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ABSTRACT

This dissertation uses qualitative research methods to describe the history of language use and maintenance on the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico. More specifically, it examines how the islands’ unique colonial circumstances have affected the maintenance of the local language. The multidisciplinary field of language planning and policy (LPP) has historically focused on documenting, categorizing and revitalizing languages that have undergone significant language shift. As a result, the majority of the discourse regarding threatened languages also implies that a threatened language will soon be endangered. The language contexts on the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico do not conform to this often assumed linear progression. The use of document analysis, interviews with key players in LPP and observations on both islands provide the data for the position that there are unique contexts where language threat can be discussed, not in terms of language shift, but in terms of perceptions of threat. In addition to providing a detailed historical account of language situations on both islands, this dissertation frames the findings within a larger framework of redefining language threat. Special attention is paid to how social agents have influenced perceptions through the social amplification of risk framework. The work concludes with an argument for a framework that incorporates not only languages that have witnessed language shift, but also language contexts where languages are perceived to be threatened, with the understanding that such a distinction could potentially move the field of LPP toward a better understanding of language maintenance.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

One of the foremost interests in the field of language policy and planning henceforth (LPP) has been the protection, maintenance and revitalization of endangered languages. However, as the field has grown, scholars have also started to cast their attention toward larger languages that are not in immediate danger of language shift. Such attention has even found some scholars arguing that languages such as English are threatened (Graddol, 1996). With so many language contexts exhibiting one form or another of language threat, it is unclear what exactly is meant when one mentions threatened languages. Thus, the concept of language threat has been used to describe two polar extremes, (1) contexts where languages are in their final stages of language shift resulting in language death, and (2) circumstances where threat is linked to even powerful world languages such as English, Spanish, and French (Graddol, 2007). While few hold the opinion that an international language such as English is actually threatened, language policies in the United States and other countries where English has legal or de facto official status have moved to protect English as if it were indeed threatened. In this dissertation, I expand the discussion of language threat to include more distinctive categories of threatened languages; specifically, those that are concerned with how political relations with a colonial power have worked to strengthen and maintain a local language. To illuminate my point, I will provide case studies of Aruban and Puerto Rican language policies and show how these two islands have worked in very different ways to maintain and bolster the language of their island.
**Research objective**

The objective of this dissertation is to describe and analyze the language contexts of both Aruba and Puerto Rico within a larger framework of language threat. After defining and discussing different typologies of language threat, this study will provide two in-depth case studies, Papiamento in Aruba and Spanish in Puerto Rico, framed within the context of language threat. The case studies provide a detailed description of the historical and political impact that colonization and the formation of national identity has had on the maintenance of Papiamento and Spanish on each island. Special attention will be paid to how these unique language contexts on two Caribbean islands are similar to different language realities throughout the world.

The field of LPP has traditionally equated threatened and endangered languages (Hale, et al. 1992; King, 1999). Ecological frameworks have been used in the field to argue that languages, in ways similar to natural species, need to be protected. However, the argument for protection assumes that the language is indeed endangered (May, 2000). The terms “threat” and “endangerment” within the field of language policy are often used interchangeably with the assumption that language threat is will inevitably develop into endangerment (Ruiz, 2006). This research argues that it is possible for a language to be perceived as “threatened” while being a vibrant language, used in virtually all societal domains and where its strength and position in society are not questioned or viewed as endangered.

Research is needed in the field of LPP to demarcate situations where languages may be threatened but are not endangered. Such situations can potentially provide
insight into how a language community can succeed in maintaining and even strengthening their language. This study also will benefit the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico in the sense that it will serve as further documentation of both the positive and negative aspects that have influenced the maintenance of the local languages. Furthermore, those involved language planning and policy on both islands will be able to understand what historic and current policies have meant for the maintenance of the local language and the cost at which such maintenance has come. The study of language maintenance is complex and thus the focus of this study will center on how local languages have been maintained when juxtaposed to other languages that have been perceived as a threat. Thus, this dissertation will provide evidence of (a) what has and what has not worked in terms of language planning and policy in Aruba and Puerto Rico, and (b) who, if anyone, has been marginalized and at what expense. These lessons, it is hoped, will prove useful in an ever-changing and globalizing world where such information could prove indispensable in future LPP ventures throughout the world.

According to Baldauf (2004), future LPP research will concentrate on more ideological and overtly political aspects, as well as their consequences on minority languages. This study will start to fill a void in the analysis of micro-level LPP which Baldauf argues will be a primary focus of the field in the years to come. Baldauf also proposes that future research should entail additional emphasis on social identity and power rather than languages of wider communication (LWCs). Thus one of the rationales for this dissertation is to move the field of LPP forward toward a better
understanding of how national identity and the perception of threat come to play a role in language use and language policy.

The field of LPP has historically placed great emphasis on understanding the impact of national language policies and their affect on smaller indigenous populations whose languages have moved toward endangerment or in many cases have died. Such has been the case for countless indigenous languages on all continents (Hale, 1992; Grimes, Grimes & Summer Institute of Linguistics, 2000; May, 2000). Thus, much of the energy within the field of LPP, and rightfully so, has concentrated on the documentation and revitalization of languages that have unjustly been marginalized and often lost. Language shift toward a politically more dominant language can come so quickly, that the disenfranchised group is left scrambling to maintain language and other traditional aspects of their old way of life that were once viewed as commonplace (Nettle & Romaine, 2000; Romaine, 2002; Wyman, 2004).

One interesting aspect about LPP is that the general public tends to have very strong ideas concerning the dominant language and the language’s position in regard to other languages and the people who speak them (Cameron, 1995). The idea of folk language LPP, playing off Preston’s (1993) notion of folk linguistics, refers to the collective opinion of everyday people in regards to their society’s dominant language and policies surrounding it. Unlike theories in atmospheric science or quantum physics, which the average person has never studied, everyone in society uses language on a daily basis. Thus, there is a sense of entitlement, especially among the elite, that one has
toward their language (Cameron, 1995). This aspect of entitlement allows ordinary people to share their opinions, thoughts and fears regarding their language. Therefore as such, the same person who has formed no opinion on the latest theories and hypotheses in quantum physics generally has a strongly formed opinion on the use of a minority language in schools or the officialization of their language in a state or nation’s constitution.

As citizens of a nation and speakers of a language, ordinary people naturally feel they have something at stake in discussions concerning language – theirs or someone else’s (Cameron, 1995). The opinions of the general population thus are influenced by their own experiences and because they do not have an academic background in LPP, thus one’s own experiences work in developing a fear of other languages and the people who speak them. Thus, in line with Cameron’s (2007), there are languages contexts in which non-endangered languages can be considered threatened or can be the cause of panic.

For a particular body of people, fear translates into a perceived threat that some how the presence of a group of speakers of another language or cultural group will eventually displace the current linguistic norm. An example of this would be English speakers in the Southwest U.S. who believe that the latest influx of Spanish-speaking immigrants to the area will lead to a permanent change in the linguistic landscape of their states. To a certain extent, language threat applies to the perceptions of everyday people who feel their language/culture is in some way threatened. These ideas of
language threat are in stark contrast to commonly understood ideas of language threat among academics dedicated to LPP. Academics generally tend to concentrate their efforts on the hundreds, if not thousands of languages that are in imminent danger of language shift. Thus, another rationale for this study is to better understand the historical influences in the development of the perception of language threat and how such threat has influenced, or not, language maintenance.

A further rationale for this study is to link the social amplification of risk framework (SARF) detailed in Kasperson, Renn, Slovic, Brown, Emel, Goble, Kasperson and Ratick (1988). The SARF describes how relatively low risk events become perceived by the general public has representing high levels of risk. The framework takes into account perceptions of risk events, how perceptions are created and disseminated and what affect they have on peoples’ actions. In addition to connecting the SARF to LPP, which to my knowledge has not been done, the case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico will highlight different types of language contexts that exemplify non-traditional examples of threatened languages. The use of the SARF will allow me to concentrate on how people’s perceptions about a language and/or culture change through both covert and overt messages from the media and those in power. The two different islands provide a stark contrast in terms of historical and current language policies which have been influenced to different extents by the social amplification of threat.
In addition to applying the SARF to threatened languages, the two case studies will allow me to compare and contrast how different governments have dealt with the complexities of language planning and how the governments themselves have amplified risk (or not) of particular local languages. Furthermore, such analysis also will shed light on the aspects of threatened languages that fit a new typology for language threat developed by Richard Ruiz.

Richard Ruiz, a scholar well known in the field of LPP for his seminal piece on language orientation (Ruiz 1984), presented a paper at the Georgetown Round Table on Language and Linguistics, where he argued that there are different classes of threatened languages (Ruiz, 2006). After providing a new typology for language threat (see table 3.1 below), Ruiz argued that the field would benefit from the analysis of language contexts where language is perceived to be threatened despite still being relatively stable. This research will provide detailed case studies for two different categories from Ruiz’s new typology: category (C) majority minoritized languages in stable states in contact with LWCs but not in significant danger of either extinction or significant shift (e.g. Spanish in Puerto Rico), and category (E) majority indigenous languages in small states in contact with LWCs (Aruban Papiamento).

Past research in the field of LPP has inadequately described the complexity of the perceptions behind language threat. Traditionally, researchers such as Joshua Fishman and Michael Krauss have worked hard to define threatened languages as those where language groups have shifted toward the use of another language. The most cited
typologies of language threat, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two, are generally based on the presence or absence of younger speakers of the language. If the younger generations are not learning the language, there is reason for concern. There are literally thousands of languages throughout the world that are threatened in the sense that those who speak the language are shifting toward another language for a variety of different reasons (Hale, 1992). Outside of the LPP field, there are also very strongly held ideas and perceptions of what it means for a language to be threatened. Often, seemingly stable languages are perceived to be threatened, due to recent immigration, return migration and so on. Movements to restrict the use of other languages in the United States or the use of English in France are directly related to the idea that somehow powerful languages can also be threatened.

Furthermore, discussions of language threat beg the question: when, if ever, can we legitimately claim that feelings of language threat or endangerment should be taken seriously as a possible sign of impending language shift/disappearance? And, how can we identify when feelings of threat are disconnected from language endangerment, and in these cases, what’s the best way to interpret language threat? While the case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico will not provide sufficient evidence to make generalizations across all language contexts, they will provide needed documentation, which along with other cases, will facilitate in delineating the threshold between language threat and endangerment.
More specifically, this dissertation looks to illustrate why different language communities develop the perception of threat, how this threat is disseminated to the general populous and what effects it has on language maintenance. In order to do this, I have developed a series of research questions that will facilitate the uncovering of these main ideas.

**Research questions**

**Main Question:** In what ways, if any, has another language(s) been perceived as a threat on Aruba and Puerto Rico and what has that perception of threat led to?

**Additional questions:**

A. With relatively little language shift on each of the islands, what are the principal reasons for successful language maintenance?

B. To what extent has a perception of threat had an effect on national identity?

C. What role has educational policy played in language shift or maintenance?

**Understanding the social amplification of risk framework**

The field of LPP is multidimensional. Kasperson et al. (1988) argue that throughout society there are various aspects of life that are misunderstood in the sense that society has been influenced by media and other sources to perceive or believe there is risk in things which, mathematically speaking, pose very little risk. Kasperson et al. (1988) argue that “hazards (often media) interact with psychological, social, institutional, and cultural processes in ways that may amplify or attenuate public
responses to the risk or risk event” (p. 177). Furthermore, these researchers argue that the opinions and findings of technical experts in a particular field often are not acknowledged by the general public, and this affects multiple facets of the society at large. Among the major culprits in influencing social amplification of risk are the stages of transfer of information, from the specialist to media to the general population. Media clearly plays a vital role in creating, intensifying and spreading notions of fear and paranoia associated with relatively low risk events.

Ideas surrounding the social amplification of risk have emerged from the field of risk studies. Kasperson and his colleagues have argued that societal factors, especially the media, have worked to bolster fear toward different uses of energy such as nuclear reactors or toward particular foods (Pidgeon, Kasperson & Slovic, 2003), and another researcher, MacGregor (2003) has even attributed such societal factors to the public’s obsession with Y2K and its effect on the world. A clear example from Kasperson et al. (1988) compares a train accident that takes many peoples’ lives to a nuclear reactor or recombinant-DNA laboratory. On the one hand, the train accident causes relatively little social disturbance (with the exception to those immediately affected) because the use of trains is a familiar system where accidents unfortunately, but rarely, happen. On the other hand, a nuclear reactor and a recombinant-DNA laboratory represent an unfamiliar system; the general public’s lack of knowledge of these systems allows for the arousal of great public concern as it may be “interpreted to mean that the risk is not well understood, not controllable, or not competently managed, thus implying that further (and possibly worse) mishaps are likely” (p. 186).
Kaspersion and colleagues discuss the SARF to highlight the different ways in which media propaganda has worked to negatively influence peoples’ thoughts and make them believe that particular aspects of society are risky, while in reality they present relatively little risk. The unfamiliarity with a minority language and its speakers is very similar to the example of the lack of familiarity with nuclear reactors or recombinant-DNA laboratories; in both instances, the unknown allows for the amplification of risk, be it a legitimate concern or something that is of little threat.

The SARF is essential to an expanded understanding of the creation of perceptions of threat in language contexts where the language is not actually endangered. For the purposes of this research, I have redefined the social amplification of “risk” as the social amplification of “threat”, which is more in line with this research. With a better understanding of the social amplification of threat, I will now define some of the other key concepts and terms that will be used throughout this dissertation.

**Definition of terms**

Two problematic terms used throughout this dissertation are “nation” and “nationalism”. Definitions of nation and nationalism have been contended in many publications regarding Aruba and Puerto Rico and subject of countless books and articles that try to define them (Anderson, 1991; Eckkrammer, 2003; Kedourie, 1993; Morris, 1996; Torres González, 2002; Woolard, 2004). Furthermore, one’s definition and use of these terms can have its own political implications. For instance, many Puerto Ricans do not consider their island a nation because it is not independent (meaning that it is not completely sovereign). Other Puerto Ricans, however, would
argue that Puerto Rico is recognized internationally as a sovereign nation with its acceptance into international organizations such as the International Olympic Committee and different international beauty pageants, as well as having local autonomy and its own constitution. I am aware of the multitude of definitions regarding these highly contested terms, but for the ease of reading, I have chosen two definitions that most accurately fall within my theoretical framework:

**Nation** is “an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson, 1991:6)

**Nationalism** can be broken into two different areas. Emotional nationalism refers to the emotional attachment to one’s country. The second aspect of nationalism refers to political organization and can be used to describe the political movement of a group toward national independence (Kedourie, 1993).

Given such definition, Aruba and Puerto Rico have created their own unique, imagined community within which there lies both a conscious and unconscious understanding of what it means to be part of each particular nation. The subsequent chapters will highlight the role that language has played in the ever-evolving conceptualization of nation and nationalism and how the perception of language threat has worked to reinforce these ideals.
Summary of chapters

This dissertation is broken up into seven chapters to facilitate reading and understanding of foundational theories, methodology, data collected and findings. Chapter Two will provide a detailed description of how the field of LPP has grown throughout the years. Special attention will be paid to the different subfields of LPP such as: status planning, corpus planning, acquisition planning and prestige planning. After summarizing the field, I will provide explanations and definitions of how language threat and endangerment are generally discussed within the field. After providing background on aspects of language threat and the different typologies used to describe threatened languages, I will then discuss the theoretical framework in which I will be working.

Chapter Three is an explanation of the methods used in this study. I will provide both rationalization and description of the case study method used in this research. Furthermore, I will set forth a detailed list of the different data that were collected and explain how they were analyzed.

Chapters Four and Five present the case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico, respectively. In these chapters, I will use my data to provide a detailed account of the historical factors that have led to successful language maintenance on both islands. Moreover, I will discuss the concept of identity and the role language plays as a marker of national identity on both islands. Special attention will be paid to the conceptualization of language threat and how its perception has been promulgated through society.
In Chapter Six, I will discuss themes that emerge from the data in both islands. Themes covered in this chapter are: history, immigration, creation of national identity/imagined communities, education, perceptions of threat and how they are created and sustained. In this chapter, I will also tie these themes into current strands of LPP and argue that the unique cases of Aruba and Puerto Rico can further our understanding of how perceptions of fear can be created.

The seventh and final chapter will provide specific recommendations to language planners and policy makers on both the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico in regards to corpus, status, acquisition and prestige planning. The chapter also will include implications for further research and conclusions.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The field of language planning and policy is a rather new academic field that brings together a number of theories and ideas from the fields of anthropology, politics and studies of power and linguistics and applied linguistics. This chapter is dedicated to defining and describing the different subfields of LPP necessary to fully understand the complex cases of Aruba and Puerto Rico and their histories from the perspective of this field of study. After defining language policy and then language planning and their various sub-fields, I set forth commonly used typologies for measuring language threat and endangerment. Understanding common definitions of language threat and language endangerment is necessary to fully understanding the case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico. Subsequent to an explanation of the various typologies used to describe threatened languages, I provide examples of different language contexts from around the world that exhibit aspects of language threat.

Language policy

Throughout the world, political elites as well as everyday people, work in conjunction with or influence, governments, departments of education, as well large and small businesses where they assess current language use and plan for the future ways in which the language(s) can and should be used (Ager, 2005; Spolsky, 2004; Wright, 2004). When used appropriately by policy-makers, planners are consultants who bring insight to key players in the writing and implementation of policies. When language planners are not used and/or their suggestions are not adopted, there is the risk that language policies might not be as fruitful in their implementation as desired. As has
been the case throughout much of the world’s history, heads of state have created language policies that work to bolster national pride and identity through language (Bamgbose, 2000; Massini-Cagliari, 2003; Mortimer, 2006; Mostari, 2004). Unfortunately, the unification of a nation through language is generally done at the expense of minority languages or languages that fall outside the favor of those in power (Alexander, 2004; Bamgbose, 2000; Garuba, 2001; Wright, 2004). Just as national language policies can work to build and strengthen national identity, they can also work to marginalize groups and individuals who do not speak the favored language or variety (Romaine, 2006).

Language policies are apparent when examining different aspects of a given society both at macro and micro levels. Macro level policies refer to those that are created at the nation-state or even state level, and may involve either a subtractive or additive policy. An example of a subtractive macro language policy would be the passing of voter-initiated referendums in California, Arizona and Massachusetts which have severely hindered the use of bilingual education programs (Combs, Evans, Fletcher, Parra, Jimenez, 2005). An example of an additive macro language policy is exemplified in the passing of Quechua and Guaraní as official languages in Peru and Paraguay, respectively (Hornberger, 1997; Choi, 2004). Micro level policies are seen at the local level and are carried out by teachers, businesses, and families, among others. Examples of micro level language planning range from teachers requiring English only in their classroom (Sheridan, 1992) to companies that require their employees to speak English at all times (Macías, 1997).
In order to better understand the different levels of policy at the macro level, I borrow from Joshua Fishman, who identified three types of language policies for three corresponding types of societies:

(1) **Type A: A-modal.** There is a consensus in these societies that there is neither an overarching sociocultural or political past and no indigenous “great tradition” (that is widely supported by all). Usually a language of wider communication (LWC) is selected as a national or official language. Examples would be the many African countries that have adopted English or French in order to add uniformity across the nation. Cameroon, for instance, is an example of an A-modal country: in Western Cameroon, English is the official language, and in Eastern Cameroon, French serves as the official language (Eastman, 1983).

(2) **Type B: Uni-modal.** There are long-established sociocultural unities with rather well-established political boundaries. There is a single “great tradition” available, and a single indigenous or indigenized language usually is selected as a national language. Examples of Uni-modal countries are Kenya and Tanzania “where Swahili has a long literary tradition and is being made modernistically functional as a national language to replace the LWC, English” (Eastman, 1983, p. 13.)

(3) **Type C: Multi-modal.** There are conflicting or competing multiplicities of “great traditions”. The nation must stand for a supra-nationalistic goal since nationalism is associated with traditional regional (sub-national) identities.
Usually regional official languages are selected, and a LWC is selected as co-official. Bilingualism is expected. An example of this type of policy is India where there are hundreds of different languages and Hindi, with a long literary tradition, is used as a national language (Adapted from Fishman 1972c, p. 194 as cited in Garcia et. al, 2006).

Fishman’s three-type classification is less complex than Faingold’s (2004) version, where twenty-four different policies were identified after the analysis of one hundred eighty-seven constitutions from around the world. According to Faingold, language policies range from countries that take a “hands off approach,” like the United States and the United Kingdom, to countries that are very involved and have created complex policies, like Mozambique, which has an official language, a national language and provisions for additional national languages. While Faingold's research is helpful in identifying the multitude of policies that are found in national constitutions, there is little discussion as to how these policies are actually implemented. Fishman and Faingold have provided the field with two different ways to categorize different policies; however, understanding these policy considerations is meaningful only when viewed within the context of implementation. While language policies are generally broken into the three different areas discussed by Fishman, language planning can be broken up into four different subfields: corpus planning, status planning, acquisition and prestige planning (as seen in Figure 1.1 below). I will now move into a discussion of language planning and its related subfields.
Language planning

As the study of language planning has evolved, so too have its subfields. The first two subfields were corpus and status planning. “Corpus planning refers to the choices to be made of specific linguistic elements whenever the language is used” (Spolsky, 2004: 11). Examples of status planning range from parents and teachers having rules on what language can be spoken at home and at school to laws dictating what languages must be used in court and in government business. Corpus planning is exemplified in situations where particular aspects of a language are officially or legally changed, be it through omission or addition. One example of corpus planning was when the Serbs legislated that Croatian elements be omitted from their language (Spolsky, 2004). The differentiation between corpus and status planning was contributed to the field by Kloss (1969) who felt it was important to distinguish between the linguistic aspects of a language (corpus) and the sociological/psychological aspects of language (status).

Acquisition planning, also known as language-in-education planning, is commonly traced to Cooper (1989) and was adopted by the many in the field of LPP to describe the multitude of factors involved in language acquisition. While many in the field view prestige planning as the newest of the areas of language planning, study Haarmann’s (1986) argument for the adoption and use of prestige planning in LPP study antedates Cooper’s acquisition planning distinction. Haarmann’s work could have been overlooked, however, because his original publications were written in German and only recently translated. Nevertheless, prestige planning is charged with the actual
implementation of status planning whereby an element of change is enacted in order to boost the value of a language (Ager, 2005; Liddicoat, 2007).

**Figure 1.1 – Origins of language policy and planning**

Haugen (1966) is regarded as the first to introduce the concept of language planning, and at that time, he broke the field into four categories: *norm selection, codification, elaboration, and implementation*. These four categories were later combined by Heinz Kloss into what is today known as *corpus and status planning*. As the field evolved, Cooper (1989) introduced the use of *acquisition planning* to refer to
the implementation of both corpus and status planning. Despite Haarmann (1986), it has only been within the last few years that prestige planning has started to garner attention in the field. Nevertheless, Haugen’s original four categories provided the general framework for LPP that is still followed today. The following sections offer expanded definitions of these four important subfields of language planning. A general understanding of these subfields is necessary in order to understand the larger discussion of threatened languages that will be discussed throughout the case studies.

**Corpus Planning**

Haugen (1966) identified *norm selection* as one of the primary aspects of LPP. Norm selection deals specifically with the selection of a language variety to be codified. Choosing a particular variety of a language can be problematic, in that the codification process can potentially provide higher status to one variety over another (Alexander, 1992). While increased codification and implementation in schools is advantageous for speakers of the selected language, large and linguistically diverse countries like Nigeria and India, in the interest of minimizing cost and time, have adopted language policies that limit the number of languages which are codified. Often, the prestige that comes with codification and officialization is another factor that influences language planners to avoid implementing local languages. That has been the case in India and Nigeria, where English was officialized in order to not endow only one local language with too much power (Ramanathan, 2005; Garuba, 2001).
The stages of codification are numerous, time consuming and costly. According to Crowley (2007), movements toward codification and implementation of literacy practices into local languages in the South Pacific have been worthwhile in promoting literacy and language maintenance. The codification process is often complicated by numerous languages and varieties within a given territory or region. Hornberger and King (2001) document the difficulty in codifying the different regional varieties of Quechua, given the range of proficiency among its speakers and the vast geographic region (mainly Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador) its speakers inhabit. Similar concerns have been highlighted by Njogu (1992) in the standardization efforts for Swahili, and by Alexander (2004), which illustrated the difficulty for South African leaders to negotiate how their respective languages should undergo the standardization process needed for codification.

Historically, many languages have been codified by missionaries who translated the Bible into local languages (Cooper, 1989). As linguists have taken the place of missionaries in the codification process, locals have been allowed more input, making the process more equitable but also more time consuming. While codification and as a result standardization, can be fruitful, the process can also exclude speakers of other dialects. Eastman (1983) describes how Swahili, once representative of the KiUnguja dialect, was implemented in the 1930s. Eastman writes, “[e]ventually the standard no longer even represents the dialect on which it is based, since it will have changed through time” (p.17). Eastman’s description of the case of Swahili provides a common example of what can potentially happen after a language is codified and spread. While
there was undoubtedly resistance to standard Swahili among many East African communities who spoke different varieties through the middle of the 20th century, Swahili speakers are still speaking a language that is more similar to what their ancestors spoke than the language of their colonizers. As such drastic language change is often met with apprehension and fear, it can potentially work to unite and provide a particular pan-identity that otherwise would not have been possible (Alexander, 1992).

In addition to choosing a particular variety, speakers and linguists involved in the codification process must agree on a particular writing system that is “accurate, economical, and consistent” (Eastman, 1983, p. 18). In other words, codification entails making sure that particular forms of documentation match up with their phonetic counterpart, that diacritics are not used unnecessarily, and that linguists and users are consistent throughout the whole codification process. Furthermore, the newly codified language often must be elaborated to include technology and foreign concepts that were not previously talked about in the local language. The development of new words to describe foreign ideas or things is an important aspect of the work of language planners, especially those working with pidgin and creole languages. Regardless of how new words are formed, Siegel (2007) discusses the importance of codifying creole languages using a phonemic orthography that can set the pidgin or creole apart from its lexifier, as well as make it easier for implementation in schools.

The final step in the codification process is the actual implementation of the newly codified language. This potentially can take place in multiple domains, but is
typically implemented through formal schooling. Thus, teachers are generally the first wave of impact with the newly codified language, and it is important that teachers receive proper training and materials so that students are provided enough resources and experiences to accompany instruction. Without ample teacher training and materials, it is extremely difficult for newly codified languages to be implemented and gain prestige (Chick, 2002; Bamgbose, 2000; Benson, 2004).

**Status Planning**

While corpus planning dates further back than status planning, it is status planning that is used to promote a language in particular domains of society. According to Cooper (1989), “[s]tatus planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the allocation of functions among a community’s languages” (p. 99). Thus, status planners generally work with governments, schools, large businesses and even the media to promote and ensure the use of the target language in various facets of society.

A language can hold different status depending on the context. For instance, in a community of Chinese immigrants in Los Angeles, English serves as the official language of the country, but Mandarin might be the variety of Chinese that is used in bilingual education programs in the schools. A particular family of Chinese immigrants might also use Cantonese as an in-group marker of identity with friends and family and/or for religious purposes. Similarly, Singapore has worked hard in status planning to institute English as the language of business, but it maintains Malay, Mandarin, and Tamil for educational and cultural purposes (Chua, 2004; Silver, 2005). Thus, in any
examination of status planning, it is important to understand the specific domain of language use that pertains to the planning.

Countries, provinces, churches, schools and even businesses often have ideas regarding the status of particular languages used. These ideas may be written or unwritten, but language policies are often *de facto* in that societal norms provide the language its high or low status (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996). Media often plays an underestimated role in the solidification of the understood, yet absent policy. An example of this *de facto* policy can be seen in the role of English in the U.S. Although English has never been designated as the official language of the United States in any formal way (such as the Constitution), according to Eastman (1983), English is actually being “elaborated through a very effective academy in the form of newspaper, radio, and television reporting” (p. 10).

The status of some languages can be highly protected by their use in religious ceremony. Islam and Judaism require the “recitation of their sacred texts and prayer” in Arabic and Hebrew, respectively (Cooper, 1989; p. 116). Similarly, the Roman Catholic Church mandated the use of Latin in their services prior to the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. In contrast, more recent Christian scriptures have been translated into thousands of languages in order to facilitate prayer and worship in local languages. While some languages may hold high status in specific religious domains, they may not hold the same status in accompanying social domains or vice versa.
Research on in-group identity (such as Bailey, 2000; Bucholtz, 1999) demonstrates how language can change and mark a person as being part of the in-group or as someone who does not belong. In many African American groups, speaking with a “standard variety” would be unacceptable and even comical to members of a speech community that uses African American Vernacular English (AAVE). Identity and language often go hand in hand and, when language is viewed as a symbol of a nation or community, members can become fearful and even paranoid when different linguistic groups are perceived to be threatening. Such is the case with the United States’ English-only movement (Baker & Giles, 2002). Proponents of this movement promote the suppression of languages other than English and even non-standard varieties of English such as AAVE, although historically and statistically there is no need to do so (San Miguel, 2004). With many different aspects to status planning, the most pungent and influential means of building a language’s status has been through acquisition planning.

**Acquisition planning**

Acquisition planning is directly concerned with the implementation of a plan or policy. Cooper (1989) outlines a number of examples of acquisition planning in action, such as the promotion of English through the British Council’s maintenance of English language libraries, and UCLA’s program to improve Korean-American language skills by allowing participants to travel to study at a university in Korea. Initially, there was some disagreement in the field about whether acquisition planning, which is really just the implementation of corpus and status planning, should stand on its own as a sub-field
of LPP. However, after analyzing the depth and breath of acquisition planning, it is widely accepted that it requires its own category.

Another example of acquisition planning is the Coral Way Elementary School in Miami, one of the first Spanish/English bilingual schools in the United States (Christian, 1996; Genesee, 1984; Andersson, 1971). It was the opinion of the surrounding Miami community that it would be advantageous for students to acquire both English and Spanish. The school, which was open to Hispanics as well as non-Hispanics, viewed language as a resource and taught both English and Spanish for the benefit of students. This dual immersion school taught Spanish-speaking children English and English speaking children Spanish. The dual immersion program used at Coral Way Elementary is one of the many different types of bilingual programs that can be used to promote the learning and acquisition of two languages (Baker, 2001).

Another model of language acquisition is the “language nest” model created for the Maori revitalization movement. Language nests were established in the early 1980’s to aid in the revitalization effort of Maori language and culture in New Zealand (King, 2001; Warner, 2001). In response to massive language shift away from Maori, the indigenous language of New Zealand, Maori leaders worked to found Maori-mediated pre-schools, also known as language nests (King, 2001). Older Maori men and women serve as caregivers to the younger children, and through the children’s experiences in the pre-school the children would start to learn and use Maori. While the programs started slowly, they have been largely successful and have provided many children with a
bilingual foundation as they enter into formal schooling (Cooper, 1989). The Maori language nests have been such a success that the Hawaiian revitalization effort has attempted to emulate the language nests, also with much success (Warner, 2001; Wilson, 1998; Wilson & Kamana, 2001).

Traditionally, acquisition planning has been instituted in a top-down manner, whereby legislators, departments of education and others impose a curriculum or method of teaching. Such was the case at the Coral Way school, where it was determined that due to the high Hispanic population in Dade County, it would make sense to offer a curriculum where students could learn both English and Spanish. More recently, language policies have moved in the direction of decentralization and bottom-up policy, which allows parents and elders to provide input on how and in what language their children are taught (Benson, 2004; Boothe & Walker, 1997; Carroll, 2005; Heugh, 2002).

**Prestige Planning**

Prestige planning is one of the newly explored topics in LPP and is concerned directly with the image of a language and how, in the case of many minority languages, language planners can work to bolster pride and prestige in a language. First discussed in Haarmann (1987), prestige planning has not received the same attention that other sub-fields of LPP have. There is some hesitation among members of the LPP field who feel prestige planning is too similar to that of status planning. While they are similar, they differ in that prestige planning’s emphasis is on image and how it affects one’s psyche, while status planning is concerned more with identifying and promoting a
language. Significantly, more recent publications have started to delve into the intricacies of prestige planning, and Baldauf (2004) argues that this will be a common trend in future research relating to LPP.

Apart from Haarmann (1987), it has only been recently that LPP has started to look at prestige planning. Ager’s (2005) also works to better define the subfield of prestige planning is. Ager (2005) examines prestige planning efforts through three short case studies of Wales, Malaysia, and Quebec. Through his analysis he argues that there are three basic categories related to prestige planning: *image and identity, image as method* and, *image as motive*. The continued definition of prestige planning allows language planners to better understand exactly what is meant by building a language’s prestige and how exactly it can be accomplished.

Ager’s category of *image and identity* is concerned mainly with attitude or the socio-psychological feelings that people have towards language. Ager (2005) identifies three elements that come into play in image and identity:

1. An awareness of the factual situation (e. g., the contrast between H and L).
2. An emotional stance toward it (e. g., a feeling that H is desirable).
3. The desire to take some action in relation to the situation (e. g., learn to use H) (p. 1040).

Speakers of any language understand the prestige that comes with particular kinds of language use. A Hawaiian understands that standard English is to be used in formal
domains because it holds more prestige in the dominant society and that Hawaiian Creole English and Hawaiian hold lesser prestige in these same domains. Often, speakers of minority languages laud the ability to speak a more prestigious variety in formal domains under the understanding that such ability will provide them the linguistic capital necessary to attain higher status (Alexander, 2004; Bourdieu, 1991). Ager (2005) and others who work in LPP believe that “[b]oth image and prestige are psychological attitudes. Attitudes can be affected by propaganda, by deliberate planning, even though the process might be long and difficult” (p. 1042). Thus, if language attitudes are malleable, language planners potentially can work to change and engineer peoples’ perceptions towards languages, thereby increasing or decreasing the prestige of specific languages.

The second category, *image as method*, builds on Fishman’s (2001) revisiting of whether threatened languages can be saved. Ager (2005) argues, as does Fishman, that language reversal comes with the bolstering of status, which cannot be something that is provided to speakers, but it has to be something that comes from within the community. The importance of community involvement in boosting language pride and culture is reiterated in Benjamin, Pecos, Romero and Filmore (1998); Ramanathan, (2005), Tollefson (1981), among others. Ager (2005) also restates the importance that Fishman (2001) attributes to language revitalization through social interaction and particularly cross-generational transmission of language.
Additionally, Ager (2005) provides examples of how each of Japan and Germany used diplomacy through language in the post-WWII era to promote its language and rebuild its prestige, which was badly damaged by the war. Likewise, colonial powers such as England, France, U.S. and Spain have had a major impact on the building of prestige for their languages through continued political and economic relations with their past colonies (Graddol, 1996; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996).

**Image as motive**, the third area of prestige planning, is concerned with learning and bolstering a language through one’s motivation to use it. Motives for language use often coincide with identity and wanting to be part of the in-group. However, *image as motive* is generally not the major factor in bolstering a language’s prestige because of the tendency for people to be motivated toward languages that already have higher prestige, thus leaving minority languages in their same position.

Like Ager (2005), Liddicoat (2007) brings together a variety of articles from around the world that speak to issues of prestige planning, but Liddicoat focuses on aspects of using mother-tongue literacy programs and how they have worked to build the prestige of a language. Chua (2004) discusses how Singaporians have adopted English as an official language but have attempted to implement literacy in Malay and Mandarin in the public schools in order to insure that students are able to retain their Asian culture. Siegel (2007) discusses the role that learning literacy through Pidgins and Creoles has played in the bolstering of prestige for languages such as Haitian Creole and Papiamentu in the Dutch Antilles. As many of the authors in Liddicoat (2007) conclude,
it is difficult to use a child’s mother tongue to teach literacy when the parents of that child do not consider their own language legitimate for such purposes (Siegel, 2007). The use of one’s mother tongue in formal domains such as schooling can work to combat previously held ideas regarding the utility of one’s language while concurrently building its prestige. It is important to keep in mind however, that the field of LPP has just recently started to pay due attention to aspects of prestige planning which have provided more complete understandings of a variety of language contexts.

**Review of literature on threatened languages**

Historically, there has been great ambiguity within the LPP field as to what is meant by a language that is threatened. On one hand, some have argued that a majority of the world’s languages are in danger of imminent death (Krauss, 1992; 2000), but on the other hand, there are powerful language communities that perceive their language to be threatened when in reality there is little to no risk of language shift toward another minority language (Ager, 2001). Powerful countries such as the United States and France have consciously put into place, to differing extents, language policies that restrict the use of minority languages. In both cases, the media and other institutions work to amplify fear and paranoia toward recent increases of immigrants who speak other languages or promote use of a foreign language in the media or popular culture. That said, traditional ways of measuring language threat in LPP have been concerned primarily with intergenerational transmission and ignore the social and psychological conditions that promote language shift. In the case study portion of this dissertation I will concentrate on the social, and often psychological, aspects of language threat.
Before discussing the case studies however, first it is important to understand the different typologies that have been used to assess language threat.

**Assessing language threat**

Throughout the history of the world, many languages have come and gone. Ostler (2005) eloquently outlines the rise and fall of many of the world’s former and current language empires. Nevertheless, recent global trends have expedited language endangerment to the extent that Dalby (2003) estimates that half of the approximately 5,000 languages alive today will be lost within the next century. The twenty-first century has witnessed increased globalization and technology which has linked people throughout the world, making common languages necessary for communication among groups that in the past would have never have met (Crystal, 2004). Now, languages clash as they compete for space on internet pages, in classrooms and in official legislation.

Undoubtedly, colonization resulted in the loss of many languages, but it has only been within the past 50 years that there have been concentrated efforts to maintain and revitalize languages that underwent severe language shift due to various colonial histories. Thus, the concept of “language threat” ranges in its contextually based definition. I will now briefly explain three typologies of threatened languages that have been developed by influential scholars within the field of LPP.

Joshua Fishman’s Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) is the most well-known and widely used typology to measure language threat. Fishman argues that
the key to successful language maintenance and revitalization is contingent on the success of cross-generational transfer of language. He breaks the language revitalization process into eight stages or levels, ranging from Stage 8 on the bottom, where all speakers are beyond childbearing age and language death is imminent, to Stage 1 where the minority language is used in higher levels of education, government and possibly media (Fishman, 1991). In other words, stability hinges on older members of the society passing their language to younger generations who actually use the language. When use of a language is no longer passed from generation to generation it falls to the lowest of the eight stages or levels. On the other hand, the upper level stages for reversing language shift are concerned more with governmental and educational aspects such as officializing a language or making it the medium of instruction in schools.

Table 1.1 – Fishman’s GIDS

| Stage 1 | Some use Xish in higher level educational, occupational, governmental and media efforts (but without the additional safety provided by political independence) |
| Stage 2 | Xish in lower governmental services and mass media but not in the higher spheres of either |
| Stage 3 | Use of Xish in the lower work sphere (outside of the Xish neighborhood / community) involving interactions between Xmen and Ymen |
| Stage 4 | Xish is used in lower education that meets the requirements of compulsory education |
| Stage 5 | Xish literacy is used in the home, school and community, but without taking on extra-communal reinforcement of such literacy |
| Stage 6 | Marked by the attainment of intergenerational informal oralcy. In this stage Xish is used in informal domains and passed on to younger generations. |
| Stage 7 | Most users of Xish are socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active but they are beyond childbearing age. |
| Stage 8 | Users of Xish are beyond childbearing age, their role in society is minimal and there is often a push towards saving the last remains of language-in- |
culture. The language is in the most advanced stages of attrition.

Adapted from Fishman (1991)

Fishman’s GIDS has been criticized because of the author’s insistence on the importance of the vertical step-by-step manner in which he argues languages must climb in order to reverse language shift (Fishman, 1991). Scholars such as Hornberger and King (2001) have argued that the GIDS may work for some languages, but it does not work for larger languages such as Quechua, which has a variety of different varities, and communities that are at different stages of language shift. Romaine (2006) voices similar criticisms toward Fishman’s GIDS in that it does not necessarily account for sixty percent of the world’s languages that have less than ten thousand speakers.

Despite a variety of criticism pointed toward the GIDS, Fishman’s more recent work has articulated some of the misconceptions regarding his typology. Fishman’s concluding chapter in, Can threatened languages be saved?, argues that reversing language shift (RLS) does not necessitate a “lock-step stage-by-stage progression” of the GIDS (Fishman, 2001: 467). While, Fishman has answered many of his critics, he still unwaveringly stands for the importance of working one stage at a time toward RLS. He understands that such progression will simultaneously require work in other stages, but warns of the dangers of working too hard in other stages and losing track of the needs of lower stages. Nevertheless, Fishman has continued to argue that a linear progression from stage eight to stage one is indeed necessary in RLS. Despite its criticism, Fishman’s GIDS is well known throughout the field and one of the most frequently used to describe threatened languages.
A second method, or typology, for identifying threatened languages comes from Krauss (2000). Krauss’ four-class category distinction of threatened languages is a quick and efficient way to obtain a general idea of how endangered a language is. Krauss’ four classes range from Class A, where the language is still spoken by all generations, to Class D, where the language is only spoken by the very oldest people in a community and there are usually fewer than 10 people. Krauss’ class system is also based on intergenerational transmission, but unlike Fishman’s GIDS, this system allows for quick assessment of a large number of languages because it is based on smaller and generally more accessible data than would be required for a GIDS assessment.

Table 2.1 – Krauss’ typology for threatened languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Still spoken by all generations including children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Spoken only by parental generation and up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Spoken only by grandparental generation and up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Spoken only by the oldest, over 70, usually &lt; 10 speakers – nearly extinct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Krauss (2000)

A third typology, developed by Richard Ruiz, was presented at the 2006 Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics (Ruiz, 2006). In this presentation, Ruiz defined two types of language endangerment: an A-type, which refers to languages threatened with immediate shift or death, and a B-type, which refers to “threats that create changes in the roles and functions that language plays in social life, such that the cultural vitality of the group is diminished.” Ruiz’s typology (seen in Table 3.1 on page 48) looks to reconceptualize language threat and examine how
language groups of dominant languages can feel threatened despite the power and prestige of their mother tongue. Ruiz’s new typology identifies eight types of language threat. In categories ranging from ‘A’ through ‘H’, Ruiz differentiates language situations from uni-centric minority/indigenous languages in full contact with an aggressive majority language of wider communication to large states where a LWC is perceived to be threatened by multilingualism.

Language situations that do not fit cleanly into Fishman’s GIDS now have a typology that can account for their level of threat in Ruiz’s typology. For instance, different varieties of a LWC, such as Spanish in the U.S. or French in Algeria, now have their own category, as do indigenous languages like Xhosa in South Africa, where recent legislation has provided corpus, status and acquisition planning, but its low prestige has curbed its widespread use in domains of power. Ruiz’s Group D category would also encompass a language like Quechua, which is endangered to varying extents, and a context that Hornberger and King (2001) felt did not fit properly into Fishman’s GIDS. Ruiz’s typology recognizes that defining language threat is tricky because it is often the case that languages are not necessarily threatened with language shift, but social and political environments have an effect on how a language is used as well as perceived, thereby leading to diverse set of outcomes. Consequently, in addition to recognizing legitimately threatened languages, Ruiz’s typology allows language planners to identify different aspects of languages that are perceived to be “at risk.” Of particular interest to this paper, Spanish in Puerto Rico (Group C) and Aruban Papiamento (Group E) are language contexts that fit into distinct categories in Ruiz’s new typology.
Table 3.1 – Ruiz’s typology for threatened languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Danger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Uni-centric minority/indigenous Ls in full contact with an aggressive majority L/LWC</td>
<td>Significant $L_1 \rightarrow L_2$; disappearance of $L_1$</td>
<td>Imminent Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Stigmatized or minoritized varieties of pluricentric LWCs in large multilingual states (e.g. US Spanish varieties) where the LWCs are not in danger of extinction</td>
<td>Significant $L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ Diminished vitality (cf Krauss)</td>
<td>Displaced and diminished $L_1$ functions; cultural disruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Majority minoritized languages in stable states in contact with LWCs but not in significant danger of either extinction or significant shift (e.g. Spanish in Puerto Rico)</td>
<td>Anti L2 LP: sanctions, rules, legislation, etc.</td>
<td>Isolation, political polarization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Indigenous Ls in multilingual states not in danger of language death (Xhosa in South Africa)</td>
<td>Pro-L1 LP: Status, corpus and acquisition planning</td>
<td>Limited use of $L_1$ in P-domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Majority indigenous languages in small states in contact with LWCs (Aruban Papiamento)</td>
<td>L1/L2 functional differentiation</td>
<td>L1 devalued, confined to non-P domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F LWCs in small states that are threatened by LWCs in adjacent states (French in Quebec)</td>
<td>Political separation; endoglossic LP</td>
<td>Political antagonisms and isolation; gradual LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Non-LWC majority Lg that perceive threats from LWCs in adjacent states (Catalan in Spain)</td>
<td>Endoglossic LP</td>
<td>Political antagonisms and isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H LWCs in large states that perceive threats from multilingualism consisting of “smaller” languages (French Creole, Vietnamese) or other LWCs (Spanish in US, Eng in France)</td>
<td>Anti L1 LP</td>
<td>Oppression of minority Ls and their speakers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The linguistic context of Puerto Rico is represented in Ruiz’s typology as a Group C language where Spanish is the language of the majority, but Spanish is minoritized when referring to the island’s colonial relationship with the United States. Evidence that distinguishes Spanish in Puerto Rico and other members of Group C from other categories is the fact that there is little to no evidence of shift away from the majority language and thus the language is stable. Nevertheless, the colonial relationship and the fact that Spanish is a minoritized language in the United States, does create some concern. Furthermore, policies created by Puerto Ricans that limits the use of English, can be perceived by the United States as disrespectful toward their colonial relationship.

The second case that will be discussed in this research is that of Aruba. Aruba represents Group E, where Papiamento is the indigenous language that is in contact with other LWC such as Dutch, English, and Spanish. The “contact” between Papiamento and the other LWC on Aruba is peaceful in the sense that societal multilingualism is the norm. This type of contact differs greatly from “full contact” which is discussed in Group A, where the goal of policy makers is not multilingualism, but monolingualism. Therefore, a language designated to be in “full contact,” is one that is fighting the encroachment of the dominant language. What is not known is to what extent, if at all, is Papiamento “devalued” due to its use in some domains of language use over others.

Thus far, I have discussed and defined the overarching subfields of language planning and policy as well as described the different ways in which those who work in
the field of language planning and policy generally speak in terms of threatened languages. The rest of my dissertation will focus on the argument that, in order to better understand languages contexts, we need to examine speakers’ perceptions of languages that might pose a threat. In doing so, I will discuss how threat has been conceptualized in different language contexts throughout the world.

How threat is conceptualized: Lessons from around the world

As was discussed above, there are a variety of different ways in which language threat is conceptualized. On one extreme, there are languages with relatively small populations of speakers which are in imminent danger of language death and therefore extremely threatened. On the other hand, there are language situations where little to no language shift has occurred, yet there is a perception of threat whether imagined or legitimate. In this section, I will provide a number of examples of language contexts with differing degrees of language threat which will provide the backdrop for the extended case studies of language threat in Aruba and Puerto Rico.

Starting at one extreme, there are a variety of cases in the world where a LWC with high prestige and political clout is perceived by its speakers to be threatened, despite little evidence of language shift away from the language. For example, throughout the past few decades in U.S. states that border Mexico, there has been a growing resentment toward the continued immigration of Spanish speakers. The states of Arizona and California, in particular, have witnessed unprecedented waves of both documented and undocumented immigration from Mexico and other parts of Central America and even South America. Such waves have ignited a backlash among many
citizens living in such states, who believe that the undocumented immigrants are a threat to their security, their culture, and most importantly for this research, their language (Barker, Giles, Noels, Duck, Hecht & Clément, 2001). While the Spanish-speaking population has ballooned over the last three decades, there is little proof that the Spanish-speaking immigrants are choosing to not learn English. To the contrary, recent immigrants have abandoned their first language and culture at a quicker pace when compared to earlier immigrant groups to the United States (Crawford, 2002). Thus, despite research proving otherwise, the media and citizens’ own experiences with Spanish-speaking immigrants have created a perception that these immigrants are not willing to learn English and are therefore unlike previous immigrants who came to the United States and rejected their former language and culture.

The perception that Spanish-speaking immigrants are somehow going to take over and change the linguistic landscape of the state of Arizona is real because people actually believe that it could potentially happen. Linguistically speaking, however, the status of the two languages, where English holds very high status and prestige and Spanish holds relatively low status, makes it highly unlikely that Spanish will overtake English as the primary language used in the southwestern portion of the United States. In fact, despite essentially no evidence that English is threatened by Spanish in the southwest, the presence of Spanish-speakers, and of Hispanics in general, has generated a fear on the part of many voters. This perception of threat in the southwestern U.S. has led to the passing of a variety of voter-initiated pieces of legislation to curb and/or prevent the use of other languages in the state of Arizona and California. Proposition
227 in California and Proposition 203 in Arizona were voter-initiated propositions that worked to prevent bilingual education programs throughout the state (Combs, Evans, Fletcher, Parra and Jimenez, 2005; Gutiérrez, Asato, Pacheco et. al 2002; Wright, 2005). Even more significant was the earlier passage of Proposition 187 in California. Proposition 187 prevented immigrants from receiving any state sponsored benefits such as education and healthcare. Despite being held unconstitutional soon after voters passed it into law in 1994, the passage of Proposition 187 demonstrated that the anti-immigrant sentiment was and still is very strong. Past cases in U.S. history highlight similar fears of xenophobic nature where similar language policies were created to eliminate German bilingual schools in the Midwest after the start of WWI (Andersson, 1971; Crawford, 1992; Wiley, 2002).

Again the perception that Spanish is a threat to English is real in the sense that literally tens or hundreds of thousands of people believe it to be true. The ways this perception has been picked up and adopted often has to do with one’s own experiences, coupled with the outside influence of media. Previous experiences that in reality pose little risk and might not have otherwise been deemed as a threat to aspects of daily life can be inflated by the media to create a sense of threat. At the present time however, English is the most powerful language in the world and the circumstances in which it is threatened would only exist in an area where the language does not hold high prestige nor high status, which is not the case in the U.S. Moreover, English is perceived as a threat to other languages throughout the world due to its propensity to garner high status and displace local languages in particular domains.
The country of Sweden is another interesting case where a language is perceived to be threatened, yet it is not endangered. While Swedish does not have the worldwide prestige of English, it is a strong language with a historic literary tradition. Furthermore, Swedish holds high status and has been the center of acute language planning and policy efforts for the past two centuries (Winsa, 2000). Nevertheless, similar to many other countries throughout the world, growing globalization and use of English has started to make Swedes more cognizant of the shift away from Swedish in particular domains of society.

Sweden was one of the first countries to promote the expansive use of English in order to improve their economic viability in an ever-globalizing world. As a result, important domains such as higher education, journals, and aspects of business relations have migrated toward an English only focus. This is just one aspect of language use that has caused alarm in the Scandinavian country. Nevertheless, Oakes (2005) argues,

…as internationalisation gives way to globalisation, as the emphasis shifts from mere contact between states to pressures for homogeneity, there is a paradoxical tendency towards cultural divergence. Economic-inspired theories of globalisation seem to have underestimated the power of identity, which has contributed to nationalist revivals around the globe. (p. 151).

It appears that the case of Sweden’s openness to instilling English has brought out a more conscious sense of Swedish identity, which was not always present. Hence, as a nation works to adopt a foreign language to improve their economy or for any other reason, the common response from the people is a backlash as speakers who identify with a particular language start to see their nation moving away from currently held conceptualizations of the nation.
In fact, throughout Sweden’s history, there have been various periods when national pride was stronger and more outspoken than others. Oakes (2005) argues that "[b]efore the 1920s and 1930s, the Swedes had a strong, overt sense of national identity… But the breakthrough of social democracy in Sweden, coupled with negative reactions to the two World Wars in general, and to Nazi racial theories in particular, led to the discrediting of the concepts of national identity and nationalism" (p.159). Oakes further argues that the nationalism feverish at the beginning of the 20th century has now returned as the country and its people face new challenges of the 21st century. Among these challenges are increased immigration, acceptance into the European Union and continued globalization which has seen many Swedish companies merge or be bought out by larger more powerful companies from Asian and American markets (Oakes 2005).

This multitude of factors have increased the perception that Swedes must do something to protect the Swedish language, in part to protect and solidify their culture. Recently, Sweden adopted a Language Act (Språklagsutredningen, 2008). The Language Act was commissioned by law makers in Sweden because of the growing perception that Swedish was indeed threatened and that safeguards needed to be put in place in order to secure the language its role and importance as the unifying agent of Sweden. The purpose of the Language Act is to: “…prescribe the status and use in Swedish society of Swedish and other languages. Its provisions are designed as a result of the feeling that there is a need to safeguard both the Swedish language and language diversity in Sweden” (p. 20). The writers of the act go on to say that:
Swedish has long been a stable language. However, as in many other countries, the language situation in Sweden has changed in recent years. It has become more multifaceted and the position of Swedish is no longer as self-evident as it was in the past. (Språklagsutredningen, 2008: 20).

Growing internationalisation is the factor that has had the greatest impact on the status of Swedish in Sweden. This has led, for example, to the increasing use of English in many areas, either replacing Swedish entirely or alongside Swedish. The fact that at least 150 different mother tongues are now spoken in Sweden also places the focus on issues involving the status of Swedish and other languages. Since 2000, five languages have been officially classified as national minority languages in Sweden. The circumstances described above give cause for establishing the status of Swedish and other languages and determining how these languages can best be safeguarded so as to preserve language diversity. The remit of the Language Act Inquiry should be seen in this light (Språklagsutredningen, 2008: 18).

Hult (2005) also discusses the continued interest and concern that English poses to Swedish and argues that managing the status and prestige of Swedish is an increasingly vital aspect of language planning. Creating spaces where Swedish grows in prestige among an immigrant population seems to be a key component of the Language Act. It is easy to imagine how non-Swedish speaking immigrants arriving in Sweden could think that learning English is their best shot at being successful because then they would be competing with the Swedes in what is also their second language. If English has such high status, it is no wonder that immigrants do not feel compelled to learn Swedish. While the writers of the Language Act went out of their way to highlight the non-prescriptive nature of the act by writing, “[the Act] should not deal with issues related to linguistic correctness or the use of language in various fields,” (p. 20) it is difficult to measure how effective it will be if Swedes themselves correct non-native speakers so much so that immigrants become discouraged and instead elect to learn
English. Thus, as Hult argues, it is essential for Sweden to not only promote Swedish to Swedes, but also to build the prestige of the language and allow all of those who are actually in Sweden to partake in the language.

Analyzing Swedish in terms of traditional dichotomies of language threat is difficult because it is a threatened language in the sense that some domains have shifted to, or are at least being shared with, English. However, it cannot be argued that a language with a history, literature, vast body of speakers, and its own geographic region could be endangered in the same way that languages on the brink of death are. This is by no means an exhaustively detailed explanation of the complexity of language threat in Sweden, but it is one of many language contexts that we can learn from in terms of the development of both perceived and actual threat, as well as the most effective ways to manage this threat.

In addition to Sweden, the adoption of English in order to improve a country’s economic future has been the primary impetuous for many other countries, but few have done so with as much fervor as Singapore. After garnering independence from Malaysia in 1963, Singapore was comprised primarily of Malay, Mandarin and Tamil, with an influential group of English speaking British expatriates who remained after the British government left the island nation. With an economy largely dependent on the importation and exportation of goods, Singaporean politicians felt that it was essential for the population to speak and be able to use English (Simpson, 2007). As a result, Singapore’s government initiated a strong and ambitious campaign to make its citizens competent in English. This intense campaign to use English and implement English in
public schools forever changed the linguistic landscape of the island. As English was embraced, however, Singaporeans put their own twist on the language. In doing so, they created their own variety of the language often referred to as Singaporean English or as it is known informally, Singlish. The use of the non-standard variety was viewed as a threat to the country’s economic well-being and a campaign to “Speak Good English” ensued to clean up the newly developed variety of English. Singaporeans quickly clung to English by sending their children to English medium schools and stressing the use of English, understanding that English would be the key to future prosperity in the island nation. While the government has been rather successful in promoting the use of English, there is a rising fear that English poses a threat to Singaporeans’ unique and hybrid form of “Asianness” (Ministry of Education, 1997)

While it is difficult to understand what exactly is meant by “Asianness,” Singapore’s government views the western ideals that are inherently present when one learns English as a direct threat to important cultural principles of many in Southeast Asia. While learning English is still viewed as a necessity for the newest generation, Singapore’s government has established LPP efforts to build the prestige of Malay, Mandarin, and Tamil by requiring students to take classes in the language of their ancestors while at the elementary school level. This policy to protect local languages is but another example of how a language, in this case English, is perceived to be a threat. In the case of Singapore, it is not necessarily a threat to the other languages, all of which are very stable within the context of Singapore, but a threat to some sort of Asian pan-identity (Simpson, 2007). In order to combat the spread of western ideals that were
embedded in the teaching and use of English, the government also initiated a campaign to promote bilingualism by providing mother tongue instruction for speakers of Malay, Mandarin, and Tamil. Another campaign that looked to maintain and boost the prestige of Singaporean Asianness was the “Speak Mandarin Campaign,” which has promoted the use of Mandarin among its ethnic Chinese citizens (Chua, 2004). Thus, while English attainment on the part of the majority of the Singaporean population is viewed as desirable, Singaporean politicians are conscious of the need to boost the prestige of local languages in order to maintain local identity and culture (Silver, 2005).

As Singapore is linguistically diverse for such a small island nation, the continent of Africa is one of the most linguistically diverse areas of the world. The post-colonial period in many African countries has brought serious questions as to what language should be official. Different countries have gone about answering this question in different ways. Countries like Ghana, Nigeria, Togo, Mozambique, Zambia, among others, have adopted the language of their colonizer (Dijté, 1993; Kashoki, 2003). Thus, the languages of English, French, and Portuguese are still used for official government purposes and are often used as the language of instruction. There have been two primary reasons for adopting the colonizer’s language in these countries. First, the colonial experience provided the country with industrial knowhow and an easy and quick supply chain of materials, especially in the Francophone countries of Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger (Alidou & Jung, 2001). Thus, maintaining the status quo through the use of the colonizer’s language is viewed as the easiest and most cost-effective way of maintaining the country (Dijté, 1993). The second, and potentially the most
important, reason was the difficulty in choosing a language and the specific variety of that language to be made official. The officialization of one or even a handful of languages can tend to marginalize non-speakers of the chosen languages, thus further dividing the country. Even in a country like South Africa, which has eleven designated official languages, English is used as the lingua franca and is currently displacing local languages (of which many are official) in ways that even Apartheid did not do (Louw, 2004). It has often been argued that, in countries of Africa, choosing the colonizer’s language would offer less of a threat to local languages, as well as dampen the threat of civil unrest based on the selection of a language that privileges one group over another, yet such use of the colonizer’s language can ultimately lead to language threat as citizens start to place less value on maintaining their first language (Alidou & Jung, 2001).

Unlike the countries that have adopted the language of their colonizers, other countries such as Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and the United Republic of Tanzania, have decided to choose local languages and undergo intense efforts in both corpus and status planning (Küper, 2003). In the case of Kenya, Swahili was a language spoken by a considerable amount of the population, but the difficulty came with choosing the variety of the language that would be the standard. In the case of Kenya, after gaining independence, leaders felt that it was important to choose one of their own languages as the official language because of the threat that English and, more importantly, western ideologies, posed to life in the country (Njogu, 1992). Similarly, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and the United Republic of Tanzania all have implemented mother tongue instruction in
primary schools throughout the country providing a higher status for local languages (Küper, 2003).

The third way in which languages have been dealt with within Africa involves a more inclusive approach that officializes multiple languages. South Africa is the best example of this, as it has designated eleven languages as official. After gaining independence from the Dutch, South Africans wanted to create a language policy that was as inclusive as possible. As a result, they named the following languages as official: Afrikaans, English, Ndebele, Pedi, Sotho, Swazi, Tsonga, Tswana, Tshivenda, Xhosa, and Zulu (Heugh, 2002). While such distinction served to raise the symbolic stature of languages that were not previously official, the lack of funding for corpus, status, acquisition and prestige planning have made the officialization of these languages merely symbolic. English, which does not have the same colonial connotations that it does in other countries in Africa, is now viewed as the most useful and important language in South Africa (Louw, 2004). The strength of English, and its potential to unite speakers of other languages who historically have been divided, may bring stability to the country but potentially at the cost of weakening the prestige of indigenous languages. Educational policy supporting local languages has been seen as discriminatory by those language groups.

Another distinct aspect of language threat is exemplified by the threat posed to regional languages within larger nation states. One such example is the threat that English poses to French in Quebec. Both English and French are obviously languages
of wider communication and are by no means threatened on a global scale. Yet, within the province of Quebec, French speakers have fought vigorously for their right to use French in all aspects of society, despite being the only province in Canada where the language is spoken by majority of the population (Maurais, 1997). The English language and speakers of it have consistently been targeted as a threat to French in Quebec, where they are often viewed as culturally undesirable, but financially necessary, for many in Quebec. This type of threat is unique to states or regions where two states border each other and the majority populations of each state speak a different LWC. Despite a language shift away from French throughout the western-most provinces of Canada, the province of Quebec has used very strict language policies to maintain French as a protected regional language (Bourhis, 2001).

The language context in Quebec differs slightly from that wherein ethnic groups that hold a regional majority, but their language is not a LWC, as is the case with many of the regional languages of Spain. The push toward the recognition of Catalan as a regional language in Spain’s Catalonia is a prime example of a language context where a local language which is not a LWC is threatened by a language of the country, Spanish, which happens to be a LWC. The fight for language rights among Catalan speakers is well documented and is based on the threat that Spanish poses to the Catalan in the region (Strubell, 2001). Because Catalonia is the only region where Catalan is used on a daily basis, Catalan is threatened such that an absence of protection and promotion of Catalan could potentially result in shift toward Spanish (Pujolar, 2007). Catalan language planners have worked to build both the status and prestige of Catalan in the
region in the post-Franco era where the language had been prohibited for a time. The resurgence of Catalan, often in direct opposition to the status of Spanish, potentially could cause friction between the region and the larger nation. In this type of language context, maintaining a peaceful understanding of language rights is necessary.

In summation, differing language contexts with varied histories provide different levels of language threat. At one extreme, powerful languages such as English in the U.S. southwest have been perceived as threatened by increased immigration and a growing Hispanic population. While some hold the perception that English is threatened, there are many more language groups that have witnessed English threatening their local languages where globalization and their country’s emphasis on gaining economic advantages have hinged on being able to do business in English. As a result, language policies in countries like Sweden and Singapore have encouraged the use of English but have more recently also had to institute policies that work to protect the local languages. Post-colonial countries in Africa also have struggled with aspects of language threat as they try to determine the most equitable and efficient manner of instituting language policies. The linguistic diversity in Africa and within its countries, however, has raised a number of different concerns at all different levels of policy and planning. Furthermore, regional languages such as French in Quebec and Catalan in Spain have worked to provide linguistic human rights to regional majorities by protecting the local languages that are constantly bombarded by the larger nation’s official language of English and Spanish, respectively. These cases provide a small slice of the different language contexts in which varying levels of language threat are
apparent, and a backdrop for discursive language threat on the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico.

**Theoretical framework**

To answer my main research question, I will be working within a theoretical framework that incorporates many fundamental theories in the multidisciplinary field of LPP. In order to facilitate understanding of my theoretical lens, I have broken up the principal theories into the three different areas of study where they originated: Linguistic Anthropology, Philosophy/Politics, and Education/Applied Linguistics.

**Linguistic anthropology**

LPP owes much of its affinity for cultures and languages to the field of linguistic anthropology. Linguistic anthropology started as a splinter section of the field of anthropology when interests in language were taken beyond the field of pure linguistics and analyzed in the cultures and places that language was used:

Linguistic anthropology must be viewed as part of the wider field of anthropology not because it is a kind of linguistics practiced in anthropology departments, but because it examines language through the lenses of anthropological concerns. These concerns include the transmission and reproduction of culture, the relationship between cultural systems and different forms of social organization, and the role of the material conditions of existence in a people’s understanding of the world (Duranti, 1997, p. 4).

Franz Boas, often credited as one of the founders of linguistic anthropology, wrote about the relativity at play when languages are used. Historically, languages from minority groups were viewed as less than equal to more dominant cultures and languages. However, Boas (1974a, 1974b) worked to highlight the equivalent complexities of
different languages and the resulting conclusion that cultures and languages are inherently equal. The idea that all languages and cultures are inherently equal provides fuel for language planners who advocate for linguistic human rights, a common theme in LPP and literature on language threat.

Following Boas, Edward Sapir and his student Benjamin Whorf continued to build on previous concepts of culture and language. The work of Sapir and Whorf with different indigenous communities in the United States and Northern Mexico led them to develop what is known as the Sapir–Whorf Hypothesis, which, put simply, means that one’s language influences the way in which one sees the world. While the hypothesis is actually an axiom, it states that one’s habitual actions are in large part influenced by the language and its grammatical structures of the language that the person speaks (Hill & Mannheim, 1992). Throughout their careers, both Sapir and Whorf worked with several different indigenous groups such as the Yana, Yahi, Nootka, Sarcee (Sapir), Nahuatl, Maya, and Hopi (Whorf). These early scholars in linguistic anthropology set the tone for their field and had a major impact on how those in LPP tend to laud linguistic diversity and view the death of any language as the end of a way of thinking (Hale, 1992; Phillipson, 2001; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1995).

More contemporary work in linguistic anthropology has documented the intricacies of language use in society. Researchers have examined language use in numerous different venues and communities ranging from politicians (Hill, 2000), to high school students and their use of language for in-group identity (Bucholtz, 1999;
Eckert, 2000; Mendoza-Denton, 1999), to the role language plays in the development of personal identity (Bailey, 2000; Kiesling, 2004). Contemporary work on the relationship between language and identity such as Bailey’s (2000) unique description of a Dominican American’s ability to use two linguistic identities highlights the importance that language plays in the nuances of everyday life.

The connection between LPP and Linguistic Anthropology rests in their common ideas regarding the importance and uniqueness of languages and cultures and their need to be protected. Specifically related to this dissertation has been the study of language ideologies within the field of linguistic anthropology. has examined some of the social and psychological conditions that either promote language shift or facilitate in language maintenance. Krookrity’s (2000) edited volume describes the complexity of language ideologies and its impact on identity and even nationalism. Language ideologies are also the subject of the influential book edited by Schieffelin, Woolard and Krookrity (1998), where Woolard argues in the introduction that a focus on language ideologies “makes a promising bridge between linguistic and social theory (p. 27). The field of linguistic anthropology has undoubtedly influenced the study of LPP and has thus impacted my theoretical framework. Nevertheless, it is important to note that while I I will be drawing on many of the key ideas that have originated in the field of linguistic anthropology, this field does not serve as the primary lens for this research.
Sociology and philosophy

Specifically related to the sociology of language and the field of LPP is the scholar Joshua Fishman who has had an enormous impact on the study of language socialization and more recently, reversing language shift. His early publications and defining of diglossia proved instrumental in the field’s understanding of the role that multiple languages can play in different language contexts. Fishman is the most consistently cited scholar in the field of LPP and was one of leaders in the creation of study of the sociology of language. His work is cited throughout this dissertation and his impact on the field of the sociology of language directly impacted the study of LPP. Contrary to Fishman’s direct work with languages, the overarching theoretical implications of Pierre Bourdieu’s work have also influenced LPP, albeit in a more indirect manner.

The fields of sociology and philosophy have also played a major role in the development of the theoretical lens used in this dissertation. The work of Pierre Bourdieu has been instrumental throughout the field of LPP and served as an important part of my theoretical framework (May, 2000; Silver, 2005). His work in cultural, linguistic and social capital outlines the exchanges made between people on a daily basis, including the way we use language and the cultural intricacies of its use.

Bourdieu (1977) argues that all human activity and practice involve exchanges between parties, which he refers to as an economy of practice. Bourdieu also defines his idea of habitus as an element of humanness that starts from birth and is identified
through a person’s particular class and culture-based way of viewing, living, and participating in history (1977). Habitus links one’s genetics with the impact that society has on a person. Within any habitus, there is a multidimensional interplay with aspects of capital whereby humans are continuously engaging in exchanges of capital among others. Bourdieu’s ideas of capital can be examined as symbolic, where cultural, economic, and social capital are the three most relevant areas to the field of LPP (Carrington & Luke, 1997).

Cultural capital encompasses a person’s or group’s knowledge, skills, linguistic knowledge (also known as linguistic capital) and various cultural goods, and it can also speak to different academic qualifications (Carrington & Luke, 1997). Bourdieu’s economic model highlights cultural capital as the knowledge that either works for, or against, the particular party involved in the interaction (Bourdieu, 1991). This is exemplified in many formal school situations where students in minority groups, who develop a different habitus as compared to the majority population, are forced to take standardized exams that are written from the standpoint of the majority. In this example, Bourdieu’s idea of cultural capital argues that in order for the students to benefit from the exchange, or do well on the exam, they must have the necessary understanding and knowledge of the linguistic and cultural features of the majority group to be successful. However, in order to understand and have the cultural capital necessary to succeed in such exchanges, such students (and people in general) must have the appropriate access to experience the very culture which is often not afforded to them.
Economic capital relates to material resources and goods that are converted directly into monetary compensation. Those with money generally have the power to persuade, attain elected positions and gain access into the social circles necessary to attain the experiences required to develop the habitus most similar to those with power. As noted earlier, LPP has been a top-down type field where policy makers have the economic and political capital work to give back to the system that facilitated their political ascent. Economic capital also comes to play in the field of education where the wealthy have enough economic capital to afford the most prestigious schools and obtain an education that is often far superior to that offered by local public schools and thereby are privy to the cultural capital of the elite.

According to Carrington and Luke (1997), Bourdieu’s third type of symbolic capital is social capital, described by them as the “access to cultural and subcultural institutions, social relations and practices” (p. 102). Money cannot always buy one access into a particular group or institutions and many cultures and subcultures are established and maintained only for people that have particular talents, are of a certain socioeconomic status, or were born in a particular part of town or nation. Social capital often can be attained by having the particular required features or talents of a given group and spending time with the group. Linguistically speaking, social capital can be identified by a person’s mannerisms, accent, or use of particular lexicon. These characteristics often take enormous amounts of time to change or adopt, especially in adulthood.
Bourdieu’s concept of power and personal exchanges are ideas that stimulate much of the analysis within the field of LPP. One of the common goals of the field has been to try to develop policies and plans that allow people and groups to keep their own local identity and habitus while still exposing them to and allowing them to gain the social and cultural capital they need to increase their chances of attaining more economic capital. If systems are in place where access to cultural capital and linguistic capital are limited and/or prevented, then those without such capital will continue living the status-quo, lacking the necessary linguistic abilities to ascend the socioeconomic hierarchy.

The internalized oppression resulting from colonization has left indigenous groups around the world trying to de-colonize all aspects of society, but most importantly their minds (Smith, 1999). Colonization generally worked to create nation-states out of large geographic regions populated by heterogeneous cultural and linguistic groups. The colonization by France, England, Spain, Portugal, and Holland (in no particular order) worked to exploit indigenous groups through institutional means even though assimilating them into the dominant language and culture was almost impossible due to systematic restraints. For instance, blacks and indigenous groups throughout Africa and the Americas were denied meaningful education, and even in situations where the oppressed succeeded academically, their skin color and/or natural characteristics provided fuel for discrimination (Freire & Macedo, 1987). With most developing countries still experiencing a post-colonial like period, there are many countries where the colonizer’s language remains alive and well. Furthermore, with the
colonizer’s language often symbolizing power and hope, many locals have internalized aspects of colonial oppression and thus believe that one of the few ways to succeed is through the learning the colonizer’s language, even if it is at the expense of their own (Louw, 2004; Küper, 2003; Djité, 1993; Arua & Magocha, 2002; Canagarajah, 2005). Combatting the low prestige of these languages due to colonial oppression has been one of the major goals of LPP.

Bourdieu’s ideas permeate discussions of how language is used, and they impact many areas of LPP discussions. Power structures form the foundation for social interaction and it is necessary to understand them when analyzing LPP or other social fields. In order to counteract these institutional power structures, the critical pedagogue Paulo Freire argued for the use of emancipatory pedagogy, where education is used to empower oppressed groups and work from the bottom up to break down long standing power structures (Freire, 1993).

**Education**

The use of critical pedagogy as a means of empowerment creates an avenue for teachers and schools to legitimately provide a space in which their students can empower themselves (Ruiz, 1997). Empowered students tend to facilitate community activism, and one of the primary ways communities can empower themselves is through local grassroots organization and movements. Advocates of grassroots movements work to resurrect the “docile body” that Foucault writes about in order to break the cyclical forms of oppression (Foucault, 1984), and they work to counteract the hegemonic
policies and structure that those in power have instituted. This type of emancipatory education was the theme and focus of the great Brazilian pedagogue Paulo Freire.

The teachings of Freire, which were greatly influenced by Gramscian political ideas, focused on educating the poor and oppressed (Freire & Macedo, 1987). Freire’s work centered on adult literacy programs in which education meant allowing students to learn how to read both the world and the word (Freire & Macedo, 1987). Freire’s work in adult literacy highlights the importance of mother tongue instruction, not only for pedagogical reasons but also to empower the learners. The most deeply embedded aspects of colonization that remain in the ‘post-colonial’ world are the languages that the colonizers left behind. In Freire’s eyes, learning the colonizer’s language, the language of the oppressor, is oppressive in itself (Freire, 1993). Freire’s work with peasants in Brazil, Guinea Bissau, and other countries taught the importance of education and the power of numbers (Shor & Freire, 1987). While the extent of his pedagogy cannot be fully explored in this space, his emphasis on mother tongue instruction and the importance he placed on developing grassroots movements are aspects that are extensively incorporated into the theoretical framework of LPP.

Freire’s work builds on sociocultural theory, which forms the foundation for my theoretical lens, is imperative in understanding the larger theoretical underpinnings of the field of LPP. A sociocultural perspective towards education involves a conscious effort to understand where students are coming from and view their language(s) and culture(s) as a resource. These ideas permeate the Funds of Knowledge work of
González, Moll and Amanti (2005), who advocate for teachers to build on the knowledge and experiences that students bring from their own community and households. The work of Moll and his colleagues is similar to that of Freire’s in that it pushes for education to be meaningful and equitable for all involved. Moll writes, “[i]t is impossible to ignore, then, that schooling practices are related to issues of power and racism in U.S. society, especially as related to the working-class children, whether the children are Latinos or otherwise” (2005, p. 276). In other words, taking the politics out of education is impossible, a thought often echoed by other critical pedagogues (Shor & Freire, 1987; Kincheloe, 2004). Similar to the use of grassroots movements and pedagogies of empowerment discussed below, the Funds of Knowledge approach uses students’ language and culture as a resource for their studies.

Pedagogies of empowerment also play a major role in the theoretical underpinnings of my theoretical lens. In order for people to change and gain power they must empower themselves. Cummins (1986) suggests a change in education where teachers empower their students. This newly found power is supposed to provide students the agency necessary to rise above their societal oppression. Ruiz (1997) however, refutes Cummins' idea that teachers alone can somehow empower their students. Ruiz counters that structural / instructional reform are needed: “[e]mpowerment comes when schools are inclusionary, when their pedagogy encourages critical independent thinking, and when they aim to find and build on a child’s strengths rather than identify their weaknesses” (Ruiz, 1997, p.322). Hence, Ruiz argues that
schools, and communities for that matter, need to provide a space in which students can work to empower themselves.

The first step in this empowerment is often believed to be achieved through one’s first language. The need for mother tongue instruction is implored by Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) and Romaine (2006), all of whom argue vigorously for L1 instruction for all children. Their philosophy is based on the idea that in order to provide children with equitable education, students need to learn in the language in which they have the most familiarity. Similarly, Freire and Macedo’s (1987) argument that a child must be able to read the world before s/he can read the word, also provides a strong argument for mother tongue instruction because people cannot truly empower themselves if the world they are attempting to read is not their own. Thus, the majority of the work in language rights throughout LPP is premised on the idea that one is better off becoming literate in one’s first language.

Although schools potentially offer a space for empowerment, they also have been a site of oppression. Formal schooling historically has played a major role in the loss of languages throughout the colonized world (McCarty, 2002; Fishman, 1991). In colonial times, schools often served as daily reminders of colonial oppression, where the oppressed were shamed and physically punished for using their own language. Lomawaima (1995) documents the history of the Chilocco Indian School, where students were taught to disregard their previous cultural knowledge and adopt English and an “American way” of life. Similar stories abound in Australia where methods of
Colonization uprooted Aboriginal children from their homes and took them to faraway places where they were forced to learn English and abandon their family, language and culture (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001).

The language of formal education in many countries has served as the default language policy when constitutions do not contain *de jure* policy (Cooper, 1989). Countries such as the U.S. and England have instituted *de facto* language policies through public education systems and mass media. When a language is used as the sole medium of instruction, it sends a clear message to students and communities regarding language, specifically that it is one of power and prestige. Throughout history, students coming into a school who spoke a language other than the one used for instruction commonly were abused physically and/or emotionally, often so extensively that many felt ashamed and afraid to use their mother tongue (Sheridan, 1992; Lomawaima, 1995). Education in a foreign and involuntary tongue can be oppressive and disadvantageous when compared to the fruitfulness that can potentially be achieved through strong bilingual education (Cummins, 2000; Baker, 2001).

**Summary**

In this chapter I have discussed the ways in which threatened languages have been presented within the field of LPP. Joshua Fishman and Michael Krauss and their two respective typologies have been seminal work within the field, but neither take into account language contexts where languages are relatively healthy yet there is the perception among speakers that the language is threatened. To understand perceptions of threat I proposed using Ruiz’s (2006) typology of threatened languages. After
examining the three different typologies of threatened languages, I provided examples and lessons that the field has learned regarding language threat from a variety of cases throughout the world. The language contexts of Sweden, South Africa, Singapore, the Southwestern United States, among others, provide various examples of situations in which local languages can be perceived to be threatened yet they are not necessarily endangered.

The chapter concluded with an explanation of my theoretical framework, which is couched in theories ranging from a variety of different fields that have helped to create the study of LPP. Three specific areas: Linguistic Anthropology, Sociology and Philosophy, and Education, all of which I believe to have influenced my thinking and understanding of data throughout this process. Now that I have discussed some of the basic principles regarding LPP and its theoretical framework, I will present the methodology used in this dissertation.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Research design

The research presented in this dissertation is based on the case studies of the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico. I chose the case study method because I felt that an in-depth and descriptive approach was essential to improved understanding of the complexity of language threat on these islands. As is customary in case study research, I compiled a variety of different data sets which I coded and analyzed in order to triangulate findings (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The case study method has given me ample data to provide a rich description of the relevant history of language planning on the two islands. The data also allowed me to determine what key figures in language planning and policy in each place think about the status of their language in relation to other languages and to assess whether language threat is a reality or merely a perception on the two islands.

I began by reviewing past publications regarding the history of language use on both islands, including: for Aruba: Fouse (2002); Frank Martinus (1996) and for Puerto Rico: Algren de Gutiérrez, (1987); Morris (1995); Nickels (2005); Pousada (2000); Vélez (2000). These researchers have examined aspects of LPP maintenance, but little has been done to centralize such research within a framework of threatened languages. After reading various case studies concerning LPP, I felt that Clampitt-Dunlap’s (1995) dissertation comparing language maintenance efforts in Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines, was one that I wanted to pattern my research after. Clampitt-Dunlap (1995)
made a historical-comparative study of language policies on the three islands, systematically documenting the factors and social processes related to language shift. The research analyzed specific variables associated with language shift and maintenance, many of which are also the focus of the present research.

The factors known to be related to language shift discussed in Clampitt-Dunlap (1995) are:

- School and government use of the language
- Societal bilingualism
- Migration
- Industrialization
- Urbanization
- Prestige level of a language
- Nationalist groups defending the native language
- Language policies and language planning efforts
- The role of media in relation to language shift (not examined in Clampitt-Dunlap’s original study).

In order to understand the historical and contemporary aspects of language maintenance and language threat, it was necessary to examine the following types of documents from each island, following Clampitt-Dunlap (1995):

- Reports from Departments of Education and other government agencies
- Bills for legislation
- Laws
- Census data
- Government publications
- Newspaper reports of events
- Speeches by public figures
- Public forums and debates
- Letters to the editor of newspapers
- Documents from non-government groups defending language or nationalities
Clampitt-Dunlap’s (1995) work is influential from a methodological standpoint, but the major difference between her study and most of the other case studies regarding either Aruba or Puerto Rico is that the latter provided only a historical account. In addition to providing a historical foundation, my research will contextualize these unique cases within an ongoing discussion of language threat, which has yet to be done.

**Research Sites: Justification for choosing Aruba and Puerto Rico**

As an undergraduate and graduate student in Puerto Rico, I became interested in language dynamics in the Caribbean. The politics regarding the use of English in Puerto Rico has been one of my principal interests throughout my graduate studies, and I have been interested in understanding why so many Puerto Ricans have not been successful in learning English despite Puerto Rico’s one hundred year association with the United States. Furthermore, it perplexed me that English, and the United States in general, were often viewed with negative connotations. Throughout my readings as a graduate student in Puerto Rico and in Arizona, I began to understand the impact that history, power, language and identity have had on the formation of Puerto Rico, as well as their effects on the perceptions that islanders have toward the United States and the English language. Therefore, it was my experiences and my background in Puerto Rico that provided me the desire to include Puerto Rico as one of the sites for this study.

In 2006, while participating on a panel at the Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics, I was intrigued to learn about the colonial similarities between Aruba and Puerto Rico and specifically the maintenance of
Papiamento throughout many years of colonization (Ruiz, 2006). Lydia Emerencia (a participant in this study) was also on the panel though unable to attend the conference, but Richard Ruiz spoke briefly about the context of Papiamento in Aruba. In further reading, I found many more similarities between the two islands than just tourist appeal. Some of the more influential similarities were:

1. Language plays a vital role in national identity on both islands.

2. Their respective colonial histories did not result in the abandonment of their native tongue.\(^1\)

3. In recent years, Aruba and Puerto Rico have started collaborating in an annual education and language conference, and have established a new affiliation between the University of Puerto Rico in Rio Piedras and the University of Aruba.

These connections, as well as the geographic and political similarities, led me to select the island nations of Aruba and Puerto Rico as the two sites for this study. Both islands have and are experiencing, to different extents, aspects of language threat. Puerto Rico’s association and political connection to the U.S. has long prompted a rhetoric that has historically associated the learning and use of English as anti-Puerto Rican (Algren de Gutiérrez, 1987; Morris, 1996). On the other hand, Aruba has a diverse linguistic landscape where Dutch and Papiamento hold official status, but English and Spanish are languages often heard and acquired by locals. Furthermore,\(^1\)

\(^1\) Taino, the indigenous language present in Puerto Rico at the time of Spanish contact, was quickly replaced by Spanish as the indigenous population rapidly either died or mixed with the Spanish.
until recently, Papiamento had not been used in the school system (Emerencia, 1998). While both islands differ in their history, geographic size and languages spoken, they are similar in that each nation has a language that has been protected throughout their most recent colonial period as if it were indeed threatened.

Similar to Puerto Rico’s association with the United States, Aruba is associated with the Netherlands. Like Puerto Ricans studying in U.S. universities, many high school graduates in Aruba attend and compete for scholarships at Dutch universities. Another similarity stems from Arubans and Puerto Ricans having great difficulty, as a whole, in acquiring an academic variety of their colonizer’s language. On Aruba, this has resulted in unusually high failure rates, as well as many dropouts. In Puerto Rico, it has often meant that students who do not know English are relegated to lower paying jobs and difficulty in post-secondary education where most textbooks are in English (Schweers & Hudders, 2000).

Geographically, Aruba and Puerto Rico are similar in that they are both Caribbean islands that attract thousands of tourists from around the world on an annual basis. As part of the Dutch Leeward Islands in the Lesser Antilles, Aruba is located just off the coast of Venezuela. Puerto Rico, on the other hand, is the eastern-most island in the Greater Antilles as it marks the waters where the North Atlantic Ocean and Caribbean Sea collide. In terms of population, Aruba is the smaller of the two island nations with approximately 100,000 inhabitants, whereas Puerto Rico has approximately 4 million inhabitants (Central Bureau of Statistics Aruba, 2009; U. S. Census Bureau,
2001). Likewise, both islands have relatively strong economies when compared to their surrounding neighbors in the Caribbean.

Politically, Aruba and Puerto Rico currently are possessions of larger more influential developed nations, the Netherlands and the U.S. respectively. Both islands hold local autonomy over local affairs, but they cannot enter into trade agreements with other countries and their laws do not trump that of their possessor. Each of Aruba and Puerto Rico, however, is considered its own nation by many of those who live on the island, as well as by other foreign entities. For instance, each island has a language or dialect that is uniquely theirs, each is represented by its own Olympic teams, and each competes as its own “nation” in a variety of other international events, such as Miss Universe beauty pageants (which are extremely popular on both islands). Due to the long and complex colonial histories of both islands, there is a unique sense of identity, one that is in many ways still in its developmental stages. This concept of national identity will be one of the themes discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters, but the complexity of such identity is a major similarity between the two islands and another justification for their selection.

To conduct this research, I could have selected any number of different sites and as I will argue later, more work needs to be done with case studies of this kind. However, I felt that case studies of both Aruba and Puerto Rico would allow me to clearly articulate my point that there are different extents to which language is threatened and / or perceived to be so.
Table 4.1 – Key similarities and differences between Aruba & Puerto Rico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Located in the Caribbean</td>
<td>- Economies largely influenced by U.S. tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Associated with another government that speaks a different language</td>
<td>- Local autonomy came around the same time 1948 PR &amp; 1954 Aruba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local autonomy came around the same time 1948 PR &amp; 1954 Aruba</td>
<td>- Major social class distinction based on knowledge of colonizer’s language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Major social class distinction based on knowledge of colonizer’s language</td>
<td>- Colonizers at one time thought that both Papiamento and Spanish were worthless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Multilingual (Aruba) vs. Mono/bilingual (PR)</td>
<td>- PR is much larger both in population and geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PR is much larger both in population and geography</td>
<td>- PR economy is much larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PR economy is much larger</td>
<td>- Spanish is a LWC and Papiamento is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spanish is a LWC and Papiamento is not</td>
<td>- Spanish has long history of being used in schools: Papiamento has a very limited history in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spanish has long history of being used in schools: Papiamento has a very</td>
<td>- Aruba has witnessed in-migration among speakers of other languages but Puerto Rico has not experienced the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited history in schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

The goal of this research is to provide a comprehensive and accurate portrayal of both current and historic events that have had an impact on LPP in Aruba and Puerto Rico. Special attention will be paid to how these events have impacted ideas concerning language maintenance and national identity, as well as how these aspects intern have impacted language threat. With these goals in mind, sufficient data collection was essential for this study. In order to facilitate understanding, I have broken the data collection section into three areas: documents, interviews, and field notes.

Documents

To understand the historical and political aspects of language policy and planning on both of the islands I relied primarily on previously published work and an
analysis of official government documents, newspaper and magazine articles that discussed language policies on each island. The collection of documents was more difficult in the case of Aruba, where I cannot speak or read Dutch and can only slightly read Papiamento. Over my eight-day stay on the island, however, I was provided a variety of publications and documents containing relevant data in English, Spanish and Papiamento. In addition, I was provided two very influential books written in English. The first was *The Kiss of a Slave: Papiamentu’s West-African Connections*, by Frank Martinus a Curaçaoan linguist/educator/writer. The second book was *The Story of Papiamentu: A Study in Slavery and Language*, written by an American academic, Gary Fouse. These two books proved to be very significant in my understanding of the history of Papiamento and the culture of the people who speak it. Moreover, these books backed up many of the ideas and historical data discussed in the interviews. I also consulted documents concerning Aruban language policy from a colleague in Tucson, Herrera, who has a broad collection of older documents that were attained and used in her dissertation. Herrera (2003) provided a rich description of language planning and education in Aruba, which was fundamental in my understanding of the local language context. Many of her documents also allowed me to read and analyze relevant information before traveling to the island for data collection.

The document analysis portion of the study for Puerto Rico was somewhat different. I already had many past language planning and policy manuals in my possession after having lived on the island for five years and having studied, taught and researched LPP efforts on the island. Nevertheless, during my weeklong visit for data
collection, I was able to photocopy a variety of different articles relevant to my research, as well as collect the newest language curricula from the Puerto Rico Department of Education.

Before arriving on each island, I conducted a considerable amount of research and reading about historical language planning and policy on that island. Because I was not as familiar with the Aruban context, I elected to take the first few days there to become acquainted with the island by actively engaging locals in conversations regarding the language situation. My informal interviews with waiters, bartenders, store salesmen, and car rental agents, among many others, allowed me to be more prepared when I went to conduct my planned interviews later in the week. On both islands, both my formal and informal interviews gave me ideas of where to find additional documents, which I photocopied and brought back to Tucson for analysis. Additionally, in Aruba I spent an afternoon searching through old magazines, books and newspaper clippings at the Biblioteca Nacional. Finally, in Puerto Rico, I used the libraries at the Inter American University of Puerto Rico – Metropolitan Campus, as well as the University of Puerto Rico – Rio Piedras, where I was able to photocopy a plethora of articles concerning different aspects of language policy.

The document analysis portion of the study forms the foundation for the rest of the study. It was through the reading of countless documents, ranging from newspaper clippings to academic journal articles, that I was able ask questions that would differentiate my study from others that have dealt with aspects of LPP on each island. It
should be noted that my lack of knowledge of Dutch and my limited ability to read
Papiamento had a major impact on the volume of primary sources I was able to utilize
from Aruba. As a result, my documentary data from Aruba is based on articles
published primarily in English and Spanish, as well as some articles and publications in
Papiamento.

**Interviews**

The interview portion of this study took place on the islands during my visit to
each island or via conference call using Skype.com. The stature of the interviewees
served as a counterbalance for my own inability to spend much time on the ground
doing research. All interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed shortly thereafter.
The interview questions were developed before I visited Aruba, but they were used as a
general guide throughout the interviews due to the varying amount of time that I had to
conduct each interview. The total number of hours involved in conducting the
interviews was 12.65 hours or 759 minutes. In total, I conducted eleven interviews with
sixteen participants for an average of one hour and fifteen minutes per interview.

The interviews in Aruba were conducted in a manner in which would allow me
to get the most input from as many people as possible. In total, I interviewed eleven
Arubans in six different interviews. Four of the interviews were one-on-one. One
interview was with two people, and the largest interview was a focus-group with five
representatives from the Aruban Department of Education who were working on a new
campaign to promote Papiamento. All of the interviews in Aruba were conducted in
English, but in almost all interviews, the participants used Papiamento, Spanish or Dutch at different times. In the focus group, one of the participants felt more comfortable answering in Spanish. Toward the end of that interview, when questioned about identity, she chose to respond solely in Spanish.

The Puerto Rico interviews were all conducted one-on-one and were set up prior to my arrival in Puerto Rico. With an existing network of colleagues in Puerto Rico, along with the ability to make frequent, inexpensive phone calls to the island, I was able to have a set schedule before arriving. The only interview that was not conducted on the island was with Professor Alicia Pousada of the University of Puerto Rico, who was off the island during my visit. Her interview was conducted and taped over Skype.com, which allowed us to talk using our computers as if we were using a speaker phone. With the exception of my interview with Dr. Jose Luis Vega, all of my interviews in Puerto Rico were conducted in English. While Dr. Luis Vega is bilingual, he preferred to answer questions in Spanish. Throughout the interview, I spoke to him in both Spanish and English.

For this research, it was necessary to interview key participants in the field of LPP on both islands. Interviews with different scholars on all islands, as well as visits to the diverse sites, allowed me to confirm findings and conclusions from the document analysis portion of the study and triangulate my data (Merriam, 1998). While much of the initial communication was done via email, I conducted formal interviews on both
islands, which after receiving informed consent, were audio-recorded and transcribed shortly thereafter.

The participants in this study are academics, politicians, and literary figures on both islands. When designing the study, I took into consideration the organizations and scholars that have been credited with the successful language maintenance on each island. Thus, in Aruba, where the movement to develop and maintain Papiamento was and still is largely an educational venture, all of the participants were from the education sector. My visit to Puerto Rico was different in the sense that the movement to maintain Spanish has been influenced by a variety of organizations and politicians. Thus, my interviews in Puerto Rico included a Secretary of Education, politicians from the Independence Party who have run for a variety of different elected positions, the current director of the Puerto Rican Institute of Culture, and two academics whose work has been dedicated to language policy in Puerto Rico. I will now briefly introduce all of the participants.

**Aruba participants**

**Evelyn Ruiz-Croes** – The daughter of native Arubans, Evelyn grew up on the island and had little access to Dutch or English until she arrived at school. She was raised in the Dutch school system in Aruba and spoke Dutch exclusively for schooling purposes. Although she has traveled abroad, she has never lived outside of Aruba. After becoming a teacher she worked in special education for thirteen years and then went to work for
the Aruban Department of Education in curriculum design. She currently works with
the Department of Education on a campaign to promote Papiamento.

Wilhelmientje Croes (Micha) – Micha’s mother is from Venezuela, and her father is
from Aruba. She grew up in Aruba speaking Spanish, Papiamento, Dutch and English.
Micha worked for many years as a teacher in the public school system. More recently,
she has held a number of positions within the Aruban Department of Education. Micha
currently works on a campaign to promote the use of Papiamento.

Ramon Todd Dandaré, Ph.D. – He was born in Columbia and immigrated to Aruba
with his parents when he was young. He learned Papiamento as a child and considers
himself Aruban. He has studied in both Holland and Columbia and has many
publications covering a wide range of language and education-related topics. He has
won a variety of literary awards for his advancement of Aruban literature, which he
writes in Papiamento. He currently teaches at the Instituto Pedagogico Arubano.

Jerney Harms – Jerney is a new member of the Department of Education, who grew
up in an Aruban family living in Holland. Her first language is Papiamento but she also
learned Dutch as a child in Holland. She has joined the Department of Education to
work on a campaign to promote Papiamento.

Lydia Emerencia, Ph.D. – Lydia is currently the President of the University of Aruba.
She is well published in the area of the pedagogical benefits of using Papiamento and
Aruban culture in the classroom. At the University of Aruba, she oversees programs in
Law, Hospitality and Tourism Management, and Financial and Economic Studies. She
also has been very influential in the promotion of Papiamento as an official language and the medium of instruction in schools. Her previous studies were in Holland, and she speaks Papiamento, Dutch, English and Spanish fluently.

**Juan Maduro** – Juan works for the Aruban Department of Education. He is originally from Aruba and grew up speaking Papiamento. He has worked with many immigrant populations to Aruba, and he focuses primarily in Math education.

**Luciano Milliard, LLM.** – Luciano is a professor of law at the Universidad de Aruba. He also has over a decade of experience studying and teaching law in Holland. The son of immigrants from Eustatius, his first language is English. As a speaker of English, Dutch, Papiamento and Spanish, he recognizes the importance of Papiamento to Aruban identity, and he writes about this in his regular contributions to *Nos Florin*, a financial magazine published on the island.

**Joyce Pereira** – Joyce is currently a professor of Education and Papiamento at the Instituto Pedagogico Arubano (Aruban Institute of Pedagogy) (IPA), and is one of the most active proponents of using Papiamento as the medium of instruction on the island. After studying Dutch for many years in Holland, she returned home to Aruba and started to think critically about why students in Aruba, unlike all the other advanced nations in the world, were being taught in a language that was not their own. Apart from teaching she has worked writing plays, short stories, and translating literature, as well as promoting and developing bilingual schools in Papiamento. She has presented her work
on Papiamento in various parts of the world, and she was one of the guiding forces behind this research.

**Juan Gilbertus Schwengle** – Juan was born and raised in Aruba, and despite his father originally having coming from Venezuela, has always spoken Papiamento. He speaks Papiamento, Dutch, Spanish and English and spent eleven years in Holland, where he studied linguistics and literature. He has been working for the Aruban Department of Education since 1999.

**Audrey Tromp** – The daughter of a Dutch father and a mother from Bonaire, Audrey grew up speaking Dutch and learned Papiamento with friends and neighbors. She started working for the Department of Education in 1997, which was dedicated as the year of Papiamento. Since 1997, she has worked to publish many articles and press releases regarding Papiamento’s status, and usefulness, and she has been working on a Papiamento dictionary.

**Puerto Rico participants**

**Carlos E. Chardón** – Chardón was the Secretary of Education under Governor Carlos Romero Barceló in the late 1970s, and in January 2009 he was again confirmed as the Secretary of Education under current Governor Luis Fortuño. Born in Venezuela, Chardón was raised in an influential circle of the Puerto Rican elite. As he was finishing his doctoral studies at Syracuse University in cultural anthropology, he was asked to serve the island in an appointed position in the Puerto Rican government. He was later named Secretary of Education of the Puerto Rico Department of Education. As
Secretary, he worked to improve the role of women in the public schools system by promoting female teachers to greater positions of power. As the current Secretary, he has expressed interest in implementing a curriculum in select public schools where English would be the medium of instruction.

**Sharon Clampitt-Dunlap, Ed.D.** – Sharon is a professor of English at the Inter American University of Puerto Rico in Ponce. Her dissertation was a historical comparative study of language policies in Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines. She moved to Puerto Rico as a high school student with her family, and she has since completed her graduate studies at Puerto Rican Universities. She also serves on the editorial board of *English as an International Language Journal*.

**Fernando Martin, J.D.** – Fernando Martin is currently the Executive President of the Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP). With a master’s degree in public policy and a juris doctorate from Harvard University, Fernando Martin has been one of the most influential voices in the PIP for the past two decades. He ran for governor of Puerto Rico in 1984 and 1992, and was elected Senator by total votes for the PIP from 1989-1993. He has served his party in many different roles and has published extensively on the different facets of American colonization of Puerto Rico.

**Alicia Pousada, Ph.D.** – Alicia is a professor in the English department at the University of Puerto Rico in Rio Piedras. She was born in New York, the daughter of Gallego immigrants from Spain, and she received degrees from Hunter College (BA) and the University of Pennsylvania (Ph.D.). Before working at the university level, she
conducted sociolinguistic research in Puerto Rican communities in Philadelphia and East Harlem. She also worked as a Title VII bilingual program evaluator in the New York City public schools. Her publications and presentations focus on language policy and planning, multilingualism, and teaching of English as a Second Language world-wide, specifically within the context of Puerto Rico.

Jorge R. Schmidt Nieto, Ph.D. – Jorge is a professor of Social Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Puerto Rico in Mayagüez. Born in Puerto Rico, Jorge grew up in the San Juan metro area and earned his BA at the University of Puerto Rico in Rio Piedras. He later completed a doctoral degree in Social Sciences at the University of Rutgers. In the Fall of 2008 he was on sabbatical as he ran, unsuccessfully, for a seat in the Puerto Rican Senate as a representative of the Puerto Rican Independence Party.

Jose Luis Vega, Ph.D. – Jose Luis is currently the Director of the Puerto Rican Institute of Culture. Born in Santurce Puerto Rico, he studied his whole life in Puerto Rican public schools and has become well known as a poet and academic on the island. He is currently on sabbatical from the Hispanic Studies department at the University of Puerto Rio Piedras. In his tenure at the University of Puerto Rico, Vega has served as Dean of the College of Humanities, Department Head of Hispanic Studies and at one time was nominated for president of the University of Puerto Rico – Rio Piedras. He also is currently the Director of the Academia Puertorriqueña de la lengua Española.
Fieldnotes

In addition to the collection of documents and interviews, I wrote fieldnotes during my visits to both islands. The fieldnotes were especially useful during my data collection in Aruba, as the environment was completely new to me. While the fieldnotes do not play a major role in the development of this research, they did serve as an important space for me to log my observations and formulate different ideas and questions to be used in subsequent interviews. It is also important to acknowledge that one of the major limitations to the fieldnotes and to the case study of Aruba in general is the amount of time that I actually spent on the island. The eight days I used for observation in Aruba was only enough to gain a general understanding of the linguistic context. Nevertheless, the observations and subsequent fieldnotes allowed me to further triangulate my data from both Aruba and Puerto Rico. The methods used for such analysis will be discussed in the next section.

Data analysis

My method for data analysis for this dissertation was based in the coding of documents, interviews and fieldnotes. To facilitate the analysis I used the Text Analysis Mark-up System Analyzer (TAMS Analyzer). The TAMS Analyzer program is “an open source qualitative package for the analysis of textual themes. It can be used for transcribing digital media and for conducting discourse analysis in the social and cultural sciences” (http://tamsys.sourceforge.net/). The program was created to aid in the analysis of ethnographic data. Using this program allowed me to upload transcribed interviews, articles and other data as Rich Text Files. After uploading the files, the data
was coded based on different themes that emerged from that data. At the start of data analysis, I coded for specific themes that I knew were present in the interviews through my experience conducting and transcribing them. As I coded for the first set of themes, I created additional code sets which were then used as I read through the documents for the second, third and fourth time. After coding all the data in the TAMS Analyzer I was able to easily access different excerpts of one particular interview or of all the interviews that were related to a specific code.

My initial codes reflected areas subfields of LPP such as: corpus planning, status planning, prestige planning and acquisition. I also originally coded for aspects of language threat or discourses of endangerment as well as language shift. Some key themes that emerged from the data were: language and its role in nationalism, immigration, language as a symbol of both personal and national identity, and colonization. In total, I had thirty-two different codes, all of which helped me better understand the linguistic realities of each island.

As is customary in phenomenological research, many of the themes emerged from the data as reoccurring ideas appeared after multiple readings (Merriam, 1998; Spradley, 1979; Bogdan & Biklin, 2003). At the beginning of the data coding, I had some expectations as to the different reoccurring themes because of my reading of various historical documents and my time transcribing the interviews. But, as I read and re-read the data, many different themes and codes arose.
With the help of the TAMS Analyzer, I was able to chunk excerpts pertaining to different codes into manageable files. This allowed me to compare the same codes with all of the interviews from each island and then again with all the interviews from both of the islands. One of the benefits of using the TAMS Analyzer was the ability to extract and code texts, while simultaneously continuing to maintain the original transcript intact. Furthermore, there was always a permanent link to the original text that allowed me to insure that I was indeed quoting the material within the context in which it was being used.

**Personal positionality**

As a white, middle class graduate student from the United States whose first language is English, I am aware that I bring a particular lens to this research that is different from that of a person who has lived in the Caribbean their whole life, or even a person who was born either on the island of Aruba or Puerto Rico. After having lived in Puerto Rico and studied its language and culture, however, I feel that I have come to know more than the average outsider in terms of island dynamics. While I am not an insider, I am also not a complete outsider.

It is also important to note that politics play a major role in language issues, especially in Puerto Rico. I do not affiliate with any particular political party in Puerto Rico, but I have always been interested in the mindset and construction of identity among Puerto Ricans and how this relates to their political party preference. As a student, and eventually as a teacher of English as a second language on the island, I have always wondered why more people on the island do not speak English. As I studied the
historical impact that colonization has had on the island, I started to understand that the answers to my original inquiries were much more complex than imagined. This complexity is what I plan to delve into through this research.

Unlike Puerto Rico, Aruba is a completely foreign environment for me. Other than a weeklong visit to Aruba when I was a child, I knew relatively little about the island. With my continued studies in languages, I have come to appreciate and marvel at the complexity of how islanders have worked to maintain language despite a political affiliation with a much larger and powerful country. Nevertheless, I do not speak Papiamento or Dutch, which are the two official languages on the island. This obviously had its drawbacks in terms of data collection, but luckily there is a considerable amount of literature on Papiamento that has been published in English and Spanish. My time and experience on Aruba is an obvious limitation to this study. While I do not claim to be the foremost authority on LPP in Aruba, my substantial reading, interviews and time on the island was indeed enough data to sufficiently and accurately answer my research questions.

**Summary**

The case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico were conducted using a variety of datasets in order to analyze and document the history of LPP on the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico, as well as the effect it has had on language maintenance. Using document analysis, interviews and observation, this study builds off of other similar studies that have defined the history of language planning on both Puerto Rico (Clampitt-Dunlap, 1995) and Aruba (Herrera, 2003). Where this study differs is that it examines how the
history of LPP plays a factor in the development of national identity and perceptions of threat toward foreign languages. Now that I have discussed the different methods by which this research will be carried out, as well as my reasons for choosing Aruba and Puerto Rico, I will now provide case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico in terms of LPP and, ultimately, analyze how LPP has affected or played a role in the development of a perception of threat toward one or more languages.
CHAPTER IV: CASE STUDY OF ARUBA

The island of Aruba serves as the first case study in this dissertation. Using themes that emerged from my data, I will provide both a historic and contemporary perspective of the threat posed to the native language of Aruba: Papiamento. The island of Aruba, which currently exhibits a multi-modal language policy, has a complex history that has resulted in a linguistically diverse island where four languages appear to flourish in relative harmony. This case study will provide the historical background necessary to understand how and why Papiamento is still thriving today, and how and why different perceptions of language threat have worked to insure the future stability of Papiamento on the island of Aruba.

The development of Papiamento

The island of Aruba is located in the Caribbean Sea, approximately eighteen miles north of the country of Venezuela. This small island is nineteen miles long and six miles across at its widest part. Aruba, together with Bonaire and Cúcuta, form the ABC islands, more formally known as the Dutch Leeward Islands. Aruba is also commonly referred to as part of the Netherlands Antilles, which it was part of until 1986. In 1986, Aruba received Status Aparte from the Kingdom of the Netherlands, granting the island its own local autonomy. Currently, Aruba has two official languages, Dutch and Papiamento, but many Arubans are also fluent in English and Spanish.

In 1499 the Spanish discovered the island of Aruba, which was sparsely populated by Caiquetio Indians who were living off the arid landscape (Razak, 1995).
Shortly after the Spanish arrived the island was declared an “Isla inutile” or useless island. The Spanish did not erect plantations on the island, which was customary in their larger colonies, but they did enslave the indigenous population to “raise horses for transportation and sheep, goats and cattle for food and hides” (Razak, 1995: 447). The 17th century saw the emergence of the Dutch as colonizers, and the islands of Aruba, Curaçao, and Bonaire were claimed under the Dutch flag between 1634 and 1636 (Fouse, 2002). The Leeward Islands served as a strategic trading point for the West Indian Company (WIC), which ran the islands administratively until they were formally handed over to the Dutch government in 1792 (Fouse, 2002: 57). The island of Curaçao, with its magnificent natural port, was the focal point of the Dutch expansion into the Americas and was the scene of the majority of the slave trade involving the Dutch. Despite its close proximity to Curaçao, Aruba did not have as much exposure to the slave trade because the island was not colonized until much later than both Curaçao and Bonaire. It was not until the late 18th century that any significant population moved to Aruba.

The first large settlements in Curaçao were comprised of Dutch merchants along with their African slaves, small groups from other European nations, and Sephardic Jews from Brazil whose ancestors were from Portugal. These groups brought a collection of diverse languages, cultures and histories, laying the foundation for what is now Aruba. While the exact language or languages used among the people throughout the 18th century is highly contested among scholars on the ABC islands, most agree that the 18th
century was an important period in the creation and formation of the language of
Papiamento.

According to Frank Martinus, one of the most respected scholars regarding the
origins of Papiamento, Papiamento is a Proto-Afro-Portuguese Creole (PAPC), which he
defines in detail in his often-cited book titled: *The Kiss of Slave: Papiamentu’s West-
African Connections* (Martinus, 1996). Martinus uses historical data and linguistic
samples to argue that Papiamento did not originate from Spanish, as many have come to
assume, given their great lexical similarities. Instead, Martinus (1996) argues that
Papiamento’s syntactic similarities to other Afro-Portuguese creoles prove that
Papiamento’s origins “began to develop in the Netherlands Antilles around 1640 as a
mixture of several Afro-Portuguese dialects transferred from the west coast of Africa
through the slave trade” (Martinus, 1996: 1). Although many scholars still debate the
exact origins of Papiamento, scholars on the three islands tend to agree that Martinus is
at least on the right track and disagree with earlier theories that Papiamento is a Spanish-
based Creole. One of the principal reasons for discounting the connection of Spanish in
the creation of Papiamento was the absence of Spanish speakers during the instrumental
years of Creole formation.

The formation of Papiamento, as well as its subsequent survival, had a lot to do
with its role as a *lingua franca* among the diverse inhabitants of the Leeward Islands.
As is customary when people of different language groups come together, a compromise
must be struck in order to communicate. The social context of the Leeward Islands was
a little different from traditional colonies in the new world because there were essentially four different groups of people confined to a relatively small space, each using its own language. Such linguistic diversity resulted in the urgent need for a common language which would enable islanders to communicate amongst one another.

The colonization practices and beliefs of the Dutch were instrumental in allowing a space in which Papiamento could grow. For instance, the Dutch did not view the slaves as worthy of speaking their language, or practicing the same religion. Thus, it is understandable that the *lingua franca* did not become Dutch because slaves would not have had enough access to learn it. The Sephardic Jews, who settled in Curaçao after having migrated from Brazil, had economic power but relatively little political power. Therefore, it was unlikely they would be able to use their language as the *lingua franca*.

Ramon Todd, a professor of Papiamento and education at the Instituto Pedagógico Arubano, articulated this difference in colonization practices in his interview:

> It comes from different types of colonization. For example, when the Spanish came to this side of the world and these countries here, they obliged two things. First was their language and second it was their religion. So they obliged the colonized people to take over their language and that is why Spanish is the language over here. But the Dutch didn't want the slaves, they just wanted them as a trade item, to buy and to sell. They didn't want to teach them and they didn't give them any education. The Dutch didn't really oppress the people to take over their language like the Spanish did and the Catholic Church. Don't forget that the Dutch and the Jews were able to hire the upper class groups, who they themselves took over Papiamento. So it wasn't just a language of part of the community, but the language of the whole community which is different from what happened in other communities like with the Spanish where the indigenous languages did not became the language of the community, Spanish did and it stayed like that. (Interview with Ramon Todd)
African slaves, who were captured from a variety of different areas on the western coast and hinterlands of Africa, spoke a plethora of different African languages. The slave traders even went so far as to separate slaves from the same language group so they could not plot a rebellion. As the slaves spent more and more time together, they used common aspects of their own languages, mixed with the language used by those in control. The fourth group that would have been present on the islands was the indigenous population. As a result of Spain’s need for slaves, however, “almost the entire Indian population of the ABC islands had been carried off to Hispaniola” by the year 1515 (Fouse, 2002: 41). Thus, the impact of the indigenous population on the language situation in the Leeward Islands was minimal. Nevertheless, the need to communicate among the three major groups in Curaçao and Aruba was great. Over time, Papiamento emerged as a viable Creole language that was spoken and embraced by all three groups living in Aruba.

While the slave trade had an enormous impact on the development of Papiamento, so too did the Catholic Church. Most of the priests who worked in Aruba and the other Leeward islands came from the Diocese of Coro in the northern tip of Venezuela, which is just a few miles from the islands. The Catholic priests sent to work on Aruba spent their early years ministering to the indigenous population. When the Dutch took over the ABC islands from 1634-1636, the religious division between Dutch Protestants and Catholics created too large of a rift, and Catholic priests were banned from the islands by the WIC. Despite Dutch restrictions, Catholic priests worked, often in secret, on the islands to spread their ministry to the small indigenous populations and
later to the slaves. The first real Catholic Church in Aruba was built in 1750, and “[t]he Catholic Church took the lead in providing initial education for the slaves, believing that it would prepare them for the day when they would become emancipated. The Catholic Church also recognized that Papiamentu\(^2\) was an appropriate vehicle to reach out to the slaves” (Fouse, 2002: 125).

Slaves would have used Papiamento for religious services and education, and the Dutch Protestants and Sephardic Jews more than likely used Papiamento to communicate among one another. Papiamento also was used for educational purposes among the slaves until the mid 19\(^{th}\) century, when the Dutch government started to provide the Catholic Church with subsidies for education with the requirement that all education would be in Dutch. It is important to note that while the Catholic Church stopped using Papiamento as the medium instruction, it continued to use Papiamento as the language of church services. Nevertheless, the move away from Papiamento in the schools was contested by many priests who disagreed and felt strongly about the importance of using Papiamento in the schools. The political clout of the priests was not strong enough, however, to reverse the policies of the powerful Dutch government. Nevertheless, Papiamento was still used as the language for religious ceremonies just as it continues to be used today. The medium of instruction in Aruban schools has been a contentious subject among pedagogues ever since.

\(^2\) In Curaçao the Papiamentu is spelled with the final-\(u\) as their spelling follows the phonemic pronunciation whereas in Aruba, Papiamento is spelled with a final-\(o\) due to its etymologically based spelling system.
The general disdain for Papiamento among the Dutch is characterized in a quote from Curaçao’s first Director of Education, Gerrit Gijsbert van Paddenburgh, who described his initial impression of Papiamento as sounding like a “cackle of turkeys” (Fouse, 2002: 138). Van Paddenburgh also showed a general dislike for Papiamento which he thought of as “Negerspaans-Negro Spanish.” Such abhorrence for Papiamento led the Dutch to officially make Dutch the language of education, which it has been since 1819 (Fouse: 2002).

Despite official language policies demanding the use of Dutch, the general populations of Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao continued to use Papiamento as the language of the masses. Efforts to implement the Dutch language were largely unsuccessful because the vast majority of people used Papiamento to speak among each other, resulting in little motivation to use or learn Dutch. In addition, the Jewish population, primarily on Curaçao, still had its historic connections to Portuguese and Spanish, and they continued to use Portuguese as their language of worship at the synagogue (in Curaçao) until around 1869 (Fouse: 2002: 138). “Indeed, many observers came to the conclusion that Dutch had little worth in the islands despite its official status in government and the schools, and that the second generation of Dutch children were growing up limited in their Dutch language ability, while learning Papiamentu instead” (Fouse: 2002: 139). As a result, Dutch’s relatively high political status did not translate into an abandonment of Papiamento. This was partly due to a revolving upper class system on the islands which rarely allowed for non-Dutch to gain acceptance, and many speakers of Papiamento who were not Dutch had little motivation to learn Dutch.
Another factor that promoted the spread of Papiamento, especially among the younger generation, was the presence of *yayas* (nannies) in Dutch homes. Throughout much of the seventeen and eighteen hundreds most Dutch families had *yayas* who lived and worked in their homes and played a major role in the child-rearing of the young Dutch. Consequently, Papiamento was the language that the *yayas* passed on to the youngest generation of Dutch. Fouse (2002) argues that the history and maintenance of Papiamento owes much of its success to the *yayas*. Along with the *yayas* the presence and use of Papiamento among Aruban youth has also continued to facilitate the strengthening and maintenance of Papiamento.

Toward the beginning of the 20th century, the Dutch government had to start competing with American influence, which was introduced upon the opening of the Lago Oil and Transplant Company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey. My Aruban participants all pointed to 1929, when the construction for the large refinery started, as a turning point in Aruban history. In contrast to their cousins in Curaçao, whose refinery was run by Royal Dutch Shell, the Lago Company and its English-speaking owners attracted English speakers from all over the West Indies. Many of these English speakers come from St. Eustatius (an English speaking island in the Netherlands Antilles) as well as other islands such as Barbados and Trinidad. The new group of English-speaking immigrants started their own community near the southern part of Aruba in the town of San Nicolaas. San Nicolass was much closer to the refinery than Oranjestad, the capital of Aruba.
The presence of the English speakers and a major U.S. business changed the linguistic complexion of the island in a matter of years. While Dutch was still the official language, Arubans now had more incentive to learn another language other than Papiamento. After the arrival of the Lago Company, the Dutch continued to symbolize a culture and authority that seemed very distant to many Arubans.

Despite the building presence of English speaking immigrants, life on the island of Aruba was all about maintaining the status quo until Nazi occupation of Holland during WWII. Fouse (2002) argues that Nazi occupation of Holland during WWII, which isolated the ABC Islands from their colonial power, worked to provide islanders the time to become more critically conscious and created a “will for a more independent status that the Dutch had to confront after the war” (p.147). The process toward local autonomy of the Netherlands Antilles which were then composed of Curaçao, Bonaire, Aruba, Saint Eustatius, Saint Maarten and Saba, started in 1946 and was completed in 1954. Under this new status, Curaçao was the capital, and the islands were granted local autonomy as one collective entity where each island was given a great deal of control over its own domestic matters.

The newfound local autonomy and the revenue from the refinery were seen as a positive, and Aruba continued to develop economically at a pace much quicker than many of its Caribbean neighbors. However, news of the future closure of the Lago Company refinery in October of 1984, as well as its eventual closure in March of 1985, sent the economy into a downward spiral (Boekhoudt-Croes, 1996). The closing
resulted in the island’s unemployment skyrocketing from five percent to twenty-seven percent (Eelens & Beukeboom, 1993 as cited in Emerencia, 1996). The government responded with policies and incentives to bolster the tourist sector. Shortly thereafter, the economy improved and made Aruba a prime destination for immigrants seeking work in the newly created tourism sector (Emerencia, 1996).

Many of the new immigrants came from Spanish-speaking countries such as the Dominican Republic, Columbia, and Venezuela, among others. As with past immigration trends, the local Arubans felt that their local way of life was threatened by immigrants who did not speak their language or know the common cultural practices. According to Luciano Milliard, a law professor at the University of Aruba, every time there has been a wave of immigrants, there has also been a counter-movement to define and re-define what it means to be Aruban (Milliard, 2008).

Along with increased immigration, Aruba’s movement to break away from the Netherlands Antilles through Status Aparte has played a major role in the development of Aruban identity. Led by Betico Croes (pronounced Betico Cruz), one of Aruba’s most beloved leaders, there was a very powerful initiative to define what was meant by being Aruban. Croes and his followers rallied around Aruba’s “dushi Papiamento” (sweet Papiamento) and culture. The masses who followed and believed in Betico’s rhetoric were often descendants of other Arubans. According to Luciano Milliard, many immigrants and descendants of immigrants felt that the “Aruba” promoted by Betico was an idealized variety, which as immigrants, they did not fit into. Though Betico died
before Aruba gained *Status Aparte* in 1986, his influence and leadership in formation of the Movimiento Electoral di Pueblo (People’s Electoral Movement) (MEP) was instrumental in the garnering of Aruba’s current political status and in the formation of a conscious national identity among Arubans (Interview with Luciano Milliard).

*Status Aparte* awarded to Aruba in 1986, provided the island with separate and complete autonomy within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, but under the Dutch crown. Such distinction allowed Aruban politicians to concentrate on their own local affairs, instead of having to pass through political channels in Curaçao, which was the case when they were part of the Netherlands Antilles. Aruba’s autonomy is considered a constituent country of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the island has its own parliament and cabinet members. While the Dutch crown appoints the governor, all other government officials such as the prime minister and deputy prime minister are elected by popular vote.

Currently, Aruba is one of the most developed islands within the Caribbean (Emerencia, 1998). The oil refinery, first opened by the Lago Company, is now operated by Valero. Together with the tourism industry, Valero has created literally thousands of jobs within the last decade. While Aruba no longer has to fight for attention as a member of the Netherlands Antilles, its movement to *Status Aparte* was supposed to eventually lead to complete independence from the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Such separation now seems much less likely, however, as the economic infeasibility of becoming completely independent seems to outweigh other nationalistic
priorities (U.S. Department of State, 2008). Due to its political status with The Kingdom of the Netherlands, Dutch is still the primary language of education, the government and the courts. Thus, while Papiamento has held joint official status with Dutch since March 19, 2003, and is spoken and used in virtually every aspect of daily life, it still plays a subordinate role in domains of education and high government. As such, even though the highest politicians generally use Papiamento to speak among themselves, official correspondence from the government is generally in Dutch, and all correspondence between Aruba and the Netherlands is in Dutch.

Papiamento still holds high status as it is used in relatively all domains, but there are particular domains in which Papiamento would be expected as the primary language and it is not. For instance, the police force in Aruba is required to write their reports in Dutch. While they obviously are permitted to communicate with the community members in Papiamento, their official records must be in Dutch. This is problematic for the police force and for the general public, however, as many Arubans have a poor working knowledge of written or academic Dutch. Such a low proficiency creates the potential, and even likelihood, that police reports and records will be and are incorrectly written. Likewise, in the court system, it is common for judges to be brought in from The Netherlands to serve three-year terms and Dutch is used for official court proceedings. Despite the use of Dutch in these rather important and influential domains, Arubans generally do not think that their language is threatened. Rather, they believe that Dutch is rather a unique symbol of their political circumstance (interviews with all participants).
The language yo-yo in Aruba: Papiamento vs. Dutch

From the start of colonization on the ABC islands, the Dutch tended to educate their children at home or through the Dutch Protestant Church for each of these domains of language use, the main language of communication would have been Dutch. On the other hand, the Sephardic Jews used Portuguese as their language of general education and as the language of worship. As mentioned before, the slaves did not have a system of education set up for them. The slaves were one of the principal agents in the creation of the language of Papiamento, however, for it was because of the slave trade and the subsequent presence and use of a Creole language that Jews and the Dutch spoke Papiamento among each other (Pereira, 2004). When the Dutch finally started to colonize Aruba in the early 18th century, they brought slaves along with Papiamento.

While there is no specific written documentation of Papiamento remaining from the early 17th or 18th century, Martinus (1996) cites Emmanuel, (1970: 682) in noting a Jewish ship which sailed in 1706 that was named De Fortijn, which “is clearly a papiamentized pronunciation of Dutch De Fortuin ‘the fortune’” (p.8). The oldest known written text in Papiamento dates back to 1775 and is a fragment of a letter. In fact, as early as 1769, a Jesuit priest named Rodier sent a letter to the Dutch Parliament arguing that priests on the islands needed to know Papiamento.

This letter from an unidentified Curaçao Jew is a remarkable phenomenon in a linguistic sense in that, in the total absence of a vernacular orthographic tradition, the writer did not hesitate to use Papiamentu in writing, and to use a spelling which, for its day, is remarkably true to the sound pattern of Papiamentu and, just as in its choice of vocabulary and
syntax, is remarkably modern (Wood 1972:22 as cited in Martinus 1996: 10).

The use of Papiamento by this Jew is significant as it is further indication that the people on the island of Aruba, as well as other islands, especially Curaçao were using Papiamento as their vernacular from a much early time than many thought. Although little concrete evidence is available, most Papiamento scholars believe that Papiamento also was the first language of many of the Jewish and Dutch inhabitants of the island of Curaçao no later than the end of 17th century. According to Martinus’ (1996) understanding of the famous Papiamento scholar Raúl Römer, Papiamento replaced Dutch as the first language or mother tongue of the traditionally Dutch families by the beginning of the 19th century. Dutch missionaries started to develop religious material in Papiamento in the early 1800s and borrowed heavily from the Spanish used by the Catholic Church. The first Papiamento newspaper was published in Curaçao in 1871 and was called Civilisadó meaning “The Civilizer” (Martinus, 1996: 11). As the population of Curaçao moved to Aruba, so too did their language.

The Catholic Church and the Dutch Protestant Church had almost completely divergent ideas regarding how to minister to the indigenous and slave populations. For the most part, the Dutch did not believe the slaves worthy of being saved. As such, slaves were not baptized, taught or provided access to the Protestant Church in the early years. The Catholics, on the other hand, felt it was their duty to rescue and work with the slaves to heal them spiritually. It was thought that such ministry required the knowledge and ability to communicate with the slaves in their common language, and
for many of the slaves, the common language had become Papiamento. Catholic priests whose mother tongue was generally Spanish, left their mark by creating common Papiamento words derived from their Spanish background that still form a major part in the language today.

The Catholic Church not only facilitated in the development of Papiamento, it was also the first to work with the slaves on an educational level. The use of Papiamento for educational purposes was promulgated through the influence of the Catholic priests on the islands who originally came from Venezuela. Fouse (2002) discusses how Dutch Catholic priests and other European priests, especially from the Dominican order, were instrumental in the development of the first Papiamentu grammar as well as a Dutch-Papiamento-Spanish dictionary (p.131).

Papiamento remained the language of instruction on the islands of Aruba and Curaçao until it became apparent to Dutch officials in the Netherlands that younger generations were not speaking Dutch to the extent and with the fluency that a member of the Dutch Kingdom should. Initially, the Dutch had taken a laissez faire stance toward education and colonization of non-Dutch ancestry citizens, but they passed important legislation in 1819 making Dutch the official language of instruction in schools (Fouse, 2002). This law was applicable to all students and schools, including those persons born on the islands themselves who spoke Papiamento as their first language. Practically speaking, however, there was no real way in which such a law could be enforced because few teachers even spoke Dutch. Moreover, on the island of Aruba, it was not
until the 1850s, when Catholic priests started schools using Spanish as the language of instruction, that public education even existed.

Even with the creation of a quasi-public school system in the 1850s, however education was not generally available to everyone. Prior to the emancipation of slaves in 1863, slaves were only allowed to “receive educational and religious instruction from the Catholic Church under Monsignor Niewindt, and that was only if their masters cooperated” (Fouse, 2002: 139). After the emancipation of slaves, the use of Dutch continued to decline as the power and influence of former slaves started growing.

Toward the end of the 19th century, teachers and other educators argued that Papiamento should be learned and mastered first and then students should study Dutch (Prins-Winkel, 1983). Fouse (2002) quotes an 1897 article written in the journal Neerlandia by Johannes Hermanus Jacobus Hamelberg. Hamelberg was a prominent Dutch observer of language who lived in the Netherlands Antilles for more than twenty years. In the article, Hamelberg writes about the Antillean affinity for learning languages, with the exception of Dutch. He goes on to argue that children should gain a working knowledge or consistent base in their first language before they start to learn Dutch (Fouse, 2002: 141). Hamelberg’s ideas of increasing the use of Papiamento in the schools and standardizing the language fell on deaf ears at the time, but his thoughts would echo much louder over a century later.

The rise of power and status of Papiamento was perplexing for newly arrived Dutch citizens who could not understand why, as a Dutch colony, Dutch was not the
language of everyday life. Whether related or coincidental, toward the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, the Dutch government started their attempt to fix the extremely unsuccessful and poor education system on the islands. This movement marked the most aggressive action toward the use of Dutch in the Aruban schools. In 1882, after a series of poor reports on the grave status of education on the islands, Dutch was again designated the sole official language to be used in schools. This was necessary because previous policies identifying Dutch as the official language for education purposes were regularly ignored. The result was that the Dutch adopted a stronger position to implement the Dutch language, such that, “no language or obstacle was to impede the acquisition of the Dutch language” (Fouse, 2000: 144). This decree lasted until 1906, by which time it had become obvious that it was impossible to teach only in Dutch because the pupils could not follow instruction in a language they did not understand. That year, the Dutch Colonial Council determined that teachers should use zo veel mogelijk or “as much as possible,” thus opening the door officially for at least some use of Papiamento in the classroom (Fouse, 2002: 144).

The back and forth use of the Dutch language in the schools of the Netherlands Antilles was further complicated in 1907. At that time, the Dutch government started providing government subsidies to Catholic schools under the condition that they would use only Dutch as their medium of instruction. While previous laws had been passed that were essentially the same, the lack of students actually attending school rendered them ineffectual. Starting in the 1920s however, there was a substantial investment on the part of the oil industry and the Dutch government to have the school system on the
island follow the Dutch school system. To achieve this objective, certified teachers from the Netherlands were brought to the islands. Almost none of these teachers knew any Papiamento and many felt that it was a waste of time to learn Papiamento, for it was their job to change the islands’ children into speakers of Dutch.

During the early and mid 20th century, Arubans were not allowed to speak Papiamento. Participants in this study, and others with whom I spoke on an informal basis, informed me that there was a time when children would be punished for using Papiamento in the schools and where children would be reprimanded by authority figures if they were caught speaking their language (Emerencia, 1995).

As the first Arubans started to graduate from the newly instituted Dutch school system, the Dutch government started providing scholarships for Aruban students to study at universities on the mainland. This was the opportunity for many of Aruba’s brightest students to leave the island and gain another perspective on life and their little island, but it was also in the 1960s and 1970s, when people around the world were re-evaluating themselves. According to Ramón Todd, “[t]he 60s were very revoltius years. A lot of people, many countries became independent, that was the time of the Vietnam War, etc and this had an impact on us and our views of identity and one of the first things that we did recognize as part of our identity was our language: Papiamento.”

In the late 1960s and 70s the movement toward using Papiamento as the language of instruction again gained momentum (Pereira, 2004). Since the late 1970s, advocates of Papiamento have been working in every aspect of language planning, with
the hope of using Papiamento as the language of instruction to improve overall education. Just within the past few years, the island of Curaçao started using Papiamento as the language instruction in elementary schools. In May 2008, however, due to pressure from the Catholic School Board, Papiamento has been removed as the required language of instruction due to an alleged lack of materials in Papiamento. The island of Bonaire, which has much fewer resources, has decided to stay the course and use Papiamento as the language of instruction through at least middle school. On the island of Aruba, a pilot program has started with elementary students in two schools and its proponents hope that Papiamento can be used as the medium of instruction throughout the Aruban education system within a few years (Interview with Joyce Pereira).

Current discussions regarding the use of Papiamento generally encompass specific concerns by proponents of the traditional Dutch education. First, there is the concern that Papiamento literature is not developed enough such that it would be difficult to translate or create a body of literature sufficient to supplement learning in the language throughout primary and secondary schooling. The second major concern of proponents of Dutch medium instruction is that, as Dutch citizens, Arubans have access to higher education in universities on the mainland. On the island of Aruba, currently there are few options for students who want to attain the equivalent of a bachelor’s degree in something other than law, education, tourism management, and business. Therefore, Dutch is important if students want to continue their studies after they finish their secondary education. Proponents of Papiamento medium instruction highlight the
general lack of success among Aruban students who leave to the Netherlands to study, but those who are pro-Dutch argue that the use of Papiamento medium instruction would foreclose a valuable opportunity for Aruban students.

The current state of education in Aruba

Aruba’s education system is based on the Dutch model, which provides free education for students from age four, when they enter school, until they finish their secondary education (Herrera, 2003). Similar to many European education systems, after eight years in primary education, Aruban students are placed in different tracks. The track system identifies three types of students. First, there are those who will take an academically challenging, but more direct route. They attend the HAVO (see Figure 2.1 on subsequent page for more definition) and after five years move on to university courses. The second group of students are those who go to MAVO and then can either finish in HAVO or study a more vocational track. The third track is the VWO. The best and the brightest students generally attend HAVO and then continue on to study in the Netherlands. Higher education in the U.S. and Canada also may be pursued among Arubans who have the financial resources, though such academic success in North American post-secondary education is often due to a student’s superior command of English over Dutch.
With the exception of a few pilot schools, Dutch is the language used for education purposes. While the draconian policies prohibiting use of any Papiamento in schools are gone, Dutch is still used in the textbooks and in many of the lectures.

\[\text{3} \text{ The VWO is actually 6 years now and there is not really a transition class between Primary Education and Secondary Education in Aruba. Instead the first two years are referred to as “Ciclo Basico” and the subsequent years are referred to as “Ciclo Avansa” referring to a basic core and advanced core of courses within aspect of secondary education in Aruba.}\]
However, as the Dutch teachers who were brought from the Netherlands have started to retire, Aruban-born Papiamento speakers have filled their positions. As a result, many teachers are able to teach lessons in Papiamento or, at the very least, help in clarifying problem areas for their students.

Beginning in the early 1990s Papiamento started to gain more status as it remained the language of instruction in kindergarten and special education classrooms and was implemented in some vocational schools. In addition, the Instituto Pedagogico Arubano started courses for teachers in Papiamento in the 1990s, and the eventual officialization of Papiamento on May 21, 2003, worked to continue to build its status (Pereira, 2004). Nevertheless, these victories for proponents of increased use of Papiamento also have raised additional issues with the teaching and use of the language. As Papiamento advocates stress the importance of using the correct, standard variety of Papiamento, students and even teachers often get frustrated at the complexity of its study. Students complain, as seen when Micha spoke about her niece and said “My niece said, ‘we have to learn that (Papiamento) and the grammar this, and the grammar that. Why do I have to learn my own language?’ You have to learn with pleasure, but with Papiamento, she will not like it.” What Micha is talking about are the demands of learning the academic variety of Papiamento. It is important to note that this academic variety was never formally taught to the parents of current students. Thus, by making Papiamento a formal course in school, it was no longer “fun” according to her niece.
Although the use of Papiamento as a core subject constituted a breakthrough and a win for those who have been fighting so hard for years to increase the use of the language in education, Dutch is still the primary language used in schools. This continues to have a negative effect on many aspects of education. In each of my interviews, I ended by asking: “Do you think the current state of education on the island provides all students an equitable opportunity to succeed? Why or Why not?” One hundred percent of the participants answered with a resounding “no.” All of them said there are a number of factors that led them to believe the general education system in Aruba needed major changes, but they also unanimously stated that the language of instruction was a major priority for all. Even Luciano Milliard, whose first language is English and who has not been a traditional supporter of the use of Papiamento in the classroom, stated that education could be made to be more equitable if Papiamento were used more:

When it comes to promoting Papiamento, you would not see me jumping on that bandwagon. Maybe because of the fact that I am English speaking. Maybe. But slowly I am being convinced that maybe it is true what the Papiamento people have been saying. That it is beneficial for a child to be educated in his mother tongue and later on he would learn another language. I am being convinced. I believe that the language in our days is our problem. The Dutch language is a problem for many students. They don't hear sufficient Dutch. Fifty years ago you would hear Dutch on the streets. Here it is confined to the school and to the court and government. You know? And you don't hear the Dutch language like you would hear the English language now on the TV, cable, the newspapers, tourists on the road, you hear English you can practice. You don't hear the Dutch language and I think this is because they are not being exposed to that language and they have this mental barrier, I think we should change maybe to Papiamento, give it a shot, make a decision and stick with it (Interview with Luciano Milliard).
As a professor of law at the University of Aruba and a person who feels most comfortable teaching in Dutch, Milliard’s idea about converting to believe in Papiamento language instruction is shared by others. For example, Ramón Todd believes that as more and more Arubans understand the clear benefits of mother tongue instruction, they too will want Papiamento to be used as the medium of instruction in Aruban schools. Unfortunately, the dissemination of such ideas, as well as educating the people on the research and the benefits of such education, has been difficult. The colonial history and the many years of harsh language policies against Papiamento have created a generation of Arubans who honestly believe that their language is not equipped to be used in high and demanding domains such as education.

The current state of education in Aruba is not aided by the political situation there, either. Representatives from the Aruban Department of Education reported that erratic spending and politicians’ inability to invest in educational programs as key reasons for poor education results. Nevertheless, the movement toward the use of Papiamento in the schools and as the medium of content instruction slowly has been gaining favor as the years go on.

**Language use and status planning of Papiamento**

All of the Aruban participants interviewed in this study reported that Papiamento is a stable language and was not in danger of language shift. They cited the use of the language in virtually all aspects of daily life, its growing status as a result of its officialization in 2003, subsequent campaigns to boost the use of Papiamento, and a
better understanding of standard uses of Papiamento (Pereira, 2005). While the average Aruban does not believe Papiamento is threatened in terms of immediate language loss, there is an undercurrent of unease and anxiety and even inferiority concerning Spanish and English in relation to Papiamento (Todd Dandaré, 2007). Some Arubans believe immigrants from South America present an ongoing threat to Arubans because they speak a language that is much more powerful in the region and much easier for Arubans to learn than Dutch, or even English. There is even a perception that immigrants coming to Aruba are unwilling to learn Papiamento, which seems inconsistent with participants’ acknowledgments that children of these immigrants all learn to speak Papiamento. Thus, there is relatively no language shift away from Papiamento, but rather the maintenance of a multilingual society which has been the norm since the island was colonized.

Similar to the use of Papiamento in Curaçao, Aruba has between six or seven local newspapers published in Papiamento, including a few from Curaçao. There are also locally printed magazines on Aruban business and leisure activities in Papiamento, and local television and radio is broadcast in Papiamento. In addition, the Instituto de Cultura Arubano (Aruban Institute of Culture) has been responsible for the production and presentation of countless children’s plays, as well as serious literary plays, in Papiamento.

As was mentioned in the history portion of this chapter, the U.S.-led oil industry in Aruba brought thousands of English-speaking immigrants to the island in the late
1920s and 1930s. Those immigrants and their descendents generally congregated in the area of San Nicolaas and many of them remain first language English speakers to this day. Before data collection, I thought that English speakers would have an almost unfair advantage, especially in their ability to cater to work in the hotel industry where the majority of the tourists are English speaking. I also thought that there would be little incentive to learn Papiamento given the status of English and the number of Arubans that already speak English. Instead, I learned that, despite the absence of a government policy that requires them to do so, Papiamento’s presence on the island is strong enough that these native English speakers are basically steered to learn Papiamento. These native English speakers begin to learn Papiamento through informal experiences with other children or when they arrive at school. Moreover, the young children seem to learn at a young age that Papiamento has a very high local prestige and is necessary for one to have in their linguistic repertoire, especially if one would like to claim to be Aruban.

Television and media also reflects the multilingual nature of Aruba. Cable television in Aruba is predominated by U.S. based channels where English is the primary language; however, there are local channels that are broadcasted in Papiamento as well as Dutch. Other channels from Venezuela appease the local Spanish speaking population and other tourists. Similar to television, Aruban radio provides an eclectic variety of hits that literally come from all over the world. Throughout my stay on the island I heard at least a dozen different genres of music, which were song in languages
ranging from Aruban Papiamento to Haitian Creole and pretty much everything in between.

**Building a corpus for Papiamento**

Corpus planning in Aruba is an aspect of LPP that has been largely ignored by local government. As a Caribbean Creole language, Papiamento does not have the literary history equal to that of Dutch, which it holds co-official status with. Early corpus planning efforts on the part of Catholic priests worked to standardize the language. However, the subsequent abandonment of using Papiamento as the language of instruction in Aruban schools curbed the need for increased publication in the local language. Nevertheless, the Catholic Church, which has always operated in Papiamento, published countless songs, prayers, and articles in the local language. Aruba has historically been literate in islanders’ ability to comprehend texts and other semiotic aspects of daily life, which are often in the local language. Such is symbolized by the many newspapers and books published in a multitude of languages.

More recently, Dutch colonial practices have changed to allow an increased amount of publication in Papiamento. Currently, there are seven newspapers circulating in either Aruba or neighboring Curaçao, which are all published in island-specific orthography. However, orthographic differences between Papiamento in Aruba and Papiamentu in Curaçao and Bonaire have proven the sharing of literary sources difficult, especially for programs that work with emergent readers. While adults may understand the differences between Aruba’s orthography, which is based in the etymology of the word versus Curaçao’s use of phonetic spelling, for emergent readers the two
orthographies represent totally different languages. Consequently, the Aruban Department of Education has had to use much of its resources to translate many of the texts that have come out of Curaçao into Aruban Papiamento. One specific organization named CHARUBA, is an organization that started in 1983 with the primary purpose of publishing both fiction and non-fiction books in Aruban Papiamento. The organization has been very successful and has been largely subsidized by the local government. The success of the CHARUBA organization has been fundamental in Aruban corpus planning efforts. Nevertheless, as the immigrant population grows and more non-native Arubans strive for literacy in Papiamento, Arubans will also have to focus on developing materials for this population, which to date, has not been the focus of Aruban corpus planning.

One of the fascinating aspects of language use in Aruba is that most Arubans are able to read the newspapers and other publications in Papiamento despite never having experienced formal instruction in the language. The fact that majority of the population has not taken Papiamento as a course in school, which just started to be taught as a subject in the late 1990s, raises valuable questions of standardization and the development of a sufficient corpus to facilitate future use of the language in schools. Historically, the government has balked at opportunities to pass an official dictionary of Aruban Papiamento, and more recently closed the office of language planning and policy shortly after Papiamento gained official status. Furthermore, the cost involved with publishing texts in the local variety, which will only be used in Aruba, raises questions of necessity, as it would require a major economic commitment on the part of
the government. Thus, increased corpus planning on the island faces considerable political resistance. Nevertheless, the Aruban Pedagogical Institute has been working for the past few years educating teachers to use standard forms of Aruban Papiamento, which are subject to change given the government’s refusal to support or sponsor the documentation of an official dictionary. Advanced college level courses are now offered that study the language, and provide aspiring teachers the tools necessary to use the local language in primary grades. Nevertheless, appropriate course materials are lacking, as is a unified consensus on what is meant by “Standard Papiamento.”

Despite the use of Papiamento as the mother tongue of a wide majority of Arubans, the language is not found in many formal domain of education. Textbooks found in traditional education on the island are in either Dutch or English, with the sole exception coming in the courses on Papiamento and some vocational programs that have only recently started to use Papiamento as the medium of instruction. Publishing in local Aruban Papiamento is also more expensive because of its lack of use off the island. This makes the printing expensive in comparison to books published in LWC. Thus, despite the societal prestige and status of the language, there is not an equally large corpus of books and literature in Papiamento that can be used for educational purposes. Without being able to effectively share corpus planning efforts between the ABC islands, Aruba is forced to work on its own to develop a corpus of literature specific to their island. Furthermore, without government intervention to set off the price of locally published books, it is hard to justify, economically speaking, the increased use of Papiamento in schools. Hence, government sponsorship is key to building a corpus of
Aruban Papiamento materials to be used in schools, but such sponsorship has yet to be realized.

**The role of Papiamento in Aruban nationalism**

While Papiamento is strong in the sense that it is well entrenched in all aspects of Aruban society and there are a number of institutions that seek to maintain and strengthen its status, one of the principal factors that has facilitated the rise and maintenance of the language over the last century has been the role that Papiamento has played in the development of Aruban nationalism.

As Papiamento emerged as the *lingua franca* between the early inhabitants of the ABC islands, it served to mark those who were there first and thus claimed entitlement to positions of power based on their experience and years on the island. As in other places in the world where language has been used to differentiate locals and outsiders, Papiamento historically has been a marker of national identity. In my interview with Ramón Todd, he argued that even the original Dutch immigrants to Curaçao used Papiamento as a reason to discriminate against new arrivals from Holland who did not speak the language.

Anderson (1991) argues that historically, language has played a fundamental role in the creation of nation states and the creation of imagined communities. In this section, I will discuss two unique aspects that have led to the interconnected nature of Papiamento and Aruban identity: immigration and the move toward *Status Aparte*. 
Immigration

Throughout my interviews and observations, Arubans repeatedly raised the topic of immigration and its impact on Aruban nationalism and Papiamento. Participants who were formally interviewed, as well as many others who I spoke to on an informal basis, highlighted the substantial impact that immigration has had on the linguistic makeup of the island. Luciano Milliard, asserted that each wave of immigration has made Arubans step back, re-evaluate and cling to what it means to be Aruban, which generally, at the fundamental level, includes being able to speak Papiamento. As discussed earlier in the chapter, the opening of the Lago Company’s oil refinery was a major jolt to the Aruban economy, but it also meant that Aruba was an attractive place for immigrants. The considerable number of English immigrants forced Arubans to define or re-define who they were as a form of protection against their new neighbors (Milliard, 2008). Arubans could have reverted to everything Dutch to protect against the large waves of immigrants who all spoke a LWC, but they did not. Instead, despite language policies that limited the use of Papiamento in schools and government, Arubans used their language, Papiamento, to differentiate themselves and maintain their status and power.

The English speaking immigrants who worked for the Lago Company tried to maintain their variety of Caribbean English and also worked hard to learn Dutch, as it was seen as an important tool necessary to be successful. What is interesting about the children of these English-speaking immigrants is that they also learned Papiamento. Of course, it is a natural for children to want to fit in, and English-speaking children growing up in Aruba understood that Papiamento held a very powerful and covert
prestige on the island. Therefore, while their parents tended not to claim to be Aruban, these children were caught in the predicament that many children of immigrants find themselves in when discussions of identity arise. Their options were to identify with their ancestral island(s) and/or country(ies) (which many had never even visited), or they could claim to be Aruban. For the children of immigrants, the role that Papiamento played in Aruban society made it clear that in order to make such a claim, one would have to be able to use Papiamento.

When immigration to the island by Spanish speakers occurred later in the 20th century, the English speaking immigrants and their children had to rethink their view of Papiamento. According to Lydia Emerencia, the current President of the University of Aruba,

> these people (the English speakers) also looked down at Papiamento, almost the same as the Dutch people. So what happened is that the Calypsonian songs would be typically in English, but then happened suddenly something and it happened around when the Largo closed down. And many people left and suddenly tourism came up again and there became a massive immigration. And so they had a new influx of Spanish speaking people and then you see that English speaking people started to feel that they were being kind of threatened.

This perception of threat exhibited by English speakers living in Aruba made them rethink their place in Aruba, and because most of those who had been living on the island were able to speak Papiamento, they were able to use that as a marker of in-group identity, a circle that new Spanish-speaking immigrants were not able to penetrate.

Once again, a new wave of immigrants provided a context in which identifying as Aruban becomes more relevant when there is the perception that a new group will be
competing for the same jobs and socio-political power. With increased development of the tourism industry Aruba will need a considerable number of new workers to fill future jobs. It will be interesting to see how the children of the most recent Spanish-speaking immigrants identify themselves and how they are accepted in Aruban society in the future.

With each wave of immigration, Aruba has continually had to define itself, and “every time Aruba goes through a new influx of immigrants, the Papiamento becomes stronger” (Interview with Lydia Emerencia). With the strengthening of Papiamento, there generally has been a corresponding increase in critical consciousness and growing Aruban nationalism, and those ideals formed the foundation for the movement toward a state where Arubans would have their own local autonomy. The use of Papiamento was a major factor in the move toward Status Aparte.

**Status Aparte**

Curaçao was and still is the capital of the Netherlands Antilles (N.A.), and it has the most influence of all the islands. Arubans felt that their interests were not being met as a part of the N.A., however, and that Aruba’s size and complex economy was worthy of having its own local autonomy. In order to attain its own political autonomy and break away from the rest of the Netherlands Antilles (Curaçao, Bonaire, St. Maarten and St. Eustatius, and Saba), it was necessary to make a case that Aruba was legitimately different from Curaçao and large enough to survive on its own.
In order to differentiate itself from Curaçao, Aruba cited its different use of Papiamento as a major barrier in the relationship between the two islands. Although Aruba shares the same language with Curaçao and Bonaire, Aruba uses its own spelling system which has been the primary linguistic divide between the islands. Curaçao’s writing system is based on the phonemic spelling system. The Aruban system is based on etymological spelling, however, where a word’s spelling is based on the historical root of the word, regardless of the way it is currently pronounced. As a result, etymological spellings often result in words that are not spelled with a one-to-one sound symbol correspondence like the spelling of words on Curaçao and Bonaire. As set forth in Table 5.1, examples in spelling differences include:

**Table 5.1 - Differences in Papiamento & Papiamentu spelling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aruban Papiamento</th>
<th>Curaçao &amp; Bonaire Papiamentu</th>
<th>Spanish and English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cas</td>
<td>Kas</td>
<td>Casa / House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsou</td>
<td>Kórsou</td>
<td>Curaçao / Curaçao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuater</td>
<td>kuater</td>
<td>Cuatro / Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinco</td>
<td>Sinku</td>
<td>Cinco / Five</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This considerable difference in spelling, as well as the linguistic differences that accompany them, have made it extremely challenging to share literary resources
between the islands and made Arubans work especially hard in creating their own body of literature. Because of these challenges, Arubans were able to effectively argue their point that Aruba was indeed different from Curacao and needed to be left to govern itself. The difference in spelling as minute as it may seem, served as a very symbolic difference from other Papiamento-speaking islands. While this distinction served to bolster Aruban’s national identity, it also bolstered their argument to secede from the Netherlands Antilles.

Waves of immigrants throughout the island’s history, as well as the island’s political push toward its own political autonomy, have had an enormous impact on a variety of different aspects of Aruban nationalism. The immigrants, who spoke a different language than locals, allowed Arubans to define themselves when juxtaposed to their new neighbors. In defining themselves, a general Aruban consciousness was born and the movement toward a self-governing island was initiated.

While my participants argued that Arubans know what it means to be Aruban, that identity is very difficult to explain because, as with all nations, Aruba is evolving as the political, cultural and even environmental landscape continues to change. This change represents a move in an uncharted direction where no one really knows what the final destination may be. With changes such as new immigrants and foreign economic interests, some Arubans continue to perceive a threat to what it means to be Aruban and, consequently, to their language.
Language threat

Within the context of Aruba, Papiamento traditionally has been perceived to be threatened on two different fronts. The first is the political association with the Netherlands and its strong anti-Papiamento policies, at the end of the 19th century and through most of the 20th century. Second, the wave of English speakers who came to the island to work for the oil refinery and, later, the waves of English and Spanish speakers who have come in recent years to fill positions in the booming tourism industry have promoted a perception of threat to local language and culture. In order to explain the different influences on the perception of threat felt toward Papiamento, I have divided this section into subsections based on a particular language and its speakers. The three subsections are Dutch, Spanish and English.

Dutch

As a Dutch colony, Arubans cannot deny their relationship to the Netherlands, and Dutch holds high status and speaking “good” has historically been equated to being intelligent (interview with Joyce Pereira). Nevertheless, it would be erroneous to believe that all or even most Arubans speak and use Dutch with a native-like fluency, especially in more formal and academic domains. In fact, despite the high status of Dutch and its use as the medium of instruction in schools for the better part of a hundred years, Dutch is the mother tongue of only 6% of Arubans (Central Bureau of Statistics Aruba, 2001). This data shows that Arubans are not choosing to shift to Dutch as they are being educated through Dutch medium instruction. Moreover, in examining Aruba’s history, it is hard to find a period in which people other than the Dutch residents (who
(expatriates) themselves never made up majority of the population) spoke Dutch in order to communicate with their family and others.

In my interview with Joyce Pereira and Juan Schwengle, I asked why they thought Arubans were so successful in maintaining Papiamento, given the island’s colonial history. They replied:

Joyce: I think it is because historical development of Papiamento. Against all odds perhaps, since the school system was in all Dutch since 1935, they tried to do it earlier but it did not succeed and 1935 being the last obligation, I think people feel that it is not a success. And they feel that it is a very difficult language to learn on the island because you just don't hear it.

Juan: The Dutch language.
Joyce: It is very difficult to learn.
Juan: It is totally, totally a foreign language.
Joyce: A foreign language. It is not even a second language.
Juan: It is not a second language, it is totally foreign.
Joyce: It is a strange language for here, for the whole region.

Joyce and Juan agreed that Papiamento has a strong history and place in Aruban history, but they also cited the failed Dutch policies and the severe imposition that Dutch had on the average Papiamento speaking Aruban as reasons why Dutch did not permeate the general Aruban population. As their interview reflects, they also pointed out the sheer difficulty of learning Dutch as a key factor in the maintenance of Papiamento. This is understandable given its Germanic origins, whereas Papiamento developed from different West African and Romance languages with little to no connection to Germanic languages. The difficulty in learning Dutch is complicated by its absence from local domains of language use, which prevents islanders from gaining necessary comprehensible input. In addition, as the Dutch have always had a distinctly influential presence on the islands of Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao, they tended not to mix racially
and socially as much as the Spanish and Portuguese did. Thus while Dutch is a language of high prestige, it has simultaneously been viewed among non-Dutch as the language of others, and therefore not attainable. As a result, Papiamento has flourished among the non-Dutch sector.

Despite the participants’ agreement that Dutch presented a legitimate threat at one point, they no longer felt such a threat exists given the present-day status and local prestige of Papiamento in relation to Dutch. On the other hand, according to Lydia Emerencia, Dutch’s historical link to colonization and oppression has caused the “difficulties that we (Arubans) have had in our country in learning and teaching Dutch because of the very heavy emotional connotations that we have with Dutch.” Thus, Arubans’ struggle to learn Dutch is not solely a pedagogical one, but it also has to do with their unwillingness to succumb to a colonial language.

There is no doubt that Dutch still holds high prestige in Aruba and most parents hope that their children will grow up and be able to use the language in an eloquent manner. Nevertheless, parents hold this hope under the assumption that it will not come at the exclusion of Papiamento. The use of Dutch as the medium of instruction is one of the primary reasons for its high prestige on the island, but is also one of the reasons schools have historically been the battleground for Papiamento. Parents and politicians alike have bought into the popular rhetoric of politicians throughout the past fifty years and the Dutch influences, both of which idealize a post-secondary experience in Holland where Aruban students will go in order to continue their studies and upon graduation, be
more successful when they return to the island. Despite this strong and influential rhetoric over the years, statistics on Aruban students who go to Holland and graduate are abysmal (Pereira, 2004). Ramón Todd and other participants argued that, as more Arubans start to understand how poorly local students are doing in the Dutch school system and how Papiamento medium instruction would rectify such failures, the general population will start to embrace the use of Papiamento as the language of instruction in public schools.

Before I arrived in Aruba, I assumed that due to the political connection between the Netherlands and Aruba, there would be a natural perception that Dutch could in some way encroach upon or threaten Papiamento. The documents and interview data suggested that while Dutch may at one time been a cause for concern for displacing Papiamento, it is no longer perceived as a threat. Discussions of language threat seem to have found another target, which include the two more powerful languages in the region: Spanish and English.

**Spanish**

As a result of the most recent waves of Spanish-speaking immigrants from Columbia, the Dominican Republic and other Spanish-speaking nations, the participants in this study expressed their concern regarding the increased spread and prominence of Spanish on the island. Over my eight days of data collection, it was very obvious that there are a large amount of Spanish-speaking immigrants on the island. My fieldnotes included numerous references to anti-immigrant discourses that were specifically aimed
at Spanish speakers. Whether it was a bartender talking about how “everywhere you go there are Spanish speakers,” or the teacher who felt that schools should not be responsible for teaching Spanish immigrant students, all of whom she assumed were undocumented, the anti-Spanish immigrant discourse was pervasive throughout my observations on the island. Lydia Emerencia explained the main difference between the recent Spanish-speaking-immigrants and past immigrant groups is that the English speakers who came to work for the Lago Company were largely confined to San Nicolaas. Now, the Spanish-speaking immigrants have moved all over the island, and their sheer numbers have startled many Arubans. This permeation of Spanish-speaking immigrants has prompted a defensive approach to protect their language and culture.

When I asked Lydia Emerencia if she thought the average Aruban would feel that Papiamento is threatened she responded:

    I think that there are people who feel that, but I would say as a matter of fact though, that I get the sense that our situation resembles that of Puerto Rico in terms of their Dushi Papiamento - I love Papiamento. They would protest firmly against especially Latin Americans who choose not to speak Papiamento because they consider that an insult, they consider that an act of arrogance, and they would really claim that Latin Americans must learn to speak Papiamento. So indeed, in their protest, they do fear that Papiamento would lose because of so much presence. That is true.

She went on to say:

    I think that they fear it (English), I think people do see it (extent to which English is a threat to Papiamento) but, not in the same extent as the Spanish because I think one reason is that in terms of numbers, we have more Latin American speaking people here, so I think we fear that they are a danger more…Latin American people are everywhere.

Despite the significant wave of Spanish-speaking immigrants to the island, only
13.2 percent of respondents to the Aruban census reported Spanish as the language of their household (Central Bureau of Statistics Aruba, 2001). Historically, and according to my participants, children of these Spanish-speaking immigrants presently are learning Papiamento. Joyce Pereira said, “But the second generation of the Spanish speaking people, they speak Papiamento. You see them at the schools and about and they don't have problems with the Papiamento.” Pereira also noted the absence of a shift away from Papiamento to Spanish. Nonetheless, the participants pointed to a growing trend among Aruban children in which they pick up on anti-immigrant rhetoric and associate the Spanish language with cheap labor and a language that is not worthy of learning.

The anti-immigrant sentiment among Aruban children was exemplified when different participants in the Department of Education focus group talked about young family members who did not like learning Spanish. These participants also noted how different the younger generation’s ideas toward Spanish speakers were from those of older Arubans who grew up with a very positive view of Latin America, primarily through their access to Venezuelan television channels. Evelyn said in the focus group, “but in terms of Spanish taking over, I don’t think it is possible. And, it is like my daughter and my nephew, they don't really like Spanish, and I don't know where that comes from.” After some reflection and comments from other colleagues, Evelyn discussed why she felt her daughter and nephew did not like Spanish and said, “[t]he kids don't wish to identify with that group (Spanish speakers).”

Aruban’s general ability to speak multiple languages and their willingness to
speak to visitors in their native tongue has made Aruba a very inviting place for new immigrants. However, there is some concern among Arubans regarding Spanish-speakers not learning Papiamento. Such concern over Spanish-speakers’ seeming unwillingness to learn Papiamento is another reason why Arubans think Spanish speakers could potentially pose a threat to Papiamento. Audrey discussed Arubans’ general affinity for language and their willing to speak to a foreigner in their mother tongue as a welcoming and hospitable gesture. She said,

in Aruba we have been taught to be hospitable. So when people come from other countries, we try to speak with them in their language. But when Spanish speakers came, and then when we realized that they were not learning Papiamento, and you were hearing Spanish everywhere you go, we started changing our attitude.

The perception that immigrants are not learning Papiamento is common in regions and areas where there has been an influx of immigrants, but, as noted above, all of the people who were interviewed agreed that the younger immigrants were generally very successful in learning Papiamento, which begs the question: so then why are Arubans so fearful? Is it that they are just trying to stage a strong front against the increased use of Spanish, understanding that, given time, the Spanish-speaking immigrants will one day speak Papiamento? Or, do they think that Spanish-speaking immigrants will be the exception to historical trends where immigrants quickly learn Papiamento?

**English**

English is the most powerful and influential language in the world at the present moment. Considering Aruba’s unique history with English speaking immigrants and the
demands of English speaking tourists, one inevitably must ask the question: to what extent is English a threat to Papiamento in Aruba?

Luciano Milliard, whose family immigrated from Eustatius to Aruba in 1950, provided me with an informative point of view of the English-speaking community in Aruba. As a child of immigrants, he was able to speak to the experiences and opinions of many of the English speakers in San Nicolaas. Luciano explained that early English-speaking immigrants did not understand why Arubans were holding onto their language so tightly, and how they felt that Arubans were missing out because they did not speak a language of wider communication like English. As Lydia Emerencia was quoted saying earlier, the English-speaking immigrants did not aspire to speak Papiamento because they saw very little value in it. As a result, the English-speaking community in Aruba has maintained a rather peculiar, peripheral relationship to Aruban culture.

West Indian cultural staples such as Carnival, Calypso and Soca music play a major role in the identity of the English-speaking Aruban’s population. The majority of the English-speaking immigrants, worship in Protestant Churches, versus their native Aruban counterparts who tend to be Roman Catholic. Nevertheless, English-speaking immigrants, and to a greater extent their children, have learned Papiamento in order to fit in with the local population. While Dutch was the language of instruction in the schools, English speakers clearly understood that Papiamento held a local prestige that was unmatched by any of the other languages on the island. This local prestige has been
one of the primary reasons for the acquisition of Papiamento on the part of English-speaking immigrants.

As Spanish-speaking immigrants started to arrive in Aruba, the English-speaking immigrants who had arrived many years before felt as if their role in society was being encroached upon. In order to differentiate themselves from the new immigrants, they clung to Papiamento as a marker of their allegiance to Aruban nationalism. Luciano Milliard expressed very clearly that, for him, the ability to use Papiamento differentiated him and other English speakers from new immigrants who could not speak the language. He went on to tell me that, “Papiamento was used as what I would call an identity or a tool for identity clarification and that happened time and again throughout history.” While the use of Papiamento as a tool or aspect of identity has played a role even among the English speakers, that has not allayed concerns of the current threat that English has on the island as it continues to devour languages throughout the world (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999).

Given the status of English around the world, the concern that English threatens Papiamento would seem to be a legitimate. The participants in my study, however, did not believe that English posed a threat to the maintenance of Papiamento. Although English generally was mentioned as a language that could be perceived to be a threat, most participants believed that it was merely a stage and attributable to young Arubans who are greatly influenced by American television and pop culture.

I see the language of the youth in English. I see the youth not communicating in Papiamento but more in English, and more the
American version of English. At times, I would think that this could be a threat to Papiamento but still I don't think so. Because I feel a push from parents, grandparents and others who work in the school system. People like, I must mention some names: my rector Lydia Emerencia, people like Joyce Pereira who really fight for Papiamento and who have been fighting for Papiamento for many years, decades! I see all of these efforts will help Papiamento survive for even a few generations more, even in a globalizing world or what have you, it will be around (interview with Luciano Milliard).

There is no debating the fact that the younger generation of Arubans has an affinity for using English due to the many different American companies and television programs that have influenced the island. Virtually everywhere you go on the island, you can find American restaurant chains and other stores and products. However, those interviewed stressed the fact that Arubans are not abandoning Papiamento to speak English. Instead, they see it is a temporary phenomenon, as discussed by Evelyn and Micha in the focus group:

**Evelyn:** But I think that it is a kind of period. It is kind of like that, how do you say that, chatting? They use Papiamento in chatting.4
**Micha:** I read that stuff and I can't understand it!
**Evelyn:** English is like a trend. I think, I hope.

Therefore, according to Evelyn Ruiz-Croes, while Aruban children tend to speak and use a lot of English, they also have adapted their mother tongue (Papiamento) to cope with modern technology as they use their own variety of netspeak to converse over the internet.

---

4 “Chatting” refers to the use of netspeak while communicating on an instant messaging program on the internet.
When I asked participants whether the use of English as the language of instruction would be positive or negative, I received mixed feelings. Most thought that the use of English in school as the medium of instruction would be more beneficial than Dutch because children come to school with a much better understanding of English than Dutch. However, they expressed concern that the use of English as the medium of instruction could then propel English to a rather strong threat to Papiamento, as it would hold much higher prestige and could tip an already vulnerable youthful population to speak solely in English. Juan Gilbertus Schwengle, from the Department of Education, articulated the potential danger of using English for educational purposes when he said:

I don't think we need to switch to English just because it is a world language. It is more a phenomena of globalization. If we offer classes in English, more people from abroad will come around for their education and that is why we have to think of that. We really have to think of it before we say just “OK, let’s just switch to English” because you don't know what would happen.

Thus, while use of English among the youth in Aruba would be cause for concern in most language environments throughout the world, on the island of Aruba, where being multilingual is the norm, the use of English is viewed as a linguistic reality and a language that cannot fulfill the deep connection that Arubans have to their Papiamento.

**Summary**

Aruba’s history of colonization has brought a variety of languages, cultures and ethnicities together, resulting in the creation and maintenance of the Creole language Papiamento. Aruba’s history is unique within the ABC islands as it was not inhabited until much later than Curaçao and, to a lesser extent, Bonaire. After the WIC opened up
the island to be inhabited, slaves from West Africa, Dutch colonizers and Spanish priests all had a major impact on both the language and what has come to be known as the culture of Aruba.

Throughout the years, the education system in Aruba has left much to be desired. This system of education and the general colonization practices of the Dutch aided in the maintenance of Papiamento. This was true even when the Dutch increased their insistence on using Dutch as the medium of instruction, and Papiamento was denigrated to a second-class language. In fact, failed attempt after failed attempt to make Aruba a Dutch-speaking island led to an increased critical consciousness among many Arubans. Coupled with having to deal with different waves of both English-and Spanish-speaking immigrants, Arubans grew together and strengthened their culture and national identity as they rallied around their language: Papiamento. This increased nationalism eventually led to the breaking away from the Netherlands Antilles and provided Arubans their own unique status through the attainment of *Status Aparte*.

Throughout the history of the island, three language groups have, to different extents, been perceived as a threat to Papiamento. In this chapter, I discussed how Dutch, Spanish, and English have been and continue to be perceived as a threat to Papiamento and, consequently, Aruban culture. Participants agreed that Papiamento is a stable language that is not in danger of language shift. Despite its strength and longevity in the region, however, participants cautioned against taking it for granted. For example, one participant stated: “Well, I have never seen Papiamento on the list of
endangered languages from UNESCO… If I saw it I would be surprised…But I think we have to be careful not to say this out loud or else we will think, "Oh we don't have to do anything," and that is a problem.” (From Juan Gilbertus Schwengle). Thus, while the participants argued Papiamento was in no way endangered, there is this idea that Arubans need to continue to work to maintain the language because, without a conscious effort, it could succumb to other languages of wider communication.
CHAPTER V: CASE STUDY OF PUERTO RICO

Introduction

The second case study for this dissertation will examine the extent to which English has and continues to pose a threat to Puerto Rican Spanish. As with the previous case study, this chapter is divided into six different sections. First, I will give a general history of the island. This will provide a historical backdrop for the other sections in this chapter, which are titled: Contesting the language of instruction; The current state of education on the island; Language use on the island and where it is headed; The role of Spanish in Puerto Rican nationalism; Influences promoting the idea of language threat.

The oldest colony in the world

Puerto Rico is the eastern-most island in the Greater Antilles, and it is one of the three Spanish-speaking nations in the Caribbean (Dominican Republic and Cuba are the other two). The island was known as Boriquén by the Taino Indians who inhabited the island when the Spanish commenced colonization of Puerto Rico with the arrival of Christopher Columbus on November 19, 1493 (Vaquero de Ramírez, 2001). The Tainos, however, were not the first to inhabit the island. Puerto Rican archaeologist Ricardo Alegria has used radiocarbon dating on remains found in a cave in the Loiza area on Puerto Rico’s northeast shore. The results of the radiocarbon dating allow scholars to estimate that the first inhabitants on the island go back to the first century A.D (Morales Carrión, 1989). It is thought that the first populations of Indians to live in
Puerto Rico arrived by traveling up the Lesser Antilles from Venezuela. The Caribe and Arawak Indians and other indigenous groups influenced what became known as the Taino Indians, and their societies flourished on both Puerto Rico and the modern-day Dominican Republic.

Within a short time after the arrival of the Spanish, a majority of the Taino population had perished due to disease and mistreatment. At the same time, many of the Spanish men took Taino women as their wives and started a new race that would become one of the pillars of modern day Puerto Rican identity – mestizaje. The mix between Spanish and indigenous blood is often recognized as an integral part of understanding what it means to be Puerto Rican (Interview with Jose Luis Vega). In addition to the racial influence resulting from the inter-marrying of Tainos and Spaniards, the Spanish conquistadores borrowed many of the names that the Tainos used for places in Puerto Rico such as Humacao, Caguas, Mayaguez and El Yunque, as well as names of plants or fruit like guayaba and cacao (Vaquero de Ramírez, 2001). Within a few generations, however, the Taino language was heard on the island only when used to describe these places, fruit, and vegetation which were not common to the Spaniards. Today, the Taino language, at least the form it was spoken in Puerto Rico, is not alive anywhere in the world (Vaquero de Ramírez, 2001).

The mode of colonization by the Spanish was very different from that of their British and Dutch peers. Most significantly, the Spanish colonizers tended not to bring their families, thereby creating an almost necessary relationship between the Spanish
and the indigenous population and, later, the slave population (Morales Carrión, 1989). San Juan, the Puerto Rican capital once thought to be the strongest port in the world, was attacked numerous times by both the British and Dutch, with the Dutch being the only ones to successfully sack the city. Despite many attacks the Spanish were always successful in retaking the strategic and symbolic port. Puerto Rico’s strategic positioning also facilitated its role in the exportation of sugar to Europe. To expedite the cultivation and harvest of sugarcane and because much of the Taino population had died off, slaves from the west coast of Africa were brought to the island to work the fields. While many slaves were brought to work on the island, many others arrived in Puerto Rico only to be sold and shipped off to other places in the Americas shortly thereafter. The African influence in Puerto Rico, and specifically the mix between the Africans and the Spanish, came to be known as a mulatto. Many West African traditions can still be seen in different aspects of Puerto Rican culture, including the traditional music of *bomba y plena*, dance and food (Flores, 2000).

In the late 19th century, when many of the Spanish colonies fought for their independence, Puerto Rico remained satisfied with its political association with Spain. In fact, because of relatively positive trade agreements with European nations, much of the political elite felt an affinity to Spain and wished to prove their loyalty. Nonetheless, during this time of, Puerto Rico sought local autonomy, albeit with the understanding that Puerto Rico would continue to be protected under the powerful Spanish flag. Local autonomy was finally granted on November 9, 1897, when “Governor Sabás Marín was informed (by the Spanish Government) of three decrees establishing an autonomous
regime in Puerto Rico” (Morales Carrión, 1989, p. 120). After the edict of autonomy was granted from Spain, internal political quarrels ensued before it was determined that elected officials would take office in May of 1898. The United States’ entrance into the war between Cuba and Spain, however, caused a delay. The legislature finally took office on July 17, 1898, but it was removed just 8 days later when Spain ceded Puerto Rico, along with the Philippines and Guam, to the United States (Morales Carrión, 1989).

The island of Puerto Rico was unlike many of the other territories the U.S. had acquired over the years. Census data from 1900 reported that the island had close to one million inhabitants, as the “[t]otal population was 953,243 with a population density seven times that of Cuba, twice that of Pennsylvania, and almost equal to the industrial state of New Jersey” (Morales Carrión, 1989: 137). Puerto Rico’s population density was so high that it severely inhibited the kind of influx of migrants seen in California and other states in the west. Nevertheless, Puerto Rico was an important political pawn that allowed the United States to flex its muscles as a powerful influence in the region. More importantly for the U.S., it strategically cut off Central and South America from further colonization by European powers.

Even though the island served as a symbol of U.S. power by 1900, the people of Puerto Rico remained Spanish at heart. Spanish continued to be the language spoken on the island, and Spanish colonization for nearly four hundred years had ingrained a sense of loyalty and respect for Spain which is still present today. Accordingly, since 1898,
the Spanish and English languages have had joint official status except in 1991 when Governor Hernández Colón briefly made Spanish the sole official language. This designation lasted only until 1992 when Pedro Rosselló was elected Governor and quickly repealed the symbolic action (Interview with Fernando Martin).

Since 1898, the political elite in Puerto Rico has struggled with the U.S. government to regain the local autonomy they had been granted by the Spanish. It was the opinion of many in the United States, however, that Puerto Ricans were uncivilized heathens who were in dire need of colonization. The mixed blood of the majority of the population only served to fuel that thought and conjured up racist ideas when discussions regarding autonomy were raised. Those ideals are exemplified in a statement by Peter J. Hamilton, a judge in the U.S. District Court appointed by President Wilson, who wrote, “[t]he Puerto Ricans have the Latin-American excitability, and I think America should go slow in granting them anything like autonomy. Their civilization is not at all like ours yet.” In subsequent months Judge Hamilton added, “the mixture of black and white in Porto Rico threatens to create a race of mongrels of no use to anyone, a race of Spanish American talkers” (As quoted in Morales Carrión, 1989: 188). Pleas for local autonomy fell on deaf ears, but the Jones Bill, signed on March 2, 1917 by President Woodrow Wilson, gave Puerto Ricans U.S. citizenship. Conveniently, this occurred just weeks before war was declared against Germany, and with their new U.S. citizenship, Puerto Ricans were eligible to enlist in the United States armed forces where, even today, many Puerto Ricans have served and given their lives.
The United States’ attempt at colonization came primarily through the public education system. The public school system has always been a symbol and a tool by which the United States and Puerto Rican governments have worked to instill a sense of culture among Puerto Ricans. Algren de Gutiérrez (1987) provides a detailed account of the various attempts on the part of U.S. appointed governors to implement English-only education in the public school system. Algren de Gutiérrez explains that these policies to “Americanize” Puerto Ricans were met with strong opposition on the part of both teachers and the political elite. After a half century of failed policies to try to Americanize Puerto Ricans, the U.S. granted Puerto Rico local autonomy and the right to elect their own governor in 1949. Thus, it took about fifty years to gain roughly the same status they had achieved with Spain right before Spain ceded the island to the United States.

When Puerto Rico was granted local autonomy in 1949, the new Secretary of Education, Mariano Villaronga, made Spanish the language of instruction for all subjects on the island. English was moved to a preferred subject and relegated to one class period per day (Torres-González, 2002). In 1952, Luis Muñoz Marín was elected the first governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The granting of local autonomy to the people of Puerto Rico gave them the power to govern local matters, but still provided them protection of the U.S. armed forces. Puerto Ricans do not pay U.S. federal taxes and they are not eligible to vote in federal elections. However, in a unique twist to their influence on Washington politics, Puerto Ricans do vote in Presidential primaries and in the 2008 democratic primaries between Senator Barack Obama and
Senator Hillary Clinton, Puerto Rico was a focal point of the campaign which eventually saw Hillary Clinton winning the most delegates on the island but later, losing to Obama in the Democratic primary. Puerto Ricans also elect a representative in the U.S. Congress. This person represents the island and serves on congressional committees but has no right to vote. Although Puerto Rico’s commonwealth status allows for local autonomy, Puerto Rico is not permitted to enter into foreign trade agreements, and any federal trials are taken up in the U.S. Federal Court system where the language of record is English (Pousada, 2008).

The United States’ economic involvement in Puerto Rico has impacted the island on a number of different fronts. Throughout the 20th century Puerto Rico’s sugar cane and coffee industries were negatively affected by hurricanes and the ripple effect from the Great Depression in the United States. Throughout the rest of the century the island slowly moved from an agricultural based economy to an industrial economy and American corporations have had a significant impact on the Puerto Rican economy. Tax incentives, coupled with a population willing to work for relatively low wages made Puerto Rico a gem for U.S. based companies (Grosfoguel, 2003). More recently, the major economic development in Puerto Rico has been the launching of a variety of pharmaceutical companies, which has had a positive impact on the local economy. In addition, the island has become a tourist capital of the Caribbean, an industry which currently brings millions of dollars to the island on a yearly basis.
Notwithstanding those developments, the Puerto Rican economy has gone through many different waves of economic hardship. Such hardship has forced many Puerto Ricans to seek jobs and a better life in the United States (Di Núbila, 2003). In the early 20th century, many Puerto Ricans decided to immigrate to the United States and chose to move to New York City in search of work, but as the Puerto Rican population has become more successful and wealthy, they have moved to other regions as well. Today, there are relatively large populations of Puerto Ricans in cities like Hartford, Connecticut; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Kissimmee, Florida, among others. Current estimates of Puerto Ricans living on the mainland United States tend to be between three and four million, while approximately four million Puerto Ricans continue to live on the island (Kerkhof, 2001).

The political system in Puerto Rico is a vibrant one, and islanders generally are full of enthusiasm and pride for their party. Voter turnout in elections averages around 80 percent, which is considerably higher than presidential elections in the United States (Torres González, 2003). The three major parties are the Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP), the Popular Democratic Party (PPD) and the New Progressive Party (PNP). All three of these parties run platforms that hinge on conflicting ideas for the current and future political status in relation to the United States. The PIP was founded in 1949 and is pro-independence. The PDP, started in 1938 by Luis Muñoz Marín, the first elected governor of Puerto Rico, believes in the commonwealth status or maintaining the status quo. The third party, PNP was started in 1968 and believes that the most beneficial political status for Puerto Rico would be to become the 51st state. In recent years, a
fourth party, Puerto Rico for Puerto Ricans (PRPP) has emerged, running on a platform to improve the island without the traditional attachment to a preference of status. Since the inception of the commonwealth status, six representatives from the PDP and four representatives from the PNP have been elected as governors of Puerto Rico.

Party politics and one’s opinion regarding the island’s status historically have been linked to opinions regarding the teaching of English and the amount of influence that U.S. educational ideals play in the classroom. With this background on some of the basic history of the island, I will move into a description of the development of the perception of threat toward Spanish on the island.

**Contesting the language of instruction**

During Puerto Rico’s association with the United States over the last 111 years, English has been perceived as a threat to Puerto Rican identity and a symbol of U.S. colonization. While language policy in the colonization era (1898-1952) ranged from a full attempt to shift Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans to monolingual English speakers to the recognition of the importance of Spanish in primary education, the intent to change Puerto Ricans’ sense of identity consistently marked the period.

When the United States invaded Puerto Rico in 1898, it brought a public school system that was new to the island. At that time, majority of the island’s population was illiterate, and the U.S. goal was not only to make Puerto Ricans literate, but to do so in English (Algren de Gutiérrez, 1987). The U.S. was explicit in their agenda to turn Puerto Ricans into “Americans.” As such, with this new public school system came an
English program that strove to “destroy the Puerto Rican nationality through education” (Bliss, 1994, p. 1). In the early years of colonization the United States attempted to make English the primary language of the island, but this approach was unsuccessful.

According to Vélez (2000), throughout “the first 50 years of American rule, colonial administrators implemented an educational language policy whose goal was to Americanize the population and make English the dominant language” (p. 6). Thus, from 1898 to 1949, English was the language of instruction in the public school system, but the use of English in the public school system changed dramatically throughout those years (see Algren de Gutiérrez (1987) for a detailed account of different policies regarding the teaching of English). For example, in 1901, Commissioner Martin G. Brumbaugh restricted English instruction to grades seven through twelve, and left the elementary curriculum to be mediated in Spanish. From that point on, although many different policies were used to implement English in all grades, few were successful (Puerto Rico Department of Education: English Department, 1998). As time passed in the early Puerto Rican colonial period, however, even more emphasis was given to Spanish in the primary grades. English, however, was always used as the medium of instruction at the secondary level. In fact, until 1949, all high school studies throughout the island were conducted in English. However, the few students who made it to high school tended to be from the elite families on the island. As Schweers and Hudders (2000) stated: “The small elite that continued in high school, however, became fully bilingual, thus exacerbating the difference between the classes” (p. 66). From the late 1940’s to the present, Spanish has been the medium of instruction in the public schools
on the island and English has played a reduced role when compared to the early years of
U.S. colonization.

Throughout the period of colonization, the Teachers Association felt that it was
foolish for their members to teach subjects in English, a language which the majority of
the teachers did not have a thorough command of (Algren de Gutiérrez, 1987). Teachers
who were not bilingual were attempting to teach classes to students in English, so
students whose native language was Spanish benefited minimally. In addition although
many teachers tried to speak in English, they often resorted back to their native Spanish
while teaching. Moreover, in the early years of colonial development, teachers were
forced to pass English proficiency exams. If these exams were not passed, the teacher’s
job would be in jeopardy (Vélez, 2000). Thus, teachers viewed English as something
that was capable of taking their jobs, as well as their place in society, and the “new
Teachers Association, [was] organized precisely to challenge the department’s
imposition of English proficiency examinations of teachers and the language’s
privileged status in the educational system” (Vélez, 2000, p. 12). When Puerto Ricans
achieved political autonomy in the late 1940s, the Teachers Association had more power
than ever before.

As colonial education policies founded in U.S. sociopolitical sentiment made
their way to the island, English language competence became the expected standard for
the island’s elite. The elite often finished their secondary education in the public school
system, and these students were able to attend universities in the United States, as well
as compete for English-speaking jobs upon returning to Puerto Rico. On the other hand, the average Puerto Rican remained monolingual and was typically not able to go beyond an elementary school education. If the poor and middle class had been economically stable enough to attend school through the twelfth grade, they too probably would have been bilingual and enjoyed the same opportunities of the elite. Even today, the ability to travel to the United States for university studies is something that is practiced primarily by the bilingual children of the elite.

When the public school system moved toward using Spanish as the medium of instruction in 1949, English lost its elite status in the Department of Education and parents were forced to send their children to private schools to receive a medium of instruction in either English or a mixture of English and Spanish. In doing so, the elite families circumvented the system (Schweers and Hudders, 2000), and many children from the Puerto Rican upper class continued their higher education on the mainland before returning to Puerto Rico after graduation to work in the best-paying jobs. The exodus of the elite from the public school system starting in the early 1950s continues to this day. It is very uncommon in Puerto Rico for children of the middle and upper class, to be sent to public schools. As these children attend private schools where there is often a greater emphasis on the English curriculum, the children are well prepared to maintain their social class distinction when they move into the job market. Thus, social class has played a major factor, not only in the learning of English, but also in the schools and experiences that are available to students.
As years passed and the United States’ goal of making Puerto Ricans an English-speaking population continued to fail, U.S. administrators recognized that their language policy of creating an English-speaking population was a disaster. Accordingly, the U.S. moved in the direction of a language policy with a stronger bilingual focus. This bilingual approach periodically resurfaced from time to time, with the latest occasion taking place in 1993 when former Governor Pedro Rosselló and former Secretary of Education Víctor Fajardo implemented the “Bilingual Citizen” program (Clampitt-Dunlap, 2000). The “Bilingual Citizen,” initiated by the pro-statehood governor, was attacked as being anti-Puerto Rican and a move away from the use of Spanish in public schools. A number of pilot schools were implemented throughout the island, but Rosselló’s goal of implementing a bilingual school in each municipality never came to fruition.

The year 2000 saw the election of the first female governor of Puerto Rico, Sila Calderón. Sila Calderón was a member of the PPD and quickly reallocated funds away from the bilingual schools, forcing many of them to close or switch to a more traditional curriculum. According to Sharon Clampitt-Dunlap, an English professor on the island and a prominent researcher in language planning in Puerto Rico, the poorly written “Bilingual Citizen” curriculum did not take a holistic approach to improving education on the island. She argues that in order to improve English education, it is necessary to make drastic and strategic improvements in the core curriculum with special emphasis on Spanish (Interview with Clampit-Dunlap). That said, the “Bilingual Citizen” initiative’s focus was on learning English, and an analysis of the document shows that it
does a very poor job of explaining the interconnected nature of English with the rest of the subjects (Interview with Clampitt-Dunlap). November 4, 2008 saw the election of a new governor, Luis Fortuño, from the PNP party. Throughout his campaign, he discussed the importance of English education. In early 2009, along with newly appointed Secretary of Education Carlos Chardón, Fortuño applauded moves from the Puerto Rican Senate to increase the use of English in public schools (Associated Press, 2009).

**Spanish mediated instruction**

Starting in the late 1940’s with the appointment of the first Puerto Rican governor and solidified with the creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in 1952, English and Spanish instruction on the island was changed forever. According to *Project for the Development of a Bilingual Citizen*, published by the Department of Education of Puerto Rico’s English Department in 1997, in 1949, Commissioner Mariano Villaronga, made Spanish the medium of instruction and transformed English into a daily required fifty minute course. Spanish, the language of the majority, was to be used as the language of instruction and English was to be taught as a regular subject from first through twelfth grade. This was seen as a big win for politicians and followers of the PIP and the PPD (Clampitt-Dunlap, 2000).

For the first time since the United States took control, Puerto Rican politicians were able to dictate the medium of instruction in the public school system, and together with the strong push from the new Teachers Association, they chose their vernacular, Spanish. The platforms of many of Puerto Rico’s earliest politicians were finally
realized, and the Spanish language dominated instruction in the public school system. This was not surprising, as the United States’ imposition of English on Puerto Ricans built animosity towards both the United States and the English language from the beginning. For years, politicians, the Teacher’s Association, and many artists and writers had fought for the right to use Spanish as the medium of instruction in the public school system (Clampitt-Dunlap, 2000; DuBord, 2004). Puerto Rican autonomy marked the end of a 50-year struggle by Puerto Ricans for the right to govern their island. As a result, at first opportunity, Puerto Ricans made Spanish the medium of instruction in all public schools.

While politicians were successful in painting a picture of English as a threat on Puerto Rican identity, they were not able to deny the importance of English for economic prosperity on the island. As a result, the use of Spanish as the language of instruction prompted many wealthy families to pull their children out of the public schools and place them in private schools, offering English education. Inequity in social class is often exacerbated by the vast difference in outcomes between private and public schools, especially, but not limited to, the learning of English. According to Schweers and Hudders (2000),

…the average Puerto Rican needs and benefits from a knowledge of English. Until now bilingual ability in English has marked class divisions. In a true democratic Puerto Rico, children from all classes should have an equal opportunity to master this necessary language (p. 70).

The language debate reached its pinnacle in the 1990s. At the beginning of the decade, the PPD with its platform promoting the status quo, was in power. The PPD felt
that English was a threat to Spanish and that the official language status of Spanish and English was not a true reflection of the people of Puerto Rico (Castro Pereda, 1993). With the backing of the PIP, they passed a bill on April 5, 1991, “making Spanish the sole official language of the island” (Schweers & Hudders, 2000). This example of political maneuvering was a symbolic stance that was described by Fernando Martin to be “all smoke and mirrors” on the part of the governor, Hernández Colón. Historically in Puerto Rico, politicians have used the language debate as a political football for their own political gain (interview with Clampitt-Dunlap). With a change in government just one year later, the PNP, led by Governor Rosselló, restored English as the joint official language with Spanish on the island. “During all of this legislation, polls consistently showed that the large majority of Puerto Ricans preferred having both Spanish and English as official languages” (Schweers & Hudders, 2000).

The fact that politicians from the PDP adopted rhetoric to justify changing the official language to Spanish is an excellent example of the resistance and controversy that surrounds the teaching and use of English in Puerto Rico. Elite politicians reacted by promoting their party’s platform to the detriment of English language acquisition, even though their position did not necessarily voice the opinions or needs of the people. This is a recurring theme in Puerto Rican politics and further accentuates the idea of the threat that English poses to Puerto Rican Spanish (see collection of writings and documents in Castro Pereda, 1993). It is also reflective of the considerable difference in opinion between voters and lawmakers concerning language policy. This difference in opinion often results from party leaders’ inability to change their political platforms on
the language issue due to their all-important stance on making Puerto Rico an independent country (PIP), the fifty-first state (PNP), or simply maintaining the commonwealth arrangement (PDP).

The current state of education on the island

Currently, Puerto Rico has the third largest public school system in the United States (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2000) but its public school system is in disarray. The system has been handicapped by fraud, as evidenced by former Secretary of Education Victor Fajardo’s embezzlement of millions of dollars from the Department of Education (to which he plead guilty in 2002). Puerto Rico’s ever-expanding Department of Education is confronted with perennially low test scores (Negrón Pérez, 2004) and outbreaks of school violence are testimonies to the need for an improved public school system. Over the years, many articles in all of the major newspaper publications in Puerto Rico have voiced opinions on these issues (Bliss, 2000; Hernández Beltrán, 1997; Millán Pabón, 2005; Ortiz, 2001; Ramírez, 1987). These problems are compounded by the fact that the majority of the schools in Puerto Rico have not met their annual yearly progress (AYP) required by the federal government’s No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). Such failures on the part of public schools has led parents who can afford it to send their children to private schools that in addition to security, often promise a comprehensive English education curriculum. This shift and the instability of the public school system has led onlookers to wonder what should be done.
The island has an abundance of private schools that place a greater emphasis on English education than public schools do. “It is almost a truism at the University of Puerto Rico that public school students do poorly in English, and private or Catholic school students do better” (Pousada, 2000, p. 112). The findings of Pousada (2000) reaffirm the fact that the wealthy who send their children to private schools do so in order to insure their children will learn English. Because the highest paying jobs in Puerto Rico require knowledge of English, the children of the elite are the few who can fill these positions, thereby allowing them to stay on top of the economic pyramid of Puerto Rican society (Ortiz, 2001).

According to the Department of Education (DE), English Department’s Project for Developing a Bilingual Citizen, the fifty minutes of English instruction provided daily to public school students in grades one through twelve does not produce students who have developed basic English language skills in either oral or written discourse. “Our students, as opposed to those graduating from the private schools, are not prepared to communicate in English” (p. 1). This document serves as evidence that the DE is not oblivious to the fact that private schools develop competent English users much more successfully than public schools. Nevertheless, other parties saw the Bilingual Citizen Program as a political move by the PNP and Governor Pedro Rosselló to bring Puerto Rico that much closer to statehood (Bliss, 2000; Hernández Beltrán, 1997).

Teachers have always been at the center of the debate on language. In the late 1940s the Teacher’s Association played a major role in making Spanish the medium of
instruction. More recently, teachers have been the center of criticism among students, parents, and the DE as they question teachers’ methods, preparation and ability to teach English (Pousada, 2000). Though Pousada (2000) did not specifically examine teachers’ preparation and education, the DE English Department’s *Project for Developing a Bilingual Citizen* states, that in 1997, the year the document was published, “… almost 50% of the teachers of English do not hold an English certificate” (p. 2). The demand for English teachers has resulted in the hiring of many teachers who are under-prepared and unqualified to teach the balance of the English curriculum established by the DE. Consequently, these teachers depend even more so on the established DE curriculum in order to teach successfully. Carroll’s (2005) analysis of the DE’s English curriculum identifies that there is essentially only a framework from which teachers are expected to create their own curriculum and find their own materials. The creation and execution of one’s own curriculum becomes increasingly more difficult when teachers do not have the proper training (Carroll, 2005).

**Corpus planning in Puerto Rico**

Efforts in corpus planning play a major role in the development and maintenance of any language and thus are important to the discussion of Spanish in Puerto Rico. With Spanish being a LWC, Puerto Rico has not had to deal with the same standardization difficulties that Aruba has. However, unlike most Spanish-speaking countries, majority of the textbooks used in public schools are outsourced to publishing companies in the United States. The use of American translated textbooks is a symbol of the powerful relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States, where the
American publishing industry has been able to monopolize and influence what is taught and the variety that is used.

Contrary to many public schools in the U.S. where textbooks generally form the basis of the curriculum, public schools in Puerto Rico often do not have enough books for each student. Furthermore, these books can represent a very different cultural reality due to the fact that they are written off the island. As a result, teachers often find themselves creating their own materials do not use them. This however is not the case for the various Puerto Rican history books that are generally written and published on the island.

Apart from texts that are used in schools, Puerto Rico has a rich literature and access to a variety of different books, magazines and newspapers that are widely read among islanders. More recently, the most widely read Puerto Rican newspapers *El Nuevo Dia* and *El Vocero*, have developed very popular websites where their articles are published for free. Despite a solid corpus of Spanish literature and other documents that are written in Spanish, many Puerto Ricans also read books that are written in English. Nevertheless, texts in Spanish are there for those who wish to read in Spanish and one chooses to purchase a book in English, it is also relatively easy to do so.

As corpus planning efforts in Aruba are more focused on standardization and the creation of a body of literature and reading material, Puerto Rican corpus planning has centered primarily around textbooks used in schools. Furthermore, my data suggests that the formal corpus planning is not a top priority among the government. However, the corpus of literature that comes with Spanish as a LWC and an island with a strong
literary tradition, corpus planning throughout the island’s history has indeed worked to maintain the language through the use of Spanish in various publications ranging from newspapers, to books and magazines.

The role of Spanish in Puerto Rican nationalism

The political history involving both Spain and the United States undoubtedly has shaped the current linguistic landscape of the island of Puerto Rico and its conceptualization of nationalism. Spanish language policies were *de facto* in the sense that shortly after the arrival of the Spanish *conquistadores*, the medium of communication for daily life on the island was Spanish. Fernando Martin, President of the Puerto Rican Independence Party, confirms the profoundly significant role Spanish has had on the island and in the region:

> Not that if it (Puerto Rico) were not a colony we would be speaking any other thing (other than Spanish). For me, the explanation (of why Puerto Rico has maintained Spanish) is relatively straightforward. If you look at the development of nationalism in the region, the three most nationalist countries of this whole region are Mexico, Cuba and Puerto Rico, and perhaps to the point of caricature. And the reason for that is that we have been the three countries that have been literally the frontier. We have been the frontier. It is in these, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Mexico, that the population has felt that Anglo American culture, the English language, the culture of Freud's overwhelming beast, that is what is about to overtake you, or overcome you (Interview with Fernando Martin).

Martin’s explanation of the important role of Spanish in the region goes beyond the geographic boundaries of Puerto Rico. It also antecedes U.S. occupation of the island, in that it goes back to historic battles between the status of Spanish versus English in the whole region. His idea that the United States and the English language have been seen historically as a threat to the vitality of Spanish and culture in the three
nations mentioned provides fuel for such “caricatured” or vibrant realizations of nationalism, which were created to protect against American imperialism and, by extension, the English language.

Not surprisingly, conscious language planning did not come to Puerto Rico until the United States took hold of the island. At that time, the Untied States used top-down policies to Americanize and implement English in its territories. When it took over Puerto Rico in 1898, however, it marked the first time that U.S. policy makers tried to incorporate an assimilist language policy in a territory where English speakers would forever make up a relatively insignificant part of the population. And, despite the American government’s conscious pro-active approach to language planning and policy, the American government failed in its attempt to Americanize and promulgate the English language in Puerto Rico. Instead, as a result of the unwelcomed top-down policies of the U.S., the Puerto Rican political elite, including professors, lawyers and others within the upper crust of society, fought to defend local identity and autonomy gained under the Spanish flag.

While top-down policies were the norm for U.S. policy makers, other world powers like Russia used different, more effective methods in their promotion of Russian, as seen in the Baltic state of Estonia. Clachar (1998) compared differing effects of linguistic imperialism of the United States in Puerto Rico to the Russiaplication of Estonia. While a number of factors have influenced the ineffectiveness of English education in Puerto Rico, Clachar argues that the methods of linguistic imperialism used
by the United States varied greatly from more successful methods. She concludes that American colonization policies were abrupt and overt, whereas:

the pressure for Russian in Estonia and the other Baltic states was at first camouflaged by this ‘illusion’ as well as by the ability of these republics to meet the new Russian requirements, by using ‘delaying tactics and token compliance’ (Kreindler, 1990b: 240)… In contrast, US language policy from the very beginning was openly and coercively assimilationist, a policy which created disruptive shifts between English and Spanish as the media of instruction, an inferior status ascribed to Spanish, ambivalence toward English, and eventually, resistance to the learning and spread of English on the island.

Communist ideology reflected in Soviet language policy was carried out in a totalitarian system which had established and consolidated very strict political control over the local Party and government hierarchy, a strategy, which prevented any possible ‘nationalist deviations’ and thereby ensured compliance with the technical issue of learning Russian. By contrast, the US government did not legislate a totalitarian context to enforce Anglicisation of the Puerto Rican population, instead it created a capitalist economy with a concomitant educational system that led to status and class distinctions operating originally between the primary and the high schools and later between public and private education in Puerto Rico. This strategy perpetuated a dual set of power relationships (those between the owning North American and intermediary Puerto Rican bourgeoisies) furthering US control over Puerto Rico. Such a strategy led to a highly charged ideological and socio-political environment in which the learning of English in Puerto Rico became synonymous with US imperialist dominance, social divisiveness, and erosion of Puerto Rican cultural identity (Clachar, 1998:115-116).

Thus, instead of succeeding in its attempted Americanization, the policies of the U.S. government had the opposite effect. As a result of those policies that viewed the average Puerto Rican as uneducated and of little worth, the Puerto Rican elite had even more reason to organize in defiance of U.S. policies than they had before (Castro Pereda, 1993). Therefore, even the though the development of a Puerto Rican
nationalism started toward the end of Spanish occupation, its meaning and purpose of defending the island, as well as their culture and language was re-defined and strengthened after the U.S. arrived. The intellectuals on the island are most commonly credited with the success and formation of Puerto Rican nationality and the defense of Spanish. Jose Luis Vega, head of the Puerto Rican Cultural Institute, explained this in his interview when he said:

Los intelectuales, el sector intelectual, piensa que fueron ellos quienes salvaron la lengua española en la isla. Porque particularmente a partir de la década de la 30 hubo una gran preocupación en círculos universitarios y escritores por la defensa del español por que creía que el español estaba amenazado. Que podría perderse o que podría convertirse en especie de lengua criolla, mezclada con el inglés. Y se articula una defensa bastante corriente del español y de los valores hispánicos y se establece, hay una visión de los norte americanos que hablan inglés como una cultura antagónica, como una cultura que amenaza.

The intellectuals, the intellectual sector, thinks that it was they who saved the Spanish language on the island. Because especially starting in the decade of the ‘30s, there was a great concern in university circles and writers for the defense of Spanish because they thought that Spanish was being threatened. That it could be lost or that it could be converted into a Creole language mixed with English. And a defense, which was rather strong toward Spanish and Hispanic values was created. This established a vision of North Americans who spoke English as an opposing culture, or a culture that threatens. (Author’s translation)

Intellectuals on the island, as well as the political elite, clearly were responsible for the creation and maintenance of institutional pillars which have served an important presence for Puerto Rican culture. The Puerto Rican participants in this study all pointed to a variety of different institutions, including el Ateno Puertorriqueño, which was founded in 1876, to preserve Puerto Rican culture through the cultivation and promotion of literature, music and art. New-found autonomy in the 1950s led to the creation of
other important institutes such as Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña (the Puerto Rican Institute of Culture) and La Academia Puertorriqueña de la Lengua Española (The Puerto Rican Academy for the Spanish Language). These institutes have worked hard to preserve and define what it means to be Puerto Rican, often to the exclusion of brethren who have left the island and/or write in English (Interview with Carlos Chardón).

When discussing such institutions, Carlos Chardón expressed his concern for the influence and the political clout these institutions hold: “…Ateneo de Puerto Rico, asociación de profesores universitarios, all those professional organizations controlled by the Independentistas y los Populares. Why because again, that is why I mentioned Power Politics. And after their intellectual power starts to dissolve, they have to control the professional groups, which was the only thing that they had left.” Carlos, an obvious statehood advocate, feels that while these institutions have protected and defended Puerto Rican culture, they have done so at the exclusion of groups not represented by their inner circle. Thus, non-Spanish speakers who have lived in the United States, even though they were born in Puerto Rico or of Puerto Rican ancestry, are often not considered to be “Puerto Rican” by cultural purists. While Jose Luis Vega assured me that there have been movements recently, to move away from such strict exclusive definitions of what it means to be Puerto Rican, researchers and writers such as Morris (1995), Clampitt-Dunlap (2000), Castro Pereda (1993) and Torres González (2002), suggest that current conceptualizations of Puerto Rican identity held by those on the island require its members to speak Puerto Rican Spanish.

In addition to the creation and maintenance of such institutions, political figures
have had other important influences in framing the developing idea of Puerto Rican identity. Influential scholars and politicians, such as Jose De Diego, Rosendo Matienzo Cintrón, Vincente Balbás Capó, Luis Lloréns Torres, Manuel Maldonado Denis and Rafael Castro Pereda, among many others, often contributed to the various Spanish newspapers on the island (Castro Pereda, 1993). As a result, the evolution of what Anderson (1991) would consider an imagined community was founded on an idealized and in some ways false perception of the average Puerto Rican. According to Jorge Schmidt Nieto, a social scientist and politician from the PIP, Puerto Rican nationalism

... is not all imagined, I mean people do speak Spanish. That concept, the criteria for an imagined community is mostly concrete, it is mostly material. But some things were left out. Puerto Rican identity included peasants, the white peasants from the mountains which is part of the Puerto Rican construction of identity in the 1950s in 1952, the popular ruling party whose lines were blurred between the party and the government, they created or helped create, or re-created. It was re-created in the 1950s and one very strong element was, ironically, most people were not small white peasants who lived in the mountains. But it was created as if we were descendants of those. Which most were not. Blacks were eliminated from the Puerto Rican identity. You know this image of el Jíbaro (a person from the mountains or rural area), with the straw hat, in 1952, and the 1950s when this image was re-created, most people did not even own a hat like that. Or had not even seen a hat like that (from interview with Jorge Schmidt Nieto).

Schmidt Nieto’s ideas regarding the recreation of a national identity highlights the unity of Puerto Ricans under an imagined criterion. However, Schmidt Nieto points out that not everything was imagined. Spanish was indeed the language of the island, and this common feature, when held juxtaposed to English and the U.S., was an obvious point of differentiation and symbol of the grand differences that divided the cultures. Again, while the development of Puerto Rican nationalism may have originated toward
the end of the 19th century, it was re-solidified to defend against restrictive colonization efforts on the part of the United States.

Arguably, language has played the most imperative role in the formation of Puerto Rican identity and nationalism under the U.S. flag (Zentella, 1999). While a colony of Spain, there was no need to defend or even consciously think about Spanish language maintenance. All of the participants in my study believed that Puerto Ricans living on the island believe in the importance of Spanish for Puerto Rican identity, whereas their brothers and sisters in New York and other cities on the mainland often have a different idea of what it means to be Puerto Rican. When discussing Puerto Ricaness, cultural purists on the island cite the connection between Spanish and Puerto Rican nationalism. Carlos Chardón captured the viewpoint of many of the defenders of Spanish and Puerto Rican identity when he said: “Oh you can’t do that (speak only English), that is not Puerto Rican because Puerto Ricans speak only Spanish. They (the average Puerto Rican) have not yet come around to the fact that Puerto Ricans can speak only English.” Chardón disagrees with traditional ideas concerning the connection between language and being Puerto Rican, but he does acknowledge that there is a common understanding among Puerto Ricans that one must speak Spanish to be Puerto Rican. This idea was confirmed in other interviews, when participants said things such as:

...some folks, if you make any kind of reference to using English then they go ballistic. And they say: "What you are doing is Americanizing... the young people are going to shift over to English and eventually lose Spanish." I try to explain that you can incorporate loan words from another language without losing your first language. You can create new forms of mixed communication and still be able to speak completely in
your native language as well. There are all kinds of ranges of bilingual discourse that can take place without losing your identity in the process, but it is a hard sell because, I am sure you have realized that people feel very, very strongly about language, particularly their own native language (Interview with Alicia Pousada).

These strong feelings that Alicia Pousada discusses highlight the emotional attachment that many Puerto Ricans have toward their language. Earlier in the interview with Dr. Pousada, she mentioned that she thinks “Puerto Ricans are very much cultural nationalists. They are staunchly behind defending their language, but they are also pragmatists” in that they understand the overall importance of learning English in an ever globalizing world. Alicia Pousada went on to say, “[r]egardless of what they (Puerto Ricans) might think about for the future status of Puerto Rico, their love of Spanish is intense and not negotiable. None of the political parties would ever propose doing away with Spanish. It would be political suicide first of all, but it would just be contrary to what people feel” (Interview with Alicia Pousada).

Alicia Pousada’s view is reflected in the politics of the PNP, which is generally pegged as one of the primary peddlers of increased use of English. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that their political platform has never waivered in terms of the importance of Spanish and its status as the official language, even if the island were one day to be incorporated as a state. The first elected PNP governor, Carlos Romero Barceló, declared, “Our language and our culture are not negotiable” (Romero Barceló, 1978:9 as cited in Morris, 1995: 59). Subsequent governors from the PNP party, including Pedro Rosselló and the newly elected governor Luis Fortuño, have echoed similar beliefs in backing the need for Spanish. Puerto Ricans’ sense of identity is a
topic that always elicits a multitude of responses; however, among residents on the island, the Spanish language traditionally has played a major role in the development of Puerto Rican nationalism.

**Language use on the island and where it is headed**

One key aspect of my interviews with both participants in both Aruba and Puerto Rico was trying to understand the extent to which participants believed the local language was threatened in any way and what that potential threat would mean in terms of future language use. On the island of Puerto Rico, all of the participants argued that Spanish holds a very strong position and is not in danger of a shift toward English, but some participants highlighted the fact that English had reached a preferred status in a few very important domains. In this section, I will examine the status of Spanish vis-à-vis English on the island using Fishman’s (1967) domains of language use.

Fishman (1967) discusses diglossic language environments where two languages or language varieties are used within the same community but act in functionally diverse ways. An example of a diglossic language environment or country would be where it is normal to go to church and pray in one language but be schooled in another. With this understanding, the participants in my study unanimously agreed that Puerto Rico did not represent a diglossic language context. While there are small pockets of people who might use English or another language in their homes, business or place of worship, the vast majority of Puerto Ricans use Spanish in all aspects of daily life. When asked why Spanish has been maintained as the language of the masses throughout over 100 years of U.S. colonization, Jose Luis Vega responded:
Porque es (español) necesario hoy en día para la vida del Puertorriqueño promedio. El Puertorriqueño que quiere sobre salir en el empleo o que quiere trabajar en un trabajo federal o que trabajar en la industria turística o que quiere tener acceso a mejores posiciones, pues naturalmente se preocupa por aprender inglés lo mejor posible. Y de allí hay un por ciento importante de Puertorriqueños que dominan inglés, algunos de una nivel rudimentaria y otros de una nivel completamente bilingüe. Pero para vivir en la isla, para vivir en Puerto Rico, el español es un requisito fundamental para la vida. Y eso es el razón por el cual el español ha mantenido vivo.

Because it (Spanish) is necessary today for the average Puerto Rican. The Puerto Rican who wishes to over achieve in his career or who wishes to work in a federal position or in the tourist industry or who wants to have better access to higher paying jobs, will naturally preoccupy themselves with learning English as best as possible. And from there, there is an important percentage of Puerto Ricans who speak English very well, others who do so at a rudimentary level, and then others who are completely bilingual. But in order to live on the island, Spanish is a fundamental requirement for life. And that is the reason why Spanish has been maintained its life (Author’s translation).

As José Luis Vega points out, there are a variety of different sectors within the job market that require or necessitate a working knowledge of English such as those of tourism or careers associated with the federal government. Nonetheless, even the work in these industries is not moving Puerto Ricans to shift away from their mother tongue. Spanish is the language of just about every aspect of the island from government to education and from religious domains to social domains. With that said, there are a few domains and peculiar aspects of the language environment in Puerto Rico which have emerged as either a concern of language threat or just an obvious state on the current linguistic reality of the island.

Although both Spanish and English hold joint official status, anyone who has ever visited the island knows after just a short visit that Spanish is the language that
predominates. Nevertheless, due to its political association, official correspondence between the federal government and the island is in English, as are proceedings in the federal court in San Juan. (For a detailed account of language use in the federal court system in Puerto Rico, see Pousada (2008)). Throughout my interviews in Puerto Rico, I asked the participants if, in their lifetime, they had witnessed a shift away from Spanish in any domains. While none of the participants said that English had totally taken over in any particular domain, media and higher education were cited as two areas in which participants believed English was gaining some market share in domains that at one time had been completely in Spanish.

Media

Puerto Rico’s history and relationship with the United States has provided those on the island more access to English than the average person in other Spanish speaking countries. For instance, in addition to the myriad of signage that is in English, cable television is predominately in English, and most movies that are released on the island are not dubbed in Spanish as they are in Mexico and other Spanish-speaking countries (Blau & Dayton, 1997). Instead, Puerto Ricans prefer to hear the original voices of the characters in English and read the subtitles for portions that might not be understood. Moreover, cable television and access to the internet have become more widespread throughout the island, American commercial interests have won the imagination of many children and adults throughout the island. It is not uncommon for Puerto Ricans to watch cable television in English or to frequent web pages designed primarily in English. In discussing the use of Spanish and English in different domains of society,
Fernando Martin was referring to the younger generation of Puerto Ricans when he said, “[t]hey are of the cable TV generation and since local TV production is so poor in general terms, cable TV is that much more attractive.”

The early years of the world wide web saw the dominance of English on millions of web pages. This has changed, however, as more people become comfortable with the internet and more businesses and newspapers publish web pages in local languages of people throughout the world. As the internet stands now, the average Puerto Rican can navigate only on Spanish websites if he or she wishes but generally speaking, he or she will have enough background knowledge in English to navigate and take information from many English-speaking web pages.

One such site, MySpace.com, was discussed in Carroll (2008), which examined Puerto Rican language use on the popular social networking site. Carroll (2008) found that Puerto Rican users were very cognizant of the language they were using. The findings indicate that while users tended to use Puerto Rican Spanish and more specifically Puerto Rican Netspeak, they also were influenced by English media, as reflected by the use of different English songs, quotes and other text that proliferated on their personal page (Carroll, 2008). Furthermore, in the description portions of the site, Puerto Rican users often used English to describe themselves because they understood that English is the default lingua franca on this popular world wide social networking site.
Higher education

Higher education in Puerto Rico has used both English and Spanish as the medium of instruction, although how much depends on the university and area of study. All universities in Puerto Rico currently require at least nine credit hours of English and Spanish as part of their core curriculum, but few universities have strict policies as to the language that must be used as the medium of instruction. The Inter American University of Puerto Rico, whose main campus was originally in San Germán and is now in the San Juan metropolitan area, was the first Puerto Rican university to be accredited and the original curriculum was in English. That has since changed, but as of 2003, students were still required to complete a minimum of nine credits in English courses and nine credits in content area courses that were taught in English. The University of Puerto Rico, the oldest and most prestigious university on the island, has a laissez faire attitude toward the use of language in the classroom, especially at the science and engineering campus in Mayagüez, where many classes are given in English without notice.

In an attempt to hire the best-qualified candidates for teaching positions, many professors are hired despite the fact they are not native Spanish speakers. Furthermore, because there are not doctoral programs in every field on the island, many Puerto Ricans go to the U.S. to complete their doctoral degrees before returning to the island to teach in one of the universities. Jorge Schmidt Nieto, a participant in this study, represents this type of professor. He expressed the difficulty in learning Spanish equivalents for concepts and theories that he learned in English. He also expressed concern that many
of his Puerto Rican colleagues from his department use an abundance of English loan words, a method he thought was interesting but in a way sends the wrong message to the students. Thus, even when Puerto Ricans come back to teach on the island, they tend to use a vocabulary that is highly influenced by the English words that they used during their coursework and writing of their dissertation.

The complex issue of what language is (or should be) spoken in higher education is further complicated because a majority of the textbooks used at the university level are in English. Thus, it is essential for students to have a good working knowledge and understanding of English before they are required to read long, and often boring, textbooks in their second language. It is important to note that textbooks for classes such as Biology or Calculus are published in Spanish in other parts of the world, but a close connection to the U.S. textbook industry has led to the use of English textbooks rather than those published in Spanish, which often come from other countries.

**Influences promoting the idea of language threat**

*Independentistas*, members of the party that supports independence for Puerto Rico, have always had a major influence on the perceived threat that English has on Puerto Rican Spanish. Puerto Rican “nationalism has been offered as the most incisive explanation for resistance to the study of and use of English leading to the unsuccessful bilingualization of the island’s population” (Clachar, 1997, p. 71). The 20th century marked the development of an enduring sense of identity among Puerto Ricans. According to Maldonado-Denis, it was,
...the decisive period in our formation as a people, as a nationality. Our literature, our music, our painting, in effect all of our cultural expressions, give testimony that in this century there crystallized a definitive manner, a culture that we call Puerto Rican (cited in Resnick, 1993, p. 262).

Much of this creation of identity equated to viewing Spanish as the language of Puerto Ricans and English as a symbol of the colonizer.

The three longstanding parties in Puerto Rico, the PIP, the PPD and the PNP, have never been able to work together to develop a language policy that benefits more people than those in their respective parties. Morales (1999) explains: “Since the political parties are determined to maintain language as a part of their political agenda, not actually bearing in mind the opinions of the people, the language issue is not clear on the island” (p. 11). What these political parties have been united on is the perception of threat that their politicians direct toward English, thereby pitting the English language against the formation of Puerto Rico identity. As a result, English has been viewed more as a problem than as a resource.

The historical impact of colonization forms the foundation for most studies on language use in Puerto Rico, but other studies have looked at more specific aspects concerning language. Clachar (1997), Clampitt-Dunlap (2000) and Morris (1995) focus on the attitude of students and other citizens in the use of English and the instruction of English on the island. Clachar (1997) found that even though her participants felt that learning English “may be a viable strategy politically, it is seen as extremely costly to the perceived high ethnolinguistic vitality of Puerto Ricans” (p. 94). Clampitt-Dunlap (2000) further explains that, “English was [and still is] associated with the United States
and Americanization and presented as a threat to all that represented Puerto Rican identity, most particularly the language” (p. 32).

This association between English and the colonizer is what has been engraved on the minds of many Puerto Ricans and has resulted in the perception that English threatens Puerto Rican Spanish, even though Spanish language maintenance has been part of the political platform and educational agenda since Puerto Rico gained autonomy. However, the political rhetoric is so powerful that the issue never dies. Nancy Morris in *Puerto Rico: Culture, Politics, and Identity* writes that “[t]he most consistently cited element of Puerto Ricanness was the Spanish language, which was mentioned in every focus group and by all interviewees” (p. 82). Morris’ study reinforces the fact that when talking about culture, Spanish is a characteristic that identifies one as being Puerto Rican. This deeply-rooted connection to identity that Spanish has reaffirms the notion that Puerto Ricans will not allow anyone or anything to harm the importance that Spanish has on the island (Morales, 1999; Morris, 1995).

The findings from the studies above articulate the strong correlation between Spanish and Puerto Ricanness and demonstrate that Spanish is at the very core of the development of Puerto Rican identity. The words of influential scholars and writers such as Rafael Castro Pereda, the author of “El idioma español es la llave de la cultura puertorriqueña” (1993: 26), sum up the islanders’ intense and conscious relation to their language. However, this relationship is only as strong as the movement to eradicate it. The initial implementation of everything American was seen as disrespectful to Puerto
Ricans and the strong society which they had built in the four hundred years of Spanish rule. The connotations that English still has as the language of the colonizer might not be in the forefront of the mind of the average Puerto Rican, but politicians from the three primary parties understand the importance of language and are willing to protect it at a relatively high cost.

As described in the previous sections, Puerto Rican Spanish has been successfully maintained, despite initial attempts by the United States to “Americanize” the island. While Puerto Rico has never experienced a mass migration of English-speaking populous, it would have been and is still unlikely, if not impossible, for the island to entirely shift away from Spanish. Unlike the southwestern United States, which did experience mass migration of English speakers, it is no surprise that this commonwealth is still, for the most part, a monolingual society (Blau & Dayton, 1997).

**Summary**

The Spanish colonization of the island of Puerto Rico had a major influence on many aspects of what is now known as Puerto Rico. As Spanish *conquistadores* mixed with both the indigenous and African slaves, the culture of Puerto Rico started to form. With such intermarriage, Spanish became the language of the masses. While other Spanish colonies were fighting for their independence, Puerto Rico and the political elite who ran the island only wanted their own local autonomy. Such autonomy was granted at the end of the 19th century but was soon taken away when the United States was ceded the island as part of concessions from the Spanish American War.
American colonization at the start of the 20th century alienated and offended many Puerto Rican poets, professors, and other influential politicians. Such alienation worked to facilitate the creation of a movement that associated English with colonial oppression. Among other things, this movement strengthened Puerto Rican nationalism and the demand for local autonomy, which was finally realized when the United States granted the island Commonwealth status. Since being granted local autonomy, Spanish has been the main language of education on the island, and efforts to increase English in schools generally have been defeated as anti-Puerto Rican.

Although Spanish on the island of Puerto Rico has never been threatened in the sense that there was a large influx of English-speaking immigrants, the political association with the United States and the United States’ past language policies constituted a threat in that they attempted to eradicate Spanish from the island. Current language use on the island points to an increased ability among Puerto Ricans to use English, but the island is still nowhere close to being bilingual in Spanish and English.
CHAPTER VI: DISCUSSION

The case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico highlight the historical relevance to the maintenance of Papiamento and Spanish on the respective islands. Furthermore, past and current policies and immigration patterns have impacted islander’s perceptions of their own language, as well as languages spoken by outsiders. In this chapter, I will examine the extent to which Papiamento and Puerto Rican Spanish are threatened, why this is relevant for current language planners and policy makers, and the impact such perceptions of threat potentially could have on the education system of each island. Throughout this chapter, I will highlight themes that have emerged from the data and relate them to contemporary discussions regarding language threat within the LPP field.

The effects of colonization on language

The differing colonization styles of the Dutch and the Spanish are obvious even through a cursory analysis. The original colonizers to Puerto Rico were the Spanish, and through interracial marriage with the indigenous population, as well as very strict methods to control their slaves, the Spanish were successful in creating and maintaining a relatively monolingual island. However, Aruba’s colonial history is almost completely the reverse. Early Dutch colonizers did not intermarry with the indigenous population like their Spanish counterparts. The islands of Curaçao, and later Aruba and Bonaire, also were populated by a more linguistically diverse collection of immigrants than most of the Spanish colonies. Moreover, the relatively high status of the Sephardic Jews and the need to communicate with slave laborers created the necessity for a lingua franca that would not benefit the Dutch more than the Jews. This multi-ethnic environment
created an atmosphere necessary for a Creole to emerge as the common language. The use of Papiamento provided no real inherent advantage to either of the two major groups who traded on the ABC islands, and it also provided an effective way of communicating with the ever-growing slave population. And by having to negotiate in a second language, the Dutch and the Jews were stripped of the potential power one group could have garnered through negotiating in their mother tongue. In contrast, in Puerto Rico, the absence of a large and powerful minority group like the Sephardic Jews virtually eliminated the possibility a language other than Spanish would be used on the island.

The slave trade era had a major impact on both islands, but in very different ways. In Aruba, slaves were one of the major reasons for the success and strength of Papiamento. Their presence made it possible for Spanish-speaking priests in both Curaçao and Aruba to educate slaves in their own language, thereby building the status and prestige of Papiamento. Because the Spanish-speaking Catholic priests were a marginalized group in Aruba, they did not hold the same responsibilities to spread Catholicism as well as Spanish, as was required of Spanish priests in Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico, as with most of the Spanish colonies (especially those in the Caribbean), there was a void in the presence of an indigenous language powerful enough to withstand the pressures to assimilate to the use of Spanish.

At the turn of the 20th century, the United States was ceded the island of Puerto Rico and a second round of colonization started on the island. The top-down colonization policies of the United States paralleled the authoritarian approach adopted
by the Dutch for the ABC islands. Colonization by both the Dutch and United States in their Caribbean colonies, came in the form of state-sponsored education. In both cases, schools were required to teach in the official language of the colonizer, Dutch and English, respectively. This form of colonization resulted in higher expectations and more pressure on the islanders to assimilate and adopt their colonizer’s language and cultural ways.

The use of Dutch and English as the mediums of instruction generally tended to be of little consequence for the wealthy, who either spoke Dutch as their native language (in Aruba) or learned English throughout their years of formal education (in Puerto Rico). Similarly, the Aruban upper class historically used Dutch as their mother tongue, and the public schooling in Puerto Rico, which only the wealthy were able to complete, provided educated Puerto Ricans sufficient access to English. Unfortunately, the Dutch and U.S. language policies worked to marginalize the lower strata of society which never became proficient in either Dutch or English, a reality that continues to this day. These top-down, draconian language policies and methods of colonization were more subtle than slavery and indentured servitude, but they still were viewed by locals as unjust and pointless. In opposition to said policies, nationalist organizations began to grow in their influence and the movement toward local autonomy began to strengthen on both islands.

The formation and influence of nationalist ideologies were generally the same for both Aruba and Puerto Rico, with the ultimate goal being local autonomy. Puerto
Rico was finally granted local autonomy upon its designation as a Commonwealth in 1948\(^5\), and Aruba gained its Status Aparte in 1977. Although the resistance of nationalist groups on both Aruba and Puerto Rico led to their respective political autonomy, full independence does not seem to be a likelihood for either island in the near future.

Throughout the 20\(^{th}\) century, nationalist groups who published their ideas through various media outlets fed locals a rhetoric that preyed on the perception that their local language and identity was threatened due to the current, and possibly future, relationship with their respective colonizer. The major difference between Aruba and Puerto Rico in the struggle for local autonomy was that Aruba was attempting to define itself in relation to the other islands of the Netherlands Antilles while also dealing with waves of non-speaking Papiamento immigrants. Puerto Rico, on the other hand, was waging a battle against ever-encroaching political, social and capitalistic ideals from the United States. Both movements attempted to identify and define their respective national identities.

The political elite in Puerto Rico inundated locals with an anti-English and anti-American rhetoric that served to combat the often racial and derogatory feelings that the United States had toward its Spanish-speaking territory. Such rhetoric is exemplified in this quote from the famous José de Diego who said,

\(^5\) Puerto Rico was originally granted local autonomy from Spain on November 28, 1897
Y al todos vosotros jóvenes estudiantes puertorriqueños, que guardáis en vuestros pechos la rebeldía contra los ilegítimos poseedores del territorio patrio; a vosotros, que por fuerza recibís la enseñanza en lenguaje extranjero y por voluntad preserváis el nativo lenguaje para la oración que os comunica con vuestro pueblo y para el ideal que os comunica con su futura victoria (Castro Pereda, 1993: 13).

And for all of you young Puerto Rican students, may you keep you in your chest (heart) your rebellious ways against the illegitimate possessors of your native territory; to you, who have been obligated to learn in a foreign language but have voluntarily preserved your native language to speak and communicate with your community with the idea that it (Spanish) will be used to communicate in your future victory. (Translation by author)

Unlike the status of the English language in Puerto Rico, the Dutch language was not viewed as a threat on Aruban identity. Nonetheless, Papiamento was reinforced as a symbolic key to national identity because one could use Papiamento to quickly differentiate locals from foreigners. As immigrants arrived in Aruba, they quickly learned Papiamento in order to gain solidarity.

Unlike Aruba, Puerto Rico never experienced a sizable migration of non-Spanish speakers. Nevertheless, growing access to television, increased American industrialization, and more recently, the advent of the Internet, have continued to fuel the perception that the core of what it means to be Puerto Rican is threatened. While the colonial histories of Aruba and Puerto Rico differ in terms of their policies, population and the languages spoken, on each island nationalist movements to maintain the local language and build its status have been effective in ensuring that Arubans and Puerto Ricans understand the importance language plays in their national identity.
**Immigration and its impact**

The arrival of a sizable population of immigrants in a foreign land is often met with resistance. Many of the cases of language threat discussed in Chapter Two have been greatly impacted by the influx of speakers of a language not traditionally found in the host country. Contemporary cases such as the United States, Sweden and France, where language policies have been passed to protect the local language despite its relative strength, exemplify the defensive manner of citizens and their governments as they react to new immigrant populations.

The case of the United States, where an influential number of non-English speakers have arrived and consistently been met with growing anti-immigrant sentiment, offers an interesting comparison to other immigrant situations. In the U.S., such anti-immigrant sentiment has led to the passing of a number of voter-initiated propositions that limit social and educational benefits for non-English speakers (Wright, 2005). In addition to a slew of anti-immigrant laws which have been enacted, the different cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds of these immigrants also has prompted legislation that seeks to curb the use of any language other than English (Brown, 2009).

In other cases, such as with many Native American groups in the U.S. and other indigenous communities throughout the world, an influx of immigrants led to the eventual death of countless speakers and, consequently, their languages (Dalby, 2002). Thus, an influx of non-native speakers of the local language has, in fact, posed a language threat in particular circumstances throughout history.
While Puerto Rico differs from the nations discussed above because it has not witnessed a sizable migration of non-Spanish speakers since the Spanish arrived on the island, Aruba has indeed experienced many waves of non-Papiamento speaking immigrants. Aruba historically has been a multilingual and multicultural island. When the Lago Company refinery opened and there was a massive influx of English-speaking immigrants to the island, it was a shock to the local population. The arrival of English-speaking immigrants was counteracted by a strong front on the part of Arubans to maintain their language as a marker of who belonged and who did not (interview with Luciano Milliard). The use of the language as a marker of identity, and as a key component of what it means to be Aruban, has been strengthened as wave after wave of immigrants has come to the island to fill positions in the growing industrial and service sectors.

Micha Croes expressed such ideas of language and identity among immigrants when she said in her interview: “the immigrants will have to learn the language of our community. They will have to learn Papiamento. They have to learn Papiamento. And, when we go somewhere, they have to answer us in Papiamento. When they come here, they need to speak Papiamento. And this is a way that we are protecting our language.”

Though Aruba has a history of immigration and positive political relations with Venezuela and Columbia (many older Arubans remember the day when their only television channels were from Venezuela), there is an ever-growing anti-Spanish immigrant rhetoric that is pervasive throughout the island. While my Aruban participants all reported that the young Spanish-speaking immigrants are learning Papiamento and census data confirms as much, most participants felt that some Spanish-
speaking adults were not making enough effort to learn Papiamento. This sentiment may stem from the immigration patterns of the Spanish speakers, who have moved all over the island, unlike their English-speaking counterparts, who arrived to work in the refinery and generally were confined to the town of San Nicolaas. Thus, the English-speaking immigrants were geographically isolated and the average Aruban had fewer encounters with the English immigrants than he or she does now with Spanish-speaking immigrants. The anti-immigrant sentiment felt on the island was summed up by Luciano Milliard in his interview, when he said: “And it is interesting to see, when you go to San Nicolaas to see, let’s say, the older Arubans and my group having a conversation talking about those immigrants. Saying there are too many immigrants in our country. All of those Latinos, get them out.”

In spite of, in fact some would say because of, the perceived threat that immigrants have posed to native Arubans over the years, both Luciano Milliard and Lydia Emerencia argued that immigration works to strengthen Papiamento as a result of the resistance Arubans wage against the new immigrants and the language that they speak. Through my interviews and my observations, it appears that many Arubans’ view of Spanish and its speakers stem from what Ruiz (1984) would call a language-as-a-problem orientation. In other words the Spanish language is starting to be viewed as something that is not socially acceptable due to its association with the marginalized immigrant population in Aruban society. The association of Spanish as a low prestige language in Aruba undoubtedly is beneficial for the maintenance of Papiamento and actually reduces the potential impact that the influx of Spanish speakers could have on
the island’s linguistic makeup. What is not yet known however, is whether Arubans will continue to learn Spanish as their third or fourth language or whether the stigma associated with Spanish will discourage the younger generation from learning it.

Despite the fact that Puerto Rico has never experienced a massive influx of non-Spanish-speaking immigrants, there have been sizable numbers of returnees from the United States. The influence of return migrants on the island is an aspect of Puerto Rican society that is often overlooked (Kerkhof, 2001). While many Puerto Ricans have spent time in different cities throughout United States, return migrants and their children are often ridiculed because of their inability to speak Spanish with the same accent and lexicon as natives (Kerkhof, 2001). As Carlos Chardón discussed in his interview, Puerto Ricans have never really known what to do with return migrants or how they fit into traditional conceptualizations of Puerto Rican identity. Zentella (1999) echoed such resistance on the part of Puerto Ricans living on the island to accept literary works from “Puerto Ricans” living in the United States into the local canon. Traditional views of what it means to be Puerto Rican, requiring the use of Spanish, precludes writers whose prose is written in English from being adopted into the Puerto Rican canon.

Similar to the immigrants in Aruba, return migrants to Puerto Rico tend to be viewed as a burden rather than an asset within the school system. As a result, these students try to assimilate as quickly as possible so as not to attract too much negative attention. The need to assimilate on the part of the return migrants symbolically reaffirms both the subtle and dominant characteristics of Puerto Rican nationalism,
which requires the use of Spanish. The use of English, or an accented version of Puerto Rican Spanish, can elicit discrimination against those who are deemed to be too “American.” My data confirms that Puerto Ricans speak Spanish among themselves, and those who choose to speak another language among their Puerto Rican brethren are often viewed as outsiders. The use of English among Puerto Ricans can elicit remarks from onlookers such as “Se va por un par de meses y se cree que es gringo” (He is gone for a few months and now he thinks he is a gringo) or simply “No sea tan gringo” (Don’t be such a gringo). While English has always been a marker of status, return migrants who choose to use English to bolster their status can be met with resentment on the part of islanders who do not appreciate their arrogance.

As for language in Aruba, the negative connotations associated with Spanish and Spanish speakers also could lead to younger Arubans having little interest in acquiring Spanish, despite its historical use as a second, third or fourth language by a majority of Arubans. In contrast, return migrants in Puerto Rico have traditionally been the only speakers of English to move to the island in substantial number. As a result, these return migrants have been the “whipping boy,” so to speak, and they are deemed not to be “real” Puerto Ricans if they do not speak the same variety as islanders. Not only does such distinction cause division among return migrants and traditional Puerto Ricans, it also fuels the decades-old rhetoric that by learning English, somehow one are giving up a portion of one’s Puerto Rican identity. It should be noted that the division between return migrants and native Puerto Ricans is not nearly as pronounced as new immigrants to Aruba and native Arubans. This is because return Puerto Rican migrants often have
maintained much of the historical and cultural traditions of Puerto Rico, whereas it would not be common for a newly arrived immigrant to Aruba to know and observe the historical and cultural traditions of Aruba.

Time will tell how the younger generation of Arubans will view Spanish and whether many of them will continue to learn the language as most of their ancestors have. Nevertheless, it is important that, as the Aruban economy grows and requires foreign labor, the government has policies in place that respect the human and linguistic rights of the immigrants. At the same time, Aruban authorities must strive to ensure that safeguards are put in place, and that there is a conscious effort to bolster the use of Papiamento, so that local language and culture can be preserved.

**Language planning efforts on Aruba and Puerto Rico**

**Corpus Planning**

The difference in prestige and status of Papiamento and Spanish has created differing needs regarding corpus planning on the part of Aruba and Puerto Rico, respectively. Spanish is obviously a language of wider communication with a well-known history. Moreover, there are many organizations throughout the world that have been dedicated to its promotion and maintenance. Papiamento, on the other hand, is a much more recent language and it lacks the literary history that Spanish has. In addition, the differences in the orthography between the Papiamentu used in Curaçao, and Bonaire versus that used in Aruba further complicates corpus-planning efforts. In fact, to this day, Aruba has yet to approve an official government-backed dictionary of Aruban Papiamento. While drafts of such a dictionary were completed many years ago,
it has not been recognized as official due to political maneuvering (Croes-Anthony, Duarte-Croes, Emerencia, Henrìette, & Rosenstand, 1997). Notwithstanding the absence of an official dictionary solely in Papiamento, Aruban scholars and authors are working diligently to build a wider selection of literature for islanders to read in Aruban Papiamento. Local writers have worked tirelessly to create Papiamento texts ranging from the translation of famous literary works like *The Diary of Anne Frank* to the writing of traditional oral histories such as the *Kompa Nanzi Stories*, which are said to have originated in West Africa. Despite increased publications every year, it is hard to keep up with the growing interests and Aruban’s newfound love of reading in their own language.

Despite great strides in the past few decades, the lack of well-written reading material is a major concern for many Arubans, especially when discussions of using Papiamento as the medium of instruction arise. Unfortunately, due to Aruba’s insistence on using a spelling system based on words’ etymology, Aruba is the only publisher of books in Aruban Papiamento. The lack of a robust volume of literature written in Papiamento has led to many on the island to question the role that their language should have in the schools. The same concern on the part of parents and schools boards played a major role in Curaçao’s abandonment of Papiamento medium instruction in all schools, as of May 2008 (Interview with Joyce Pereira).

Concerns regarding the lack of materials written in Papiamento are valid, and backers of Papiamento as a medium of instruction have been working to rectify that
concern by increased publication of relevant materials. For now however, it appears that there is a sufficient body of literature for emergent readers to become literate in their mother tongue before being exposed to reading in a second language.

Still, some Arubans remain opposed to the use of Papiamento as the medium of instruction because they believe it would run counter the goal of many, which is to be able to learn sufficient Dutch in order to be able to attend a university in the Netherlands. When asked why some people do not think Papiamento should be used in school, Audrey Tromp of the Department of Education responded,

One of them is that they don't think that Papiamento is fixed enough to be used properly in the schools. So we tell them, but there are other arguments also, such as that we need lots of materials, which we don't have and those cost a lot of money. I would just also say that, most of the students who graduate high school go to study abroad in Holland and they think that if you teach in Papiamento that their English or their Dutch will not be sufficient to succeed in Holland.

Puerto Rican corpus planning differs greatly from the struggles experienced in Aruba because they do not have the same standardization issues. However, there has been some concern regarding the lack of Puerto Rican literature. Although it maybe in Spanish, much of the literature used in Puerto Rican classrooms is not authentically Puerto Rican, and thus does not reflect the cultural, geographic and linguistic realities of Spanish on the island. Moreover, while Puerto Rico has a very rich literary tradition, with its own famous poets, play writers and novelists, it is common for such writers not to be sufficiently taught in the school curriculum. As a result, students are not able to make connections because the use of Spanish in the texts often is not of a Caribbean, or even a Puerto Rican, variety. Similarly, in the English classroom, there is little in the
form of English texts which are written for Puerto Rican English language learners. Thus, for an English language learner in Puerto Rico, reading English texts that are difficult and do not resonate with Puerto Rican culture can lead to unengaged readers who become discouraged and lack confidence.

Interestingly, the arguments against the use of Papiamento in Aruban schools parallel the arguments for increased use of English in the Puerto Rican public schools. Both Dutch and English are viewed as a necessity for success at the post-secondary level, which among the elite from both islands often takes place off the island. Nevertheless, the need for additional materials written in Papiamento has necessitated an acute focus on corpus planning efforts in Aruba, which has not been the case for Puerto Rico. As island polities, however, Aruba and Puerto Rico share similar concerns regarding limited literature that is both authentic and relevant to the unique aspects of their island life in the Caribbean. Thus corpus planning does play a role on both islands.

**Status Planning**

Attainment of official status was a considerably longer venture for Papiamento in Aruba than it was for Spanish in Puerto Rico. Spanish was the sole official language under the Spanish flag, and it only changed to joint official status with English under American occupation in 1898. The only exception throughout its association with the United States came in 1992, when Governor Rafael Hernández Colón passed a law to make Spanish the sole official language of the island. Nevertheless, the law was quickly repealed in 1993, returning Spanish and English to equal status. Regardless of such
language policies, Spanish has never wavered from being the language of everyday use in all domains of Puerto Rican society.

Aruba, on the other hand, has had to fight long and hard for its language to be recognized as official. As a Creole language, its proponents have had to continue to educate the public on its legitimacy as a language. The colonial impact of the Dutch school system, which for over a hundred years worked to convince Papiamento speakers that their Creole language was a bastardized variety incapable of being used for formal education, was and remains significant. As a result of such acute attacks on the psyche of Papiamento speakers, Dutch is still favored as the language of instruction by many Arubans. Furthermore, despite Arubans’ understanding of the importance of Papiamento in their daily lives and their general defense of the language when threatened by English- or Spanish-speaking immigrants, many Arubans still do not believe that Papiamento is a language worthy of being used in the schools. Ramón Todd, a famous Aruban poet and educator, argues that while that status of Papiamento is high, there is still much work to be done in educating Arubans about the benefits of using their language in Aruban schools.

The passing of Papiamento as an official language in May 2003 was a major win for the status of the language. It has led to the use of Papiamento in almost all aspects of the government and legitimized the language in the eyes of many who believed it was just a pigeon language. As the judicial branch and law enforcement in Aruba still must
use Dutch for official business, however, problems remain as important aspects of an infraction or a case often are lost in translation.

One must remember that the move toward officialization has always centered on the school system, and the use of Papiamento as the medium of instruction was one of the principal missions for improving the status of the language. As the majority of the status planning, and language planning in general, has been to allow for the implementation of Papiamento as the medium of instruction in schools, one of the necessary first steps was to garner official status, which the language has now held for six years. Although schools have yet to adopt Papiamento as the language of instruction, the use of the language as a core course in the public school curriculum has worked to build its status. Public opinion has been changing toward more acceptance of Papiamento as the medium of instruction, but educators who are backing such implementation still have a way to go.

Reservations on the part of many parents and teachers regarding the use of Papiamento as the language of instruction stem from the lack of post-secondary options Aruban students have where Papiamento is used. With few post-secondary options on the island, it is the goal of many parents to prepare their children to be successful in university level studies, which will more than likely take place in the Netherlands, the United States or Canada. Thus, many parents believe that the use of Papiamento merely delays the inevitable need to learn an academic variety of both Dutch and English, in order to enjoy future success. As a result, there are still many Arubans who see little
value in their language being used for academic purposes. The viewpoint among many Arubans that Papiamento’s status on the island is secure, and that children learn sufficient Papiamento at home, also serves to undercut proponents of using mother tongue instruction.

The limited use of Papiamento in the schools, and the fact that it is not a language of wider communication, fuels the idea that Papiamento needs to be protected. Evelyn Ruiz-Croes highlighted such feeling when she said, “I think we have to work very hard to safeguard the status of Papiamento and where we wish to be. There are still people who believe that Papiamento is not a language, or maybe a language not worth learning.” Thus, despite official status and its use in almost all notable domains of life in Aruba (except education and the law) language planners and advocates of Papiamento still stress the need for continued language planning to further build and maintain the status of Papiamento.

Puerto Rico’s efforts in the realm of status planning have focused more on diminishing the importance of English than they have on raising the status of Spanish. With Spanish historically holding exceedingly high status, it has been the joint official status of English which has ignited a successful campaign to make English’s official nature purely symbolic.

As Spanish often is taken for granted as the language of widespread use in Puerto Rico, examining Puerto Ricans’ attitudes toward their own Spanish is research that needs to be undertaken. Anecdotal evidence, as well as my own observations and
experiences from living on the island, reveals that Puerto Ricans are not fully certain about how their variety of Spanish strands compared with that of other Spanish-speaking countries throughout the world. There is a relative insecurity among Puerto Ricans about their Spanish as compared to other Spanish speakers, and this creates another layer of complexity to the situation. In my interview with Jorge Schmidt Nieto, he went so far so to argue that the use of a prestigious variety of Spanish is more valuable than knowing English. While further research must be conducted to confirm these assertions, if this is found to be true, it would behoove the Puerto Rican government to take a more active role in promoting a Puerto Rican variety of Spanish such that islanders can feel confident and proud regarding their Spanish vis-à-vis other varieties of Spanish throughout the world.

Though the status of Papiamento and Spanish have relatively high prestige on the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico, respectively, those working in language planning could benefit from an increased emphasis on the local language. The past efforts from the Aruban Department of Education through their campaigns to improve the status of Papiamento exemplify the results that can be achieved. On Puerto Rico, however, a long-standing paranoia regarding the expansion of English has resulted in too much attention being paid to English instruction and not enough toward enhancing the status of Puerto Ricans’ own variety of Spanish.
**Acquisition planning**

Papiamento in Aruba and Spanish in Puerto Rico both have the benefit of holding joint official status on their respective island. As a result, each enjoys various language rights that are not necessarily provided in other geopolitical contexts. Among first world countries, it is commonplace for the language of instruction to be that of a variety of the majority’s first language (Küper, 2003). Recently, UNESCO (2003) declared children the right to be educated in their first language (which still does not happen in many countries), but such documentation is a positive sign that some policy makers are aware of the research that points to the benefits of mother tongue instruction. With that said, there are countless minority groups throughout the world who do not enjoy the fortune of receiving mother tongue instruction (May, 2000). Despite the proven benefits of exposure to a second language at an early age, children who are not literate and who do not have a well-developed academic foundation upon which to build, often fall behind in their content-area courses when taught in a second language (Cummins, 2000). As the acquisition of an academic language requires between four and seven years, students who are taught in a language that is not their own often fall behind and it is difficult for them to ever catch up (Crawford, 2004). For these reasons, Aruban educators have been fighting so hard for the use of Papiamento as the medium of instruction for decades. Aruban’s struggle for Papiamento medium instruction parallels the fight to implement Spanish mediated instruction that Puerto Ricans had throughout the first fifty years of U.S. control. As has been well documented, the
adoption of Spanish as the medium of instruction in Puerto Rico in 1949 changed the entire academic landscape there, both for teachers and students.

Accordingly, efforts to improve acquisition planning on both islands have centered on the language of instruction. The use of Papiamento in public schools is just now starting to gain the support of Arubans because like many language contexts in Africa and other places where the language has just recently been codified, Arubans have been led to believe that their language is not worthy of use in the classroom. It has been only recently that Arubans are slowly being convinced of the cognitive and cultural benefits of mother tongue instruction. Ramón Todd explained part of this problem in his interview when he said:

It is a barrier and we have a huge language barrier with Dutch as the language of instruction… It is a big problem that people keep having the idea that well, "I was taught in Dutch and I learned" but nobody knows how much you have lost through all of those years where our children repeat years. Our repetition is very high. How much we read, our people don't read! Why don't they read? [It is] because they have learned to read in a language that is not their own. And these are the kinds of things that we need to bring forth to the people of Aruba to let them understand why they should support the use of their own language in school.

Todd’s mention of particularly high failure rates is a major concern for those working in education. The lack of success that Aruban students have in the public school system, with retention rates ranging from nine percent in primary education to twenty-five percent in HAVO-E, is extreme (Central Bureau of Statistics Aruba, 2006). Furthermore, of the Aruban students who are successful enough to gain admittance to institutions in The Netherlands for university studies, only half actually finish the degree that they set out to study for (Pereira, 2004).
Puerto Rico also has dismal education statistics, but its poor numbers cannot be blamed on the medium of education, with Spanish being the medium of instruction in Puerto Rican public schools. Despite mother tongue instruction, Puerto Rico consistently fares poorly in all aspects of nation-wide testing. A comparison between Puerto Rico and the rest of the United States on the U.S. national mathematics assessment shows that Puerto Rican students fifty percent worse than their state-side peers for both fourth and eighth graders (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). On the other hand, Puerto Rico’s retention rates and graduation rates have improved tremendously in comparison to the early and mid-1900s, when it was common for students to attain only an elementary school education. Spanish mediated instruction undoubtedly has opened the doors for many students to gain content area knowledge. However, poor teacher preparation, low socio-economic status and a lack of parental involvement, together with teachers who are overworked and underpaid, has resulted in a public education system with major problems in its general quality, not to mention in the teaching of English as a second language (Carroll, 2005).

As it pertains to other languages, acquisition planning is different on Aruba then Puerto Rico. Aruba’s multilingual reality makes the teaching and learning of other languages, namely English and Spanish, something that is almost taken for granted. Arubans also pride themselves on their ability to speak many languages. In Puerto Rico, however, it would be very easy to go days without hearing English or any language other than Spanish for that matter. Furthermore, English education in Puerto Rico traditionally has been tied to economic capital, which assumes that the learning of
English will open doors as one enters the job market. Interestingly, the commonly held assumption that English serves as a gatekeeper toward upward social mobility has been called into question by social scientist Jorge Schmidt Nieto. Schmidt Nieto believes that there is little evidence that knowing English actually provides access to better jobs (Interview with Jorge Schmidt Nieto). The fact that Puerto Rico exhibits aspects of both foreign and second language learning environments (Blau & Dayton, 1997) makes it difficult to create a coherent language curriculum. The various geographic regions of Puerto Rico, all of which have their own needs and cultural nuances, further compound that difficulty (Carroll, 2005).

One major benefit of multilingual environments is that they generally provide students the opportunity to receive comprehensible input in a number of different languages from a young age. This has been the case in Aruba’s multilingual context, where formal instruction of English and Spanish has served to reinforce the multilingualism that is already found on the island. As Arubans grow up, Dutch, English, Spanish and Papiamento surround them, and as a result multilingualism is viewed as the norm and a logistical reality. Thus, it is not surprising that according to census data, more than seventy percent of native Arubans report that they speak Spanish and/or English fluently (Central Bureau of Statistics Aruba, 2001B). Conversely, in Puerto Rico, many students do not grow up with similar access to other languages. English is generally the language that children in Puerto Rico have the most access to via television and other forms of mass media, but the society as a whole is monolingual. Therefore, it is difficult for students to experience the benefits of learning English
because the average Puerto Rican is not using English on a daily basis. As there is little need for the use of English by the average Puerto Rican, and a history of poor implementation of the English curriculum, only nineteen percent of Puerto Ricans report that they speak English well (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007).

Another factor that comes into play in acquisition planning is the role of socioeconomic status. As was discussed in the chapter on Puerto Rico, children whose parents are able to afford to send them to a private school have an almost immediate advantage toward those whose parents do not have the same resources. Thus, socioeconomic status in Puerto Rico plays a major role in who learns English and who does not. Such distinction in socioeconomic status works to exacerbate already clearly marked lines between the have and the have-nots.

While socioeconomic status was a theme that emerged from my data in Puerto Rico, it was not the case in Aruba. My data from Aruba did not suggest as vast of a difference in socioeconomic status. This probably stems from stronger public schools in Aruba. While there are undoubtedly some elite private schools in Aruba, middle class families tend to send their children to state-sponsored schools. However the Ministry of Education in Aruba, is much more liberal than Puerto Rico or the U.S. in their distinction of what constitutes a private school. For instance, parochial schools as well as normal private schools are eligible for state funds, making tuition minimal or free. Furthermore, private schools in Aruba are most similar to charter schools in the United States, where the private school is able to implement their own curriculum. This was
exemplified in a visit to a private school in San Nicolaas where classes were taught in English and the main curriculum was based around technology. Nevertheless, the education system and the languages that one learns in Aruba does not seem to be based as much on socioeconomic status as it does in Puerto Rico.

Acquisition planning has been the focal point of each island’s LPP efforts. Work in corpus and status planning in Aruba has helped facilitate the future use of Papiamento as the language of instruction. In Puerto Rico, teachers’ unions, as well as many politicians, fought long, hard and successfully for Spanish to be used as the language of instruction, which has now been the case since 1949. As Puerto Rico already uses Spanish as the language of instruction, its acquisition planners need to work on a curriculum that both supports children learning English and reinforces literacy skills in the students’ native language. Aruba, on the other hand, needs to continue to work toward mother tongue instruction. Such instruction would allow students to develop a strong foundation in literacy and their other content areas, and in turn, that foundation could be translated into other languages, as they mature.

It should be noted that acquisition planning is also the most politically contested aspect of LPP on both islands. Thus, it is important that educators, who are knowledgeable about the related theories and historical significances of language instruction, be consulted before designing or implementing LPP.
**Prestige Planning**

The islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico have both consciously and unconsciously conducted aspects of prestige planning that have played a role in the successful language maintenance of Papiamento and Spanish, respectively. As was described in the second chapter, prestige planning is one of the newer and least discussed areas of LPP. According to Haarmann, prestige planning is “planning with regard to elements of evaluation in the ethnic identity of a speech community” (p. 87). According to Haarmann, in addition to traditional aspects of language planning, further attention must include both ethnopolitical and ethnopsychologic variables (Haarmann, 1986: 86). Despite a variety of actions that have worked to build the prestige of their local languages, in the literature regarding LPP in Aruba and Puerto Rico there is essentially no mention of conscious prestige planning.

More recent discussions of prestige planning have been brought into mainstream conversations of LPP by Ager (2005), who discusses prestige planning as the attitudinal stance among speakers toward a particular language. There are obviously cases where one language can hold both high status as well as high prestige, for example English in the United States or French in France, but such correlation is not mutually exclusive. Ager’s description of Welsh in Wales, however, exemplifies a language’s ability to garner high levels of prestige even when it does not hold the highest level of status. Thus, it is entirely possible that a local or covert prestige can work to maintain a language or language variety, despite the presence of a powerful language with high status.
Understanding how a language variety can attain high prestige without high status stems from a better understanding of users attitudes toward their language and those it is in contact with. Language planners therefore must be careful in their emotional appeals. Haarmann (1986) argues that such planning should not come in the form of direct defiance of more powerful languages, but instead such planning should focus on bolstering the realization of multiple identities that one can have. He goes on to say: “Ideally, prestige planning in a setting of contact between a minority language and a dominant language is balanced so that the potential circumstances of ethnic friction and conflict can be reduced to a minimum” (1986: 89).

Incorporating a minoritized language as an official language can build the status of the language, but for many regional and/or minoritized languages, this political gesture is only meant to be symbolic and it is not accompanied with the necessary funds or policies to ensure the languages use (Fainglod, 2004). For example, the recognition of indigenous languages in national constitutions has led to greater status of the individual languages in many countries. The subsequent lack of funding for programs and their implementation, however, has undermined any movement to raise the language’s prestige (Faingold, 2004; Hamel, 1997; Kamwangamalu, 2004).

Although prestige planning in Aruba and Puerto Rico constitutes a rather unexplored area of study within LPP, both islands provide excellent examples of prestige planning. Aruba’s government and historical reality has allowed for the prestige of Papiamento to remain high, even though it has not held official status for
many years. Recent changes in public policy have raised the language’s status in terms of its use in government and in the realm of education, but not to the exclusion of Dutch or even of Spanish or English. Moreover, the prestige of Papiamento has been entrenched in the daily lives of Arubans.

With both Papiamento and Spanish already used pervasively throughout daily life, both islands have unique and oftentimes informal spaces where their language and culture is embraced. The Cas di Cultura in Oranjestad, Aruba is an excellent example of one of these spaces. The Cas di Cultura is an institution that promotes plays and other artistic performances, most of which are in Papiamento. Plays in Papiamento from Aruba, Bonaire and Curacao, as well as translated renditions of popular international works, are performed here on a regular basis. Such exposure provides school children and adults the opportunity to use Papiamento and see it used in an artistic, informative and enjoyable light. The Cas di Cultura also provides a fun environment for students to build on their literacy skills in Papiamento. The use of literacy and mother tongue instruction was the topic of Liddicoat (2007), which argues that the use of a stigmatized language for literacy will work to build the language’s prestige. Aruba is a literate island and traditionally Arubans have become literate in Papiamento without much formal instruction. The various newspapers, magazines and radio and television programs in Papiamento work to build the prestige of the language. Moreover, recent steps to use Papiamento with emergent readers have worked to magnify the prestige of the language. Literacy in Papiamento among Aruban adults has secured a higher level of status for Papiamento than many other indigenous languages and cannot be
discounted as factor in the successful language maintenance. Thus, literacy as a whole in Aruba has worked to help build the language’s prestige.

The Catholic Church historically has played an important role in life on Aruba, and it has served as an institution significant in the maintenance of the prestige of Papiamento. Similar to religious services, which continue to be presided in Papiamento, the various parties and social events, which are sponsored by the Church, also provide a place in which locals can interact with their peers and Church leaders in language. This use bolsters the prestige of Papiamento, and such events should not be taken for granted just because Papiamento almost always has been the language used in the religious domain for Catholic Arubans. In fact, as the Dutch loosened their reign on religious practices in the ABC islands, they could have started to demand that Dutch be used as the language of worship of the Catholic Church (but they decided not to). Unlike many places in the world where a foreign language was used as the base for religious services, the presence of the Catholic Church protected the Papiamento vernacular of Arubans and worked to legitimize the language and build its prestige.

Puerto Rico has a plethora of examples of prestige planning efforts. Though these efforts are rarely created to retain language per se, their *de facto* effect has led to the maintenance of Spanish on the island, as well as a continued sense of national identity. Puerto Ricans are well known throughout the United States and the world for their jovial attitude towards festivals and various holidays. As part of the United States, U.S. holidays such as Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Veteran’s Day, and Memorial Day
are recognized, but there are also a variety of other holidays recognized only on the island, including the Emancipation of Slavery Day, the Day of the Puerto Rican Constitution, and Eugenio Maria de Hostos Day, all of which entitle government employees and public schools a day off. Frequent holidays, as well as investments from both the private and public sector, facilitate in providing spaces where Puerto Ricans can come together to enjoy typical music, eat, drink and take pleasure in their beautiful island.

In addition to the various recognized holidays, there are countless local festivals that happen throughout the calendar year that allow Puerto Ricans to come together. Traditionally, the mayor of each municipality, together with the local Catholic Church, come together to throw what are called fiestas patronales. This is a week-long to ten day celebration of the patron saint of the town. The state-side equivalent would be a county fair, as they have many rides and kiosks, and a variety of local musicians play every night. While these festivals have largely lost their religious significance, they still play a major role in bringing the town together in a celebration largely of “Puerto Ricanness” thus working to reinforce common perceptions of Puerto Rican national identity. Again, the fiestas patronales provide a space where Puerto Rican culture exudes through both traditional and contemporary music and people of all ages can come together and share in the experience. I would argue that the holiday festivities and local festivals play a major role in the life of many Puerto Ricans and also provide islanders the opportunity to remain close to their family and friends, in turn reinforces the maintenance of the Puerto Rican identity and language.
Both Aruba and Puerto Rico have aspects of prestige planning embedded throughout various aspects of island life, but it seems to be much more apparent in Puerto Rico. The plethora of local festivals in Puerto Rico has worked to create a tangible experience that Puerto Ricans can live, which consequently works to continue to build on the shared experiences influencing Puerto Ricans’ shared sense of national identity. The size of Aruba and its dependence on tourism, however, makes it difficult for similar festivals to be created there because the private interests will generally attract tourists, which often necessitates the use of English, Spanish or Dutch in such an event. The use of these languages could negate the strengthening of Papiamento and in fact, actually may work to strengthen the use of the other language. In this sense, Aruba’s dependence on tourism hinders its ability to create this type of space for the use and celebration of certain cultural aspects particular to Aruban Papiamento, that are commonplace in Puerto Rico. Nevertheless, it is important that Aruban youth have a forum to celebrate their unique culture and language; therefore, more sponsorship of such festivals could work toward the maintenance of high prestige for Papiamento.

While prestige planning has played a successful role in Aruba and Puerto Rico, in some language contexts throughout the world, too much language shift has already occurred, which has made similar prestige planning efforts more difficult than in Aruba and Puerto Rico. Liddicoat (2007) discussed many cases throughout the world where the native language was used in early literacy programs. The promotion of literacy as a worthwhile practice in languages that have witnessed language shift can go a long way in promoting and building the prestige of the language. Prestige planning can thus be
implemented in a very conscious manner where the direct goal is to allow community members to see the utility of using their own language through literacy and or other events. At the same time, prestige planning can occur without planners even realizing it as when they create festivals, plays, and other events where there is a safe place for language to be used, without interference from competing languages.

It is important to note that not just any event works to build prestige, however. In fact, many events can actually work to lower the prestige of a language. Both Aruba and Puerto Rico are popular destinations for various well-known musicians who sing in both English and Spanish. If all the festivities and/or music are controlled by speakers of another language or companies who do not advertise in the local language, the local population who enjoys such an event will start to associate the foreign language with that of prestige and enjoyment. Although it is unlikely that one or two major concerts a year would change much in islander’s perspectives towards language, the total absence of local language in music and arts for an extended period of time could have a devastating effect in lowering a languages’ prestige. Thus, a lack of financial backing for the development of local musicians and artists could result in the local scene becoming dominated by artisans and performers who do not speak the local language. Although this seems unlikely in Puerto Rico, where the government and local organizations have worked to maintain and promote the arts, in Aruba, because of it’s relatively small population, the lack of such promotion for a number of years could be devastating to this aspect of prestige planning there.
Prestige planning efforts on both islands have been successful in their maintenance of the local languages, but it is unclear what price has been paid. Recent trends in immigration in Aruba have attracted a Spanish-speaking population and that population and their language are resented. The emotional attachment and perception that Spanish is related to low wages and immigrant status grinds on the perception of threat among Arubans as they move away from a language-as-a-resource orientation to that of a language-as-a-problem orientation. This recent move toward viewing Spanish a having very little prestige should be a concern to Arubans, for it has and will continue to marginalize speakers of Spanish living on the island. For that reason, language planners in Aruba should work to maintain the high prestige of Papiamento, but they should not do so to the exclusion of the other languages spoken on the island.

Like Aruba, Puerto Rico has been successful in promoting and maintaining the prestige of Puerto Rican Spanish, but in Puerto Rico it is often done at the expense of English. The political rhetoric that has defended the local vernacular has done so by juxtaposing it to English. Puerto Rican language planners need to understand the importance of Spanish, but not by discounting the benefits that more bilingual Puerto Ricans could bring to the island. As discussed earlier, even though English holds high status, it does not hold equally high prestige in Puerto Rico. The relatively low prestige of English in Puerto Rico has been a blessing for continued language maintenance, but it has had a detrimental effect on the learning of English. In fact, due to the imposed nature of early U.S. policies, English is still symbolic of Puerto Rico’s colonial relationship and as a result, it is considered by many to be anti-Puerto Rican. As a
result, any movement to improve the prestige of English would have to be countered with an even greater push to promote and strengthen the prestige of Spanish. Past movements to increase English education had little effect because of the fear that English will eventually win out over Spanish. Therefore, language planners must work to develop a campaign that will allow Puerto Ricans to engage in multiple identities. By continuing to promote Spanish as the foundation and the dominant identity, but also allowing space for one to adopt alternative identities, such as that of English users, without jeopardizing one’s national identity.

Although prestige planning has not been a focus of attention in either Aruba or Puerto Rico, government, organizations and individual people have worked to maintain a high level of prestige for their local vernacular despite the high status of the colonial language. In the case of Aruba, island residents historically have been able to balance the use of multiple languages while simultaneously working to build the prestige of their own language. Puerto Rico, on the other hand has experienced a very intense fight against a colonial power that sought to impose the use of English. As a result, Puerto Rico developed an emotional and attitudinal affinity for Spanish and the prestige given to Spanish has come at the cost of learning English effectively. Aruba’s linguistic situation teaches us that it is entirely possible to create and maintain an atmosphere where the local language is maintained while other languages are learned at the same time. At this time, however, Arubans must be strong in their understanding of the power of Papiamento and not use its high prestige and status to discriminate against others. Such discrimination, especially against the new waves of Spanish-speaking immigrants,
is a move in the wrong direction. Continued prestige planning for Papiamento is needed to strengthen Arubans’ feelings about their own language and its place in Aruban society. With this necessary emphasis, Arubans can continue to accept the benefits of learning Spanish along with the other languages that they generally learn.

**Social amplification of threat framework**

The main purpose of the case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico was to gain a better understanding of the extent to which Papiamento and Spanish are threatened as the native language on the respective islands. While I would argue that neither language is threatened in the sense that neither island will experience any language shift away from their current vernaculars in the near future, historically there has been rhetoric on both islands that has promoted the idea that the language, and specifically the local identity, is threatened. One of the ways to understand how such feelings of threat have spread throughout the islands is to use a framework developed in the study of risk. The social amplification of risk framework (SARF), described in Kasterson et al. (1988), is the theory that there are specific social agents, namely the media, which report on events which are then magnified due to one’s own personal experiences with the discussed topic. An example relative to issues in LPP might be:

An English-speaking person goes into a U.S. store to buy a pair of jeans. While in the store, the English-speaking person overhears other shoppers speaking Spanish and sees a sign with an advertisement in English and Spanish. The English speaker does not think much of this encounter, but two days later reads an article about an increased number of undocumented immigrants working in their city.
At face value, the news article might be alarming to the reader, but when coupled with the experience of not hearing English being used by the other shoppers and seeing Spanish on the advertisement, the newspaper article could potentially incite fear and the perception of threat. Such perceptions of threat may lead people to believe that eventually immigrants are going to take over and subsequently change the local language and way of life. While this may be an extreme example, the anti-immigrant discourse throughout the U.S. is full of similar fears.

Similar examples of experiences with Spanish speakers are common in states like Arizona and California, where there is an abundance of people who speak both Spanish and English fluently. Unfortunately, often assumptions are made on the part of the English speaker that the people speaking Spanish do not speak English. While this assumption may be true, it also may be the case that those same shoppers speak English fluently but prefer to speak to each other in Spanish. Nevertheless, the assumptions that one makes based on his or her own experiences aids in the creation of a perception of threat. Such experiences often tend to trump reports from the media or even scientific studies that report findings contrary to one’s experiences (Rosa, 2003).

The question becomes: What does the social amplification of risk framework have to do with language threat? My research in Aruba and Puerto Rican language contexts reveals similar situations in which colonial languages have been and continue to be perceived to be more of a threat than they actually are. The colonial relationship provides an interesting wrinkle in the discussion of language threat because both the
Netherlands and the U.S. attempted, at various points in history, to implement their language at the expense of the local language. However, immigration patterns as well as local prestige of Papiamento and Spanish on the two islands, have secured each language’s existence, at least for the foreseeable future.

The social amplification of risk framework, which I refer to in this dissertation as the social amplification of threat (SAT), provides language planners a clearer explanation and describes the extent to which the local languages are threatened. The particular linguistic contexts on both islands bode well under this framework because both islands have witnessed intense propaganda and rhetoric defending the native language against that of the colonizer. Such rhetoric, often promulgated through the media, is processed by individual people who themselves have had experiences with the foreign language. One’s own experiences with speakers of another language, or even the difficulty one goes through in learning the second language, can strengthen negative sentiment toward the language being discussed in the media and, in turn, present it as a threat to the national language and identity.

Aruban media is full of rhetoric directly and indirectly pointing to Papiamento being the language most representative of the culture and identity of Arubans. The long struggle for Status Aparte also led key politicians like Betico Croes to create an atmosphere where non-Arubans, who were generally assumed to be non-Papiamento speaking immigrants, were viewed as a threat to Arubanness. This threat to Aruban identity worked to strengthen the national identity of the island, as well as strengthen the
status and prestige of Papiamento. The political rhetoric, coupled with the experiences of the average Aruban who witnessed different waves of immigration, has made its mark on the perception of threat among many Arubans. As a result, they tend to inflate or amplify the actual potential for threat that outside languages have to Aruban Papiamento. Such influences could range from a variety of common interactions, for example, going to the store and overhearing English or Spanish being spoken by other customers or the store’s staff or going to a restaurant and being greeted in Spanish by the host. Experiences such as these, when reconfirmed by the media, may lead to an exaggerated fear that one’s language or culture is indeed threatened.

The Puerto Rican language context mirrors much of the rhetoric that is pervasive in the English-only movement in the United States, where the use of an outside language is identified as being anti-American. In Puerto Rico, the use of a language other than Spanish can be viewed as anti-Puerto Rican, depending on the context of the speech act. The use of English among Puerto Ricans also can be viewed as a way of showing off one’s linguistic and cultural capital but also can be a sign of arrogance, depending on who is listening. The fight for Spanish to be the medium of instruction in the public schools, as well as the constant questions regarding what the language situation would be like if the island were ever to become a state, have elicited a very strong emotional connection to Spanish in Puerto Rico. Despite there being essentially no language shift away from Spanish and no sizeable migration of non-Spanish speaking immigrants, English in Puerto Rico historically has been treated as a threat to the local language and identity.
The promulgation and movement of such ideas, I would argue, are better understood within the SAT framework. It is understandable that Puerto Ricans would have defended their language and culture in response to the draconian top-down policies of the United States during the first half of the 20th century. Understanding the success that the nationalist movement had in rejuvenating a sense of Puerto Rican identity that in turn was directly correlated to the maintenance of Spanish is key. Such understanding can provide valuable direction as to what kind of media and campaigns would have to be waged in order to promote a sense of Puerto Rican nationalism while simultaneously improving English education in the island.

Similarly to the case of Aruba, most Puerto Ricans have been exposed to English-speaking people at one time or another. However, unlike in Aruba, where there is a considerable population who speaks English as their first language (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2001), those who only speak English in Puerto Rico are generally tourists, on the island for business or military duty or perhaps an English professor. For that reason, much of the English-speaking influence many Puerto Ricans have experienced has been through English television and music. The other common source of contact with English with which Puerto Ricans are generally familiar is the English class, which Puerto Ricans often refer to as “el difícil” or “the difficult” one, according to Carlos Chardón. Negative experiences with English in schools, as well as the concern on the part of older Puerto Ricans that television and music are slowly eroding Puerto Rican ideals seem to play their perceptions of threat as they relate to English. Thus English, and more generally, “Americanization,” work to threaten Puerto Rican ideals in a larger,
more theoretical sense. The social amplification of threat has grown over the years, but it seems to be fading slowly with the continued Commonwealth status of the island. Today, ideas regarding language and the perception of threat tend to flare up primarily when there are renewed discussions of increased use of English in schools or when a referendum regarding statehood is being discussed.

Throughout my interviews and my analysis of different news and academic publications on both Aruba and Puerto Rico, it was obvious that language threat is not at the forefront of the average islander’s mind. For example, when asked what the view of the average Puerto Rican was regarding the threat to Spanish, Carlos Chardón responded that they did not really care. When I asked why not, he responded, “… these are topics that are only spoken about by the elite. The average Puerto Rican has his identity, and he knows who he is, and he does not give a damn about these other issues.” According to my data, both Papiamento in Aruba and Spanish in Puerto Rico are vibrant languages that locals use throughout their daily lives and day to day struggles, on both islands, severely outweigh discussions and thoughts regarding the future of language use of the island, as a result, conversations of language threat are not the norm for most islanders. Therefore, while the majority of Arubans and Puerto Ricans take their first language for granted, the conscious decisions and concerns come at the elite level where politicians, educators and the media work to create policies to protect the local language, as well as prepare the islands’ youth to be competitive in the future.

Both my Aruban and Puerto Rican participants were quick to point out that their local languages are not threatened in the sense that language shift is underway.
However, participants on both islands understood the necessity of not taking one’s native language for granted and the importance of maintaining programs and organizations dedicated to the promotion of that language. While both Arubans and Puerto Ricans have experienced aspects of the SAT, it is important to understand that positive media promoting multilingualism or bilingualism would not necessarily be effective in changing most islanders’ minds regarding the use of foreign languages. In order to amplify the effect of media, citizens must have experiences that would confirm any positive press or media attention regarding those other languages. I would argue that Puerto Ricans as a whole understand the importance of English and want their children to learn the language and thus the general citizen is really starting to see beyond the political rhetoric that pits Spanish against English. This has been evidenced over the past thirty years with the max exodus of middle class students from public to private schools where it is understood that they will learn English more successfully. The average Puerto Rican does not see English as a threat to Spanish because English plays such a minimal role in the everyday lives of most Puerto Ricans. Thus, politicians should begin to exercise caution as they pedal old party platforms discounting the need for English. I believe Puerto Ricans’ experiences and perceptions tell them that being bilingual in Spanish and English actually is beneficial and not a threat to either Spanish or the Puerto Rican identity.

Aruba, on the other hand, is faced with an ever-increasing immigration of Spanish speakers. Therefore, it is important for the media and politicians to protect the use of Spanish as a language right, but at the same time they should encourage and offer
classes in Papiamento to the new immigrants. While this has already started to happen, Arubans need to be able to have positive experiences and see for themselves that the new immigrants are indeed learning and using Papiamento before their perception of threat will diminish.

**The perception of threat and its impact on national identity**

Perceived threats to language and culture have worked to create and strengthen nation-states throughout history, but often to the detriment and extinction of local indigenous languages (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). As a common national language became one of the principal ingredients in creating a cohesive and powerful nation-state, minority languages were pressured to give up many of their cultural and linguistic practices for the betterment of the nation. France, which is commonly referred to as the first nation-state, promoted the use of French instead of the various minority languages used throughout the different regions of the country (Ostler, 2005). As the continued use of regional languages was seen as a threat to the newly developed nation, there was a conscious effort by the French government to bring together the linguistically and culturally diverse groups of people in order to unify as a stronger political entity.

The colonial ideologies of imposing the colonizer’s language have been challenged over time, as minority groups started to voice their opposition due to understandable resentment. More recently those working in LPP as well as local speakers of threatened languages have led a new struggle to maintain and protect the language rights of speakers of all languages, including the often-stigmatized regional
and minoritized languages (Fishman, 1991; Fishman 2001). Past paradigms of one country: one language have been disputed and linguistic human rights of minority language users have come to the forefront of language planning and policy (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). Leaders in the fight for language rights have published on the importance of protecting regional languages such as Welsh, Catalan, Maori, Inuktitut, and French (in Quebec), among many others (May, 2003). The right to receive a primary education in one’s mother tongue also has been at the very core of improving literacy rates and working to provide basic linguistic human rights to speakers of minority languages (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages, 2003).

As colonies of world powers, both Aruba and Puerto Rico were and continue to be tied to official languages that represent their political associations; however, unlike the regional languages mentioned in the previous paragraph, these two islands are far more geographically isolated from speakers of the colonizers’ languages. The islands’ geographic isolation has limited immigration from the Netherlands and the U.S., but did not exempt either from strong colonial policies and presence.

In the early stages of the colonization process, Aruba and Puerto Rico both benefited from an established base of nationalist leaders who did not take kindly to their loss of authority to the colonial superpowers. It is important to remember that while the Dutch have controlled Aruba since the 1630s their policies on the island were quite laissez faire. That allowed locals to become very instrumental in the local government until the early 1900s, when the Dutch created The Netherlands Antilles and Curaçao was
named the capital. Similarly, Puerto Rico had secured its own autonomous state shortly before it was ceded to the U.S. in 1898, and also had its own politicians and influential elite. When the Dutch and U.S. started to impose their respective colonization efforts, the local politicians responded with nationalistic discourses that highlighted the differences between locals and the colonizers. In essence, island leaders were working to define core cultural ideals to rally around, which became a necessity in opposing the various colonial policies that sought to assimilate Arubans and Puerto Ricans as Dutch and Americans, respectively.

The influence in the education sector to eradicate Papiamento and English on the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico were followed by harsh words from politicians from Holland and the U.S. respectively. It was a commonly held idea that, as a colony of the Dutch or of the U.S., the constituents should lose their mother tongue and adopt that of the colonizer to show their solidarity and respect for their government. Political leaders on Aruba and Puerto Rico, however, countered the colonial ideologies and argued vehemently to maintain their respective local language and culture. Aruba’s movement toward separation, and their eventual attainment of Status Aparte, defined the importance of Papiamento as a marker of their identity. A similar move toward local autonomy among Puerto Ricans, who also worked to rally nationalist pride, resulted in the attainment of Commonwealth Status. The rallies of nationalist pride on both islands came in direct opposition to mounting attempts to colonize.
Despite the fact that many of the core ideals of Arubanness and Puerto Ricanness presumably were present, it was only after major policy changes promulgated by their colonial powers that islanders were forced to examine what it meant to be Aruban and Puerto Rican. Aruba did experience migration of non-Papiamento speakers and the island has always been a multilingual island where one language has been used as the *lingua franca*. Thus, Dutch, Spanish and English-speaking immigrants continued to learn and use Papiamento because of the political capital that is associated with it. The Aruban multilingual context contrasts sharply to the monolingual context of Puerto Rico, where there has never been a sizeable migration of non-Spanish speaking people. As such, the threat that was posed through English-only schooling policies was defeated soundly, thus squashing any immediate threat to Spanish.

In Aruba, immigrants were faced with a choice: they could either go against the grain, elect not to learn Papiamento and risk being ostracized and not accepted, or they could maintain their own language at home and insist that their children learn Papiamento as a symbol of their willingness to assimilate into Aruba’s unique culture. My data suggests that there are a number of societal cues that immigrants to Aruba would have picked up on shortly after moving to the island. While Arubans are on the whole extremely supportive of and nice to visitors, Papiamento is essential in being able to claim any sort of “Arubanness.” This is felt throughout the island and primarily in the anti-immigrant discourse. While Aruba’s anti-immigrant discourse strongly encourages immigrants to use Papiamento, the general multilingual environment and language-as-a-resource orientation encourages immigrants to maintain their native language even as
they add Papiamento to their oftentimes complex linguistic repertoire. This is refreshingly different from the language-as-a-problem orientations that seem to permeate many countries throughout the world. This view that a minority’s first language is unnecessary and unwanted baggage, is frequently experienced by immigrants in the United States, where anti-immigrant discourses and English-only proponents reiterate the importance of linguistic assimilation.

**Summary**

This chapter has discussed a variety of themes that emerged from my data in Aruba and Puerto Rico. The different colonial histories of the two islands provided the foundation to future language use. Dutch colonial policies allowed for the existence of other languages and their initial *laissez-faire* involvement in aspects of Aruban language allowed for Papiamento to grow in prestige and status long enough that Papiamento was able to survive policies that sought to demolish it in the late 19th and 20th centuries. On the other hand, Puerto Rico has never been an island with a significant population of speakers of different languages. The indigenous groups mixed quickly with the Spanish conquistadores and Spanish colonial practices ensured the use of Spanish in schools.

Aruba and Puerto Rico also have experienced very different immigration patterns. Apart from the slave populations that arrived speaking a number of different African languages, Puerto Rico never has experienced an influential wave of immigrants who do not speak Spanish. Aruba, on the other hand, has experienced multiple waves of immigrants, including those who came to work in the oil refining industry and, more recently, in tourism. The presence of the immigrants prompted Arubans to come
together and language became a symbol of Arubanness where a clear line was drawn between those who were able to speak Papiamento and those who were not. Puerto Rico’s only similar experience has involved the return migration of people of Puerto Rican heritage who moved to the United States to seek better paying jobs and then return. While many of these return migrants to Puerto Rico speak some form of Spanish, it tends not to be of the standard Puerto Rican variety or even fully fluent. Nevertheless, return migrants to Puerto Rico are not truly immigrants like those who have moved to Aruba speaking primarily English and Spanish and thus have less difficulty assimilating into the dominant society.

In this chapter, I also discussed various aspects of LPP and how each one of the subfields: corpus, status, acquisition, and prestige have played a role in LPP efforts on the two islands. Both Aruban and Puerto Rican LPP efforts have focused on acquisition planning, as both islands have struggled to use their native language in the classroom, and Aruba is still in the middle of this fight. Furthermore, I argued that prestige planning is an aspect of LPP that has been a common practice on both islands, though it has gone relatively unnoticed. However, I believe conscious efforts to improve and maintain prestige planning efforts will go a long way in the maintenance of both Papiamento and Spanish on Aruba and Puerto Rico, respectively.

The chapter concluded with sections discussing a new framework that describes how the perception of language threat is amplified and how this perception of threat has impacted the idea of national identity on both islands. The social amplification of threat
framework allows researchers to better understand how ideas regarding language threat are promulgated and amplified. Significantly, while media plays an obvious role in the dissemination of ideas, it is also the personal experiences that impact the way in which they react to such stimuli. Negative and/or defensive reactions on the part of locals have brewed a strong sense of national identity among both Arubans and Puerto Ricans. Finally, the two island nations continue to work in their development of local identity as they continue their association with their respective colonizer. However, as islanders continue to create and re-create what it means to be Aruban or Puerto Rican, they undoubtedly will continue to use language as a very important symbol of their complex identity.
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

The goal of this research has been to provide a detailed historical analysis of LPP efforts on the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico and how such efforts have led to a sense of language threat. In this chapter, I will specifically answer the research questions posed in Chapter 1 and offer specific recommendations to the islands of Aruba and Puerto Rico in terms of what can be done with future LPP ventures. The chapter will close with recommendations for future research and a concluding statement.

Research Questions

Main research question: What ways, if any, has another language(s) been perceived as a threat on Aruba and Puerto Rico and what has that perception of threat led to?

To different degrees, Aruba and Puerto Rico have experienced the perception of threat toward their local language. While the origins of Papiamento are still debated, the role that the language has had in the creation of Aruban identity and nationalism is not. Before I initiated my research in Aruba, I assumed that Dutch would present the most significant threat to Aruban Papiamento; however, the past colonial practices on the part of the Dutch, as well as the considerable presence of African slaves and Sephardic Jews, created a linguistic landscape where Dutch held high status, but local prestige was measured in one’s ability to speak Papiamento. As an island where merchants arrived from all over the Caribbean and the world, Papiamento became the language that identified a person as being a local rather than a foreigner. The cultural and even social capital awarded to Papiamento carried the language through the 20th century despite
additional direct political moves on the part of the Dutch government to require the use of Dutch in the classroom. A later influx of English speakers to work in the Lago Company oil refinery reaffirmed Papiamento as the language of Arubans when it was used to divide the population among locals and outsiders. This theme has been revisited recently as an influx of English-speaking immigrants has moved to the island to work in the tourism industry. As a result of these waves of immigrants, the perception of threat to Papiamento has been concerned more with the speakers of English and Spanish, who have moved to the island in great numbers, than the very colonizers who consciously sought to make the island Dutch-speaking. Although Aruba’s struggle for Status Aparte also figured into bolstering the status and prestige of Papiamento, in terms of language threat, such political maneuvering largely has been overshadowed by the perceived threat to Papiamento that immigrants have had. Apart from the impact of immigration, one must take into consideration the fact that Papiamento does not exist in total isolation and thus to an extent is supported and reinforced by its use in Bonaire and Curaçao.

The history of Spanish in Puerto Rico paints a rather different picture. As a colony of Spain for over four hundred years, the Spanish language and a sense of Puerto Ricanness was present when the United States took control in 1898. As a result of early American colonization practices that not only imposed English and American ideals but also made a mockery of the local Puerto Rican politicians, the Puerto Rican elite mounted a long and intense campaign for local autonomy where everything American was viewed as anti-Puerto Rican, including the English language. The movement against the teaching of English on the island, as described in Algren de Gutiérrez (1987),
as well as various speeches and publications by the Puerto Rican elite, combined to create an atmosphere in which English was thought of as foreign, difficult and unnecessary.

While the movement to protect Spanish and Puerto Ricanness was effective in creating a perception of threat, the actual threat that English posed was quite minimal. In concurrence with Clampitt-Dunlap’s (1995) findings, the continued language maintenance of Spanish has been aided by the absence of any sizeable population of monolingual English speakers on the island. For this reason, there really never was a legitimate threat in the first place, nor has there ever been one. Failed English-only policies from the start of the 20th century gave way to a public school system that now uses Spanish as the language of instruction. As English-only policies become a faint memory, the average Puerto Rican wanted their children to learn English. While the use of English in schools is an extremely political subject, for the most part Puerto Ricans respect the English language. Nevertheless, even today, plans to increase the importance and access to English education often are met with resistance on the part of teacher’s unions, as well as politicians who see any move toward an increased importance of English as move toward statehood. The political connections between English and the United States are obvious and understood and they will not vanish in the foreseeable future. As English continues to become a symbol of upward social mobility, however, more and more parents will demand that the public school system offer results similar to those in private schools, where many students learn English effectively.
Sub-question 1. With relatively little language shift on each of the islands, what are the principal reasons for successful language maintenance?

The main reason for the maintenance of Papiamento in Aruba has been the language’s role as the *lingua franca* and its symbol of Aruban nationalism and identity. During the colonization period, Papiamento served as an important *lingua franca* among the Dutch, Jews and African slaves. Despite not being used for formal schooling and not even holding official status until 2003, Papiamento symbolizes Aruban identity. That status has trumped moves to eradicate the language on the part of the Dutch and recent immigrants quickly understand the necessity of learning the local language in order to be accepted.

Unlike Papiamento in Aruba, Spanish is a language of wider communication and its status throughout the world is understood to be very powerful. However, the greatest reason for the maintenance of Spanish is the fact that there has never been a large English-speaking population that has moved to the island. Unlike Hawaii or even more politically similar, Guam, islands which both saw an influential influx of English speakers after becoming part of the U.S., Puerto Rico has never witnessed such a demographic shift. Nevertheless, it is debatable, even if they had, whether Puerto Ricans would have stopped speaking Spanish. Should Puerto Rico ever experience an influx of immigrants who are monolingual speakers of English (which is highly unlikely given the island’s current population density), I tend to believe Puerto Ricans would
respond in a similar manner to those in Aruba. In other words, they would strive to use the local language as a marker of local identity necessary to attain social capital.

**Sub-question 2.** To what extent has a perception of threat had an effect on national identity?

The perception of threat has led to increased national pride on both islands, as well as a consciousness among islanders as to the importance of their language and identity. Aruban and Puerto Rican nationalism have come as a direct result of their struggles to gain local autonomy. Each island’s movement toward local autonomy worked to create differences between “locals” and “outsiders.” The most obvious and significant of these differences was language. The waves of immigration in Aruban and the return migration of English speakers in Puerto Rico have aided in the creation of an imagined community that shares much of the same history, language and experiences.

**Sub-question 3.** What role has educational policy played in language shift or maintenance?

Educational policy has played a major role in language maintenance in both Aruba and Puerto Rico. The focus on corpus and status planning in Aruba has been with the intent to use Papiamento as the language of instruction. Although past policies have either focused on maintaining Dutch instruction or been inadequate in implementing Papiamento as the medium of instruction, current trends seem to be moving more toward the use of Papiamento than away from it. The removal of draconian polices that forbid students from using Papiamento helped to build the language’s prestige within the
school system, and the continued use of Papiamento in schools also has served to build
the language’s status. Nevertheless, there is still much work to be done in terms of
educating the Aruban population about the benefits of mother tongue instruction.
Parents and teachers need to be convinced to buy into a program where Papiamento is
used as the language of the classroom. This will allow students to gain much needed
literacy skills and develop a basic foundation in their other content area classes. These
skills can then be transferred over into other languages as students prepare for post-
secondary studies.

The movement against the use of English as the medium of instruction in Puerto Rico has worked to maintain the status and prestige of Spanish on the island. However, without ever experiencing an influx of non-Spanish speaking immigrants, Puerto Rican Spanish has not been threatened to the same extent as islands and other nations that have to compete with other local languages. Despite a minute population of monolingual English speakers, education policy in Puerto Rico has facilitated the politicization of the teaching of English, which has in many ways restricted the effects of English education on the island. As a result of its educational policy, as well as, other political and educational factors, Puerto Rico is a monolingual society. Given its resources and quasi-English as a foreign/English as a second language environment, Puerto Rico could have a population where citizens are able to use both Spanish and English with great fluency. In order to make this a reality, however, policy makers first must strengthen the Spanish curriculum and other areas of content instruction before they can try to implement an ambitious curriculum or campaign to learn English.
Implications for Aruba

On the island of Aruba, policy makers, especially those who work in education, must understand the benefits of mother tongue instruction. Not only is mother tongue instruction a linguistic human right, but research overwhelmingly proves the benefits for a child who learns to read in his or her mother tongue.

In terms of corpus and status planning, proponents of using Papiamento in the schools have worked tirelessly for years, but there is still work to be done in creating a large enough corpus of literature in Papiamento. The government could assist them finally approving and publishing the official Aruban Papiamento dictionary. This would help to standardize the language, and in turn, help writers. In recent years, policy makers have promoted Papiamento as the language of government and the language of the social sphere; however, more work needs to be done to improve the prestige of Papiamento and change the negative feelings many parents have toward its use as the language in schools.

During my visit, the Aruban Department of Education was engaged in a year long campaign to promote the use of Papiamento. While the participants are doing a good job promoting the language through increased publicity and education, there needs to be continuity among these efforts. I would suggest a commitment from the government and the Aruban Department of Education to have a section of the Department dedicated to the promotion of Papiamento. Unlike, Curaçao, Aruba closed their LPP office after Papiamento gained official status. This was an unfortunate move, as the island could use an organization dedicated to the research and promotion of the
true benefits and status of Papiamento. The Fundashion pa Planifikashon di Idioma (The Foundation for Language Planning in Curaçao) has published countless valuable research projects, including a recently edited volume that discusses much of the latest work regarding Papiamentu (Faraclas, Severing & Weijer. 2008). In addition to serving Arubans, the foundation for language planning and policy in Aruba would also be able to work in conjunction with Curaçao and Bonaire in order to coordinate research and other particular events related to Papiamento.

It is also important for Arubans to be secure with the position of Papiamento on the island. While perceptions of threat come naturally as a defense mechanism, it is important that the media and Arubans alike start to reflect on the role that immigrants have played in the history of their island. Participants in this study, as well as history and census data, show that immigrants tend to learn Papiamento and thus the language is safe. Therefore, anti-immigrant discourses need to be officially addressed by the local government and locals need to understand the facts regarding immigrants learning Papiamento. Such attention to immigration issues is important as continued anti-immigrant fervor could potentially lead toward unforeseen consequences such as the isolation of Spanish speaking immigrants and a potential failure among Arubans to continue to learn Spanish as well as they historically have. In an extreme case, civil unrest could erupt if the large immigrant population is not eventually welcomed into Aruban society, as has been the case recently in France (Common, 2007; CBC News, 2007; Smith, 2005).
Papiamento has strengthened over the years as native Arubans have clung to their language despite continued Dutch political involvement and waves of both English and Spanish immigrants. The use of Papiamento as a marker of Aruban identity is something that is well entrenched in the mindset of most Arubans, and its history and current status point to a bright future for this unique, and relatively new, Creole language.

**Implications for Puerto Rico**

Spanish in Puerto Rico has never been threatened to the extent that Papiamento has in Aruba. With no sizeable population of non-Spanish speakers, it is hard to imagine exactly how English could or would ever displace Spanish. Nevertheless, the American colonial policies have had a notable impact on the island, especially in relation to language. It is important for politicians and teachers unions to come to an agreement on the role that English is going to play in the public education system on the island. The difference in the quality of education being offered in private schools and public schools seems to be growing as more parents elect to send their children to private schools. While safety is often one of the major reasons for private school enrollment, so too is improved English education. Whether it is true or not, Puerto Ricans tend to believe that English serves as a gatekeeper to higher paying jobs and endless opportunities. As a result, children in public schools are being left behind and not able to compete later in life without improved English skills. Thus, an increased focus on English education would be ideal in the public schools of Puerto Rico.
Due to the political connotations and linguistic insecurities directly related to past and current colonial policies, however, Puerto Rico needs to complement any movement toward increased English education with an even stronger and more influential campaign to improve Spanish and other core areas. One of the problems that past curricula have faced in terms of improving and increasing the use of English has been that the campaigns have been isolated in their goals on increasing the use of English. In order to improve English education in Puerto Rico, however, there has to be equal or more emphasis on Spanish education.

Puerto Rican’s national pride and love for their language is unparalleled, but its political relationship with the United States provides the island an opportunity that very few other Spanish-speaking countries have: increased access to English. English should be viewed as a language to be used for academic and work purposes as well as a tool to connect to an ever-globalizing world. Puerto Ricans must be reassured that Spanish is and should continue to be the language used in all other domains, as it is now. While I agree that it is advantageous to prepare students to be able to converse on an informal level with native English speakers, an emphasis on academic language will provide Puerto Rican students much needed tools to succeed in a work environment that is in English. In addition, their critical thinking skills and background knowledge of English will allow them to easily acquire more informal varieties.

Prestige planning efforts to protect and safeguard Puerto Rican identity have played an important role in language maintenance of Puerto Rican Spanish. Puerto
Rican festivals play a major role in the creation of Puerto Rican identity and the reinforcement of an imagined community where members share similar experiences. However, budget cuts and increased privatization of such festivals have taken a lot of the control out of the hands of the government. While it is unlikely that Puerto Rican festivals will cease to exist any time soon, it is important for the government to play a role in the promotion of such events so that Puerto Ricans can continue to come together and celebrate their culture and heritage.

**Implications for language policy and planning**

The most commonly used typologies for identifying language threat were created to identify language shift (Krauss, 2000) and provide language planners a detailed account of how to reverse language shift (Fishman, 1991). However, these typologies provide little insight into the complexity of environments where languages are perceived as threatened. Ruiz’s (2006) typology of threatened languages provides eight different categories describing different contexts of language threat, many of which do not fit cleanly into either of the previously mentioned typologies. The use of this typology within the field of LPP will facilitate researchers in categorizing different language contexts that exhibit a complex mixture of social, political, and psychological factors that have led to the perception of threat.

The use of Ruiz’s (2006) (see table 1.3 on page 49) typology of threatened languages proved fruitful in delineating differences between language contexts that are generally grouped together. Group C, which Puerto Rico fell into, was evidenced by the policies that have worked to limit the teaching of English on the island. Furthermore,
making Spanish the sole official language of the island in 1991 was legislation that was dangerous in that it started to encourage cries to isolate Puerto Rico among English-only advocates in the United States. Because it was overturned quickly, it is unclear to what extent the United States would go to ensure that English plays an official role on the island.

The case of Papiamento in Aruba, also falls relatively cleanly into Group E, as Spanish in Puerto Rico did within its respective category. The context represented in the case of Papiamento on Aruba is undoubtedly deserving of its own category. Historical evidence along with the continued political associations with the Netherlands continues to create the potential for Papiamento (L1) to be relegated to non-Power domains, as has been the case in Aruba’s past. Thus, Ruiz’s “danger” column is relevant to the case of Aruba. Despite Papiamento’s fit in Group E, I do think that more needs to be made of what exactly constitutes Ruiz’s L2 distinction. Within a multilingual context such as Aruba, L2 can mean a number of different languages. While Ruiz is undoubtedly referring to the second official language, Dutch in this case, both English and Spanish currently present a more realistic threat than the co-official language of the Netherlands. Thus, limiting the discussion of threat to the official L2 can be deceiving in that other languages that are involved in the context can present an equal or even greater threat than the official language. Nevertheless, given the complexity of developing a new typology of threatened languages, this is a minor critique. However, continued research, representing the other categories represented in Ruiz’s typology, are necessary in order to gain a more nuanced understanding of the new typology.
Further analysis of the complexity of the perception of threat lends itself to a better understanding of how ideas and perceptions are amplified throughout society. Kasperon et al.’s (1988) description of the social amplification of risk framework, which for the purposes of LPP I have renamed as the social amplification of threat framework (SAT), is useful in order to describe and analyze how fears metastasize, given the proper ingredients of media attention and one’s own personal experiences. The case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico have highlighted how one’s experiences with the difficulty of learning a colonizer’s language and restrictive colonial policies, coupled with the rhetoric that accompanies nationalist agendas, can work to create a perception that one’s language and nationalism is threatened. I think increased use of the SAT to explain perceptions of threat in different language contexts would be helpful for identifying not only the media’s role in the social amplification of threat, but also in assessing the experiences that people are having in relation to the threat event. Understanding such experiences potentially would allow for the creation of counter-experiences that could work to dispel misconceptions regarding the speaker’s fears and perceptions of threat.

The perception of threat and discussions of language threat have worked to unite different groups on both islands. This is not always the case in language contexts, however, where discussing language threat might lead to utter despair on the part of the local community of speakers. In both Aruba and Puerto Rico, the perception of threat has been just that: a perception of something that could potentially happen. Other language contexts where language shift has already occurred, fall into a different
category because the language is not solely perceived to be threatened, but is indeed threatened as evidenced by language shift. Thus the key distinction between perceived threat and actual threat is in language shift. A move from Xish to Yish in one or more domains should be a signal of legitimate threat. Furthermore, one must understand that in a historically bilingual or multilingual society, there will be domains of language that the population may use that are in the majority’s second language or even a third language and such domains will be affected and will naturally shift over time. Nevertheless, discussions of perceived threat and actual or inherent threat can be used to mobilize and address how a community would like to precede regarding language use within the community.

The detailed case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico shed light on the complexity of language threat, as well as how perceptions of threat have grown and manifested themselves throughout history. Unfortunately, these are only two of the literally thousands of language contexts that need to be documented. The case studies presented here provide examples of different ways in which languages can be successfully maintained despite an adverse political climate. It is important for the LPP field to document endangered languages and describe language contexts that are currently undergoing language shift, but it is also important to understand language contexts where language has been maintained. Understanding the success of programs tied to the maintenance of particular languages can potentially result in the application of similar programs in other language contexts.
Thus, one of the central arguments of this research is: those who are influencing and creating language policies must be attune to the historical relevance of past policies and efforts. As time passes different language groups are perceived as a threat, yet the knowledge that is gained from past experiences can serve as a guiding factor in dictating the appropriate measures for future action. Thus, past polices should not be the sole impetus for new polices, but do indeed need to be understood so that the same or similar mistakes are not made more than once. Hence, the findings and maintenance efforts from cases of Aruba and Puerto Rico are in no way generalizable, but certain aspects of language of their success might be applicable to other environments that have not witnessed language shift, but where there is the perception of language threat toward an outside language or languages.

One of the specific areas of LPP that needs to be examined in more detail is prestige planning. The maintenance of Papiamento and Spanish in Aruba and Puerto Rico is clearly related to islanders’ ability to maintain the prestige of the local language. The frequency of festivals in Puerto Rico, which work to maintain and strengthen local identity, also work to maintain the language. Likewise the use of Papiamento as the language in which children learn valuable literacy skills works to build the prestige of Papiamento. Prestige planning efforts undoubtedly are being utilized in a variety of language environments, yet most of these ventures have yet to be recognized.

Suggestions for future research

The case studies of Aruba and Puerto Rico illuminate the complexity of language maintenance and how history and societal factors come to play in language use. The
role that the perception of threat plays in language maintenance and or shift is still something that must be examined using various other language contexts. Additional case studies of this kind would be helpful in better understanding the threshold in which language threat turns into language endangerment.

Another area of study that needs to be examined is the role of race and social class in the language situations of Aruba and Puerto Rico. As Caribbean islands, both Aruba and Puerto Rico are racially diverse through generations of racial mixing among Caucasians, descendents of African slaves and the indigenous populations. As a result, discussions of race and its role in language use often go unnoticed. Future research on the islands should look at the role that race plays in who learns what language and how.

Similar to the role of race in Aruba and Puerto Rico, questions regarding the effect that socioeconomic status has on access to Dutch in Aruba and English in Puerto Rico are also aspects of the language contexts that need to be analyzed in an in-depth manner. The gap between the haves and the have nots in Puerto Rico, as exemplified by those who can afford to send their children to private schools, provides evidence that socioeconomic status does play a role in the learning of English in Puerto Rico. However, it is not clear why private school students are so much more successful in learning English than their public school peers in Puerto Rico. Within the context of Aruba, it would be interesting to see to what extent socioeconomic status plays a factor in students’ success in school as well as its relationship to retention rates.
Conclusion

Past typologies to identify threatened languages often have focused on languages that have experienced widespread language shift. Ruiz’s (2006) typology for threatened languages brings to light a variety of different language contexts in which languages are perceived to be threatened but have yet to exhibit language shift. The case studies of both Aruba and Puerto Rico reflect two categories within Ruiz (2006)’s new typology and highlight various reasons for language maintenance. History and immigration patterns always play a key role in the maintenance and or loss of a language, but the conscious efforts on the part of both Arubans and Puerto Ricans have also worked toward preserving and maintaining the status and prestige of Papiamento and Spanish, respectively. Despite successful language maintenance, both islands still have plenty of work to be done regarding language. The use of Dutch medium instruction still works to handicap Aruban students, whose first language is Papiamento. On the island of Puerto Rico, the colonial relationship with the United States has politicized English education to the point where many Puerto Ricans do not receive an education necessary to make them bilingual.

Throughout the years of colonization, both Papiamento and Spanish have continued as symbols of the strength and tradition of Arubans and Puerto Ricans, respectively. Although it is important for locals to be cognizant of the importance of their local language, it is also important that islanders not perceive non-viable threats in a way that can be detrimental to others or that can hurt their future stability. In an ever-globalizing world, it is important that islands such as Aruba and Puerto Rico maintain
their own language and culture, but they must also understand that they can accept others to their island and learn foreign languages without having to forgo their own.
APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

Informed Consent

THE PERCEPTION OF THREAT IN LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY: ANALYZING LANGUAGE THREAT ON THREE ISLAND NATIONS

Introduction

You are being invited to take part in a research study. The information in this form is provided to help you decide whether or not to take part. Study personnel will be available to answer your questions and provide additional information. If you decide to take part in the study, you will be asked to sign this consent form. A copy of this form will be given to you.

What is the purpose of this research study?

The goal of this research is to provide an in-depth examination of language policy and planning efforts on the islands of Aruba, Puerto Rico and Singapore. The examination of such language policy and planning efforts will provide a better understanding of how threat is posed by non-majoritized languages and describe how the islands have been successful (or not) in terms of language maintenance.

The main purpose of this study, then, is to understand the interplay between historical language policies and how they have influenced the perception of threat that foreign languages pose toward majority languages. As part of this context, this study wants to develop a deeper understanding of how languages are perceived as threats to other languages that have seemingly witnessed relatively no language shift. More specifically, I want to be able to understand how these perceptions have impacted the learning of additional languages among the children and general populous of each island. The researcher invites you to collaborate as an informant. If you accept to participate, the investigator will conduct a taped interview with you either in person, over the phone or via email.

Why are you being asked to participate?

You are being invited to participate in this study because you have been identified as someone who has extensive knowledge on the history of language planning and policy and how it affects education on at least one of the following islands: Aruba, Puerto Rico or Singapore.

How many people will be asked to participate in this study?

Approximately 15 persons will be asked to participate in this study.
What will happen during this study?
This study will focus on the history of language policy and planning on your island of expertise and how it has effected either positively or negatively toward the perception of threat of other languages. If you agree to participate,

- You consent to allow for at least 1 audio-taped interview with the principal investigator that will last a minimum of 45 minutes and a maximum of two hours. The interview will be conducted in person, over the phone or via email.
- You consent to allowing follow up questions, which will be conducted, via telephone or email.

How long will I be in this study?
About 1 hour will be needed to complete this study.

Are there any risks to me?
You may feel shy and somewhat uncomfortable with the audio recorder and/or researcher present. In order to minimize this, the researchers will make every effort to establish rapport with you and to make you feel at ease. Furthermore, all the data collected will be used for research and evaluation purposes only. All the data will be strictly confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without your prior consent.

Are there any benefits to me?
You will not receive any benefit from taking part in this study.

Will there be any costs to me?
Aside from your time, there are no costs for taking part in the study.

Will video or audio recordings be made of me during the study?
We will make an audio recording during the study so that we can be certain that your responses are recorded accurately only if you check the box below:

☐ I give my permission for audio recordings to be made of me during my participation in this research study.

☐ I do not give my permission for audio recordings to be made of me during my participation in this research study.

Version Date 2/14/08: Page 2 of 4 Participant’s Initials
Will the information that is obtained from me be kept confidential?

The only persons who will know that you participated in this study will be the research team members: the Principal Investigator and research personnel.

Your records will be confidential. You will not be identified in any reports or publications resulting from the study. It is possible that representatives of the sponsor that supports the research study will want to come to The University of Arizona to review your information. Representatives of regulatory agencies (including The University of Arizona Human Subjects Protection Program) may access your records.

☐ I give my permission for my identity to be revealed during my participation in this study.

☐ I do not give my permission for my identity to be made public. Therefore, I want my identity to remain anonymous during my participation in this study.

May I change my mind about participating?

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may decide to not begin or to stop the study at any time. Your refusing to participate will have no effect on your employment. You can discontinue your participation with no effect on employment. Also any new information discovered about the research will be provided to you. This information could affect your willingness to continue your participation.

Whom can I contact for additional information?

You can obtain further information about the research or voice concerns or complaints about the research by calling the Principal Investigator Kevin S. Carroll, Ph.D. Candidate, at (520) 626-5885. If you have questions concerning your rights as a research participant, have general questions, concerns or complaints or would like to give input about the research and can’t reach the research team, or want to talk to someone other than the research team, you may call the University of Arizona Human Subjects Protection Program office at (520) 626-6721. (If out of state use the toll-free number 1-866-278-1455.) If you would like to contact the Human Subjects Protection Program via the web, please visit the following website: http://www.irb.arizona.edu/contact/.
Your Signature

By signing this form, I affirm that I have read the information contained in the form, that the study has been explained to me, that my questions have been answered and that I agree to take part in this study. I do not give up any of my legal rights by signing this form.

Name (Printed)

Participant's Signature __________________________ Date signed __________

Statement by person obtaining consent

I certify that I have explained the research study to the person who has agreed to participate, and that he or she has been informed of the purpose, the procedures, the possible risks and potential benefits associated with participation in this study. Any questions raised have been answered to the participant's satisfaction.

Name of study personnel __________________________

Study personnel Signature __________________________ Date signed __________
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