THE POLICIES AND POLITICS OF LANGUAGE IN PUERTO RICO: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Laura I. Martínez Ortiz

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of:

Doctor of Philosophy

February 21, 2020

Department of English
College of Humanities
University of Puerto Rico

Approved by:

_____	_____
Dr. Alma Simounet Reader	Dr. Ann Albuyeh Reader

_____
Dr. Alicia Pousada
Thesis Director

Table of contents

List of tables iv

Dedication v

Acknowledgments vi

Abstract vii

Author's biography viii

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0 Introduction…… 1

2.0 Historical background…… 1

2.1 Puerto Rico before 1898……. 1

2.2 The language policy spectrum……...…… 3

2.2.1 Americanization…….. 3

2.2.2 Puertorricanization…….. 6

2.2.3 Bilingualization…….. 8

3.0 Statement of the problem: Language, politics, and identity…….. 10

4.0 Justification……...……. 12

5.0 Purpose of the study……...…… 14

6.0 Research questions……...….. 15

7.0 Hypotheses……. 16

8.0 Structure of the dissertation……...…… 18

Chapter 2: Review of literature

1.0 Introduction……...……. 20

2.0 Theoretical framework……... 21

3.0 Context……..…… 23

3.1 Political science and language policy……...……. 24

3.2 Sociology and identity……...……. 26

3.3 Sociolinguistics and language attitudes……. 28

3.4 Education and motivation…….. 30

3.5 History and language policy……...…… 32

4.0 Critical Discourse Analysis……...……. 34

5.0 Timeline: History of language policies on the island……..…….. 38

Chapter 3: Methodology

1.0 Introduction……...…. 44
2.0 Analysis of context……...…….. 44
3.0 Analysis of discourse and semiotic structures…….. 51
4.0 The overall methodology……... 56
5.0 The samples…… 58

Chapter 4: Analysis

1.0 Introduction…… 60
2.0 Sample 1: Official Language Act of 1991……. 60
2.1 Context……...… 60
2.2 Discourse…… 66
2.2.1 Section analysis……...…...… 66
2.2.2 Overall analysis of sample 1……... 75
3.0 Sample 2: Rafael Hernández Colón's speech at the *Principado de Asturias*… 77
3.1 Context……...…… 77
3.2 Discourse…… 84
3.2.1 Section analysis……...…… 84
3.2.2 Overall analysis of sample 2……... 105
4.0 Sample 3: Advertising campaign 1991 referendum……... 109
4.1 Context……...…… 109
4.2 Discourse…… 114
4.2.1 Section analysis……...…… 114
4.2.2 Overall analysis of sample 3……... 119
5.0 Sample 4: Official Languages Act of 1993…… 121
5.1 Context……...…… 121
5.2 Discourse…… 126
5.2.1 Section analysis……...…… 126
5.2.2 Overall analysis of sample 4…….. 139
6.0 Sample 5: Plan for Puerto Rico……. 142
6.1 Context……...…… 142
6.2 Discourse…… 146

6.2.1 Section analysis……..…… 146
6.2.2 Overall analysis of sample 5…….. 153
7.0 Integrative analysis……. 155
7.1 Introduction…… 155
7.2 Analysis: Self-categorization and linguistic capital…….. 156
7.3 Conclusion…….. 159
Chapter 5: Conclusions and implications
1.0 Introduction…… 161
2.0 Summary of the thesis…… 161
3.0 Hypotheses……. 164
4.0 Implications…… 166
5.0 Limitations and future research…….. 168
6.0 Recommendations…….. 170
7.0 Conclusions…… 171
References 172
Appendices
Appendix 1: Detailed timeline of language policies in Puerto Rico…...…. 182
Appendix 2: Sample 1: Official Language Act of 1991……..…... 198
Appendix 3: Sample 2: Rafael Hernández Colón's speech in Asturias……. 201
Appendix 4: Sample 3: Advertising campaign 1991 referendum…… 207
Appendix 5: Sample 4: Official Languages Act of 1993……. 209
Appendix 6: Sample 5: Plan for Puerto Rico…….. 213

List of tables

Table 1: Abbreviated timeline…… 39

Table 2: The ideological square……. 53

Table 3: Overall methodology……... 56

Table 4: Tabulation sample 1……. 74

Table 5: Tabulation sample 2……. 104

Table 6: Tabulation sample 3……. 119

Table 7: Tabulation sample 4……. 139

Table 8: Tabulation sample 5……. 152

Dedication

This work is dedicated to students everywhere, especially those who move us to be patient, kind and generous.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Alicia Pousada, my captain and dissertation adviser, whose confidence in my potential was unwavering. I chose wisely, for only she could bring out the very best in me. Much before the dissertation process began, I had read much of her work on language planning in Puerto Rico and had hoped to be taken under her wing. I first became her student when I enrolled in her course on Language and Culture, which gave me the perfect excuse to analyze political rhetoric. Our next venture together was an independent study that allowed to study two things: the history of language policies on the island, and our dynamic as mentor and mentee. And that is how I knew. She is the toughest professor I have ever had, the one I have strived hardest to impress, and whose respect and affection I value profoundly. To her I am grateful.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my readers, Dr. Alma Simounet and Dr. Ann Albuyeh, whose guidance led me to hone in on my secondary areas of study and maximize (and even enjoy) the comprehensive examination. Their enthusiasm was wonderful motivation throughout the entire dissertation process. This work could not have been accomplished without their advice, accessibility, and genuine desire to see me succeed.

Finally, I would like to thank my team at home and at work: my husband, who feeds and loves and soothes me; my family, whom I had to miss during birthdays and holidays; friends, who listened to endless rants; and the CDCL staff, who had my back through thick and thin. Thank you.

Abstract

In this dissertation we analyze the political discourses surrounding language policies in Puerto Rico. Specifically, we analyze Puerto Rican political discourses regarding English and Spanish in five sample texts (including legislation, a speech, advertisement, and a campaign platform), and how politicians use the language issue as a tool to reinforce ideological agendas and shape language attitudes. The work critically analyzes the historical context of language policies in Puerto Rico, the politics of identity, and the political and rhetorical strategies that shape language discourses using a combination of approaches to context analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis. To analyze context, we repurpose Dell Hymes' SPEAKING model and employ several of Gee's (2011) analysis tools; the methodology to analyze discourse considers different aspects of the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA), the socio-cognitive and the dialectical-relational approach.

The study confirms that the use of Critical Discourse Analysis is productive for identifying ideological motivations that help explain a group's behavior, and it illustrates how language ideologies have been shaped on the island and their sociological effects on Puerto Ricans. Moreover, the study reveals that both major political parties in Puerto Rico are focused on establishing a bilingual political system to accommodate the autonomist relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States rather than producing a bilingual populace.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, language ideologies, language policy and planning, language and power, bilingualism

Author's biography

Laura Isabel Martínez Ortiz was raised in Guaynabo where she had the privilege of receiving a bilingual education. She completed her Bachelor's degree in Boston University as a double major in English and Hispanic Literature.

It was August 2006 when Laura first became a student at the University of Puerto Rico in the Graduate Translation Program. For her Master's thesis, she produced a partial translation of René Marqués' novel, *La víspera del hombre*, which she titled *On the eve of man.* While she completed the requirements for her Master's degree, she also worked as a tutor at the College of General Studies with fellow graduate students from a variety of disciplines in the *Centro para el Desarrollo de Competencias Lingüísticas* (CDCL).

After completing her Master's degree, she continued to translate technical and literary texts for many different clients. What occupied most of her time, however, was the world of Academia. In August 2009, she became an English instructor at the Puerto Rico Conservatory of Music, where she developed teaching methods specialized for musicians. This later became an area of research which she presented at several conferences in Puerto Rico.

In 2014, she was given the opportunity to return to the UPR, both as a professor at the College of General Studies and as a doctoral student in the College of Humanities. By 2016, she had become the director of the tutoring center where she first got started. Since then, she has continued to promote the advancement of formative experiences for graduate students, such as the one that led her to her current achievements.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0 Introduction

Our perception of the world is shaped, in part, by the language we use to build it. Philosopher of language, Wilhelm von Humboldt, proposed that language is a "formative organ of thought" (as cited in Mueller-Vollmer and Messling, 2017), and the means by which humanity represents reality. Thus, when we analyze language, we may discover layers of belief, cognition and emotion, beyond what is literal or evident. This dissertation intends to analyze the discourses that shape Puerto Ricans' perceptions of language, particularly in the context of nation-building. Barreto (1998) defines nation, not as a geopolitically delimited region, but as a people who band together to pursue common goals and protect common interests (p. 14). For over a century, nation-building in Puerto Rico has centered on defining a national identity and has placed language on the frontline of battle. This has been a continuous political process. Throughout the dissertation, we explore the contexts and discourses produced by the seemingly unending status quo of the island.

2.0 Historical background

In order to properly contextualize the topic explored in this dissertation, it is necessary to understand the historical events that led to the political discourse of the 1990s regarding language policy.

2.1 Puerto Rico before 1898

The second half of the 19th century saw the emergence of independence movements in Puerto Rico that sought to separate the island from Spain after several

centuries of colonial rule. Part of the *criollo*[1] intellectual and political class understood that its relationship with the Spanish metropolis would not lead to the principles of progress, democracy, and modernity to which it aspired, and thus an Antillean, native Puerto Rican identity began to be forged. However, as González (2018) states, by 1898 Puerto Rico was still *a nation in formation* (p. 25), and different sectors in society (conservatives and liberals) pushed to protect their diverse interests.

When the United States military first occupied the island, the liberal elites saw in the American[2] presence a path toward the democratic values they had wanted to achieve. They would soon be disillusioned when the Foraker Act of 1900 established a political process that would replace the *criollo* elite with an American elite and suppress local culture through an Americanization program. This would lead important figures such as Luis Muñoz Rivera, Nemesio Canales, and José de Diego to look to the past to redefine Puerto Rican values, using language as a form of resistance (Nazario, 2019, p. 17). The new rulers brought with them a modernizing project in which English would play a leading role, but they would face a nationalist elite who would imbue the defense of Spanish with new meaning and transform it into a national duty.

After 1898, a series of language policies would be implemented in an attempt to Americanize the island and its people. However, throughout the 20th century, Puerto Rico would transition through three different phases which reflect political or ideological shifts. Schmidt (2014) calls them *Americanization*, *Puertorricanization*, and

[1] *Criollo* refers to the island-born descendants of Spanish colonialists who developed their own cultural identity and ideology.

[2] For the purposes of the study, American refers specifically to the United States of North America.

Bilingualization. Language policies also reflect these periods and show the evolution of language ideologies on the island.

2.2 The language policy spectrum

Language policies in Puerto Rico may be organized by placing them on a spectrum within the three mentioned periods. All policies since the American occupation served to promote a degree of bilingualism on the island, some more balanced, others more English-leaning, and others more Spanish-leaning. Politics determine tendencies within the language policy spectrum, but even the most radical policies have kept some form of bilingual objective in sight.

2.2.1 Americanization

The first period was undeniably an Americanization project in which the United States imposed the colonial language as a means to promote American values and culture. However, the first educational language plan, which lasted seven years, retained Spanish as the language of instruction throughout elementary school and then utilized English as the teaching language starting in middle school. Few children studied beyond elementary school (except in the San Juan area), few teachers were qualified to teach in English, and schools were sparse throughout the island, leading to the ultimate (and predictable) failure of the language policy. Regardless of the outcome, the intention behind this particular policy was a first step toward a transitional bilingualism with the goal of eventually recruiting enough English teachers to finally make Puerto Ricans English monolinguals (Torres-González, 2002, p. 105). Even though the long-term plan in the Americanization agenda was to phase out Spanish, the means to that end was to create an initial, bilingual setting.

The Official Languages Act of 1902 established the indistinguishable use of both Spanish and English, specifically in the upper echelons of government, and proposed a bilingual context for the island so that its predominately English-monolingual administrators could, in effect, govern the colony. The subtext of the official language policy was class-based and diglossic: it implied that Spanish would be spoken by the majority of people, while English would remain reserved for the Americans and select Puerto Rican bilinguals who occupied high ranking positions in the government (Ostolaza, 2001, pp. 10-11). The Official Languages Act and the educational language policy mirrored each other in that those who actually spoke English belonged to specific sectors in society.

In 1905, Commissioner Roland Falkner established an "English Only" policy which made English the language of instruction starting in 2nd grade and provided for the teaching of Spanish as a subject class. This language policy lasted until 1916, when Commissioner Paul Miller implemented a more evenly distributed language program in which classes were held mostly in Spanish until the 4th grade, included a bilingual transition year where both English and Spanish were used as languages of instruction simultaneously, and then continued in English (Schmidt, 2014; Torres-González, 2002). When Juan B. Huyke became Commissioner, he pushed this language policy further toward the English side of the spectrum. Changes in language policy from 1905 to 1934 were truly significant because they actually had an impact on schoolchildren and elementary school teachers at the same time that participation in formal schooling was increasing at a fast rate throughout the island.

The Americanization effort had a simple goal: the assimilation of the people of Puerto Rico into American culture. Schmidt (2014) explains that it is in the State's interest to use the school system to socialize its citizens according to its ideological program (p. 1), and that language education facilitates this process because language is inherently political. Notwithstanding, this plan did not shut down Spanish altogether, not even during Falkner's tenure. Ostolaza (2001) points out that Puerto Rican Spanish was in the right context to resist being phased out by English because Puerto Rico was so densely populated and the education system and the teaching of Spanish were growing quickly, among other factors. Thus, Spanish was not something the Americans could ignore if the Americanization agenda was to succeed. Moreover, the most radical English-leaning policy, Falkner's, only lasted a little over a decade; this strategy might have been effective in other territories, but the Americans discovered it was not the right strategy for Puerto Rico.

During this period, Puerto Rican nationalist activism increased. In 1911, the first teachers' union was created, and among its demands was the return to Spanish as the language of instruction as had been the case under Spanish rule. By 1913, Commissioner Dexter, Falkner's successor, did not have good ties with the teachers, and the Puerto Rican legislature was at odds with the American governor, George Radcliffe Colton. This friction prompted the Puerto Rican legislature to eliminate the annual English courses and exams for teachers and create the Spanish General Supervisor position (Torres-González, 2002, pp. 118-119). At the same time, the intelligentsia continued to use the defense of Spanish as an emblem of their fight for sovereignty and made efforts to counter English-leaning policies. As in any political relationship, there was a constant tug-of-war among

factions, and language stakeholders tried to push language policies closer to or away from English or Spanish, depending on their interests.

2.2.2 Puertorricanization

Schmidt (2014, p. 55) states that the Padín/Gallardo era marks the decline of the Americanization period. However, Padín's policy (1934) was similar to Brumbaugh's (1900). The linguistic policy spectrum shifted to a middle-ground position, where Spanish and English took turns as languages of instruction. At the same time, Puerto Rican nationalism continued to rise due to a number of critical developments. The Great Depression worsened, the *Treintistas*[3] were active, the Ponce massacre[4] occurred, and Chancellor Jaime Benitez and the Council of Higher Education made Spanish the preferential language of instruction at the University of Puerto Rico,[5] among other relevant events. Many of these developments were reactions to the dire socioeconomic and political circumstances afflicting Puerto Rico in the 1930s. One could argue that the *Puertorricanization* period began earlier than 1949, the date suggested by Schmidt, but it must be made clear that *Puertorricanization* had more to do with the strengthening of a mythological, Puerto Rican "personality" than with language policy. On the other hand, if *Puertorricanization* is associated with the golden age of the pro-Commonwealth party,

[3] The *Treintistas* (or Generación del Treinta [Generation of the 1930s]) were a group of Puerto Rican intellectuals who insisted that writers dedicate themselves to exploring local identity with reference to the U.S. presence on the island. Most notable among the *Treintistas* were Antonio Pedreira, René Márquez, Concha Meléndez, Margot Arce, and Abelardo Díaz Alfaro.

[4] The Ponce massacre took place on Palm Sunday, March 21, 1937. A peaceful civilian march organized by the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party to commemorate the abolition of slavery in 1873 and to protest the U.S. government's imprisonment of the Party's leader, Pedro Albizu Campos, on sedition charges, was attacked by police. Nineteen civilians and two police officers were killed, and more than 200 civilians were wounded. An investigation by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights declared Governor Blanton Winship to be ultimately responsible for the actions leading to the massacre, and he was removed from office in 1939.

[5] As cited in Torres González, 2002, p. 164.

the *Partido Popular Democrático* (PPD) or Popular Democratic Party, then the period rightly began in 1949 when the PPD facilitated the Americanization project through industrial development funded by the Federal Government, but disguised itself with appropriated nationalist symbols, including the defense of Spanish.

In 1948, Muñoz Marín became the first elected governor of Puerto Rico, and he named Mariano Villaronga Commissioner of Education. Villaronga's language policy was diametrically opposed to Falkner's (1905): Spanish was made the language of instruction, while English was taught as a subject course throughout the grades. Thus, the linguistic policy spectrum shifted to the opposite pole and has remained relatively unchanged in the majority of schools in the public education system up to the present time.

Evidently, the presence of English was significantly diminished in schools, but at the same time, bilingualism was encouraged from a different perspective. While Spanish was the language that symbolized nationalism, English symbolized citizenship, and these were complementary under the *Estado Libre Asociado* (ELA). In addition, because the government encouraged migration to the United States,[6] bilingualism became a tool for survival for those who left the island to seek economic advancement in New York and other Eastern seaboard cities. Now more than ever, English was associated with progress, which placed Spanish in a different echelon than English (Torres-González, 2002, pp. 171-175).

[6] Scarano (1993) explains that the rapid increase in population growth prompted the State to encourage migration to the United States so to remove obstacles from the industrialization process on the island. Three strategies were implemented: increase air traffic and lower costs for flights to the U.S., widely announce employment opportunities abroad, and establish minimum standards for labor conditions, especially for seasonal workers in the agricultural sector in the U.S. (p. 754).

2.2.3 Bilingualization

Schmidt (2014) proposes that the *bilingualization* period began in 1969 when "the political language stakeholders supporting English emerged with the [sic] strength, aided by several historical developments" (p. 61). The "historical developments" he refers to are the Bilingual Education Act of 1969 under President Lyndon Baines Johnson, which promoted the creation of bilingual education programs for return migrants who were English-dominant in a Spanish-speaking island, the diminished threat of English as anti-Puerto Rican, and the rise of the pro-Statehood party known in Spanish as the *Partido Nuevo Progresista* (PNP) or New Progressive Party. In practice, however, Ramón Mellado Parsons, the new Commissioner of Education under pro-statehood Governor Luis A. Ferré, continued Villaronga's language policy and modified it by strengthening English education programs on top of the existing structure. For example, Mellado created more bilingual schools and immersion programs in addition to transitional bilingual programs for English speakers who needed to integrate into a Spanish-speaking society. He also brought in English teachers from the States using federal funds (Schmidt, 2014, pp. 62-63). However, Mellado stated that Spanish should be the medium of instruction throughout the school years and that English should be a preferential language course from the first grade to the second year of college. He added that English was best taught as a foreign language using the corresponding methodologies and texts and that teachers should have command over the language (as cited in López Laguerre, 1998, pp. 13-14).

Again, we see that there is a slight shift in the language policy spectrum, this time toward English, but it is not altogether new or significantly different from the previous

period. Moreover, the pro-statehood party spoke of bilingualism as a means for "equal opportunity" in addition to strengthening links with the United States (Torres-González, 2002, p. 241). This view is not a great departure from the PPD's position.

It is not until 1991 that, due to political motivations, Governor Rafael Hernández Colón and the PPD made Spanish the only official language of Puerto Rico. This did not directly affect language education policy, however. Thus, while the language policy spectrum shifted more toward the Spanish side, Villaronga's bilingual policy prevailed. As a reaction to this political move, in 1993, Governor Pedro Rosselló reinstituted both English and Spanish as official languages through the first law enacted by his administration, one that was similar to the 1902 Official Languages Act, except that it did not contextualize the uses of English and Spanish. Thus, stating that the use of both languages is "indistinguishable" under this law (Ostolaza, 2001, pp. 13-14) is an inaccurate representation of reality.

Throughout the 1990s, 2000s, and the 2010s, the Puerto Rican government approved measures that, in theory, were meant to strengthen education in the two languages in Puerto Rico. The 2010 Census questioned island residents regarding the degree to which they could speak English. The options were "very well," "well," "not well," and "cannot speak English" (Sherwood, 2013). Census data indicate a moderate increase in the number of speakers (reporting different degrees of fluency) in recent decades: 48% in 1990, 47% in 2000, and 52% in 2010 (Fayer, 2000; Sherwood, 2013). However, as of 2010, 22% of those who said they spoke English to some degree chose "not well" to describe their speaking skills in English., and 44% of the population claimed to lack any English-speaking ability whatsoever. Thus, while bilingualism has

always been envisioned as an objective in the sociopolitical game, the fact remains that the small shifts within the language policy spectrum have not led to the accomplishment of the official goals as stated by the government.

3.0 Statement of the problem: Language, politics, and identity

Language is regularly used as a symbol of identity by the political elites of Puerto Rico. Spanish is one of the most significant markers of cultural nationalism for most insular Puerto Ricans and is thus exceedingly relevant in the formation of language attitudes that ultimately affect the language learning process. Throughout the modern history of the island, politicians of all parties have reaffirmed the importance of maintaining Spanish as an integral part of being Puerto Rican. This narrative has been sustained as a rhetorical strategy and an appeal to a unified, national identity or an in-group identity.

Luis Muñoz Marín, first elected governor of Puerto Rico, and the *Partido Popular Democrático* pushed for a *criollo* cultural nationalism and compartmentalized cultural and political identity (Torres-González, 2002, p. 164), while Luis A. Ferré, founder of the *Partido Nuevo Progresista*, coined the term *estadidad jíbara* to refer to a culturally autonomous and distinctive Puerto Rican identity under American statehood. Both parties have openly embraced a homogeneous imaginary of what it is to be Puerto Rican, and the defense of Spanish as the vernacular occupies an important place in the political platforms of both parties, reinforcing people's nationalistic attitudes toward Spanish.

On the other hand, English continues to be presented as the language of social mobility and economic progress. Mariano Villaronga, Commissioner of Public Instruction under Luis Muñoz Marín, created English courses to facilitate out-migration

in the 1950s. For entirely different reasons, but expressing the same subtext, in 1991, Carlos Romero Barceló (PNP) stated that "limitar el uso y la enseñanza del inglés en Puerto Rico es limitarles las oportunidades de estudio y trabajo a nuestros hijos"[7] (as cited in Torres González, 2002, p. 232). These two instances are examples of discourses that ascribe a specific type of linguistic capital to English that is not shared with Spanish in the Puerto Rican context.

According to polls published by *El Mundo* in September 1990, the people of Puerto Rico wanted to have both English and Spanish as official languages (as cited in Barreto, 2001a, p. 73). Language attitudes toward English have continued to improve as more people believe that being bilingual is not just beneficial, but also necessary for economic reasons. This means that, through the years, the government has fomented an *instrumental motivation* for learning English, as defined by Gardner and Lambert (1972, as cited in Baker, 1992, p. 32).

Political leaders of the PPD and the PNP have historically agreed that Spanish and English are both important in Puerto Rico for different reasons. Politicians on both sides also claim to understand the importance of teaching English and have stated, to different degrees, that they promote bilingualism. In general practice, with the exception of a few truly bilingual schools, public school language education has not changed significantly since 1949. However, at different moments during the contemporary history of Puerto Rico, language policy has sparked passionate controversy among administrators belonging to both major parties. This seems contradictory considering that they have

[7] To limit the use and teaching of English in Puerto Rico is to limit our children's study and work opportunities.

tacitly agreed to essentially the same teaching models. Thus, one must question: what has been the real, underlying controversy?

4.0 Justification

We have demonstrated that since the American occupation of Puerto Rico in 1898, language policies implemented on the island have established different paradigms for bilingualism in which language usage has often corresponded to different domains. With the exception of the Falkner plan which aimed to eliminate Spanish from the public school system almost completely, the government's official plan always fostered the development of some form of bilingualism, if only for transitional purposes. This is true of legislative declarations of official languages as well as school language policies. Even the Official Language Act of 1991, which made Spanish the only official language of Puerto Rico, protected the teaching of English as a Second language in public schools as well as the use of English or any other language in any government office when convenient and in compliance with rules and regulations. Some of the school language policies through the years have proposed a more balanced distribution of English-Spanish instruction; others have been more English-leaning; and still others have favored more emphasis on Spanish. However, the number of English-speaking Puerto Ricans on the island is still slow to increase.

The fact that English is not more widely spoken in Puerto Rico leads researchers and educators to ask very basic questions: Why are so many Puerto Ricans not advancing in their English learning process? Is this due to questionable teaching methods? Moreover, what is the Department of Education doing to improve the rate of English language

acquisition? Is this something within the scope of control of the Department of Education? What are some external variables that affect bilingualism on the island?

Puerto Rican language policies through time have been supported by "expert" opinion. Why, then, have they not been effective? Is there a problem in the classroom? What other variables ought to be considered? Perhaps the situation responds to what Resnick (1993) calls "motivated failure—a society's successful resolution of a conflict between government planning for bilingualism and a social pressure for monolingualism" (p. 259). He attributes these "social pressures" to issues of national identity and removes blame from the educational methodology employed.

As a counterattack upon the Americanization agenda, the nationalistic intelligentsia utilized the rejection of English and the defense of Spanish as a form of defiance to the colonial regime. This bifurcated language ideology resonated all through the 20th century. Maxims such as *Somos en español* [We are/exist in Spanish] establish the essential link between language and national identity (Pabón, 2003a). This "social pressure" was exerted mainly by the intellectual elites and members of the PPD. Pabón (2003a) suggests that the myth of national identity is a domesticating, political strategy used by the State. The result is that the government and the intellectual elite function as the gatekeepers of language practice, regardless of policy.

One of the main premises on which this research is based is that language policy has been used as a playing card by politicians to further their ideological agendas, as proposed by Barreto (2001a), Clampitt-Dunlap (2000), Pabón (2003a), and Torres-González (2002), among several others. Dating back to the 1930s, José Padín, Commissioner of Education at the time, and Juan José Osuna, Dean of the School of

Education at the University of Puerto Rico, agreed that, "el problema lingüístico-escolar en Puerto Rico no se había resuelto precisamente porque las autoridades concernidas habían basado sus decisiones al respecto en consideraciones más políticas que pedagógicas o lingüísticas"[8] (as cited in Torres-González, 2002, p. 144). This was true during the Americanization period, and it is still the norm today.

5.0 Purpose of the study

The object of this study is to analyze the political discourses surrounding language in Puerto Rico: that is, to analyze how Puerto Rican politicians have spoken about English and Spanish, how they have used the language issue as a tool to reinforce ideological agendas, and how their political behavior has affected language attitudes. The work critically analyzes the historical context of language policies in Puerto Rico, the politics of identity, and the political and rhetorical strategies that shape language discourses. While the connection between language and identity in Puerto Rico has been researched and analyzed by numerous others from diverse perspectives (Clampitt-Dunlap, 2000; Dominguez, 2012; Duany, 2007; Epstein, 1967; López Laguerre, 1989; Lorenzo-Hernández, 1999; Morales & Blau, 2009; Morris, 1995; Pabón, 2003a and b; Resnick, 1993; Torres-González, 2002; Valdez, 2016), the underlying semiotic structures of discourses surrounding it have not been considered. A fundamental assumption in taking on this research is the belief that a better understanding of the social representations that have been ingrained in Puerto Rican society through the years

[8] The language education problem in Puerto Rico had not been resolved precisely because the authorities concerned had based their decisions on considerations that were more political than pedagogical or linguistic.

regarding the roles of Spanish and English can better equip us to explain and change language attitudes to make language education more effective.

A critical analysis of the language-identity political discourse in Puerto Rico can shed light on the complex status of English on the island. Moreover, if we can observe a significant change in contemporary discourses that correlates with improved language attitudes, we may find alternatives to make English instruction more effective on the island.

6.0 Research questions

This dissertation is guided by a series of research questions including, but not limited to, the following:

1. What are the similarities and differences among the discourses about language policy used in the 1990s and the 2010s?
2. What are some of the thematic patterns and metaphors that are repeated in different discourses? Who uses them and in what context?
3. Which ideologies are woven through interdiscursive texts? Are they coherent?
4. To what extent has the nationalistic narrative changed in Puerto Rico?
5. How was the notion of identity or identities built through political discourse in Puerto Rico through the years? Has it changed?
6. What are the roles of Spanish and English in contemporary Puerto Rican identity? What ideologies do these roles respond to?
7. To what extent have language attitudes changed in the last decade? Is the concept of “motivated failure” still applicable to the case of bilingualism in Puerto Rico?

7.0 Hypotheses

We hypothesize that political discourse relating to language in Puerto Rico today does not allude to issues of identity as vehemently as it did in the 1990s. Polls published by *El Mundo* in 1990 demonstrated that 77% of Puerto Ricans preferred keeping both English and Spanish as official languages, which suggests that language attitudes have been changing since then. Morris's (1995) interviews reaffirm the traditional role of Spanish as a marker of identity, which is confirmed in Lorenzo Hernández's (1999) study about categorization of return migrant Puerto Ricans. However, as the review of literature in Chapter 2 will show, there seems to be a decrease in the literature about language and identity in Puerto Rico after the early 2000s. The decrease in scholarly production and public debate on the issue must be representative of changing paradigms. The 1990s represent a turning point in the discourses of language policy because politicians were forced to change strategies to best serve their interests.

We agree with Schmidt's (2014) assessment that the PNP is now more likely to speak of teaching English and bilingualism as a matter of social justice. Moreover, the PNP no longer says much about the *estadidad jíbara.* The English-only groups gathered strength in the 1980s and, as McCarty (2004) proposes, the United States is currently "in the midst of a language panic" (p. 88) in which Spanish speakers are now the target of legislation that limits access to social equality. It is not in the PNP's interest to defend Spanish as it used to; instead it continues to endorse bilingualism.

In addition to the theme of social justice, we also expect to find discourses of globalization within the PNP's more recent texts regarding language education. These examples of interdiscursivity are usually conflicting, but they represent a modernized

version of their traditional narrative style through the decades. The nationalistic sentiment (*jíbaro*) is replaced by their conceptualization of social justice, while their vision of statehood is broadened by speaking of a modern, globalized world.

As for the PPD and PIP (*Partido Independentista Puertorriqueño,* or Pro-Independence party), it is more difficult to hypothesize about their more recent discourses because they do not seem to be as vocal about language policies in Puerto Rico as they used to be. A hypothesis to explain this, however, is that ideas about Puerto Rican identity have changed significantly since the beginning of the 21st century. Their previous discourses incited fear of linguistic and cultural displacement due to assimilation. Such rhetoric has probably lost some of its power because of the increasing rate of migration and the vast amount of exposure to North American popular culture through different media. Puerto Ricans have been Americanized, but so has much of the world.

Questions remain regarding the effects of new discourses on language education policy. If controversy has somewhat dissipated, then there is reason to believe that language attitudes have improved as observed by Morales and Blau (2009). It is probable, then, that the 2020 Census will show an increase in the number of Puerto Ricans who claim to speak English well. It is important to point out that there are many other variables that promote bilingualism, such as constant exposure to media and the influence of migration. On the other hand, if there is no meaningful increase in the number of speakers, then the Department of Education should consider introducing substantive reform to language education policy in public schools in Puerto Rico.

In sum, we may formulate several hypotheses to synthesize our expectations of this interdisciplinary and reflexive research:

1. Political discourse relating to language in Puerto Rico today does not allude to issues of identity as frequently as in the past.
2. Among the pro-statehood faction, it is now more likely that discourses surrounding bilingualism frame the matter as a means to social justice.
3. In addition to the theme of social justice, we also expect to find discourses of globalization within the PNP's more recent texts regarding language education.
4. The PPD and PIP are not as vocal about language policies in Puerto Rico as they used to be because ideas about Puerto Rican identity have changed since the onset of the 21st century.
5. Language attitudes toward English have improved, as observed by Morales and Blau (2009) and Dominguez (2012, 2019).
6. The 2020 Census will show an increase in the number of Puerto Ricans who claim to speak English well.

8.0 Structure of the dissertation

In the next few chapters, the reader will find that this dissertation presents, first, a review of literature that is focused on a variety of texts that illustrate the construction of the sociopolitical context in which discourses are produced and reshaped concerning the relationship between language and identity in Puerto Rico. In Chapter 2, we also include a timeline of language policies that provides an ampler view of the historical circumstances that led to the modern-day linguistic reality of the island as well as the stakeholders who designed it. In Chapter 3, we define the methodology to produce a

Critical Discourse Analysis of said discourses. We provide important definitions and delineate our plan of action to objectively and formulaically approach discourse analysis. In Chapter 4, we apply this methodology to the analysis of five political texts: two legislative pieces, a speech, a television commercial, and a political platform. The first four samples were produced between 1991 and 1993, and the fifth and last sample was produced 25 year later in 2016. Finally, Chapter 5 summarizes the most relevant aspects of the dissertation, reviews the hypotheses and objectives, outlines the implications, and offers recommendations that may lead to better attitudes and more positive educational outcomes.

Chapter 2: Review of literature

1.0 Introduction

This review of literature synthesizes an array of the sources that create a panoramic view of the object of study as well as the theoretical framework and methods to analyze it. At the end of the chapter, there is also an abbreviated timeline of the history of language policies in Puerto Rico. A detailed version of the timeline in included in the appendices of the dissertation.

The literature explored in this study includes texts in the fields of Political Science, Sociology, Sociolinguistics, Education, History, and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The sources from the first five disciplines are sources that provide *context,* while the sources on CDA provide different *methods* or approaches to the practice of discourse analysis. The latter are further discussed in Chapter 3: Methodology, so they will only be touched upon briefly in this review. Within the *context* category, there are numerous instances in which rhetorical strategies and identity discourses are analyzed such as Pabón's essays in *Nación postmortem* (2003b) as well as Torres-González's *Idioma, bilingüismo y nacionalidad* (2002). These books, however, do not formally use CDA approaches, but are rather critical-historical texts.

The literature that fits under the *context* category was chosen to provide a rich and varied supply of context for two basic reasons. First, one of the essential qualities that defines CDA is its interdisciplinary approach, which would not be attainable without using a variety of sources from different disciplines. Second, understanding historical developments is necessary for the accurate analysis of context. All these sources provide

diverse scholarly perspectives into the multi-layered issues of language and identity in Puerto Rico.

2.0 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework within which scholars write about the language problem in Puerto Rico is rooted in the conviction that language and culture are inevitably linked to the political status of the island. The PPD (pro-commonwealth) and the PNP (pro-statehood) have consistently stressed the need to separate cultural identity from political identity,[1] but until the status question is resolved, both parties will continue to establish language policies according to what is convenient for their partisan politics. In this process, they promote language ideologies that appear to benefit their political interests and distance themselves from opposing groups with differing objectives. We may define language ideologies as perceptions of language that are constructed to benefit a specific group (Hamers and Blanc as cited in Dominguez, 2012, p. 25). These perceptions are wrought through discourses that appeal to the values, norms, and motivations of different communities.

As van Dijk (1998) explains, the main social function of ideologies in general is "the co-ordination of the social practices of group members for the effective realization of the goals of a social group, and the protection of its interests" (p. 24). By critically analyzing ideological discourses used in language policies, we can further explain language ideologies and power dynamics between groups and expose the political motivations behind the decision-making process.

[1] The purposeful separation between cultural and political identity regards the culturally sanctioned Puerto Rican "personality" as distinct from the political label "American citizen." In the words of Luis Muñoz Marín, "for Puerto Ricans there is a great difference between feeling like an American citizen and feeling like an American" (my translation, as cited in Torres-González, 2002, p. 171).

Bourdieu (2000) claims that defending an official language that has been legitimized by the dominant class is the same as defending a hegemonic, social, and political structure that reproduces the unequal distribution of capital. When the State establishes an official language, it is simultaneously affirming its political authority and that of the language as the standard by which all other languages should be compared. This implies then that the state grants supremacy to a particular linguistic expression and delegitimizes others.

He also posits that the labor market together with the education system ratify the validity of the official language. To become more competitive and have access to better employment opportunities, people must accept the superiority of the imposed official language. Bourdieu states that acceptance is unconscious and accidental simply because the market favors "the holders of a given linguistic capital" (p. 471). Furthermore, the educational system's agenda is to centralize and continue legitimizing the language practices of the dominant class.

Similarly, McCarty (2004) views language policy as a mediation of power dynamics because, "as ideological constructs, language policies both reflect and (re)produce the distribution of power within the larger society" (p. 72). In addition, McCarty incisively introduces the concept of "national language panic" (p. 74), in which groups define cultural and linguistic diversity as "safe" or "dangerous" according to the apparent threat they present to the dominant classes and their perception of control.

If we apply Bourdieu's thesis to the Puerto Rican context where English is described by some as possessing higher linguistic capital because it is linked to economic progress (via college studies and job postings in the U.S.), then the defense of Spanish

would seem to function as a barrier to progress, and the fact that English instruction has not been significantly modified to improve student outcomes reveals that the State controls access to the legitimized language. On the other hand, the counterargument for the defense of Spanish includes emphasizing its prestige and linguistic capital in a global context (Ostolaza-Bey, 2001, p. 17), but academic achievement examination scores administered during academic year 2011-2012 demonstrated that 53% of students in the public education system only had basic mastery of written Spanish (as cited in Reyes, 2013, p. 48). Thus, access to both legitimized languages (or their standard varieties) is restricted. While we recognize that student outcomes depend on many variables which may or may not be within the scope of control of the public-school system, the established order preserves the status quo.

Regarding bilingualism, Pabón (2003b) accuses the intellectual elites of being hypocritical since they have access to and take advantage of private-school bilingual education while they oppose bilingual education for the lower classes and claim that learning English leads to Americanization and loss of identity (p. 100). This claim is connected to "language panics" as defined by McCarty in that English is presented as a danger and a threat to Puerto Rican integrity.

3.0 Context

The review that follows will consider the literature related to political science and language policy, sociology and identity, sociolinguistics and language attitudes, education and motivation, and history and language policy.

3.1 Political science and language policy

Throughout the literature, regardless of discipline, authors often reiterate that *language is intrinsically political.* It is not surprising, then, that political scientists would also produce their own contributions on the topic. These contributions are particularly significant to the exercise of Discourse Analysis because they work to confirm hypotheses regarding motivations and values within different ideological groups.

Schmidt (2014) focuses his study on the people and processes that influence educational language policies and the institutions where those policies are determined. He explains:

> educational language policies result from the refraction of individuals' and groups' interests through the institutions of the educational system. Those individuals and groups act as language stakeholders, people who invest time and resources, expecting to increase their influence over educational language policies. (p. 2)

Through the last century, different stakeholders effectively created or attempted to make changes in language policy, according to their ideological aims. Schmidt outlines how and why these different stakeholders acted by detailing important events in politics, education, and language policy in Puerto Rico since 1898. The author details all of Puerto Rico's Commissioners of Education, their position toward English education, and their place within Puerto Rican politics. He also analyzes other language stakeholders, such as the teacher's union and non-system actors, and describes their positions and roles in the education system as well as the degree of influence they held throughout the three periods he calls *Americanization*, *Puertoricanization,* and *Bilingualization*.

In contrast, Barreto (2001a and 2001b) analyzes changes in language policy from a game theory vantage while providing detailed accounts of the political circumstances that led to policy changes. He explains that language policies in Puerto Rico have historically responded to Rational Choice and Nested Games. Through Rational Choice theory, the author explains that, while the stated goal of all administrations has been to produce bilingual citizens through the education system, it is not in the politician's interest to change policy if it will affect the electoral payoff (lose votes). Using a spatial model to demonstrate Puerto Ricans' electoral preferences on a center-periphery axis, the author asserts that "status preferences are continuous, not discrete" (2001b, p. 99), meaning that both ends of the continuum lean toward the center. In other words, historically the PNP has had to defend Puerto Rico's "cultural autonomy" (through the *estadidad jíbara,* for example) to assert cultural nationalism and appeal to the electorate, while the PIP has asked to retain American citizenship even as an independent country, leaving the PPD somewhere in the middle.

Interestingly, politicians representing both major political parties in Puerto Rico have used the same strategy that digresses from the voter maximization rationale. Both Hernández Colón (governor responsible for Official Language Act of 1991) and Rosselló González (governor responsible for Official Languages Act of 1993) engaged in a Nested Game with a non-electoral payoff. The first intended to hurt the chances for statehood, while the other meant to align its policy with the "metropolitan logic" to improve Puerto Rico's chances of being admitted as a state. Barreto explains the timing and motivation for the implementation of both language policies, evidencing that decisions had more to

do with politics than with sociological or cultural considerations that would benefit Puerto Ricans.

3.2 Sociology and identity

A great source of sociological information is put forth by Morris (1995) who explores how Puerto Rican identity was defined by Puerto Ricans from the U.S. occupation to the 1990s. She questions the concept of "nation" when it implies cultural distinctiveness and homogeneity and results in the definition of an ingroup. Morris chronicles important moments in Puerto Rican history in which national identity was challenged due to the political relationship between the island and the United States; this includes changes or attempted changes in language policy and their symbolic relevance. Morris underscores the language issue as a point of conflict between political factions and its power as a symbol of defiance against the United States. However, there seemed to be a consensus about what it was to be Puerto Rican.

Part of that definition, what makes Puerto Ricans Puerto Rican, is a strong identification with the Spanish language. Lorenzo-Hernández (1999) studied how insular Puerto Ricans perceive Puerto Rican migrants based on Self-Categorization Theory and found that returning migrants "may be wrongfully perceived as hybrids who may 'contaminate' the culture with influences from the North" (p. 991). The author and other researchers agree that language is a critical element that indexes identity. Lorenzo-Hernández cites Lucca-Irizarry and Pacheco's psychological study of returning Puerto Rican migrants (1992) where they found that 70% of the subjects felt rejected because of their language usage (p. 993). Migrant Puerto Ricans who have difficulties expressing

themselves in Spanish or do not speak Spanish may be perceived as “violators of group consensus,” or “violators of important values of the Puerto Rican society” (p. 993).

Examining the research produced by Morris and Lorenzo-Hernández, we may draw conclusions regarding what a Puerto Rican is and what a Puerto Rican is not, according to the common imaginary. This anchored stereotype has been developed throughout the decades and serves to delineate the ingroup from the outgroup, and further highlights the importance of Spanish as a common value and an identity marker.

Nearly a decade later, Duany (2007) wrote about contrasting perspectives of Puerto Rican identity, considering the diasporic experience. The conception of Puerto Ricans as transnational rather than static emphasizes the heterogeneity and fluidity of cultural identity. Regarding language, however, Duany states that “while the Spanish language continues to be a basic symbol of national identity on the island, it has become a less reliable mark of Puerto Ricanness in the mainland” (p. 54). Thus, while there are sectors in society that are aware of different ways of being Puerto Rican, a common identity marker among insular Puerto Ricans continues to be the Spanish language.

Dominguez (2012, 2019) confirms in her doctoral dissertation and in a recent ongoing study that people today might be more open to redefining the Puerto Rican identity and changing their perceptions regarding the language and identity nexus. What is striking, however, is that, while there may be a rational openness to the idea, all participants in Dominguez’s study showed “a sense of ambivalence” when discussing the evolution of the Puerto Rican identity since the “Puerto Rican lifestyle has been changed because of exposure to the United States” (2012, p. 105). It is clear, then, that insular

Puerto Ricans are not yet entirely comfortable with redefinitions of the Puerto Rican identity.[2]

3.3 Sociolinguistics and language attitudes

Sources from the field of Sociolinguistics help contextualize the uses and functions of English and language attitudes in Puerto Rico. This information sheds light on the behavior and beliefs of insular Puerto Ricans and how they relate to both English and Spanish.

Fayer (2000) presents an analysis of the data collected by the United States Census Bureau in 1976, 1987-88, and 1996 regarding language use in Puerto Rico. The author explains who participated in the Census, their level of schooling, the domains in which they use English, among many other details. An enriching aspect of this analysis is that it reflects Puerto Ricans' feelings about the role and use of English through the years. Fayer's research suggests that, as the number of speakers increases, it can be assumed that people's language attitude toward English is becoming more positive. Also, she highlights that Puerto Ricans consume American popular culture through music and film, which have a direct influence on people's perceptions of language prestige. The author also notes a correlation between speaking ability and income (p. 94); this is an important factor to consider when analyzing power dynamics in language policy.

Regarding language attitudes, an important concept is introduced by Resnick (1993): motivated failure. The author posits that the official goal of the government has been to produce competent bilinguals, but it has consistently failed due to a "motivated

[2] A good example of ambivalence and flip-flopping of public opinion related to Puerto Rican identity is seen in the initial criticism and later support of Madison Anderson Berríos, Miss Puerto Rico 2019 (Guzmán, 2019). Madison was born in Arizona and raised in Florida, and her father is from the States while her mother was born in Puerto Rico. Madison did not grow up speaking Spanish.

failure—a society's successful resolution of a conflict between government planning for bilingualism and a social pressure for monolingualism" (p. 259). He attributes these "social pressures" to issues of national identity and removes blame from educational methodology. The association of language and identity restrains people from learning or practicing English because there is a fear that the colonial language will replace Spanish, resulting in cultural shift as well.

The fears and negative associations discussed by Resnick are further clarified by Clampitt-Dunlap (2000) who explains that language maintenance depends greatly on language attitudes and how people perceive a language in terms of its prestige and usefulness. She states that a country's intelligentsia is the main agent in presenting the vernacular as intrinsically linked to cultural identity so it is preserved, but in the case of Puerto Rico, the language maintenance "strategy" also includes a firm rejection of English (p. 26). The author presents a brief overview of public figures and institutions dedicated to the defense of Spanish, including José de Diego and Luis Muñoz Marín, and highlights how language was used to symbolize national identity with examples such as: [Spanish is the] "reflection of our personality… the vehicle of our maximum expression, of our spirit and our existence as Puerto Ricans" (López-Galarza as cited by the author, p. 30). Clampitt-Dunlap also illustrates how English was portrayed as a threat to Puerto Rican identity by citing Fernández-Vanga who felt that there were "intentions to rip out the mother tongue to replace it with English" (p. 30). These two examples illustrate her thesis that language maintenance in Puerto Rico and the small increase of English-speakers on the island has depended on both the support of the vernacular and the rejection of English.

Supporting Clampitt-Dunlap's thesis is López Laguerre's (1989) study of the attitudes of public school teachers toward bilingualism in Puerto Rico. In this study, the author examines how language ideologies espoused by politicians and intellectuals have shaped language attitudes throughout the years. She confirms that teachers' attitudes are ambivalent due to the conflicting ideas proposed by different, influential sectors of society.

Language attitudes, in addition to historical, political, socioeconomic, and pedagogical factors, can affect a society's ability to become bilingual. Pousada (1996) proposes that effective language planning (including planning of official languages) could help solve or at least improve the language teaching conflict. More specifically, in the case of Puerto Rico, she recommends the establishment of a non-partisan and independent language commission with representation from public and private schools, government, private enterprise, and the media, as well as language experts. One of its major missions would be to carry out surveys of language attitudes and sponsor public events to popularize language planning and debate.

3.4. Education and motivation

Aspects of sociolinguistics overlap with education, particularly since language attitudes have a decided effect on language learning. The most relevant aspect highlighted in the review of education literature is motivation. Lambert and Gardner (1972) state that instrumental motivation is pragmatic, individualistic, and for self-advancement, and integrative motivation is social, interpersonal, and "may concern identification with a language group and their cultural activities" (cited by Baker, 1992,

p. 32). The articles discussed in this section associate generally positive attitudes among students with instrumental motivation.

While López Laguerre's study demonstrates less than positive attitudes toward English and bilingualism among teachers in Puerto Rico, other studies have shown that students do not necessarily feel the same way. In an older study, Epstein (1967) analyzes students' achievement in Spanish and their attitudes toward English and Puerto Rican identity. The findings suggest that students who attended private schools did not feel less Puerto Rican despite their English language education, and that many public school students wanted to learn more English. Similarly, Lladó Berríos (1978) analyzed attitudes toward English among public school students in urban and rural areas and found that they generally had positive attitudes and recognized the importance of English for future employment, which suggests an instrumental motivation. Thirty years later, Morales and Blau (2009) highlight the possible transition toward potential bilingualism as a consequence of English media exposure[3] and Puerto Rican consumption of American popular culture. The authors describe this as "a sort of impersonal integration into North American culture" (p. 48).

These studies are relevant in that they provide information that projects toward the future. First, they ratify that, while there is a desire to learn English, on the one hand, personal integration is still not attractive to participants. It seems the conditions for a generalized integrative motivation have not been met just yet. For the participants in these studies, English is regarded instrumentally and is not considered for integrative or interpersonal reasons. More recent research on motivation, however, has shown that

[3] The rapid rate at which Puerto Ricans have been exposed to the English language over the last few decades is evidenced in Ruiz's 2019 doctoral dissertation.

English proficiency levels correlate with motivation where a high proficiency leads to high integrative motivation (Acevedo, 2017, p. 55), so there is reason to believe that attitudes progressively change as students develop their English speaking skills. Nevertheless, stigmas surrounding the English language in Puerto Rico have not faded entirely. English continues to be associated with higher social classes and to the statehood political ideology specifically, as reveled in the Guzzardo, Loureiro-Rodríguez, Fidan Acar and Vélez Avilés (2018) matched-guise study. These are defining identity markers that affect how people perceive English speakers.

3.5 History and language policy

Negrón de Montilla (1975) and López-Laguerre (1998) provide a detailed history of the language policies implemented by the Department of Public Instruction through the decades of the 20th century. Both authors cite the Annual Reports submitted by the Commissioners and the *Cartas Circulares* that instituted each policy. These texts are important references for creating the historical backdrop that led to our current context. In the case of Negrón de Montilla, her focus is specifically on the Americanization efforts made through Education policy up to 1930. López Laguerre continues this research up to the 1990s and weaves in details about the political circumstances of the island.

The last few sources to be included in this portion of the review of literature may be cataloged as critical-historical texts. The essential benefit of incorporating them into the review is that they read important historical events from a critical perspective that exposes ideologies.

Torres-González (2002) provides a historical account of bilingualism on the island from the Americanization period at the beginning of the 20th century to the policies

implemented during the inception of the 21st century. His contribution to this area of study is rich in details, and he also provides a critical analysis of political motivations that favored one language or another. He discusses the rhetoric utilized by politicians when discussing issues of language, as well as the policies implemented by different administrators.

Pabón (2003a) criticizes neonationalism in Puerto Rico as a constricting conceptualization of national identity that proposes a homogenous and Hispanophile national identity that excludes a large portion of Puerto Ricans (p. 19) to obstruct cultural assimilation and statehood. He discusses how the symbols of nationalism were usurped by the State to deradicalize nationalism and create a social consensus regarding national identity that was not at odds with colonialism. In providing a unified and static view of identity, Puerto Ricanness has been reduced, commodified, and exploited. Thus, Puerto Ricans consume and replicate a State-produced imaginary of neonationalism that does not respond to the multiple facets or fluidity of national identities.

This topic is also developed by González (2018) who observes that in a class-based society, the dominant class imposes its culture on the dominated class, and that which is representative of "national culture" is chosen by the dominant class (p. 11). This leads to the genesis of the Puerto Rican "national culture" and its nostalgia for a Spanish agrarian past. This is important in the construct of race and nationalistic discourse in Puerto Rico.

Pabón (2003b) also critiques the intellectual elites for assuming the right to police national identity as they define it and for using a discourse that naturalizes Spanish as biological inheritance from Spain, disregarding the colonial process that led to it. He

criticizes the hypocritical stance of the elites who, due to their privilege, effectively become competent bilinguals but object to the teaching of English on the island because of a fear of cultural disintegration. Pabón calls out this double standard as demagogic, elitist, and condescending (pp. 99-100). Pabón's reasoning resonates with Bourdieu and McCarty's postures regarding the legitimation of official languages as hegemonic barriers to linguistic capital.

The previously discussed sources together provide a wide window into the sociolinguistic reality of Puerto Rico, its history, and its stakeholders. Having a clear understanding of the events and the people that produced each sample text gives us clarity for studying how discourse and context shape each other.

4.0 Critical Discourse Analysis

The second category of literature reviewed deals with Critical Discourse Analysis which provides the tools to perform the analysis presented in this dissertation. The main authors consulted are Reisigl and Wodak (2016), van Dijk (1998), Fairclough (1998), and Gee (2011). According to these scholars, CDA is an interdisciplinary mediation through which to examine the relationship between language and society within a historical context which produces a discourse of its own (Wodak & Meyer, 2016, p. 19). The authors are emphatic in asserting that CDA does not establish any one method. Instead the context of the researcher (as well as that of the discourse) determines the approach. In addition to Gee's conception of context as infinite (2011), another essential contribution from Gee's approach is his view that a distant and empirical study of text and talk allows the analyst to approach the study of discourse as a fair and accurate outsider. As previously stated, Chapter 3 will detail the methods of Critical Discourse Analysis

proposed by each author. The following section briefly discusses other literature within the CDA category and its contributions to the field in general and in the Puerto Rican context, specifically.

An important addition to the field of CDA in general was produced by Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, and O'Garro-Joseph (2005) who, after analyzing 46 peer-reviewed articles in which some form of CDA took place in an educational setting or in educational policy documents, found that the exercise of CDA was not always handled in an objective, empirical manner. The authors outline important critiques to CDA: "(a) that political and social ideologies are read into the data; (b) that there is an imbalance between social theory, on the one hand, and linguistic method, on the other; and (c) that CDA is often divorced from social contexts" (p. 372). In this dissertation, such criticism has been taken to heart and reflected upon continuously throughout the process of analysis to identify and eliminate personal bias. The tabulation of patterns with the use of the ideological square is an attempt at approaching CDA in a logical and empirical fashion, and the analysis to be presented in Chapter 4 has been embedded in the largest possible frame of sociohistorical context to gain a clear perspective of participants' motivations and values.

Contributions that are specific to Puerto Rico include studies by Valdez (2016) and Shenk (2013, 2016). The analysis of metaphors in the development of ideological discourse is the main object of study in two of the sources. Valdez (2016) analyzes representations of Spanish, English, and Spanglish in different texts from mid-twentieth century Puerto Rico. Specifically, he analyzes the metaphors used by ideologues as tools

of persuasion and calls to action, linking them to Bourdieu's notion of "symbolic violence."

In the examples presented by Valdez, language ideologies, which shape language policy, are represented through metaphors of biology and essentialism or organicism. He affirms that purists "spread and defend the idea that the cultural and biological uniqueness of Puerto Ricans is encoded in Puerto Rican Spanish" and that the influence of English is a "terrible threat posed to it by those beyond its boundaries, a threat which calls for those most loyal to act and to police" (p. 3). This discourse contains biological metaphors that present language as a separate entity from the speakers with a life of its own.

The author briefly discusses the history of language in Puerto Rico and affirms that as a countermove to the Americanization program of the first half of the 1900s, the intelligentsia who favored independence wrought a nationalist identity in which Spanish was an essential component of Puerto Rican idiosyncrasy.

Salvador Tió, a "newspaper humorist," coined the term *espanglish* and campaigned against bilingualism and bilingual speakers using strong metaphors of biology and violence that spoke of *la lengua* as both the organ and the language and warned against the disfiguration, poisoning, and killing of Spanish through language contact. An example of his discourse can be seen below:

> No es capricho que lo más duro en el cuerpo humano sean los dientes. Defienden la lengua. Y no hay angustia mayor que la del hombre que sabe que quieren

> arrancársela. Hoy, más que ayer, la defendemos con uñas y dientes. (Tió as cited in Valdez, p. 20)[4]

Moreover, in this purist campaign, there is an Othering and a stigmatization of speakers. Proponents "fail to address the social context, the fact that the speakers of words are the ones on the receiving end of the social isolation and not merely the words by themselves" (p. 18). Salvador Tió's rhetoric implies that speakers who taint the language could very well destroy the culture and society.

Valdez's contribution is not strictly defined as Critical Discourse Analysis, but his approach to the analysis of metaphors is informed by the works of Bourdieu, Fairclough, Lakoff, and Foucault, which constitute the theoretical pillars of the critical analysis of discourse.

Shenk (2016) performs a similar analysis of metaphors related to bilingualism on the island during the period after Governor Luis Fortuño made two important announcements in 2012: first, that there would be a status plebiscite, and second, that math, science and physical education would be taught in English as part of the *Escuelas del Siglo XXI* (Schools of the 21st Century) curricular program.

An important insight of her analysis of Puerto Rican periodicals is that bilingualism on the island does not truly mean a binary linguistic system where people benefit from the knowledge of two languages, Spanish and English. Rather, bilingualism is understood as the ability to speak English, specifically (Shenk, 2016, p. 18). Moreover, in her analysis she confirms that, throughout the samples, there are repeated metaphors

[4] It is no whim that the hardest part of the human body is our teeth. They guard the tongue. And there is no deeper anguish than that of a man who knows others want to rip it out. Today, more than yesterday, we defend it with nails and teeth.

that associate English and Opportunities, and English and Opening Doors, which lead to mobility. This is further discussed throughout this dissertation.

Shenk (2013) also published an analysis of the discourses used to argue for and against bill H. R. 2499, the *Puerto Rico Democracy Act*[5], during the 2010 legislative session in Washington D. C., and illustrates how the debate turned from the question of Puerto Rico's political status to issues of language policy. This study focuses on discourses of erasure and legitimization throughout the debate, and it analyzes rhetorical strategies used to conceptualize cultural and linguistic identities. The author formally applies Critical Discourse Analysis theory proposed by experts such as van Dijk, Fairclough, Wodak, van Leeuwen, and a number of other authors.

This dissertation contributes to the scholarly production related to topics of language, identity, and politics in Puerto Rico under the methodological framework of Critical Discourse Analysis. The previously discussed literature recapitulates the transdisciplinary work that contextualizes the discourses to be analyzed and provides examples and models to perform the task at hand.

5.0 Timeline: History of language policies on the island

The following timeline details significant moments in the history of language policy in Puerto Rico. The abbreviated timeline includes only the official and educational language policies on the island and the groups and individuals who were in power at the time the policies were proposed or implemented. The timeline was produced as part of a

[5] The U.S. House of Representatives passed a bill titled the *Puerto Rico Democracy Act* which authorized a federally backed plebiscite to determine the political status of the island in relation with the United States. It was referred and formally presented in the U.S. Senate, but was tabled in 2010.

prior historical study of language policies in Puerto Rico (Martínez Ortiz, 2016), and a longer, more detailed timeline is available in the appendices of the dissertation.

Table 1: Abbreviated timeline

Year - Author	**Official Language Policy**	**Educational Language Policy**	**Political Power/Event**	**Governor-President**
1898-1900 John Eaton/Victor Clark	--	English: language course starting in the 1st grade; language of instruction from middle school onward.	USA military government	US Generals (4) W. McKinley
1900 Martin Brumbaugh	--	Spanish: language of instruction from 1st to 7th grade; English from 8th to 12th grade.	Foraker Act - civil government *Partido Republicano* Legislature	C. Herbert Allen W. McKinley
1902	Official Languages Act: Indistinguishable use of Spanish and English, except in municipalities, municipal and criminal courts, and the offices under them.			W. Henry Hunt T. Roosevelt
1905 Roland Falkner		English: language of instruction starting in 2nd grade; Spanish: language course.	*Partido Unión* Legislature (friendly with Winthrop)	B. Winthrop W. H. Taft

1911 AMPR			*Partido Unión* Legislature (disappointed with Winthrop)	E. Dexter (Commissioner) G. R. Colton W. H. Taft
1916 Paul Miller		Spanish: language of instruction in most classes until 4th grade; 5th grade included classes in Spanish and English; 6th and higher, English as language of instruction except for physiology and Spanish.		A. Yager W. Wilson
1917			Jones Act – U.S. Citizenship	A. Yager W. Wilson
1921 Juan B. Huyke		Continued Miller's policy. Implemented oral English exam to graduate; official department communications were written in English.		E. M. Reily W. G. Harding
1934 José Padín		Spanish: language of instruction up to 8th grade; English: language class up to 8th grade, language of instruction in high school.	*Partido Republicano* Legislature	R. H. Gore F. D. Roosevelt

1937-1940 José Gallardo		Spanish: language of instruction until 2nd grade, 2/3 of courses in 3rd and 4th grade, ½ of courses in 5th and 6th, 1/3 of courses in 7th and 8th. English: language of instruction in high school.		B. C. Winship F. D. Roosevelt
1940-1942 José Gallardo		1st and 2nd grades were taught in Spanish, 3rd through 6th were taught in Spanish with a content review session in English, and 7th and 8th classes were taught in English.	*Partido Popular Democrático* Senate; Pro-statehood Coalition House	Several interim governors, including Gallardo himself, R. Tugwell (1941) F.D. Roosevelt
1942 José Gallardo		Padín's Policy: Spanish 1st-8th grade; English in high school.		R. Tugwell F. D. Roosevelt
1949 Mariano Villaronga		Spanish: language of instruction; English: preferential language course.	PPD	L. Muñoz Marín H. S. Truman
1969 Ramón Mellado Parsons		Villaronga policy; more bilingual schools, immersion and transitional bilingual programs for English speakers in Spanish-speaking society.	PNP	L. Ferré

1990		*Ley Orgánica del Departamento de Educación del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico*		R. Hernández Colón George H. W. Bush
1991 Gov. Rafael Hernández Colón	Spanish: sole official language			George H. W. Bush
1993 Gov. Pedro Rosselló	English and Spanish equal as official languages		PNP	Bush/Clinton transition
1997 Victor Fajardo		*Proyecto para formar un ciudadano bilingüe*		P. Rosselló B. Clinton
1999		*Ley Orgánica de Educación – español "y/o" inglés*		P. Rosselló B. Clinton
2012		*Generación Bilingüe* was announced, but it was not made official.		L. Fortuño B. Obama
2017		*Bilingüismo, llave para el éxito* was approved via executive order but was not implemented.		R. Rosselló Nevares D. Trump

The more detailed timeline (Appendix 1) includes comments on the political background that shaped language policy as well as the reactions produced by the policies. These comments are meant to provide context. The timeline also presents legal and political expressions regarding official language policies as well as educational language

policies by political leaders, intellectuals, educators, and other language stakeholders and their actions to promote a change in the linguistic spectrum in Puerto Rico.

Chapter 3: Methodology

1.0 Introduction

There is no one correct way to critically analyze discourse. At best, we can design approaches that lead to the productive analysis of language in a particular context. It is this last element—context—that determines which tools we need in discourse analysis in addition to a critical mindset, that is, the ability to question what motivates and shapes the way we think and communicate.

The approach to discourse analysis used in this dissertation combines aspects of the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) as illustrated by Reisigl and Wodak (2016), aspects of van Dijk's (1998) sociocognitive approach, as well as Fairclough's (2016) dialectical-relational approach and several of Gee's (2011) tools for discourse analysis. Specific objectives include: clearly defining historical and political contexts diachronically to better trace intertextuality and interdiscursivity; identifying logical fallacies and thematic patterns or motifs to deconstruct arguments; and tracing the desired emotional effect on the audience, especially regarding identity, through the rhetorical and semiotic strategies used to evoke it.

The methodology utilized in this dissertation is organized into two parts: analysis of context and analysis of discourse and semiotic structures. By layering and defining different concepts, we will be able to elucidate shifting meanings and purposes in political language in Puerto Rico throughout time.

2.0 Analysis of context

Context may be generally defined as "the environment in which a discourse occurs" (Song, 2010, p. 876). However, the literature on Critical Discourse Analysis

provides different definitions of context and proposes direct and indirect ways of addressing its analysis.

For example, Fairclough (1998, 2001, 2016) rarely speaks about context and instead refers to *social practices* that include particular discourses as well as values, instruments, objectives, etc. His dialectical approach to the analysis of semiosis and social practice proposes *orders of discourse*: the semiotic "social practices that constitute social fields, institutions, organizations, etc." […], configured through different *genres, discourses* and *styles* that correspond to each group's identity (2016, pp. 88-89). As a specific example, let us consider the social practices in the field of the political campaign where a political candidate presents a persuasive speech to an audience according to the semiotic norms of the political rally speech genre that correspond to the ideological discourse and style associated with the politician's particular way of presenting the world to his or her constituents.

The Reisigl and Wodak (2016), on the other hand, define context directly as having four components:

a. the immediate, language or text-internal co-text and co-discourse;
b. the intertextual and interdiscursive relationships between utterances, texts, genres, and discourses;
c. the social variables and institutional frames of a specific 'context of situation';
d. the broader sociopolitical and historical context, which discursive practices are embedded in and related to. (pp. 30-31)

Thus, the DHA views context as varied sources of data which include the immediate linguistic context, the interdiscursive and intertextual context, the specific context of

situation, and the wider sociohistorical context. The DHA examines different layers of context such as language communities, social actors, and fields of political action that shape public opinion (p. 38). To analyze the context of an article about climate change, the DHA would evaluate the participants, the types of interdiscourses employed to convey a point, as well as the physical placement of the text in a website or journal and the sociopolitical moment in which it occurs, among other features.

In contrast, van Dijk (2006) speaks of *context models* which "are not 'objective' or 'deterministic' constraints of society or culture at all, but subjective participant interpretations, constructions, or definitions of such aspects of the social environment" (p. 163). Van Dijk holds that contexts are not observable, but that their results are made explicit through discourse. Moreover, he states that "traditional" views of context are unsatisfactory because, in any given case, participants who share the same contextual factors would not necessarily speak and behave in the same way. For example:

> Tony Blair's position, his international policies, or the rules of the UK House of Commons do not 'cause' or 'determine' the way he speaks as if these were 'objective' conditions. If this would be so, all PMs in the 'same context' would have said the same thing, which is highly unlikely. (p. 162)

We do not believe anyone would claim that which van Dijk criticizes, though we understand that this example is meant to make a point regarding the variability of individual context. Van Dijk's approach to context is centered on *mental models* and the idiosyncratic interpretations of communicative events according to personal evaluations of the world. While we do grant that contexts are reinterpreted and reshaped by complex human beings within their own subjectivities, we also understand that a valuable tool to

understand discourse is attempting to comprehend that which is identifiable (genres, styles, sociopolitical circumstances, etc.) and how it works in the larger scheme of human interaction. As Rogers et al (2005) point out, CDA should not remove the social context in which discourse was produced, and we add that individuals actively perform within their social networks to shape and be shaped by the circumstances around them.

Gee's (2011) definition of context harmonizes many of the different elements introduced by the previously discussed definitions. He puts together an analysis of context represented through language where orders of discourse, metalinguistic, situational, sociohistorical, and cognitive components are considered. He states:

> Context, however, is indefinitely large, ranging from local matters like the positioning of bodies and eye gaze, through people's beliefs and previous interactions, to historical, institutional, and cultural settings. […] There is always the possibility of considering other and additional aspects of the context, and these new considerations may change how we interpret the utterance. (p. 31)

There are aspects of context which will be beyond the analysist's reach, and that is understandable. A reflexive and critical attitude guides the researcher to approach the analysis of context in a structured manner that aims for the greatest degree of objectivity possible and a responsible analysis of discourse.

In this dissertation, we define *context* as the immediate location and shape of a text within the sociopolitical moment it occupies in its culture; location refers to the real-time appearance of the text within a historical period, and shape refers to the physical embodiment of the communicative event. Moreover, context is the product of social and historical events that simultaneously result in diverse discourses, as they are socially

produced by groups in epistemic communities according to their common circumstances, values, and goals. Context may be fragmented and rebuilt. The relationship between context and discourse is dialectical in that they continually reshape each other.

As a first step to analyze context, we may begin by providing an empirical description of the macrostructure of the text in question to contextualize the text in itself: its length, media, genre, references, etc. (Reisigl and Wodak, 2016, p. 45). The analysis of the macrostructure is enriched by using a modified version of Dell Hymes' SPEAKING model (Salzmann, Stanlaw, and Adachi, 2012, pp. 189-196), which provides a structured guide to which elements to consider as we approach the texts. This method helps analyze context since it decodes "communicative behavior in relation to the sociocultural variables associated with human interaction" (p. 186), or social practices. The model is used as a point of departure and modified to suit the researcher's needs as follows:

- Setting and scene: the physical and atmospheric setting where a speech event takes place, contrasted with the "psychological setting" (scene) within and among the participants.
- Participants: the speaker, the intended listener, and the unintended listener. Participants belong to social groups according to their age, gender, social status, goals, values, principles, etc.
- Ends (or objectives): communicative events take place to achieve a goal, whether to explain, persuade, for emotional effect, or other reasons that have an impact on the recipient.
- Act sequence: the sequence of events, signs, and gestures as they occur.

- Keys (or mood): attitude and register, the manner and tone in which a message is delivered; performance, if applicable.
- Instrumentalities: linguistic or semiotic channels through which meaning is expressed.
- Norms (or expectations of conduct): the rules of interaction and interpretation, including turn-taking, silences, volume, proxemics, body language, etc.
- Genre: the predictable forms a specific communicative act takes; for example, political speeches, religious sermons, academic lectures, courtroom trial, legislative hearings, etc.

The SPEAKING model coincides somewhat with Fairclough's (2016) elements of the order of discourse and social practices, though the latter addresses context through its semiotic representations and emphasizes its sociocognitive nature. They both define genre as a way of acting in a specific field, and that which Fairclough defines as style ("identities or ways of being" within a specific context) is similar to Hymes' norms and keys and may allude to a sort of performance. Finally, Fairclough's definition of discourse, the "semiotic ways of construing aspects of the world which can generally be identified with different positions or perspectives of different groups of social actors" (p. 88) is closely associated with participants and how they categorize themselves and others. Making the connection between Hymes' model and Fairclough's orders of discourse bridges empirical and semiotic aspects of the same components of context and provides for a multilayered analysis.

The next step in the analysis of context uses three of Gee's (2011) tools for discourse analysis. We shall call them disambiguation tools because, as he posits, "we need to see all the assumptions and information speakers leave unsaid and assume listeners know and will add in to make the communications clear" (p. 8). This refers to the shared knowledge of an epistemic community. The analyst must make this part of context overt, while it is most likely implicit in the communicative event. The specific tools to be used are Gee's *Fill in tool*, *Frame problem tool,* and *Make strange tool.*

The *Fill in tool* (p. 12) asks what information listeners must have in order to understand a message as the speaker wants it to be understood. With this tool, we can build a better profile of the participants and their epistemic community, since it invites us to question what their underlying assumptions and values are.

The *Frame problem tool* (pp. 29-37) addresses the frame or scope of the context that is considered when analyzing discourse. Gee suggests that the cutoff in learning about context depends on the relevance of details and reminds us that "any aspect of context can affect the meaning" (p. 31). This is why Gee highlights the importance of falsification as we research context. The more context we are able to grasp, the better we are able to view the complete picture of when, where, and why a communicative event takes place the way it does. The frame problem tool (which approaches context from a wider, more inquisitive perspective) allows the analyst to validate or reject (falsify) a hypothesis.

Gee's *Making strange tool* (pp. 12-19) enables the analyst to approach the study of discourse as an outsider. This tool allows us to reveal explicitly that which we may take for granted. Why was a message delivered in such a way? What did the speaker

mean by the use of a specific word? What was the purpose of a silence or an image? Above all, it provides for a wider view of text and talk, given that it invites the analyst to consider everything, rather than aim at specific "flags" which may sway the analysis in one way or the other. By having a wider scope, we are able to question everything within and surrounding the object of study.

3.0 Analysis of discourse and semiotic structures

For the purposes of this dissertation, we are attempting to separate the analysis of context from that of discourse and semiotic structures. It is important to point out, however, that the boundaries between the two analyses may be unclear because of their very nature. Language and discourse bring to light large portions of context that are not necessarily initially evident to the analyst; thus, to understand the context, we must analyze the language. On the other hand, language cannot be meaningful without its context; thus, to understand meaning, we must analyze the context. There is, therefore, a dialectical relationship between context and discourse. Moreover, because this dissertation intends to carry out a diachronic analysis of shifts in discourse, it is also important to emphasize that "discourses are historical and can therefore only be understood with reference to their context" (Wodak and Meyer, 2016, p. 19).

The literature on CDA also provides different but complementary definitions of the concept of discourse. We have already mentioned Fairclough's view of discourse as a semiotic rendering of the world according to the perspectives of different groups. Other definitions combine semiotic and sociocognitive elements and also highlight the role of context. Van Leeuwen (2016), for example, defines discourses as "socially constructed ways of knowing some aspect of reality which can be drawn upon when that aspect of

reality has to be represented, or […] context-specific frameworks for making sense of things" (p. 138). In other words, *discourse* is the way a group of people perceives, articulates, and recreates its view of the world regarding a particular subject in a specific context that may be narrow or large. Through the analysis of discourse, we can identify the speaker's ideological objective.

This dissertation will use different strategies to zoom into specific discursive patterns. Taking *self-categorization theory* as explained by Reicher and Hopkins (1996) as a starting point to approach issues in identity, we will utilize discourse analysis tools such as the *ideological square* (van Dijk, 1998), the *analysis of argumentation/validity of claims* (Reisigl and Wodak, 2016), *recontextualization* (Fairclough, 2016), and *intertextuality and interdiscursivity* (Fairclough, 2016; Reisigl and Wodak, 2016). The sample texts will be analyzed separately. For each text, a narrative analysis of each section will be provided. After the section analysis is complete, a tabular representation of the results will classify the findings from the entire sample text into different categories to help identify patterns. Finally, an overall analysis of the complete text will conclude the study of each sample text. Once all the sample texts are analyzed, we shall present the overall analysis of discourse on language policies in Puerto Rico.

Self-Categorization Theory (SCT**)** proposes that people define themselves in relation to an ingroup and an outgroup, in such a manner that their identities fit the qualities that define group membership and reject the qualities of the outgroup (Reicher and Hopkins, 1996, p. 354). The analysis of participants (age, gender, social status, goals, values, principles, etc.) helps us index the qualities that define group membership. On the other hand, *othering* participants and social groups refers to the discursive strategy that

establishes the opposing view point as a threat to the common goals and values of the ingroup. These criteria may be framed within the ideological square, so we can identify the use of *polarizing* discourse, which aims to divide groups, ratify ingroup values, and dissuade opposition at the risk of losing ingroup membership.

The *ideological square* (van Dijk, 1998) identifies linguistic and semiotic patterns and organizes them by category and frequency of occurrence. It is made up of the specific or general descriptions that are included in propositions. In discourse, the ingroup is described with specific, positive attributes, whereas positive attributes of the outgroup are described in a general, superficial way. The negative attributes of the ingroup are mentioned in a general way, while the negative attributes of the outgroup are described in specific detail. Thus, we may diagram this discursive pattern in the Ideological Square:

Table 2: The ideological square

	Specific	**General**
(+)	in	Out
(-)	out	In

A schematic organization of elements and concepts of this type can show patterns in grammar and semantic structures that aim toward *self-categorization, othering,* or other discursive objectives. We shall take the ideological square as a model and modify it to suit our purposes as shown below.

Some of the grammatical and semantic elements to consider are:

- Active/passive voice: to enhance or reduce agency

  Example: *<u>The police</u> shot down protesters. / Protesters were shot down <u>by the police</u>.* The active voice places the police as subjects

and primary agents, while the passive voice sets the police on a secondary level of agency.

- Referents: clear versus ambiguous referents

  Example: *Employees will not receive a Christmas bonus this year; it is in the community's better interest to make small sacrifices now that will have positive results for all in the long term.* The concepts "community" and "all" are ambiguous: Is higher management part of the community? Who does "all" refer to? Moreover, how does the speaker define "positive results" regarding the different interests of the various sectors within the community?

- Lexical items: association of words with specific values and norms (van Dijk, 1998, p. 31)

  Example: *I will filibuster any attempt to pass any socialist policy.* Among politically conservative groups in the United States, the word "socialist" is used to label the opposition, often without regard to the definition of "socialism."

- Motif: reoccurrence of lexical items, images or other semiotic content throughout discourse; may be used to *anchor* meaning and limit the number of possible interpretations of discourse (Barthes, 1977, p. 156).

  Example: In a longer text or in several texts, speakers of the same ideology may use the same cliché, tagline, or narrative to present a coherent view of a subject from a unified perspective. A specific example would be Donald Trump's catchphrase "Make America

> great again." Throughout his presidential campaign and during his presidency, the phrase creates a sense of nostalgia for an ambiguous, previous greatness which guides the discursive lines of Trump's speeches.

These elements together help thread ideological discourses. In addition to analyzing the grammatical and semantic structures that fit within the ideological square, we shall also examine the validity of claims that build social narratives.

Argumentation/validity of claims refers to the analysis of discursive strategies to deconstruct premises as reasonable topics or fallacies. An analysis of the claims allows us to identify the thesis and evaluate its supporting evidence, whether it is built on a coherent line of thought or logical fallacies. The analysis of rhetorical strategies sheds light on the discursive objectives and the desired psychological and cognitive effect of the speaker on the audience.

Following the DHA's approach, this research project puts forward the "diachronic reconstruction and explanation of discursive change" (Reisigl and Wodak, 2016, p. 57). To do so, it is important to analyze how semiotic information may be *recontextualized* and how the speaker employs *intertextuality* and *interdiscursivity*. These three strategies emphasize the dialectical relationship between language and context, as discourse and semiotic elements may be imbued with new meaning over and over again.

Recontextualization: Fairclough (2016) explains recontextualization as the "colonization" or "appropriation" of a discourse by a foreign social field (p. 89). Historically, we can see how different semiotic elements (the Puerto Rican flag, for example) have been repurposed for political strategy to eliminate the original meaning.

Recontextualization may be connected to the *erasure* of identities and the *legitimation* of new meanings. More organically, however, the DHA recognizes that discourses are dynamic and reshaped by contexts just as contexts are reshaped by discourse.

Intertextuality is the recurrence of a text, concept, argument, etc. in different texts throughout time. It may be a form of recontextualization or decontextualization. As a rhetorical strategy, intertextuality may also be used to appeal to authority or to tradition.

Interdiscursivity links topics and subtopics characteristic of one discourse with another discourse. For example, during the last few decades, discourses about education have used a language that is typically associated with discourses about the global economy. Interdiscursivity may also be associated with the styles and genres of a specific discourse as they are woven into a different discourse (Fairclough, 2016, p. 90).

4.0 The overall methodology

The overall methodology utilized in this dissertation is summarized in the table below which organizes the analytical process into different stages, starting with different components of context and then decoding the semiotic discursive structures. Once these structures and strategies are identified and tabulated, the frequency of occurrence should show definite patterns within the object of study.

Table 3: Overall methodology	
I. Analysis of context	
Concept	**Analysis**
Macrostructure	summary of description
Setting and scene	physical and atmospheric setting; emotional content
Participants	age, gender, social status, goals, values, principles, etc.; ideological group; self-categorization (qualities of group)

Ends	goals and objectives; ideological aims
Act sequence	description of sequence of events
Keys	attitude and register; performance; semiotic markers of identity
Instrumentalities	linguistic or semiotic channels
Norms	rules of interaction; semiotic markers of identity
Genre	format, style in which event takes place
Fill in tool	common knowledge or shared assumptions required for effective communication
Frame problem tool	relevant contextual details; historical and sociopolitical location of text
Making strange tool	making explicit that which is implicit

II. Analysis of discourse and semiotic strategies		
Concept	**Analysis**	**Patterns**
Ideological square	Ingroup/outgroup references • Self-categorization: self-identify with a group according to common values and goals • Othering and polarizing: distancing from opposing group • Grammar and semantic structures: active/passive voice, referents, lexical items, motifs, etc.	
Argumentation/validity of claims	Reasonable topics or fallacies (*non-sequitur*[1], *ad verecundiam*[2], appeal to emotion, etc.)	
Recontextualization, Intertextuality, Interdiscursivity	• repurposing of semiotic data • recurrences of a text, concept, argument, etc. in different texts • uses topics that are distinct in one type of discourse in different discourses; applicable to styles	

[1] Problem in logical construction of argument: equivalent to "does not follow."

[2] This refers to the use or misuse of an authoritative source as evidence.

5.0 The samples

The period to be focused on will be the 1990s, taking elections and referendums as landmarks. It was during this decade that, for the first time in Puerto Rican history, Puerto Rican legislators enacted two official language acts in a span of two years. It was also during this decade that the Organic Act of the Department of Education established in 1990 that public schools should use Spanish as the language of instruction and teach English as a mandatory language course, a stipulation which was later amended in 1999 so that the language of instruction could be either Spanish or English.

Moreover, to analyze the diachronic changes in discourses, the research will also consider Ricardo Rosselló's *Plan para Puerto Rico* (2016) to examine if the same trend has continued or if it has diverged somehow.

The specific texts to be analyzed in this dissertation are the following:

a. Official Language Act of 1991

b. Rafael Hernández Colón's speech representing the people of Puerto Rico at the ceremony of the *Principado de Asturias,* 1991

c. Advertising campaign 1991 referendum, *Vota no contra la separación*

d. Official Languages Act of 1993

e. *Plan para Puerto Rico: Un modelo para la transformación socioeconómica de nuestra isla,* 2016

Most of the samples are available online. The consulted databases were the *Fundación Hernández Colón* website, *YouTube*, the *Oficina de Servicios Legislativos (OSL)* website, and Ricardo Rosselló's political platform website, *Plan para Puerto Rico*. The oldest of the legislative pieces, the Official Language Act of 1991, is not available through the OSL and was requested at the Puerto Rico Supreme Court Library.

The next chapter will present the discourse analysis of the selected samples.

Chapter 4: Analysis

1.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed analysis of each of the five sample texts. As previously explained in Chapter 3, the context of each text is explained followed by a narrative analysis of its discourse. The description of the context consists of the macrostructure, the setting, participants, and ends, the act sequence, keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genre, as well as information obtained by utilizing the Fill in Tool, the Frame Problem Tool, and the Making Strange Tool. The analysis of the discourse consists of a close, line by line analysis of each section of the text followed by a tabulation which summarizes the findings and a final overall analysis which makes connections among discourse, ideology, and identity.

2.0 Sample 1: Official Language Act of 1991, Law 4, April 5, 1991, to declare Spanish the official language of Puerto Rico

2.1 Context

2.1.1 Macrostructure

This legislative piece follows the standard format and is introduced by the long title of the law, which, according to legislative rules and regulations, must clearly communicate the purpose of the enactment of said law and address a single issue at a time (Oficina de Servicios Legislativos, 2017, p. 20). The title is followed by a six-paragraph statement of purpose or legislative preamble, the "decree clause," and then the seven articles that provide the normative body of the law. The statement of purpose, which is discretionary, provides a brief chronological history of language policies in Puerto Rico since 1902 and cites laws, bills, and judiciary decisions. Important political

leaders are mentioned as well as their positions regarding language policy on the island. The case of the Philippines is also mentioned in passing. The last paragraph in the statement of purpose provides a justification for adopting the Official Language Act of 1991. The language used in these paragraphs is more nuanced than the language used in the following articles. The statement of purpose allows the author of the legislative piece to document his rationale and build a case for the legislation.

After the "decree clause," the seven articles establish the terms under which the government of Puerto Rico would carry out the law. They may be summarized as follows: Article 1 declares Spanish the official language; Article 2 establishes that all government offices must enable mechanisms for compliance with the law; Article 3 provides for exceptions and protection of constitutional rights; Article 4 repeals the language law of 1902; Article 5 protects the teaching of English as a second language; Article 6 exempts documents previous to the enactment of the law from compliance; and Article 7 is the required clause that declares when the law will take effect, in this case, immediately upon approval.

2.1.2 Setting, participants, and ends

The bill was presented and debated in both chambers of the Puerto Rico legislature and was later signed into law by Governor Rafael Hernández Colón in the *Centro de Bellas Artes* in Santurce on April 5th, 1991. The bill was written by the Representative from Utuado, Héctor López Galarza, who had previously worked as a high school teacher. López Galarza was chair of the House Commission on Education and Culture for the *Partido Popular Democrático* (PPD), the ruling party at that moment. Other participants included politicians from the three different parties who had to debate

the measure, some of whom supported and others of whom rejected the measure. Outside of the legislative process and among the general population of Puerto Rico, polls revealed in 1990 that 77% of Puerto Ricans supported having two official languages and only 22% supported making Spanish the sole official language (Barreto, 2001a, pp. 66-73).

The bill declared Spanish the official language of Puerto Rico. While it did not intend to make significant changes in ordinary government practices, the text, as penned by López Galarza, overtly aimed to eliminate the status of English as an official language in order to confirm Spanish as the language used by the vast majority of people and the insular government. Previously, legislators had introduced similar bills, but none were approved.

2.1.3 Act sequence, keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genre

The bill was introduced by the Commission on Education and Culture in 1989 but was not debated in the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico until 1990. The Puerto Rican Senate passed the bill in March 1991, and the governor signed it into law exactly one month later.

The text is written entirely in Spanish. Like any piece of jurisprudence, the law is written using a formal register. Unlike other examples of legal writing, laws are written clearly and concisely to guarantee that all readers will understand the intended message. The statement of purpose uses a rhetorically richer language that contextualizes the legislative piece and provides justification for its immediate approval. It also establishes the ideological program which drives the creation of said law. This is standard in this genre of writing. Laws are directive speech acts (Solum, 2012), and the articles included

in the text use authoritative language that expressly informs the consequences of the approval of the law.

2.1.4 Fill in tool

To understand the full depth of the text, the reader must first have basic knowledge of certain aspects of Puerto Rican history and its sociopolitical relationship with the United States. The text functions within the premise that the reader understands what *Commonwealth* or *Estado Libre Asociado (ELA)* means in the context of Puerto Rico and specifically from the perspective of the PPD. The reader must understand that it is the PPD's position that the Commonwealth status resolves the status quo, makes possible a positive, political relationship between both nations, and that Luis Muñoz Marín is the man who made this political state a reality. Muñoz serves as a chronological marker that divides what happened before the creation of the ELA from what happened after its foundation.

Moreover, it is important to understand the defense of Spanish as a cultural value that is important to the author and those who are likeminded. When the United States first arrived in Puerto Rico, its officials decided that the best way to accomplish their goals for the island would be through an Americanization process. One of the strategies was to impose English as the language of instruction with the intention of phasing out Spanish among the natives. Puerto Rico had a very well-educated *criollo* intelligentsia who would "take on the task of presenting the vernacular as an essential component of ethnocultural identity to the masses" (Clampitt-Dunlap, 2000, p. 26). In a 1998 interview, López Galarza stated that language policy had always been an issue of concern for him as a high

school teacher (Barreto, 2001a, p. 67). The resistance to the imposition of English continues to be a signifier of Puerto Rican identity, justice, and patriotism.

2.1.5 Frame problem tool

Prior to the enactment of the law, United States Congress had debated whether or not to hold a federal referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico. The hearings, which started in the summer of 1989, questioned whether Puerto Rico would be culturally compatible with the rest of the United States, focusing a great deal of attention on language usage. Ultimately, the hearings ended unproductively in October 1990 since there was no consensus regarding the terms of the three status options to be presented in the plebiscite (Barreto, 2001a, pp. 60-72).

In 1990, the *Ley Orgánica del Departamento de Educación del Estado Libre Asociado* was enacted. It ratified that Spanish would continue to be the language of instruction and English would continue to be taught as a subject course as instituted by Luis Muñoz Marín's Secretary of Education, Mariano Villaronga, back in 1949 (Torres-González, 2002, p. 212). In other words, the educational language policy would not change.

2.1.6 Making strange tool

The text provides several details that may be clarified to help contextualize its discourse. For example, the author enumerates several political and cultural leaders on the island and then states that they failed to protect the role of Spanish in education. However, an explanation of their failures is missing. In actuality, their efforts were unsuccessful because the American executive council vetoed the projects (Torres-González, 2002, p. 118). This harkens back to the 1902 official language law which

enabled the U.S. federal government to place English speakers in the highest positions of insular government, effectively impeding Puerto Ricans from occupying decision-making positions. Moreover, though the text mentions that the United States president appointed "civil servants that only spoke English to the highest positions" of government (para. 3), it fails to clarify that this dynamic benefitted English speakers and created a sort of diglossic class system within the government.

Héctor López Galarza, the author of the bill, also mentions the Supreme Court decision in *Pueblo v Tribunal Superior* which established that all legal proceedings in the insular court system would be held in Spanish. He states that the 1965 decision nullified the applicability of the 1902 language law to the local court system, but upon closer reading of the Supreme Court ruling, it is clear that the 1965 decision simply ratifies the 1902 statute. The 1902 law directly establishes in Section 5 that the interchangeability of English and Spanish is not applicable to the municipal court system to which the Superior Court belongs. Thus, the court decision does not produce a new precedent, but rather clarifies that the indistinct use of the languages "only has administrative reach and does not confer a right, neither for the accused nor his attorney, to choose the language in which the criminal proceeding should be aired" (*Pueblo v Tribunal Superior,* 1965).

Regarding the link between Puerto Rico and the Philippines, López Galarza mentions that they both became possessions of the United States after the Spanish-American War and were subject to the imposition of English as an official language as part of a plan for cultural assimilation (Para. 1). The second paragraph emphasizes that Filipinos did not speak Spanish and that the United States rulers postponed the deadline for making English the only official language in the Philippines three times, but it does

not explain why this postponement occurred or provide details regarding the linguistic reality of the Philippines. The text establishes a linguistic and historical contrast between both island nations, but it is not developed further.

Several language bills had been introduced to the Puerto Rican legislature at different points in time to no avail. One must wonder why Law Number 4 of 1991 was any different and what allowed it to be approved. What political circumstances favored its approval? How does the language used in the law reflect those circumstances? Barreto (2001a) explains that "changes in attitude resulted from the 1988 U.S. elections and the federal government's commitment to address the status question" (p. 57). He proposes that the 1991 Official Language Act passed as a means to deter the United States Congress from allowing Puerto Rico to become a state of the union.

2.2 Discourse

2.2.1 Section analysis

The following section fragments the original text to facilitate closer reading. The use of **boldface** and underlining is added by the researcher to guide the reader and should not be mistaken as being part of the original text. The use of *italics* is included in the analysis of discourse to distinguish concepts pertaining to CDA.

Cuando los Estados Unidos adquirieron a Puerto Rico y a las Filipinas como resultado de la Guerra Hispanoamericanas los nuevos gobernantes **intentaron** sustituir las instituciones de estos pueblos con **instituciones estadounidenses. La imposición del inglés como lengua oficial** fue la piedra angular de esa política de asimilación cultural.

To introduce the statement of purpose, the author provides a cause-and-effect explanation of the colonial relationship between the United States, and Puerto Rico and the Philippines. He refers to the U.S. as "los nuevos gobernantes" (the new rulers) who attempted to replace the institutions of these people with U.S. institutions (line 3). With the word "intentaron*"* (attempted, line 2), he points to their failure to impose English on the population or to effectively provoke cultural assimilation. After referring to U.S. institutions in line 3, the train of thought that immediately follows is that all of the preceding led to the imposition of the English language (lines 3-4), implying that English and Spanish are institutions in themselves.

5 En Filipinas, donde el uso del **español** nunca se generalizó entre la población
6 nativa y por consiguiente **tampoco llegó a ser la lengua materna** del grueso de los
7 filipinos, los gobernantes norteamericanos dispusieron en el 1900 que el **inglés** sería el
8 **único idioma oficial** a partir del 1ro. de enero de 1906. Esta fecha luego fue pospuesta
9 para el 1ro. de enero de 1911, y finalmente para el 1ro. de enero de 1913.

This paragraph is dedicated solely to discussing English as an official language in the Philippines but does not clarify the outcome or context of that moment in Filipino history. The author asserts in lines 6 and 7 that *because* Spanish never became widespread in the Philippines, U.S. authorities decided that English would become the only official language. This cause and effect exposition *erases* the existence of other languages (Tagalog and Ilocano, for example) and *legitimizes* the imperialistic view of Spanish and English as valid official languages. This *decontextualized* fragment of

Filipino history (from the Puerto Rican author's perspective) is meant to contrast the Philippines and Puerto Rico.

10 En Puerto Rico, **una sociedad homogénea en su cultura y lenguaje**, los nuevos
11 gobernantes decretaron, **con la misma intención de asimilación cultural**, el uso
12 indistinto del español y del inglés en los departamentos, oficinas y tribunales del
13 Gobierno Insular. **En los primeros años de este siglo**, el presidente de los Estados
14 Unidos acostumbraba a nombrar a los más altos cargos del gobierno de la Isla a
15 funcionarios que sólo hablaban inglés. Se dispuso además que el **inglés** fuera el **vehículo**
16 **de enseñanza** en las escuelas del país, y que el español se enseñase como una asignatura.
17 La legislación de 1902 sobre el idioma es reflejo de un **tiempo desaparecido.**

In lines 10 and 11, López Galarza uses appositives to describe Puerto Rico as "una sociedad homogénea" (a homogeneous society) in terms of its culture and language and to establish a parallel, colonial situation between Puerto Rico and the Philippines, motivated by the same goal of cultural assimilation in both locations ("la misma intención"). The use of these non-essential phrases reveals how the author *rationalizes* why Puerto Ricans were allowed to maintain the Spanish language in addition to English. As in the previous paragraph, the author establishes a hierarchy of cultural prestige.

The perception of *homogeneity* is an important building block when creating a national myth and proposing a unified national identity. To do so, nationalists manifest a distinct cultural identity by emphasizing the objective traits of the culture, such as its food, flag, and language (Barreto, 1998, p. 14). In this paragraph, homogeneity, a lexical item, is invoked to define the *ingroup* as Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans.

The use of the active voice in the first two sentences (lines 10-15) places the new rulers ("los nuevos gobernantes") in the subject position, while the results of their actions (indistinct use of languages and privileging English speakers) take a secondary position. This syntactic placing *minimizes* the effects of the ruling on the island. Had López Galarza rephrased the sentence in the passive voice as: "Con la misma intención de asimilación cultural, el uso indistinto del español y del inglés en los departamentos, oficinas y tribunales del Gobierno Insular fue decretado por los nuevos gobernantes" (With the same intent of cultural assimilation, the indistinctive use of Spanish and English was decreed by the new rulers), then the language issue would have been the focal point of the sentence.

The third sentence (lines 15-16), in contrast, uses the passive voice to emphasize the educational language policy, but uses an impersonal reflexive pronoun "se" (it), relieving the new rulers of agency or responsibility. This syntactic change is significant because debates regarding the language of education are particularly controversial.

The logical structure of this paragraph presents the 1902 law as the element that set the conditions for the imposition of English in public schools. By authorizing the indistinct use of both languages in the higher echelons of government, then it was possible to name English speakers as Commissioners of Education, who, in turn, enforced language education policies. This connection, however, is not explicit. On the contrary, the use of the passive voice and the fact that the Commissioner of Education is never mentioned creates distance between language of education and the official language statute.

Building on the motif of the passing of time, López Galarza uses phrases to strengthen the notion of antiquity. “En los primeros años de este siglo” (in the first years of this century) and “tiempo desaparecido**”** (a time gone by) in lines 13 and 17 echo the idea that the effects of the colonial government or the colonial power dynamics are no longer relevant. This rhetorical strategy is used to establish a “before and after” paradigm as will be seen in the next paragraphs.

La resistencia a ambas medidas fue firme y persistente. **Desde temprano** se alzaron en protesta las voces de Luis Muñoz Rivera, Eugenio María de Hostos, José de Diego, Luis Lloréns Torres y otros esforzados **defensores de los valores puertorriqueños**.

“Desde temprano” (early on) in line 18 again references the passing of time and alludes to a tradition of patriotic resistance. The list of historical figures in lines 19 to 20 makes an *appeal to authority* and to a set of “valores puertorriqueños” (Puerto Rican values), a lexical flag. These two strategies together speak to nationalistic ideals that inspire a sense of nostalgia and respect for the passionate group of intellectuals who firmly and persistently (“firme y persistente”) faced off against the American colonial government in the defense of that homogeneous Puerto Rican culture. This appeal invites the reader to agree with the sentiment because defending said values is part of the Puerto Rican tradition, and not defending such values would remove ingroup membership.

Tras múltiples esfuerzos fallidos de la **antigua** Cámara de Delegados, que **se remontan al 1913**, y de la Asamblea Legislativa más tarde, para disponer que el **español**

fuera el vehículo de enseñanza, se logró alcanzar esa meta cuando Luis Muñoz Marín se convirtió en el primer Gobernador electo por el voto directo de todos los puertorriqueños. La ley de 1902, que **en realidad no alcanzó el propósito que perseguían sus impulsadores** ya que no estableció lengua oficial alguna, sino que **se limitó a** permitir el uso indistinto de los dos idiomas que conviven en nuestro medio, **perdió por otra parte lo que pudo quedarle de razón de ser** al cesar el gobierno de Puerto Rico de estar en manos de funcionarios estadounidenses que no conocían el español. **Desacorde** como siempre estuvo con la realidad puertorriqueña, la Ley de 21 de febrero de 1902 que por la presente se deroga **se convirtió en una expresión inconsecuente en el 1965**, cuando nuestro Tribunal Supremo le negó carácter preceptivo en los procedimientos judiciales puertorriqueños.

The first sentence (lines 22-25) points to the history of political struggle to make Spanish the language of instruction and the turning point which defined the role of Spanish in the public school curriculum: Luis Muñoz Marín's election. By emphasizing the many failures of the political figures from yesteryear, the author creates greater contrast between them and Muñoz Marín and builds the narrative for a champion.

López Galarza again emphasizes the passing of time by referencing the "old" Chamber of Delegates and the year 1913 to highlight the antiquity of the language debate. This leads to the next sentence (lines 26-30) which contains three non-essential clauses. This syntactic structure builds a path for the reader to interpret the 1902 law as irrelevant as it *rationalizes* its obsolescence. While it is true that the Americanization program through the imposition of English did not succeed in eradicating Puerto Rican language or culture, other goals, such as administering the colony by appointing English

speakers to the highest ranks of government and effectively introducing other aspects of American culture, were indeed accomplished.

Regarding the logical structure of the paragraph, there is once again a link between the language of education (line 24) and the 1902 language law (line 26), but it is not explicit, particularly because the remainder of the paragraph focuses on the official language issue. Moreover, there is a problem with coherence in paragraphs 1, 3, and 5. Paragraph 1 states that English was imposed as an official language; paragraph 3 explains the domains in which English or Spanish could be used indistinctly; and paragraph 5 claims that by allowing the indistinct use of both languages, no official language was established at all, contradicting its initial premise. López Galarza also appeals to authority by citing *Pueblo v Tribunal Superior* in lines 31-34 as a precedent to justify the current law, and in lines 30 and 32 describes the 1902 law as “desacorde” (out of tune) and “inconsecuente” (inconsequential). Gradually, the narrative erodes the officiality and impact of the 1902 language law.

El propósito de la legislación que hoy se adopta es **abolir un anacronismo** y reafirmar nuestra **condición histórica** de pueblo hispanoparlante, unido **libremente** al pueblo de los Estados Unidos. En virtud de los **fuertes vínculos políticos, económicos e ideológicos** que nos unen a esa nación, el pueblo de Puerto Rico está comprometido a adquirir el pleno dominio del inglés como segundo idioma, pero no está dispuesto a rendir **ni su** lengua, **ni su** cultura, **ni la prerrogativa fundamental** de determinar que su gobierno se comunique en el vernáculo de **su gente**: el idioma español.

The passing of time is emphasized once again, first to reiterate the irrelevance of the 1902 law and then to highlight the *historical identity* of Puerto Ricans as Spanish-speakers. The use of the term "condición" alludes to *biological metaphors* which "fuses the biological in the image of language as a species… [that] is naturally homogeneous" (Valdez, 2016, p.3). The author introduces common ground between the United States and Puerto Rico mentioning the political, economic and ideological links between the two nations but establishes the essential difference highlighted by the autonomist State: Puerto Rico will always protect its own distinct culture and the Spanish language. This is the premise that defines the *ingroup*. In order to further distinguish the ingroup from the outgroup, the author uses the lexical items "pueblo hispanoparlante" (Spanish-speaking populace) in line 36 as opposed to "pueblo de los Estados Unidos" (people of the United States) in line 37.

The topic of the teaching of English as a second language is presented in lines 38-39 as a political commitment to the United State. The people of Puerto Rico are obligated to learn the language because of strong ties ("en virtud de los fuertes vínculos"). While the majority of the text retains a neutral tone, lines 39-41 manifest a rejection of the English language and any possibility of a new linguistic imposition. The parallel structure that expresses resistance by reiterating the conjunction "ni" (neither) three times is a dramatic appeal to nationalistic emotions.

Table 4 summarizes the findings of the analysis of discourse and semiotic strategies in sample 1:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Table 4: Tabulation sample 1</th></tr>
<tr><th>Concept</th><th>Analysis</th><th>Patterns</th></tr>
<tr><td>Ideological square</td><td>United States:
-Nuevos gobernantes intentaron (active)

-Instituciones estadounidenses→ La imposición del inglés (lexical)

-Nuevos gobernantes decretaron… uso indistinto del español y el inglés (active)

-El presidente acostumbraba nombrar a los más altos cargos… (active)

-Se dispuso además que el inglés fuera el vehículo de enseñanza… (passive)

Common bonds:
-political
-economic
-ideological

Puerto Rico:
-Sociedad homogénea en su cultura y lenguaje (lexical)

-Se alzaron en protesta [por] valores puertorriqueños (patriotic appeal; appeal to authority)

-LMM, democracy and self-governance (active)

-Condición histórica de pueblo hispanoparlante (lexical)

Differences (autonomism):
-language
-culture</td><td>-Focus on U.S. action; consequences in Puerto Rico take secondary position

-Puerto Rico action: emotional appeals

-Hierarchies of culture and language (official language)

-Ingroup values: defense of Spanish

Motifs (time):
-1902 law antiquated, limited, out of tune, inconse-quential
-Historical defense of Spanish</td></tr>
<tr><td>Argumentation/ validity of claims</td><td>-Appeals to authority: Puerto Rican values
-Appeals to nationalism
-Coherence: links between 1902 law and education policy
-Coherence: the objectives of the 1902 law</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Recontextualiza-tion, Intertextuality, Interdiscursivity</td><td>-Law 1902
-Pueblo v Tribunal Superior
-Biology metaphor</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

2.2.3 Overall analysis of sample 1

Lluch (2011) explains that autonomism is concerned with establishing a clear cultural identity that prevents the homogenizing effects of federalism (p. 2). The legislative preamble of the Official Language Act of 1991 is a good example of the autonomist ideological program led by the PPD in the early 1990s. It clearly defines a unique, cultural identity that distinguishes Puerto Rico from the United States while minimizing the effects of colonialism on the island and replicating hierarchies of cultural prestige to establish common ground.

Throughout the text, the qualifying identity marker for Puerto Rican identity is the defense of Spanish. This quality is a primary descriptor of the so-called homogeneous society or ingroup. The author utilizes the motif of the patriotic defense of the vernacular to signal a familiar, positive narrative that highlights Puerto Rican nationalistic sentiments. For this strategy to be effective, it must be appealing to a broad range of participants. This text does not attempt to polarize those with opposing views. Instead, it diplomatically states differences in cultural values and language practices between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Rather than criticizing the negative effects of the language law of 1902, López Galarza modulates how he refers to the effects of the law through the use of non-essential clauses and active and passive voice. The purpose of eroding its importance is two-fold: first, few would object to repealing a law that is irrelevant, and second, it minimizes the effects of colonialism in order to protect the colonial status. Throughout, the tone is neutral when addressing U.S. government-led actions. However, paragraphs 4 and 6 and lines 23-25 in paragraph 5, which discuss Puerto Rican values and the defense of

Spanish, use more emotional language (the courageous resistance, the champion of Spanish education, a history to be proud of) to appeal to the ingroup and a nationalistic sense of pride.

The logical scheme of this argument pivots on the premise that Luis Muñoz Marín and the ELA resolved the colonial status of the island. The before and after paradigm is meant to contrast the impotence of the Puerto Rican political leaders before the ELA and the ability to make significant changes in policy after. While this is true to a certain extent, the fact that López Galarza is careful in articulating the effects of U.S. policy on the island reveals a desire to keep peace within the status quo formula by emphasizing the victories of the ELA and minimizing the hardships of the colonial status.

This text also replicates hierarchies of cultural and linguistic prestige. The first two paragraphs that contrast the Philippines with Puerto Rico legitimize the imposition of official languages and establish equal ranking between Spanish and English in both the Puerto Rican and the U.S. perspectives. The author implies that the U.S. rulers accepted Spanish as a prestigious language that was worthy of official language status, while in the Philippines there was no such language. Thus, the false premise is that homogeneous societies with homogeneous linguistic practices have intrinsic prestige and are worth preserving. This narrative is a motif among Puerto Rican elites who propose a hispanophile, static view of Puerto Ricanness that has been reduced and commodified to obstruct Americanization (Pabón, 2003a). It is also strengthened by the biological interdiscourse that proposes the concept of language as an organic, essentialist part of an idealized national identity.

3.0 Sample 2: Rafael Hernández Colón's speech representing the people of Puerto Rico at the Principado de Asturias, 1991

3.1 Context

3.1.1 Macrostructure

The text of this speech is available in the digital archive section in the *Fundación Hernández Colón* website, and the full video was posted on YouTube by the *Fundación Princesa de Asturias* on February 19, 2019. The speech has a duration of approximately 16 minutes, and the written text is organized into 26 paragraphs (some are stand-alone sentences), five dependent clauses, and three instances when the speaker uses the vocative to address directly his Royal Highness and the court. The event took place on October 18, 1991, six months after Spanish became the only official language of Puerto Rico.

Throughout the speech, Hernández Colón references sixteen historical and literary figures to illuminate the cultural ties between Puerto Rico and Spain. The body of the text is sectioned off by the three vocatives to focus on three topics. The first section is the longest and discusses the cultural reasons why Puerto Rico was worthy of receiving the accolade and explaining the relationships between Puerto Rico and Spain, the United States, and the Spanish-speaking world. The second topic regards economic progress and modernity. The last section is the shortest and celebrates the people of Puerto Rico and their defense of the Spanish language.

3.1.2 Setting, participants, and ends

Príncipe de Asturias Prize Ceremony, 1991 (FPAMultimedia, 2019)

The *Fundación Princesa de Asturias* celebrates its annual awards ceremony to extol cultural and humanistic values. In 1991, Governor Rafael Hernández Colón traveled to Spain to accept the prize for the category of literature or *letras*, "aimed at recognizing the work of fostering and advancing literary creation in all its genres," (Fundación Princesa de Asturias, 2019) on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico. It was the first time this honor was bestowed on the people of a nation rather than a sole individual (Leal as cited in Barreto, 2001a, p. 78).

The speech event takes place in the grand Campoamor Theater in Oviedo, Asturias. The prize winners of the different categories are seated to the left of the large stage. Their Royal Highnesses are seated at the center table, golden banners suspended over them. To the right of the stage, a number of dignitaries on scaffolded seats listen behind the podium where the prize winner delivers his speech. The draped walls in blue

with the world flags lined against them, and the golden, carpeted floors create a regal, stately atmosphere.

The speaker representing the people of Puerto Rico is Governor Hernández Colón, who had four years before invited and received the King and Queen of Spain, Juan Carlos I and Doña Sofía, to Puerto Rico on the occasion of the *V Conferencia de Comisiones Nacionales de las Celebraciones de los Quinientos Años del Descubrimiento de América*, held 26-31 May 1987 (*El Vocero*, 23 May 1987). Among the participants at the prize ceremony are the monarchs, the court, the President of the Principality of Asturias, and international guests. The event receives international attention; thus, people across the world listen to the acceptance speech, including Puerto Ricans and the United States leadership.

The speech is delivered with the intent of giving thanks for receiving the honor on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico. The speech reaffirms why Puerto Rico is worthy of receiving such a prize and exalts its cultural autonomy and political relevance in the international community. The speech event is also an opportunity for Hernández Colón to justify his decision of enacting Law 4 of 1991 making Spanish the sole official language of Puerto Rico.

3.1.3 Act sequence, keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genre

The speech begins with the protocolary greeting to His Royal Highnesses, the President, dignitaries, and the audience in general. The camera is mostly focused on Hernández Colón, who speaks from a podium that reads *Fundación Principado de Asturias*. It slowly zooms closer to frame his upper body and face. From time to time, it shifts from a wider picture of Hernández Colón at the podium, to the Prince and King at

the center table, and wider takes of the entire stage. Hernández Colón reads the speech slowly and clearly, looking up often to make eye contact with the general audience (when he looks front and to his left) and with the King and Prince (when he looks to his right). At the end of the speech, when Hernández Colón gives thanks again in the name of Puerto Rico, he holds his gaze in the direction of the King and Prince. Finally, he receives the applause of the audience and Their Royal Highnesses. Though this action does not appear in the clip, the prize is presented by the 23-year-old Prince of Asturias, Felipe de Borbón (EFE, 20 April 1991), current King of Spain.

While it is a celebratory event, formality and protocol characterize the keys and norms. At all times Hernández Colón speaks calmly, purposefully modulating his tone and pausing to clarify the sequential order of ideas. He speaks in Spanish with very clear diction and does not rely on body language any further than making eye contact with the listeners at different points and accentuating stressed syllables with his shoulders. In terms of genre, while it is an acceptance speech, it is also a "pitch" and a diplomatic opportunity to deliver a political speech that provides justification for adopting a controversial linguistic policy and to simultaneously position Puerto Rico as a successful, internationally recognized link between the Spanish-speaking world and the United States.

3.1.4 Fill in tool

While giving the speech, Hernández Colón is primarily concerned with three sectors of the audience: the Spanish leadership (monarchs and politicians), the people of Puerto Rico, and the United States leadership. To emphasize common bonds with Spain, he highlights their shared cultural values with Puerto Rico focusing on the linguistic and

literary traditions set forth by Spanish colonizers, the *criollo* intelligentsia, and a history of literary figures. He celebrates the origins and unifying strength of Spanish and Spain's linguistic footprint in the Americas and Puerto Rico. Thus, the Spanish language is an important signifier of cultural and political power for both the speaker and the Spanish participants.

The shared value, however, is problematic when regarded by the United States leadership because it contradicts federalist views dating back to the 1800s which forced English instruction and cultural assimilation of Native Americans and other non-English speakers (McCarty, 2004, p. 80). The end of the Congressional hearings that aimed at holding a federally backed status plebiscite in Puerto Rico confirmed this point of view.

This is a delicate topic since it harkens back to the Americanization period when the United States government in Puerto Rico implemented a plan to Americanize Puerto Ricans, mainly through the imposition of English as the language of instruction. It is important to the speaker that the participants understand this period, not just as a violation of human rights, but also as an attempted erasure of a Spanish-based identity.

Moreover, language conflict is problematic among Puerto Ricans because of the differing opinions regarding the status question of the island. The defense of Spanish and rejection of English is generally associated with independence and autonomist movements, while the maintenance of Spanish with the inclusion of English is associated with annexationist parties. Thus, there is a direct connection between political ideology and language.

3.1.5 Frame problem tool

Spain had undergone deep social and economic changes throughout the 1980s. After the death of Franco in 1975 and throughout the transition toward a democratic government, the country opened its doors to Europe and the world. As early as 1973, but mainly in the decade of the 1980s, Spain and the international community began planning the commemoration of the Quincentennial (*Quinto Centenario*) held in 1992, which included the Universal Exposition in Seville, the Columbus Regatta, and the Summer Olympics in Barcelona (Dixon, 2005, p. 431). As part of the planning process for the Quincentennial, the King and Queen of Spain visited Puerto Rico in 1987. Former Secretary of Education, Carlos Chardón, recalled that in the 1990s, people in Puerto Rico mockingly called Hernández Colón the "Duke of Ponce" and that he seemed to have become a royalist (as cited in Barreto, 2001a, p. 78).

After the federal plebiscite lost Congressional support in 1990 and the Official Language Act of 1991 was enacted, the government of Puerto Rico coordinated a referendum titled *Reclamación de Derechos Democráticos* which sought to constitutionally guarantee specific democratic rights to the people of Puerto Rico. The law that enabled this electoral event was signed on October 2, 1991 and the election was held on December 8, 1991.

Meanwhile, immediately after the Official Language Act was signed into law, New Progressive Party (PNP) candidate, Pedro Rosselló, vowed to reinstate English as an official language if he were elected governor in 1992. He kept his campaign promise.

3.1.6 Making strange tool

In the first section of the speech, the speaker states that enacting the Official Language Act was "a difficult exercise of political will" (line 51). This admission indicates that the political stakes were high, but for whom, and why? Could Hernández Colón foresee the decision would cost his party the 1992 election, or was the comment a jab at Puerto Rico-United States relations?

Throughout the speech, Hernández Colón underscores the cultural legacy of the Spanish empire in Puerto Rico, mentions briefly the influence of Taínos and African slaves, and omits entirely any influence from the United States. It is important to note a quick reference to the wave of Spanish migration to Puerto Rico produced by the *1815 Real Cédula de Gracias* in the first section of the speech. In the mid-1800s, Puerto Rico received a high influx of European foreigners who were given incentives to stimulate the agrarian industry and simultaneously whiten the elite sector of the population. Bowman (2002) clarifies that "in essence, this legislation promised the continuation of Spanish political control in Puerto Rico but moved to expand the economy towards foreign interests" (p. 5). In order to move the plantation economy forward, however, the decree also allowed for a significant increase in the African slave population. Díaz Soler (1981) points out that by 1834, over half of the population of the island was comprised of slaves and people of color (p. 117).

The Puerto Rican literary tradition has epitomized its national identity in the figure of the *jíbaro,* the white peasant from the mountain region who had adopted many practices (dietary and clothing, for example) of another poor community on the island: the enslaved Africans (González, 2018, p. 20). The authors who signified national

identity through the *jíbaro* evidently did not consider statistical representations of Puerto Rican demographics at that time and omitted the cultural influence of the Afro-Antillean peoples. Moreover, the *jíbaro* introduces a false nostalgia for a time of colonial exploitation that was romanticized by a literary elite who were the descendants of the European and criollo landowners. González (2018) states that the myth replicated through the literature of the elite was actually an expression of social and racial prejudice: "el 'jibarismo' literario de la élite no ha sido otra cosa, en el fondo, que la expresión de su propio prejuicio social y racial" (p. 37).

3.2 Discourse

The text to be analyzed is 127 lines long. A few passages from the introduction shall be summarized for the sake of brevity. The complete text is found in the appendices of this dissertation.

3.2.1 Section analysis

The speech is introduced with the protocolary greeting to Their Royal Highnesses, the President of the principality, the court and guests. Lines 3 through 7 (omitted) immediately propose cultural links: two literary references that connect the Spanish poets, Juan Ramón Jiménez and Pedro Salinas, with the virtues of Puerto Rico. These first two examples of *intertextuality* are meant to standardize the literary and intellectual rapport between nations. Jiménez lived in Puerto Rico and was a professor of Spanish Literature at the University of Puerto Rico. Salinas delivered an often-cited commencement speech at the University of Puerto Rico titled "Aprecio y defensa del lenguaje" in which he stated that those who do not protect their language are doomed to "[vivir] en el olvido de su propia dignidad espiritual, en estado de deficiencia humana"

(live in the oblivion of their own spiritual dignity, in a state of human deficiency) and encouraged the graduates to use English as a tool for "the commerce of ideas" (Ferrer, 1945, pp. 60). This *intertextual* element signals one of the main topics presented throughout Hernández Colón's speech: Spanish is a quintessential part of the individual.

Line 6 poses the rhetorical question: Why does Puerto Rico deserve the prize? Lines 7 through 16 provide answers, the first being a partial reference to Salinas's text "por su aprecio y defensa del lenguaje" (for its appreciation and defense of the language). Hernández Colón uses anaphora to emphasize the varied reasons:

8 Por haber defendido su vernáculo decisivamente frente a una **política**
9 **implantada** durante los primeros 45 años de este siglo para educarle **en otra**
10 **lengua**; por la **vigencia** lingüística del español en la intimidad de la vida
11 individual; por su **vigencia** en todas las manifestaciones de la vida colectiva
12 puertorriqueña; por la creatividad de nuestros novelistas, poetas y escritores;
13 porque en vista de todo ello, **el Gobierno del Estado Libre Asociado** ha
14 proclamado el español como el idioma oficial de Puerto Rico.

The first reason (lines 8-10) refers to the United States government's imposition of English as the language of instruction during the Americanization period. Hernández Colón does not use clear referents in this sentence to indicate who implemented the language policy or which language was forced on Puerto Ricans, even though all participants are well aware of the information that is being suppressed. As a rhetorical strategy, he emphasizes the victory of the people of Puerto Rico, rather than the identity of the oppressor.

The word “vernáculo” (line 8) is a lexical item that signals a connection between language and that which is native (identity). This is stressed in the links between Spanish and “intimacy” (line 10), the “collective Puerto Rican life” (line 11, a singular entity) and the “creative” (line 12). Moreover, by mentioning Puerto Rican novelists, poets and authors, a parallel is drawn with the Spanish literary tradition that was previously mentioned with Jiménez and Salinas.

All the aforementioned reasons are simultaneously meant to justify the enactment of the Official Language Act of 1991, which is the final reason for deserving the prize: the government, namely Rafael Hernández Colón as governor and president of the Popular Democratic Party (PPD), for the first time, decided to abolish the 1902 law. It is important to remember that bills like the López Galarza law had been introduced in legislature, but not approved until this moment in history.

The next section (lines 17-24, omitted here, see appendix for details) references several important figures in Spanish imperial history, starting with King Alfonso the Wise (who strengthened the use of Spanish for scholarly purposes), Nebrija (who wrote the first Spanish grammar), and Queen Isabel (who sponsored Columbus’ voyage to the Americas), among others. Hernández Colón then enumerates several “archaic” words from the Castilian that are used in rural Puerto Rico (“vocablos corrientes del habla campesina,” line 19), though many are proper to urban usage as well (“chavo, bellón… ínsula”). He also mentions the artistic traditions of the “romance” and “décima” that have survived in rural Puerto Rico. These references to historical and cultural elements help build a narrative of *recontextualized Spanish tradition* and an enduring legacy localized in the mountains of Puerto Rico, far from its urban centers.

This recontextualization is further emphasized in lines 25 through 28:

25 En Puerto Rico al igual que en **las otras Antillas**, la sonora y dulce lengua de
26 Castilla, **se enriqueció** con los tainismos de nuestros aborígenes y **con los aportes**
27 lingüísticos que a través de los siglos hicieron los africanos **que también contribuyeron**
28 **a enriquecer** nuestra formación étnica y cultural.

This *generalization* regarding the status of Spanish in the Antilles limits the geographic confines of the region specifically to the Greater Antilles, sans Haiti and Jamaica. Moreover, it whitewashes the history of the Caribbean and omits the role of the Spanish Empire in killing off the natives of the Antilles and participating in the African slave trade. While the speaker recontextualizes "the sweet-sounding tongue of Castile" in the Antilles, he also *minimizes* the roles of the Taino and African peoples in Puerto Rican linguistic and cultural history.

Lines 29 through 31 (omitted) reference the *1815 Real Cédula de Gracias* which increased Spanish migration to Puerto Rico. Among the Spanish migrants, the speaker mentions the Asturian Manuel Fernández Juncos (line 32) who would later become the first Secretary of the Treasury of a briefly autonomous Puerto Rico in 1897. Lines 33-34 describe Fernández Juncos as a defender of the Spanish language, and lines 35-36 praise him for composing the lyrics of "La borinqueña," the Puerto Rican national anthem.

Jumping ahead, at the end of the speech, Hernández Colón mentions Fernández Juncos again to create a circular narrative. Fernández Juncos, a literary and political figure, becomes an important icon of a Spaniard who *becomes* Puerto Rican. The speaker

wishes to emphasize that there is a short distance between the Spanish identity and the Puerto Rican identity. This reminds us of what Roberts (2008) explains regarding the consolidation of the white *jíbaro* as a signifier of Puerto Rican identity and the generalized use of Spanish on the island: "it was not difficult for the concept of *Puertorriqueño* to emerge in nineteenth-century Puerto Rican literature as a climatically modified European" (p. 312). Hernández Colón's constant references to a *recontextualized* Spanish language and culture follow a similar discursive line.

A final comment regarding lines 29-36 focuses on the *minimization* of the past Spanish colonial government as expressed in the speaker's language. First, he states "Luego de la colonización, la interacción de Puerto Rico con España fue intensa" (the interaction of Puerto Rico with Spain, line 29), and then "Al producirse el cambio de soberanía en el 98, fue de los más eficaces defensores de nuestro idioma" (the change of sovereignty, lines 33-34). In the first fragment, the speaker establishes the political situation, but makes Puerto Rico the active agent in the interactions with Spain. In the second, "el cambio de soberanía" seems to be agent-less; the first sovereign is not mentioned by name, and neither is the second. The speaker remains neutral both times he references the Spanish government of Puerto Rico. This is fitting as he also celebrates that Fernández Juncos composed the lyrics to the official national anthem of Puerto Rico (lines 35-36); meanwhile, the original, revolutionary lyrics, written by Lola Rodríguez de Tió, incited to revolt against the Spanish government.

37 En 1987, con motivo de la reunión en San Juan de las Comisiones Nacionales
38 para la **Celebración** del Quinto Centenario, don Juan Carlos y doña Sofia realizaron la

primera visita a Puerto Rico de unos soberanos españoles. Resaltó, esta visita, el **reencuentro entrañable y familiar de nuestros pueblos** que había comenzado unos años antes. Ese reencuentro se ha multiplicado en relaciones oficiales, financieras, culturales, educativas y en otras formas que han estrechado los lazos entre España y Puerto Rico de manera singular.

Lines 37 through 43 show gratitude to the Spanish monarchs for visiting the island. The text omits the detail, but it was Hernández Colón who invited the King and Queen to Puerto Rico in November 1986 (*El Vocero,* 1987). The result of said visit is said to be productive for Puerto Rico, though it is ambiguous at this point how specifically ("relaciones oficiales, financieras, culturales…" line 41-43). We know, however, that in 1992, Puerto Rico participated in both the Universal Exposition in Seville and the Columbus Regatta. Hernández Colón hints at this participation in lines 100-104 when he states directly that he trusts Puerto Rico to partake in the Quincentennial events.

The international commission organizing the Quincentennial officially decided in 1987 to "commemorate" rather than "celebrate" the Europeans' arrival to the Americas (Dixon, 2005, p. 431). It is significant, then, that Hernández Colón would choose to use "celebración" (line 37) rather than "conmemoración." In light of the fact that he invited the monarchs for political gain and that the visit succeeded (evidently it did, Hernández Colón was accepting a prize for Puerto Rico, after all), he would be more inclined to celebrate. Moreover, it has already been established that, throughout the text, Hernández Colón minimizes the colonial role of Spain in Puerto Rico to align himself with the Spanish.

The lexical items “entrañable” (dear) and “familiar” (line 40) further emphasize the idea of Spain as the motherland (“la madre patria”) and Puerto Rico as part of its family. Moreover, “entrañable” comes from the word “entraña” (entrails), which adds a connotation of an organic, *biological* relationship between Spain and Puerto Rico.

Coinciden estos acercamientos con otros que Puerto Rico ha efectuado con su entorno caribeño y centroamericano. Nuestra apertura al mundo iberoamericano, con el que compartimos una cultura y una lengua, ha coincidido con la **voluntad del país** de **actuar en la historia definiéndose con la fuerza que nos viene de lo más profundo de nuestro ser**.

De ahí surge la decisión en cuanto a nuestra lengua. Decisión que, por las distintas opiniones existentes entre nosotros sobre lo que **debe ser** la vinculación con Estados Unidos, **exigió un difícil ejercicio de voluntad política.**

In the next few sentences, Hernández Colón invokes the will of the people (“voluntad el país,” line 46) as well as political will (“voluntad política,” line 51). In the case of the will of the people, it seems a risky choice of words considering that he knew, as well as the rest of the island, that 77% of the population favored having both Spanish and English as official languages (Barreto, 2001a, p. 73). The level of support for the law is greatly *exaggerated* in this international forum. This is coherent when he speaks of the difficult exercise of political will, for there is *ambiguity* regarding whose will. He refers to a plurality in the decision-making process, despite the previously mentioned statistics.

He reiterates the *homogeneous,* qualifying characteristics of the *ingroup* and the unifying force of a shared language and culture (line 46) which simultaneously reject the

Other, the English-speaking United States. This distinction of identities is clarified when Hernández Colón directly refers to the relationship between *us* (Puerto Rico, "entre nosotros") and the United States (line 50).

Lines 47 and 48 express an *emotional appeal* to flattery. First, the speaker uses populist discourse to illustrate that the people of a nation have accomplished a historical feat. Again, we emphasize that the people of Puerto Rico were generally not in favor of the Official Language Act, and Hernández Colón is giving them credit for his own political decision. The second part of the sentence, the strength that comes from the depths of our being ("con la fuerza que nos viene de lo más profundo de nuestro ser," line 47-48), utilizes a discourse of essentialism and biology. Moreover, Hernández Colón states directly that language choice is determinant in defining identity ("definiéndose," line 47).

52 La afirmación de lo propio no es negación de lo ajeno. El **respeto** del otro se gana
53 partiendo del **respeto** a uno mismo. Nuestras relaciones con los Estados Unidos de
54 América están basadas en el **respeto** mutuo, y en la **libertad** de cada pueblo para ser
55 quien es.

In short, lines 52 through 55 express that Puerto Rico and the United States have a paradoxical relationship. The first sentence (line 52) is a seemingly evident statement, but given the context, it is actually a contradiction. Generally, it is a valid statement that affirming one's identity is not a rejection of the other's identity. However, in the case of Puerto Rico and the United States as presented by Hernández Colón in the previous paragraphs, to be Puerto Rican means to reject the United States identity, to embrace

Spanish is to discard English. This is part of the *polarized* structure on which Hernández Colón plays with *identity politics*.

Hernández Colón creates a *syllogism* regarding respect. According to him, self-respect is manifested by reaffirming a distinct identity, which, in this case, intrinsically rejects the other. The other is supposed to respect this affirmation/rejection that, in turn, leads to mutual respect. The freedom (line 54) to be accepted as different is what enables this relationship of mutual respect. Thus, should the United States impose a policy to violate this contact, then it would be disrespectful or colonialist. In a way, this line of thought functions as a veiled threat, considering that the international community is listening, and the ELA is supposed to resolve the colonial status of the island.

56 Puerto Rico tuvo la visión de, **ni federarse a, ni separarse de**, los Estados
57 Unidos. **Para salir del estatus colonial**, Puerto Rico creó su **propio espacio político**
58 **autonómico: el Estado Libre Asociado**. Espacio que le permitía la fortaleza de la unión
59 política y económica, a la vez que la fuerza de su integridad cultural. Al contemplar los
60 acontecimientos mundiales, pensamos que quizás **Puerto Rico y Estados Unidos**
61 **podemos ofrecer las experiencias y lecciones de nuestras relaciones** llevadas por
62 noventa y- tres años. Dentro de instituciones flexibles de democracia y libertad, pueden
63 convivir armoniosa y provechosamente la **potencia más fuerte del mundo y un país**
64 **pequeño**, con el espacio político **suficiente** para afirmar cada cual su propia identidad y
65 cultura y **superar enfrentamientos, terrorismos y violencias.**

Logically, Hernández Colón proceeds by providing a definition and an explanation of the virtues of the ELA, placing special emphasis on autonomism. That

which links Puerto Rico and the United States concerns matters of politics and the economy, but the line is drawn in matters of culture (line 59 and 64-65). Democracy and liberty (line 62) are lexical items meant to establish universal values before introducing "la potencia más fuerte del mundo" in contrast to "un país pequeño" (strongest world power and a small country, lines 63-64) illustrating a problem in the ratio of power which conflicts with the previously mentioned values. Moreover, the modifier "sufficient" (line 64) suggests that there may be limits to that liberty. (At this point, Hernández Colón had tried and failed twice to have the United States Congress move toward an enhanced ELA.)

This passage also presents Puerto Rico as resilient and mature in the face of an oppressor. First, Hernández Colón credits Puerto Rico entirely for resolving the colonial status creatively ("Para salir del estatus colonial, Puerto Rico creó," line 57). It is evident that the U.S. government had to approve of the foundation of the ELA, but the speaker reduces the United States' agency. Considering the true distribution of power, discursively minimizing the United States and enhancing Puerto Rico's power, the speaker positions the island at the level of "partner" in the phrase "podemos ofrecer las experiencias y lecciones de nuestras relaciones" (we can share experiences and lessons from our relationship, line 61). He simultaneously also positions Puerto Rico as an attractive political model and investment opportunity for the international community. However, at the end of the paragraph, listeners are reminded of the unequal distribution of power, where Puerto Rico has had the maturity to *overcome* confrontations, terrorism and violence ("superar enfrentamientos, terrorismos y violencias," line 65). This is an *emotional appeal* to sympathy and a reference to the Americanization period on the

island. Throughout these lines, Puerto Rico is always the active subject, and the United States remains in a secondary position.

66 Este Premio que hoy se confiere a Puerto Rico, también **honra** a los Estados
67 Unidos de América. Los **honra** precisamente por el **respeto** que han guardado frente a
68 esta decisión puertorriqueña. La **libertad** que asegura nuestra relación autonómica,
69 brinda un amplio margen a nuestra diversidad cultural.

Lines 66 through 69 use lexical items that again invoke universal values: honor, respect, freedom. The logic of honoring the United States by association (a *fallacy of association*) is another way of obligating them to take a politically correct stance regarding language usage in the eyes of the international community. Otherwise, the United States would again become terrorists (line 65). Hernández Colón gives agency to the people of Puerto Rico again as the decision-makers ("decisión puertorriqueña," line 68), and places autonomy and cultural distinctness front and center to reaffirm the ELA as the correct political solution for Puerto Rico.

70 Más aún, dentro de la democracia y libertad que potencia el desarrollo del
71 **pluralismo social y étnico** dentro de los propios Estados Unidos, llegará el día en que
72 esta gran nación, partiendo de la **coexistencia en su seno de la lengua inglesa y la**
73 **lengua española**, proyecte una visión renovada del hombre y del mundo.

This passage states that ethnic and social pluralism is possible in the United States because democracy and liberty, core American values, make it viable. Hernández Colón introduces an optimistic vision of the United States where both Spanish and English may

exist in harmony, knowing fully well that the language issue in Puerto Rico was an impediment for negotiations during the congressional hearings for the federal referendum, and that the possibility of the coexistence of languages causes internal political conflict in the United States. The term "coexistence" (line 72) is an important lexical flag because historical precedents show that linguistic "coexistence" is generally not acceptable in the United States, only assimilation.

It is significant to point out that, nearly 30 years later, current language attitudes toward Spanish in the United States have deteriorated to the level of a "national language panic," where groups define cultural and linguistic diversity as "dangerous" according to the apparent threat they present to the dominant classes and their perception of control (McCarty, 2004, p. 74). More state legislatures have passed laws granting English official language status, though the federal government has not yet acted to do the same.[1]

Alteza, Señoras y Señores:

La **definición lingüística** de Puerto Rico, **más que al pasado**, **mira hacia el futuro**. Nuestra sociedad es de **vanguardia**. Somos un **país isleño** que en el **entorno caribeño** ha desarrollado, desde la democracia y desde una economía abierta, una tecnología y un sector industrial diversificados, competitivos en todos los mercados del mundo; un sector financiero fuerte, que se proyecta poderosamente sobre los países de la región; y un comercio exterior que en **Iberoamérica** solo superan México y Brasil.

[1] According to the 2018 American Community Survey, the number of people in the U.S. who speak a language other than English at home has tripled since the 1980s. The data revealed that, between 2010 and 2018, the number of people who spoke Spanish at home increased by 4.5 million, with a total of 41.5 million at home Spanish speakers in the U.S. (Zeigler & Camarota, 2019).

81 Tenemos una clase obrera que figura entre las más diestras del mundo; un 10% de
82 nuestra población posee educación universitaria adquirida tanto en Puerto Rico como en
83 los centros de educación más avanzados en el exterior. Disponemos de una clase
84 científica y técnica altamente calificada. Competimos respetablemente en el deporte
85 internacional. Nos estamos preparando para postular la sede de las olimpiadas para el
86 2004. Nuestros creadores artísticos tienen proyección internacional.

This is the second time Hernández Colón uses the vocative to show his respect and adherence to protocol and the ingroup's norms. It is also a way of establishing closeness with the monarchs.

Lines 75 through 86 fuse national identity with economic development. Hernández Colón holds that the affirmation of Spanish as a marker of identity is a guide toward economic growth within the Spanish-speaking world. The United States is not mentioned at all in these lines. Instead, non-U.S. modifiers are emphasized (island nation, Caribbean setting, lines 76-77). Hernández Colón also positions Puerto Rican commerce in the Ibero-American context specifically (line 80). These qualifiers emphasize the Puerto Rican national identity as non-United States and emphasizes the specific *ingroup* in which Puerto Rico aspires to have *membership*.

"Vanguardia" (line 76) is an important lexical item because it introduces Puerto Rico as a place that breaks the mold, that is progressive and attractive because of its Spanish-based identity and distinct set of qualities. This section of the speech functions as a pitch to sell Puerto Rico to the international community and uses a discourse proper to capitalist economies and international commerce. Hernández Colón describes Puerto Rico as "competitive," having developed "industrial and technological sectors" (line 78),

a “strong financial sector” and “foreign commerce” (lines 79-80), and an above average workforce (lines 81-84). He also emphasizes internationalization through athletes, artists and the Olympics (lines 84-86).

In sum, the discursive strategies used in this passage highlight that the Spanish language makes it possible for Puerto Rico to be in the forefront of economic development. Generally speaking, language perceptions often link English with international commerce and economic growth. In this section, however, Hernández Colón indirectly challenges this claim. This idea will be repeated in line 98.

Esta **sociedad moderna y dinámica** se ha **enriquecido culturalmente** en su contacto con la sociedad norteamericana. El **inglés** es para nosotros una **herramienta eficacísima** que valoramos altamente. **Pero** nuestra lengua materna es la que nos cohesiona como pueblo, con la cual expresamos nuestros sentimientos y creencias más íntimas, nuestros pensamientos y valores más profundos. La oficialidad del español es punto de partida para una recia política **contra el semilingüismo**. Combatimos el **semilingüismo**, un mal que afecta a los pueblos en situaciones de **culturas confluyentes**. El empobrecimiento colectivo de la expresión, la carencia de vocabulario, la imprecisión del pensamiento, y la incoherencia lingüística colectiva son algunos de sus lastres. Promovemos en cambio el **bilingüismo** con amplias oportunidades educativas, pero reconocemos que **es producto del esfuerzo y del interés individual por adquirirlo**.

In this passage, Hernández Colón gives credit to the cultural enrichment produced by the contact between the United States and Puerto Rico, but does not specify how exactly, other than describing Puerto Rican society as “moderna y dinámica” (modern

and dynamic, line 87), lexical items that may be associated with the 1990s bustling economy of the United States. He also sets the value of the English language as an "efficient tool" (lines 88-89). The next line of thought, however, is introduced by the contrasting conjunction "but" (line 89) to juxtapose the practical use of English with the emotional, spiritual and cohesive use of Spanish (lines 89-91). "Lengua materna" (line 89) is a lexical item that alludes to a natural, biological relationship between Puerto Ricans and the Spanish language. The uses of both languages are separated by domains and cannot be mixed. At this point, Hernández Colón utilizes the discourse of purists, such as Salvador Tió, who claimed that speakers who tainted the language could very well destroy culture and society (Valdez, 2016, p. 20).

In this same line, Hernández Colón uses the term semilingualism when referring to Spanglish or code-switching and blames it for the impoverishment of linguistic competency and the collective capacity for effective communication. This is again the same discourse used by those of purist ideology who believe that the "corruption" of language leads to the corruption of the soul because "the cultural and biological uniqueness of Puerto Ricans is encoded in Puerto Rican Spanish" (Valdez, 2016, p. 3).

Bilingualism is regarded as an asset, and Hernández Colón states that the government of Puerto Rico provides ample educational opportunities ("amplias oportunidades educativas," line 96) to foment it. What is most revealing is that he purports that it is each individual's responsibility to become bilingual ("producto del esfuerzo y del interés individual por adquirirlo," line 97). This greatly reduces the State's responsibility in producing a bilingual population. Moreover, it does not consider the wide variety of social factors that are at play in language acquisition. Considering the

slow rate of growth of English speakers on the island, he indirectly suggests that Puerto Ricans are not interested in learning English and washes his hands of the problem.

98 El pueblo de Puerto Rico se propone **hacer futuro desde el español**. Al recibir
99 este Premio nos sentimos **honrados y acogidos por nuestros hermanos que comparten**
100 **esta lengua y con ella una visión del mundo**. Contemplamos con el mayor interés, los
101 acontecimientos que con motivo del V Centenario se desarrollarán en España durante el
102 año entrante. Confiamos en que, **desde nuestra instalación política** como Estado Libre
103 Asociado a los Estados Unidos de América, participemos en todas ellas en el grado nos
104 corresponde como un **país irrenunciablemente iberoamericano**.

Again, the proposition is that the future of Puerto Rico is in Spanish, not English (line 98). There is first the matter of identity, but also the matter of economic development through Spanish. There is an appeal to solidarity, to the brotherhood of Spanish-speaking nations ("honrados y acogidos por nuestros hermanos que comparten esta lengua y con ella una visión del mundo," lines 99-100), for acceptance into the *ingroup* despite the political connection with the United States ("desde nuestra instalación política," line 102). The notion of sharing a "worldview" by virtue of language usage references the existence of a homogeneous set of values carried through language and implicitly presents opposition with the "other's" worldview. Hernández Colón is direct in identifying Puerto Rico as an Ibero-American nation (as opposed to belonging to the United States) and stresses that the cultural identity of Puerto Ricans is undeniable and irrevocable under any political circumstances, which emphasizes the autonomist ideology (line 104). Two sentences begin with verbs ("contemplamos" and

"confiamos," lines 100 and 102) to highlight the desire to participate actively and be part of the international celebration of the Quincentennial as a member of the *ingroup*. The third and final section of the speech begins with a third vocative, again, to observe protocols, abide by the norms, and reestablish contact with the audience and insert himself in the *ingroup* (line 105). In this final section, Hernández Colón uses more dramatic language and builds a narrative that praises the everyman on the island. Lines 108 through 129 are a series of emotional appeals, especially appeals to the people. The speaker makes constant use of anaphora and enumerates a series of locations as well as internationally renowned authors from the Spanish-speaking world to personalize or connect human referents to a cause: the defense of Spanish.

La **defensa heroica** del español a través de casi un siglo, no fue sólo la **gran defensa** que hicieron nuestros intelectuales, nuestros políticos y nuestros escritores. **La resistencia vital** vino del pueblo, de la gente sencilla y humilde de Puerto Rico. **La resistencia** vino de los barrios de San Juan, de los morrillos de Cabo Rojo; de los cañaverales de mi pueblo de Ponce, de las playas de Luquillo, de las montañas de Utuado, de aquellos humildes jíbaros que aprendieron **sus rezos**, **sus décimas** y **sus trovas en español**. **La resistencia** vino de ese pueblo que atesora en los **recovecos de su espíritu** y en el **temblor de su alma**, las voces castellanas que le **dan sentido a su vida**.

Ese pueblo es el **héroe**. Ese es el pueblo que ha conservado la lengua en que **Dios dio el Evangelio del Quijote a Cervantes**. Ese es el pueblo cuya **resistencia heroica** ahora nos permite pertenecer a la comunidad lingüística que hermana a trescientos cuarenta y un millones de seres humanos que se expresan en español.

117 Ese es el pueblo cuya **victoria** ha hecho posible que la creación de nuestros
118 poetas, novelistas, dramaturgos y ensayistas se lleve a cabo en la **lengua universal** que
119 comparten con Juan Ramón, con Borges, con García Márquez, con Cela, y con Octavio
120 Paz.

The use of anaphora in the first paragraph highlights "la resistencia" (lines 107, 108, 114). Once again, the speaker omits the oppressive entity and focuses solely on the victories of Puerto Rico ("la defensa heroica del español," line 105). "La Resistencia" refers to resistance to the English language when it was imposed by the United States government during the first half of the 20th century. If we analyze this discursive strategy according to van Dijk's *ideological square*, where there is an implied rather than direct accusation against the United States, we observe that, even though the United States is *othered* throughout the speech, the speaker is using a language that is usually applied to the *ingroup* for both groups: Spanish speakers (positive-specific reporting) and the United States (negative-general reporting).

Throughout the entire section, Hernández Colón stresses the heroism of "el pueblo." This subject is present as an anaphora in lines 113 through 120. "El pueblo" is also illustrated as different, localized versions in the first paragraph, when the speaker refers to specific poor or rural geographic locations in Puerto Rico to define it ("barrios de San Juan… morrillos de Cabo Rojo… cañaverales de mi pueblo de Ponce… playas de Luquillo… montañas de Utuado," lines 108-110)[2]. The speaker describes "el pueblo" as simple and humble (line 107) and refers to the "humildes jíbaros" (line 110), the icon of rural Puerto Rican identity and the PPD's emblem. At this point, Hernández Colón

[2] Urban neighborhoods in San Juan… steep, rocky formations or cliffs off the coast of Cabo Rojo… sugarcane fields in my hometown of Ponce… beaches of Luquillo… mountains of Utuado..

summons the virtues of the poor and rural sectors of the island; he does not refer to the booming metropolis he described in the previous section of the speech (lines 74-86). However, he includes intellectuals, politicians, and authors (line 106) in the social struggle to illustrate that different sectors in society contributed to reach the same goal.

There is also an *emotional appeal* in lines 110-111 where Spanish is illustrated as the language of prayer and poetic and musical creation, actions that are closely linked to identity. The speaker also connects the provincial defense of Spanish in Puerto Rico to a spiritual and existential purpose ("atesora en los recovecos de su espíritu… temblor de su alma… voces castellanas que le dan sentido a su vida," lines 111-112). This repeats the essentialist discourse of the intelligentsia (Clampitt-Dunlap, 2000; Pabón, 2003a). Moreover, Hernández Colón comes close to deifying Spanish when he parallels *Don Quijote* to a biblical text (line 114). In addition to accentuating the essentialist link between language and identity, the speaker makes an emotional appeal to heighten the spiritual significance of Spanish to the everyman.

Generally speaking, we may classify the discourse utilized in this section as *epideictic rhetoric*, a form of persuasion in which the speaker praises a subject for past deeds and connects that praise to present time (Lauer, 2015, p. 5) with the aim of gaining the listener's sympathy. According to Hernández Colón, the heroic defense of Spanish led Puerto Rican authors to produce creative texts in Spanish, which the speaker connects with several internationally renowned Spanish-language authors (lines 1180-120). Hernández Colón plays with language prestige and syntax to lead the listener to an *association fallacy* in which non-specific Puerto Rican authors are given the same status as specific Nobel-prize winners. The speaker aims to provide another reason to fit Puerto

Rico within the *ingroup*. Also, Hernández Colón reiterates the homogenizing view of language when he uses the lexical item “lenguaje universal” (line 118) as well as the “comunidad lingüística que hermana” (line 115): the poor and uneducated, and the privileged and famous are linked by a common language.

121 En nombre de la tierra de Borinquen, que recibió la letra de su himno nacional de
122 un hijo de esta tierra que hoy nos premia; en nombre de la isla que aquel gran asturiano
123 llamó la hija del mar y el sol; en nombre del buen pueblo puertorriqueño que ha sabido
124 **ser leal a sus esencias**, les doy las ¡Gracias!

To conclude the speech, Hernández Colón refers again to Manuel Fernández Juncos (“hijo de esta tierra,” “gran asturiano,” line 122), an important metaphor about the proximity between Spanish identity and Puerto Rican identity, to create a circular narrative. The very last sentence ratifies the essentialist discourse where the people of Puerto Rico are uncorrupted because they continue to speak Spanish. “Leal a sus esencias” (loyal to their essence, line 124) is a final *emotional appeal* to tradition that again homogenizes Puerto Rican identity and *erases* other ways of being Puerto Rican. Reasserting cultural autonomy (as opposed to assimilation) confirms Puerto Rico’s membership in the Spanish-speaking *ingroup*.

Table 5: Tabulation sample 2

Concept	**Analysis**		**Patterns**
Ideological square	**Ingroup:** -Puerto Rico, Spain, Spanish-speakers -Puerto Rico: agents, active subjects; specific activities; minimization of non-Spanish culture influence; jíbaro -Spain: cultural legacy; erasure of wrongdoing during imperial time ("cambio de soberanía," slave trade) -Spanish: solidarity, shared worldview, shared identity, shared literary tradition, progress, "vanguardia" -Lexical items: vernáculo, iberoamericano, integridad cultural, vanguardia, esencia, etc. -Self-categorization: almost purely Spanish-based culture; not United States	**Outgroup:** -United States -Implied referents, agency in negative action is minimized ("política implantada por 45 años") -Lexical items: Democracy, modernity, honor, respect, cultural freedom -English: useful -Paradoxical relationship: "La afirmación de lo propio no es negación de lo ajeno."	-Focus on P.R. action; celebrates legacy of Spanish culture -U.S. passive -Spanish: future and progress -Ingroup values: defense of Spanish **Motifs:** -Homogeneity -Tradition -Essentialism -Language defines identity -Cultural autonomism -Historical defense of Spanish
Argumentation/ validity of claims	-Emotional appeals: pride, sympathy, solidarity, populism, etc. -Association fallacy: ingroup qualities -Ambiguity, exaggeration, contradiction		

Recontextualiza-tion, Intertextuality, Interdiscursivity	-Recontextualization: décimas y romances; Official Language Act of 1991 -Intertextuality: J.R. Jiménez; P. Salinas (*Aprecio y defensa del idioma*); M. Fernández Juncos (*La borinqueña*); Cervantes (*Don Quijote*); Nobel-prize winners, etc. -Interdiscourse: internationalization, capitalist economic model; essentialist, purist, organicist	

3.2.3 Overall analysis of sample 2

Let us place this speech event in its political context. At this point in history, Hernández Colón had tried and failed twice to negotiate an enhanced ELA with the United States federal government, and he knew he was no longer a viable candidate to be governor. Even though the plebiscite had lost federal backing, the Bush administration was open to the idea of granting statehood to Puerto Rico, and Rosselló (PNP) was likely to win. It was under these circumstances that Hernández Colón continued to stir "the most right-wing, racist, and bigoted elements of American society" (Negrón Muntaner as cited in Barreto, 2001a, p. 116) to impede as much as possible Puerto Rico's becoming a state. To do so, Puerto Rico had to be inserted into an entirely different ingroup, but one that enjoyed cultural prestige and whose economy was flourishing. This was meant to be Hernández Colón's legacy and a major contribution to the autonomist program led by the PPD.

Throughout this speech, Hernández Colón makes Puerto Rico available to the Spanish-speaking world and distances the island from the United States. He emphasizes that, culturally and morally, Puerto Rico is the same as Spain and Ibero-America by virtue of language. As a discursive strategy, he signals Manuel Fernández Juncos as a

"Puerto Rican Spaniard" to embody the proximity of identities. Moreover, he stresses the white *jíbaro* identity to illustrate a Spanish-based view of Puerto Ricans. Through these referents, he personifies a recontextualized Spanish tradition on the island.

The frequent references to literary figures and the connections made with Puerto Rican authors are meant to establish a standard for a shared literary tradition, not only because Spanish authors have lived, visited, or been inspired by the island, but also because Puerto Rican authors use the same language for their own creative activities. This reasoning is riddled by fallacies of association and shows a hispanophile, colonial ideology that does not recognize the different ways of being Puerto Rican.

Hernández Colón defines the ingroup using terms that make that ingroup "available" to Puerto Rico in the eyes of the international community. The shared values proposed by the speaker are the defense and maintenance of Spanish, language as an essential part of identity, and that—similar to the theory of linguistic relativity—Spanish speakers share the same worldview. We may assert that this is a fallacy of projection given that the speaker's definition of national identity is generalized to the rest of the Puerto Rican population, regardless of differences of opinion. It is also an association fallacy, not all Spanish speakers will share the same views, as well as an appeal to tradition where the historical defense and maintenance of Spanish provide a common cause for unity.

His definition of the Puerto Rican identity is a repetition of the class-based narrative that dates to the 1800s, where the white *jíbaro* is meant to be an organic representation of a nation. This representation is decontextualized from the Afro-Antillean setting that surrounded the original *jíbaro*, and it is romanticized by the

intellectual elites who belonged (and still belong) to the dominant class and, thus, control nationalistic discourses. As a side note, we must remember that the *jíbaro* becomes the emblem of the PPD and the ELA; thus, the *jíbaro* is closely linked to the autonomist solution to the status problem. His definition of Puerto Rican is also homogeneous and static; he proposes the same definition as the elite class did a century ago.

Some of the discursive strategies utilized to align himself or self-categorize with the ingroup regard his view of the colonial history of Spain in Puerto Rico and the Americas. As was previously mentioned, the speaker "celebrates" (line 37) rather than "commemorates" the Quincentennial of Columbus's voyages; he omits agents when referring to the colonial Spanish government of the island ("el cambio de soberanía," line 33); and he celebrates the fact that colonizers like Juan Ponce de León (line 17), who massacred the Taínos, brought with them the Spanish language to the island. To emphasize membership within the ingroup, Hernández Colón minimizes and even erases the influence of other cultures. As previously stated, he minimizes the influence of Taino and African people in the construction of a national identity (lines 26-28), and he entirely erases the effects of the United States influence. The only unsaid result of the political relationship with the United States illustrated in the text is the description of Puerto Rico as an industrialized, democratic society, and even then, Puerto Rico is located exclusively in the Caribbean context (lines 76-77) when in reality the island's economy is essentially controlled by the United States. Hernández Colón dismisses that which is obvious.

Regarding the outgroup, the United States, it is interesting that Hernández Colón erases its cultural influence and uses passive forms to reduce its political impact ("una política implantada," lines 8-9, for example). Thus, he uses strategies that we would

normally see applied to the ingroup. We could conclude that Hernández Colón is "protecting" the diplomatic relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States, but that seems unlikely considering that his political strategy is to create a rift between the nations. The speaker defines the common values between Puerto Rico and the outgroup: democracy and modernity. At the same time, he expressly states that one nation has nothing to do with the other: "La afirmación de lo propio no es negación de lo ajeno" (line 52). Thus, we may conclude that this discourse reflects the paradoxical ideology proposed by the ELA.

The proposition of "hacer futuro desde el español" (line 98) defies general perspectives of English as the lingua franca of international commerce and economic development. While it is true that English is considered a "world language" of significant importance on the international front, it is also true that economic development can occur in Spanish, just as it happened in post-Franco Spain and in the Spanish-speaking countries in Latin America. Hernández Colón is distancing Puerto Rico from a future held in English. Moreover, his treatment of the English language is close to indifferent and he minimizes the government's role in producing a bilingual populace. Perhaps this backhanded comment is the best evidence that educational English language policies in Puerto Rico are not actually designed for the purpose of improving education.

4.0 Sample 3: Advertising campaign 1991 referendum, *Vota no a la separación*

4.1 Context

4.1.1 Macrostructure

The advertisement to be analyzed is 30 seconds long. It combines text, images, portrait pictures, audio effects, and male and female voice-overs. It begins with a reference to the 1991 Official Language Act and the December 8, 1991 referendum. This ad is only one sample from a larger advertising campaign promoting the NO option, backed by the New Progressive Party. The selected ad is the 5th clip (starting at 1 minute, 50 seconds) in a longer video available on YouTube. The advertisement was publicly sponsored by "puertorriqueños que no quieren perder la ciudadanía americana."

The complete compilation video is titled "Campaña por el NO referéndum 1991 contra la separación (archivo)," available on the conservative *InYourFaceTV* YouTube channel (retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ov0l3TfVAeY). In total, it is 10 minutes long, but the content is divided in two parts. The first half is a compilation of different ads from the NO campaign. The second half is a glimpse into Governor Pedro Rosselló's 1992 election campaign titled "Un documento para la historia," produced by Guastella Films.

4.1.2 Setting, participants, and ends

Because this is a TV advertisement, the setting, participants, ends, act sequences, and such are not observed the same way as in a live speech event or a linguistic text, as we have seen in the previous samples. *Multimodality*[3] must be considered to a far larger

[3] *Multimodality* emphasizes the importance of visual elements and texts in the meaning making process. It holds that all communication combines different modes to convey a message: text, tone, image, format, etc. (Lyons, 2016). Kress and van Leeuwen (1998) explain that text analysis must account for "the interplay between the verbal and the visual, and adequately analyze visually expressed meanings" (p. 187).

extent because this is, above all, an audiovisual text. We may establish that the various semiotic cues are meant to produce a distressing *psychological setting* directed toward the centrist Puerto Rican voter who values having political ties to the United States. This state of alert is created with a combination of elements which will be discussed in the analysis of act sequence, keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genre.

The *participants* are those who produced the ad as well as those who consumed it. However, it is especially addressed to pro-center voters which include those who favor statehood and those who identify with the Popular Democratic Party but are more inclined to preserve stronger ties with the United States rather than seek autonomy (Barreto, 2001a, p. 50). The *end*, of course, is to persuade, create a sense of urgency and provoke a distressed emotional response which compels voters to exercise their democratic right to vote for the NO option.

4.1.3 Act sequence, keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genre

The *act sequence* is fast paced since the advertisement is limited to a 30 second television spot. The speed, however, adds tension to the communicative event and psychological setting. There is, first, a male voice-over who reads a white text that appears on cue over a black background, as accompanied by the sound of a typewriter in the background. The typewriter sound effect is meant to blur the lines between objective reporting and propaganda: the sound of a typewriter is associated with professional news and information providers, especially before the boom of the Internet. This first section reports a threat. The next act in the sequence presents black and white pictures of the main actors in the opposing ideological groups. The background colors used are representative of the PPD and the PIP. The second section defines the outgroup. The

typewriter sound is carried through uninterruptedly through the end of the third act in the sequence. A female voice-over reads on cue the white text that appears on a black background. A yellow background and a white textbox reminiscent of the *Comisión Estatal de Elecciones* logo illustrates how to draw an X to vote for the NO option. The third section is a call to action. Finally, recipients are informed about the ad's sponsorship with the Puerto Rican and United States flags separating from one another and a clanging noise in the background. This defines the ingroup.

We may describe the *keys* of this ad as anxious and serious. The male voice speaks quickly and seems out of breath at times, which dramatically emphasizes a perceived state of emergency. The female voice also speaks with energy. Regarding *instrumentalities*, this ad utilizes many different semiotic channels. While all linguistic output (written and oral) is in Spanish, there are also color codes, sound effects, and visual representations of ideological actors.

Norms are specific to television ad regulations. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) as well as the broadcaster establish norms that may limit the content of the ad. Regarding *genre*, as was previously mentioned, this ad follows a formula that is commonly seen in political campaign advertisements. It presents a threat, an outgroup, an ingroup, and makes a call to action.

4.1.4 Fill in tool

The federal plebiscite to resolve the status quo in Puerto Rico failed to receive support from the U.S. Congress when negotiations turned to matters of culture, mainly issues of language. As a result of this political impasse, Hernández Colón enacted a law on October 2, 1991 to hold a special referendum titled *Reclamación de Derechos*

Democráticos which sought to constitutionally guarantee specific rights to the people of Puerto Rico. Morris (1995) explains that initially all three major parties had agreed to certain non-negotiable terms under any of the three status options, but the PNP withdrew its support when clauses protecting Spanish and the Puerto Rican flag and anthem were included (p. 60). The main political parties divided themselves into two factions before the election: PPD and PIP in favor, PNP against. In addition to the PPD and the PIP, people who identified with smaller left-wing political movements also rallied in favor of the bill (Torres-González, 2002, p 232). The complete text of the ballot may be found in the appendices of this dissertation.

To fully understand the metaphors in this ad, viewers must identify that one of its semiotic codes is the use of colors. The meaning of each color is clear to those who are familiar with local political party branding. Other than the predominating colors used in the main text (black and white), there is a background transition from red (the identifying color of the PPD) to green (the identifying color of the PIP). This transition is meant to insert Hernández Colón in the same pro-independence ideological groups as Rubén Berríos (PIP) and Carlos Gallisá (*Partido Socialista Puertorriqueño*, PSP).

4.1.5 Frame problem tool

As was previously mentioned, this ad is only one sample from a wider campaign in favor of the NO option. The original video from which this clip was taken is a compilation of eight complete ads and one additional incomplete ad for a total of 9 different commercials. There are two main topics in the NO campaign: defending American citizenship and taking action against crime. The latter is a red herring that also functioned as part of Pedro Rosselló's election campaign. In fact, Rosselló is the

protagonist in three of the ads: his message against the referendum focused on "mano dura contra el crimen"[4]. All the ads but one attack directly Hernández Colón for either being ineffective against crime or being a separatist. Meanwhile, the YES campaign focused its message on affirming the Puerto Rican cultural identity (Morris, 1995, p. 61).

In the end, the NO option prevailed with 53% of the vote. Morris explains that, while the result was surprising, there were several factors that led to the PNP's victory:

> The abstention of commonwealth party voters in response to internal party divisions; confusion generated by a complex ballot; rising support for statehood and the fear of losing U.S. patronage; and displeasure with Rafael Hernández Colón… who had pushed the referendum (p. 61).

4.1.6 Make strange tool

Torres-González (2002) points out that this election produced strange alliances and bizarre results. The ballot stated that a vote for the YES option sought to guarantee the people's inalienable right to choose their preferred political status, the preservation of the Puerto Rican cultural identity, and the protection of U.S. citizenship, irrespective of a plebiscite outcome. The alliance between the PPD, PIP and left-wing movements had as a common purpose to emphasize the differences between Puerto Rico and the United States, creating further impediments to statehood. Thus, while the left voted to protect U.S. citizenship, statehood promoters voted against protecting it at the same time they voted against the language and culture clause (pp. 232-233).

[4] The *Iron Fist Against Crime* campaign was Pedro Rosselló's anti-crime plan which strengthened policing and increased punitive measures to reduce crime rates in Puerto Rico starting in 1993.

4.2 Discourse

4.2.1 Section analysis

The transcription of the selected advertisement places audiovisual cues in brackets in italics. These cues are described in detail to produce a complete picture. The linguistic text is sectioned by forward slashes (/) to indicate when it becomes visible to the audience. The use of asterisks (*) marks emphatic accents.

[Black background; white, bold, capitalized letters; ***typewriter*** *sound; male voice-over and corresponding text appears in phrases organized as follows:]*

Después de haber eliminado el inglés como segundo idioma oficial, /

su gobierno local llevará a cabo un referéndum el 8 de diciembre que establece **reclamos de soberanía /**

e independencia al congreso de los Estados Unidos. /

Este es otro **gran*** paso hacia la **total* separación** de Puerto Rico de los Estados Unidos.

As previously mentioned, the typewriter sound that accompanies the text and audio creates the illusion of traditional newspaper reporting. This semiotic strategy means to blur the line between objective reporting and propaganda. The white text appears at the same time as the male voice reads it, which makes the information seem as if it had just been received and published (“hot off the press”). The voice speaks hurriedly to impress on the viewer a sense of urgency. The duplicate input of voice and text together have a deeper emotional imprint than voice or text alone. These semiotic strategies appeal to the authority of news outlets and emotional distress.

"Después de haber eliminado el inglés como segundo idioma oficial" (After eliminating English as a second official language, line 3), emphasizes what was "taken" from citizens. This is the *anchoring* premise throughout the advertisement, that the government wants "to take" from the people, first English as an official language and next Puerto Rico's political ties to the United States. The fact that the ad begins recalling the Official Language Act confirms the symbolic importance of the legislation and the official status of English on the island. This is immediately linked to the political relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. What this line does not reflect is a different valuation of either language, which was the case for the PPD and Hernández Colón where Spanish was linked to cultural identity.

The text argues that "Su gobierno local" (Your local government, not the federal government) is directly responsible (active voice) for making claims for "soberanía e independencia" (sovereignty and independence, lines 4-6) through the referendum; these are lexical items that oppose the political ideology of the PNP as well as the more traditional members of the PPD, the groups that are targeted by the advertisement. Because these are emotionally charged words with a negative impact on the target audience, this is an effective introduction to the subsequent appeal to fear: "Este es otro gran paso hacia la total separación de Puerto Rico de los Estados Unidos," (This is another huge step toward total separation, line 7). However, it is important to note that, according to the ballot, this claim is not true. The YES choice mentions the "sovereignty" of the people of Puerto Rico in their right to vote for either the ELA, statehood or independence, at the same time it seeks to protect U.S. citizenship (Referéndum del 8 de diciembre de 1991).

The speaker accentuates the modifiers “gran” and “total” for dramatic effect. The speaker places great significance on the electoral outcome, once again, to urge people to vote. However, it was also understood that the result of the referendum would have no legally binding consequences. At most, it would send U.S. Congress a message (Morris, 1995, p. 61).

8 *[Black-white picture of Hernández Colón over **red background**. Background **transitions**
9 **to green** as black-white pictures of Rubén Berríos and Carlos Gallisá are **revealed from**
10 **behind HC’s picture**: Berríos’ picture moves center to left; simultaneously, Gallisá’s*
11 *moves center to right, both pictures at each side of HC’s picture. Below each picture,*
12 *their names, “Rubén, Rafael, Gallisá,” appear in white.]*
13 Este es el objetivo de es la **alianza** independentista, popular y **socialista**.

Lines 8 through 13 define the *outgroup*. As previously mentioned, the most significant semiotic strategy in this section is using party colors to suggest that Hernández Colón’s political stance was really the same as the independence party. Transitioning from red to green symbolically inserts him toward the left rather than the center of the ideological spectrum, which is opposite to the target audience. The ad uses a metaphor of concealment (lines 9-10): Berríos and Gallisá’s pictures are revealed from behind Hernández Colón’s picture to suggest a hidden complicity. The alliance, however, was not secret. We should also note that the cold war had only ended in 1989. “Socialist” is a lexical item that still today is used by conservatives to instill fear; back in 1991, the negative connotations associated with the PSP and Marxist ideology were even stronger.

[Black background; white, bold letters; typewriter sound; ***female*** *voice-over text appears in phrases organized as follows:]*

Madre puertorriqueña defiende tu ciudadanía, lleva a tu familia a votar.

*[****Yellow background****; white box with text in black, capital letters: VOTA NO. An X below in hand script shows how to vote.]*

Vota no a la **separación**.

This section makes a call to action while reproducing a patriarchal discourse. A female voice replaces the male voice and addresses Puerto Rican mothers, specifically. This is the only instance in which an audience member is addressed directly other than the use of the ambiguous pronoun "su" (your) in line 4. Line 16 proposes that women are responsible for making their family members vote and leading them to vote "correctly": "lleva a tu familia a votar" (take your family to vote). Moreover, there is an emotional appeal to be the protector, harnessing maternal powers to defend U.S. citizenship in the interest of protecting the family.

The image of the white box over the yellow background is reminiscent of the *Comisión Estatal de Elecciones* (CEE) logo, which is semiotically misleading and may lead viewers to believe that the NO option was backed by the CEE. Line 19, "vota no a la separación" (vote no to separation), repeats the idea of an imminent political separation from the United States and *recontextualizes* the electoral event to reject or embrace independence.

This recontextualization creates, in essence, a *slippery slope fallacy* as defined by the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: "from a given starting point one can by a series of incremental inferences arrive at an undesirable conclusion, and because of this

unwanted result, the initial starting point should be rejected" (Hansen, 2019). The starting point is that the referendum makes claims for sovereignty, which leads toward political separation from the United States. The conclusion is that U.S. citizenship is at risk and the referendum must be rejected.

20 *[Gray background; white, capitalized text "Dile no a la **separación**" initially covered by*
21 *both the Puerto Rican flag and the United States flags. The **flags are separated abruptly,***
22 *giving the impression that they have been **torn apart**; a **clanging sound** emphasizes the*
23 *sudden separation. When they are separated, the complete text is seen unobstructed.*
24 *Male voice-over:]*
25 Auspiciado por **puertorriqueños que no quieren perder la ciudadanía americana**.

The final section of the ad establishes the *ingroup*: "puertorriqueños que no quieren perder la ciudadanía americana" (Puerto Ricans who do not want to lose American citizenship, line 25). This is a wide-enough *ingroup* to include members of all political ideologies. It also repeats the initial *anchoring motif* where the emphasis is placed on what could be taken away. This is semiotically stressed with the separation of the flags revealing "dile no a la separación" (say no to separation, lines 20-23). The visual representation of the political rift between Puerto Rico and the United States embellished with the clanging sound inspires fear and proposes an imminent threat. Again, the ad *recontextualizes* the electoral event so that viewers perceive it as a rejection or embrace of independence.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Table 6: Tabulation sample 3</th></tr>
<tr><th>Concept</th><th colspan="2">Analysis</th><th>Patterns</th></tr>
<tr><td>Ideological square</td><td>Ingroup:

-“puertorriqueños que no quieren perder la ciudadanía americana”, pro-center voters

-mothers/families</td><td>Outgroup:

-Hernández Colón, PIP, left-wing

-Active voice: “su gobierno local”

-Lexical items: soberanía, independencia, separación, socialista</td><td rowspan="3">Anchoring motif: Government is taking from citizens</td></tr>
<tr><td>Argumentation/ validity of claims</td><td colspan="2">-Appeals to fear and anxiety
-Slippery slope fallacy</td></tr>
<tr><td>Recontextualiza-tion, Intertextuality, Interdiscursivity</td><td colspan="2">-Recontextualization of electoral event
-Intertextual allusion to Official Language Act</td></tr>
</table>

4.2.3 Overall analysis of sample 3

Duany (2007) explains the difference between political nationalism and cultural nationalism as one in which the former is “based on the doctrine that every people should have its own sovereign state” and the latter as “the assertion of the moral and spiritual autonomy of each people” (p. 52). He explains that political nationalism has waned considerably on the island while cultural nationalism remains deep-rooted among insular Puerto Ricans as well as the diaspora. However, the results of the referendum, instead of reflecting the fervor of cultural nationalism, showed the very low level of political nationalism on the island.

The advertisement immediately anchors the viewer to that which Hernández Colón and the PPD "took away" in order to weaken political ties with the United States. Quite differently from the PPD, in this case the PNP utilizes language as a political bridge, not an identity maker. The advertisement is not about language or cultural identity at all, which was one of the aims of the referendum; it is simply about the political status of the island.

In the past, all three main political parties coincided in protecting Spanish as a marker of cultural identity. Referring back to the Congressional hearings in 1989, when Romero Barceló (PNP) was probed regarding making English the official language of Puerto Rico, he responded "That would be unacceptable" (as cited in Barreto, 2001a, p. 61) because it opposed the PNP's proposal for an *estadidad jíbara*. It seems, however, that the Official Language Act and Hernández Colón's political actions to further highlight the cultural differences between Puerto Rico and the United States would lead the PNP to omit links between language and cultural identity and refocus the language issue as a matter of politics. In a way, the advertisement is truthful in the sense that eliminating the co-officiality of language did create a deeper divide between U.S. Congress and Puerto Rico. However, it is not truthful in stating that an assertion of cultural rights leads to a definitive separation from the United States for two reasons. First, cultural nationalism and political nationalism are not proportional in the context of Puerto Rico; that is, cultural nationalism levels are very high, while political nationalism level (the desire to be an independent, sovereign state) are very low. Second, U.S. Congress will always have the final word regarding the political status of the island.

Unlike the previous samples, in this advertisement, language is not given a cultural value. Instead, the ad emphasizes that the officiality of the English language in Puerto Rico is relevant for political matters. In Sample 4, the Official Languages Act of 1993, a similar discursive line is carried through the legislative preamble. Without necessarily contradicting the *estadidad jíbara* thesis, the PNP works to counter the effects of the Spanish only law as well as the hispanophile propaganda left by the Hernández Colón administration.

5.0 Sample 4: Official Languages Act of 1993, to decree both Spanish and English as official languages of the Government of Puerto Rico

5.1 Context

5.1.1 Macrostructure

The composition of this law follows the same standard format as Sample 1. It is introduced with the long title of the law followed by the legislative preamble ("exposición de motivos"). As previously discussed, the long title must express the purpose of the enactment of said law and make sure it addresses a single issue at a time (Oficina de Servicios Legislativos, 2017, p. 20). In this case, the legislative preamble includes four initial paragraphs that discuss the history of the English language in Puerto Rico, the political and cultural links between Puerto Rico and the United States, among other themes, and four additional paragraphs that clarify the purposes and limitations of the law. Throughout these eight paragraphs, there are several references to historical texts such as official language policy, federal and local constitutions, and the 1965 *Pueblo vs Tribunal Superior* case. The concept *fiat legislativo* is also used.

The law enumerates ten articles after the decree clause which are not included in the following discourse analysis. In brief, they establish the following: Article 1 orders that both Spanish and English are official languages in Puerto Rico; Article 2 clarifies that translators and interpreters would be used when necessary; Article 3 establishes that government offices must use translators and interpreters to carry out the law; Article 4 prohibits that documents written in either language be discarded; Article 5 allows for the use of other languages when necessary; Article 6 permits the legislative and judicial branches to determine language usage in their internal processes; Article 7 reassures that the law would not limit constitutional rights; Article 8 repeals law 4 of 1991; Article 9 disposes that if a section of the law were repealed, the rest of the law would continue to be in effect; and Article 10 establishes that the law would go into effect immediately.

5.1.2 Setting, participants, ends, and act sequence

When Pedro Rosselló made the Official Languages Act his very first law upon being elected governor, he was keeping a campaign promise. The first week of January, Rosselló instructed the Legislative Assembly to replace the 1991 language law. Unlike the López Galarza bill, a unified PNP pushed to approve reinstating English as an official language quickly and only held four days of passionate public hearings on the topic (Barreto, 2001a, pp. 119-120). On January 28, House Resolution 1 became the Official Languages Act of 1993 in the *Parque de las Ciencias* in Bayamón where the attending schoolchildren were guaranteed “two flags, two anthems, two languages” (Barreto, 2001a, p. 121).

Participants included politicians from all parties siding along party lines. The PIP organized massive protests in San Juan to demonstrate the people’s opposition to the

project. Journalists reported that approximately 100,000 participants took the streets, and they also described the public hearings as intense. The Teachers' Association (*Asociación de Maestros de Puerto Rico*) also opposed it as it was reminiscent of an Americanization era (Barreto, 2001a, pp. 119-121). All the while, it is interesting to recall that polls revealed that 77% of the population favored having both English and Spanish as official languages in 1991. The legislative preamble states that the objective of this law was to "correct the adverse effects and [practical] setbacks" resulting from law 4 of 1991, but several politicians agreed that its primary end was to "send a message" to U.S. Congress and reaffirm Puerto Rico's loyalty. The target audience is, thus, U.S. Congress.

5.1.3 Keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genre

One of the keys that characterized this legislative piece was Rosselló and the PNP's rush to get it approved. The PNP had control over both houses and did not intend to reach a consensus with the other parties. The text is written completely in formal, Puerto Rican Spanish, and its content is generally easy for the reader to follow. Within the text, there is use of legal jargon (*legislative fiat*) and several references to other legal or political documents. Compared to Sample 1 in this analysis, the style used in this legislative preamble is less ornate. The arguments are illustrated as based on verifiable facts and provide references and quotations to this effect.

5.1.4 Fill in tool

This PNP-backed legislation cites the constitution of the *Estado Libre Asociado* to reiterate the nature of the political relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. It evokes an era when the local and federal governments negotiated the terms that led Puerto Rico to become a model for progress in the Caribbean (as illustrated in the

1962 McGraw-Hill propaganda). This is significant as it is a reminder of the economic and political bonds between both nations. Moreover, the text brings together groups from two competing ideologies (statehood and commonwealth) by identifying their common ground, their different yet similar desire to remain politically linked to the United States.

Throughout the text, the writer expresses that the Official Language Act of 1991 was not cost-effective for the government of Puerto Rico. Upon further research, we learn that the previous law had indeed caused problems, particularly among the commercial and professional sectors who carried out their business in English prior to the enactment of the law (Torres-González, 2002, p. 233). After signing the law, Hernández Colón provided linguistic wavers in an attempt to prevent the expected negative economic impact (Barreto, 2001a, p. 76), but the reach of the wavers was not sufficient.

5.1.5 Frame problem tool

One of the issues that Law 1 is adamant about clarifying is that it did not in any way attempt to change educational language policy or revive an Americanization program. We must remember that, until 1990, Mariano Villaronga's 1949 Department of Instruction Administrative Decree was the only document regulating educational language policy on the island. It was not until 1990 that the PPD administration (with minority party consensus) approved the *Ley Orgánica del Departamento de Educación* (Organic Law of the Department of Education) which legally established for the first time that Spanish would be the language of instruction and English a second language course (Art. 1.02).

Regarding the passage of Law 1 of 1993, then-President of the Teachers' Association, Renán Soto, warned that this was a first step toward a "pro-English

educational policy" (Barreto, 2001a, p. 119). Despite the fact that the language law claimed the contrary, in 1997, Victor Fajardo, Secretary of Education under Rosselló, instituted the *Proyecto para formar un ciudadano bilingüe,* a partial immersion program that taught Math and Science in English to Spanish speakers (Schmidt, 2014, p. 66). Not long after (in 1999), the language portion of the Organic Law of the Department of Education would be amended to allow either Spanish or English as languages of instruction (Art. 5.06).

Pedro Rosselló's agenda for his first year as governor included repairing the cultural fissure highlighted by Hernández Colón. Rosselló was interested in winning back the favor of the U.S. Congress and further stressing Puerto Rico's loyalty to the United States and American values. In addition to reinstating English as an official language, Rosselló also coordinated a non-binding status plebiscite held on November 14, 1993 which resulted in a victory for the commonwealth option (49%), statehood came in close second (46%), and independence last (4%). It was also in 1993 that President Clinton would recommend eliminating Section 936 from the Internal Revenue Code.

5.1.6 Making strange tool

The primary issue to be problematized within the text is the phrase "indistinct use" of both Spanish and English, which implies a specific interpretation of the linguistic reality of Puerto Rico. The legislative preamble affirms that the current law intends to reestablish the 1902 law without discerning that the 1902 law did define the domains and contexts in which English and Spanish would be used. The 1993 law erases this distinction and thus insinuates that English is used more widely than it is in actuality.

Torres-González (2002, p. 235) describes the preamble's exposition of Puerto Rico's linguistic reality as "pendular": the text recognizes that Spanish is the language of "the people" but contradicts itself by insisting on nine decades of indistinct use of both languages. Moreover, the law states that it would again allow English to be used in government offices and processes, but specifically limits its scope in education and the judicial branch. There is a recurrent confusion of the "indistinct use" of Spanish and English, or what is meant by "indistinct use," and the linguistic reality of Puerto Rico.

5.2 Discourse

5.2.1 Section analysis

En 1898 se estableció mediante la Orden General Núm. 192 del Cuartel General del Ejército, Despacho del Ayudante General, en Washington, D.C., que el idioma oficial a utilizarse en el Gobierno de Puerto Rico sería el inglés. **El 21 de febrero de 1902** se aprobó una ley, que autorizó a emplear **indistintamente**, los idiomas español e inglés en el Gobierno de Puerto Rico. **Ochenta y nueve años más tarde**, la **Ley Núm. 4 de 5 de abril de 1991** declaró el español como idioma oficial de Puerto Rico para usarse en el trámite de los asuntos oficiales de todos los departamentos, municipios u otras subdivisiones políticas, agencias, corporaciones públicas, oficinas y dependencias gubernamentales de las Ramas Ejecutiva, Legislativa y Judicial del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico. Según la exposición de motivos de esa ley, el propósito de la misma es **reafirmar nuestra condición histórica de pueblo hispanoparlante**, **a la vez que expresa el compromiso de adquirir el pleno dominio del inglés como segundo idioma**, **sin rendir ni su lengua ni su cultura**.

To introduce the statement of purpose, the author presents three legal orders establishing official language usage in Puerto Rico. At first glance, we see that the same pieces of information are provided for all three orders: year or date of effect, and the ruling. The first sentence, however, provides additional information regarding the precedence of the order ("mediante la Orden General Núm. 192 del Cuartel General del Ejército, Despacho del Ayudante General, en Washington, D.C.," lines 1-2) which reminds us that the military government, before the Foraker Act, eliminated any local participation in government affairs. The second sentence pertaining to the language law of 1902 is the shortest of the three, and only provides a passive construction ("se aprobó una ley," lines 3-4) that states that the law allowed for the indistinct use of English and Spanish in Government in general. We know this to be nuanced given that the original text states in article 5 that the law did not apply to any office or court at the municipal level. The third sentence begins with an introductory clause of time, "ochenta y nueve años más tarde" (eighty-nine years later, line 5) to emphasize the passage of time without changes to language law. It is followed by a list of government offices that emphasizes the scope of the applicability of the law. The final sentence summarizes accurately what is expressed in the legislative preamble of the Official Language Act of 1991.

This introductory paragraph presents a timeline of official language policies with the aim of highlighting that the coexistence of Spanish and English had been the norm before the 1991 law. The composition style is factual and straightforward; it is not ornate or emotional. It defines the discursive line as an appeal to reason and frames the coming arguments within a historical paradigm of linguistic coexistence.

14 El preámbulo de la **Constitución del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico**
15 expresa, entre otras cosas, que "consideramos como factores determinantes en nuestras
16 vidas la **ciudadanía de los Estados Unidos de América**, la **lealtad** a los **postulados de**
17 **la Constitución Federal**; (y) la **convivencia en Puerto Rico de las dos grandes**
18 **culturas del hemisferio americano**...". El Pueblo de Puerto Rico, además, **ha**
19 **manifestado una y otra vez a todo lo largo del siglo XX** su voluntad de mantener y
20 fortalecer su relación con los Estados Unidos de Norteamérica. El **progreso político,**
21 **económico y social** del Pueblo de Puerto Rico está íntimamente ligado al propósito de
22 que tanto el idioma español como el inglés sean los idiomas oficiales en esta jurisdicción.

It is significant that PNP legislation would cite the constitution of the ELA as a primary source to justify the approval of the measure. This use of *intertextuality* addresses those who traditionally favor the commonwealth option, not those who favor statehood. The author is expanding the *ingroup* to members of both main political parties on the island. The choice of quote stresses the nature of the political relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States (determinant factors in our lives, lines 15-16): having American citizenship requires Puerto Ricans to show loyalty to the values entrenched in the Federal constitution (lines 16-17) and the Puerto Rican identity is twofold (cohabitation in Puerto Rico of the two great cultures of the American hemisphere, lines 17-18). This is linked to language usage by virtue of the political relationship that results in "political, economic, and social progress" (lines 20-21). At the same time, the word "progress" is a *lexical item* that is closely linked to the American dream and imagery of an industrialization era. In short, the law's thesis is that a desire for progress justifies having two official languages (lines 20-22).

"El Pueblo de Puerto Rico" is an active subject in line 18 and has a voice. The author references the repeated results from previous status plebiscites that favor the commonwealth status with statehood steadily gaining votes thusly: "ha manifestado una y otra vez a todo lo largo del siglo XX su voluntad de mantener y fortalecer su relación con los Estados Unidos" (has manifested over and over again throughout the 20th century its will to maintain and strengthen its relationship with the United States, lines 19-20). This is supporting evidence to demonstrate that establishing language links between Puerto Rico and the United States is a *reasonable* political action. A final detail to note is the use of the word "jurisdiction" in line 22: a territory that is subordinated to another. This stands in stark contrast with the PPD's rhetoric where Puerto Rico is deemed a "país" or country (Samples 1 and 2).

La Ley Núm. 4 de 5 de abril de 1991 **no ha llenado las expectativas** del Puerto Rico de hoy que aspira a **participar activamente** en las **iniciativas de desarrollo** en la **Cuenca del Caribe, Latinoamérica, Norteamérica y a nivel internacional.** Se necesitan vehículos prácticos para que el **Gobierno de Puerto Rico** pueda continuar comunicándose en forma efectiva con su propio pueblo y el mundo exterior. El inglés constituye el idioma que más frecuentemente se utiliza para llevar a cabo las comunicaciones internacionales hoy día. Por razones históricas, **nuestro Pueblo** ha venido utilizando indistintamente el español y el inglés por más de nueve décadas sin que ello haya significado que hemos postergado o abdicado nuestro vernáculo, el idioma español, ni que hayamos rendido nuestra lengua ni nuestra cultura. Por el contrario, nuestros **ciudadanos** se encuentran en la **posición privilegiada** de haber estado

34 **expuestos** y **tenido la oportunidad de aprender y hablar** dos idiomas importantes.
35 Tanto el español como el inglés pueden convivir como lo han hecho hasta ahora en
36 armonía y **conforme a las necesidades del pueblo** puertorriqueño, sin que uno
37 desvalorice al otro.

Lines 23 through 25 show an *interdiscourse* similar to that which can be observed in Sample 2, Hernández Colón's speech in Asturias. Both speakers utilize a discourse proper of international commerce. One of the main differences is that, while Hernández Colón places Puerto Rico specifically in the Ibero-American context and seems to have omitted the United States in its plans for economic development, the author of Law 1 includes the United States in addition to the Caribbean and Latin America (as opposed to Ibero-America). Both speakers state that Puerto Rico aspires to be an "active participant" in initiatives for "development" (line 24), which is a similar lexical item as "progress" in line 20. Diametrically opposite to Hernández Colón's speech is the suggestion that limiting the use of English (as stipulated in Law 4 of 1991) would keep Puerto Rico from the economic development to which it aspires. "No ha llenado las expectativas" (has not fulfilled the expectations, line 23) is an ambiguous verbal phrase that insinuates there are unspecified shortcomings to not having English as an official language. This is also a questionable valuation of the English language, given that there are many countries that participate actively in international commerce without holding English as an official language. The text gives English more economic power than Spanish within the global market, though both languages are referred to as "vehículos prácticos" (practical vehicles, line 26) and "idiomas importantes" (important languages, line 34). These lexical items

suggest a material valuation of what is useful and prestigious, perhaps in contrast to perceptions of other languages.

Regarding language functions, English is associated with *internationalization* (the language most frequently used to carry out international communications, lines 28-29) whereas Spanish is reaffirmed as the vernacular linked to culture (without giving up our language or our culture, lines 31-32). The author presents an inaccurate illustration of the relationship between both languages in Puerto Rico in two instances. First, the author states that historical reasons have led the people of Puerto Rico (not the government but "nuestro Pueblo," line 29, in the subject position) to use Spanish and English indistinctly (lines 29-30). It is a well-known and documented fact that this is not true of insular Puerto Ricans as shown, for example, in Fayer's (2000) census analysis which revealed that Puerto Ricans generally feel more skilled at reading and comprehending English and less so at writing and speaking in English. Moreover, the author qualifies that the uses of English correspond to the "needs" of the people of Puerto Rico (line 36), but does not seem to grasp the linguistic reality of the island where English is not truly used in ordinary settings except in specific sectors. The second inaccuracy is when the author suggests, through the use of the present perfect form ("como lo han hecho hasta ahora en armonía"), that Spanish and English have coexisted "harmoniously" (line 35-36) for a prolonged period of time. Sociolinguistic studies in Puerto Rico have shown that language attitudes have ranged from negative in the early 20th century, to ambivalent toward the end of the 20th century (López Laguerre, 1989), to generally positive with instrumental motivation in the early 21st century (Morales and Blau, 2009; Dominguez, 2012). This history of language attitudes and functions should have been a significant

impediment for a sustained, truly harmonious coexistence of languages in Puerto Rico by 1993. Nevertheless, even today (2020), it would be a hasty generalization to state that Spanish and English coexist harmoniously on the island.

Line 33 uses the lexical items “ciudadanos” (citizens) and “posición privilegiada” (privileged position) to allude to the benefits of American citizenship and the political ties with the United States. Like Hernández Colón, the author diminishes the State’s responsibility in producing a bilingual society through effective language education. Instead, the implication is that by sheer virtue of having a political relationship with the United States, Puerto Ricans have had the appropriate educational setting to produce English speakers (“la posición privilegiada de haber estado expuestos y tenido la oportunidad de aprender y hablar dos idiomas,” lines 33-34). This belief does not consider the many variables that foment or hinder language acquisition, and (just like Hernández Colón’s speech) it places the burden of becoming bilingual on the individual.

38 **Nada** de lo expresado en esta ley significa un retroceso lingüístico o una
39 **imposición cultural** al Pueblo de Puerto Rico. Cualquier referencia a un intento de
40 **asimilación cultural** es cosa del pasado. El propósito de esta medida es corregir los
41 efectos adversos y los contratiempos de naturaleza práctica creados por la Ley Núm. 4 de
42 5 de abril de 1991, al declarar y establecer que el español e inglés serán idiomas oficiales
43 a usarse indistintamente en todos los departamentos, municipios, u otras subdivisiones
44 políticas, agencias, oficinas y dependencias gubernamentales de las Ramas Ejecutiva,
45 Legislativa y Judicial del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico. **En esta forma se hace**

justicia y se valida una realidad existente en nuestra sociedad desde hace aproximadamente un siglo.

From this point on, the text of this law presents its defense against any criticism that may focus on the Americanization of Puerto Rico. It is direct in rejecting cultural impositions (line 39) and in dispelling fears of cultural assimilation (line 40) to align itself with the wider Puerto Rican ingroup that *self-categorizes* first and foremost as Puerto Rican (Morris, 1995, p. 104). The passage begins with a negation ("nada," line 38) to rhetorically strengthen this point and disassociate itself from accusations. "Cualquier referencia" (any reference, line 39) alludes precisely to those accusations and dismisses them as "cosa del pasado" (a thing of the past, line 40). This last phrase echoes the *motif* of the passing of time from Sample 1, the Official Language Act of 1991, and *minimizes* the impact of the Americanization program during the first half of the 20th century.

The author continues to reason with the reader and reaffirms the *practical* nature of the text as a corrective measure, reiterating that the Official Languages Act was an administrative mistake (lines 40-41), as established in paragraph 3. Lines 42-45 repeat the ordinance using the same words as the Official Language Act as cited in paragraph 1, which describe the scope of the applicability of the law in government offices. The very last sentence in this paragraph again describes a linguistic setting that is removed from the reality of the island ("se valida una realidad existente en nuestra sociedad desde hace aproximadamente un siglo," lines 46-47). The text continuously proposes that Spanish and English coexist on the island to a higher degree than what is accurate. The legal "validation" of this untruth ("se valida," line 46) is an artificial means to make the indistinct use of Spanish and English in Puerto Rico a political, though not social, reality.

A final observation about this paragraph is the use of the lexical item “justicia” (justice, line 46). This lexical item is used by the PNP as part of a narrative for equality and social justice through statehood, as exemplified in Carlos Romero Barceló’s book *La estadidad es para los pobres* or Statehood is for the poor (Meléndez, 1993, p. 211).

The defensive yet rational style of the text is carried throughout the rest of the legislative preamble. Lines 48 through 84 consist of four clarifications that emphasize the *values* of the *ingroup*.

48 A propósito de **despejar dudas** sobre la **intención legislativa** referente a esta
49 medida reiteramos lo siguiente:
50 1. Esta medida permite utilizar el inglés nuevamente en gestiones de Gobierno en
51 Puerto Rico. Como norma general, el uso del inglés en diligencias gubernamentales
52 se proscribió aquí en 1991, cuando se legisló para darle categoría de idioma oficial
53 sólo al español. Hasta ese momento, el inglés también había sido idioma oficial en
54 Puerto Rico. En resumen, con la aprobación de esta medida **restablecemos, sin**
55 **quitar ni añadir nada, la situación jurídica que existía** en Puerto Rico con
56 anterioridad a la aprobación de la ley de 1991.

The clarifications are introduced with a claim to transparency and clarity (“despejar dudas”) regarding the “legislative intention” (line 48). This statement of intention is meant to gain the reader’s trust; at the same time, it creates a distance from any real-world implications of the law. An “intention” is symbolic, whereas the impact of a law may be concrete.

Lines 50 through 56 emphasize that English was used in ordinary government dealings prior to the 1991 law. The argument is composed of premises that establish what was habitual through the use of lexical items referring to time or frequency: "permite utilizar el inglés *nuevamente*" (allows the use of English again, line 50) and "*hasta ese momento*, el inglés también había sido idioma oficial" (until that moment, English had also been an official language, line 53). This appeal to common practice is meant to justify the decision: "restablecemos, sin quitar ni añadir nada, la situación jurídica que existía" (we reestablish, without taking or adding anything, the preexisting legal situation, lines 54-55). Once again, the text erroneously suggests that the 1902 law and the 1993 law are equivalent.

2. A través de esta medida, la Asamblea Legislativa no pretende establecer, **por fiat legislativo**, una condición de bilingüismo, extraña a la realidad cotidiana del pueblo puertorriqueño. Nos limitamos a reconocer otra realidad: que la relación de Puerto Rico con Estados Unidos, **cada vez más estrecha en lo político y lo económico**, lo mismo que la aspiración a perpetuar esa relación expresada en las urnas por los votantes de los dos partidos principales —que congregan más del 90 por ciento del electorado— multiplica las instancias en que es preciso que **nuestro gobierno reciba y conteste comunicaciones en inglés** y tramite asuntos oficiales en ese mismo idioma. Proscribir el uso del inglés, **por puro fiat legislativo**, como se hizo en 1991, **entorpece y encarece el funcionamiento** de nuestro gobierno innecesaria e injustificadamente.

Lines 57-59 reinforce the interpretation of lines 46-47 in that the law seeks to create a bilingual, political reality that is separate from the linguistic reality of the island. It is at this point that the text contradicts itself: throughout, the author claims that Spanish and English coexist to the level of "indistinct" usage, but then he openly asserts that the people of Puerto Rico are not bilingual ("una condición de bilingüismo, extraña a la realidad cotidiana del pueblo," line 58). Thus, it is this other reality ("reconocer otra realidad," line 59), the political reality, that produces language policy, regardless of the linguistic reality of the people. The author establishes that the political and economic links between the United States and Puerto Rico justify making English an official language; the decision is not truly concerned with English usage in Puerto Rico. Moreover, the functions of English are associated specifically with local government communicating with the United States ("nuestro gobierno reciba y conteste comunicaciones en inglés," line 64), given the political and economic ties between nations (line 60), not the people.

The political nature of the decision is further clarified by emphasizing that a majority of voters in Puerto Rico have constantly ratified the desire to remain politically linked to the United States, whether through the *Estado Libre Asociado* or statehood (lines 61-62). This is also suggestive of the wider *ingroup* (PNP and center PPD) and their common ambition to perpetuate ("aspiración a perpetuar," line 61) their affiliation to the United States. It simultaneously emphasizes democratic values and erases minority party voters (PIP) and disregards their viewpoint.

There is also a contrast in the use of the term *fiat legislativo* (legislative decree) when referring to Law 1 of 1993 and Law 4 of 1991. In the case of the latter, the author

uses the adjective “puro” to describe the way in which Law 4, 1991 was enacted, suggesting it was a whim of government which was hindersome and ineffective (“por puro *fiat* legislativo, entorpece y encarece el funcionamiento[5],” lines 65-66). It is relevant to remember that Law 1, 1993 was the first bill signed into law to satisfy a campaign promise, that it was not thoroughly discussed in public hearings, and that, similar to Law 4, 1991, it did not have unanimous support from the people.

3. Ninguna disposición de esta medida da amparo o valida la **infundamentada especulación** de que, al aprobarla, la Asamblea Legislativa estaría abriendo puertas a que pueda utilizarse un lenguaje que no sea el español como vehículo de enseñanza en las escuelas públicas de Puerto Rico. Este proyecto de ley no deroga, ni cambia, ni enmienda el Articulo 1.02 de la Ley Orgánica del Departamento de Educación—Ley 68 de 28 de agosto de 1991— que, en lo pertinente establece “que la educación se impartir en el idioma vernáculo, el español. Se enseñará el inglés como segundo idioma”. Reiteramos aquí la política pública a esos efectos.
4. Ninguna disposición de este proyecto de ley da amparo a la **infundamentada especulación** de que, al aprobar el mismo, la Asamblea Legislativa estaría autorizando o validando el uso de un idioma distinto al español en procedimientos judiciales en los tribunales del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico. La cuestión del idioma judicial fue resuelta por nuestro Tribunal Supremo en el caso de Pueblo vs Tribunal Superior (1965) y lo establecido allí no sufre cambio alguno con la aprobación de esta medida. La misma tampoco altera la Regla 8.5 de Procedimiento

[5] Merely out of a legislative *fiat*

Civil a efecto de que “las alegaciones, solicitudes y mociones deberán formularse en español” en los Tribunales de Puerto Rico.

Clarifications three and four are mirror clauses responding to perceived threats on language of education and language of the court system. Both start with a negation (“ninguna disposición,” lines 68 and 76) to emphasize the defense against the “infundamentada especulación” (unfounded speculation, lines 68 and 76) that may be presented by the opposition. The legislative assembly (lines 69 and 77) is an active subject and governing body in both clauses before citing jurisprudence, the Organic Act of the Department of Education and the *Pueblo vs Tribunal Superior* case. The *intertextual* pieces inserted as direct quotes contextualize the current legislation within the existing legal framework and present the arguments as products of authoritative research. Unlike the rest of the legislative preamble which presents arguments in favor of the law, these clauses use starker language. Clause number two also makes the legislative assembly (line 57) an active agent and makes use of legal jargon (*fiat legislativo*). The language of these clauses contributes to the authoritative style of the text by which the author attempts to reason with the reader, based on a historical and legal framework (*ad veracundiam*), rather than appeals to emotion, national pride or tradition. Language is dealt with matter-of-factly, and politics are presented following a calculated approach.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Table 7: Tabulation sample 4</th></tr>
<tr><th>Concept</th><th colspan="2">Analysis</th><th>Patterns</th></tr>
<tr><td>Ideological square</td><td>Law 1, 1993:

-Wide ingroup includes people who favor statehood and commonwealth; erases minority voters

-Pragmatic, reasonable, based on historical reasons/ political context

-Lexical items: “progreso,” “vehículos prácticos”

-Active agent: “pueblo de Puerto Rico”</td><td>Law 4, 1991:

-Discourse is not polarizing of others

-Lexical items: “efectos adversos,” “contratiempos de naturaleza práctica”</td><td>Anchoring motif: “indistinct use” throughout history

Functions:

English→ Internatio-nalization, progress

Spanish→ vernacular, culture</td></tr>
<tr><td>Argumentation/ validity of claims</td><td colspan="2">-Appeals to authority (ad veracundiam)
-Appeals to common practice
-Cherry picking</td><td rowspan="2">Not about identity; emphasis on American values</td></tr>
<tr><td>Recontextualiza-tion, Intertextuality, Interdiscursivity</td><td colspan="2">-Recontextualization/reinterpretation of 1902 Law
-Intertextual use of legal/political texts: 1898 General Order 192; 1902 language law; 1991 Official Language Act; 1952 Constitution of Puerto Rico; 1965 Pueblo vs Tribunal Superior; 1990 Department of Education Organic Act
-Interdiscourse: internationalization</td></tr>
</table>

5.2.3 Overall analysis of Sample 4

Governor Pedro Rosselló was on a mission to confirm Puerto Rico’s eligibility as a potential state of the Union. As a means to repair the damage inflicted by Hernández

Colón, Rosselló created the conditions for political bilingualism to exist separately from the linguistic reality of the island. The discursive line in this text aims at pragmatism and logic and avoids all emotional language that may be associated with national pride. While it recognizes Spanish as the vernacular and associates it with Puerto Rican culture, at no point does the text provide the slightest indication of a link between language and identity. The only suggestion of a general, Puerto Rican identity is introduced by citing the constitution of the *Estado Libre Asociado* and highlighting the political duality of the island, where the "two great cultures of the American hemisphere" meet. Opposite to Hernández Colón's Official Language Act, Rosselló's law 1 is an attempt at building a cultural bridge to move Puerto Rico closer to American culture.

To further contrast the style used to distinguish one ideological discourse from the other, Sample 4 is built on appeals to a variety of legal authorities to emphasize its objective, rather than emotional, approach. However, the author is very liberal in his interpretation of the 1902 language law, the language practices of the people of Puerto Rico, and the definition of the word "indistintamente." The dictionary of the *Real Academia Española* (2019) defines the term, "sin distinción ni preferencia." This is evidently not the case of Spanish and English in Puerto Rico, as documented by many authors and studies. Moreover, all references to the 1902 law omit the details pertaining to language domains. Thus, while the text is based on credible resources, the author cherry-picks data and presents a different version of reality.

There is also the matter of perception of language prestige and linguistic capital. As in other texts, English is closely associated with "progress," an important value within the American cultural model. It is also associated with internationalization but from a

limited point of view. The law refers to the frequency of use of the English language in international communications and then refers to local and intergovernmental communication between Puerto Rico and the United States. This contrasts with Hernández Colón who spoke about building a future in Spanish and communicating with the international (specifically Ibero-American) community as an active participant in the global market. Law 1 of 1993 is more concerned with fitting into the United States *ingroup* than belonging to the international community, even though the law emphasizes English as a world language. This is further demonstrated in the second paragraph which renews the commitments first made by the ELA and seconded by the statehood movement.

Bilingualism on the island is addressed twice: first as a result of sociohistorical circumstances (line 34) and then as a linguistic situation that is strange to the Puerto Rican reality (line 57). There is an apparent contradiction regarding language usage. The text often mentions “el pueblo de Puerto Rico” as a subject or object, making them regular participants in the “indistinct” use of both languages. This “organic” bilingualism is not connected to formal educational processes led by the State, and the only reference to language education is clarification number 3 which establishes that English would continue to be taught as a second language. Thus, official bilingualism is not for the people, but for politics. This is reaffirmed in clarification number 2 which underscores that the law would not establish a “strange” bilingual setting for the people but rather “recognize another reality,” a political commitment to the United States.

6.0 Sample 5: Plan for Puerto Rico: A model for the socioeconomic transformation of our island, 2016

6.1 Context

6.1.1 Macrostructure

This text is a fragment of the political platform presented by former Governor Ricardo Rosselló Nevares during the 2016 campaign period. His *Plan para Puerto Rico*: *Un modelo para la transformación socioeconómica de nuestra isla* (Plan for Puerto Rico: A model for the socioeconomic transformation of our island) included a section on how to transform the Department of Education (D.E.) with a subsection titled "A new school system," featuring "Bilingualism: the key to success" and other such topics. The downloadable document was available through http://planparapuertorico.com/ but was taken offline after the summer of 2019.[6] The website itself was very attractive and colorful and provided a good deal of semiotic data. Rosselló Nevares and his team launched the website and plan on September 11, 2016, approximately two months before election day. The complete text is 229 pages and is divided into different topics such as agribusiness, the environment, and tax reform, among many others.

The sub-section "Bilingualism: the key to success" is 5 paragraphs long. There are other topics related to language and internationalization, but they are not included in this study. The author often cites experts and refers to numeric data such as population

[6] During the summer of 2019, a mass movement of dissatisfied citizens of all political persuasions and economic levels developed to force the governor to resign. The movement was triggered by a leaked chat between Rosselló and his closest government officials in which they use misogynistic and homophobic language as well as make lewd and mocking comments about public figures. The chat also suggested they had engaged in unethical and perhaps illegal activity; citizen outrage focused mainly on the use of politically incorrect language.

percentages and timelines. The original text uses the color blue to emphasize titles and keywords, though this is not transmitted in the text herein.

6.1.2 Setting, participants, ends, and act sequence

On September 20, 2015, Ricardo Rosselló Nevares, son of Governor Pedro Rosselló, announced his candidacy for the governorship as well as his Plan for Puerto Rico in the Roberto Clemente Coliseum. A year later, he and his team published said plan online, and a day after its publication, 92% of delegates voted in favor of the plan at the party's general assembly in Fajardo, Puerto Rico (Caro, 2016). The plan includes a list of over 20 collaborators.

Throughout the campaign season, Rosselló Nevares controlled his public discourse to reach a generic, popular audience while repeating the talking points found in his plan. Upon closer reading, it is clear that the text itself is addressed to followers of the PNP since both forewords by Rosselló Nevares and Commissioner González are emphatic in establishing the values and semiotic markers of the ingroup. The overall message is based on the premise that statehood is the route toward equality for the island, and the use of blue text provides a visual cue for PNP membership. Moreover, the plan was approved at the party's general assembly. Because it is addressed almost exclusively to people who already subscribe to the PNP's ideology, its objective is not to convince others to join the movement, but rather to reaffirm membership of those who already identify with the ingroup and secure their vote.

6.1.3 Keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genre

The writing style is formal but accessible, and special text such as keywords and phrases as well as titles and sub-titles are emphasized in blue, the iconic color of the pro-

statehood party, the New Progressive Party (PNP). Generally, the text is in the first-person plural, referring to a collective team effort to build a new Puerto Rico, and it mentions several times that the ideas and proposals have been taken directly from conversations with citizens from all over the island, creating a sense of inclusion. The content is presented with great optimism, as one would expect from a political platform presented during the campaign period.

6.1.4 Fill in tool

Throughout the text, we find that the themes of globalization and capitalism shape the author's interpretation of the world. Within the context of the subsection titled "Bilingualism: the key to success," certain concepts need to be defined according to this interpretation. For example, "success," in this context, is synonymous with "economic development" while "bilingualism" means having command of Spanish and English, specifically, not other languages. Thus, this section is built on the premise that *English is the key to economic development*.

In Puerto Rico, the development of competent bilinguals is closely associated with the middle and upper classes who are able to enroll their children in private schools where English instruction is usually more effective (Fayer, 2000; Pousada, 1996; Epstein, 1967). This correlation allows the above premise to "make sense" in the Puerto Rican context. Moreover, the historical association between social mobility and the English language (voiced by Muñoz Marín and echoed by countless others) provides the sociological framework for confusing correlation with causation.

6.1.5 Frame problem tool

At that moment in history, Puerto Rican migration to the United States was rising due to the economic crisis on the island caused by the government's continuous mismanagement of public funds, and the U.S. Congress had recently approved the creation of the Federal Oversight and Management Board ("la Junta"). During the 2016 electoral period, the issue of the financial stability of the island was particularly prominent. It is logical that Rosselló Nevares would campaign on the promise for "socioeconomic transformation" as advertised in the long title of his plan.

Ricardo Rosselló was a young technocrat who identified with the scientific and academic sector (he obtained a PhD in Bioengineering) and had a particular interest in developing opinion poll technology. The 2016 election period was also characterized by the emergence of independent candidates: Rafael Bernabe, Manuel Cidre and Alexandra Lúgaro.[7] It was Lúgaro who truly maximized the use of social media to garner support from constituents. These details, while peripheral to the analysis of the text, are important to contextualize that 2016 was chronologically and technologically distant from the 1990s. Census data show that by 2017, over 50% of Puerto Rican households had Internet service (Instituto de Estadísticas de Puerto Rico, 2018). Social media, the Internet, and technology would play a major role in Ricardo Rosselló's career, but it would also shape

[7] Rafael Bernabe, a professor at the University of Puerto Rico in Río Piedras, ran for governor under the leftist *Partido del Pueblo Trabajador* (Party of the Working People) which does not subscribe to any status ideology. He is a socialist, and his campaign focused on social and environmental justice. Manuel Cidre is an entrepreneur with a history of leadership in business organizations in Puerto Rico. He ran as an independent candidate and rejected statehood. Alexandra Lúgaro is a lawyer and a millennial. She ran as an independent candidate and used Facebook live regularly as part of her campaign strategy. She emphasized her experience as a federal fund administrator in education projects and as a defense attorney to the poor.

the way the young politician introduced his platform as well as the globalized image he and his team would present for the "future" of Puerto Rico.

6.1.6 Making strange tool

As part of this globalized imaginary of a prosperous economic model for the island, Rosselló Nevares mentions Japan and Finland as productive references to follow and is emphatic about framing Puerto Rico in the international landscape. What is interesting is that the portion of the text selected for analysis, which focuses on the teaching of English, does not mention the United States at all, and the 30 remaining pages dedicated to the reformation of the Department of Education only mention the United States twice. This is significant considering that Rosselló Nevares proposed to pursue the Tennessee Plan as a path toward statehood and that the *Plan for Puerto Rico* was "firmemente vinculado a una transición a la estadidad" (tightly linked to a transition toward statehood, Rosselló, 2016, p. 19). This, according to the PNP, is the only means toward equality.

6.2 Discourse

6.2.1 Section analysis

Bilingüismo: Llave para el éxito

Las potencias educativas **(Japón, Finlandia, Singapur, Alemania, entre otros)** promueven la enseñanza de **más de un idioma**. Aunque existen discrepancias en términos de enfoques, medios, modelos y estrategias de enseñanza, es imprescindible en la **modernidad** poder dominar **varios idiomas**. El idioma del inglés es utilizado por **más de 300 millones de personas como primer idioma** y otros **350 millones lo utilizan como segundo idioma** (Paul et al., 2013). Asimismo, es **la segunda lengua oficial** en

alrededor de **60 países** y de **numerosas organizaciones internacionales**. El inglés también se utiliza predominantemente en asuntos internacionales de la política, los negocios, la ciencia, y otros temas de alto impacto social y económico. En Puerto Rico, además del gobierno local, tenemos el federal, y su lenguaje de funcionamiento es el inglés.

From the start, the author establishes what he considers to be the educational model and quickly enumerates some of the world's established and growing economies (Japan, Finland, Singapore, Germany) as "potencias educativas" (educational powers, line 2). There is an immediate connection between education and economic power by mixing these two concepts (educational + power). A common detail is they all promote the teaching of several languages in their schools despite there being debate regarding methodologies and other pedagogical considerations (lines 3-4). "Modernity" (line 5) is invoked in the context of globalization, a major *motif* threaded throughout the text. The language used here sets a first-world standard that is rooted in a conception of modernity as depicted by global economic power and implies that these countries should be models for other nations because they are powerful. This is an *interdiscursive* text that incorporates the language of globalization and neoliberalism to frame its posture.

One can clearly see that the *anchoring* theme in this paragraph is economic development rather than language education because the text *mitigates* methodological challenges in language education models. There is no information as to whether the language education policies in the mentioned countries have been successful. Moreover, bilingualism is immediately reduced to having knowledge of English specifically—even though the texts says "más de un idioma" (more than one language, line 3) and "varios

idiomas" (several languages, line 5)—because, according to the text, it is the key to compete in the global market.

Lines 5 through 8 focus on the number of English speakers in the world to impress upon the reader that the spread of English is far-reaching in its different modalities (ESL, EFL) and that its formal adoption as a second language by countries and organizations is reasonable and productive. The functions of English are identified with domains linked to political and economic power (lines 9-10, international politics, business, science, and other topics of high social and economic impact). The implicit evaluation of Puerto Rico is that it is outdated. This paragraph introduces the author's general appreciation of the economic virtues of English and a justification for moving Puerto Rico in that direction. The argument is flawed, however, as it seems to create a link between bilingualism and economic development; this is *non-sequitur* (or, does not follow) given that no direct causal relationship exists between bilingualism and economic success.

Yuan (2005) establece que la Educación Bilingüe se está convirtiendo en un **bien exclusivo para personas adineradas** que deseen que sus hijos sean capaces de dominar el inglés para utilizarlo en los negocios, las ciencias y otros elementos de comunicación con el resto del mundo. Por lo tanto, la educación bilingüe **no es un andamiaje ideológico**, sino una **herramienta de apoderamiento** para que aquellos que **no** nacieron con los recursos económicos puedan abrirse al mundo y logren mayores oportunidades para su crecimiento y desarrollo personal y profesional.

Paragraphs one and two both cite sources to present a researched argument to the reader (Paul et al., 2013, line 7; Yuan, 2005, line 13). The *intertextuality appeals to authority* to justify a class-based argument for bilingual instruction. This is simultaneously an *appeal to emotion* and *social justice*. The wording to describe English as a "bien exclusivo para personas adineradas que deseen que sus hijos [puedan utilizarlo]" (an exclusive good for the wealthy who wish their children to use it, lines 13-15) is heavily charged. It *polarizes* "rich parents" against "working class parents" and their children's futures. English is presented as a luxury, and people who can afford bilingual education are classified as affluent, regardless of their situations. The functions and domains of English are again typified as paths to economic progress to which non-English speakers do not have access. We know that the world of business and science also exists in Spanish-speaking countries and throughout the globe.

Lines 16-19 *appeal to the masses* and make a claim for social justice using *lexical items* such as "herramienta de apoderamiento" (a tool of empowerment, line 17) and "mayores oportunidades" (more opportunities, line 18). The text does not mention other conditions that may hinder personal or professional growth. Instead it simplifies the complexity of socioeconomic inequality to a matter of language. In alluding to the "andamiaje ideológico" (ideological framework, lines 16-17), the plan presents a defense against those who oppose the teaching of English, which leads the reader to believe that someone is preventing the strengthening of bilingual education for political reasons.

Generally, the argument is *non-sequitur*; there is no evidence to support a direct causal relationship between English and economic prosperity as proposed in lines 16-19. In Puerto Rico, there is a correlation between bilingualism and the middle and upper

classes, and the author uses this correlation for rhetorical purposes. The lexical item "herramienta de apoderamiento" and the reference to the disadvantaged ingroup as "aquellos que no nacieron con los recursos económicos" (those who were not born with economic resources, lines 17-18) model a discourse of class struggle and conflict. This emphasizes the distinction between *ingroup* and *outgroup*. Moreover, the author proposes that English is endowed with powers that allow people, regardless of their situation, to "abrirse al mundo" (open themselves to the world, line 18). This is a *generalization* and a *simplification* of complex socioeconomic circumstances.

Desarrollaremos un **programa bilingüe** utilizando la **integración tecnológica** y la **metodología multisensorial** para aumentar el porciento de estudiantes que tienen dominio del idioma inglés. En Puerto Rico, menos del 50% de los estudiantes tienen dominio del idioma inglés. Los ciudadanos que tienen dominio del inglés **tienen mejores oportunidades de empleo**.

Lines 20 through 24 are incoherent. First, there is no clear connection between bilingualism, technology, and multisensorial methodologies (lines 20-21). However, as lexical items, they may be appealing to the reader as "innovations." These ambiguous methodologies might seem as an advance in education and a path to progress, but the author does not provide examples or supporting proof for his objective.

The next two sentences establish a link between English language competency and employment opportunities and competitiveness. In stating that less than 50% of students lack command of English, the text implies that over half of the students will have difficulties finding a good job because they do not know English well enough. Once

again, the fallacy is *non-sequitur* because other considerations are not being examined. Moreover, the levels of English proficiency are not defined. This *ambiguation* strategy is meant to create apprehension since the audience may interpret the statement as an either-or conclusion in which their own language abilities determine their success in the job market.

La iniciativa Bilingüismo: Llave para el éxito, procura **aumentar en un 20%** las escuelas bilingües en Puerto Rico durante el primer año para que los estudiantes puedan desarrollar las artes del lenguaje (leer, escribir, hablar y escuchar) en el idioma inglés y crear en cada municipio escuelas con proyectos bilingües.

En estos proyectos se utilizarán **nuevos enfoques de enseñanza del inglés**, tales como cursos televisados, cursos en línea tipo MOOC (Massive Open Online Course), alianzas con universidades e integración curricular. En **Finlandia y Japón**, entre otros países, se han desarrollado proyectos similares que han tenido un **impacto significativo en la economía tras haber desarrollado una fuerza trabajadora con mayor competitividad.**

Line 25 provides numeric data, "aumentar en un 20%" (increase by 20%), a *motif* we have seen in several instances throughout the text. This *appeal to numbers* is a strategy to illustrate a plan based on facts and research. As in the previous paragraph, lines 30-31 repeat the idea that effective English instruction is possible through *new* teaching approaches ("nuevos enfoques de enseñanza del inglés," line 29) and an *appeal to innovation*, which include technology. The argument to justify the implementation of said approaches, ambiguous as they may be, is that Finland and Japan have implemented

similar projects that “han tenido un impacto significativo en la economía tras haber desarrollado una fuerza trabajadora con mayor competitividad” (have had a significant impact on the economy after having developed a strong workforce that is more competitive, lines 32-34). The audience is asked to accept the premise that because something worked in these countries, it will also work in Puerto Rico’s colonial context. Moreover, the text works according to a neoliberal framework that is focused on production. The degree of success of the project is measured by the increase in a competitive workforce, not by the growth in linguistic competence, and by a general improvement in the economy, not by an individual’s personal gains.

Table 8: Tabulation sample 5

<table>
<tr><th>Concept</th><th colspan="2">Analysis</th><th>Patterns</th></tr>
<tr><td>Ideological square</td><td>Ingroup:

-Economic Powers (Finland and Japan)

-International English speakers

-Working class of Puerto Rico, “herramienta de apoderamiento”</td><td>Outgroup:

-Affluent groups in Puerto Rico, “bien exclusivo para personas adineradas”</td><td rowspan="3">Anchoring motif: globalization

Functions of English→ Internatio-nalization, economic progress, social justice

Not about identity; emphasis on economic development</td></tr>
<tr><td>Argumentation/ validity of claims</td><td colspan="2">-Appeals to authority (ad veracundiam), numbers, innovation, social justice
-Non-sequitur
-Ambiguity</td></tr>
<tr><td>Recontextualization, Intertextuality, Interdiscursivity</td><td colspan="2">-Intertextual use of research (Paul et al., 2013; Yuan, 2005)
-Interdiscourse: internationalization, globalization, capitalism, neoliberalism</td></tr>
</table>

6.2.3 Overall analysis of sample 5

Governor Ricardo Rosselló's plan for Puerto Rico clearly defines its ideological posture throughout the text. Given the context in which the plan was introduced, we understand that the target audience subscribes to its values and therefore desires Puerto Rico to belong to the ingroup described in the text. To build an argument that fits the historical moment and maximize people's anxiety regarding the economic crisis, the language of the text is shaped to reproduce a discourse of economic power. While there are many conceptions of "success" (from humanistic to material), in the context of an economic crisis within the capitalist model, "success" can only mean economic development.

The discursive line of the text also reproduces Western values, namely globalization and capitalism. Rosselló Nevares uses the language of international economy and neoliberalism within the context of education. This *interdiscursivity* is aligned with his plan for Puerto Rico which, according to the title, proposes "A Model for Socioeconomic Transformation in Our Island." The denoted value is economic development from a capitalist perspective.

Arguments for social justice are not based on principles of equality or freedom. The apparent objective of the plan for Puerto Rico is to create citizens who are more attractive in the job market necessary for the socioeconomic transformation proposed in the title. Such a vision of socioeconomic transformation responds to neoliberal definitions of progress and modernity, which the arguments link to the English language. English is thus represented as an ideological symbol of capitalist power.

Throughout the text, the audience is asked to look outward toward the international community, especially the global economic powers, and adopt their values and education models. The working premise is that the people of Puerto Rico can be like them if they follow a globalizing trend that leads to economic development. The implicit premise is that what is local (or Spanish, which is not mentioned at all though bilingualism implies two languages) is lacking. The plan does not propose looking for solutions within the island and instead recommends a globalized view of education, which erases Puerto Rican culture and agency. Interestingly, the only reference to the United States is a quick mention of the federal government and the fact that its language of communication is English (line 11). As opposed to every other text analyzed in this dissertation, Rosselló Nevarres' plan does not link language to local politics. Instead, his political platform removes the traditional language debate and creates a list of aspirations for internalization beyond what was viable for Puerto Rico in 2016.

Within this ideological framework, the text defines English as the means to achieve the economic development that bridges Puerto Rico to the international ingroup. While having knowledge of English is an advantage in certain domains within the colonial context of Puerto Rico, it is not the sole determining factor for acquiring a good job, and a good job does not guarantee economic stability. The discursive strategies that point to English as the key to economic development reproduce a capitalist discourse and omit other complex socioeconomic factors that compose the reality of the working class and those who live in poverty.

Having examined the arguments, we conclude that the claims are based on premises that are assumed to be true without providing logical validity to corroborate

them. The *motifs* and *interdiscourse* reproduce neoliberal values and superimpose them on the audience. A very foreign and distant ingroup is described as those who have economic power, which contrasts with Puerto Rico's current state, implicitly outdated and stagnant. The section on bilingual education focuses very little on pedagogical issues and instead promotes English as the solution to unemployment and social mobility. It is also worth remembering that as part of a political campaign, Rosselló Nevares would present a "plan" of optimistic ideas. Whether they were realistic or not is not truly important for the purposes of this investigation. However, the language makes evident that the Rosselló Nevares administration had a neoliberal view of education and language planning.

7.0 Integrative analysis

In the section that follows, the different analyses undertaken in this chapter will be integrated. We will illustrate the discursive patterns that coincide and diverge in the previously analyzed samples and draw conclusion regarding the language ideologies proposed by the PPD and the PNP.

7.1 Introduction

After the Villaronga educational language policy and before the 1990s, there had been political language debates. Several bills had been introduced to repeal the 1902 language law, but it had never been politically relevant for the dominant parties to do much about language. Once the 1990s arrived, however, there was a reason to believe that political change could come to the island. The first four samples analyzed in this dissertation took place within a period of two years, 1991-1993, when language debates were at their peak. The last sample took place 25 years later. It is important to keep this in

mind as we analyze the discourses regarding language ideology and identity as promoted by the political class of Puerto Rico through the years.

Historically, both the PPD and the PNP had coincided as to the general definition of what it meant to be Puerto Rican. Both parties defended the Spanish language as an essential part of the Puerto Rican personality, both integrated the *jíbaro* into each party's semiotic system (emblem of the PPD and *estadidad jíbara*), and both upheld the duality of the cultural-political dichotomy resulting from their respective autonomist proposals. Changes in discourses are a result of political uncertainty.

This integrative analysis contrasts the discursive strategies that are characteristic of the PPD and the PNP in the 1990s and then compares it to the more contemporary discourse of 2016. We examine how each party puts forth language ideologies by connecting thematic patterns and illustrations of language prestige and linguistic capital already discussed in each sample's overall analysis.

7.2 Analysis: Self-categorization and linguistic capital

The discursive strategies used by the PPD appeal to a Spanish tradition. Sample 1, for instance, insists on the defense of Spanish as an important value to define the ingroup. The vast majority of Puerto Ricans would not oppose the defense of Spanish in itself, and thus, it becomes an identity marker that qualifies any individual for group membership. Recalling the historical struggles against the Americanization period and restating the cultural differences between the United States and Puerto Rico, the author is establishing an *us AND them* structure, as opposed to an *us VS them*. In this sense, the discourse is not polarizing, although it does demarcate cultural distinctness. However, the effect on the social perception of English is that it *does not belong to the ingroup*. There is indeed a

commitment to the teaching of English as a Second Language, but it is solely a *quid pro quo* resulting from the political relationship between the two nations: *En virtud de los fuertes vínculos políticos, económicos e ideológicos que nos unen a esa nación, el pueblo de Puerto Rico está comprometido a adquirir el pleno dominio del inglés como segundo idioma*[8] (lines 37-39).

Sample 2, mainly addressed to the rulers of Spain, also makes a strong argument for the defense of Spanish as an essential element of being Puerto Rican. In his praise to the everyman of Puerto Rico for defending the language, Hernández Colón creates an ingroup in which all Puerto Ricans can assume membership by mentioning numerous geographic locations on the island among other rhetorical strategies. Moreover, his appeals to nationalist pride at the beginning and the end of the speech are meant to stir emotions of patriotism among the participants as well as the struggle to affirm cultural identity through the defense of language. Again, the use of English is not presented as something negative; rather it is a foreign asset that *does not belong* to the ingroup: *El inglés es para nosotros una herramienta eficacísima que valoramos altamente. Pero nuestra lengua materna es la que nos cohesiona como pueblo, con la cual expresamos nuestros sentimientos y creencias más íntimas, nuestros pensamientos y valores más profundos*[9] (lines 88-91).

Samples 1 and 2 also reproduce discourses of cultural prestige and homogeneity to encourage identification with the selected, prestigious ingroup. Studies in discourse

[8] By virtue of the strong political, economic, and ideological links that unite us to that nation, the people of Puerto Rico are committed to fully acquiring English as a second language.

[9] We hold English as an extremely efficient tool that we value highly. But our mother tongue is that which gives us cohesion as a people, that with which we express our feelings and most intimate beliefs, our thoughts, and deepest values.

analysis have shown that "lay opinion privileges social homogenization as a natural state of affairs and marginalizes heterogeneity as impossible and problematic" (Dunmire, 2012, p. 742). This is precisely what we observe when López Galarza (Sample 1) contrasts the colonial situation of the Philippines and Puerto Rico and legitimizes the imposition of official languages. The desire for the native language to be perceived as prestigious simultaneously justifies the rejection of other languages. If the ingroup is satisfied with the prestige associated with its language, it is in the ingroup's interest to protect that status. Homogeneity is, thus, an important tool for preserving the existing distribution of power and invalidating any threat to the dominant class which ingrains and reproduces national discourses of cultural identity.

In the case of Samples 3 and 4 by the PNP, we observe that references to the language-identity nexus are diminished or eliminated. Ingroup formation is instead based on shared values linked to American citizenship, and thus, bilingualism (English), is placed at the forefront of an aspired political (not cultural) identity. Spanish is not rejected, but we see that the qualifying characteristics of ingroup membership are reshaped. From this point on, identity discourses by the PNP are different from what they were: *La relación de Puerto Rico con Estados Unidos, cada vez más estrecha en lo político y lo económico, lo mismo que la aspiración a perpetuar esa relación expresada en las urnas por los votantes de los dos partidos principales —que congregan más del 90 por ciento del electorado— multiplica las instancias en que es preciso que nuestro gobierno reciba y conteste comunicaciones en inglés*[10] (lines 59-64).

[10] The relationship of Puerto Rico with the United States, ever closer in political and economic matters, in addition to the desire to perpetuate that relationship as expressed at the ballot box by voters belonging to both main parties—which constitute over 90 percent of the vote—multiply the instances in which our government receives and answers communications in English.

Two decades later, a quick search of the word “identity” through Ricardo Rosselló’s 229-page political platform produces only three results of which only one is connected with culture and “archeological tourism” (2016, p. 132).

Discourses by the PPD are consistent in emphasizing the identity value of Spanish as an essential feature of Puerto Ricanness, but Hernández Colón also highlights the linguistic capital of Spanish through the internationalization of Puerto Rico in Ibero-America and the Spanish-speaking world. This progressive or modernist view of Spanish, however, looks back to a Spanish, colonial tradition. Hernández Colón’s discursive strategy associates the future of Puerto Rico with a nostalgia for a Puerto Rican imaginary validated by the insular elites.

On the other hand, discourses by the PNP emphasize the political and economic opportunities resulting from a bilingual system of government, and later, from a bilingual system of production. The PNP also links language, in this case English, with progress and modernity, but latching on to a different metropolis: the United States.

7.3 Conclusion

Political discourse is not focused on changing the relationship between language and identity but instead produces language ideologies that are centered on means of production. The fact that language policies since 1993 have not changed, except to “strengthen” bilingual education in school, is an affirmation that, regardless of political ideology, the current concern regarding language is not cultural but political and economic. This does not mean that popular views of Puerto Rican identity do not rely on Spanish as an identity marker, and the homogenous conception of Puerto Ricanness continues to be replicated through institutions such as the Institute of Puerto Rican

Culture and the Department of Education, but it is not in the State's interest to reject English because the language is a required semiotic marker of political identity and progress.

In the fifth and final chapter of this dissertation, the implications and limitations of these findings will be explored, and conclusions will be presented.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and implications

1.0 Introduction

The final chapter of this dissertation provides another chance for reflection on the topics analyzed in this dissertation. We shall first summarize the content of the study by reviewing the seminal works presented in Chapter 2, the methodology described in Chapter 3, important definitions utilized throughout the dissertation, and the results of the extended critical analysis of discourse presented in Chapter 4. We will next assess to what degree we were able to validate our initial hypotheses proposed in Chapter 1, and then discuss the implications of our findings, particularly the sociolinguistic effects of language ideologies produced through political discourse. We shall also reflect on the limitations of the study and provide recommendations for future research.

2.0 Summary of the thesis

The present study confirms that the use of Critical Discourse Analysis is productive for identifying ideological motivations that help explain a group's behavior. All social participants need to be aware of the ideological representations put forth by the dominant classes in order to critically discern whether they are harmful or beneficial to the wider society. The research presented in this dissertation shows how language ideologies have been shaped on the island and their sociological effects on Puerto Ricans.

Chapter 2 presented a theoretical framework based on the belief that the State imposes hegemonic norms and values that legitimize some languages and not others in order to control access to linguistic capital and thus to education, the labor market, and positions of power (Bourdieu, 2000). These linguistic paradigms preserve the status quo and organize aspects of society into what is viewed as acceptable and what is considered

a threat to sociopolitical structures. It is in the State's interest to reject that which may upset the prevailing power dynamics, and it uses semiotic mechanisms to define ingroups and outgroups and coordinate the protection or interruption of its goals.

The transdisciplinary review of literature contained in Chapter 2 illustrated, via sources from political science, sociology, sociolinguistics, history, and education, that the relationship between language and politics in Puerto Rico has stirred much debate and produced voluminous analyses. The studies reviewed reached the same general conclusion: language policy in Puerto Rico has been subordinated to partisan political interests instead of being the product of a researched, analyzed, and coordinated linguistic plan at the hands of experts. Moreover, the origins of language ideologies linked to national identity have resulted in less than positive attitudes toward English which hinder the language learning process.

In addition to these transdisciplinary sources which made it possible to achieve a holistic view of the object of study, we reviewed sources on the methods of Critical Discourse Analysis and important texts that discussed the different types of metaphors utilized in the defense of Spanish and the promotion of English in Puerto Rico. Finally, we presented a Critical Discourse Analysis of H. R. 2499 Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2010 which illustrated how discussions of the political status of Puerto Rico quickly turned to discussions of language and cultural compatibility with the United States.

In Chapter 3, we provided a detailed explanation of the methods of Critical Discourse Analysis utilized in Chapter 4. Since it was our understanding that the accurate analysis of discourse is informed by its sociopolitical and historic context and that the analysis of context reveals layers of meaning beyond what is palpable through a surface

examination of language, we attempted to separate the analysis of context and the analysis of discourse. This permitted an ampler view of the circumstances that created the ideological discourses and revealed how these discourses were reshaped by circumstances (and vice versa in dialectical fashion).

In Chapter 4, we gave a precise explanation of the data gathering and analytical procedures followed in the dissertation, beginning with the analysis of context via a summary of the macrostructure of the discursive event. Next, Dell Hymes' SPEAKING model was adapted to further enrich what was known about setting, participants, ends, act sequences, keys, instrumentalities, norms and genre. Then Gee's (2011) Fill in Tool, Frame Problem Tool, and Making Strange Tool were applied to problematize what was known, preview the speaker's worldview, and question what remained unsaid.

Afterwards, the analysis of discourse was accomplished using van Dijk's (1998) *ideological square* as a guide. Grammatical and semantic elements in the language that helped place participants and their values within the ingroup/outgroup paradigm were identified and active/passive structures, referents, lexical items, and motifs were analyzed. The repeated appearance of these elements produced linguistic patterns that were indicative of ideological constructs. We also examined the logical or fallacious construction of arguments to confirm or reject the validity of claims. Finally, we considered the purposes and meanings of *recontextualization*, *intertextuality* and *interdiscursivity* in the meaning-making process.

In Chapter 4, we applied this systematic method of analysis to deconstruct five selected samples. Each section of the samples was marked to distinguish the grammatical and lexical elements in addition to the arguments and other discursive features, and then

the section was analyzed. Afterward, the analysis of the entire sample was tabulated, and an overall narrative analysis of the sample concluded the process.

After the five samples were analyzed following the same methodology, an integrative analysis was produced to recapitulate the most important characteristics of ideological discourse. We confirmed that, in the 1990s, the PPD shaped its discourse based on a traditional defense of Spanish as an essentialist part of Puerto Rican identity as promoted by the intellectual elites at the beginning of the 20th century and repeated throughout the decades by members of both the PPD and the PNP. This discourse was based on ideologies of cultural prestige and relied on the conviction of a homogeneous Puerto Rican imaginary where all citizens conform to the same values and norms.

We also found that, after 1990, the PNP's discourse regarding language limited its references to cultural identity (except to refer to the duality of the Puerto Rican American citizen) and instead highlighted the links between English and political identity. The tone and style of argumentation was pragmatic above all else and emphasized the linguistic capital of English over Spanish on the international front. The most revealing finding, however, was that language ideologies were gearing toward the development of competitive human resources, and this was true of Hernández Colón's defense of Spanish as well.

3.0 Hypotheses

At the outset of the study after a thorough preliminary assessment, we hypothesized that more contemporary political discourse relating to language in Puerto Rico would tone down links between language and identity. This hypothesis was confirmed. In fact, it became clear that the 1990s represented a turning point in the

discourses of language policy because politicians, particularly in the PNP faction, were forced to change strategies to achieve their political goals.

While the PNP continued to refer to bilingual education as a matter of social justice, we found that this was glossed over and political aims took precedence. *Interdiscursivity* of globalization and internationalization channeled bilingualism as a means of production and focused on the development of human resources rather than human beings. Spanish was not rejected; it was mostly taken for granted.

Though we did not formally analyze discourses produced by the PPD after 1991, we have corroborated informally that the PPD has remained relatively silent regarding language issues in recent years. The Organic Act of Education was amended in 1999 to allow English to be the language of instruction in public schools, and no PPD governor has repealed it. The Puerto Rico Senate issued a Report on the status of both languages in Puerto Rico in 2001, but it did not have political consequences. Moreover, in 2014 Senator Fas Alzamora proposed a bill to make Spanish the first official language and English the second official language of Puerto Rico; the bill was approved by the Senate in September 2015, but it was not signed into law by Governor Alejandro García Padilla. It seems the PPD has made peace with the fact that English is here to stay, whether in concept or in practice.

The validity of hypotheses regarding the flexibilization of the Puerto Rican identity as perceived by the masses and the improvement of language attitudes is yet to be confirmed. It is interesting to observe how the general population reacts to public figures of Puerto Rican ancestry. On occasion, they are accepted immediately (astronaut

Joseph Acabá) and in other instances it has taken more time (Miss Puerto Rico Madison Anderson Berríos). In the end, however, they are welcomed as *boricuas*.

4.0 Implications

The implications of the study may be divided into three overlapping topics: language policy, politics, and language attitudes. Throughout the study, we have made several observations connecting these topics that have historically had an effect on language acquisition and the learning process. We may now reexamine these observations through the lens provided by the analysis:

1. The State's official plan has always been to establish some form of bilingualism.
2. Language policy is created according to political ideology, not sociolinguistic or pedagogical considerations.
3. Official language policy has not been satisfactory (1991), nor has it been an accurate reflection of society (1993).
4. There is a difference between political bilingualism and social bilingualism.
5. Political discourse has fomented an undeniably instrumental motivation to learn English.
6. Educational language policy has not been effective.

Through the Critical Analysis of Discourse, we have revealed that the political objectives of both major parties in Puerto Rico are focused, not on creating a bilingual citizenry, but rather on establishing a bilingual political system to accommodate the autonomist relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. This implies that for the current administrative structure, developing effective English curricula or fomenting bilingualism are not priorities. During his acceptance speech in Asturias, Hernández

Colón asserted that it is the individual's effort that leads to bilingualism, and Rosselló González's 1993 law states that Puerto Ricans' exposure to English organically creates the conditions for bilingualism to occur. Both these statements confirm that the government does not feel a responsibility for pursuing this educational goal.

Furthermore, providing the required tools that might lead to bilingual competence might offset the distribution of power on the island. The PPD intends to perpetuate the ELA-colonial status, which implies that cultural distinctions (Us vs Them, P.R. vs U.S.) would continue to shield the party's interests. On the other hand, if Puerto Rico were ever to become a State, the PNP would arguably cease to exist. Regardless, contemporary history has demonstrated that it is unlikely that Puerto Rico would become a State, and thus, there is little integrative motivation from the PNP itself.

Regarding language attitudes, the research has demonstrated that language ideologies hinder integrative motivation and organize language usage in the *cultural identity* versus *political identity* paradigm. Baker (1992) explains Rosenberg and Hovland's (1960) three-component model of attitude where the *cognitive* component refers to a rational belief, the *affective* component responds to emotional associations, and the *behavioral* component refers to actions (p. 13). While average Puerto Ricans might understand the benefits of learning English (cognitive), the belief that bilingualism might erode their Puerto Rican identity (affective) negatively affects their readiness to engage in language practice (behavior). Connecting both points—that the government is not truly interested in producing bilingual citizens and that language attitudes are less than positive—we could say that Resnick's (1993) *motivated failure* has yet to be overcome.

Another factor that may hurt the development of a bilingual citizenry is the fact that discourses surrounding language are becoming increasingly intertwined with discourses of globalization. It is unlikely that this discourse would resonate with the average Puerto Rican who is more concerned with the local economy rather than the international market. The neoliberal view of bilingual human resources as objects of production is also conflicting with the traditional PNP discourse of English as a means to social justice. Interdiscursive strategies of this kind do not create an appealing argument for bilingualism on an impoverished island.

Identity politics have also been discussed throughout this dissertation. The most important revelation in the semiotics of identity is that the PNP does not refer to the *estadidad jíbara* anymore and has moved away from discourses of a homogeneous national identity. Instead, as previously mentioned, the PNP is more likely to focus on the duality of the Puerto Rican following the *cultural identity* versus *political identity* paradigm, as previously mentioned.

5.0 Limitations and future research

The research presented in this dissertation is limited to five samples of text in which language was placed in a political context. Due to the scope of this project, other samples that were also analyzed, though not quite as systematically, were not included in the dissertation. It was necessary to analyze similar texts, if only at a glance, in order to corroborate discursive trends. In the research process, we also considered the following, to name just a few: Rafael Hernández Colón's speech when signing the Official Language Act of 1991, all the available advertisements for the 1991 referendum

campaign, including ads for the YES alternative produced by the Independence Party, and language bills introduced before and after the 1990s.

The variety of samples was chosen to show precisely differences that might arise in different genres of political texts. To review, we analyzed two official language laws, one political advertisement, one political speech, and one political platform produced during campaign season. What is interesting to note is that the three samples that were not legislative pieces all sought to openly sell an ideological thesis. Were this project to continue and expand the variety of samples, we would include the texts that were previously mentioned, and we would organize them by genre to further examine how language is modulated according to aims and audiences.

This study is also focused on texts produced by politicians or political parties. To further contribute to the diachronic analysis of discursive change, a different study could focus on language ideologies produced by periodicals and news outlets and reproduced through social media. Twitter is also abundant in analysis-worthy discourse. For example, in October 2019, Governor Wanda Vázquez responded via Twitter to insinuations that she did not speak English. Her seemingly very authentic, not-at-all-political response diverged entirely from what is expected from a politician representing the PNP. She stated that she "defends" herself in English, that she would defend the Spanish language, and that her degree of command of English has not been a determining factor in her life (Enfrentados la gobernadora, 2019). The last comment, of course, contradicts the PNP's official discourse regarding English. This might be an accurate reflection of the average Puerto Rican's feelings toward the language.

A final limitation is the fact that the 2020 Census is currently underway. It was in our interest to acquire new statistical data regarding language usage in Puerto Rico to verify if more insular Puerto Ricans claimed to speak English or not. We anxiously await the results, though we shall use that data in future research.

6.0 Recommendations

Language ideologies have been ingrained deeply in the Puerto Rican psyche. We believe that to improve language attitudes and facilitate a healthy bilingual education, educators of both Spanish and English (or any other language for that matter) must work to remove stigmas surrounding the language as well as the speakers. For example, it is not uncommon to hear Puerto Ricans say that Puerto Rican Spanish is inferior to other varieties of Spanish. This unfounded belief has significant impact on speakers' linguistic self-esteem and may hurt their willingness to further develop their competence in their native language. In addition to teaching grammar and literature, language education should also address sociolinguistic factors and raise linguistic awareness so that students may see language varieties for what they are: different systems of communication.

The case of English in Puerto Rico would require a rebranding of sorts, so it is no longer perceived as a threat to culture or the Puerto Rican identity. To accomplish this, educators could discuss the role of the diaspora and its contributions to Puerto Rican culture. This would help students break away from traditional notions of identity and reject cultural and linguistic stereotypes.

An important part of changing perceptions would include refocusing from an instrumental valuation that may or may not be fruitful in the future, to focusing on the present, enriching aspects of engaging in social interactions and enjoying media in

English. Curricular innovation could integrate music with proficiency appropriate lyrics, for example, to develop aural and oral skills that strengthen self-confidence and help alleviate language anxiety. Moreover, students must be provided with chances to practice in order to become *active bilinguals* instead of *passive bilinguals*. Morales and Blau (2009) stress the importance of practicing at the conversational level to create settings in which students effectively engage in social interaction. If English is perceived as useful and enjoyable from the start, the effort to learn to the language will be easily justified.

7.0 Conclusions

Discourses surrounding language in Puerto Rico have caused a great deal of anxiety regarding cultural identity. For decades, English was perceived strictly as the language of the enemy, while Spanish was an essential aspect of the Puerto Rican personality. Upon the creation of the ELA, English was suddenly acceptable for political reasons and, at the individual level, to facilitate migration and social mobility. Meanwhile, Spanish was an emblem of Puerto Rican identity.

Today, English is imbued with diverse meanings that may or may not seem conflicting to the individual Puerto Rican. Political parties have utilized counterproductive discourses that manifest their ideological aims to serve current power structures at the expense of the people. However, the Critical Analysis of Discourse does not only reveal hidden agendas, it also empowers society to defy them.

References

Acevedo, V. (2017). *Motivation to learn and teach English in Puerto Rico's public and private schools* (Master's thesis). University of Texas at San Antonio. Retrieved from https://biblioteca.uprrp.edu:2075/docview/1906293495?accountid=44825.

Arce de Vázquez, M. (1998). *La obra literaria y el pensamiento poético de José de Diego.* Retrieved from https://books.google.es/books?id=2mURnPxz9rYC&hl=en

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Barthes, R. (1977). Rhetoric of the image. In *Image, music, text.* (pp. 32-51). London, UK: Fontana Press. Retrieved from http://dss-edit.com/prof-anon/sound/library/Barthes__Roland_-_Image_Music_Text.pdf

Barreto, A. (1998). *Language, elites, and the state: Nationalism in Puerto Rico and Quebec*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Barreto, A. (2001a). *The politics of language in Puerto Rico.* Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Barreto, A. (2001b). Statehood, the English language, and the politics of education in Puerto Rico. *Polity, 34*(1), 89-105.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). The production and reproduction of legitimate language (1982). In L. Burke, T. Crowley, & A. Girvin (Eds.), *The Routledge language and cultural theory reader* (pp. 467-477). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bowman, K. (2002, March 4). Slavery in Puerto Rico. Retrieved from http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/pub/eres/BLPR243_PIMENTEL/slavery.pdf

Caro, L. (2016, September 12). PNP firma compromiso anticorrupción. *El Nuevo Día.*

Retrieved from https://www.pressreader.com/puerto-rico/el-nuevo-dia1/20160912/281483570837168

Celebran reapertura de escuela bilingüe en Patillas. (2015, February 12). Retrieved from http://www.fortaleza.pr.gov/content/celebran-reapertura-de-escuela-biling-e-en-patillas

Clampitt-Dunlap, S. (2000). Nationalism and native-language maintenance in Puerto Rico. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *142*, 25-34.

Díaz Soler, L. (1981). Historia de la esclavitud negra en Puerto Rico. San Juan, PR: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Dixon. C. (2005). Quinto Centenario. In E. Rodgers (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of contemporary Spanish culture* (p. 431). New York: Routledge.

Domínguez-Rosario, B. (2012). *Language and identity: The study of a possible ongoing change in attitudes towards American English and Puerto Rican Spanish in Puerto Rico* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras.

Domínguez-Rosario, B. (2019, October). *Language and Puerto Rican Identity Revisited: Implications for English Teachers* [Conference presentation]. TESOL Eastern Chapter 2019 Conference.

Duany, J. (2007) Nation and migration: Rethinking Puerto Rican identity in a transnational context. In F. Negrón-Muntaner (Ed.), *None of the above: Puerto Ricans in the global era.* (pp. 51-63). London. UK: Palgrave.

Dunmire, P. (2012). Political Discourse Analysis: Exploring the language of politics and the politics of language. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 6*(11), 735-751.

EFE-AP. (1991, April 20). Premio príncipe de Asturias a Puerto Rico. *El Tiempo.*

Retrieved from https://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/MAM-67626

Enfrentados la gobernadora y Bhatia por el inglés. (2019, October 22). *Primerahora.com*. Retrieved from https://www.primerahora.com/noticias/gobierno-politica/nota/enfrentadoslagobernadoraybhatiaporelingles-1371512/

Epstein, E. (1967). National identity and the language issue in Puerto Rico. *Comparative Education Review, 11*(2), 133-143.

Escuelas de primera. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.app.gobierno.pr/?page_id=123

Fairclough, N. (1998). Political discourse in the media: An analytical framework. In A. Bell, & P. Garret (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). Oxford. UK: Blackwell.

Fairclough, N. (2001). The dialectics of discourse. *Textus*. *14*, 231-242.

Fairclough, N. (2016). A dialectical-relational approach to Critical Discourse Analysis in social research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse Studies* (pp. 86-108). London, UK: Sage.

Fayer, J. (2000). Functions of English in Puerto Rico. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 142*, 89-102.

Ferrer, J. (1945). Salinas: Aprecio y defensa del lenguaje. *Revista Hispánica Moderna, 11*(1/2), 59-61.

Fortuño dice que hay suficientes maestros para la educación bilingüe. (2012, June 14). *El Nuevo Día*. Retrieved from http://www.elnuevodia.com/noticias/politica/nota/fortunodicequehaysuficientesmaestrosparalaeducacionbilingue-1279076/

FPAMultimedia. (2019, February 19). *Discurso de Rafael Hernández Colón en representación del Pueblo de Puerto Rico* [Video file]. Retrieved from

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=toqHJTXkrl4

Fundación Biblioteca Rafael Hernández Colón. (2015). Retrieved from http://rafaelhernandezcolon.org/

Fundación Princesa de Asturias. (2019). Regulations. Retrieved from https://www.fpa.es/en/princess-of-asturias-awards/regulations/

Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York, NY: Routledge.

González, J. L. (2018). El país de cuatro pisos. *El país de cuatro pisos y otros ensayos.* 13th ed. Río Piedras, PR: Ediciones Huracán.

Guzmán, M. B. (2019, December 8). Madison Anderson, del rechazo nacional al orgullo boricua. *El Nuevo Día*. Retrieved from https://www.elnuevodia.com/ entretenimiento/ farandula/nota/madisonandersondelrechazonacionalal orgulloboricua-2533835/

Guzzardo, R., Loureiro-Rodríguez, V., Fidan Acar, E. & Vélez Avilés, J. (2018). Attitudes in progress: Puerto Rican youth's opinions on monolingual and code-switched language varieties. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 40(4),* 304-321.

Hansen, H. (Fall 2019). Fallacies. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.) *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/fallacies/

indistintamente. 2019. In *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*. Retrieved November 20, 2019, from https://dle.rae.es/indistintamente?m=form

Instituto de Estadísticas de Puerto Rico. (2018). Tres municipios tienen 70% o más de sus hogares con acceso a internet (Press Release).

InYourFaceTV. (2012, October 21). *Camapaña por el "no" referendum 1991 contra la*

separación [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ov0l3TfVAeY

Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (1998). Front Pages: (The Critical) Analysis of Newspaper Layout. In A. Bell & P. Garret (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 186-219). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Lauer, I. (2015). Epideictic rhetoric. *Communication Research Trends, 34*(2), 4-18.

Ley Orgánica del Departamento de Educación del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico, Pub. L. No. 68, § LPRA 391 (1990). Retrieved from http://www.lexjuris.com/leyorg/lexeduca.htm

Lladó-Berrios, N. (1978). English as a second language in Puerto Rico: A language attitude study and its pedagogical implications. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 39, 7321A.

Lluch, J. (2011). Autonomism and Federalism. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism,* 1-28.

Los documentos oficiales de la visita de los reyes. (1987, May 23). *El Vocero*. Retrieved from http://www.rafaelhernandezcolon.org/Boletin%20FBRHC/PDF/documentos_oficiales.pdf

López Laguerre, M. (1989). *El bilingüismo en Puerto Rico*. San Juan. PR: Editorial Espuela.

López Laguerre, M. (1998). Trasfondo histórico de la educación en Puerto Rico. *Educación Puerto Rico, 58,* 1-20.

Lorenzo-Hernández, J. (1999). The Nuyorican's dilemma: Categorization of returning migrants in Puerto Rico. *The International Migration Review, 33*(4), 988-1013.

Lyons, A. (2016). Multimodality: Origins and Conceptual Basis. In Z. Hua (Ed.),

Research Methods in Intercultural Communication: A Practical Guide. John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Marrero, J. (2017, January3). Maestros aprueban orden ejecutiva de bilingüismo. *El Vocero*. Retrieved from https://www.elvocero.com/educacion/departamento-de-educacion/maestros-aprueban-orden-ejecutiva-de-biling-ismo/article_98e3d19b-22d7-5822-9801-f0c1f2e6eae7.html

Martínez Ortiz, L. (2016). *English in Puerto Rico: A detailed review of the history of language policies on the island.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras Campus.

McCarty, T. L. (2004). Dangerous difference: A critical-historical analysis of language education policies in the United States. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 71-93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Meléndez, E. (1993). *Movimiento anexionista en Puerto Rico*. Rio Piedras, PR: Editorial de la UPR.

Morales, B., & Blau, E. (2009). Identity issues in building an ESL community: The Puerto Rican experience. *New Directions for Adults and Continuing Education*, *121*, 45-53.

Morris, N. (1995). *Puerto Rico: Culture, politics, and identity*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Mueller-Vollmer, K. & Messling, M. (Spring 2017). Wilhelm von Humboldt. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.) *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2017/entries/wilhelm-humboldt/

Nazario, R. (2019). *La historia de los derrotados: Americanización y romanticismo en*

Puerto Rico, 1898-1917. San Juan, PR: Ediciones Laberinto.

Negrón de Montilla, A. (1975). *Americanization in Puerto Rico and the public-school system: 1900-1930*. Rio Piedras, PR: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Official Language Act of 1991, Public Law No. 4 (1991).

Official Languages Act of 1993, Public Law No. 1 (1993).

Oficina de Servicios Legislativos. (2017). Redacción de Medidas. Retrieved from http://www.oslpr.org/v2/PDFS/RedaccionMedidas.pdf

Ostolaza Bey, M. (2001). *Informe final sobre el idioma en Puerto Rico*. San Juan, PR: Senado de Puerto Rico, Comisión de Educación, Ciencia y Cultura.

Pabón, C. (2003a). De Albizu a Madonna: Para armar y desarmar la nacionalidad. *Nación postmortem: Ensayos sobre los tiempos de insoportable ambigüedad,* (pp.17-53). San Juan, PR: Ediciones Callejón.

Pabón, C. (2003b). La imposible lengua apropiada. *Nación postmortem: Ensayos sobre los tiempos de insoportable ambigüedad* (pp.89-103). San Juan, PR: Ediciones Callejón.

Pousada, A. (1996). Puerto Rico: On the horns of a language planning dilemma. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), 499-510.

Propone restablecer el Instituto de Planificación Lingüística. (2015, February 28). *Telemundopr.com*. Retrieved from http://www.telemundopr.com/noticias/local/Fas-Alzamora-propone-restablecer-el-Instituto-de-Planificacion-Linguistica-294479811.html

Pueblo v. Tribunal Superior. (1965). 92 D.P.R. 596. Retrieved from https://vlex.com.pr/vid/92-d-p-r-684577881

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (1996). Self-category constructions in political rhetoric; An analysis of Thatcher's and Kinnock's speeches concerning the British miners' strike. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *26*, 353-371.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2016). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies* (pp. 23-61). London, UK: Sage.

Resnick, M. (1993). ESL and language planning in Puerto Rican education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(2), 259-275.

Reyes, M. (2013). El aprendizaje del español y del inglés en Puerto Rico y sus influencias extranjeras. *Scientific International Journal*, *10*(3), 44-53.

Roberts, P. (2008). *The roots of Caribbean identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & O'Garro-Joseph, G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in Education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 75(3),* 365-416.

Rosselló, R. (2016). *Plan para Puerto Rico: Un modelo para la transformación socioeconómica de nuestra isla* (pp. 110-112). San Juan. PR: Partido Nuevo Progresista.

Ruiz Correa S. (2019). *The evolution of the English language in daily life in Puerto Rico: A socio-historical analysis of recent events and their impact* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras. ProQuest.

Salzmann, Z., Stanlaw, J., & Adachi, N. (2012). *Language, culture, and society: An*

introduction to linguistic anthropology. (5 ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. 189-196.

Scarano, F. (1993). *Puerto Rico: Cinco siglos de historia.* Bogotá, Colombia: McGraw-Hill Interamericana.

Schmidt, J. (2014). *The politics of English in Puerto Rico's public schools*. Boulder, CO: First Forum Press.

Schmidt, J. (n.d.). Portal electrónico de Jorge R. Schmidt Nieto. Retrieved from http://academic.uprm.edu/jschmidt/id113.htm

Shenk, E. (2013). H. R. 2499 Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2010. *Journal of Language and Politics, 12(4),* 583-605.

Shenk, E. (2016). El engañol y el cuco: Metaphors in the nexus between language and status in Puerto Rico. In Roberto Valdeón (Ed.), *Spanish in the USA: Linguistic, translational and cultural aspects* (pp. 12-28). London/NY: Routledge.

Sherwood, M. (2013, June 5). Censo y bilingüismo [Blog post]. Retrieved from http://maiasherwood.com/columnas-lista/185-censo-y-bilingueismo

Solum, L. (2012). Legal theory lexicon: Speech acts [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://lsolum.typepad.com/legaltheory/2012/03/legal-theory-lexicon-speech-acts.html

Song, L. (2010). The role of context in discourse analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(6), 876-879.

Torres-González, R. (2002). *Idioma, bilingüismo y nacionalidad: La presencia del inglés en Puerto Rico.* Río Piedras, PR: Editorial de la UPR.

Valdez, J. (2016). The battleground of metaphors: language debates and symbolic

violence in Puerto Rico (1930–1960). *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics, 2(1)*, 1-25.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In A. Bell & P. Garret (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse, context and cognition. *Discourse Studies, 8*(1), 159-177.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2016). Discourse as the recontextualization of social practice – A guide. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies* (pp. 137-153). London, UK: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). Critical discourse studies: history, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies.* (pp. 1-22). London, UK: Sage.

Zeigler, K. & Camarota, S. (2019, October 29). 67.3 Million in the United States Spoke a Foreign Language at Home in 2018. *Center for Immigration Studies.* https://cis.org/Report/673-Million-United-States-Spoke-Foreign-Language-Home-2018

Appendix 1: Detailed timeline of language policies in Puerto Rico

1898 **Law:** United States established a military government in Puerto Rico.	
1898-1899 **Education:** John Eaton was in charge of the education bureau with the objective of teaching American values. Eaton recommended using Massachusetts educational laws as a model. With his aid, Victor Clark, Eaton established that English would be learned as a language course starting in the 1st grade and that it would become the language of instruction from middle school onward. Victor Clark took John Eaton's place as commissioner from 1899 to 1900 (Schmidt, 2014, pp. 48-49).	According to Schmidt (2014), most people on the island studied up to elementary school. Moreover, there weren't that many middle and high schools outside of the metropolitan area. Children in the San Juan area were most likely to see the effects of these policies. Thus, the impact of this language policy was limited by the characteristics of the region (p. 49). Many educators were not against the teaching of English, but rather they were against the methods used by the department. One of these educators was Ana Roque (Schmidt, 2014, p. 72).
1899 **Politics:** The pro-statehood party, *el Partido Republicano*, stated in its party platform that English should be taught "because it 'will soon be the official language' of the island and that it would place Puerto Rico, 'in more favorable conditions, soon to become a new state'." They did not reject Americanization strategies (Schmidt, 2014, p. 50).	
1900 **Law:** The Foraker Act established a civil government. **Education:** Commissioner Martin Brumbaugh established a similar language policy: Spanish would be the language of instruction from 1st to 7th grade and English from 8th to 12th grade (Schmidt, 2014, p. 49).	
1902 **Law:** The Official Languages Act of 1902 established that either English or Spanish	Samuel Lindsay was Commissioner of Education.

could be used in Departments, Courts and Government offices; however, municipalities, municipal and criminal courts, and the offices under them were exempt from the law (Ostolaza, 2001, p.10).	Government offices operated in English; thus, their workers were either Americans brought in from the States or a small number of Puerto Ricans who were able to perform in English (Schmidt, 2014, p. 70). The exception to the law underlined that it was understood that the people of Puerto Rico were not expected to speak English in their daily lives (Ostolaza, 2001, p. 11).
1905 **Education:** Commissioner Roland Falkner established English as the language of instruction starting in 2nd grade. Spanish was only a language course. This policy lasted until 1916 (Schmidt, 2014, p. 49). To become a licensed teacher, individuals needed to take English courses and pass an annual English exam (Schmidt, 2014; Torres-Gonzalez, 2001). In reality, there were not enough qualified teachers throughout the island, so, particularly in the rural areas, classes continued to be held in Spanish (Osuna as cited in Torres-González, 2001, p. 107).	According to Schmidt (2014), Falkner was not as severely criticized as previous commissioners because Governor Winthrop and the *Partido Unión*-lead legislature were in good terms. Since the former had placed *unionista* leaders in high ranking positions and the Foraker Act was still recent, there was the illusion that Puerto Rico was heading toward self-government (p. 50).
1911 **Education/Politics:** *Asociación de Maestros de Puerto Rico* was founded on July 8, 1911. It spoke out against the English language policies. The AMPR criticized the methodologies and books imported for teaching: they came straight from Massachusetts and were foreign to the Puerto Rican context. The AMPR allied itself with the *Partido Unión* which, years earlier, had broken ties with the executive council (governor Regis Post). The AMPR opposed the use of English as the language of instruction stating that it was not only anti-pedagogical, but also costly to teachers who had to invest time in preparing to teach in a foreign language.	

Meanwhile, the Department of Education offered monetary incentives to teachers who were willing to take preparatory courses and teach all their classes in English (Schmidt, 2014, p. 51).	
1913 **Law:** The legislature, controlled by the *Partido Unión*, passed a bill that made Spanish the language of instruction in primary schools. While it was vetoed by the executive council, two secondary projects were approved: eliminating the annual English courses and exams for teachers and creating the Spanish General Supervisor position (Torres-González, 2001, pp. 118-119).	US Congress was at that time considering whether or not to grant Puerto Ricans American citizenship (Schmidt, 2014, p. 51).
1915 **Law:** José de Diego led another bill to make Spanish the official language as well as the language of instruction (school and university) and the court system. It passed in the House but was vetoed in the Executive (Torres-González, 2001, pp. 118-119). **Education:** José de Diego founded the *Instituto Universitario José de Diego* which used only Spanish as its medium of instruction (Arce de Vázquez, 1998, p. 528).	The intellectual groups that favored autonomy used the defense of Spanish as an emblem of their fight for sovereignty and cultural identity; this was deeply rooted in hispanophilic ideals (Torres-González, 2001).
1916 **Education:** Paul Miller became the Commissioner of Education and established the following language policy: "Spanish would be the medium of instruction for most classes until 4th grade. 5th grade would include classes in Spanish and English while grades 6th and higher would have English as the medium of instruction except for physiology and Spanish." The *Partido Unión* and the AMPR believed it was a step in the right direction (Schmidt, 2014, p. 52). José Padín (school supervisor, scholar, and future Commissioner of Education)	The new language policy recognized the linguistic reality of Puerto Rico and ratified that knowledge of the native language was important in second language acquisition. Miller did not ease on the Americanization project and threatened students and teachers who refused to use English (Torres-González, 2001, pp. 108-109).

published the first paper on the island's educational system in which he criticized Falkner's policy and supported Spanish as the language of instruction (Schmidt, 2014, p. 53).	
1917 **Law:** The Jones Act was enacted, granting U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans and separating the executive council from the legislative process, but it did not allow for the democratic election of the governor. Disappointment caused Puerto Rican nationalism to rise in schools as well as the use of patriotic symbols to assert Puerto Rican identity and sovereignty (Schmidt, 2014, p. 53).	US Drafted Puerto Ricans for WWI. There was an increase in American immigrants who arrived to the island due to "economic penetration" (Schmidt, 2014, p. 72).
1921 **Education:** Juan B. Huyke became the first Puerto Rican Commissioner of Education. Even though he was a *Unionista* he maintained Miller's language curriculum and reinforced the use of English in other areas: students had to take an oral English exam to graduate and official department documents and communications were to be written in English. He also did not hire teachers who favored independence (Schmidt, 2014, p. 54).	**1922** The *Partido Nacionalista* was founded (Morris, 1995, p. 39).
1923 **Education:** The University of Puerto Rico increases its autonomy from the Department of Education; under Chancellor Thomas Benner, Pan-Americanism and the defense of Spanish takes flight (Torres-González, 2001, p. 109). In 1923, 1924, and 1925 Huyke continued to profile and threaten teachers and students who refused to use English in schools by means of administrative decrees (*cartas circulares)* (Torres-González, 2001, p. 109).	**1924** The *Partido Unión* rejected independence as a long-term solution and proposed the ELA. The *Partido Unión* and the *Partido Republicano* formed the *Alianza Puertorriqueña* while the Barbosa faction of the *Partido Republicano* and the Socialist Party joined forces. The *Partido Alianza* won the election and took over legislature (Schmidt, "Portal").

1925 **Education:** The Puerto Rican legislature commissioned a study to Teachers' College at Columbia University (Schmidt, 2014, p. 54). It concluded the following: • Huyke's policy was unjustified • English instruction should begin no earlier than 4th grade because most students left school before then and needed basic education in their native language • English as language of instruction should begin no earlier than 7th grade • Puerto Rican regarded learning English as something positive	
1926 **Politics:** Huyke's relationship with the AMPR, the *Unionistas* and the nationalists continued to decay. He favored statehood and rejected the decentralization of the department (Schmidt, 2014, p. 54-55).	
1930 **Education:** President Hoover appointed José Padín as Commissioner of Education. He had held several positions within the Department and had published research on the language issue. Padín was well received by the *Unionistas* and the AMPR after the long and polemic Huyke tenure (Schmidt, 2014, p. 55). Meanwhile, Juan José Osuna was dean of the University's School of Education. Padín and Osuna approached the matter from a scientific and pedagogical perspective. According to them, "el problema linguístico-escolar en Puerto Rico no se había resuelto precisamente porque las autoridades concernidas habían basado sus decisiones al respecto en consideraciones más políticas que pedagógicas o lingüísticas" (Torres-González, 2001, p. 144).	**1928 and 1932** Two hurricanes hit Puerto Rico. **1929** Great depression. The *Treintistas* was a group of authors and intellectuals that promoted the search for a Puerto Rican identity rooted in hispanophilic ideals and opposed the use of English as language of instruction. Regardless, they favored the teaching of English as a second language (Torres-González, 2001, pp. 136- 139). **1932** The Socialist Republican Coalition, whose membership was pro-statehood, wins the 1932 elections (Schmidt, "Portal").

Padín continued gathering information, in addition to his previous research and that of the Teachers College at Columbia University.	**1933** The PRERA (PR Emergency Relief Administration) rises with the aftermath of the 2 hurricanes (Schmidt, "Portal").
1934 **Education:** Padín established an educational language policy based on research. The new policy made Spanish the language of instruction up to 8th grade, English was a language course since the first grade. English was the medium of instruction in high school (Schmidt, 2014, p. 55).	**1936** The U.S. Senate proposed the Tydings Bill which called for a plebiscite on the island for independence without transition; it did not include a statehood alternative (Morris, 1995, pp. 39-40).
1937 **Education:** Padín was criticized for years as an anti-American. This finally led to him leave his post. José Gallardo took his place as Commissioner and he tried to cater to President F.D. Roosevelt's request: creating a bilingual, Puerto Rican population. Gallardo began a series of experiments which, according to Schmidt (2014), led to instability and confusion. The experiments were: • **1937-1940**: Spanish was the language of instruction until 2nd grade, 2/3 of courses in 3rd and 4th grade, ½ 5th and 6th, 1/3 7th and 8th, and high school was completely in English. • **1940-1942**: 1st and 2nd grade were taught in Spanish, 3rd through 6th were taught in Spanish with a content review session in English, and 7th and 8th classes were taught in English. • In **1942**, Gallardo reverted to Padín's policy (p. 56-57). Census data showed great advances in literacy among Puerto Ricans (1899, 22.7% → 1940, 68.5%), but little progress in the acquisition of English (1910, 3.6% → 1940, 27.8%) (Torres-González, 2001, p.151).	**1937** Ponce Massacre. Around **1942**, Gallardo spoke before the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs to clarify expectations about the use of English in Puerto Rico and stated that the teaching of English is "handicapped" because students did not have chances to use it outside of their language class (as cited in Schmidt, 2014, p. 86).
1938	**1939-1945**

Politics/Education: The PPD (*Partido Popular Democrático)* was founded. It included in its platform that Spanish would be the language of instruction (Torres-González, 2001, p. 164). In addition, the PPD pushed toward a *criollo* cultural nationalism and compartmentalized cultural identity and political identity.	WWII The PPD was the pro-independence faction of the Liberal Party (Morris, 1995, p. 40). **1941** PPD controlled the Senate (Schmidt, *Portal Electrónico*).
1942 **Education:** The *Consejo Superior de Enseñanza*, the university board, in coordination with Chancellor Jaime Benitez, establish Spanish as the language of instruction at the UPR. This paralleled Commissioner Gallardo's decision to revert back to Padín's language policy (Torres-González, 2001, p. 164).	Operation Bootstrap Benitez was a proponent of "Occidentalism" and argued that Puerto Rican culture was a fusion of occidental cultures. This line of thought would later influence the PPD's rhetoric (Torres-González, 2001, p. 160).
1946 **Politics/Education:** The PPD legislature passed a bill declaring Spanish the official language of instruction at all levels. The governor vetoed it, but the legislature approved it nonetheless. It was then passed on to President Truman who vetoed it finally. Truman designated Jesús T. Piñero as the first Puerto Rican governor of the island and the legislature recommended Mariano Villaronga as Commissioner of Education. He was the interim commissioner for a year and left his position because the vetting process in Washington was delayed (Torres-González, 2001, p. 166).	**1945** LMM rejected independence as a solution and advocated for a middle-of-the-road solution to the political status of Puerto Rico (Morris, 1995, p. 41). **1946** The *Partido Independentista de Puerto Rico* (PIP) was founded (Torres-González, 2001, p. 158).
1947 **Politics:** The Jones Act was amended. The people of Puerto Rico would be able to vote for their governor and the governor would be able to designate the members of the executive cabinet, including the Commissioner of Education (Torres-González, 2001, p. 161).	
1948 **Politics:** Luis Muñoz Marín became the first governor elected by the people of Puerto Rico. The PPD's political campaign	The *ley de la mordaza* is enacted to suppress nationalist activism (Torres-González, 2001, p. 163).

used nationalist symbols that had previously been associated with the independence movement and repackaged them according to the *criollo* cultural identity it proposed in the *jíbaro* (Schmidt, 2014, pp. 57-58). **Politics/Education:** During a campaign speech, Muñoz Marín spoke of the language issue using the same type of rhetoric as Padín and Osuna—scientific and pedagogical—and referred to the use of Spanish as the language of instruction as the "pedagogic truth." (Torres-González, 2001, p. 167)	Muñoz Marín's campaign emphasized that after Puerto Rico was industrialized and had developed its economy, then it could choose between independence or statehood (Morris, 1995, p. 43).
1949 **Education:** The Puerto Rican Department of Public Instruction was established. Mariano Villaronga was appointed Secretary of Instruction, this time by Governor Muñoz Marín (Schmidt, 2014, pp. 59-61). During his second term, Villaronga implemented the following reforms: • Reduced the educational use of English and increased the educational use of Spanish • Replaced textbooks for Social Studies, History and Spanish classes • Spanish was the language of instruction • English was taught daily as its own course throughout school • Recruitment of English teachers from the States stopped • English became departmentalized in elementary schools, so only specialized teachers could be English teachers • The position of English supervisor was eliminated • Conversational English courses were created to facilitate migration	The PPD did not eliminate English as an official language as was established in the Official Languages Act of 1902 (Shmidt, 2014, p. 76). Torres-González (2001) highlights that the subtext in the PPD rhetoric depicted English as the language of economic progress: English has a higher cultural capital compared to Spanish.

to the United States and reduce unemployment Administrative Decree 10 August 1949 stated that Spanish would be the language of instruction at all levels and English would be taught as a preferential language course (Torres-González, 2001, p. 168).	
1950 **Education:** Teachers College at Columbia University published another study on the status of English in Puerto Rico. Their findings supported Muñoz Marín and Villaronga's educational language policy and stated that the best way to teach English in the island was as a preferential foreign language course (Torres-González, 2001, p. 174).	Public Law 600 allowed Puerto Rico to write its own constitution. The *ley de la mordaza* was most aggressively enforced in this period (Torres-González, 2001, pp. 162-163).
1952 **Law/Education:** The constitution of the Estado Libre Asociado is ratified and public education became a universal right (Schmidt, 2014, p. 124).	Close ties between the PPD and the AMPR (Schmidt, 2014, p. 129). *Manos a la obra* linked Puerto Rico's economic progress with industrialism and the United States (Torres-González, 2001, p. 182). **1953** The UN Special Committee on Decolonization eliminated Puerto Rico from the list.
1955 **Education:** The *Academia Puertorriqueña de la Lengua* was founded; it was supposed to be politically neutral and study and defend the Puerto Rican variety of Spanish (Schmidt, 2014, p. 60). The Institute of Puerto Rican Culture was also founded that year. Both these organizations were key elements in the PPD's ideological, cultural project (Torres-González, 2001, p. 194).	
1957 **Education:** Villaronga created an educational, government TV channel which Secretary Efraín Sánchez Hidalgo strengthened. The educational	

programming on WIPR included a Conversational English program for potential migrants to the United States. Sánchez Hidalgo also promoted parent involvement in the learning process (Schmidt, 2014, p. 60).	
1960-1968 **Education:** Secretary Cándido Oliveras continued his predecessors' projects. He updated English textbooks and teaching methodologies and obtained scholarships so teachers could study English in the states. Controversy (1962) (Torres-González, 2001, p. 210) arose surrounding private schools and their choice of language of instruction, but in the end, they continued to teach in the language of their preference, including both English and Spanish. Angel Quintero Alfaro, Oliveras's undersecretary, took his place as secretary and experimented with innovative teaching models and created new, advanced English courses for public high schools. He created a teacher exchange program with the United States and further developed previous policies (Schmidt, 2014, p. 61).	
1965 **Law:** *Pueblo v. Tribunal*, The Puerto Rico Supreme Court ratified that legal processes in the State court system would be held in Spanish (Ostolaza, 2001, p. 10).	
1966 **Politics:** The *Federación de Maestros de Puerto Rico* established itself as a left-wing alternative to the AMPR, a labor union that supported other workers in their struggles, voiced its opinion on topics outside of education, and criticized the AMPR for its relationship with the PPD (Schmidt, 2014, p. 142).	
1967 **Politics:** A plebiscite on the political status of Puerto Rico took place. The ELA won with 60.4% of the votes, statehood	

received 39% of the votes, and independence 0.6%.	
1968 **Law/Education:** Lyndon Johnson enacted the Bilingual Education Act which stated that children should receive their education in their native language. Puerto Rican migrants were returning to the island. This paved the way for more bilingual programs (Schmidt, 2014, p. 62).	The *Partido Nuevo Progresista* (PNP) was founded in January. The party won the general elections that year.
1969 **Education:** Ramón Mellado Parsons was appointed new Secretary of Public Instructions under Governor Luis A. Ferré. Mellado Parsons used federal funds to strengthen English education programs, and hire English professionals from the States. Mellado created more bilingual schools and immersion programs in addition to transitional bilingual programs for English speakers who needed to integrate into a Spanish-speaking society (Schmidt, 2014, pp. 62-63). Mellado stated that Spanish should be the medium of instruction throughout the school years, and that English should be a preferential language course from the first grade to the second year of college. He added that English should be taught as a foreign language using the corresponding methodologies and texts, and that teachers should have command over the language (as cited in López Laguerre, 1998, pp. 13-14)	Peak of U.S. involvement in Vietnam war. Federal grants covered 1/5 of the DE's funding by 1969 (Schmidt, 2014, p. 87). Under Mellado's tenure the bureaucracy of the department grew and 50% of its employees were non-teaching staff (Schmidt, 2014, p. 138). Ferré coined the concept of the *estadidad jíbara*, a culturally Puerto Ricanized version of statehood. **1979** Mellado published *La educación en Puerto Rico*.
1973 **Education:** Between 1973 and 1979, Secretaries of Public Instruction Celeste Benitez, Ramón Cruz and Carlos Chardón amassed an unprecedented amount of federal funds for the department. "By the end of the 1970's the federal grants accounted for almost half the budget of the department of education" (Schmidt, 2014, p. 64).	Rafael Hernández Colón's first term as governor.
1977	**1976**

Education: A third teachers' union is founded: *Educadores Puertorriqueños en Acción*.	Foundation of the *Macheteros* organization. **1978** Cerro Maravilla. **1980** *Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional* raid George Bush's campaign office in the mainland; other terrorist actions claimed throughout the 70's and 80's (Morris, 1995, pp. 56-57).
1983 **Education:** Maria Lacott (Secretary under Governor Romero Barceló) reemphasized English education. During her term, she was able to fund the Residential English Immersion Schools with federal grants and spoke of English as a "second language" that complemented Spanish rather than replace it (Schmidt, 2014, p. 139).	Villaronga's policy remained mostly unchanged.
1985 **Education/Politics:** Awilda Aponte Roqué became Secretary of Public Instruction under Governor Rafael Hernández Colón and proposed eliminating English altogether from 1st to 3rd grade. While the teacher unions supported this measure, it did not materialize due to the opposition from the Private School Association and nonsystem actors, namely Puerto Rican intellectuals (Schmidt, 2014, p. 64). In addition, during Aponte Roque's tenure there were clear demonstrations of "allegiance to the United States while promoting Puerto Rican nationalist sentiments" (Schmidt, 2014, p. 139).	Rafael Hernández Colón's second term as governor.
1990 **Education:** The *Ley Orgánica del Departamento de Educación del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico* was enacted. It reaffirmed Villaronga's linguistic policy that Spanish would be the language of instruction and English would	U.S. Congressional Hearings aimed at holding a Federally backed referendum started in the summer of 1989 and ended in October 1990 (Barreto, 2001)

continue to be taught as a language course (Torres-González, 2001, p. 212).	
1991 **Law:** Under Governor Rafael Hernández Colón a new official language law was enacted (*Ley del Idioma Oficial, ley num. 4, 5 de abril de 1991)* and made Spanish the only official language of Puerto Rico (Schmidt, 2014; Torres-González, 2001). One of the PNP's main arguments against this law was: "Limitar el uso y la enseñanza del inglés en Puerto Rico es limitarle las oportunidades de estudio y trabajo a nuestros hijos…" (Romero Barceló as cited in Torres-González, 2001, p. 232).	The 1991 Constitutional Amendment Referendum (Referendum on Democratic Rights) was held in December 8. The PNP won. Governor Hernández Colón received the *Principe de Asturias Award*. Torres-González (2001) argues that in 1952 when the ELA constitution was written the PPD did not make statements about the official language because, given the political relationship with the U.S., it would be accurate to leave the Official Language Act of 1902 untouched as English is the language of all American Citizens (pp. 212-215).
1993 **Law:** Governor Pedro Rossello's first law made English and Spanish equal in legal status *(Ley que establece el español y el inglés como idiomas oficiales, ley num. 1, 28 de enero de 1993).* **Education:** Governor Rosselló appointed Jose Arsenio Torres (opponent of statehood) as Secretary of Education. He proposed the project for the *Escuelas de la Comunidad*, but did not promote any language policies because they were either not a priority or because he did not wish to create conflict with the governor's plans (Schmidt, 2014, pp. 63-65).	In November 1993, Rosselló proceeded with a local status plebiscite: ELA won with 48.6% of the popular vote.
1997 **Education/Politics:** Secretary Victor Fajardo's language policy seemed to prioritize the teaching of academic English; improving the teaching of Spanish was a means to that end (Torres-González, 2001, p. 361). This was problematic because students did not learn the formal use of either language properly. Fajardo instituted the *Proyecto para*	Schmidt (2014) states that "pro-statehood discourse now became one of social justice since the globalized era would reward those who spoke the lingua franca over those who didn't" (p. 145). Rosselló's project included a wide campaign to promote statehood locally and even in Washington in addition to two plebiscites. Rosselló and Fajardo

formar un ciudadano bilingüe. This partial immersion program taught math and science in English, and viewed English as a primary language. The partial immersion, bilingual program was focused on immersing Spanish speakers into the English language (Schmidt, 2014, p. 66). Fajardo implemented an English language policy for the teaching of mathematics and science. In some schools, it faced great opposition and did not last. (Schmidt, 2014, p. 146).	made efforts to "make Puerto Rico look more like a state" in an attempt to move the island closer to statehood (p. 146) In the project, bilingualism was defined as having comparable fluency is both English and Spanish (Torres-González, 2001, p. 356). Private schools on the island were taken as a model regardless of the socio-economic differences between them and their students (p. 369).
1998 **Politics:** Project Young, a US Congress bill that aimed to organize a plebiscite on the political status of Puerto Rico, stated that Puerto Rico had to use English as language of instruction before becoming a State (Torres-González, 2001, p. 243).	Carlos Romero Barceló withdrew his support of the Young Bill because it forced English as the language of instruction and government (Camiptt-Dunlap, 2000)
1999 **Law:** *Ley Orgánica de Educación del 1999* stated "la enseñanza se impartirá en español y/o inglés en las escuelas del Sistema" (as cited in Torres-González, 2001, p. 247).	
2001 **Education:** The *Partido Popular Democrático* (PPD) won the elections and reduced its funding for English programs under Secretary César Rey. He focused on teaching Spanish but did not eliminate English classes (Schmidt, 2014, p. 67). **Law**: A Senate Resolution stated that a study on the linguistic issue in Puerto Rico be published. Months later, the resulting *Informe Final sobre el Idioma en Puerto Rico* listed recommendations regarding the official language of Puerto Rico and the instruction of Spanish and English for additive bilingualism. In addition, it recommended the foundation of the *Instituto de Planificación Lingüística* (Ostolaza, 2001). The Institute was created	Antonio Fas Alzamora, president of the Senate, was interested in language issues in Puerto Rico, more so than governor Sila M. Calderón. In **2003**, Fas Alzamora proposed a bill to make Spanish the only official language of Puerto Rico. The bill never became law because Anibal Acevedo Vilá, who was at that time candidate for governor, lobbied against it (Rodíguez-Sánchez, 2004).

by virtue of law in 2002, but it was never instituted. The law was repealed through further legislation in 2010, but Fas Alzamora proposed to reinstitute it in 2013. However, it never made it to the Senate floor ("Propone restablecer el Instituto de Planificación Lingüística", 2015).	
2004 **Politics:** Gloria Baquero served as Interim Secretary, but she was not appointed officially because she would not give into political pressures that favored nepotism and cronyism (Schmidt, 2014, p. 67).	
2005 **Eduction:** Secretary Rafael Aragunde continued the previous language policy; he lost federal funds because he failed to apply the required methodology for the teaching of English to the teaching of Spanish (Schmidt, 2014, p.67).	
2008 **Education:** 75% of public school teachers subscribed to the *Federación de Maestros de Puerto Rico.* It was decertified by the Commission on Labor Relations of Puerto Rico under Secretary of Education Rafael Aragunde and Governor Aníbal Acevedo Vilá's tenure.	
2012 **Education:** Governor Luis Fortuño appointed a number of Secretaries of Education: Carlos Chardón, Odette Piñeiro, Jesus Rivera Sánchez, and finally Eduardo Moreno. Language policies became relevant throughout the election year. In January an administrative decree determined the public policy on the curricular content of the English program for all schools; this document established the policy and approach for teaching English and referred to the *Estándares de Contenido y Expectativas de Grado* implemented in 2007.	The *Escuelas para el Siglo XXI* program was funded with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) funds and planned to modernize 102 schools (Puerto Rico has over 1,500 schools). 71 schools were remodeled and 6 schools were newly constructed. According to the *Autoridad para las Alianzas Público-Privadas* Website, remaining funds are being used in a second stage for

In April, Fortuño announced the program *Generación Bilingue* under the project *Apoderando Estudiantes para el Siglo XXI* which was also closely linked to the ARRA funded project *Escuelas para el Siglo XXI.* In this period, 31 schools began a bilingual program in which some classes (math and science) were taught in English at the elementary level. Other schools' curriculum remained the same. That year there were summer English immersion camps for both teachers and students.	modernizing schools called *Escuelas de Primera* ("Escuelas de Primera"). According to the Sub-Secretary of Academic Affairs at the DE, the teachers who would impart those classes "expressed" fluency in English but were only required to be certified general elementary school teachers ("Fortuño dice que," 2012).
2014 **Education:** The Department of Education under Secretary Rafael Román and Governor Alejandro García Padilla revised the *Estándares de Contenido y Expectativas de Grado* for the English curriculum. According to the document, students in the 6th grade would have developed basic competencies in grammar and phonology to hold a fluid conversation.	Fas Alzamora presents a language bill, this time to make Spanish the first official language and English the second official language. Did not make it through the legislative process.
2015 **Education:** Secretary Román stated that the Department aimed to develop the bilingual education program ("*Celebran reapertura,*" 2015), but there are no administrative decrees to evidence this. An administrative decree emphasizing the teaching of Spanish, however, was published in July.	
2017 **Education:** Ex-governor Ricardo Rosselló Nevares promoted a curricular program titled *Bilingüismo, llave para el éxito*. The plan was approved via executive order but was not implemented. It had the support of several teacher unions (Marrero, 2017).	

Appendix 2: Sample 1: Official Language Act of 1991, Law 4, April 5, 1991, to declare Spanish the official language of Puerto Rico

Para declarar y establecer que el español será el idioma oficial de Puerto Rico a usarse en todos los departamentos, municipios u otras subdivisiones políticas, agencias, corporaciones públicas, oficinas y dependencias gubernamentales de las Ramas Ejecutiva, Legislativa y Judicial del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico y para derogar la Ley de 21 de febrero de 1902, "Ley con respecto al idioma que ha de emplearse en los Departamentos, Tribunales y Oficinas del Gobierno Insular".

Exposición de Motivos

Cuando los Estados Unidos adquirieron a Puerto Rico y a las Filipinas como resultado de la Guerra Hispanoamericanas los nuevos gobernantes intentaron sustituir las instituciones de estos pueblos con instituciones estadounidenses. La imposición del inglés como lengua oficial fue la piedra angular de esa política de asimilación cultural.

En Filipinas, donde el uso del español nunca se generalizó entre la población nativa y por consiguiente tampoco llegó a ser la lengua materna del grueso de los filipinos, los gobernantes norteamericanos dispusieron en el 1900 que el inglés sería el único idioma oficial a partir del 1ro. de enero de 1906. Esta fecha luego fue pospuesta para el 1ro. de enero de 1911, y finalmente para el 1ro. de enero de 1913.

En Puerto Rico, una sociedad homogénea en su cultura y lenguaje, los nuevos gobernantes decretaron, con la misma intención de asimilación cultural, el uso indistinto del español y del inglés en los departamentos, oficinas y tribunales del Gobierno Insular. En los primeros años de este siglo, el presidente de los Estados Unidos acostumbraba a nombrar a los más altos cargos del gobierno de la Isla a funcionarios que sólo hablaban

inglés. Se dispuso además que el inglés fuera el vehículo de enseñanza en las escuelas del país, y que el español se enseñase como una asignatura. La legislación de 1902 sobre el idioma es reflejo de un tiempo desaparecido.

La resistencia a ambas medidas fue firme y persistente. Desde temprano se alzaron en protesta las voces de Luis Muñoz Rivera, Eugenio María de Hostos, José de Diego, Luis Lloréns Torres y otros esforzados defensores de los valores puertorriqueños.

Tras múltiples esfuerzos fallidos de la antigua Cámara de Delegados, que se remontan al 1913, y de la Asamblea Legislativa más tarde, para disponer que el español fuera el vehículo de enseñanza, se logró alcanzar esa meta cuando Luis Muñoz Marín se convirtió en el primer Gobernador electo por el voto directo de todos los puertorriqueños. La ley de 1902, que en realidad no alcanzó el propósito que perseguían sus impulsadores ya que no estableció lengua oficial alguna, sino que se limitó a permitir el uso indistinto de los dos idiomas que conviven en nuestro medio, perdió por otra parte lo que pudo quedarle de razón de ser al cesar el gobierno de Puerto Rico de estar en manos de funcionarios estadounidenses que no conocían el español. Desacorde como siempre estuvo con la realidad puertorriqueña, la Ley de 21 de febrero de 1902 que por la presente se deroga se convirtió en una expresión inconsecuente en el 1965, cuando nuestro Tribunal Supremo le negó carácter preceptivo en los procedimientos judiciales puertorriqueños.

El propósito de la legislación que hoy se adopta es abolir un anacronismo y reafirmar nuestra condición histórica de pueblo hispanoparlante, unido libremente al pueblo de los Estados Unidos. En virtud de los fuertes vínculos políticos, económicos e ideológicos que nos unen a esa nación, el pueblo de Puerto Rico está comprometido a

adquirir el pleno dominio del inglés como segundo idioma, pero no está dispuesto a rendir ni su lengua, ni su cultura, ni la prerrogativa fundamental de determinar que su gobierno se comunique en el vernáculo de su gente: el idioma español.

Appendix 3: Sample 2: Rafael Hernández Colón's speech representing the people of Puerto Rico at the Principado de Asturias, 1991

Mensaje del gobernador del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico honorable Rafael Hernández Colón en la aceptación del Premio Príncipe de Asturias de las letras 1991 conferido al pueblo de Puerto Rico, Oviedo, España

18 de octubre de 1991

Alteza, Excelentísimo señor Presidente del Principado de Asturias, Excelentísimos señores, señoras y señores,

La tierra que Juan Ramón Jiménez llamó la Isla de la Simpatía y que el gran poeta escogió como su morada fuera de España, recibe hoy el Premio Príncipe de Asturias de las Letras que otorga esta Fundación para el año 1991. ¿Por qué merece Puerto Rico este premio? Podría contestarse con unas palabras de Pedro Salinas, otro gran poeta español, "por su aprecio y defensa del lenguaje".

Por haber defendido su vernáculo decisivamente frente a una política implantada durante los primeros 45 años de este siglo para educarle en otra lengua;

por la vigencia lingüística del español en la intimidad de la vida individual;

por su vigencia en todas las manifestaciones de la vida colectiva puertorriqueña;

por la creatividad de nuestros novelistas, poetas y escritores;

porque en vista de todo ello, el Gobierno del Estado Libre Asociado ha proclamado el español como el idioma oficial de Puerto Rico. Estos hechos han merecido el reconocimiento que ahora celebramos y que agradezco en nombre y en representación de mi país.

La lengua del Rey Alfonso El Sabio, de El Cid, de Nebrija y de la Reina Isabel, llegó a nuestra tierra hace ya casi cinco siglos. La traían conquistadores como Juan Ponce de León, religiosos como el obispo Alonso Manso, colonizadores como García Troche y Baltazar de Castro. Arcaísmos del castellano medieval que nos legaron como chavo, bellón, ansina, ínsula y muchos otros son vocablos corrientes del habla campesina. En nuestros campos podemos escuchar los antiguos romances de Delgadina, Blanca Flor y otros cantares que llegaron a nuestras playas hace casi cinco siglos. La décima sigue siendo la rima preferida de nuestros trovadores.

En Puerto Rico al igual que en las otras Antillas, la sonora y dulce lengua de Castilla, se enriqueció con los tainismos de nuestros aborígenes y con los aportes lingüísticos que a través de los siglos hicieron los africanos que también contribuyeron a enriquecer nuestra formación étnica y cultural.

Luego de la colonización, la interacción de Puerto Rico con España fue intensa sobre todo durante el siglo pasado. Españoles y puertorriqueños cruzaban el Atlántico en grandes números y 'en ambas direcciones. A mediados de siglo, de aquí de Asturias, partió Manuel Fernández Juncos con 11 años de edad hacia Puerto Rico. Habría de ocupar un sitial de honor en nuestra política y literatura. Al producirse el cambio de soberanía en el 98, fue uno de los más eficaces defensores de nuestro idioma. Dentro de todo lo Puerto Rico tiene que agradecer a este hijo de Ribadesella, está la letra de nuestro himno nacional "La Borinqueña".

En 1987, con motivo de la reunión en San Juan de las Comisiones Nacionales para la Celebración del Quinto Centenario, don Juan Carlos y doña Sofia realizaron la primera visita a Puerto Rico de unos soberanos españoles. Resaltó, esta visita, el

reencuentro entrañable y familiar de nuestros pueblos que había comenzado unos años antes. Ese reencuentro se ha multiplicado en relaciones oficiales, financieras, culturales, educativas y en otras formas que han estrechado los lazos entre España y Puerto Rico de manera singular.

Coinciden estos acercamientos con otros que Puerto Rico ha efectuado con su entorno caribeño y centroamericano. Nuestra apertura al mundo iberoamericano, con el que compartimos una cultura y una lengua, ha coincidido con la voluntad del país de actuar en la historia definiéndose con la fuerza que nos viene de lo más profundo de nuestro ser.

De ahí surge la decisión en cuanto a nuestra lengua. Decisión que, por las distintas opiniones existentes entre nosotros sobre lo que debe ser la vinculación con Estados Unidos, exigió un difícil ejercicio de voluntad política.

La afirmación de lo propio no es negación de lo ajeno. El respeto del otro se gana partiendo del respeto a uno mismo. Nuestras relaciones con los Estados Unidos de América están basadas en el respeto mutuo, y en la libertad de cada pueblo para ser quien es.

Puerto Rico tuvo la visión de, ni federarse a, ni separarse de, los Estados Unidos. Para salir del status colonial, Puerto Rico creó su propio espacio político autonómico: el Estado Libre Asociado. Espacio que le permitía la fortaleza de la unión política y económica, a la vez que la fuerza de su integridad cultural. Al contemplar los acontecimientos mundiales, pensamos que quizás Puerto Rico y Estados Unidos podemos ofrecer las experiencias y lecciones de nuestras relaciones llevadas por noventa y- tres años. Dentro de instituciones flexibles de democracia y libertad, pueden convivir

armoniosa y provechosamente la potencia más fuerte del mundo y un país pequeño, con el espacio político suficiente para afirmar cada cual su propia identidad y cultura y superar enfrentamientos, terrorismos y violencias.

Este Premio que hoy se confiere a Puerto Rico, también honra a los Estados Unidos de América. Los honra precisamente por el respeto que han guardado frente a esta decisión puertorriqueña. La libertad que asegura nuestra relación autonómica, brinda un amplio margen a nuestra diversidad cultural.

Más aún, dentro de la democracia y libertad que potencia el desarrollo del pluralismo social y étnico dentro de los propios Estados Unidos, llegará el día en que esta gran nación, partiendo de la coexistencia en su seno de la lengua inglesa y la lengua española, proyecte una visión renovada del hombre y del mundo.

Alteza, Señoras y Señores:

La definición lingüística de Puerto Rico, más que al pasado, mira hacia el futuro. Nuestra sociedad es de vanguardia. Somos un país isleño que en el entorno caribeño ha desarrollado, desde la democracia y desde una economía abierta, una tecnología y un sector industrial diversificados, competitivos en todos los mercados del mundo; un sector financiero fuerte, que se proyecta poderosamente sobre los países de la región; y un comercio exterior que en Iberoamérica solo superan México y Brasil.

Tenemos una clase obrera que figura entre las más diestras del mundo; un 10% de nuestra población posee educación universitaria adquirida tanto en Puerto Rico como en los centros de educación más avanzados en el exterior. Disponemos de una clase científica y técnica altamente calificada. Competimos respetablemente en el deporte

internacional. Nos estamos preparando para postular la sede de las olimpiadas para el 2004. Nuestros creadores artísticos tienen proyección internacional.

Esta sociedad moderna y dinámica se ha enriquecido culturalmente en su contacto con la sociedad norteamericana. El inglés es para nosotros una herramienta eficacísima que valoramos altamente. Pero nuestra lengua materna es la que nos cohesiona como pueblo, con la cual expresamos nuestros sentimientos y creencias más íntimas, nuestros pensamientos y valores más profundos. La oficialidad del español es punto de partida para una recia política contra el semilingüismo. Combatimos el semilingüismo, un mal que afecta a los pueblos en situaciones de culturas confluyentes. El empobrecimiento colectivo de la expresión, la carencia de vocabulario, la imprecisión del pensamiento, y la incoherencia lingüística colectiva son algunos de sus lastres. Promovemos en cambio el bilingüismo con amplias oportunidades educativas, pero reconocemos que es producto del esfuerzo y del interés individual por adquirirlo.

El pueblo de Puerto Rico se propone hacer futuro desde el español. Al recibir este Premio nos sentimos honrados y acogidos por nuestros hermanos que comparten esta lengua y con ella una visión del mundo. Contemplamos con el mayor interés, los acontecimientos que con motivo del V Centenario se desarrollarán en España durante el año entrante. Confiamos en que, desde nuestra instalación política como Estado Libre Asociado a los Estados Unidos de América, participemos en todas ellas en el grado 'que nos corresponde como un país irrenunciablemente iberoamericano.

Alteza, Señoras y Señores:

Para terminar estas palabras, permítanme hacer referencia a mi pueblo puertorriqueño que hoy recibe este gran honor.

La defensa heroica del español a través de casi un siglo, no fue sólo la gran defensa que hicieron nuestros intelectuales, nuestros políticos y nuestros escritores. La resistencia vital vino del pueblo, de la gente sencilla y humilde de Puerto Rico. La resistencia vino de los barrios de San Juan, de los morrillos de Cabo Rojo; de los cañaverales de mi pueblo de Ponce, de las playas de Luquillo, de las montañas de Utuado, de aquellos humildes jíbaros que aprendieron sus rezos, sus décimas y sus trovas en español. La resistencia vino de ese pueblo que atesora en los recovecos de su espíritu y en el temblor de su alma, las voces castellanas que le dan sentido a su vida.

Ese pueblo es el héroe. Ese es el pueblo que ha conservado la lengua en que Dios dio el Evangelio del Quijote a Cervantes. Ese es el pueblo cuya resistencia heroica ahora nos permite pertenecer a la comunidad lingüística que hermana a trescientos cuarenta y un millones de seres humanos que se expresan en español.

Ese es el pueblo cuya victoria ha hecho posible que la creación de nuestros poetas, novelistas, dramaturgos y ensayistas se lleve a cabo en la lengua universal que comparten con Juan Ramón, con Borges, con García Márquez, con Cela, y con Octavio Paz.

En nombre de la tierra de Borinquen, que recibió la letra de su himno nacional de un hijo de esta tierra que hoy nos premia; en nombre de la isla que aquel gran asturiano llamó la hija del mar y el sol; en nombre del buen pueblo puertorriqueño que ha sabido ser leal a sus esencias, les doy las ¡Gracias!

Appendix 4: Sample 3: Advertising 1991 referendum, *Vota no a la separación*

Campaña por el NO, referéndum 1991 contra la separación (archivo): Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ov0l3TfVAeY (start 1:50; end 2:19)

[Black background; white, bold, capitalized letters; typewriter sound; male voice-over and corresponding text appears in phrases organized as follows:]

Después de haber eliminado el inglés como segundo idioma oficial, /

su gobierno local llevará a cabo un referéndum el 8 de diciembre que establece reclamos de soberanía /

e independencia al congreso de los Estados Unidos. /

Este es otro gran paso hacia la total separación de Puerto Rico de los Estados Unidos.

[Black-white picture of Hernández Colón over red background. Background transitions to green as black-white pictures of Rubén Berríos and Carlos Gallisá are revealed from behind HC's picture: Berríos's picture moves center to left; simultaneously, Gallisá's moves center to right, both pictures at each side of HC's picture. Below each picture, their names, "Rubén, Rafael, Gallisá," appear in white.]

Este es el objetivo de la alianza independentista, popular y socialista.

[Black background; white, bold letters; typewriter sound; female voice-over text appears in phrases organized as follows:]

Madre puertorriqueña defiende tu ciudadanía, lleva a tu familia a votar.

[Yellow background; white box with text in black, capital letters: VOTA NO. An X below in hand script shows how to vote.]

Vota no a la separación.

[Gray background; white, capitalized text "Dile no a la separación" initially covered by both the Puerto Rican flag and the United States flags. The flags are separated abruptly, giving the impression that they have been torn apart; a clanging sound emphasizes the sudden separation. When they are separated, the complete text is seen unobstructed. Male voice-over:]

Auspiciado por puertorriqueños que no quieren perder la ciudadanía americana.

Appendix 5: Sample 4: Official Languages Act of 1993

Ley núm. 1 de 28 de enero de 1993

Para establecer que el español y el inglés serán los idiomas oficiales del Gobierno de Puerto Rico, y que ambos se podrán utilizar indistintamente; y para derogar la Ley Núm. 4 de 5 de abril de 1991.

Exposición de Motivos

En 1898 se estableció mediante la Orden General Núm. 192 del Cuartel General del Ejército, Despacho del Ayudante General, en Washington, D.C., que el idioma oficial a utilizarse en el Gobierno de Puerto Rico sería el inglés. El 21 de febrero de 1902 se aprobó una ley, que autorizó a emplear indistintamente, los idiomas español e inglés en el Gobierno de Puerto Rico. Ochenta y nueve años más tarde, la Ley Núm. 4 de 5 de abril de 1991 declaró el español como idioma oficial de Puerto Rico para usarse en el trámite de los asuntos oficiales de todos los departamentos, municipios u otras subdivisiones políticas, agencias, corporaciones públicas, oficinas y dependencias gubernamentales de las Ramas Ejecutiva, Legislativa y Judicial del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico. Según la exposición de motivos de esa ley, el propósito de la misma es reafirmar nuestra condición histórica de pueblo hispanoparlante, a la vez que expresa el compromiso de adquirir el pleno dominio del inglés como segundo idioma, sin rendir ni su lengua ni su cultura.

El preámbulo de la Constitución del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico expresa, entre otras cosas, que “consideramos como factores determinantes en nuestras vidas la ciudadanía de los Estados Unidos de América, la lealtad a los postulados de la Constitución Federal; (y) la convivencia en Puerto Rico de las dos grandes culturas del

hemisferio americano...". El Pueblo de Puerto Rico, además, ha manifestado una y otra vez a todo lo largo del siglo XX su voluntad de mantener y fortalecer su relación con los Estados Unidos de Norteamérica. El progreso político, económico y social del Pueblo de Puerto Rico está íntimamente ligado al propósito de que tanto el idioma español como el inglés sean los idiomas oficiales en esta jurisdicción.

La Ley Núm. 4 de 5 de abril de 1991 no ha llenado las expectativas del Puerto Rico de hoy que aspira a participar activamente en las iniciativas de desarrollo en la Cuenca del Caribe, Latinoamérica, Norteamérica y a nivel internacional. Se necesitan vehículos prácticos para que el Gobierno de Puerto Rico pueda continuar comunicándose en forma efectiva con su propio pueblo y el mundo exterior. El inglés constituye el idioma que más frecuentemente se utiliza para llevar a cabo las comunicaciones internacionales hoy día. Por razones históricas, nuestro Pueblo ha venido utilizando indistintamente el español y el inglés por más de nueve décadas sin que ello haya significado que hemos postergado o abdicado nuestro vernáculo, el idioma español, ni que hayamos rendido nuestra lengua ni nuestra cultura. Por el contrario, nuestros ciudadanos se encuentran en la posición privilegiada de haber estado expuestos y tenido la oportunidad de aprender y hablar dos idiomas importantes. Tanto el español como el inglés pueden convivir como lo han hecho hasta ahora en armonía y conforme a las necesidades del pueblo puertorriqueño, sin que uno desvalorice al otro.

Nada de lo expresado en esta ley significa un retroceso lingüístico o una imposición cultural al Pueblo de Puerto Rico. Cualquier referencia a un intento de asimilación cultural es cosa del pasado. El propósito de esta medida es corregir los efectos adversos y los contratiempos de naturaleza práctica creados por la Ley Núm. 4 de

5 de abril de 1991, al declarar y establecer que el español e inglés serán idiomas oficiales a usarse indistintamente en todos los departamentos, municipios, u otras subdivisiones políticas, agencias, oficinas y dependencias gubernamentales de las Ramas Ejecutiva, Legislativa y Judicial del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico. En esta forma se hace justicia y se valida una realidad existente en nuestra sociedad desde hace aproximadamente un siglo.

A propósito de despejar dudas sobre la intención legislativa referente a esta medida reiteramos lo siguiente:

1. Esta medida permite utilizar el inglés nuevamente en gestiones de Gobierno en Puerto Rico. Como norma general, el uso del inglés en diligencias gubernamentales se proscribió aquí en 1991, cuando se legisló para darle categoría de idioma oficial sólo al español. Hasta ese momento, el inglés también había sido idioma oficial en Puerto Rico. En resumen, con la aprobación de esta medida restablecemos, sin quitar ni añadir nada, la situación jurídica que existía en Puerto Rico con anterioridad a la aprobación de la ley de 1991.

2. A través de esta medida, la Asamblea Legislativa no pretende establecer, por Fiat legislativo, una condición de bilingüismo, extraña a la realidad cotidiana del pueblo puertorriqueño. Nos limitamos a reconocer otra realidad: que la relación de Puerto Rico con Estados Unidos, cada vez más estrecha en lo político y lo económico, lo mismo que la aspiración a perpetuar esa relación expresada en las urnas por los votantes de los dos partidos principales —que congregan más del 90 por ciento del electorado— multiplica las instancias en que es preciso que nuestro gobierno reciba y conteste comunicaciones en inglés y tramite asuntos oficiales en ese mismo idioma. Proscribir el uso del inglés, por

puro Fiat legislativo, como se hizo en 1991, entorpece y encarece el funcionamiento de nuestro gobierno innecesaria e injustificadamente.

3. Ninguna disposición de esta medida da amparo o valida la infundamentada especulación de que, al aprobarla, la Asamblea Legislativa estaría abriendo puertas a que pueda utilizarse un lenguaje que no sea el español como vehículo de enseñanza en las escuelas públicas de Puerto Rico. Este proyecto de ley no deroga, ni cambia, ni enmienda el Articulo 1.02 de la Ley Orgánica del Departamento de Educación ~Ley 68 de 28 de agosto de 1991— que, en lo pertinente establece "que la educación se impartirá en el idioma vernáculo, el español. Se enseñará el inglés como segundo idioma". Reiteramos aquí la política pública a esos efectos.

4. Ninguna disposición de este proyecto de ley da amparo a la infundamentada especulación de que, al aprobar el mismo, la Asamblea Legislativa estaría autorizando o validando el uso de un idioma distinto al español en procedimientos judiciales en los tribunales del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico. La cuestión del idioma judicial fue resuelta por nuestro Tribunal Supremo en el caso de Pueblo vs Tribunal Superior (1965) y lo establecido allí no sufre cambio alguno con la aprobación de esta medida. La misma tampoco altera la Regla 8.5 de Procedimiento Civil a efecto de que "las alegaciones, solicitudes y mociones deberán formularse en español" en los Tribunales de Puerto Rico.

Appendix 6: Sample 5: Plan for Puerto Rico: A model for the socioeconomic transformation of our island (2016)

Bilingüismo: Llave para el Éxito

Las potencias educativas (Japón, Finlandia, Singapur, Alemania, entre otros) promueven la enseñanza de más de un idioma. Aunque existen discrepancias en términos de enfoques, medios, modelos y estrategias de enseñanza, es imprescindible en la modernidad poder dominar varios idiomas. El idioma del inglés es utilizado por más de 300 millones de personas como primer idioma y otros 350 millones lo utilizan como segundo idioma (Paul et al., 2013). Asimismo, es la segunda lengua oficial en alrededor de 60 países y de numerosas organizaciones internacionales. El inglés también se utiliza predominantemente en asuntos internacionales de la política, los negocios, la ciencia, y otros temas de alto impacto social y económico. En Puerto Rico, además del gobierno local, tenemos el federal, y su lenguaje de funcionamiento es el inglés.

Yuan (2005) establece que la Educación Bilingüe se está convirtiendo en un bien exclusivo para personas adineradas que deseen que sus hijos sean capaces de dominar el inglés para utilizarlo en los negocios, las ciencias y otros elementos de comunicación con el resto del mundo. Por lo tanto, la educación bilingüe no es un andamiaje ideológico, sino una herramienta de apoderamiento para que aquellos que no nacieron con los recursos económicos puedan abrirse al mundo y logren mayores oportunidades para su crecimiento y desarrollo personal y profesional.

Desarrollaremos un programa bilingüe utilizando la integración tecnológica y la metodología multisensorial para aumentar el porciento de estudiantes que tienen dominio del idioma inglés. En Puerto Rico, menos del 50% de los estudiantes tienen dominio del

idioma inglés. Los ciudadanos que tienen dominio del inglés tienen mejores oportunidades de empleo.

La iniciativa Bilingüismo: Llave para el Éxito, procura aumentar en un 20% las escuelas bilingües en Puerto Rico durante el primer año para que los estudiantes puedan desarrollar las artes del lenguaje (leer, escribir, hablar y escuchar) en el idioma inglés y crear en cada municipio escuelas con proyectos bilingües.

En estos proyectos se utilizarán nuevos enfoques de enseñanza del inglés, tales como cursos televisados, cursos en línea tipo MOOC (Massive Open Online Course), alianzas con universidades e integración curricular. En Finlandia y Japón, entre otros países, se han desarrollado proyectos similares que han tenido un impacto significativo en la economía tras haber desarrollado una fuerza trabajadora con mayor competitividad.