The Unlinking of Language and Puerto Rican Identity:

New Trends in Sight

The Unlinking of Language and Puerto Rican Identity:

New Trends in Sight

By

Brenda Domínguez-Rosado

The Unlinking of Language and Puerto Rican Identity:
New Trends in Sight

By Brenda Domínguez-Rosado

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

It is with great pleasure that I dedicate this book to my sons, Roberto and Armando Rivera-Domínguez; grandson, Adrián Rivera-Chaur; mother, Vilma Rosado-Colón; deceased father, Tony Domínguez-Luján; husband, Thomas Colón-Olivares; and sisters, Debra Domínguez-Varas and Ivette Domínguez-Lovell. You are all my greatest blessings in life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of my doctoral dissertation and subsequent book was the culmination of a process that included the support of many people. I wish to thank the following for their help and contributions:

1. My dissertation committee: Dr. Alma Simounet (director), Dr. Alicia Pousada, and Dr. Nicholas Faraclas.

   It would have been impossible to complete my degree without these three wonderful linguists who inspired me because of their own excellence as educators and scholars. Dr. Simounet was my professor in both of my master's degree programs and introduced me to the concept of the link between language and identity in her specialized doctoral course dealing with that particular subject. Her caring support and insight were invaluable to my keeping on track with all of the final phase requirements and retaining my sanity. Dr. Pousada inspired me to change my doctoral major from literature to linguistics after taking her graduate course, Language and Culture. Her writings about language issues in Puerto Rico served as a base for my own ideas about the subject. Her suggested revisions and attention to detail were greatly appreciated and made all of my work much better. Dr. Faraclas opened my eyes to the relationship between language and power, contributed greatly to my development as a published author and speaker at conferences, and exposed me to the diasporic Puerto Rican community in St. Croix. I will be eternally grateful to him for all of those things.

   I had the "Dream Team" as my dissertation committee. Others should be so lucky!

2. My colleagues at the University of Puerto Rico, Bayamón (UPRB). They supported me in my efforts and always had words of encouragement and good advice when fatigue wanted to overcome me. They believed that I would finish my doctorate and to prove them right, I did!

3. The former chancellor, Dr. Arturo Avilés, and the former dean of academic affairs, Dr. Edna Miranda, at UPRB who facilitated my initial research (completion of questionnaire) and subsequent focus group sessions on campus.

INTRODUCTION

Language and identity have traditionally been linked to each other. The way we speak, the vocabulary we use, and the colloquialisms that pepper our communications establish who we are. Language reveals where we are from and where we live. It establishes "an individual's or speech community's place in society" (Djité 2006, 3). It dictates expectations others have of us and opportunities we are afforded, expectations and opportunities that help us rise or constrain us to remain where we are.

Although bilingualism—even multilingualism—exists in a majority of the countries of the world, people usually identify more with one particular language and culture than others. But what determines their choice? Is it because the majority of the people in their community speak that language? Is it because that language is perceived as more powerful than the others spoken in the community? Is it possible to separate language from the culture to which it is linked; that is, is it possible to speak a language without expecting any type of cultural interference? What effects does bilingualism or multilingualism have on an individual's personal, social, and ethnic identities? According to Haugen,

> Wherever languages are in contact, one is likely to find certain prevalent attitudes of *favor* or *disfavor* towards the languages involved. These can have profound effects on the psychology of the individuals and on their use of the languages. In the final analysis these attitudes are directed at the people who use the languages and are therefore inter-group judgments and stereotypes. (quoted in Grosjean 1982, 118)

Because of these types of negative attitudes and stereotypes and the need to confront and eradicate them, the traditional idea of one language–one identity may be weakening. Technological advances and globalization are bringing us closer to people of other languages and cultures. As we become pluricultural and multilingual, the need—even the desire—to link a specific language with a specific culture or identity becomes more and more constraining.

Yet divorcing ourselves from that link is not easy. Because language is a "symbol of social or group identity, an emblem of group membership and solidarity," (Grosjean 1982, 117) it goes hand in hand with the attitudes and values of both speakers and nonspeakers. In communities in

which both speakers and nonspeakers of a particular language coexist, these attitudes play an important role, especially when one language is considered more prestigious than the others.

Puerto Rico epitomizes the one language–one identity debate. For generations, to be a Puerto Rican meant speaking Puerto Rican Spanish (PRS), not the American English (AE) brought to the country over a century ago. Although granted U.S. citizenship in 1917, Puerto Ricans have continued to consider themselves Puerto Ricans first and Americans second (Morris 1995). Language is but one indication of the mixed feelings Puerto Ricans have concerning the Americanization of their country, of their political realities, and of their desires for the future.

Recently, however, research has indicated that attitudes toward AE may be changing. One language–one identity may be slowly fading away in Puerto Rico. In its place, a bilingual–bicultural viewpoint seems to be emerging, one similar to those that have emerged in other Caribbean islands and in countries around the world.

Do Puerto Ricans feel they can now accommodate more than one language into their daily lives and their sense of identity? Are these changing attitudes due to the Americanization of Puerto Ricans or simply to the need to think globally? Is the new attitude toward AE the reason for changes in the perceptions of PRS? As always with issues that concern human beings, we generate more questions than answers. In attempting to resolve these questions, we need to observe, study, and analyze any attitudinal change in progress.

This monograph is a beginning step in that work. We first examine the literature on language and identity, including multiculturalism. We then look at language policies in Puerto Rico, including the historical background of PRS and the introduction of AE to the island. These historical and political events have affected Puerto Ricans' views of both languages. Next, we consider two studies that revealed the possible attitudinal changes toward these two languages, a pilot study conducted in 2010 and an in-depth mixed-methods study designed to obtain a tri-generational view of these possible changes. We conclude with a summary of the key findings, implications of the research thus far, and recommendations to continue the work.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AE   American English

ESL   English as Second Language

PRS   Puerto Rican Spanish

UPRB   University of Puerto Rico, Bayamón

CHAPTER ONE

LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

Sociolinguists, social psychologists, and anthropologists have repeatedly identified the nearly inseparable line between language and identity.[1] Still, the link between language and identity is not clear cut. It involves much more than a simple connection between a people, a culture, and a series of sounds or gestures that embody a language. Its complexity affects the very root of who we are as individuals:

> I would never come to know myself and be conscious of my separate individual identity were it not that I become aware of others like me: consciousness of other selves is necessary for consciousness of self or self-consciousness. The individual has therefore a social origin in experience. Nay, more, it is through the use of the purely social instrument of language that I rise above the mere immediacy of experience and immersion in the current of my experience. Language gives names to the items of my experience, and thus through language they are first isolated and abstracted from the continuous body of my experience. (Jan Christiaan Smuts 1927, quoted in Joseph 2004, 8)

Consequently, language and identity are "powerfully and complexly intertwined" (Edwards 2009, 255). Because it is ingrained in culture, we can "read between the lines" of our own culture, something those who do not belong to our group ("outsiders") cannot do.

But what exactly is identity? According to Djité (2006),

> Identity is the everyday word for people's sense of who they are. It is both about the sameness with others and uniqueness of the self. (6)

Identity is not singular but multiple, not just individual but social and national. Our identity is influenced by the people around us so that in some respects we are the "same" as others. But we also have ways of seeing, doing, and analyzing things that make each of us unique.

---

[1] See Djité (2006).

Joseph (2004) suggested that we each have three fundamental pairs or subtypes of personal identity: (a) one for real people and fictional characters, (b) one for ourselves and others, and (c) one for individuals and groups. Thus, we actually have multiple identities and are different at different times and for different people. Language is but one of the pillars of identity. Through language we transmit our own ideas about who we are and what we feel. We communicate with others who teach us their beliefs, customs, and traditions thus including us in a cultural group and establishing within us strong ties to a community or nation. Language, people, and place are all parts of national identity, something we can easily see, especially in Europe, in countries where the names of the languages spoken and the countries themselves are essentially the same (e.g., France and French, England and English, Germany and German; Roberts 2008).

Individual and national identities shape individual and national languages and vice-versa. In the modern world, this translates into a political identity as well because we are automatically identified with a country. Consequently, language cannot only "sharply distinguish between insider and outsider through difference in accent, idiom, structure and word" but also "establish bonds between all communities of human beings [as well as] barriers between communities" (Roberts 2008, 1–2). Human beings, however, are not restricted to use of a single language.

Bilingualism and multilingualism complicate matters because they alter the relationship between language and identity as Edwards (2009) observed among bilinguals responding in "interviews and questionnaires": These individuals often created "slightly different pictures of themselves, depending on the language used" (249) and might respond

> more emotional[ly] through one variety . . . more strongly affirm[ing] their
> sense of ethnic identity in one language than in another. (249)

Bilingualism or multilingualism heightens awareness of and increases concern for this issue:

> The importance of being bilingual is, above all, social and psychological
> rather than linguistic. Beyond types, categories, methods and processes is
> the essential animating tension of identity. Beyond utilitarian and
> unemotional instrumentality, the heart of bilingualism is belonging. (255)

Yet, despite increasing bi- and multilingualism throughout the world, the one language–one identity ideology is still prevalent, with language being the "differentiator" of identity and culture (Carli et al. 2003, 880). Sociolinguists, therefore, choose to study minority groups because they

usually exhibit more bilingualism. In these groups, the degree of variation in languages often reflects variations in ethnic identity, attitudes, and behaviors (Fishman 1999; Radford et al. 1999).

Language and Ethnicity

Cultural pluralism is not new. We no longer live in isolated communities surrounded exclusively by people of similar ethnic or class background. Our encounters with people of different cultures and languages require appropriate communication skills, especially when the situations involve establishing rights and entitlements or persuading others to accomplish something in a particular manner. When misunderstandings arise, they may lead to value-laden ideological distinctions that contribute to the creation of differences in the "symbolization of identity" (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1987, 3). Such encounters may also change the nature and significance of ethnic and social boundaries.

The *old ethnicity* was reinforced through "clusters of occupational, neighborhood, familial, and political ties" (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1987, 5). The *new ethnicity* is less dependent on geographical proximity and shared occupations; its focus is the "highlighting of key differences separating one group from another" (5). In the old ethnicity, people remain loyal to a language that may not be used by the majority group. In the new ethnicity, people's identities rely on very different linguistic symbols that establish speech conventions. Such conventions are not merely markers of identity but may be used wherever the minority or majority language is spoken, thus reflecting the identity of the group itself. These conventions may also be perceived as nonstandard versions of the primary or most powerful language. According to Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1987),

> social identity and ethnicity are in large part established and maintained through language . . . [but] only by understanding the specific historical roots of language divergence can we adequately account for the specific character of the communicative practices and monitor ongoing processes of social change." (7–8)

Thus, social identity changes along with language practices.

In ideal situations, nothing is more straightforward than a people and their language (Dorian 1999). Unfortunately, this link is far from perfect. Ethnicity goes beyond people having biological ties in common. It is socially constructed and, therefore, subject to change for a variety of reasons (e.g., war, migration, lack of resources, trade).

In addition, the social standing of a group of people carries over to the

language they speak. When people favor more "powerful" or "official" languages, they often give their ethnic or ancestral language less support and respect. In terms of nationalism, the language that embodies traditions may become a "symbol of [an] oppressed state . . . a banner under which to assemble the troops" (Edwards 2009, 253). On the other hand, people who have been subjugated politically and/or economically are often more determined to hang on to their culture and language (Dorian 1999).

Two links exist between an ethnic group and its language. First, language serves as an identity marker. Similar to traditional dress or food, we use language to identify people who belong to a specific group. Second, language carries "extensive cultural content" (Dorian 1999, 31). Names of geographical places (some with mythological or supernatural significance), special events, plants, animals, and traditional stories and tales often lose their original character when translated into another language (Dorian 1999).

However, as a result of greater exposure to other languages that may offer more opportunities in society, younger generations within many ethnic groups are not learning their ancestral language. This creates a problem for the older generations. Do they insist that membership in the group requires learning the language or choose not to resist the changes? As a result, ethnic language is becoming less important as an identity marker. Unfortunately, once a language ceases to be spoken, both the language and its cultural content may never be fully recoverable (Dorian 1999). Sociolinguists also explore the link between language and ethnicity because of the relationship between variations in language and in ethnic identity, attitudes, and behaviors (Fishman 1999), and even though people may have multiple ethnic identities, contextually constructed and changeable from one occasion to another, when more than one language is present in a society, its members may try to preserve and protect the one that has "traditionally been the carrier of group identity" (246). This contradictory stance shows how variable this type of connection has become.

The saliency of any given component of ethnicity is also variable. According to Fishman (1999), six variables highlight saliency with respect to the link between language and ethnicity: (a) contextual variation, (b) functionality, (c) attitudinal–functional mismatch, (d) language planning, (e) status planning, and (f) language policy and implementation. Contextual variations concern grievances that heighten ethnolinguistic saliency once consciousness is aroused. Functionality concerns advantageous functions that heighten saliency. Attitudinal–functional mismatches concern differences between attitudes, which are merely predispositions to behavior, and the

acquisition and implementation of overt language use, which is governed quite separately from attitudes. Language planning involves both the functional utility of languages and the corpus of languages. Status planning involves the positive–negative, supportive–restrictive, permissive–prohibitive nature of polices. Language policy and its implementation involve language behaviors that are authoritatively implemented via the legal system of a speech community. Such policies may contribute to greater appreciation of the social construction of the language–ethnicity link (156-59). When an ethnic language is restricted or maligned, its users are more likely to use it among themselves and even try to have it recognized and accepted by others (Fishman 1999).

Ethnolinguistic identity is a consequence of a dynamic socialization process that includes childhood social and psychological events (Hamers and Blanc 2000). Bilingual persons have one unique identity that integrates the two cultures to which they have been exposed. The "harmonious integration" of the two cultures depends upon a social setting in which multiculturalism is valued. In such a setting, the two cultures are not presented as "conflicting" or "mutually exclusive" (214). According to Hamers and Blanc, bicultural, bilingual individuals should have the following cultural identity characteristics: (a) a positive identification with both cultural /ethnic communities, (b) high valorization of the two languages, (c) perceptions of both cultural groups as dynamic, (d) perceptions of minimum vitality for each reference group, and (e) no perceptions of insurmountable contradictions in being a member of both groups (221).

Power relations among different groups in the same society and their level of economic and social development dictate the variations in their languages and ethnic group identities. The survival or loss of a minority language depends upon two things: the interests of the dominant group and the minority's capacity to fight against assimilation. "Minorization" produces negative group identity, with some members trying to "pass" into the majority by speaking the "legitimate" language (Hamers and Blanc 2000, 279). On the other hand, the revalorization of a stigmatized language through which the language is "standardized, modernized, and purified" can result in the language becoming a symbol of reborn ethnic identity (281).

Language Ideology

Language ideologies are "perceptions of languages and their uses that are constructed in the interest of a specific group" (Myers-Scotton 2006, 109). Although ideologies are usually subconscious, because they concern

group interests, they may be used to galvanize a group into action and, thus, rise to a conscious level (Freeden 2003; Myers-Scotton 2006; Van Dijk 1998). Furthermore, since ideologies are essentially social or sociocultural beliefs, they are the basis for social identity, and cannot exist as individual or personal ideology (Van Dijk 1998). Social or group identity includes beliefs that are generally shared by the group and answer questions such as "Who are we?, Where do we come from?, Who belongs to us?, What do we (usually) do, and why?, What are our goals and values?, and so on" (Van Dijk 1998, 121). However, just because a particular group upholds a particular belief in general, does not mean that individual members of the group cannot diverge from it or that the belief or ideology remains static or unchanged throughout the passage of time. Social or political changes can provoke strategic adaptation (Van Dijk 1998) or fuel a fight for survival which can lead to new and previously unexpected attitudes or behavior. This certainly applies to societies and their language policies relating to identity, culture, education, or politics, among other areas.

An example of this is seen in the following study by Carli et al. (2003) where the researchers considered linguistic diversity to be a fundamental element of ethnic and cultural identity, used to assert, confirm, or defend power interests. Their study involved the interviewing of informants from six East–West European border communities. Among other things, these interviewees formulated explicit and implicit reflections on language use, linguistic diversity, and language variation. Based on the subjects' responses, Carli et al. concluded that the interviewees' language ideology was based on the "one nation, one language principle" which emphasized how their "mother tongue" created their unique character or mentality (865). This ideology gave rise to three key issues concerning linguistic ecology:

1. the restriction of societal bilingualism to minority groups[,]
2. the risk of minority language endangerment or obsolescence[, and]
3. the close ties between the prestige or stigma of the language and resulting social power. (865)

The linguists also concluded that the Western communities did not wish to learn the Eastern languages, although the Eastern communities did wish to learn the Western languages. Both sides felt that English was the "language of globalization" and, consequently, was an important language to master (865). Thus, although the subjects revealed a definite link between ethnic identity and a specific language, they acknowledged that global languages, such as English, should not be rejected but should be

utilized to their best advantage. In spite of the fact that their language ideology suffered a perceptible transformation, the will to survive in an ever-changing world was more important.

The Growing Norm of Multiculturalism

Our world is changing because of our proximity to our neighbors and access to multimedia and modern technology. In this modern, more interactive world, multilingualism and multiliteracy are becoming the norm rather than the exception.

Millions of young people are now growing up in communities in which people speak a variety of languages. They are learning not only the languages within their communities but also global languages (e.g., English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic; Velázquez Pérez 2007). People use these "mega-languages" for wider communication; but they rely on their local languages for local literacy, government, media, and economic development (Fishman 1999).

Although the world may be global in terms of free trade, it is significantly smaller because of people's abilities to communicate in languages once limited to certain regions. Thus, multi- or pluriculturalism, and with it multiple identities, is becoming the norm. The desire for social assimilation leads to a process of "permanent re-actualization" (Velázquez Pérez 2007, 12). According to Djité (2006),

> individuals and speech communities will select, use, and maintain the language repertoire(s) most relevant to their everyday communicative needs, often to the detriment of their own or constructed identities. (15)

Djité argued that neither language nor identity is "fixed in time and space"; instead, we "adopt and adapt whichever language and/or identity . . . we need." Such adaptations, however, do "not necessarily imply that we lose our sense of loyalty to our mother tongue" (15).

In *Language, Culture and Society* (2007), Salzmann refers to the long history of scrutinizing the relationship between language and culture, explorations conducted long before the recognition of anthropology as a scholarly field. He cites Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), a German diplomat and scholar, who had "very definite thoughts" about this relationship:

> Language is the outward manifestation of the spirit of people: their language is their spirit, and their spirit is their language; it is difficult to imagine any two things more identical. (49)

Franz Boas (1911) and Edward Sapir (1921) both believed "language and culture [were] not intrinsically associated" (Salzmann 2007, 50) but that because a particular language could serve to help the younger generation of a particular society learn to function within that society's culture, some type of link could develop between the language and the culture. Benjamin Whorf (1940) contributed the principles of "linguistic determinism" (the way one thinks is determined by the language one speaks) and "linguistic relativity" (the differences among languages must be reflected in the differences in the worldviews of their speakers; 54). However, Salzmann believed Whorf "overstated his case" (55). If these principles were correct, cross-cultural communication and understanding should be impossible to achieve. He concluded that as a result of multimedia, modernization, and international travel, cultural differences around the world have become "less distinct." Therefore,

> the language of a minority population may be the only prominent badge of its ethnic identity and pride. (328)

Language Attitudes

Attitudes about languages are "assessments that speakers make about the relative values of a particular language" (Myers-Scotton 2006, 109). Although we make judgments and act on the basis of our attitudes, they are largely unconscious. According to Chin and Wigglesworth (2007), attitude is

> a concept central to bilingualism . . . [and] has been linked in various ways to the language proficiency, use of the bilingual's two languages and bilinguals' perception of other communities and of themselves. It has also been linked to the vitality of bilingual communities and, finally, to the loss of language within that community. (106)

Thus, language policy implementation cannot ignore prevalent language attitudes because "they provide social indicators of changing beliefs" (Baker 1992 quoted in Chin and Wigglesworth 2007, 106).

Researchers have observed several commonalities in the various definitions of language attitudes. They are:

1. related to the perception of speakers of different language varieties,
2. learned from the individual's experience,
3. of an enduring, rather than momentary, nature[, and are]

4. related to behavior. (Chin and Wigglesworth 2007, 108)

Negative or positive attitudes toward a language can deeply affect the users of that language and their desire to learn that language (Grosjean 1982). Hamers and Blanc (2000) acknowledged that

> all societies value language as a tool of communication and of cognition; however, they tend to valorise certain functions more than others, e.g. the cognitive function in school . . . At the individual level a similar mechanism operates. To the extent that the adults around the child value the use of language for certain functions, he will also value [it] and thus develop these aspects. . . . The acquisition of a second language is not only the function of the teaching method, but is also mediated by, for example, attitudes in the community and by individual motivation. (13)

Consequently, attitudes towards language are transmitted from generation to generation through both academic and societal circles.

In Puerto Rican society, the roles of PRS and AE are similar in that both are used to communicate and both are taught in school. They are also different because PRS is considered the "traditional" first language, linked to Puerto Rican identity for centuries, while AE is the "Johnny-come-lately," imposed by an external power and used in limited arenas in its official capacity (Fayer 2000). Therefore, we cannot ignore the strong resistance to the imposition of the English language that characterized the history of Puerto Rico immediately after the U.S. invasion of the island and the continuing concern among some social and political circles with this imposition in the educational system (Torres González 2002). This has had a profound effect on the Puerto Rican psyche and has motivated a number of studies on the island dealing with the link between an imposed language and identity and attitudes towards learning it. The following are summaries of only a few of these studies:[2]

- Giles et al. (1978) observed 384 Puerto Rican students selected from four age levels (10, 12, 15, and 17 years of age). Analysis of a card-sorting task revealed that social identity was not aligned with a specific language or cultural group but with "socially desirable personality characteristics" and the perception of what a "good"

---

[2] The perception of Puerto Ricans concerning the need to learn English despite the failed methods of the Puerto Rican educational system has also been presented in Lladó-Berríos (1978), Vélez and Schweers (1993), Garcés Valencia (2004), and Pizarro (2006).

Puerto Rican was according to religion or skin color (199).[3]

- Lladó-Torres (1984) administered a language attitudes questionnaire to 184 seventeen-year-old high school students from various urban and rural regions in Puerto Rico. Results revealed that the students' ability to learn English as their second language was related to their willingness to use the language. The students reflected a positive attitude towards learning English and recognized its value. Parental encouragement, personal motivation, and teaching methods and materials were all factors that promoted this attitude. However, political affiliation was not a determiner.[4]

- Caratini-Soto (1997) showed that the link between political affiliation and attitude towards AE or PRS had great saliency. The three main political parties (pro-statehood, commonwealth, or independence) were represented among the five participants. The subjects were all adults from the center of the island who were returning to college as students. They stated that learning English was a "central political issue" (1) and that political affiliation affected their feelings about the language. The statehood and commonwealth supporters held that English was a language of value; the pro-independence advocates emphasized the preservation of Spanish as a marker of identity.

  The desire to preserve the vernacular has historically lent itself to resistance towards learning English. The pro-independence supporter acknowledged that he had limited proficiency in the language despite having been exposed to it for many years in the school system. Although we can infer from this statement that perhaps his attitude was an impediment, lackluster teaching methodology may also have been an important factor. Ironically, he and everyone else agreed that they wanted their own children to learn English because of its role as a facilitator of job opportunities.

- Rodríguez (2000) documented the high value the majority of her study participants placed on bilingualism. Participants were first-year students at the University of Puerto Rico, Utuado campus.

---

[3] The categorization of "good" Puerto Ricans according to skin color is another controversial topic that is beyond the scope of this book. However, its existence affects other issues of identity on the island.

[4] This study and the Giles et al. (1979) study were completed thirty or more years ago. At that time, a tendency to move away from linking language and identity was already underway. The link between teaching methods and interest in the language was also firmly established. If the methodology was boring or lackluster, this had a direct effect on the learning process of the language in question.

They acknowledged the "pragmatic purposes" (100) linked to English: academic success, use of computer technology, and increased contact with speakers of English off the island. Of importance, however, is that the study revealed no conflicts within the participants concerning the roles of English and Spanish.

- Garcés Valencia (2004) documented the beliefs of a group of students from the University of Puerto Rico, Arecibo campus, concerning their desire to learn English and to communicate both in speech and in writing in that language. However, they were unmotivated in class because of teaching methods utilized in their pre-collegiate academic experiences. They felt they had not learned enough English in previous years and were thus unprepared for college and its challenges.

- Pizarro (2006) emphasized the great variations in attitudes towards English on the island. These variations existed because, even though students had an interest in learning the language, scores on standardized tests were becoming lower, which hypothetically reflected less interest. Pizarro indicated she had found no studies revealing negative attitudes toward the teaching of English as a second language. However, she did find studies that showed opposition to the intention of replacing the Puerto Rican language and culture with English and American culture.

  She studied first-year students from the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras campus. Although she expected to find a negative attitude among her participants towards English, they revealed a positive attitude instead. They also had no fear of losing their native language because of the "intromission" of a second language (114). Consequently, her findings indicated that the stronger the person's ethnolinguistic identity, the more positive the person's attitude towards learning a second language.

- Martínez-Schettini (2007) concluded that Puerto Rican identity is a cognitive process that occurs

  > in a slow manner and involves individual essential features and collective behaviors that take place from early childhood to early adulthood. (vi)

  She indicated that attitudes toward bilingualism are just part of the whole process of "multiple identities" with which Puerto Ricans have to deal and which align them with many other groups of people in the world. She advocated teaching ESL educators about the importance of these new cognitive behaviors and their

implications for teaching and learning a second language.

Researchers have also documented past negative attitudes towards migrant Puerto Ricans, known as Nuyoricans (descendants of the first wave of migrants to New York City):

- Lorenzo-Hernández (1999) studied 121 returning migrants and 121 nonmigrants in west Puerto Rico high schools. Students with Nuyorican attributes (i.e., the mixing of many English words into Spanish; different clothing styles, lifestyles, and cultural values; poor mastery of PRS; more "agitated" and "independent" behavior) were rejected and categorized as part of the "outgroup" (988). The Nuyorican label excluded the returning migrant from being categorized as Puerto Rican.

  Lorenzo-Hernández emphasized that Nuyoricans have been wrongly perceived as

  > hybrids who may "contaminate" the culture with influences from the North. . . . [or be] perceived as violators of important values of the Puerto Rican society. (993)

  According to the study, this negative attitude affected perceptions of English because it was the language that "outsiders" prefer to the detriment of PRS.
- Sánchez (2008) studied a new wave of migrants, known as Orlandoricans (i.e., Puerto Ricans who migrated to Orlando, Florida). These migrants saw themselves as being different from Nuyoricans, although they also had a similar notion of Puerto Rican-ness, one that distanced them from Spanish as an indicator of Puerto Rican identity.

These two different notions of Puerto Rican-ness (one from Orlando and one from New York City) are "sensitive to spatial variation" and are not "homogeneous" (Sánchez viii). Thus, we may infer that every diasporic community may have its own version of Puerto Rican identity, suggesting that identity involves a complex web of intertwined cultures and languages unique to the particular surroundings.

As the Puerto Rican diaspora increases, its members are forging their own views about the link between language and identity. Because they are still in frequent contact with Puerto Ricans on the island, their new ideas about the fading link between language and identity may be influencing the way the islanders perceive such issues.

The studies focusing on issues of attitudes towards AE and the link

between language and identity in Puerto Rico are evidence that a previously negative attitude appears to be evolving into a more positive one, despite botched attempts to teach English in schools. However, the sole focus of these studies has been students; extended families have not been included, leading us to more questions:

- Do parents and grandparents share this same change in attitude?
- When did the new attitude emerge?
- Will the tendency continue?

According to Joseph (2004), current approaches to the "language-identity nexus" indicate trends in five major areas (41–42):

1. A move from seeing those aspects of language that are connected with identity as being mere by-products of another activity (such as communication of information) to being an important, directly functional activity in their own right;
2. A move from seeing language itself as a determinate structure that directly determines important aspects of the lives of its speakers, to seeing it as something the speakers themselves control and use to their own ends;
3. A move from focusing uniquely on the self-identity of an individual or group, to a granting of equal importance to the interpretations others make of a person's or group's identity;
4. A move from identifying the "groups" relevant to identity solely in terms of institutionally recognised categories and toward "micro" groups; and
5. A move from *essentialism* to *constructionism*, in other words, from analysing linguistic diversity as a given and fixed aspect of who an individual or group is, to something changeable and variable as it is constructed and performed.

Rather than a static vision of one language–one identity, these trends acknowledge the flexibility, constant evolution, and changing perspectives within the arena of human interaction. Consequently, they are crucial to developing a new understanding of the link between language and identity.