

**Historical and Ideological Differences between English and Spanish Curricula
in Puerto Rico**

by

Alison Torres Ramos

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
ENGLISH EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO
MAYAGÜEZ CAMPUS
2012

Approved by:

Kevin S. Carroll, PhD
President, Graduate Committee

Date

Judith Casey, Ed.D.
Member, Graduate Committee

Date

Ellen Pratt, PhD
Member, Graduate Committee

Date

Maribel Acosta, PhD
Graduate School Representative

Date

Kevin S. Carroll, PhD
Interim Director, Department of English

Date

ABSTRACT

This study comparatively analyzes the curricular documents published by the DEPR for the English and Spanish programs from 2000 until 2010. The documents were analyzed in terms of their similarities and differences, the content of the programs, and the cultural, pedagogical, and political ideologies that they contain. I examined the socio-political and historical context in which the documents were written in order to see how these factors influenced the content of the documents. This project was also accomplished by employing the use of critical discourse analysis, which allowed me to closely read each text in order to find the not so obvious power relationships implied within them. This research can ultimately be defined as a historical research project because I looked at curricular documents that spanned the first decade of the 21st century in order to see how their context shaped them and how they can potentially shape the future.

RESUMEN

Este estudio analiza comparativamente un conjunto de documentos curriculares publicados por el DEPR para los programas de español e inglés desde el 2000 hasta el 2010. El análisis considera las semejanzas y diferencias entre las guías para cada programa, el contenido de cada uno y las ideologías culturales, pedagógicas y culturales subyacentes. La investigación se enmarca en la teoría crítica y post-estructuralismo lo cual permite apreciar dichos documentos no sólo como guías curriculares, sino también como textos que reflejan las visiones divergentes que afronta el DEPR como la sociedad puertorriqueña respecto al bilingüismo. El estudio emplea la metodología de análisis crítico del discurso para leer atentamente todos los textos a fin de desentrañar las sutiles relaciones de poder que estos articulan. Esta tesis da cuenta de los contextos socio-político e histórico en el que los documentos curriculares fueron generados en la primera década del siglo XXI con el fin de determinar cómo estos factores influyeron en la configuración de los mismos y como podrían influir a el futuro.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible if it were not for the help and support of various people. First, I would like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Kevin Carroll, for all of the guidance, advice, and help that he has provided me over the past two and a half years. He was always there for me and was a constant source of support even when this project was in its initial stages. I would also like to thank my thesis committee members: Dr. Ellen Pratt and Dr. Judith Casey for their never-ending support throughout the writing process. Also, I would like to thank Dr. Jocelyn Geliga Vargas for her help and support during the proposal and thesis writing process. Furthermore, I thank the English Department of the University of Puerto Rico Mayagüez for providing the tools necessary for helping me complete this study and grow for helping me grow as a professional.

I would also like to thank my husband for his support throughout my graduate studies. He never objected to the countless hours spent writing this thesis and studying for my graduate classes. On the contrary, he was always a constant source of encouragement even when times got tough. Moreover, I would like to thank my friends/ colleagues who have been with me since my undergraduate studies. It was nice to be in Mayagüez surrounded by familiar faces from UPR Aguadilla. Their friendship provided me with constant inspiration and encouragement. Furthermore, I would like to thank all of my past professors from the University of Puerto Rico Aguadilla. Finally, I would like to thank God for the many blessings that I have received throughout the years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
RESUMEN	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES	ix
LIST OF IMPORTANT ABBREVIATIONS	x
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Research Topic	1
Research Questions	2
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Significance of the Topic	5
Previous Studies on the English Language in Puerto Rico	7
Language Education in Puerto Rico	9
Absence of Language Shift in Puerto Rico	10
Politics related to the curricular documents	11
Current Events in PR that Affect English Teaching.....	12
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	15
Corpus of the Study	15
Theoretical Framework.....	16
Methodological Framework.....	19
Data Gathering Process.....	21

Ethical Issues.....	22
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS	24
Historical and Socio-Political Context of the Curricular Documents	24
Standards of Excellence 2000.....	24
Curricular Framework 2003	25
Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations 2007	25
Similarities and Differences between English and Spanish Programs	26
Notable Ideologies Present in English and Spanish Curricular Documents	30
Ideologies Present in the English Program Curricular Documents	30
Ideologies Present in the Spanish Program Curricular Documents.....	33
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION.....	35
Federal Involvement in the Curriculum.....	35
Laws Governing Curricular Documents	36
Curricular Collaborators	37
Collaborators' Place of Residence	38
Number of Pages: Spanish vs. English Documents	39
Limited Amount of Curricular Modification from 2000-2010	41
Lack of Encouragement for the Transfer of Skills	42
Ideological Language Imbalance	43
Diverging Focuses of Both Programs.....	46
What Does this Study Say About How Language is Viewed in Puerto Rico?	48

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSIONS	50
Research Questions Conclusions.....	51
Pedagogical Implications	53
Suggestions For future Research.....	54
Limitations of the Study	55
Final Thoughts.....	56
References	58
Appendix A: Skills by Program.....	63
Appendix B: Ideologies.....	67
Standards of Excellence 2000: English Program	67
Curricular Framework 2003: English Program.....	69
Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations 2007: English Program.....	72
Standards of Excellence 2000: Spanish Program.....	73
Curricular Framework 2003: Spanish Program	74
Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations 2007: Spanish Program	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Page Count in each Document.....	37
Table 2: Number of Pages that Explain Teaching Methods and Techniques.....	38
Table 3: Content Standards found within the Curricular Documents.....	39

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Skills by Program.....	70
Appendix B: Ideologies.....	78

LIST OF IMPORTANT ABBREVIATIONS

SE (2000): Standards of Excellence (2000)

CF(2003): Curriculum Framework (2003)

CS&GLE(2007): Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations (2007)

E/S: English and Spanish

PR: Puerto Rico

DEPR: Puerto Rico Department of Education

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Research Topic

Throughout my teaching career, which has spanned four years in both public and private institutions across the elementary and secondary levels, I have noticed a marked difference between the teaching and learning expectations in English and Spanish classes in Puerto Rico. I have had the opportunity to teach in diverse school contexts, in various grade levels including second, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade. I also had the experience of teaching at the adult level in a local public school in Moca, Puerto Rico and more recently at the post-secondary level at the University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez. While teaching, I consistently noticed a significant difference between what was taught in Spanish classes and what was taught in English classes, not just in terms of content, which is to be expected, but also in terms of overall curricular objectives. For example, while working in a private school as an English teacher for grades 4-6, I wanted to teach my fourth grade classes about word analogies. However, since this was neither in the established course curriculum nor in the assigned textbook, I decided against teaching this topic because I thought that the students did not possess the skills necessary to understand this material. Nonetheless, a few weeks later I noticed that several of my students were discussing a quiz, which turned out to be a quiz from their Spanish class and it focused on word analogies. It turned out that the students performed very well on the quiz. This experience made me question the differences between English and Spanish class and why many educators and curriculum experts do not seem to focus on the transferring of skills from one language to another.

Moll and Diaz (1987) persuasively argue, that “nothing about the students’ language or culture should handicap their schooling” (p. 300). After reading this article I was provoked to examine how language and culture in the Puerto Rican context affects schooling. Specifically, I

was interested in studying this issue from an educational/curricular policy perspective by collecting and analyzing the various documents provided by the Department of Education of Puerto Rico (DEPR) with regards to Spanish and English programs of study in the K- 12 system.

Puerto Rico is an island of 3.8 million residents of which various positions are held regarding the role that the English language should play in education. Throughout this project, my stance was that English should be just as important as Spanish in the school system. This stance stems from the fact that Puerto Rico still maintains close ties to the United States. Additionally, Puerto Rico is surrounded by other Caribbean countries that speak English, this language is important for global communication and is the *lingua franca* of the business sector, and bilingualism and/or multiculturalism are essential skills in the contemporary globalized world (Seidhofer, 2005). Furthermore, I believe that all citizens of Puerto Rico should have the opportunity to become bilingual because of the many benefits that learning two languages can entail to the speaker in academic, social, and economic realms (Dreifus, 2011; Savoie, n.d.).

Research Questions

My research questions stemmed from my interest in the Spanish and English programs in public and private education in Puerto Rico. In my experiences as an educator, which parallel those of my peers, it is the norm for English and Spanish teachers not to build off one-another's lessons. This is unfortunate, especially in light of Moll's (1987) findings and reiterated by many scholars both before and after; students can transfer the skills that they know from their first language into their second language. This notion is mirrored by Dr. Long, as mentioned in Rodríguez Bou (1966). Long wrote a report on the condition of English education in Puerto Rico and found that "in the high schools there is very little coordination of the work of English teachers with that of Spanish teachers. It would seem that both languages would gain from a

certain amount of coordination at all levels” (p. 180). Cummins (1998) ideas and research in second language acquisition theory also confirm these findings. Cummins argues that within the process of second language acquisition there is a common underlying proficiency, which allows and facilitates the transfer of skills from a student’s first language to a second. This means that students may use their native language to help them with their target language. My goals were to closely examine an assortment of documents from the Spanish and English programs between 2000- 2010 in order to examine what differences, if any, they have and what ideologies they may appear to promote, and how they relate to the historical context in which they were written. Thus this study sets out to answer three main questions:

1. What differences or similarities exist in reference to the content, levels, and scope of the English and Spanish Programs as reflected in the curricular documents developed and circulated by the DEPR from 2000- 2010?
2. What are the cultural, political, and pedagogical ideologies present in the curricula, standards, and grade level expectations established by the DEPR between the years 2000 and 2010 for both the Spanish and English Programs?
3. How do the curricular documents issued by the DEPR from 2000- 2010 reflect the larger socio-historical and socio-political contexts in which these were created and disseminated?

For the first question, I closely analyzed the documents from both language programs in order to see what differences existed between the two in terms of content, levels, and scope. Finding any differences between the two programs is important because Puerto Rico is a language context where Spanish is still the leading and most used language despite over 113

years of American rule (Vélez 2001; Clampitt- Dunlap 2000; Fayer 2000; Algren de Gutierrez 1987).

The second question was designed to analyze the various documents written by the DEPR in order to determine what cultural, political, or pedagogical ideologies are present and to examine to what extent they affect the content of those documents. The documents that I analyzed are varied in nature because they deal with different aspects of the public school system, they ranged from different grade levels, and they spanned both the English and Spanish Programs. I chose to incorporate such a variety of documents in order to examine whether and to what extent the ideologies found in them are similar or different.

Question three was designed to analyze the extent to which the socio-historical context of the time might have influenced the discourse employed in the documents. As stated earlier, Puerto Rico underwent various political shifts between 2000 and 2010 and it indispensable to determine to what extent the different political parties that went into power imbued their political agendas into the policy work of the DEPR.

Through these questions, I was able to study the documents in a way that shed light as to what hidden agendas may have guided their publication. In the next chapters, I will discuss a review of literature that covers topics that are relevant to my study. Next, I will discuss the methodology that guided my quest to find the answers to the research questions. Moreover, I will present the data gathered from this study along with a discussion. Finally, this thesis will conclude by presenting the final conclusions of this study along with my final thoughts.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

It was ultimately my teaching experience that guided the inspiration for the research questions of this thesis. In this chapter, I will present a discussion on why my research topic is significant in the field of language education in Puerto Rico. It is important to note that there have previously been no other studies that have the same objectives as mine. Subsequently, the historical context of Puerto Rico is discussed with an emphasis on the prior research that has been conducted in my area of study. This section also includes an overview of an assortment of studies that have been conducted in several areas that relate to my research. Moreover, this section includes a succinct discussion on the role of politics in Puerto Rico and their relation to the educational policies on the island.

Significance of the Topic

The study of the history of language education in Puerto Rico in conjunction with a mixture of documents from the DEPR for the English and Spanish programs is important because there have not been, to my knowledge, any prior studies that comparatively consider the curricula of these programs. Carroll (2005), in his master's thesis from the University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez, studied the English Program *Curricular Framework* (2000) but the focus of this study did not take into consideration other documents such as curricular documents published in different years nor did it consider documents from the Spanish curricula. Other studies like Acevedo-Biaggi's (2008) thesis dealt with the creation of a particular English curricular unit in a specific grade level but it did not look to transfer the skills that students knew or were learning in Spanish into the English classroom. Torres González (2002) and Algren de Gutierrez (1987) both studied the history of English education in Puerto Rico but they did not study the curricula itself. A different study examined the language teachers in Puerto Rican public schools who taught

both Spanish and English (Comisión de Educación, 2004). The researchers examined both the English and Spanish Programs carefully and debated whether or not English should be taught starting in fourth grade (instead of beginning in first grade as it is currently taught). However, the researchers failed to consider the differences between both curricula (Comisión de Educacion, 2004). These studies center on the teaching of English in Puerto Rico but they do not comparatively consider the English and Spanish programs in terms of the curricular documents which is the objective of my study.

Puerto Rico is an exceptional island because despite having been occupied by American forces in 1898 and maintaining close political, economical, military, and cultural ties to the US, the English language has not made a noticeable imprint on the amount of native speakers of English on the island. Veléz (2000) and Clampitt- Dunlap (2000) both explain the reasons why Spanish has remained dominant in Puerto Rico in their respective studies. Both scholars found that Spanish has retained its supremacy because it was used by politicians, poets, and the media as a way of connecting Spanish with national Puerto Rican identity and English with Americanization and potentially more important, there has never been a sizeable influx of people to the island who only speak English.

Similarly, Fayer (2000) also identified the varied functions of English amongst different age groups and contexts of the people living in Puerto Rico. Fayer's main finding showed an increase in the use of English among Puerto Ricans from the early 1900s until 1990. She also found that the diverse uses of English in reading, writing, speaking, and listening has increased. Furthermore, she found that there is a direct correlation between income level and English proficiency. However, Fayer did not look at the English learning issues through a pedagogical or

critical point of view, which is what this thesis accomplished. Moreover, many of these studies were conducted over a decade ago which points to a need for further investigation on this topic.

Previous Studies on the English Language in Puerto Rico

For the purpose of comprehending the context of my study, a brief overview of English education in Puerto Rico is necessary. Algren de Gutierrez's *The Movement Against the Teaching of English in Puerto Rico* (1987) is a seminal piece regarding the teaching of English in Puerto Rico, where the author documented the multiple policies regarding the teaching of English on the island. Algren de Gutierrez argued that "the movement against the teaching of English in Puerto Rico," which she closely linked to the autonomist movement, will continue until the Island's political status is clearly defined. This "movement" is an idea that she used in order to describe the resistance that English education received on the island. Algren de Gutierrez's study is important because it relates politics and while she systematically links the role that party politics played in the teaching of English in Puerto Rico

Similarly, a study prepared for the American Council on Education in 1951 by Fife and Manuel coincides with Algren de Gutierrez's findings regarding the use of language as a political tool in Puerto Rico. They state that many Puerto Ricans in the early half of the twentieth century "nourished a feeling of attachment to Spanish culture and talked of danger threatening the language of their fathers" (p. 32). Fife and Manuel (1951) argued: "[w]hat ever the future status of Puerto Rico, it seems likely that the differences of attitude towards the place of English in Puerto Rican education will continue to play a role in party politics" (p. 38). Similarly, Veléz (2000) found a connection between politics and education and identified important reasons why little language shift has occurred in Puerto Rico. He noticed that many politicians and writers "restated the presumably natural connection between language and ethnicity" (p. 12). He argues

that before this type of rhetoric was employed, Puerto Ricans had no firm national identity. However, after the U.S. invasion of the island, Spanish soon became an identity symbol which linked language and culture.

From a more historical perspective, Morales Carrión (1983) found that the people of Puerto Rico consistently defended Spanish “as the language of the land through the struggle for identity” (p. 335). He provides two examples of poems that represent how Spanish is looked at by Puerto Ricans. The first poem, as translated in the book, that Morales Carrión presents is called “The Castilian Language” by José Mercado which reads:

Immortal tongue, my Borinquen land
is united forever in your existence.

The canon roared, foreign soldiers
set their bold foot,
and an inexorable law was fulfilled,...

This knot, which force yesterday broke asunder,
tie it, my Castilian tongue.

For a flag can be changed,
but never sentiments! (p. 336)

The second poem, also translated in the book, is an excerpt from “The Castilian Language” by Rivera Chevremont:

The language that dressed my cradle with words
is the language born in the Castilian soil...

The language-voice of the centuries-joins my word.
They shall not destroy it, for it is the best part
...The substantial, the eternal-of the whole of my race.

And my race is, in all, faith, sorrow, love, art. (p. 336)

Clearly, both of these poems show how the Spanish language is an important identity marker for Puerto Ricans. The first poem also demonstrates the importance of the Spanish language despite the United States' occupation. I believe that Morales Carrión's (1983) book is relevant to my study because my research topics deal with English education, which is a controversial subject in Puerto Rico.

Recent perspectives with regards to the relationship between politics and education can be found in Carroll (2005) and Torres González (2002). Carroll (2005) found a relationship between constant political change resulting in teacher burn-out because teachers are forced to change the way that they give and prepare a class with every change in government administration. In my study, I also examine the political context and incorporating it into the analyses of a range of DEPR documents in order to pursue further analysis of the potential correlation between political ideologies and educational policies and examine how the political climate between 2000 and 2010 affected the way that these documents were conceived and disseminated.

Language Education in Puerto Rico

Prior research on language education in Puerto Rico has not only focused on its political roots and ramifications, but also on issues having to do with teachers' language training. For instance, Torres González's (2002) book on language in Puerto Rico's history, presents data that suggest that language teachers of Spanish and English are not adequately trained to teach either language. Furthermore, the researcher found that some teachers did not possess adequate knowledge in the language that they were teaching. This finding mirrored those reported by the Comisión de Educación, Ciencia y Cultura del Senado de Puerto Rico in 2004, the Comisión found that language teachers needed better training and evaluation before becoming certified as

teachers (2004). Also, Torres González (2002) found that the textbooks and materials used in language classrooms do not fit the Puerto Rican context, which was also reported by Carroll (2005) in English classrooms. In his study of the *Curricular Framework English Program* and educators' perceptions of the document and the DEPR, Carroll found that many English teachers were unsatisfied with the textbooks that the DEPR provided for them because they were of little relevance to the students. The famous Puerto Rican author Abelardo Díaz Alfaro also wrote about English textbooks and their irrelevancy in the Puerto Rican classroom through his short story "Peyo Mercé Ensena Ingles" [Pedro Mercé Teaches English] which appeared in his book *Terrazo* (1947). In this short story, Díaz Alfaro relates how a Puerto Rican teacher is forced to teach English. The main character agrees to teach English because he needs the money not because he agrees with the school administration. The story ends with one of the students stating that American roosters sound different than Puerto Rican roosters. This story was published over a half-century ago yet it demonstrates how much of the materials that are given to English teachers are not easily relatable to the student's context. This is problematic because it hinders student learning and comprehension.

Absence of Language Shift in Puerto Rico

Clampitt-Dunlap (2000) conducted a study of the way that politicians, poets, teachers, and other public figures of Puerto Rico's history defended the use of the Spanish language. She found that Puerto Rico was a good example of language maintenance because although almost all Puerto Ricans "affirm their dedication to maintaining the vernacular, very few islanders would dispute the usefulness and relevance of English in modern Puerto Rican society" (p. 26). Thus, Puerto Rico is unique when compared to other U.S. islands such as Guam and Hawaii, because despite the acknowledgement that English is important, a language shift from Spanish to

English has not occurred in over the century since the United States' political involvement. Nevertheless, Velez's (2000) study offers one plausible explanation for this because one of his major findings was that census data revealed that Puerto Rico was a densely populated island upon U.S. arrival which made it difficult for any substantial American or European immigration to occur. English speaking immigrants have never composed "more than 4 percent of the total population" (p. 16). The scarcity of English speakers meant that average Puerto Ricans had very little contact with English. Furthermore, studies like the one conducted by Clapmitt-Dunlap (2000) show that English language resistance has been due to the political resistance that has manifested itself throughout the years following the US occupation.

Politics related to the curricular documents

This study focused on the years between 2000 and 2010, which are important in the overall history of Puerto Rico because of the different political shifts that took place. The two major political parties in Puerto Rico are the *Partido Nuevo Progresista* (PNP) and the *Partido Popular Democrático* (PPD). These political parties differ with respect to the degree of political and economical integration that they want with the United States. In general terms, the PNP party is interested in developing stronger ties with the US and their ultimate goal is to become a state in the US. The PPD is a party that wants to maintain the commonwealth status or gain complete autonomy and not pursue stronger ties to the US. Because of the diverging political viewpoints of these political parties, their views on language also differ. That is why these political shifts affect English education in Puerto Rico.

Between the years 2000-2010, several political shifts have occurred in Puerto Rico's government. From 1992-2000 Dr. Pedro Rosselló was the elected governor of PR and represented the PNP party. He had control of the government for two, four-year terms. He was

succeeded by two governors from the PPD party. From 2000-2004 Sila M. Calderón was the governor for one term and was followed by Aníbal Acevedo Villá from 2004-2008. This shift in government from the PNP (1992-2000) to the PPD (2000-2008) is interesting because both political parties have tended to view the importance of English language education from different perspectives (Torres González, 2002). English and Spanish had been the official languages in Puerto Rico since 1902 but in 1991, then Governor Rafael Hernández Colón, of the PPD party, changed the policy and made Spanish the only official language (Torres González, 2002). That change was short lived because in 1993, the new governor, Dr. Pedro Rosselló, re-instated both English and Spanish as the national languages (Crawford, 1997). Not only did Rosselló change the language policy to include English, but he started a rigorous campaign aimed at producing bilingual citizens through an educational reform plan called the “Project for Developing a Bilingual Citizen” (Torres González, 2002). However, from 2000 to 2008 the government returned to PPD rule, with governors Sila M. Calderón and Aníbal Acevedo Vilá, and they did not follow up on Rosselló’s plan despite the fact that they decided to maintain English and Spanish as co-official languages. The complexity of the politics and the effects on education stemming from these political changes make the time period from 2000-2010 a crucial one for analyzing the documents produced by the DEPR in order to see how they mirror the political atmosphere of the time.

Current Events in PR that Affect English Teaching

There are an assortment of current events that are taking place in Puerto Rico and the United States that have the potential to alter the way that English Education are viewed in the island. The Puerto Rican Democracy Act, also called HR 2499, is a bill that was approved by the House of Representatives on April 29, 2010 (Abrams, 2010). This House Bill has the power to

“effectively give the people of PR the right to vote on two plebiscites that will decide the island’s future association with the United States” (PRSSA, 2010). According to the official PRSSA website, the first plebiscite will ask the people of Puerto Rico whether or not they want to change Puerto Rico’s political status. If the majority of the citizens answer yes to this question, a second plebiscite will be held. This second plebiscite will give Puerto Ricans the right to choose between four options: Independence, Associated Sovereignty, Statehood, and Commonwealth.

However, if this plebiscite turns out to mirror the previous three plebiscites that were held in 1967, 1993, and 1998, it will not yield the results that will spur a change in Puerto Rico’s political status (Álvarez Rivera, 2011). In 1967, 60.4% of voters chose the Commonwealth option on the ballot (Álvarez Rivera, 2011). This option simply means that Puerto Rico would stay as it currently is (a freely-associated state). In 1993, the Commonwealth option was also the most popular with 48.6% of the votes (Álvarez Rivera, 2011). In 1998, the choice of *None of the Above* won with 50.3% of the votes (Álvarez Rivera, 2011). The current plebiscite could potentially reap the same results that were obtained in the previous plebiscites. However, if statehood gains the most votes, its implications for language education on the Island would be significant. This plebiscite is important for English education because if the majority of Puerto Ricans vote for statehood, then English will have a greater probability to be seen in a more positive light and it might be able to coexist with Spanish in a positive way. But, if the majority of Puerto Ricans choose any of the other choices, then English could be evidence of a perception of threat that the language may have on Puerto Rican identity. This House Bill has to be approved by the senate before the first plebiscite takes place.

This chapter gave an overview of different topics that provide a context for my study. It also provided information that demonstrated what a complicated topic English education is in Puerto Rico along with a succinct discussion on the role of politics in education. For the next chapter, I will explain the theoretical frameworks and methodologies that guided my study. These include historical research, critical theory, post-structuralism, critical discourse analysis, and ideology critique.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This is a qualitative and quantitative study that used as theoretical perspectives critical theory, ideology critique, and post-structuralism which worked together in order to find the hidden interests at work within the documents and to find the specific ideologies buried beneath them while maintaining the stance that no interpretation of a text is definitive. The methods that guided the data gathering process were both historical research and critical discourse analysis. Historical research aided in making connections between the primary texts and the context in which they were published and critical discourse analysis helped me to discover the overall themes relating to power-relations that were found within the documents.

Corpus of the Study

For the purpose of this study, a wide range of documents were selected spanning multiple topics and a decade in order to get a broad sample that represents a large part of the DEPR Spanish and English Programs. The documents are varied in nature and are all primary sources of information. Curriculum guides, curricular frameworks, standards of excellence, and content standards along with grade level expectations from both the Spanish and the English programs were also explored. These documents are all concerned with the curriculum and state what students are expected to learn at each grade level for each language class. As stated above, I focused specifically on documents regarding the teaching of the subjects of English and Spanish.

The DEPR documents that were examined are dated from the year 2000 until 2010. The documents included curricula *Curricular Framework 2003 (CF 2003)*, standards which include the *Standards of Excellence 2000 (SE 2000)*, and grade level expectations which are called the *Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations 2007 (CS&GLE 2007)* found in each program. These documents included all grade levels: elementary, intermediate, and high school. I

examined all grade levels in order to see the differences between the two programs. Furthermore, I analyzed the different political, pedagogical, and cultural ideologies that were present in these documents. The analysis of the ideologies was important in order to understand differences between the two programs from the eyes of the DEPR policy makers.

Theoretical Framework

Giroux (2003), states that in critical theory “the claims of any theory must be confronted with the distinction between the world as it examines and portrays, and the world as it actually exists” (p. 27). This means that the ideas that are in the world today must be examined and compared between what they outwardly represent to what they actually mean. He adds that one of the central values of the critical theory is “a commitment to penetrate the world of objective appearances to expose the underlying social relationships they often conceal” (p. 28). Moreover, according to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2003), the main goal of critical theory is to “uncover the *interests* at work in particular situations and to interrogate the legitimacy of those interests” (p. 28). Thus, critical theory guided me in the analysis of the curricular documents issued by the DEPR in a way that allows me to uncover the claims to legitimacy articulated in these documents and to examine the extent to which the socio-political context of the time influenced these texts. This was accomplished through the historical analysis of political developments in the years 2000-2010, as informed by prior developments, in order to discuss how politics might have influenced educational policies. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2003) state that an important aspect of critical theory is ideology critique, which “exposes the operation of ideology in many spheres of education” (p. 30). Researchers who are employing ideology critique are concerned with uncovering and examining the “vested interests at work which may be occurring consciously or subliminally” (p. 30).

Ideology critique was central to my research because I examined the assorted cultural, political, and pedagogical ideologies that were represented in the different DEPR publications. The reason why I chose to find pedagogical ideologies was because the documents that formed the basis of my thesis were educational in nature. I chose to look for cultural ideologies because I wanted to see to what extent the Puerto Rican culture influenced the content of the documents. It was also my goal to look for political ideologies because I wanted to see if Puerto Rican or US politics influenced the publication of the documents. These three ideology types worked together in order for me to draw conclusions and themes that would come up from them. This was accomplished through ideology critique.

Palmer (2003) draws from the German philosopher Jurgen Habermas to outline the numerous steps in the process of ideology critique. The first stage consists of “a description and interpretation of the existing situation” (p. 230). In the second stage, the researcher attempts to identify “the reasons that brought the existing situation to the form that it takes—the causes and purposes of a situation and an evaluation of their legitimacy, involving an analysis of interests and ideologies at work in a situation, their power and legitimacy” (p. 230). The third stage involves providing a plan to promote an egalitarian society. The final stage involves evaluating the results of the plan enacted in the third stage. My project focused on the first two stages of ideology critique outlined above. The first stage consisted of describing the current situation. I accomplished this by examining the curricular documents and relating them to the historical context in which they were written. The second stage involved examining the variety of ideologies that are present and evaluating whether the existence of power is legitimate or not. I accomplished this by uncovering the political, cultural, and/or pedagogical ideologies in the texts written by the DEPR.

My research was also informed by post-structuralism, which is defined by Hall (2001) as the examination of social construction of discourse and “the power deployed and social relationships organized through discourse” (p. 162). Post-structuralists agree that, “their own interpretations are never definitive—although they are certainly defensible (because of their supporting detail) –and emphasize that their own articulations are certainly fair game for further critique” (Hall, 2001, p. 164). I am aware that my interpretations of the curricular documents are not definitive, but will contribute to igniting and continuing discussions and further research about curricula, politics, language policies, among others. Post- structuralists ask themselves several questions when analyzing texts such as: “What are the text’s presuppositions and blind spots? What does the text assume to be unassailable ‘truth’? What foundation ... is the text so inflexibly built on that a challenge to it would threaten to bring down the entire structure of reference and meaning?” (p. 165). These questions guided my analysis of the texts under consideration.

Hall (2001) also states that “Post- structuralism is rooted in the tradition of close textual reading, and it examines the many ways that texts betray the instability and tenuous nature of their own presuppositions and sign systems” (p. 166). This was a key aspect of my research because I was trying to find the veiled ideologies present within a range of texts while making connections between them and their socio-historical context.

One of the objectives of this study was to critically examine recent historical documents from 2000-2010 pertaining to the teaching of English and Spanish in Puerto Rico. My objective in this respect was to unveil the ideological discourses reflected and represented in these documents. According to Nealon and Searls-Giroux (2003) an ideology is; “a discourse that always misrepresents concrete conditions and specific causes, trading concrete realities for

murky, vague, metaphysical explanations” (p. 84). The authors go on to explain the relationship between culture and ideology by stating that “ideology, as a network or consensus of interconnected ideas, is in some sense *both the source of cultural discourses and their outcome*” (p. 86). With regards to the intricate relationship between ideology and politics, the authors state that politicians frequently employ the use of ideologies when they generalize problems in order to cover up concrete realities. Similarly, Gerring (1997) states that ideologies become political ideologies when politicians design a concrete program of action which, for example, can be seen in party platforms. On the other hand, with regards to pedagogical ideologies, Bir (2010) states that there are “a set of assumptions or beliefs that guide the actions of educators” (p. 21). These sets of beliefs deal with “the place of teachers and students in the construct of academia... [which] guides and shapes all professional and pedagogical decisions” (p. 22). Thus, the term *ideology* encompasses many aspects including culture, politics, and pedagogy. Political, pedagogical, and cultural ideologies are the three ideological areas that will be explored later in this document.

Methodological Framework

I employed both historical research and critical discourse analysis methods in order to conduct a qualitative study of documents from the DEPR for both the English and Spanish programs. According to Rury (2006), people conducting historical research examine a combination of primary and secondary sources to seek explanations of past events. He adds that primary sources are key to historical research because they provide details about the past and help the researcher in the analysis of the time period. Secondary sources are chiefly used as a way of cross-examining the evidence found in primary texts. Borg (2006), as quoted in Walliman (2005), coincides with Rury’s (2006) ideas on historical research as he defines it as

“the systematic and objective location, evaluation, and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusions about past events” (p. 158). He mentions that historical research has great value because it “enables solutions to contemporary problems to be sought in the past ... [and] throws light in present and future trends” (p. 113). Similarly, Walliman (2005) explains that historical research “involves the meaning and relationship of events, and as its resource it uses primary historical data” (p. 113). The documents that I used throughout the data collection process and the research phase were a combination of primary (circular letters, curricula, and official publications from the DEPR) and secondary (journal articles and books) sources.

Throughout the analysis of the curricular documents from the DEPR, I also made use of critical discourse analysis (CDA). Billing (2008) states that researchers using CDA “seek to analyze language critically, exposing the workings of power and ideology within the use of language” (p. 783). According to Habermas as quoted in Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2003), “discourse analysis would seek to uncover, through ideology critique the representative forces which ‘systematically distort’ communication” (p. 298). The curricular documents might be distorted by politics, which is something I investigated. Furthermore, the authors also state that “discourse analysis requires a careful reading and interpretation of textual material, with interpretation being supported by linguistic evidence” (p. 299). Throughout the study, I carefully read each curricular document in order to uncover the not so obvious ideologies embedded in them. In the subsequent chapters I will make no claims without first providing ample textual evidence for that claim. Van Dijk (1993) states that “CDA should deal primarily with the discourse dimensions of power abuse and the injustice and inequality that result from it” (p. 107). These definitions inform and guided my project because I intended to unearth the ideologies present in the curricular documents and whether or not there is a connection between the socio-

historical and political context of 2000-2010 and the content of the documents. Critical discourse analysis ties into both theoretical paradigms that I used--critical theory and post structuralism—because of the careful reading of texts and the uncovering of the hidden ideologies and issues of power found within the text.

. The use of historical research merged with critical discourse analysis for this project might shed light on the numerous ideologies present in the curricular documents issued by the DEPR from 2000-2010 and showed how the documents relate to the larger socio-historical context in which they were created and in which they sought to have an impact. These documents are part of recent history because they were published within the last twelve years.

Data Gathering Process

The first step in the data gathering phase was finding the documents. This was easy to do because I already had access to the English curricular documents. I found the Spanish documents by searching for them in the official DEPR website. After I saved all of the documents on my computer (they were in *pdf* format), I proceeded to print these documents. I then put all of the English documents in one four inch binder and the Spanish documents into another binder. Next, I underwent a series of careful reading of the documents which spanned a range of around six months. For the first reading, I was only reading the documents casually in order to get the overall sense of what information they contained and their format. For the second close reading, I was specifically looking for the similarities and differences between the documents of both programs. Here is where I obtained the quantitative data. This data contained page numbers and number of collaborators. The third reading was where I was looking for the ideologies. For this phase, I had a coding system where I would highlight the phrases or sentences that I thought represented an ideology in the color that represented the ideology type (orange/pedagogical,

yellow/cultural, green/political). After highlighting the phrases or sentences in their corresponding color (or colors because some ideologies overlapped) I wrote the page number in a simple chart that stated the document name as the title and the type of ideology across. The page number was written under the corresponding ideology type(s). For the final reading, I had obtained a plethora of information from the previous reading so it was important for me to see how this information fit together. This led me to read both the documents and the data in order to see what themes came up from the documents. These four close readings provided the data for this thesis.

The reason why I chose to study curricular documents published between 2000-2010 is because many political changes happened during this time period. Furthermore, many changes relating to education and standardization began to take place after the year 2000, thus this time period was one where a variety of curricular documents were published. This is one of the reasons why I did not include documents published at earlier times (despite having access to the *English Program Curriculum* of 1994. I chose to focus on the curriculums that focused on grades K-12 because I thought that these were the grade levels that received the most attention in academic studies, current events, and within the DEPR. I had access to the Adult Education curriculum, but I decided not to include it into the corpus of this study because it is not as widely used as the K-12 curricula.

Ethical Issues

I did not conduct research on human subjects and all of my research was based on textual analysis. However, the issue of objectivity is one that I strove to uphold in my analysis of the texts. Furthermore, the issues that I dealt with, particularly when comparing the texts to the socio-political and historical context of the time, could have lent themselves to be controversial

if I had dealt with them in a subjective manner. It is understood that complete objectivity is a somewhat impossible goal to achieve, but I had a diverse group of scholars review my analysis of the texts in order to remain as objective as possible. However, my stance in regard to language teaching in Puerto Rico is that English and Spanish should have the same or at least similar importance in schools. Puerto Rico's political status remains undefined, but it is still tied to the US meaning that both languages should be emphasized in schools. While Spanish is more important as an identity marker and general success in public education, it is also the language of Puerto Rico, and is in no danger of language threat (Carroll, 2009). Therefore, it is my opinion that it would be beneficial to Puerto Ricans as a whole if English education, and other languages for that matter, were given more importance in public schools. Thus, the knowledge of two or even three languages has the potential to provide significant opportunities to bilingual individuals as Puerto Rico looks to reinvent itself within an ever-globalizing world economy.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

This chapter presents the data obtained from analyzing the Spanish and English curricular documents published from 2000- 2010. The chapter begins by exploring the historical and socio-political context of each document. Next, I explain the differences between the content, levels, and scope of the documents. Then, the similarities between these documents are presented. Finally, after describing the similarities and differences I present the cultural, political, and pedagogical ideologies found in the documents.

Historical and Socio-Political Context of the Curricular Documents

This section provides the data obtained from the curricular documents of both the English and Spanish programs with regards to the historical and socio-political context that the documents were written and disseminated. The documents are discussed in pairs according to the year that they were published. This means that, the English and Spanish *SE* (2000) will be discussed together before moving on to the English and Spanish *CF* (2003) and the final documents to be discussed are the English and Spanish *CS&GLE* (2007).

Standards of Excellence 2000

The Standards of Excellence of both the Spanish and English programs were written at a time when the PNP party had control of the governorship. These documents were written by the same group of people who made part of the Standards Commission. The secretary of education at the time of publishing was Victor Fajardo. The only two people that differed on the Commission were the directors of the program. Prof. María E. Jaime Ramos was the Spanish director and Prof. Gladys Pérez was the director for the English program. The English document, Circular Letter 3- 2000- 2001 appears and its main purpose is to justify why the Standards of Excellence were written for all programs. The document states that the standards were written in order to

satisfy Law 149 “which establishes the policy for public education in Puerto Rico” (p. 1). The letter also says that the *SE* (2000) was also written in order to accomplish “Goals 2000 [of] the Educate America Act of March 31, 1994 ... [and] Public Law 103-182 of 1994, ‘Improving America School Act’ ” (p. 2). These acts were a precursor to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). This is important information to note because this represents the first time when the Federal School System focused their education on Standards.

Curricular Framework 2003

As with the *CF* (2003), both documents share the same group of editors with exception of the directors of each program. The secretary of education was Dr. César Rey Hernandez was appointed by Governor Sila Calderón of the PPD. The Spanish program director was Prof. Ruth M. Flores Silva and the English program director was Prof. Nancy Velázquez Arroyo. After listing the editors, both documents go on to list the educators who collaborated with the documents. It is interesting to note that the Spanish document lists 99 educators along with their credentials and the English document only lists 32 educators, two of which have no credentials listed. Out of the Spanish collaborators, only 9 come from the western side of Puerto Rico and the majority came from the metro area. Out of the English collaborators, only two educators were identified as being from the western side of Puerto Rico and the bulk came from the metro area.

Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations 2007

Rafael Aragunde Torres was the secretary of education who oversaw the publication of the Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations (2007) for both the English and Spanish programs. Aragunde Torres was appointed by Governor Anibal Acevedo Vilá of the PPD. These documents start with an identical letter by Aragunde Torres which provides justification for the

document's existence. This particular document was written in order to conform to NCLB and to provide a guide for teachers so that students can be taught the same skills in order for them to score well on the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento (PPR) and the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Evaluación Alterna (PPEA). Similar to the previous documents, the editors are the same in both documents with exception on the directors of the programs. India C. Bobonis Pastrana is the director of the Spanish program and Prof. Pura CottoLópez is the director of the English program. There are 38 contributors in the Spanish program and 45 contributors in the English document.

As can be seen from the data presented above, the historical and socio-political context of the curricular documents found in both the English and Spanish programs vary widely in terms of political party, secretary of education, and number of contributors. However, the documents are similar in that they were written in order to comply with the established laws regarding education at the federal level.

Similarities and Differences between English and Spanish Programs

Throughout this current section I will identify the similarities and differences between the English and the Spanish curricular documents.. Additionally, special attention will be given to the differences and similarities between the content, levels, and scope of these curricular documents.

While examining the English and Spanish curricular documents in terms of general content, found several differences. The first disparity among the documents, which was the most obvious, is the difference in the length that the Spanish documents versus the English documents as seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Page Count in Each Document

Spanish Curricular Documents	
Standards of Excellence: <i>SE</i> (2000)	141
Curricular Framework: <i>CF</i> (2003)	195
Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations <i>CS&GLE</i> (2007)	112
TOTAL PAGES	448
English Curricular Documents	
Standards of Excellence: <i>SE</i> (2000)	94
Curricular Framework: <i>CF</i> (2003)	84
Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations <i>CS&GLE</i> (2007)	91
TOTAL PAGES	269

This discrepancy demonstrates Spanish curricula are more detailed than its English counterpart. Such difference may be expected because Spanish is more widely spoken in Puerto Rico than English and because it is the majority of students' first language, and thus more content knowledge is to be expected. Such detail might be needed in order to better guide Spanish teachers. However, the page difference becomes an issue when examining the content of these documents.

Carroll (2005) found that English teachers lack guidance from an established curriculum, thus they are forced to create their own curriculum with little or no experience in how to accomplish this task. In the English curricular documents, the amount of pages spent on explaining the diverse teaching techniques and methods range from three pages in the *E-SE* (2000), eleven pages in the *E-CF* (2003), and eighteen pages in the *E-CS&GLE* (2007). This means that out of all three English curricular documents, only thirty-two pages are dedicated to providing English teachers techniques, methods, and strategies for classroom use. The Spanish documents, on the other hand, have many more pages dedicated to this purpose. Furthermore, in the *S-SE*(2000) there are three pages, sixty-six pages in the *S-CF* (2003), and twenty-seven pages in the *S-CS&GLE* (2007) which provides a total of ninety-six pages being devoted to explaining

the methods and techniques that teachers can use in their classrooms. The sixty four page difference is enormous given the fact that both are language courses that comprise the same amount of course time throughout a given school year. The document with the greatest differences in the amount of pages is the *Curricular Framework*. As explained above, a big part of this difference lies in the amount of detail that Spanish teachers are provided and the various techniques and methods that they can use in their classrooms. This information is provided in

Table 2: Number of Pages that Explain Teaching Methods and Techniques.

English Documents	Number of Pages	Spanish Documents	Number of Pages
<i>SE</i> (2000)	3	<i>SE</i> (2000)	3
<i>CF</i> (2003)	11	<i>CF</i> (2003)	66
<i>CS&GLE</i> (2007)	18	<i>CS&GLE</i> (2007)	27
Total	32	Total	96

The next difference between the documents of the Spanish and English programs can be seen in the general content standards of each. Content standards represent the main focus areas that students will concentrate on while studying a particular subject. Within the content standards, the course sequence is described according to the grade level and subject. The following Table has the names of these content standards of the *CF* (2003) and *CS&GLE* (2007) of both programs. The *E/S-SE* (2000) have been omitted because the content standards are the same as the *CF* (2003).

Table 3: Content Standards found within the Curricular Documents

Spanish Curricular Documents: Content Standards	
<i>CF (2003)</i>	I. Comunicación Oral y Comunicación Escrita, Producción de Textos
	II. Discriminación Auditiva, Lectura y Observación
	III. Investigación y Tecnología
	IV. Ética, Estética y Cultura
<i>CS& GLE (2007)</i>	I. Comunicación Oral
	II. Comunicación Escrita
	III. Comprensión de Lectura
English Curricular Documents: Content Standards	
<i>CF (2003)</i>	I. Oral Communication
	II. Written Communication
	III. Reading Comprehension
	IV. Literary Appreciation
<i>CS&GLE (2007)</i>	I. Listening/ Speaking
	II. Reading
	III. Writing

As the chart shows, the English and Spanish content standards differ most in the *CF* (2003). The English version of this document simply focuses on the four strands of language (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) with an emphasis on reading (reading comprehension and literary appreciation). However, the *S-CF* (2003) includes content standards that include skills other than the four main language strands. The Spanish program is responsible for teaching students investigative and technological skills along with showing them skills that tie into ethics, esthetics, and culture. This Important difference will be discussed in depth in the next chapter.

The next aspect of the curricular documents that was analyzed in terms of similarities and differences are the specific skills that students are tested on at the end of sixth and twelfth grade in both the language programs. I decided to focus on these two grades because they represent the end of elementary and secondary education respectively. For the purposes of this study, only the *E/S CS& GLE* (2007) were compared at this level because their content standards mirrored each other the most. Despite having similar content standards, the individual achievements at the end

of sixth and twelfth grade varied widely. The chart in Appendix A compares the skills from both the English and Spanish *CS & GLE* (2007) for sixth and twelfth grade.

Despite the fact that the curricular documents from the English and Spanish programs presented an assortment of differences, some similarities exist. For example, the documents mirrored each other in the basic format that they followed. All of the documents started with introductory pages, followed by the program mission and vision. The next major section of the document was the individual content, performance, and assessment standards for each grade. Finally, the documents ended with a glossary and appendixes. This was also the case for the *CS&GLE* (2007).

As can be seen in the results above, the documents have many more differences than similarities. The impact of these differences and how they might come to play in the classroom will be discussed in the subsequent chapter.

Notable Ideologies Present in English and Spanish Curricular Documents

In this section, I present important ideologies found in the curricular documents of the English and Spanish program. The ideologies mentioned in this section do not represent the totality of the ideologies found in the documents, but a sample. For a complete list of ideologies that I identified in the relevant documents, please refer to Appendix B. For the purposes of this study, I focused specifically on identifying cultural, pedagogical, and political ideologies present within the documents.

Ideologies Present in the English Program Curricular Documents

The majority of the ideologies present in these documents view the English language as an asset and partner to the Spanish language. English and Spanish are both the official languages of PR, but as stated before, there has historically been a tendency to look at the English language

as a threat. After the careful analysis of these documents, it can be seen that the curriculum editors were careful to treat English language teaching in a non-threatening way and to stress the collaboration between the English and Spanish programs. For example, on page ii, the *SE* (2000) states that bilingualism is “part of the curriculum core for all subjects.” This phrase is interesting because it makes it seem like bilingualism should be one of the ultimate goals of all subjects (including Spanish). Nevertheless, the editors are careful to preserve the dominance of Spanish by calling the teaching of English in Puerto Rico “English as an Additional Language,” instead of a second language, which is how English is legally defined in Puerto Rico (*SE*, 2000, p. 1). In the *CF* (2003), the editors go even as far as to explain why English has not gained second language status in Puerto Rico:

A myriad of decisions and reversals, and the resulting uneasiness and concern about the success of the teaching and learning of English has had a de-stabilizing effect on Puerto Rico. It lingers on even until today... The bilingual teaching decision has always been regarded as a decision taken by an outside entity. As such, it has been rejected as having a ‘foreign influence.’ It is seen as a major threat to the very core of Puerto Rico’s cultural and linguistic identity (p. 1).

The editors also state that “Schools need to address the problem that many students and their parents perceive English as a threat” (p. 14). They also state that,

The teaching of English in Puerto Rico has long been affected by the close connection that exists between language and identity and between a person’s vernacular and his/her feelings of belonging to a specific language community. In the same way, there is also a close link between a country’s language policy and its future development - political, cultural, economic and otherwise. Once a child

has developed a vernacular language identity by school age, any attempt to modify this identity to include another language creates conflict in the second (or foreign) language (L2) learner and needs necessarily to be followed by conflict resolution (p. 6).

The authors propose a possible solution to this previously stated problem in that they argue that English should be viewed as a “second language” (ESL) but not in the traditional sense, because of its political and emotional connotations. What they mean is that English should be seen as the second language that Puerto Ricans learn after Spanish, thus the term “second language” becomes a sequential one, thus making the term ESL “less politically and socio-psychologically charged” (p. 8).

Above all, English as a second language has to be taught in a socio-linguistically non-threatening environment, recognizing [and reassuring the L2 learners and their parents] that Spanish is and will be the students’ vernacular...Collaboration between the Spanish and English programs is therefore necessary and crucial (p. 12).

The editors of the *CS&GLE* (2007) also think along these lines when they state that “each student should feel committed to the vernacular language, Spanish, and to his/her Hispanic culture, while simultaneously developing a high sense of solidarity, respect, and appreciation to other people and other cultures” (p. 14). They also mention that, “collaboration between the English and Spanish programs is crucial and necessary” (p. 14).

Ideologies Present in the Spanish Program Curricular Documents

The English curricular documents tend to point towards the importance of collaboration between Spanish and English. However, the Spanish program curricular documents go through great lengths to explain the importance of Spanish without mentioning English. On the first page of the *S-SE* (2000), the editors state that “la literatura lo conecta con la vida para que pueda valorar el lenguaje como la herramienta principal para su desarrollo profesional y el de la sociedad donde vive” [literature connects them to life so that they can value language as the primary tool for professional development and the society where he lives]. They also articulate that one of the goals of the program is

Que el estudiante conozca y aprecie la literatura y el patrimonio cultural que lo identifica como puertorriqueño, reconociendo las aportaciones de otros pueblos y culturas a nuestro desarrollo histórico, situándose, a su vez, en el contexto de un mundo diversificado culturalmente, que se orienta hacia una economía global [That the student appreciates literature like the cultural father that identifies him/her as a Puerto Rican, recognizing the contributions of other peoples and cultures to our historical development, reaching, in turn, in the context of a culturally diverse world, which is oriented towards a global economy] (p. 5).

Noticeably absent from the above goal, is that the editors fail to mention English despite its status in Puerto Rico and around the world. On the *S-CF* (2003) they also make the assertion that “Los estudiantes deben entender la relación entre lengua, cultura e identidad” [The students should understand the relationship between language, culture, and identity] (p. 47). This assertion is problematic with the teaching of English because one of the reasons why English is met by strong opposition from the general populace is because many political leaders, educators,

and writers in the past tied language to the Puerto Rican identity in a way that view English as a threat as discussed in chapter two. A general objective of the Spanish program as stated in this document is to “Afianzar los sentimientos de amor, respeto y preservación de la lengua vernacular” [Strengthen the feelings of love, respect and preservation of the vernacular language] (p. 16). They go on to state that, “La lengua tiene una función fundamental en el desarrollo de la identidad nacional” [Language plays a key role in the development of national identity] (p. 46). These ideals are also articulated in the *S- CS&GLE* (2000) when the editors state that, “La enseñanza del español obliga a reconocer el papel que tiene la lengua como herramienta de conocimiento y de comunicación social y cultural” [Teaching Spanish forces recognition of the role that language has as a tool for knowledge and social and cultural communication] (p. 1).

All of the ideologies presented fall into one of the following categories: political, pedagogical, or cultural. Most of the ideologies overlap categories as drawing dividing lines on such fluid and complex concepts is virtually impossible. Nevertheless, it is important to note how differently language is viewed in both programs. The English program generally presents a guarded and collaborative stance towards language while the Spanish program is very direct, assertive, and Spanish only.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a discussion of the data presented in the previous chapter. I begin by discussing the laws that governed the publication of the documents including the extent of the federal government's involvement with the DEPR. Subsequently, I look into the curricular collaborators and the issue that arises from their place of residence. After discussing those responsible for the creation of the variety of documents and how they represent Puerto Rico I will move my focus to some of the most significant differences between the Spanish and English programs in terms of ideologies, their focus, and number of pages. The differences in the curriculum will work to reconfirm what earlier studies have said about how language is viewed in Puerto Rico. Thus, using these findings I will provide some general recommendations for policy makers and curriculum writers in order to lessen the tension that exists between the Spanish and English languages in Puerto Rico.

Federal Involvement in the Curriculum

The *SE* (2000) is a document that represents the ever increasing government involvement with the local curriculum. Before this intervention, schools and educators in Puerto Rico for the most part had the autonomy to teach what they felt best served the needs of the students, with little or no way that the government could tell what was going on inside of the classrooms because standardized testing was not being widely used. By the time the *CS&GLE* (2007) was published, the standardized exams called Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento and Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Evaluación Alterna were already in full affect within the school system in order to conform to the No Child Left Behind Act 2001 (NCLB).

Laws Governing Curricular Documents

The *E-SE* (2000) starts with Circular Letter 3-2000-2001. This letter tells the reader the reason why this document was written. The circular letter states that the *SE* (2000) was written in order to conform to “Law 149 of July 5 [1999], known as the organic law of the Department of Education” (Standards of Excellence, 2000, Circular Letter p.1). This law “establishes that the central benchmark of education is to assure the growth and development of the student in all his/her physical, mental, social, emotional, and ethical-moral aspects” (Standards of Excellence, 2000, Circular Letter p.1). This circular letter was not reprinted in the *S-SE* (2000), but it was the law that governed all curricular programs. The year 2000 marked a time where the Puerto Rican government became increasingly more involved with the school system.

From the careful reading of the curricular documents of both the English and Spanish programs, I noticed that the Spanish program does fulfill Organic Law 149 because the standards are shown to encompass the whole life of the student. However, the English curricular documents tend to solely focus on language skills. Thus the social, emotional, and ethical-moral aspects of the student were rarely touched upon in the English classroom.

Organic Law 149 was trumped by NCLB in 2001 with the main purpose of raising school accountability school accountability by requiring all schools to give standardized test to their students and improve these test scores year over year (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). For example, New York State was now required to give their students Regents Exams, Florida gave their students the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, and Puerto Rico gave their students the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento (PPA) or the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Evaluación Alternativa. This law also required teachers to be highly qualified and for all schools to have a yearly increase in their test scores. Failure in these requirements or one of the many others

set forth by the NCLB meant added initial help resulting in long term risk of punitive measures (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.).

The PPA test began to be administered in 2002. These exams were designed to test the skills covered in the curricular documents of the English, Spanish, and Math programs. In theory, the exam should be simple for the students to pass because it covers the skills that they should have learned in class over the past year. However, as of the 2010-11 school year, 1,225 out of 1,482 public schools in Puerto Rico are under an improvement plan due to their low test scores (López Alicea, 2011). Within the 2011-12 school year, the number of schools who are under an improvement plan in Puerto Rico increased to 1,262 (Departamento de Educación, 2011-2012). The goals for the 2010-11 school year were for 83.18% of students to pass the Spanish part of the exam and for 34% of students to pass the English part. However, no grade tested (3-8 and 11) achieved more than an 83.18% in the Spanish section. Conversely, all grades scored higher than 34% on the English section with the exception of seventh grade which scored a 32% (Departamento de Educación, 2011-2012).

This trend in having higher expectations for the Spanish program over the English program can be seen in numerous aspects of the curriculum, not just in how the NCLB Act is enforced. However, this is not surprising in the sense that students in English speaking states would not be held responsible for being tested in a foreign language to meet NCLB standards.

Curricular Collaborators

The number of collaborators on the English and Spanish curricular documents varies widely in the *S/E-CF* (2003). As stated in Chapter 4, the *S-CF* (2003) lists 99 educators along with their credentials and the *E-CF* (2003) only lists 32 educators, two of which have no credentials listed. The fact that the *S-CF* (2003) has 67 more collaborators when compared to the

English program potentially shows the importance that the DEPR has towards the Spanish program. This might be political in nature because when the PNP was in power for the redaction of the *S/E-SE* (2000), the collaborators of both of the programs were the same in number. Yet, the *S/E-CF* (2003) were published while the PPD party held office. The political party is important to note because with the change in government, came a change in the number of contributors that each document was provided. This is not the most beneficial scenario for the student and the public because the political party should not influence the content of curricular documents unless it was to improve the documents.

Collaborators' Place of Residence

Across all curricular documents published from 2000-2010 for the English and Spanish program, an imbalance was noted. I found that for both English and Spanish documents the majority of the contributors came from the San Juan Metro Area (the Zona Metropolitana). This finding was also noted in Carroll (2005). This has the potential to be problematic because student experiences vary from region to region within Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico might be a small island, but its residents live diverse experiences based on local geography, industrial and/or agricultural focus as well as students' access to foreign tourists. For example, a student from San Juan (the capital of Puerto Rico) may not go through similar lived experiences as the student who lives in Utuado, located in the rural, less developed, center of the island.

This is a situation that should be corrected in order to provide the best learning environment possible for each Puerto Rican student and their teacher. The best way to improve this issue would be for educators to have the liberty and resources to create a local curriculum. Perhaps it would be unpractical for each school to make their own curricular documents, but the island can be divided up into several regions with a specialized curriculum in each area. Through

a local curriculum, students can receive an education that accurately reflects their context, thus improving student learning.

Number of Pages: Spanish vs. English Documents

Among the many differences that I found within the documents of both programs, one of the most obvious differences is the number of pages found within the six curricular documents that I studied. The Spanish curricular documents all have more pages than their English counterparts. The biggest differences were found between the *SE* (2000) and *CF* (2003) of each language program. As mentioned in the previous section, the Spanish program within these documents had content standards that encompassed more than just basic language skills. The biggest difference was found in the *CF* (2003) where the Spanish program had one-hundred and eleven (111) more pages than its English counterpart. Clearly, this shows the different weight that each language holds for the DEPR. This is to be expected in part because of Spanish's dominant status in Puerto Rico, however, these documents are just curricula meant to be used by educators to teach students one 50 minute English/Spanish class a day. Carroll (2005) found that English teachers felt that they lacked guidance from their curriculum. However, the Spanish program provides their teachers with much more detailed documents, which we can only speculate might make teachers feel they have been provided more guidance on curricular matters. The discrepancy in detail and length demonstrates the weighted importance that is given to the Spanish curriculum. Despite my awareness that official documents and curricula often do not directly influence the general population, English teachers, in particular, could seem to benefit from a more detailed curriculum (Carroll, 2005).

The length of the documents is also important because it shows how higher expectations are held in the Spanish program. From my study, I saw that the Spanish program is expected to form the core of each student's academic repertoire and it includes skills that are fundamental to all students such as culture and technology. However, these same expectations are not present in the English programs because the focus is more skills based. This is unfortunate because it is beneficial for students if both Spanish and English classes build off with one another. For example, students can read books in English class that deal with the same topics that are covered in Spanish class. Books that can be used for this are *Felita* by Nicholasa Mohr, and *When I was Puerto Rican* by Esmeralda Santiago, among others. These books talk about themes that students can relate to in both classes such as migration, culture, family, and being Puerto Rican. Student learning is facilitated when the same themes and topics are covered in both Spanish and English class.

Also, the length of the document shows the difference in teacher support that educators in both programs receive. The English curricular documents barely have any pages dedicated to describing different teaching methods to the teachers. However, the Spanish documents include noticeably more teacher guidance. This is only problematic in my point of view because it shows that much more can be done within these documents to prepare English teachers, things that are already being done with the Spanish curriculum. Nevertheless, it is possible that the imbalance in emphasis and detail is a semi-conscious effort on the part of the creators of both the Spanish and English curricula to maintain the imbalance between Spanish and English, which would then continue to secure Spanish as the primary language.

Limited Amount of Curricular Modification from 2000-2010

Throughout my years of teaching and in observations in a variety of schools, teachers seemed to always be talking about the amount of change in the school every time there is a change in governor. This was also found by Carroll (2005). However, my analysis of the curricula suggests that despite the publication of different documents every time there is a new governor, very little in terms of content changes. Through this study, I expected to see a heavy influence on political party and document content. However, throughout the years and despite several political changes, I found a limited amount of curricular modification among the English and Spanish curricular documents with regards to the scope and sequence of each program. I find this limited change to be positive in nature because curricular documents should not have to change according to the political party which is currently in power. This study found that the DEPR is just putting a new name on an old document.

The biggest change in the documents came with *the S/E-CS&GLE (2007)*. However, this change just made the scope and sequence of each program more condensed. For example, the language strand of Literary Appreciation which was present in the *E-SE (2000)* and the *E-CF (2003)* was merged with the Reading Comprehension strand. Furthermore, the Spanish content standards were changed in order to reflect their English counterpart. Before, the Spanish program had content standards that dealt with Investigation and Technology and Esthetics, Ethics, and Culture in the *S-SE (2000)* and the *S-CF (2003)*. In the *CS & GLE (2007)* both the English and the Spanish documents had content standards which consisted of Listening/ Speaking, Reading, and Writing. I find this change to be a good one because it has the potential to facilitate the collaboration of Spanish and English teachers and the transfer of skills from one language to another.

Lack of Encouragement for the Transfer of Skills

For this part of the study, I examined the different skills that should be learned in both the English and Spanish programs. I specifically looked at the *E/S CS& GLE* (2007) because these two documents showed the most similarities. I also only examined grades six and twelve because these grades represent benchmark years in the public school system (the end of Elementary school and the last year of high school). A complete chart that compares both programs in terms of individual skills can be found in Appendix A.

As stated in Chapter IV, the *E/S CS& GLE* (2007) included three content standards which include Listening Speaking, Writing, and Reading. For sixth and twelfth grade, my main finding was that the skills that students had to master for the Spanish program were not easily transferable to their English class. For example, in the Listening/ Speaking content standard, students in the Spanish class had to recognize a speaker's tone, enthusiasm, and different effects of conversation in formal and informal settings. However, this same content standard in the English programs makes no mention to these skills despite the fact that they can be easily transferred to the English language. Furthermore, in the Writing content standard, students in Spanish class are expected to recognize the influence of English and other languages in the Spanish language. However, the recognition of Spanish's influence on the English language is ignored. This discussion would be helpful for ESL learners in order to help them identify cognates and false cognates. Furthermore, technology use is discussed in the Spanish program as an aid in research and oral presentations. However, technology is never mentioned in the English programs despite many computer programs being in English as well as many web sources such as database journals. Technology is something that can potentially be used in all academic

subjects and these skills can easily transfer from one class to another. Yet, the curricular writers failed to acknowledge this.

Ideological Language Imbalance

The curriculum document writers of both the Spanish and English programs say outright how they feel about language within the curricular documents. In this section, I will discuss the ideologies and their significance as found within the English curricular documents. Then, I will move on to the ideologies and their implications as found within the Spanish curricular documents.

The English program curriculum writers take great care in presenting English as non-threateningly as possible. I found this to be interesting considering the fact that their main audience is English educators. They then continually point out how much of a threat English is viewed in Puerto Rico. This is found within all English documents that were studied. The *E-CF* (2003) explicitly states that English “is seen as a major threat to the very core of Puerto Rico’s cultural and linguistic identity” (p. 1). This is something that Algren de Gutierrez (2003), Fife and Miguel (1951), and Morales Carrión (1983) also point out in their studies. In the *E-CS&GLE* (2007), the authors state that “each student should feel committed to the vernacular language, Spanish, and to his/her Hispanic culture, while simultaneously developing a high sense of solidarity, respect, and appreciation to other people and other cultures” (p.14). It seems as if they are constantly re-iterating this point across the English curricular documents in order for the teachers to be aware with the population that they are working with and possible reasons as to why their students might be English resistant. These reasons seem valid and perhaps an educator might use this information in order to consciously lessen the tension between the two languages within the classroom.

However, I think that the *E-CF* (2003) editors did not have the authority to state that first time English learners need “conflict resolution” because of the conflict that learning English creates in the mind of the learner (p. 6). The author of that statement is not mentioned, nor do the editors back that claim up with studies that prove that statement to be true. By stating this, the editors are proposing that a compromise must be held between both languages in order for English learning to be successful. I do not agree with this because some students have English as their first language, yet they are expected to learn Spanish without educators considering “conflict resolution” for them. The editors then go on to state how English educators should treat the language as if it were an “additional language” instead of a second (despite the fact that English is legally defined as a second language in Puerto Rico). I found this stance to lack in depth as it highlights how the editors try to weaken the importance of English in Puerto Rico. If educators and curriculum collaborators continue to promulgate these ideas, the language situation in Puerto Rico might never begin to evolve into a system that promotes both English and Spanish so that they are seen not as enemies but as languages that can co-exist in harmony.

In the *E-CS&GLE* (2007), the editors state that it is very important for both language programs to work together in order to best educate students. These language programs must change the way that they view English and Spanish, in order to facilitate a collaborative atmosphere between both languages. Now, I will discuss the ideologies present within the Spanish curricular documents and their significance to language teaching in Puerto Rico.

The Spanish curricular documents take an assertive stance when it comes to discussing the Spanish language. For example, the *S-SE* (2000) states that the Spanish language is what identifies a person as being Puerto Rican. While this idea is commonly held by many in Puerto Rico, it is not an absolute truth. Many people such as myself consider themselves to be Puerto

Rican yet, learned Spanish as a second language and prefer to speak in English. This document also states that it is important for students to be able to appreciate other cultures in order to match the world economy that is forming, but they fail to mention both the United States and the English language despite the ties that Puerto Rico has with them. The *S-CF* (2003) and *S-CS&GLE* (2007) continue on to view language culture and identity in a way that sees English as a threat by constantly asserting Spanish dominance. The *S-CF* (2003) even states that one of the main goals of the program is to foster feelings of love, respect, and preservation of the Spanish language amongst students. I find that these attitudes are beneficial for forming patriotism and national identity, but these attitudes coupled with the movement against the teaching of English in Puerto Rico, it makes it difficult for the language situation in Puerto Rico to improve (Algren de Gutierrez, 1987).

Furthermore, an observation I made while studying the curricular documents was that the curriculum writers were viewing English through a *language as a problem* orientation (Ruiz, 1988). They view English as a threat to the very core of their identity and they consciously or unconsciously treat English as if it were a second class language when compared to Spanish. This language as a problem orientation has become so ingrained into the Puerto Rican psyche that it is not uncommon to find students who downplay their English skills in order to avoid being ridiculed by their peers. Instead of viewing English as a threat, Puerto Rican language planners should advocate a *language as a resource* orientation in which English is viewed as an asset in the lives of Puerto Ricans (Ruiz, 1988). This finding was uncovered through multiple careful readings of the documents, meaning that the true meaning of the documents was covert in nature. Once English is looked upon as positive skill to learn instead of as a threat, both Spanish

and English can coexist in Puerto Rico and English proficiency might potentially improve (Carroll, 2009).

Diverging Focuses of Both Programs

The data found in this study clearly shows that there is an unbalance between the English and Spanish programs. This is unfortunate because language skills have the potential to pass from one language to another (Cummins, 1998). Both the *S-SE* (2000) and the *S-CF* (2003) had content standards that differed from the English program. The English program has always focused on the basic language skills such as reading, writing, listening, and speaking. However, the Spanish program had a wider scope which included investigation and technology and ethics, esthetics, and culture (see Table 2). This is inopportune because a lot of English language issues in Puerto Rico might be resolved if students were introduced to other facets of the English language instead of just the basic skills. Students can be taught how English knowledge can benefit their lives and have workshops that emphasize real-world English use and situations. Furthermore, students can be exposed to a wide variety of literary works while encouraging their creativity by having them produce works that reflect a variety of genres. Educators can also include popular television programs, movies, and even songs into the curriculum. Students come into frequent contact with English in their daily lives, but some of them do not realize it.

Most technology used in Puerto Rico is found in English. This includes computer programs, keyboards, video games, and social media. Cable and satellite television in the home is also a major source of English. Furthermore, many Puerto Ricans will go to the movie theater to see a movie with no subtitles if necessary without a problem. I have been a witness to several Puerto Rican Spanish speakers complaining when their company provides them with Spanish keyboards and a Spanish operating system. I also have family members who have changed the

factory default of their cell phones from Spanish to English because they do not understand the phone when it is in that language (despite Spanish being their first language). Furthermore, students are increasingly using social media which is almost always provided for in English. Additionally, most of the data bases that students have access to through their library are in English. Therefore, there is much potential in including an investigation and technology content standard in the English program, especially in today's ever increasing technological world.

As mentioned previously, the Spanish program has a wider scope when compared to the English program. Another reason why I believe this to be true is because they are the only program to include a content standard based on ethics, esthetics, and culture. I believe that these areas can also be included within the English curriculum. Much of the problem that English faces in Puerto Rico may be that students are not exposed to these concepts in the English classrooms. By restricting the concept of culture solely to the Spanish program, the curriculum writers are sending a subtle message to students that culture and language are linked and therefore English is not part of Puerto Rican culture. While it is true that language plays a vital role in culture, it does not have to be regarded as the sole marker of a person's culture or identity.

By teaching students about ethics, esthetics, and culture in the English class plus other educational programs such as History, the potential for the students to begin to perceive English in a more positive light. Furthermore, these skills can transfer in from the Spanish classroom which increases the chances of there being harmony between the two languages. There is a wealth of literary resources that deal with Puerto Rican culture that are written in the English language. Additionally, the majority of students can relate to stories of Puerto Ricans who have moved to the US because many have family members who have lived there before. Therefore,

one of the keys to overcoming the language barrier in Puerto Rico lies in educating the students on concepts that match the Spanish curriculum in order to bridge the gap between both programs.

This process of uniting both language programs has begun at least on paper. In the *S/E-CS&GLE* (2007), the content standards of both programs mirror each other. Both programs are starting to teach the same skills within the language classrooms (see Table 2). However, while this integration appears in the curricular document, it is unknown whether or not this is actually happening inside of schools. As Carroll (2005) noted, educators are not properly trained in the use of the curriculum. Therefore, it is difficult to assume that when the *S/E-CS&GLE* (2007) were published, teachers immediately began to change the way that they gave class. However, I see this change as a promising and positive start towards improved language teaching in Puerto Rico.

What Does this Study Say About How Language is Viewed in Puerto Rico?

After examining the data that was uncovered by the study, several generalizations can be made with regards to how languages are viewed in Puerto Rico. The Spanish language is seen as supreme and is the language that is tied to the Puerto Rican identity (Algren de Gutierrez, 1987). While it is true that Spanish is the most widely spoken language in Puerto Rico, the people must understand that English is not a threat to their identity. Language, which became a political weapon since the turn of the 20th century, still holds power in Puerto Rico. In fact, I would argue that the “movement against the teaching of English” as described in Algren de Gutierrez (1987) is still strong today. I argue this because within all of the English curricular documents examined, regardless of what political party responsible for its writing, they all wrote of English in an apologetic and secondary fashion. These authors made sure that they did not offend anyone with the way that they wrote about the English language. Thus, despite political party affiliation,

one thing is clear, that all of the political parties in Puerto Rico believe strongly in the importance of Spanish.

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSIONS

Through the analysis of six curricular documents which were obtained from the Spanish and English programs of the Department of Education of Puerto Rico, I was able to understand the relationship that these documents have with one another and with the historical teaching of English on the island. The relationship became evident through the hidden ideologies that each program contained. Furthermore, this relationship became clear after comparing each of the Spanish and English documents to the others in their disciplines as well as cross analysis between Spanish and English curricula. Throughout the research process, I used critical theory and post-structuralism as a theoretical foundation to understand the embedded ideologies. These theories helped me to see the texts not just as curricular documents, but as documents that gave a glimpse into the real issues facing both the DEPR and Puerto Rico as a whole. My goals were also accomplished by employing the use of critical discourse analysis, which allowed me to closely read each text in order to find the not so obvious power relationships implied within them. Therefore, this research can ultimately be defined as a historical research project because I looked at primary sources that spanned a decade in order to see how their context shaped them and how they can potentially shape the future. In the next section, I will briefly review the research questions that formed the basis for my research and will provide concluding remarks for each question.

Research Questions Conclusions

1. What differences or similarities exist in reference to the content, levels, and scope of the English and Spanish Programs as reflected in the curricular documents developed and circulated by the DEPR from 2000- 2010?

The most salient finding from this research regarding the differences between the documents published by the Spanish and English programs focused on the length of each document which was quantified in total page numbers. The Spanish curricular documents were much longer in length and were noticeably more detailed. In addition to the great discrepancies in total page length, the content standards found within the documents, which form the basis for everyday teaching, were also much longer for the Spanish documents.

I also examined the individual differences that existed between the skills that students should be able to master by the end of sixth and twelfth grade of both programs. My major findings were that the Spanish program content standards were designed to encompass the whole life of the student while the English program focused on the basic writing skills of reading, speaking, listening, and writing. The Spanish program documents also provided more guidance to their teachers when compared to the English program. A lack of teacher guidance was also something that Carroll (2005) found in his study. Lastly, I found that the individual skills that each student is expected to learn by the end of sixth and twelfth grade did not facilitate any concept of skill transfer from one language to another, nor did the documents promote the cooperation between English and Spanish educators.

2. What are the cultural, political, and pedagogical ideologies present in the curricula, standards, and grade level expectations established by the DEPR between the years 2000 and 2010 for both the Spanish and English Programs?

I found a plethora of ideologies in all of the documents that were examined (see Appendix B for the full list). These ideologies pertained mostly to culture, politics, and education. While it is my belief that it is impossible to write an ideologically free document, I believe that many of the ideologies that I found hurt the relationship between the English and the Spanish programs. The Spanish program constantly asserted its dominance and importance within the lives of the Puerto Rican people while the English documents were constantly apologetic and treated English as if it were not as important as Spanish. While it is true that Spanish is more widely spoken in Puerto Rico than English, the idea that English and Spanish is the de facto official language in practice, the documents seem to continue or at least maintain the status quo of English language status in the school system which was articulated in Algren de Gutierrez (1987). This historical positioning of language as a problem orientation has had a negative effect on English and I think you could argue on the teaching of Spanish as well. If the languages were seen on more equal grounds, this would allow for more transfer between the languages and their curricula aiding students to learn their second language of English, but also better learning Spanish as they are able to reflect and master the differences between the two languages.

3. How do the curricular documents issued by the DEPR from 2000- 2010 reflect the larger socio-historical and socio-political contexts in which these were created and disseminated?

For the third and final question, I examined the laws that governed the redaction of the documents and the collaborators. I found that these documents were written in order to conform to either Law 149 or the NCLB Act of 2001. Exams like the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico were a result of increased standardized testing initiated by NCLB,

which has identified the fact that many Puerto Rican students are performing poorly in both of these important content areas.

One of the potential reasons for such poor test scores could be because there was one standard curriculum for each academic program for the whole island and while Puerto Rico is the third largest public schools system in the United States, it is much more geographically diverse than the other school systems at the top of the list. This is not ideal because student experience varies according to the area in which they live. This problem was further increased by the fact that the majority of the curricular contributors came from the San Juan Metro Area and thus are not representative of the unique geographic realities found elsewhere on the island. These findings were also found by Carroll (2005). Both Carroll (2005) and I promote the idea of a local curriculum to be written by the teachers themselves in conjunction with curriculum specialists at the regional level. Such a venture would, perhaps solve many problems faced by teachers when they have to decide how to teach their students an ever more standardized curriculum.

Pedagogical Implications

Even though my research did not study actual students, teachers, or schools, it still has some pedagogical implications due to the nature of the documents which I studied and the findings that came out of my research. A pedagogical implication that arose from my study is that teachers should be given the tools and resources necessary to create their own curricula. This way, they can better meet the needs of their students.

Another pedagogical implication centers on the idea of teacher collaboration. Schools as a whole must promote bilingualism instead of just looking at English as a single class. While it is important for students to obtain passing scores in the PPRAA, it is more important to actually

learn lifelong skills within the classroom. Creating life long learners means that teachers from Spanish and English must get together to plan collaboratively and Spanish teachers from different grade levels must meet with one another to talk about grade level expectations. This should obviously take place within the English courses as well.

The act of viewing language as a resource is articulated in Ruiz (1988) and such a switch in ideology on the part of curriculum designers could potentially aid in the way both Spanish and English are taught. By changing the way language is viewed, students could be more receptive to learning English. This project is also useful to policy makers from the DEPR because it has the potential to make them aware of the different ideologies that are found in the documents that they produce and the effects that those documents may have on the educational community.

Suggestions For future Research

This study can be expanded upon in a variety of ways. First, all curricular documents from 1990-2010 can be studied in order to see if my findings hold true if previous curricular documents were analyzed. I know that in 1994 there were curricular documents for all programs and they were all published during the time that Dr. Pedro Rosselló was governor. This is significant because he was a big proponent of the bilingual citizen project. Furthermore, other curricular programs can be analyzed such as history in order to see what affect this program has on language views in Puerto Rico. While I was teaching an adult education course in English, the DEPR provided me with a curriculum that had all of the standards for all programs including English and Spanish. It would be interesting if this document was analyzed in order to see if adult education has a different view on language and to examine whether or not my findings could be replicated with this document.

An aspect that was not examined in my study was the teacher's point of view. My study had no human subjects whatsoever and it is no doubt essential if someone were to interview educators, administrators of the DEPR, and even students to get their thought on the language issue in Puerto Rico in order to see if their perspectives match my findings. This can be accomplished through the use of interviews and/or questionnaires.

My study examined six curricular documents in a very broad way. Someone could potentially take an even closer look at the documents and examine them grade by grade and skill by skill to get an even more complete picture of the Spanish and English programs. They can even examine the political context of the time with more detail in order to see a wider scope of how politics shaped the publication of these documents. Furthermore, someone can even conduct a study where two teachers coordinate their lessons (in Spanish and English class) in order to see if the students perform better.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of my study was that this study did not look into all of the factors that shaped the way that the curricular documents were published. For example, I did not look at the budget that was allotted to each program. A program's budget is important because it can dictate the amount of emphasis that a program is given. These funds could have also provided information as to how much weight was provided to each program.

Another limitation was that I did not examine all of the documents that I had at my disposal. For example, I had access to the Adult Education Curriculum (for all academic subjects) and the English Standards from 1994, but I chose to not include them in the study. The reason why I chose not to include the Adult Education Curriculum was because I believed that it was not as widely used as the six that I studied. I did not include the English Standards of 1994

because I could not find its Spanish counterpart. I tried to locate this document through the internet, asked different teachers, and even asked some Education Professors from the University of Puerto Rico in Aguadilla and Mayaguez, but no one had the document. It would have been interesting to include these documents because they were published at a time were Dr. Rosselló was promoting the Project for a Bilingual Citizen in Puerto Rico. Furthermore, the English Standards of 1994 included ways for teachers to integrate English into all subjects. The results of my study could have been radically different if these documents were included within the corpus of my study.

Despite the limitations of this study, the results have the potential to change the way that English and Spanish education is viewed on the island. Prior to this study, there were no previous studies that comparatively examined the curricular documents of both the Spanish and English programs. This project also shed light on how the English language is viewed in Puerto Rico and confirms how Spanish and identity are tied together in a way that makes English look like a threat. The data obtained from the careful analysis of these documents provides an ample amount of knowledge that can aid curriculum developers and language planners in the future.

Final Thoughts

I hope that this study helps shape the way language program planners in the DEPR look at the language dilemma in Puerto Rico. I firmly believe that the English language should stop being thought of as a threat to Puerto Rican society, culture, and identity. It is time for the antiquated political rhetoric that has shaped the power relations between Spanish and English to stop in order to help students on their journey to becoming bilingual. Language teachers should work together and plan their classes in a way that facilitates the potential transfer of skills from English to Spanish and vice versa. Only when language is looked upon as a resource can Puerto

Rican's view of English start to change. Once this change happens, I believe that both English and Spanish can begin to coexist peacefully on the island and every Puerto Rican will have the liberty of learning English without apprehension. It will be a difficult journey, but I think that the outcome will be worth the effort.

References

- Abrams, J. (2010, April 29). Congress approves referendum on Puerto Rico future. *Boston.com*. Retrieved April 30, 2010, from http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/04/29/congress_debates_puerto_rico_plebiscite/
- Acevedo-Biaggi, F. (2008). *The Creation of an English curricular unit for 10th graders in a public school in western PR*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, PR.
- Algren de Gutierrez, E. (1987). *The movement against the teaching of English in schools of Puerto Rico*. Maryland: University Press of America.
- Alvarez Rivera, Manuel (2012). Elecciones en Puerto Rico. Retrieved Jan 15, 2012 from http://eleccionespuertorico.org/home_es.html
- Billing, M. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: The case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society*, 18(6), pp. 783-800.
- Bir, E. A. (2007). *Teaching matters: Pedagogical ideologies and success in the basic writing classroom*. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, Retrieved April 20, 2011 from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304832819?accountid=28498>
- Carroll, K. (2005). *Teachers speak out on the use of the English curriculum in southwestern Puerto Rico*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, PR.
- Carroll, K. (2009). *Language maintenance in Aruba and Puerto Rico: Understanding perceptions of language threat*. The University of Arizona. *ProQuest Dissertations and*

- Theses*, Retrieved April 15, 2012 from
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/304841610?accountid=28498>
- Clampitt-Dunlap, S. (2000). Nationalism and native-language maintenance in Puerto Rico. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 142, pp. 25-34.
- Cohen L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2003). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Comisión de Educación, Ciencia, y Cultura del Senado de Puerto Rico. (2004). La enseñanza del español y del inglés en Puerto Rico [The teaching of Spanish and English in Puerto Rico]. In *Informe sobre el idioma en Puerto Rico* [Report on language in Puerto Rico]. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.
- Crawford, J. (1997). Puerto Rico and official English. *Language Policy*. Retrieved April 5, 2011, from <http://www.languagepolicy.net/archives/can-pr.htm>
- Crosson, A., & Lesaux, N. (2009). Revisiting assumptions about the relationship of fluent reading to comprehension: Spanish-speakers' text-reading fluency in English. *Read WritI*, 23(5), pp. 475-494.
- Cummins, J. (1998, February 9). *Beyond adversarial discourse: Searching for common ground in the education of bilingual students*. Presentation to the California State board of education, Sacramento: CA. Retrieved May 5, 2010 from <http://www.languagepolicy.net/archives/cummins.htm>
- Department of Education. (2000). *Standards of excellence English program*. Hato Rey, PR: Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2000). *Estándares de excelencia: Programa de español*. [Standards of excellence: Spanish program]. Hato Rey, PR: Department of Education.

- Department of Education. (2003). *Curricular framework: English program*. Hato Rey, PR: Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2003). *Marco curricular: Programa de español*. [Curricular framework: Spanish program]. Hato Rey, PR: Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2005). *Circular letter num. 1-05-06: Directrices en relación al contenido curricular del programa de ingles para todas las escuelas públicas elementales, intermedias, y superiores*. Hato Rey, PR: Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2007). *Content standards and grade level expectations: English Program*. Hato Rey, PR: Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2007). *Estándares de contenido y expectativas de grado: Programa de español*. [Content standards and grade level expectations: Spanish Program]. Hato Rey, PR: Department of Education.
- Departamento de Educacion. (2011-2012). *Perfil del departamento de educación de Puerto Rico*. Hato Rey, PR: Department of Education.
- Díaz Alfaro, A. (1947). *Terrazo*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Fundación Editorial el perro y la rana, pp. 74-78.
- Fayer, J. (2000). Functions of English in Puerto Rico. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 142, pp. 89-102.
- Fife, R., & Manuel, H. (1951). *The teaching of English in Puerto Rico*. San Juan, PR: Department of Education Press.
- Gerring, J. (1997). Ideology: A definitional analysis. *Political Research Quarterly*, 50(4), pp. 957-996.

- Giroux, H. (2003). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*. Pp. 27-56. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Hall, D. (2001). *Literary and cultural theory*. Boston: Houghton- Mifflin.
- López Alicea, K. (2011). Transformarán 63 escuelas. *El Nuevo Día*. Retrieved Feb 12, 2012 from <https://www.adendi.com/archivo.asp?Xnum=897940&year=2011&mon=2>
- Mohr, N. (1997). *Felita*. New York: Puffin Books.
- Moll, L., & Diaz, S. (1987). Change as the goal of educational research. *Anthropology Education Quarterly*, 18(4), pp. 300-311.
- Morales Carrión, A. (1983). *Puerto Rico: A political and cultural history*. Houston: Norton.
- Moss, W. (1977). Oral history: An appreciation. *The American Archivist*, 40(4), pp. 429-439.
- Nealon, J., & Searls-Giroux, S. (2003). *The theory toolbox*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Palmer, J. (2003). *Fifty modern thinkers on education: From Piaget to the present*. London: Routledge.
- Rodríguez Bou, I. (1966). Significant factors in the development of English in Puerto Rico. In *Status of Puerto Rico: Selected Background Studies*. pp 3-35. Washington: United States- Puerto Rico Commission.
- Ruiz, R. (1988). Orientations in language planning. In S. McKay, & S. Wong (Eds.), *Language diversity: Problem or resource?* pp. 3-25. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Rury, J. (2006). Historical research in education. In J. Green, J.L., Camilli, G., & Elmore, P.B. (Eds.), *Handbook of Complementary Methods in Education Research* 323-332. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Santiago, E. (1993). *When I was Puerto Rican*. New York: Perseus Books.

- Savoie, G. (n.d.). Comparative advantages of bilingualism on the job market: Survey of studies. Retrieved Jan 15, 2012, from http://www.district18.nbed.nb.ca/sites/district18.nbed.nb.ca/files/doc/edservice/508/the_comparative_advantages_of_bilingualism_on_the_job_market_-_survey_of_studies.pdf/
- Saidlhofer, B. (2011). English as a lingua franca. Retrieved Jan 15, 2012, from <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/59/4/339.full.pdf>
- The Puerto Rico statehood students association (PRSSA). (2010). *HR 2499: The Puerto Rico Democracy Act*. Retrieved April 30, 2010 from <http://www.hr2499.org/>
- Torres González, R. (2002). Anglicanización socioeconómica, mediática, y educativa...: La anglicanización escolar y universitaria. [Anglicization socioeconomic, media, and educational ...: The Anglicization school and university] In *Idioma, bilingüismo y nacionalidad* (pp. 208-305). San Juan, PR: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2). pp. 249-283.
- Veléz, J. (2000). Understanding Spanish-language maintenance in Puerto Rico: Political will meets the demographic imperative. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 142, pp. 5-24.
- Walliman, N. (2005). *Your research project: A step by step guide for the first-time researcher* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Appendix A: Skills by Program

Skills that should be learned by the end of sixth grade as stated in the *CS&GLE* (2007) of both the Spanish and English programs:

Note: Spanish skills are translated to English from Spanish by me. The original Spanish version are found in the documents which are available to download for free in .pdf format at <gobierno.de.pr>.

Content Standard	English Program	Spanish Program
1 Listening/ Speaking Comunicación Oral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Listens and responds during a read aloud from a variety of fiction and text styles to comprehend, identify, and relate to character and setting -Distinguishes between homophones and identifies figurative language -Listens, responds to, and analyzes complex instructions and statements; applies instructions and directions; answers and formulates both closed and open-ended questions in a variety of scenarios -Applies correct language patterns to identify and organize events in a variety of narrative texts and text styles -States the main idea or topic and important details from learned concepts or read aloud of a variety of expository texts -Applies understanding to summarize the text using acquired vocabulary and appropriate language structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Narrates a variety of literary genres -Describes information about themselves -Discusses information obtained from spoken messages -Critically relates their point of view in a conversation -Incorporates images to enhance their oral expression -Recognizes the speaker's tone of voice, enthusiasm, and different effects of conversation in formal and informal settings -Compare/contrast oral discourses -Pronounces letters and words correctly -Infers meaning of unknown vocabulary from context - Recognizes paronyms -Recognizes homophones and uses them correctly -Communicates in an interview, for a report, ask ad give information -Reads out loud with fluidity
2 Writing Comunicación Escrita	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Examines spelling patterns and applies structural analysis to correctly spell words -Identifies complete sentences, fragments, and run-on sentences; uses a variety of sentence types in writing -Applies the parts of speech -Identifies subjects and objects using prepositional phrases in sentences -Identifies elements in descriptive, narrative, and expository forms of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Uses punctuation correctly -Writes legibly in both script and cursive -Understands the types of sentences -Recognizes the influence of English and other languages in the Spanish language -Organizes in a logical way information in an outline -Recognizes the parts of a business letter

	<p>writing; uses a variety of sentence types and basic organizational patterns to construct narrative, descriptive, and expository paragraphs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Uses the writing process -Applies prewriting strategies to generate ideas - Uses the dictionary as an aid in the writing process - Identifies spelling, capitalization, and ending punctuation errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Organizes an investigative report using various sources -Recognizes subject and predicate in simple and complex sentences -Uses verb tenses correctly -Produce a variety of narrative texts -Uses comparatives and superlatives correctly -Uses technology to aid in the writing process -Capable of peer reviewing work -Organizes written work in a logical manner
<p>3</p> <p>Reading</p> <p>Comprensión de Lectura</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Analyzes the text and distinguishes text features to enhance comprehension - Applies context clues, reference sources, and other vocabulary expansion strategies to assess word meaning; uses prefixes, suffixes, and root words to determine the meaning of unfamiliar and compound words -Distinguishes main character from supporting characters, compares and contrasts character traits, and describes the setting in fiction -Sorts and organizes relevant events, identifies cause and effect, makes predictions and inferences, and identifies problem and solution in narrative and expository text -Explains the differences between fiction and nonfiction; identifies fact and opinion -States main idea or topic and determines important details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Differentiates between fact/opinion, cause/effect, and real/imaginary -Recognizes the function of words and the structure of sentences -Demonstrates the comprehension of a text -Utilizes a variety of strategies for the understanding of new vocabulary -Identifies details, sequence of events, and answers complex questions about a text -Recognizes figurative language -Recognizes different literary modes -Gathers information from a variety of sources in order to carry out an investigation -Recognizes the cultural elements of different genres -Evaluates and identifies the different purposes of a text - Makes inferences, draws conclusions, and makes generalizations from a text -Analyzes characters -Understands retrospection, prediction, and symbolism in a text -Expresses and discusses themes and common connections amongst texts

Skills that should be mastered by the end of twelfth grade as stated in the *CS&GLE* (2007) of both the Spanish and English programs (Spanish skills are translated to English by me):

Content Standard	English Program	Spanish Program
------------------	-----------------	-----------------

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Listening/ Speaking</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Comunicación Oral</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Listens carefully during a read aloud, presentation, or performance -Makes connections to text - Listens and responds to synthesize, explain, describe, analyze, justify, and debate information; answers and formulates questions -Uses appropriate language structure to analyze and evaluate issues, to problem solve, to explain a process, and to express opinions integrating comparison and contrast statements -Expresses thoughts and opinions to evaluate text, debate current events, concepts, and literary elements -Makes predictions and inferences, as well as draws conclusions from listening to a variety of texts -Listens to sort and prioritize information. -Analyzes and explains the main idea or topic and important details -Summarizes, evaluates, and judges effectiveness of the text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Demonstrates ethical conduct, human virtues, and positive values while speaking -Values ethics, esthetics, and culture in works of art -Makes judgments and respects the ideas of others including opposing views -Expresses information relevant to a cybernetic text -Uses computer programs in the aid in oral presentations -Able to give spontaneous oral presentations -Gives organized discourses with an introduction, development, and conclusion -Uses images and technology to aid in oral presentations -Familiar with videoconferences and teleconferences -Identifies false judgment in discourse -Produces oral presentations based on literary investigations -Recites poems, discourses, and dramatic plays
<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Writing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Comunicación Escrita</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Analyzes and assesses word choice to convey meaning -Evaluates and applies a variety of organizational techniques to write effective narrative, expository, and persuasive essays using the writing process -Demonstrates a preferred style of writing -Uses creative writing styles to produce literary forms -Compares, contrasts, evaluates, and critiques two or more forms of writing on similar topics to write a critical essay -Organizes, synthesizes, outlines, and evaluates information to write a research paper -Demonstrates voice and knowledge of topic throughout the writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Generates complex sentences -Writes expository, cause and effect, and argumentative paragraphs -Creates and elaborates various types of curriculum vitae: ejective compendium, synopsis, and paraphrase -Able to correct sentences and paragraphs for grammar to correct errors -Prepares and outline and gives formal presentations -Writes an extensive essay using outside sources for support -Uses various esthetic and rhetorical strategies in writing -Integrates database articles, graphs, and charts in essays -Has proper knowledge and usage of Spanish grammar and syntax -Produces various types of literary texts
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Evaluates context clues, reference sources, and vocabulary expansion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Analyzes the characteristics and rhetorical strategies of public

<p>Reading</p> <p>Comprensión de Lectura</p>	<p>strategies to assess word meaning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Classifies, applies, and analyzes vocabulary as academic, cultural, or contemporary based on current trends - Argues on characterization techniques and character development using text evidence to justify responses -Evaluates the setting in fiction and nonfiction -Classifies point of view using text evidence to support responses -Classifies genre, analyzes plot, establishes cause and effect; makes connections, predictions, and inferences -Draws conclusions, analyzes and determines conflict and resolution, uses text evidence to validate responses -Distinguishes between fact and opinion, infers and supports the main idea in a variety of texts -Debates the theme or topic using text evidence to justify and validate position -Uses elements of poetry and plays to analyze, interpret, and compare and contrast styles, genres, topics, and themes; -Debates using text evidence to justify position 	<p>documents such as debates, proposals, and discourses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Evaluates the effects of tone, irony, and style of authors of literary works -Critiques the value of arguments and literary proposal -Evaluates the author's use of literary resources and language to provoke emotions in the reader -Analyzes works of different literary periods and compares the themes and resources used in each one -Evaluates the influence of philosophy, politics, religion, and ethics in different texts of various literary periods
--	--	---

Appendix B: Ideologies

Note: The Spanish ideologies are not translated in order to maintain fidelity to the original meaning of the text.

Standards of Excellence 2000: English Program

Page Number	Cultural
Circular Letter	“All the standards have been revised for the purpose of aligning the content and applicability of the core of knowledge in response to the demands of the new millennium” (p. 2).
iii	Cultural Diversity: “ethnicity; race; age and gender; origin; socio-economic status; type of family; schooling; migration; bilingualism.” This is part of the curriculum core for all subjects (p. ii).
iv	Institutional Goals: II. “A dynamic and effective educational system that takes into consideration the cultural diversity and needs of students in its educational offerings, in such a way as to make it attractive, interesting, pertinent, and adequate, encouraging both student and teacher to engage in the learning process.”
3	“The standards presented in this document will provide articulation and sequence to the vision, mission and goals of the English Program by taking into consideration the culturally diverse student population that is served.”
31	“One of the most important components of any culture is its literature.”
Page Number	Pedagogical
i	When describing the theoretical framework of the document, the authors state that it is centered on the cognitive-humanistic theory of learning and the constructivist approach to learning.
iii	“It is expected that the fusion of these elements will lead to the development of an individual that will continually construct his/her learning from a humanistic perspective, both personally and collectively. In this way, he/she will help reconstruct society and the world in which he/she lives. This humanistic approach facilitates the development of positive and productive citizens that will contribute to the socio-economic progress and development of Puerto Rico.” (Goal of the document)
1	“Most recently several approaches integrated into the Balanced Literacy Approach have pointed towards a new direction. This is the English as an Additional Language – Technology Integrated approach (EAL-TI). Standards included in this document have been based on this approach.” ... “The theories underlying the teaching of English as an Additional Language in Puerto Rico are The Natural Approach, The Communicative Approach, and the Whole Language Philosophy using a literature based curriculum. The integration of all three approaches has led to the Balanced Literacy Approach.”
3	“The English Program Standards have been revised in keeping up with the latest research. The standards have been organized into four major strands: Oral Communication, Written Communication, Reading Comprehension, and Literary

	Appreciation.”
Page Number	Political
Circular Letter	<p>“This initiative was accomplished through the collaborative efforts of a group of teachers, facilitators, curriculum specialists, university professors, business people, and other resources” (p. 2).</p> <p>“In this revision, other essential components have been preserved including: teaching and assessment to attend the needs and/or abilities of special students including students with a home language other than Spanish; competencies measured by the Puerto Rican Test of School Competencies and those required by the world of work (SCANS); the incorporation of recommendations from the State Council report on the development of the Improvement Plan for Elementary and Secondary Education of Puerto Rico Goals 2000 (1999); and the findings of the report Follow-up to the Implementation of the Standards of Excellence, produced by the Undersecretary of Academic Affairs” (p. 3).</p>
Pyramid Chart	<p>There is a chart between pages iii and iv that explains the Curriculum Core 2000. This chart only appears on this document and is written in English. However, there is a typo because under the technology section, one of the goals are “reglamentación” and it is written in Spanish instead of English like the rest of the chart.</p>
1	<p>“The Puerto Rico Department of Education through its English Program has offered an English as a Second Language curriculum since 1948-49. Prior to this, different policies had been developed.”</p> <p>...</p> <p>This document refers to the teaching of English in Puerto Rico as “teaching of English as an Additional Language.”</p>
4	<p>“English plays an essential role in commerce, communications and technology worldwide. In Puerto Rico, business and industry require employees to be able to communicate effectively in English, as well as in Spanish.”</p>

Curricular Framework 2003: English Program

Page Number	Cultural
3	“In addition, the goals of each program are grounded on students’ values and educational needs within the context of Puerto Rican society.”
5	<p>“Most people accept that adequate English proficiency provides advantages for the citizens in Puerto Rico even though Spanish is the vernacular and the medium through which most daily affairs are carried out... Importantly, English is also the preeminent international language in our ever-changing global society and the language of the information age. Moreover, English has become a language of social empowerment. Gatekeepers that permit socioeconomic mobility in this society use it as a “door-opener”.”</p> <p>“Learning English is beneficial for those who want to grow personally. It serves as a measure for increased enlightenment, social, emotional and moral development, value development and appreciation, self-awareness and self-confidence. Since culture is embedded in learning a language, learning English can assist the learner in becoming more culturally aware. Students can learn to appreciate and respect the cultures of the English speaking world albeit through a second language.”</p>
6	<p>“A myriad of decisions and reversals, and the resulting uneasiness and concern about the success of the teaching and learning of English has had a de-stabilizing effect on Puerto Rico. It lingers on even until today.”</p> <p>“The bilingual teaching decision has always been regarded as a decision taken by an outside entity. As such, it has been rejected as having a “foreign influence”. It is seen as a major threat to the very core of Puerto Rico’s cultural and linguistic identity.”</p>
7	<p>“Lugo and Medina (2003) quote Babin (1983 [sic], p. 231) who stresses that “the language policy has been at the core of the cultural struggle throughout the 20th century” (p.3).”</p> <p>...</p> <p>“According to Lugo and Medina “One of the pitfalls of the language policies that have significantly contributed to the apprehension toward the learning of the language has been the isolation of the historical viewpoint of how and why we have had to learn English in Puerto Rico” (p.3).”</p>
14	“Schools need to address the problem that many students and their parents perceive the teaching of English as a threat.”
16	<p>“At the same time, the positive values of our society need to be reinforced, taught and experienced in the English language classroom.”</p> <p>...</p> <p>“The wide discrepancies among students learning English as a second language in Puerto Rico is particularly obvious with regard to students’ socio-economic status; their needs and attitudes towards learning English; the support they get at home in this particular subject; their interests and personal as well as professional goals; and the opportunities for exposure to English outside the L2 classroom.”</p>
Page Number	Pedagogical
3	“Teachers select, evaluate and design their own curriculum (instructional design) conceptualizing the learning process to the reality of student learning styles.”
4	It is “the teacher who determines what occurs in the classroom day by day.”
5	“There is strong evidence that learning a second language also has cognitive advantages. Critical thinking, creativity, and mental flexibility are enhanced and intellectual ability is increased in the process of second language learning. In addition, language is indigenous to all learning that takes place and is the means by which students assimilate and give meaning to their experiences. Mastering two languages enriches and expands their learning

	experiences.”
7	“They [Lugo and Medina 2003]continue to point out that the educational system in Puerto Rico has been guided by two objectives, namely to eradicate illiteracy and to develop a bilingual person while preserving his/her vernacular language, Spanish.”
8	“As mentioned above, English has been taught in Puerto Rico “as a second language” (ESL)... However, by moving away from the traditional definition of teaching and learning ESL and stressing the meaning of “second* as sequential in terms of the timing, i.e., sequence of language acquisition, we can move away from the traditional concept and its various emotionally and politically charged connotations. In this way, we can clarify and establish the order of acquisition of L1(Spanish first) and L2 (English second) in Puerto Rico. Thus, a chronological sequence is established and the term ESL becomes more neutral and less politically and socio- psychologically charged.”
9	“The pedagogy must vigorously move forward towards an additive approach where the learning of English as a second language is genuinely perceived as desirable additional knowledge, which will open up new opportunities for learners, and will not be seen as a socio-psychological or political threat.”
10	“The learners’ different learning strategies and multiple intelligences are taken into consideration and addressed as well as further developed through a variety of teaching techniques and activities and appropriate materials.”
18	“In addition to its flexibility, the English Program is further characterized by an interdisciplinary approach where learning English as a second language is integrated with the learning of other subjects. To this effect, cooperation and collaboration among teachers of different subjects is emphasized in order to put this integrative approach to teaching and learning into practice.”
Page Number	Political
1	“This document is of great importance to governing bodies of the Department of Education as well as the different school boards, parents and communities when evaluating educational practices (including the curriculum) developed for Puerto Rico’s public schools.”
4	“The effectiveness of the curriculum can be assessed by measuring student academic achievement.”
5	Among the most important reasons for learning English from a social, political and economic perspective are the strong ties to the United States as a result of the migration of Puerto Ricans to the United States over the years. ... It is important to note, at this time, that English as well as Spanish are the official languages of Puerto Rico.
6	“The teaching of English in Puerto Rico has long been affected by the close connection that exists between language and identity and between a person’s vernacular and his/her feelings of belonging to a specific language community. In the same way, there is also a close link between a country’s language policy and its future development - political, cultural, economic and otherwise. Once a child has developed a vernacular language identity by school age, any attempt to modify this identity to include another language creates conflict in the second (or foreign) language (L2) learner and needs necessarily to be followed by conflict resolution.” “For a better understanding and ability to deal with the present situation of the teaching of English in Puerto Rico, we need to look briefly at what has happened over the past 100 years.”

	<p>“The time between the beginnings of the American presence in Puerto Rico in 1898 until today can be roughly divided into two periods. From 1898 to 1947, the island’s educational policy was largely determined outside of Puerto Rico by the federal government; after 1947, it has since achieved educational and policy autonomy. While English was taught in Puerto Rico’s schools prior to 1905, the educational policy set by the United States government henceforward conserved Spanish as the language of instruction. The ultimate purpose was for teaching two languages in public schools, and the so-called “bilingualization” of the people in Puerto Rico.”</p> <p>“Constant trials and challenges characterized the past 100 plus years, especially the first fifty years. The issues that were repeatedly raised and addressed throughout this time centered primarily on the following three key questions: (1) what should be the language of instruction in the public school system? (2) What should be the language of the textbooks? (3) At what age should the teaching of the second language begin?”</p>
7	<p>“Disconnection from our historical reality and the disbursement of related language policies have deepened the controversy and created a myth surrounding the teaching of English. The myth imposed the belief that learning English meant losing their vernacular and consequently their identity. These circumstances led to the learner’s resistance to visualize the possible positive consequences of acquiring the language of the dominating country.”</p>
8	<p>“Resnick (1993) indicated, that the conflict between “government planning for bilingualization and social pressure for monolingualism” (p. 259) impedes the use of the psychologically highly charged term “bilingual”. Therefore, “Puerto Rico’s language policy must acknowledge and justify the primary status of Spanish as the ancestral vernacular and the [primary] language of normal interaction in almost all domains” (Velez, 2002, p.8). However, he continues, “the official status of English [as a second language] should be recognized” because of its political, financial and economic ties to the United States (ibid.)”</p>
12	<p>“Above all, English as a second language has to be taught “in a socio-linguistically non-threatening environment, recognizing [and reassuring the L2 learners and their parents] that Spanish is and will be the students’ vernacular.”</p> <p>…</p> <p>“Collaboration between the Spanish and English programs is therefore necessary and crucial.”</p>
14	<p>“In such a learning environment, the teaching of English is not seen as a threat to the students’ first language and the dominant culture.”</p>

Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations 2007: English Program

Page Number	Cultural
14	“Each student should feel committed to the vernacular language, Spanish, and to his/her Hispanic culture, while simultaneously developing a high sense of solidarity, respect, and appreciation to other people and other cultures.”
Page Number	Pedagogical
14	“It is acknowledged that strong mastery of the vernacular language is fundamental to the effective development of a second language. Therefore, collaboration between the English and Spanish programs is crucial and necessary.”
Page Number	Political
13	“A diverse group of educators and curriculum specialists were consulted.” (For the writing of the document)

Standards of Excellence 2000: Spanish Program

Page Number	Cultural
2	“Hoy, la tecnología ha acortado distancias, llevando a reflexionar acerca de la necesidad de unión y comprensión entre los pueblos. Se precisa que el estudiante entienda la diversidad cultural y lingüística como un derecho que tienen el individuo y los pueblos. De esta manera, desarrollará una actitud de interés y respeto hacia el ejercicio de ese derecho.”
3	“Esperamos que este esfuerzo, producto de un trabajo en equipo en el que participaron maestros del salón de clases, sea de utilidad para el logro de una educación de excelencia en el nuevo milenio.”
5	“Que el estudiante desarrolle su sensibilidad para apreciar los valores éticos y estéticos y así, actuar de forma creativa y correcta para orientar su vida en torno a éstos.”
Page Number	Pedagogical
1	“Las aspiraciones del Programa, vertidas en los estándares, persiguen que el estudiante comprenda y produzca mensajes orales y escritos con propiedad, autonomía y creatividad. Además, que los utilice para comunicarse y para organizar sus propios pensamientos y reflexionar sobre los procesos que inciden en el uso del idioma. De esta forma se apodera de habilidades y estrategias efectivas para producir textos expositivos, informativos y argumentativos. Se anhela que éstos sean lectores, escritores, oyentes y observadores competentes para que analicen críticamente los mensajes verbales y no verbales, principalmente los provenientes de los medios de comunicación.”
Page Number	Political
1	“El Programa facilita que el estudiante reconozca en la lectura las características primordiales de los movimientos estéticos en la literatura puertorriqueña, hispanoamericana, española y universal. Además, que reconozca y valore los principales escritores de las letras hispanas. A ello se añade que lea críticamente los textos literarios en su dimensión sociocultural, textual y estética. Esto implica que la literatura lo conecte con la vida para que pueda valorar el lenguaje como la herramienta principal para su desarrollo profesional y el de la sociedad donde vive.”
5	“Que el estudiante conozca y aprecie la literatura y el patrimonio cultural que lo identifica como puertorriqueño, reconociendo las aportaciones de otros pueblos y culturas a nuestro desarrollo histórico, situándose, a su vez, en el contexto de un mundo diversificado culturalmente, que se orienta hacia una economía global.”

Curricular Framework 2003: Spanish Program

Page Number	Cultural
ix	<p>“No obstante, sin la participación de las familias, las instituciones comunitarias, religiosas, sociales y políticas sería imposible realizar integralmente esta tarea. La responsabilidad, en última instancia, es de todos. Podremos alcanzar el éxito en la medida en que unamos nuestras voluntades para que germine en nuestros corazones la firme convicción de que “Educación somos todos”.”</p>
5	<p>“El Programa de Español, en esta sección del Marco Curricular, valora los cambios, las tendencias, los valores y las necesidades sociales y académicas de la sociedad actual que plantean nuevas necesidades educativas.”</p> <p>“Puerto Rico vive en la actualidad la experiencia de la sociedad de la información y de la globalización de manera similar a otros países. Somos parte de ese universo nuevo, abierto, carente de límites físicos determinados de antemano, multidireccional, continuamente sujeto a modificaciones y ampliaciones y en el que, además, muchas novedades también mueren rápidamente.”</p> <p>“Se anuncia el fin de la historia, de las ideologías, de las utopías. Se duda sobre las ideas de validez universal y afloran los escepticismos. Otros problemas se presentan más acuciantes, porque son más inmediatos: los conflictos medioambientales, los psicosociales, las nuevas enfermedades, la violencia, la inseguridad, etc., todos abordados desde una perspectiva predominantemente individual.”</p>
11	<p>La acelerada modernización de nuestro país, que se da a partir de la década de 1950, tuvo como consecuencia el surgir de nuevos espacios comunicativos significativos. Entre estos cabe destacar los que abrieron, en estrecha relación: el consumo, los medios de comunicación masiva, la tecnología de las comunicaciones y el mundo del espectáculo (tanto artístico como deportivo). La interacción en la televisión y de los espectadores con ella, en el cine, en la prensa, en el concierto, en el centro comercial (mall), etc. ha adquirido un peso cada vez mayor en la formación de la competencia comunicativa de las nuevas generaciones. Desde luego, el surgimiento y fortalecimiento de estos espacios se lleva a cabo parcialmente a costa de los tradicionales, la escuela incluida. Por supuesto, los espacios tradicionales no han permanecido ajenos a estas nuevas influencias; en el hogar se introduce el caballo de Troya de la prensa, la televisión y la tecnología de la comunicación. Así por ejemplo, es precisamente en su seno donde los niños son introducidos, incluso antes de que comiencen a hablar, al mundo de la televisión.</p>
16	<p>General objectives of Spanish Program: “Analizar, comprender e interpretar los valores literarios, éticos, estéticos y culturales encarnados en las obras y autores representativos de las letras puertorriqueñas, latinoamericanas y españolas, de ayer y de hoy.”</p>
19	<p>“Como parte de la cultura, el lenguaje cumple dos funciones esenciales: 1) sirve de medio de comunicación e interacción social y 2) sirve de base esencial para construir el conocimiento y para representar, categorizar e interpretar la realidad.”</p>
45	<p>“La enseñanza de la lengua vernácula es inseparable del proceso de construcción de la identidad lingüístico-cultural de la persona.”</p>
47	<p>“Los estudiantes deben entender la relación entre lengua, cultura e identidad.”</p>
Page Number	Pedagogical
ix	<p>“La Educación, y por consiguiente la escuela, ocupa un lugar fundamental en el mejoramiento de la calidad de vida de la sociedad puertorriqueña. Para construir un país mejor necesitamos jóvenes que posean una educación sólida, producto de su formación al amparo de un sistema</p>

	educativo de alta calidad.”
2	“En este sentido, el Marco Curricular es el documento que sirve de base y marco de referencia para la elaboración del currículo en los diferentes niveles de concreción
Page Number	Political
5	“Vivimos tiempos en los que se alteran las relaciones de poder, las identidades sociales, los sistemas de representación, los equilibrios naturales.”
8	<p>One of the eight educational needs of students as outlined in the document is called: “2. El desarrollo de la identidad cultural y nacional.”</p> <p>“La competencia comunicativa, es decir, el dominio de las actitudes y capacidades para entender, valorar y manejar reflexiva y creativamente la lengua es mucho más que un mero instrumento de comunicación. La lengua y la competencia comunicativa son fundamentales en la conformación de una comunidad, desde la pareja hasta la humanidad entera. La cultura lingüística contribuye a estructurar la sociedad, acompaña su historia y forma parte de su identidad. La lengua constituye el medio privilegiado de comunicación, ya que posibilita los intercambios más complejos y la interacción social propiamente humana y, a través de ellos, regula la conducta propia y la ajena. Por medio de la lengua, las personas se apropian de las imágenes compartidas del mundo, de los saberes socialmente convalidados e históricamente acumulados. La competencia lingüística es posibilitadora de la conciencia y de la identidad de un pueblo.”</p>
13	“El Programa de Español aspira a lograr que el estudiante domine el conjunto de las funciones del lenguaje y la comunicación de forma reflexiva, crítica y creativa. Que además, este asuma una actitud de compromiso con su cultura y con su lengua vernácula, y desarrolle una conciencia individual y colectiva, así como unas señas de identidad y sentido de trascendencia que le permitan convertirse en un ente práctico, sensible y colaborador, capaz de aprovechar la vida plenamente y de servir a la sociedad de la cual forma parte.”
15	Que el estudiante: “Asuma el proyecto de su autodesarrollo pleno, de modo tal que integre su formación espiritual, intelectual, emocional, moral, cultural y social con el estudio de su lengua vernácula.” (Goals of Spanish Program)
16	General objectives of Spanish Program: “1. Afianzar los sentimientos de amor, respeto y preservación de la lengua vernacular.”
20	“Desde esta perspectiva, las lenguas vernáculas no se entienden solamente como sistemas de signos regidos por reglas socialmente compartidas, sino también como patrimonios culturales y constructoras de saberes políticos, ideológicos, culturales o estéticos determinados.”
45	“Ser puertorriqueño implica sentirse y saberse nacido en Puerto Rico. Sentir esta tierra como el punto de partida que lo orienta en el camino de la vida.”
46	<p>“Ser puertorriqueño es también sentirse y saberse miembro de una colectividad humana que llamamos pueblo; definirse en el marco de una identidad colectiva de la cual nos sentimos orgullosos; formar parte de una comunidad histórico cultural desde la que nos proyectamos hacia el futuro, en la que nos formamos y que nos da sentido de identidad, frente a otras comunidades geográficas e histórico-culturales.”</p> <p>“Ser puertorriqueño es, además, identificarse con una cultura, entendida ésta como la totalidad de las creencias aprendidas, herramientas y tradiciones compartidas por un grupo de humanos para dar continuidad, orden y significado a sus vidas (García, 1992). Se trata de compartir una lengua, una identidad étnica, una fe religiosa, una localización geográfica, una historia común; una especie de todo estructurado, de modo de pensar, actuar y creer que proporciona a la colectividad puertorriqueña respuestas a los problemas del entorno, asegurando la cohesión entre sus miembros. La cultura es, sobre todo, comunicación.”</p>

	<p>“Ser puertorriqueño es también expresar una historia de vida colectiva y compartida.”</p> <p>“La lengua tiene una función fundamental en el desarrollo de la identidad nacional.”</p>
54	<p>“La educación ha de respetar los estilos propios que representan las diversas comunidades sociolingüísticas. Debe potenciarse y protegerse, en la enseñanza del español, la rica variedad de estilos y repertorios lingüísticos que enriquecen la lengua puertorriqueña. Pero, a la vez, deben eliminarse del hecho educativo aquellas formas de lenguaje que reflejen prejuicios de clase social, género o raza, por presuponer la asimilación de estereotipos sociales falsos. Los estudiantes deben ser capaces de reflexionar sobre el hecho de que el lenguaje impone formas de ver e interpretar la realidad, no siempre justificadas, y que hay diferencia entre “decir” y “poder decir”.”</p>

Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations 2007: Spanish Program

Page Number	Cultural
1	“La enseñanza del español obliga a reconocer el papel que tiene la lengua como herramienta de conocimiento y de comunicación social y cultural.”
Page Number	Pedagogical
1	“El lenguaje, por lo tanto, tiene una función constructiva del pensamiento además de constituir un sistema culturalmente más elaborado para la comunicación en el entorno social. La integración social del individuo, así como de su desarrollo cognitivo, estará condicionada por el grado de dominio y uso de los diversos sistemas existentes.”
2	“El establecimiento de estándares educativos permite medir la calidad educativa que los estudiantes reciben en la sala de clases. De igual forma, permite evaluar el sistema educativo en su totalidad utilizando los resultados de las evaluaciones para tomar decisiones que incidan y propicien el mejoramiento del proceso educativo. La búsqueda de la calidad es un proceso que debe ser supervisado y los estándares proporcionan las herramientas necesarias para llevar a cabo tal proceso.”
Page Number	Political
1	“El documento Estándares y expectativas de grado responde a un requerimiento que establece la Ley Federal de Educación “No Child Left Behind”, NCLB 2001. El mismo, indica los conceptos y destrezas que el estudiante debe dominar por grado. A su vez, establece los parámetros a considerar al producir las Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico (PPAA).”