

The competent bilingual in Puerto Rico

ALICIA POUSADA

Abstract

In Puerto Rico, despite official educational policy mandating English-as-a-second-language instruction in grades 1–12, many students enter the university lacking sufficient proficiency in English to carry out basic communicative functions. The situation results from a generalized ambivalence among the Spanish-speaking populace, which simultaneously supports English language acquisition and covertly resists it. Nevertheless, significant numbers of Puerto Ricans are adept in English and can be characterized as competent bilinguals. In order to determine the overall parameters of this situation, a qualitative investigation was carried out. Thirty bilingual individuals connected with the University of Puerto Rico were interviewed in-depth in an attempt to ascertain the social and educational factors involved in the development of competent bilinguals. The ultimate goal would be to utilize these findings to improve existing instruction so that more Puerto Rican students could become “good” learners and eventually competent bilinguals.

Introduction

From a global perspective, multilingualism is hardly exceptional. The monolingualism that US residents often consider “normal” is neither possible nor desirable in most of the world, where speakers routinely utilize two or more language varieties for various purposes in different social domains. Nevertheless, the bilingual with nativelike competence in both languages is a rare find. This is particularly true when the second-language learning process takes place outside of the target-language speech community.

In Puerto Rico, bilingualism has long been a stated goal of the public school system, yet for the most part, this goal has not been realized.

The reasons are many and can be traced to the cultural and political complexities and contradictions of colonialism.¹ While there is a near consensus among the Puerto Rican people with regard to the utility of English as a language of wider communication, there is considerable resistance toward actually mastering the language (Algren de Gutiérrez 1987). Some of this resistance to English is no doubt due to its imposed nature on the island; people naturally resist that which is forced upon them. Many may also fear betraying Spanish or their Puerto Ricanness if they become too competent in English. In addition, a lion's share of the problem can be attributed to the poor quality of English instruction in many schools, particularly within the crisis-ridden public school system.²

Given the ambivalence that exists regarding bilingualism, it is not surprising to find that a great many students enter the University of Puerto Rico (after 12 years of mandatory English-as-a-second-language instruction) lacking sufficient proficiency in English to carry out the most basic of communicative functions. What is amazing is the fact that a small but significant group of students is quite adept in English and uses it with effectiveness. Furthermore, numerous professors of all intellectual and ideological persuasions on campus (many of them University of Puerto Rico graduates) can be characterized as competent bilinguals.

In order to determine the overall parameters of this situation, a qualitative investigation into the basic characteristics of the competent bilingual in Puerto Rico was carried out. Thirty bilingual individuals connected with the University of Puerto Rico were interviewed in-depth in an attempt to isolate the elements that played a critical role in their linguistic formation. The goal of the study was to ascertain the social and educational factors involved in the development of competent bilinguals in order to improve existing English-as-a-second-language instruction so that more Puerto Rican students could become "good" learners and eventually competent bilinguals.

Before presenting the methodology of the study and its findings, let us consider exactly what is meant by the term "competent bilingual."

What is a "competent bilingual"?

Bilingualism is a phenomenon that resists definition. Much like "love," it represents a concept that everyone comprehends at some level yet is hard pressed to define with any exactitude. Furthermore, the definitions offered may be based upon the linguistic competence of the speaker, the functions that speaker is able to carry out, and/or the attitudes

of the speaker and the listeners toward use of the two languages (Skutnabb-Kangas 1981: 80-93).

The renowned structural linguist Leonard Bloomfield (1935: 55-56) referred to bilingualism as the "native like control of two languages." Another noted linguistic scholar, Uriel Weinreich (1953: 3), referred to it as "the practice of alternatively using two languages." Such definitions fail to pinpoint just how proficient a person needs to be in order to be categorized as bilingual. Einar Haugen, a lifelong investigator of multilingualism, attempted to address this problem by suggesting that we "start at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language (1969: 6-7). However, by this criterion, all of the E.S.L. students at the U.P.R. are bilingual since they can usually say "Hello. How are you? My name is So-and-so," complete and meaningful utterances in anyone's book. Obviously we need something a bit more stringent to rank speakers of different degrees of proficiency.

In the literature of bilingualism, there exists a great variety of terminology regarding relative grades of bilingualism. In (1), we can see the continuum of bilingual abilities, beginning with the first forays into bilingualism and ending with complete command of both languages.

(1) Bilingual continuum

Incipient	—	Receptive	—	Functional	—	Equilingualism	—	Ambilingualism
bilingualism		bilingualism		bilingualism		(balanced)		(perfect)

The *incipient bilingual* (Diebold 1961) is beginning the process of sorting out the stimuli received in the second language and creating mental schema for the comprehension and use of the new system. The first language is the major point of reference at this stage, and the second language is mostly a bewildering array of strange sounds and curious groupings. Yet the process has begun, and the learner has started acquiring new ways of thinking and communicating needs and feelings. Typically "poor" learners get frozen or "fossilized" (as Stern 1975 puts it) at the incipient level, while "good" learners advance beyond this point by continually revising and upgrading their hypotheses about language (Rubin 1975).

The *receptive bilingual* (Hockett 1958) has progressed to the point where (s)he can comprehend or read much of what is presented in the second language but finds it difficult to produce speech or writing. This stage is often a transitional one leading to functional bilingualism; however, in many cases (as is true in Puerto Rico), bilinguals remain at this level all their lives, especially when the second language is restricted to the so-called "passive" activities of listening and reading.

Receptive bilingualism is also very common in situations of complex multilingualism where many language varieties are in use in one speech community (e.g. India, East Africa), or in situations of language shift or language loss in which the younger generations may be in the process of moving from L₁ monolingualism to bilingualism and possibly on to L₂ monolingualism as L₁ gets left behind. Immigrant children in the US are often receptive bilinguals and carry out nonreciprocal conversations with their parents, with each party emitting one language and receiving the other.

The *functional bilingual* (Baetens Beardsmore 1982) has achieved sufficient ability in both languages so as to carry out most social and communicative functions without difficulty. There is relatively little that (s)he cannot process or utilize effectively, in general conversation or reading, although there may be gaps in specific domains of usage. There is usually clear influence from the first language, and minor mishaps may occur in the phonology, grammar, and syntax of the second language. Usually these divergences from a native standard do not adversely affect intelligibility, although at times there may be embarrassing violations of sociolinguistic norms of appropriateness. It is usually possible to determine the functional bilingual's dominant language without much trouble. Functional bilingualism is the stated goal of the Puerto Rican public school system (López Laguerre 1989), but it is usually only attained within the private and parochial institutions on the island.

The *equilingual or balanced bilingual* is the individual whose mastery of the two languages, according to Baetens Beardsmore (1982: 9), "is roughly equivalent and ... may match that of monoglot speakers of the respective languages if looked at in broad terms of reference." This speaker can move smoothly between the two languages and has a balance between the skills developed in each language. There may be traces of influence of one language upon the other, but these are usually minimal and within the realm of acceptability. The speaker is fluent and communicatively competent.

Finally, the *ambilingual or perfect bilingual* (Halliday et al. 1970) is the person who is capable of functioning equally well in either of the languages in all domains of activity and without traces of one language in the linguistic system of the other. In essence, such an individual's speech consists of two parallel monolingual repertoires, and (s)he evidences no hesitation in translating from one to the other. There are serious doubts among scholars (e.g. Fishman 1971; Grosjean 1982) as to whether such a specimen actually exists, since (barring a continual life-long migration between two societies) it is nearly impossible for a speaker to develop the same breadth of vocabulary in all semantic fields in both languages.

Even professional interpreters and translators who are trained to overcome this tendency report difficulties. Most bilinguals have some functional specialization of the languages.

For the purposes of the present study, 30 individuals were selected from the right side of the bilingual continuum — primarily highly functional bilinguals and equilinguals or balanced bilinguals. To simplify matters, they will all be referred to as "competent bilinguals." In general, the younger members of the sample can be characterized as highly functional and the older as equilingual, although there are some exceptions. A few claimed total interchangeableness between their two languages (i.e. ambilingualism), but after probing, generally some distinction was found between their use or command of the two languages.

Let us now turn to the structure of the investigation.

Sample selection

Sample members were selected on the basis of personal observation of their bilingual skills, referrals of other bilinguals, and self-designation. Thirty individuals were interviewed — half between the ages of 19 and 30 and half over the age of 30. Thirteen were students; 13 were professors; two were teaching assistants; and two were members of professors' families. While no formal measure of social class was taken, they may be safely classified as middle or upper-middle class. Twenty-three of the 30 were born in Puerto Rico. Of the seven born in the US, five came to Puerto Rico before starting kindergarten. One came in intermediate school, and one in high school. Most of the sample members had either lived in or visited the United States. The average total length of exposure to US society was five years, although there was a range of 1–15 years. Women outnumber men two to one in this sample, but this is probably an artifact of the heavily female composition of the Rio Piedras campus rather than an indication of the actual distribution of the sexes among competent bilinguals.

Interviews

The interviews were carried out in the author's office and took approximately one hour. All were tape-recorded. A basic questionnaire was utilized to structure the interviews, but the order of the 42 items and the emphasis given each varied with individual speakers. In short, while the same essential topics were covered with each informant, the sessions

were tailored to fit their individual characteristics and life histories. Usually the older interviewees were able to speak at greater length, due to longer experience, but the younger interviewees were able to give fresher detail about their school years.

The interviews were carried out in English to confirm the degree of mastery of the second language. While there was no psychometric measure of bilingual competence in the present investigation, all interviewees functioned without problem in this rather demanding speech event, evidencing considerable mastery by so doing.

Questions

During the interview, information was sought regarding the linguistic formation of the individual from birth to the present with particular emphasis on school and home experiences, the factors most instrumental in providing opportunities and motivation for second-language learning and maintenance, and attitudes toward bilingualism, biculturalism, and language instruction in Puerto Rico. Interviewees were also asked to evaluate their proficiency in both languages in reading, writing, speaking, and understanding, and to indicate the language(s) used with different individuals in different situations.

Let us now take an overview of their responses to these questions.

Language acquisition and dominance

Twenty-three of the 30 respondents reported Spanish as their first language. Only three reported English, and they were all born in the United States. Four claimed that they acquired both languages together (all were either born in the US or born in Puerto Rico with one or both parents being North American). All sample members reported acquiring their second language before the critical age of puberty (nine in infancy and 21 in childhood). It should be noted that learning L₂ in childhood usually meant learning it primarily in a school setting rather than a home setting.

Fourteen of the 30 (nearly half) felt that Spanish was their dominant language. These were primarily the younger members of the sample. Eleven of the 30 considered that both languages were on an equal footing in their repertoires (these were primarily the older members of the sample). Three (all under the age of 30) pointed to English as their dominant language. Two others (one younger, one older) confessed

that they honestly did not know which language prevailed, if any. As one (#04) put it, "It shifts daily," testimony to the dynamic quality of bilingualism.

Defining bilingualism

When asked what it meant to be bilingual, many found it difficult to state a simple definition until the task was broken down into the different criteria shown in Table 1. There was strong support for the criterion of fluency and the criterion of oral and literate proficiency. However, the sample was undecided as to whether regular use of the two languages was necessary, and many cited cases of individuals (sometimes themselves) who had not spoken a language for some time but were still bilingual. There was also a division regarding the bicultural criterion. Most respondents pointed out that learning a language well usually meant learning some of the culture that went with it, but biculturalism was not a necessary condition for bilingualism. The criterion of passing as a monolingual was rejected by more than two-thirds of the sample, and some openly said that this was never one of their personal goals. This is further confirmation of the belief held by most students of bilingualism that bilinguals should not be judged by monolingual norms. Passing as a monolingual appears to have been more important for some during the teenage years, especially for those who went to the US and were seeking to diminish the effects of racism.

Degree of bilingualism

All but one of the sample members considered themselves to be bilingual. (The one maverick felt that being truly bilingual was impossible,

Table 1. *Criteria for being bilingual (N=30)*

	Not important (%)	Somewhat important (%)	Very important (%)
Regular use of two languages	10 (33)	6 (20)	14 (47)
Fluency	0 (0)	8 (27)	22 (73)
Biculturalism	15 (50)	9 (30)	6 (20)
Passing as a monolingual	20 (67)	4 (13)	6 (20)
Oral and literate proficiency	0 (0)	0 (0)	30 (100)

so therefore he could not be bilingual.) All ranked their proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and understanding in both Spanish and English as being 3, 4, or 5 on a scale of 1–5 with 5 being the highest. By far, most respondents marked 5, especially in Spanish. Writing was the skill area most likely to be marked down in both languages.³

Subconscious use of language

There was a great deal of variation of responses to questions regarding the language(s) used when hurt, dreaming, praying, doing mental arithmetic, or swearing. There were no clear patterns. It appears that much of the variation is due to the people near the individual or the people being dreamed of or sworn at. (Several respondents proudly proclaimed that they were fluent cursers in both languages.)

Media

All reported watching cable television or bilingual local channels. The great majority claimed to read newspapers in English. Radio listening was primarily in Spanish, although a few reported having their radios tuned constantly to the English language station, WOSO. The general comment about reading newspapers in English was that the choice was made on the basis of the quality, variety, and completeness of coverage.

Third language

Twenty-one of the 30 respondents indicated that they had some competence in a third language. The overwhelming majority of these had studied a Romance language — French, Italian, Portuguese, in that order. A few had tackled more “exotic” tongues like German, Japanese, Arabic, Russian, and Rumanian. Virtually all indicated that being bilingual had helped to some extent in mastering a third language because of the similarities of structures or the knowledge of useful learning strategies. One woman spoke of doing mental contrastive analysis whenever she found herself in a new linguistic situation.

Code-switching

All respondents admitted to mixing or code-switching at least upon occasion, and the great majority reported that they did it daily. Three felt

it was bad and stated that they tried to avoid it, or if they did switch, they would usually signal their awareness of the switch by making quotation marks in the air or saying a phrase to explain its use (e.g. “as we say in Spanish,” or “como se dice en inglés”). The rest felt that code-switching was natural, comfortable, even fun, although they underscored that they would only do it with other bilinguals and that there were social situations when it was completely inappropriate and should be avoided. Reasons for code-switching included forgetting a word, seeking a specific nuance only possible in the other language, joking, following the lead of the other speaker, changes in topics, situations, or interactants, similarity of words in the two languages, strong emotion, and emphasis. While a few indicated that they might code-switch more when tired, the majority felt that tiredness had little effect on their two languages aside from slowing their pace, slurring their pronunciation, or causing memory lapses.

Translation

The 30 respondents were divided right down the middle between those who did a lot of translation in their daily lives for study purposes, to help friends or family, or in jobs (two were professional translators), and those who did little or shunned it. A couple pointed that if there were any disadvantages associated with being bilingual, this was one, since people take advantage of bilinguals and force them to translate.

Factors in bilingual development

Since bilinguals do not spring from the womb ready-made, it is important to know how their bilingualism develops. To this end, respondents were asked to indicate how important a number of personal factors were in their development and maintenance as bilinguals (see Table 2). Based on their indication of the very important factors (the rightmost column), we can establish the following ranked list: school was far the most important factor, followed by personal talent and travel experiences. Parents and occupation were tied in fourth place.⁴ The remaining factors (place of residence, marriage, political ideology, military service, and child-rearing) were very important to 27 percent or less of the sample. It should be noted that because of the inclusion of young people in the sample, marriage and child-rearing were not applicable to many, and because of the overwhelming female constitution of the sample, the military was not a prevailing influence.

so therefore he could not be bilingual.) All ranked their proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and understanding in both Spanish and English as being 3, 4, or 5 on a scale of 1–5 with 5 being the highest. By far, most respondents marked 5, especially in Spanish. Writing was the skill area most likely to be marked down in both languages.³

Subconscious use of language

There was a great deal of variation of responses to questions regarding the language(s) used when hurt, dreaming, praying, doing mental arithmetic, or swearing. There were no clear patterns. It appears that much of the variation is due to the people near the individual or the people being dreamed of or sworn at. (Several respondents proudly proclaimed that they were fluent cursers in both languages.)

Media

All reported watching cable television or bilingual local channels. The great majority claimed to read newspapers in English. Radio listening was primarily in Spanish, although a few reported having their radios tuned constantly to the English language station, WOSO. The general comment about reading newspapers in English was that the choice was made on the basis of the quality, variety, and completeness of coverage.

Third language

Twenty-one of the 30 respondents indicated that they had some competence in a third language. The overwhelming majority of these had studied a Romance language — French, Italian, Portuguese, in that order. A few had tackled more “exotic” tongues like German, Japanese, Arabic, Russian, and Rumanian. Virtually all indicated that being bilingual had helped to some extent in mastering a third language because of the similarities of structures or the knowledge of useful learning strategies. One woman spoke of doing mental contrastive analysis whenever she found herself in a new linguistic situation.

Code-switching

All respondents admitted to mixing or code-switching at least upon occasion, and the great majority reported that they did it daily. Three felt

it was bad and stated that they tried to avoid it, or if they did switch, they would usually signal their awareness of the switch by making quotation marks in the air or saying a phrase to explain its use (e.g. “as we say in Spanish,” or “como se dice en inglés”). The rest felt that code-switching was natural, comfortable, even fun, although they underscored that they would only do it with other bilinguals and that there were social situations when it was completely inappropriate and should be avoided. Reasons for code-switching included forgetting a word, seeking a specific nuance only possible in the other language, joking, following the lead of the other speaker, changes in topics, situations, or interactants, similarity of words in the two languages, strong emotion, and emphasis. While a few indicated that they might code-switch more when tired, the majority felt that tiredness had little effect on their two languages aside from slowing their pace, slurring their pronunciation, or causing memory lapses.

Translation

The 30 respondents were divided right down the middle between those who did a lot of translation in their daily lives for study purposes, to help friends or family, or in jobs (two were professional translators), and those who did little or shunned it. A couple pointed that if there were any disadvantages associated with being bilingual, this was one, since people take advantage of bilinguals and force them to translate.

Factors in bilingual development

Since bilinguals do not spring from the womb ready-made, it is important to know how their bilingualism develops. To this end, respondents were asked to indicate how important a number of personal factors were in their development and maintenance as bilinguals (see Table 2). Based on their indication of the very important factors (the rightmost column), we can establish the following ranked list: school was far the most important factor, followed by personal talent and travel experiences. Parents and occupation were tied in fourth place.⁴ The remaining factors (place of residence, marriage, political ideology, military service, and child-rearing) were very important to 27 percent or less of the sample. It should be noted that because of the inclusion of young people in the sample, marriage and child-rearing were not applicable to many, and because of the overwhelming female constitution of the sample, the military was not a prevailing influence.

Table 2. Factors in own development as bilingual (N=30)

	Not important (%)	Somewhat important (%)	Very important (%)	Not applicable (%)
Parents	8 (27)	5 (17)	17 (57)	0
Place of residence	16 (53)	6 (20)	8 (27)	0
School	8 (27)	0	22 (73)	0
Friends	10 (33)	8 (27)	12 (40)	0
Occupation	0	5 (17)	17 (57)	8 (27)
Travel	6 (20)	6 (20)	18 (60)	0
Marriage	7 (23)	0	5 (17)	18 (60)
Military	0	0	3 (10)	27 (90)
Child-rearing	5 (17)	4 (13)	3 (10)	18 (60)
Political ideology	21 (70)	4 (13)	5 (17)	0
Personal talent	4 (13)	5 (17)	21 (70)	0

Table 3. Type of school attended by level (N=30)

	Elementary school	Intermediate school	High school
Public	10 (3 in US)	9 (2 in US)	10 (1 PR→US) (2 US→PR)
Private	9	8	6
Catholic	10 (1 in US)	12	12
Public+Catholic	1 (US→PR)	1 (US→PR)	1
Public+private	0	0	1 (US→PR)

Type of school attended

Given the importance of schooling in the development of these bilinguals, it is critical to examine the area of education with great care. It is almost a truism at the University of Puerto Rico that public school students do poorly in English, and private or Catholic school students do better. Examining Table 3, we can see that this generalization holds up to a great extent with this sample. If we combine the respondents who attended the private and Catholic schools, at each level, they outnumber the public school students in our sample by almost 2 to 1. (This also indirectly reveals the social class of the group.) It should be noted that among the public schools are schools in the US, where the general pattern is to attend public rather than private or parochial institutions. It is also important to observe the moves indicated in the table. Wherever an arrow appears, it means that the student moved during that level to the other country. In the cases of "public+Catholic" and "public+private," we see that these are public school students in the US moving to Puerto Rico and going

into Catholic or private schools. This mobility, in all likelihood, is a contributing factor in the respondents' bilinguality.

It is important to note, furthermore, that there is variation in the language policies of the different schools. While all of the sample members who went to public schools in Puerto Rico had Spanish as the language of instruction, those in public schools in the US had bilingual or English-only training. Of those who attended private or Catholic schools in Puerto Rico, some had Spanish as the medium of instruction and others had English as the medium of instruction. Those who attended private or Catholic schools with Spanish as the medium of instruction indicated that most if not all of their textbooks were in English, so they were being exposed to the language on a daily basis regardless of the official language of instruction.

Aspirations for children

All of the 30 respondents indicated that they advocated bilingualism for the children in their lives, be they their own children, nieces and nephews, godchildren, etc. It appears that bilinguals enjoy passing on their skills to the younger generations. Those who were parents at the time of the interviews indicated the use of television, videos, books, magazines, trips to the US, and English-only times at home as strategies for producing bilingual children. Many talked at length about how their parents had encouraged them and provided them with opportunities to learn both languages, even when they themselves were monolingual. Others mentioned word games, dictionaries, rules about code-switching, books, etc., that their parents used in the home that they planned to use with their own kids. Movie-going and reading literature were also signaled as important aspects of their childhood bilingualism that they wanted to foster in their children.

English instruction in Puerto Rico

When asked about education in Puerto Rico and what could be done to improve English instruction on the island, most registered great disgust with the current situation and placed the blame squarely on the teachers, in particular their English preparation and their motivation of the students. Sample members remarked that if teachers had better training, taught exclusively in English, explained why things were the way they were in English instead of teaching by rote,

Table 2. Factors in own development as bilingual (*N*=30)

	Not important (%)	Somewhat important (%)	Very important (%)	Not applicable (%)
Parents	8 (27)	5 (17)	17 (57)	0
Place of residence	16 (53)	6 (20)	8 (27)	0
School	8 (27)	0	22 (73)	0
Friends	10 (33)	8 (27)	12 (40)	0
Occupation	0	5 (17)	17 (57)	8 (27)
Travel	6 (20)	6 (20)	18 (60)	0
Marriage	7 (23)	0	5 (17)	18 (60)
Military	0	0	3 (10)	27 (90)
Child-rearing	5 (17)	4 (13)	3 (10)	18 (60)
Political ideology	21 (70)	4 (13)	5 (17)	0
Personal talent	4 (13)	5 (17)	21 (70)	0

Table 3. Type of school attended by level (*N*=30)

	Elementary school	Intermediate school	High school
Public	10 (3 in US)	9 (2 in US)	10 (1 PR→US) (2 US→PR)
Private	9	8	6
Catholic	10 (1 in US)	12	12
Public+Catholic	1 (US→PR)	1 (US→PR)	1
Public+private	0	0	1 (US→PR)

Type of school attended

Given the importance of schooling in the development of these bilinguals, it is critical to examine the area of education with great care. It is almost a truism at the University of Puerto Rico that public school students do poorly in English, and private or Catholic school students do better. Examining Table 3, we can see that this generalization holds up to a great extent with this sample. If we combine the respondents who attended the private and Catholic schools, at each level, they outnumber the public school students in our sample by almost 2 to 1. (This also indirectly reveals the social class of the group.) It should be noted that among the public schools are schools in the US, where the general pattern is to attend public rather than private or parochial institutions. It is also important to observe the moves indicated in the table. Wherever an arrow appears, it means that the student moved during that level to the other country. In the cases of "public+Catholic" and "public+private," we see that these are public school students in the US moving to Puerto Rico and going

into Catholic or private schools. This mobility, in all likelihood, is a contributing factor in the respondents' bilinguality.

It is important to note, furthermore, that there is variation in the language policies of the different schools. While all of the sample members who went to public schools in Puerto Rico had Spanish as the language of instruction, those in public schools in the US had bilingual or English-only training. Of those who attended private or Catholic schools in Puerto Rico, some had Spanish as the medium of instruction and others had English as the medium of instruction. Those who attended private or Catholic schools with Spanish as the medium of instruction indicated that most if not all of their textbooks were in English, so they were being exposed to the language on a daily basis regardless of the official language of instruction.

Aspirations for children

All of the 30 respondents indicated that they advocated bilingualism for the children in their lives, be they their own children, nieces and nephews, godchildren, etc. It appears that bilinguals enjoy passing on their skills to the younger generations. Those who were parents at the time of the interviews indicated the use of television, videos, books, magazines, trips to the US, and English-only times at home as strategies for producing bilingual children. Many talked at length about how their parents had encouraged them and provided them with opportunities to learn both languages, even when they themselves were monolingual. Others mentioned word games, dictionaries, rules about code-switching, books, etc., that their parents used in the home that they planned to use with their own kids. Movie-going and reading literature were also signaled as important aspects of their childhood bilingualism that they wanted to foster in their children.

English instruction in Puerto Rico

When asked about education in Puerto Rico and what could be done to improve English instruction on the island, most registered great disgust with the current situation and placed the blame squarely on the teachers, in particular their English preparation and their motivation of the students. Sample members remarked that if teachers had better training, taught exclusively in English, explained why things were the way they were in English instead of teaching by rote,

provided more opportunities for students to speak in class, and showed students the advantages and pleasures of English, then students would not be so apathetic, unmotivated, lazy, and negative toward English. One respondent also pointed out that if Spanish were not taught so stiffly and defensively as a museum piece, then students would have a better linguistic base upon which to construct their English proficiency.

With regard to bilingual education as a possible remedy to the educational ills of Puerto Rico, 19 of the 30 felt unprepared to make a judgment due to lack of information. Five felt that it would not be good since in their opinions children need a strong base in one language before starting a second. Six felt it should be considered, although they felt that it would not work on a broad scale. One interviewee, who had attended a bilingual school in New York City, felt that bilingual education had helped her to improve her English, but that the level of Spanish instruction in the city schools was offensive to island-educated youngsters, as it was too easy.

Language use by domains

As we have seen, the school domain is one in which both Spanish and English were operative for the sample as a whole. However, even more openness to both languages was indicated for the domains of work and recreation. Many in the sample used English professionally as teachers, translators, workers in tourist shops or government offices, etc. Still more reported having friends of all language configurations so that recreation could be in Spanish, English, or both, depending on the friends present and the activity selected.

In contrast, more than three-quarters reported using Spanish-only with their neighbors in their communities and in their churches. With family members, the situation was more complex despite an overall tendency to use Spanish in the home. The presence of spouses or significant others, parents, or in-laws of different language backgrounds, bilingual siblings who code-switched constantly, relatives in the US, or recent arrivals from the US often provided opportunities for these bilinguals to use English in their homes. One young couple interviewed confessed that although their dominant language was Spanish, they consciously and exclusively used English with each other in order to practice the language, and they did not care what anyone else thought about it.

With these competent bilinguals, therefore, it is not so easy to pose a diglossic situation in which the two languages are kept functionally

separated by domain, as has been suggested for the Puerto Rican society as a whole (Resnick 1987).

Cultural identification

It was important to know how these bilinguals identified themselves psychologically and culturally. Thirteen of the 30 indicated that they did not feel different from monolingual Puerto Ricans. The other 17 reported feeling distinct because of their preparation and the advantages it afforded them, but not superior or distant in any way. When asked if they felt any less Puerto Rican for being bilingual, they were unanimous and emphatic in their rejection of such an idea. In their eyes, being Puerto Rican and being bilingual were in no way incompatible nor destructive of either identity.

Regarding the idea of biculturalism, however, there was some confusion and variation. Eight of the respondents did not have a clear idea of what biculturalism would entail. Nine felt that biculturalism was not possible, that one always had a base culture. Three others felt that biculturalism would be inherently bad and confusing — “I think one should be identified with one’s culture. It’s O.K. if you can move to another culture and get along, but to me, my culture is more important to me than any other culture” (#03).

The other ten members of the sample had cautiously affirmative views of biculturalism. They stated that they participated in certain aspects of North American culture (e.g. they were more liberal, direct, and time-conscious than most Puerto Ricans, and they shared certain cultural references with North Americans). Nevertheless, their general consensus was that they were Puerto Ricans at core and had merely adopted certain elements of US culture that suited their personalities. Those born and raised partially in the US tended, not too surprisingly, to see biculturalism as more of a possibility than did those who had spent all or most of their lives in Puerto Rico.

When the bicultural question was brought down to the personal level and informants were asked whether they felt any differently when they used English as opposed to Spanish, most seemed quite surprised at the question. Seventeen of the 30 said absolutely not. The other 13 were not certain if they actually changed in personality, but they indicated that they had different feelings toward the languages. In general, they felt Spanish was more natural, loving, romantic, sentimental, joking, home-like, emotional, and softer, while English was more special, businesslike, professional, cynical, and aggressive.

Advantages and disadvantages of being bilingual

All 30 respondents felt that being bilingual was a great benefit in terms of more job opportunities, greater access to world literature, broader perspectives on the world, increased social confidence, expanded vision of human culture, more possibilities of helping others, making friends, traveling, improving academically, appreciating rock music, and promoting world communication and peace. The only disadvantages cited were the abuse of their translation abilities and the fact that island-raised Puerto Ricans often mocked the speech and cultural values of US-raised Puerto Ricans and viewed English-speaking Puerto Ricans on the island as snobs or colonialists.

Application of findings

While sweeping generalizations cannot be made based on the testimony of only 30 individuals, nevertheless there is food for thought in these findings.

First of all, it is clear that the schools will have to be involved in any real movement toward bilingualism in Puerto Rico. It is very difficult to change people's family structure, social class, place of residence, selection of friends, etc., but it is somewhat easier to alter the school environment in which they learn language. If the sample members' suggestions are followed, the schools in Puerto Rico will have to give students the opportunity to use the two languages regularly in order to develop fluency in both oral and literate forms. The exposure to both languages should include access to the written and broadcast media. Second-language education should begin as early as possible, and teachers should be well trained and motivating.

The competent bilinguals revealed a receptive attitude toward languages, and many had tried third languages. This kind of attitude (noted by Rubin 1975; Reiss 1981; and Chamot 1987 as necessary for good language learning) should be fostered so that Puerto Rican students are able to appreciate the beauty and adventure of English as they do for French or Italian.

More travel opportunities should be opened up by means of exchange programs so that Puerto Rican students can use their English in real communicative settings. Schools can also foster the integrative element by providing conversational partners and taking students on field trips within the work and recreation domains so that they may see and hear English in action and use it themselves. In this way, they can appreciate both the utility and the fun of the language.

Finally, given the general political interpretation of bilingualism in Puerto Rico (which was not shared by most of the sample members), it is incumbent upon competent bilinguals such as those examined here to demonstrate how one does not stop being Puerto Rican if one learns English and that learning English is compatible with all kinds of ideological positions and goals.

University of Puerto Rico, Rio Pedras

Notes

1. The same situation is reported by Yu and Atkinson (1988) for another colonial society — Hong Kong. There the resistance to English is even more pointed because of the predominance of secondary schools taught in English, despite the fact that 98% of the population is Cantonese-speaking.
2. An excellent review of the situation can be found in López Laguerre (1989).
3. Nearly all admitted that they read more in English than in Spanish, regardless of dominance.
4. This is very similar to what was found by Andino Pratt (1989) in her investigation of eight English teachers on the island.

References

- Algren de Gutiérrez, E. (1987). *The Movement Against Teaching English in the Schools of Puerto Rico*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Andino Pratt, Aida (1989). Strategies used by successful E.S.L. Puerto Rican students to acquire oral communicative proficiency. *SABE Journal* 5(1), 64–72.
- Baetens Beardsmore, H. (1982). *Bilingualism: Basic Principles*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Bloomfield, L. (1935). *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Chamot, A.U. (1987). The learning strategies of E.S.L. students. In *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, A. Wendon and J. Rubin (eds.), 71–83. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Diebold, A.R. (1961). Incipient bilingualism. *Language* 37, 97–112.
- Fishman, J.A. (1971). Sociolinguistic perspective on the study of bilingualism. In *Bilingualism in the Barrio*, J.A. Fishman, R. Cooper, and R. Ma (eds.), 557–582. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K.; McKintosh, A.; and Strevens, P. (1970). The users and the uses of language. In *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, J.A. Fishman (ed.), 139–169. The Hague: Mouton.
- Haugen, E. (1969). *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Hockett, C.F. (1958). *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- López Laguerre, María (1989). *Bilingüismo en Puerto Rico: Actitudes sociolingüísticas del maestro*. Río Piedras: López Laguerre.
- Reiss, M.A. (1981). Helping the unsuccessful language learner. *Modern Language Journal* 65(2), 121–128.
- Resnick, M. (1987). El inglés en las escuelas de Puerto Rico: política lingüística e identidad nacional. Paper delivered at the VIII ALFAL conference in Tucumán, Argentina September 7–11.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly* 9, 41–51
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981). *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon England: Multilingual Matters.
- Stern, H.H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review* 31, 304–318.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Yu, V.; and Atkinson, P. (1988). An investigation of the language difficulties experienced by Hong Kong secondary school students in English-medium schools: II. Some causal factors. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 9(4), 307–321.