeño participants seemed to be unable to associate the Andean Spanish morphosyntactic features with a provinciano identity in the same way they did during the
first fieldwork. This was due to the fact that I only used Limeño Spanish speakers for the guises so that the phonological features remained the same and only one feature was modified in each phrase. Limeño participants looked confused and expressed how they knew the person was white or capitalina (from the capital) but, at the same time, they also knew that no Limeño (probably referring specifically to traditional Limeños, not new Limeños) would say something like that. This sort of ‘confusion’ was also shown during the first fieldwork for the case of the LS speaker using AS morphosyntax and, to a lesser extent, of the AS speaker using LS morphosyntax. In other words, even though Andean Spanish phonology was shown to be central for indexing Andeanness, AS morphosyntax also has social meaning, just in a somehow subconscious manner. This is the reason why Limeños recognized a given AS feature as ‘weird’ or not likely to be said by the person in the recording, but not necessarily could tell why: the different components of grammar index Andeanness to different degrees.

One of the recurring patterns found through the quantitative analysis in the first part of Chapter 5 is that it is more important to establish the difference between groups in terms of power than in terms of solidarity. This is shown in the significantly greater distance between the two Limeño Spanish speaker guises and the ones by the AS speaker in terms of the characteristics related to status. That is to say that Limeño Spanish obtained higher scores for those characteristics related to status; simultaneously, it was Andean Spanish which tended to receive higher scores for those characteristics related to solidarity.
Another interesting finding is what the analysis of the data collected during the second phase of field work revealed to us: that Limeños are more radical in their answers as the charts demonstrate through the greater distance between different elements than in the case of Andean migrants. After this result, one can conclude that they perceive more distinction between provincianos and themselves than provincianos do. However, regarding provincianos and the solidarity dimension, it is somewhat surprising to find that the statistical analysis sometimes (for example, in the simpática-antipática scales) shows that Limeños perceive the AS speaker as nicer (more simpática) than migrants do although one might have expected provincianos to feel more empathy for people like themselves.

The aforementioned findings of the present dissertation constitute contributions to the fields of sociolinguistics, social psychology and linguistic anthropology by bringing an interdisciplinary and inclusive perspective: the analysis of the selected AS morphosyntactic features embedded in the particular sociolinguistic context of internal migration to Lima; the use of a Matched-guise test, a tool to measure (language) attitudes in the field of social psychology; and the integration of concepts from linguistic anthropology such as enregisterment, indexicality and social meaning in order to explain linguistic ideologies of both Andean migrants and Limeños.

Linguists have studied AS grammar in Peru in relative depth, both as the variety of Quechua-Spanish bilinguals\(^9\) as well as the variety of monolinguals. However, there are

\(^9\) i.e. an SLA phenomenon
only a few studies dealing with the linguistic identity of AS speakers in the specific context of migration, at least in the case of this Andean country, hence there are still many gaps to be filled. The interdisciplinarity of my approach offers a much more complete analysis, an analysis that can represent the complexities of the social and linguistic dynamics of the city.

Finally, a central contribution, not only to linguistic research but to Limeño society in general, is the recognition of the role that language plays in shaping the identity of ‘the other’. One of the main goals of this study was to raise awareness of how important dialectal perception is in defining the interaction of different groups in Lima and how ignoring this fact could lead to social exclusion and deeper inequalities among the groups which make up the country.

Migration as a social phenomenon plays a central role in the construction of linguistic identities, as Hazen and Hamilton (2008) show in their article about Appalachian English in the diaspora. Currently, there are no other studies that deal with the linguistic identity of AS speakers in the specific context of migration—at least not in Peru—and my research brings to light important aspects of this topic. In this way, I have contributed to understanding better to what extent Andean migrants’ identity is re-shaped when they migrate to Lima and become provincianos.
6.3. Questions to be answered and future directions

In this section, I will mention the main topics opened by this research but necessarily neglected in this project due to time or other resource constraints. First of all, the fact that Andean Spanish speakers can recognize the ‘incorrectness’ of certain features that they might use is proof of their bidialectalism; in other words, the fact that AS speakers can recognize a certain feature as *motoso* and are able to change it into a more standard feature shows that they are bidialectal. Second language acquisition and psycholinguistic factors influence who feels the urge to learn what. As a consequence, I would dare to say that *provincianos* become bidialectal very soon, mostly to avoid discrimination. To clarify this idea, when I use the term ‘bidialectal’, I am not affirming that an AS speaker, after some months of living in Lima, sounds like any other Limeño. My claim is that they start learning Limeño Spanish and throughout time they start gaining more and more proficiency. The first stage in this process, due to discrimination against them by Limeños, is the perception of the features of the speech that are considered stigmatized in the city and, consequently, its substitution for more accepted traits. In the same way that Andean Spanish speakers are aware of their Spanish and the Spanish spoken by Limeños, many of my participants have shown awareness of differences among Andean Spanish dialects. Unfortunately, variation in Andean Spanish has only been addressed so far in terms of specific features such as *leismo* in Cajamarca (northern Peruvian Andes); general descriptions of Andean Spanish, however, do not often specify interdialectal differences.
Finally, another topic I would like to address in further research is the sociolinguistic situation of new Limeños. The children and grandchildren of Andean migrants, despite being born and raised in Lima, are not considered Limeños by traditional Limeños and, furthermore, don’t consider themselves as such, but neither are they provincianos. These particular circumstances make their Spanish an incredibly interesting object of study.
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Appendices

**Appendix A: Participant demographics, Experiment I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Family origin</th>
<th>Places where they have lived</th>
<th>Current district</th>
<th>Language(s) spoken</th>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Huancabamba, Piura</td>
<td>Huancabamba</td>
<td>Huancabamba and Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, a &quot;little&quot; English</td>
<td>Highschool</td>
<td>Maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poroy, Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco, Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Quispicanchis, Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco (42 years), Lima</td>
<td>Santa Anita</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (1°)</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lima, father from Arequipa</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Pueblo Libre</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Lima, father from Arequipa but lived in Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Highschool</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Lima, papá catalán</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Miraflors</td>
<td>Spanish, some English</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
<td>Cajamarca, Lima(20 years)</td>
<td>Santa Anita</td>
<td>Spanish (parents speak Q)</td>
<td>Highschool</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Canta</td>
<td>Canta</td>
<td>Canta, Lima</td>
<td>San Martin de Porres</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Didn't finish highschool</td>
<td>Farmer, salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Abancay, Apurímac</td>
<td>Abancay, Apurímac</td>
<td>Apurímac, Lima (25)</td>
<td>Manchay, Pachacámac</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (1°)</td>
<td>Highschool</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ayacucho</td>
<td>Ayacucho</td>
<td>Ayacucho, Lima (15)</td>
<td>Chorrillos</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua, English</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Designer, trader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lima, mother, Piura</td>
<td>Lima, Argentina, Cuzco, Bolivia, Lima (15)</td>
<td>Ate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>Father's Place</td>
<td>Mother's Place</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Huancayo, Junin</td>
<td>Huancayo, Cuzco (father)</td>
<td>Huancayo, Lima (70)</td>
<td>Surquillo</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Salesman, art teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Ancash (mother, Q), father Puno (Ay)</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Pueblo Libre</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (understands)</td>
<td>Jeweller, artisan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Piura, Andes</td>
<td>Piura, Lima (23)</td>
<td>Piura, Lima</td>
<td>Ventanilla</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Highschool Maid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
<td>Spanish Institute</td>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, Ica</td>
<td>Ica, Lima (6)</td>
<td>Magdalena</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Highschool Housewife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ayacucho</td>
<td>Ayacucho, Lima</td>
<td>Villa el Salvador</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (1°)</td>
<td>Highschool Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, Chimbote (father)</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Callao</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Higher Education Student, waiter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Villa Maria del Triunfo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Highschool Waiter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco, Lima (father)</td>
<td>Cuzco, Lima (16)</td>
<td>Villa Maria del Triunfo</td>
<td>Spanish, parents Quechua</td>
<td>Highschool Cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
<td>Huancabamba (f), Cajamarca (m)</td>
<td>Cajamarca(15), Chiclayo(Lima)(2)</td>
<td>Ventanilla</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Highschool Cook, bus driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Piura, Andes</td>
<td>Huancabamba, parents; Ecuador, grandparents</td>
<td>Piura until 5, Tarapoto until 18, Lima (5)</td>
<td>Ventanilla</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Highschool Juice maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
<td>Cajamarca until 11, Chiclayo until 14, Lima (9)</td>
<td>San Martin de Porres</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Higher Education Student, waitress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ancash</td>
<td>Ancash</td>
<td>Ancash, Lima (14)</td>
<td>Ventanilla</td>
<td>Spanish, parents Quechua</td>
<td>Higher Education Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Arequipa</td>
<td>Arequipa</td>
<td>Arequipa until 25, Junin, USA when 50, Spain, Italy, La Perla, Callao</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Abancay, Apurímac</td>
<td>Abancay, Apurímac</td>
<td>Abancay, Lima (49)</td>
<td>Carabayllo</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (lost in Lima)</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>Waiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Huaycaybamba, Huánuco</td>
<td>Huaycaybamba, Huánuco</td>
<td>Huánuco, Lima (25)</td>
<td>Ventanilla</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (1°)</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>Waiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Andahuaylas, Apurímac</td>
<td>Andahuaylas, Apurímac</td>
<td>Apurímac, Lima (44)</td>
<td>San Juan de Lurigancho</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (1°)</td>
<td>Highschool, unfinished</td>
<td>Waiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lima (Callao)</td>
<td>Lima (Callao)</td>
<td>Ventanilla</td>
<td>Ventanilla</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, Ica</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Puente piedra</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>cleaning person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Lima, Austria (father)</td>
<td>NY, Lima(4-13), LA(14), Lima(15-19), Israel (20-21), Lima (21-26), Spain(27-33), USA (33), Lima</td>
<td>Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, English, Hebrew</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
<td>Cajamarca (7), Trujillo (5), Chiclayo (10), Lima (8)</td>
<td>Independencia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Logistics manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Ciencuilla</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Highschool</td>
<td>Busboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Barrrios Altos</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Highschool</td>
<td>cleaning person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Quillabamba, Apurímac</td>
<td>Quillabamba, Lima (22)</td>
<td>Villa Maria del Triunfo</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (understands)</td>
<td>Highschool, unfinished</td>
<td>janitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco (16), Lima (3), Arequipa, Puno, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Lima (1)</td>
<td>Surco</td>
<td>Spanish (1°), Quechua, English</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Waiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima (grandfathers from Ayacucho, from one side)</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Arequipa</td>
<td>Arequipa</td>
<td>Juliaca (13), Arequipa (3), Lima (5)</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
<td>Spanish, some English and French</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Pastry cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Huancavelica, Ancash</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Chosica</td>
<td>Spanish, some English and German</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Personal assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, Cajamarca (father)</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>La Molina</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Motupe, Lambayeque</td>
<td>Lambayeque</td>
<td>Motupe (20), Rioja (3), Motupe (2), Lima (18)</td>
<td>Villa María del Triunfo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Primary school, unfinished</td>
<td>Juice maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parinacochas, Ayacucho</td>
<td>Ayacucho</td>
<td>Ayacucho (12), Lima (8)</td>
<td>Villa el Salvador</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (1°)</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>cleaning person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, (1 grandfather from Huánuco, 1 from Arequipa)</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
<td>Spanish, some English and German</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Huancabamba, Piura</td>
<td>Huancabamba, Piura</td>
<td>Huancabamba(14) and Lima(34)</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>cleaning person, maid, saleswoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Huancabamba, Piura</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Saleswoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Huancabamba, Piura</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Highschool</td>
<td>Babysitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Ayacucho father, Arequipa mother</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, some English, some Quechua</td>
<td>Highschool</td>
<td>Student (English institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Huancabamba father, Cuzco mother</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Student/in the Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Apurimac</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Participant demographics, Experiment II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Family origin</th>
<th>Places where they lived</th>
<th>Current district</th>
<th>Language(s) spoken</th>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>father Talara, the rest Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Father Tacna, the rest Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco, Lima at 11</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Parents Piura, grandparents various</td>
<td>Lima and different towns in Peruvian Amazon; Bolivia a couple years</td>
<td>Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, a little English</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Business consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Father Ferreñafe, mother Tarma</td>
<td>Lima, Iquitos (not too long)</td>
<td>Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Professional dancer</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Apurimac</td>
<td>Apurimac</td>
<td>Apurimac, Lima 24 years</td>
<td>Pachacamac</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (1)</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Mother Lima, Father Cajamarca (came to Lima to study university)</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>La Molina</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Huarochiri (Lima's Andean area)</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Santa Anita</td>
<td>Spanish, a little English</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, Pacasmayo</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
<td>Spanish, English, German</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, grandparents Lima and other countries</td>
<td>Lima, 3 years in USA, 1 in Argentina, 2 in Chile and back to Lima</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
<td>Spanish, English, German</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Human Resources manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Ancash</td>
<td>Ancash</td>
<td>Ancash until 4, then lived in Huacho until 11, Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua (learned as an adult)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco until 20, then Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Ayacucho</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, understands Quechua</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>School teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Huamachuco, sierra La Libertad</td>
<td>Huamachuco until 11, the Amazon 3 years, then Chiclayo, then Lima in 1976</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ica</td>
<td>Ica, Lima 5 years ago</td>
<td>San Borja</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, grandparents Lima, OXapampa, Cerro de Pasco and Chiclayo</td>
<td>La Punta</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Lima, great grandparents from Cuzco</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Surco</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Huancayo</td>
<td>parents Lima, grandparents Lima, Huánuco, Huancayo, Italy</td>
<td>Huancayo, Lima since 16</td>
<td>Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>grandparents Piura and Arequipa</td>
<td>Lima, Canada from 8 to 10, NY grad school</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Catalan father, Lima mother</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, a little English</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cuzco</td>
<td>Cuzco, Arequipa grandparents, some spoke Quechua</td>
<td>Cuzco (city/jungle) and Lima 2 years ago</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Huánuco province (2 de mayo)</td>
<td>Huánuco</td>
<td>Ingenieros, La Molina</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Father and grandparents Ayacucho</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>San Juan de Miraflores</td>
<td>Spanish, father and grandparents Quechua</td>
<td>Unfinished secondary</td>
<td>Maid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>