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HistoryMiami
This case study examines students of Cuban descent at a school that exemplifies the often overlooked phenomenon of Cuban Catholic schools and their persistence in contemporary Miami. These Cuban Catholic schools serve as an educational and cultural institution that promotes distinct concepts of acculturation not observed elsewhere. Miami stands out for its Cuban and, more recently, pan-Hispanic influences.

This study first incorporates archival data to chronicle the changes that Cuban Catholic schools faced during prerevolutionary Cuba, their “transplant” to Miami in the 1960s (Jorge Suchlicki and Leyva de Varona 1991) and their evolution to pan-Hispanic influences in the 1990s and 2000s. The research then incorporates survey data to determine how students of Cuban descent perceive their ethnic identity and what attitudes they hold towards the English and Spanish languages. The surveys will also compare the ethnic identities and perceived language attitudes of Cuban-immigrant youth and their parents to examine intergenerational differences. Lastly, the surveys will compare the perceived ethnic identities and language attitudes of students of Cuban descent, and students of non-Cuban Spanish-speaking descent from Latin America and the Caribbean, to determine intragenerational differences. Ultimately, the research asserts that students of Cuban descent are acculturating to American
mainstream society, but they are doing so within the unique context of a Cuban and 
pan-Hispanic Miami.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview

In the early 1960s, thousands of elite Cubans migrated to Miami in exile in order to escape Communist Cuba (Croucher 1998; Nijman 2011; Resnick 1988; Portes and Rumabut 1996). Among those who came, there were teachers, administrators, priests, parents, and students alike affiliated with Catholic schools in Cuba that were uprooted after the Castro regime nationalized all private schools in 1961 (Sonreia 1997b). In an effort to preserve these schools, they were “transplanted” from Cuba to Miami during this initial wave of the Cuban diaspora (Jorge Suchlicki and Leyva de Varona 1991). Since their arrival into the US, however, their identity has often been conflicted. While the private schools maintained a strong Cuban presence, based on the strength of the Cuban co-exile community (Portes and Rumbaut 2001), they were also mandated by the Archbishop of Miami to implement an English-language curriculum (Jorge, Suchlicki and Leyva de Varona 1991; Poyo 2007). This conflict of Cuban and American influences arises with the students’ oral bilingualism (English/Spanish). While evidence has shown that Cuban students attending private schools, particularly those within the Cuban co-exile community, are more likely to be proficient in Spanish than Cubans attending public schools, the students’ English language preference is marked in the literature (Porcel 2006; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Meanwhile, as Cuban Catholic schools have remained in Miami, they have been undoubtedly subjected to the processes of Hispanicization (Boswell 1994), as the city has attracted more immigrants from across Latin America and the Caribbean since as early as the 1980s. Over fifty years have...
passed since these unique schools that received support from the Cuban co-ethnic exile community were “transplanted” to Miami, and yet they remain absent from academic literature, meriting their study.

This study seeks to explain how students of Cuban descent attending a Cuban Catholic school in Miami have selectively acculturated to retain their heritage culture and language (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Schools such as this one provide students of Cuban descent a unique opportunity to embrace both their Cuban heritage and non-Anglo culture. The study asserts that the students retain a symbolic attachment to a Cuban identity, or *la cubanidad*, i.e. the values, customs, norms and beliefs of the Cuban co-ethnic community in Miami (García 1990). However, the study maintains that the Cuban identity that the students have retained is not one that is shaped in Cuba, but rather, in Cuban Miami. The study then argues that students of Cuban descent have acculturated to American mainstream society, mainly through loyalty to the English language. Lastly, the study claims that there is a third force of acculturation not previously mentioned in academic literature relating to acculturation that the students are experiencing. The thesis shows that the students of Cuban descent are acculturating to a unique Cuban and pan-Hispanic Miami context.

The research is incorporated into four chapters. The first chapter contextualizes Cuban Catholic schools in Cuba, as well as within the historical, political, economic, and social context of Miami. The second chapter examines Spanish language use of students of Cuban descent, students of non-Cuban Spanish-speaking descent, and parents of Cuban descent. The third chapter analyzes ethnic self-identification and pan-Hispanic preferences among students of Cuban descent, students of non-Cuban Spanish-speaking
descent, and parents of Cuban descent. The fourth chapter gauges English and Spanish language attitudes prevalent among the students to determine current and future acculturation trends among Cuban and non-Cuban friends alike.

**Research Questions**

This research seeks to address three fundamental questions related to acculturation of Cuban immigrant youth at the Cuban Catholic school under study:

1) How have students of Cuban descent maintained a Cuban identity?

2) How have students of Cuban descent accepted a mainstream American identity?

3) How have the identities of students of Cuban descent been influenced by the Hispanicization of Miami?
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Processes of Acculturation

The processes underlying acculturation, particularly in relation to Cubans in Miami, have been debated. Szapocznik and Hernandez (1988) hypothesized that Cubans have undergone a three-tiered process of biculturation, which incorporates acculturation to the mainstream Anglo society; retention of Cuban heritage; and the syncretization of the acquired Anglo culture and retained Cuban culture. Portes and Rumbaut, in their book *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation* (2001), advance the ideas set forth by Szapocznik and Hernandez (1988) regarding acculturation and assimilation processes experienced by contemporary second generation youth in the US. According to them, acculturation is based on how the second-generation adjust to the language and customs of the host country. The process of acculturation—consonant, dissociative or selective—can serve as a precursor to whether an immigrant is assimilated “upwards” or “downwards” into a society (53-54). Thus, not every immigrant is structurally incorporated into society in the same manner in terms of his/her linguistic and cultural assimilation (Linton 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

The ideal mode of acculturation undoubtedly is selective acculturation, which is when the second generation is successfully able to embrace the language, culture and customs of both their ethnic background and the host country. Youth with parents that not only have high human and social capital but are surrounded by a tight-knit co-ethnic community are more likely to selectively acculturate, which delays certain Americanization processes such as becoming monolingual English speakers. What
distinguishes selective acculturation from other theories on immigrant incorporation is how it is achieved through the influence of their parents, their families and their surrounding communities (Portes and Rivas 2011; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). In other words, the decision to maintain ties to their ethnic language, customs and overall heritage does not stem from the children’s agency, but from the co-ethnic community. According to Portes and Rumbaut (2001), American mainstream culture is extremely overpowering, and most of the immigrant second generation is unable to selectively acculturate. The dominance of American culture and speaking only English often overrules any efforts conducted by the co-ethnic community to retain the native culture and heritage, with the exception of one notable group—Cuban youth, and more specifically, Cuban youth attending private bilingual schools. This immigrant youth group is thought to retain their parents’ Cuban culture and heritage due to the salient Cuban identity within their co-ethnic community.

While the selective acculturation of Miami Cubans has gained recognition in the field of social science, there are researchers that postulate alternative forms of acculturation. For instance, Pérez Firmat (1994) recognizes the processes of biculturation evident among Cubans in Miami. However, from his personal experience, he challenges how simple the process of biculturation is, arguing that it is a “balancing act”. From his perspective as a researcher and as an immigrant himself, it is difficult to tell which culture is subordinate and which is dominant. Otheguy, García and Roca (2000) recognize the nuances in the acculturation process, and argue that Cubans in the US, particularly in Miami-Dade County, perhaps do not undergo the typical processes of acculturation that Portes and Rumbaut suggest. Rather, through adapting the terminology
used by Fernando Ortiz in his study *Contrapunteo Cubano del Tabaco y del Azúcar*, Cubans as an ethnic group have been strong at fostering “transcultural” connections since the island was colonized, seamlessly blending African, Taíno and Spanish cultures—and now in Miami, they have been forging a neocultural Cuban-American identity. Perhaps the Cuban students attending private schools are most susceptible to maintaining, or at the very least retaining their Spanish, as their parents and grandparents almost certainly share a neocultural Cuban American identity. Likewise, Yúdice (2003) notes how Miami Cubans are challenging these assimilationist and identity politics that are commonplace in the US due to their strong transnational identities (206). Thus, as a new context of bilingualism is emerging, there is a possibility that a new context of acculturation is emerging as well, skewing the acculturation and assimilation processes prevalent among privately educated Cuban youth within 21st century Miami.

The relationship that the acculturation processes have to language and ethnicity is intricate and complex. In the sections that follow, the components integral to acculturation will be examined.

**Intergenerational Language Shift**

The commanding theory in intergenerational language shift, most notably coined by Fishman (1966), is a tiered three-generational model. The first generation learns to communicate enough in the language of the host country—in this case, English—to sustain themselves and their families economically. In turn, the second generation speaks the ethnic language at home, but otherwise uses English in school, at work and in virtually all aspects of public life. The second generation, born in the host country, can be functional bilinguals, but through adulthood disassociates from the ethnic language.
Completing the sequence, the third generation solely uses English inside and outside of the home (Fishman 1966; Portes and Schauffler 1996; Tran 2010; Veltman 1983). To summarize the three-generation model, Veltman (1983) defines the process as “Anglicisation” (16), which is similar to Fishman’s (1966) theory of post-migration language loyalty and maintenance (27). The three-generation language shift model has garnered significant attention in the field of sociolinguistics, with Alba et al. (2002) further legitimizing the theory by stating, “Nowhere has the impact of generation been greater than in the realm of language, in which a three-generation process of Anglicization has, by and large, prevailed” (467). Language assimilation is deemed by linguistics and sociology scholars alike to be more of a given than an anomaly.

Over the years, empirical evidence has validated the Fishman three-generation language shift model. Lutz (2006) found that according to data from the 1988 National Educational Longitudinal Sample (NELS), the number of third-generation respondents that speak a language other than English at home is 58%, compared to 90% of second generation Hispanics and 92% of first-generation Hispanics. Arriagada (2005) discovered also from logistic and tobit regression models based on the national level that Spanish language use is significantly less likely for second-and third-generation children (609). Alba et al. (2002) noted that among Hispanics and Asians listed in the 1990 IPUMS 1990 Microdata sample for the 1940 and 1970 US Censuses, there was a unanimous increase in the rates of only speaking English at home, with over half of the ethnic groups reported being over 90% English-only by the third generation. By and large, the Fishman three-tiered model of language shift appears to be a prevalent phenomenon observed in the second and third generations.
In spite of the insurmountable pressures for immigrant children to speak solely the language of the host country, there is still a notable push in immigrant communities to encourage second and third generation youth to become fluent bilinguals. Language is shown, even in situations where foreign groups are stigmatized in urban settings, to still maintain its fundamental role as an identity marker. Parents have a powerful influence on language shift, often serving as the most proactive influence on their children. Hakuta and D’Andrea (1992) determine that language use with parents at home is principally associated with Mexican high school student Spanish language maintenance. Some Latino parents see the benefit of their children becoming bilingual, because ideally they want their children to learn English if it means helping them attain a better education, a better job and overall a better future, while simultaneously wanting their children to speak Spanish at home in order to preserve their culture, heritage, and communication to the parents (Flor Ada and Zubizarreta 2001; Worthy and Rodríguez -Galindo 2006).

However, a review of the literature indicates “a decreasing degree of intergenerational ethnolinguistic continuity, as well as growing constriction to oral use within the family domain even among those who do maintain it” (Fishman 1966, 123). Hakuta and D’Andrea (1992) found that the studied Mexican high school students in LA, generally preferred English. Ultimately, the youth could be fully proficient in Spanish, but their language choice depended on their attitude toward the language, which is heavily influenced by peer language use. Furthermore, they claim that, “outside of the home domain, a subject’s language choice shows consistent shift towards English” (85). Caldas and Caldas (2002) discovered the same phenomenon with their second generation French-speaking children that attended an English/French bilingual private school in New
Orleans, Louisiana, and additionally each summer resided in Québec, Canada—a predominantly French-speaking city. Even when the parents spoke French consistently at home, resistance to the home language intensified, especially as the children entered their adolescent, with one of the daughters even complaining when the father spoke French to her in public (502). Although the children were generally proficient in French, their language preference in the US was English. All in all, Latino parents want their children to retain their language and culture to communicate with family members, but they do not often realize how easy it is for them to lose Spanish language abilities (Flor Ada and Zubizarreta 2001, 233). Latino parents start recognizing that regardless of efforts at home to preserve Spanish, prolonged exposure to English in school—an institution symbolizing the desired outcomes of mainstream society—pressures children to speak English more (Worthy and Rodriguez-Galindo 2006). Thus, not even parents can prevail against the inevitable forces of language shift in their children.

In spite of the credibility that the Fishman model gained, some scholars have questioned its applicability to Hispanic populations and their Spanish-speaking tendencies. Portes and Schauffler (1996) postulate that Spanish-speaking native born youth in areas with a continuous stream of monolingual Spanish immigration are an exception to the general pattern of intergenerational language shift, experiencing a “dulled” assimilation process (435). Tran’s (2010) central argument is that Latinos, while still falling into the Fishman model of language assimilation, defy it more than any other minority group in the US. He believes that over the last few decades, a “new context for bilingualism among Latinos” has emerged (261). The factors contributing to this new context include the critical mass effect, which Linton (2004) argues is when the
individual preference of a language user is altered due to the language preference of the “collective mass” in a community. When that individual may have been inclined to speak the language of the destination country—in this case English—instead, he/she is inclined to use the heritage language, as the critical mass effect of those preferring to speak the ethnic language is pushed past a tipping point, making usage of the ethnic language more common. In the case of Miami, the critical mass effect is largely the result of both ongoing immigration from Latin America and the rise of transnational activities across the Spanish-speaking Americas. Likewise, according to Portes and Hao (1998) among the second generation youth in their study, the Latin American students were undoubtedly the most likely to maintain and preserve their Spanish-speaking abilities. This study will provide new insight into the case of second and third generation Hispanics in Miami.

While their shift towards speaking English is clear, in comparison to Spanish-speaking Latino youth from other national origins, Cubans are most likely to be bilingual (Alba et al. 2002; Carter and Lynch 2015; Otheguy, García and Roca 2000; Portes and Hao 1998; Tran 2010). This is due in part to the sustained migration of Cubans to Miami over the last half-century (Otheguy, García and Roca 2000; Tran 261). Portes and Schauffer (1994) found that out of their sample of Hispanics in South Florida, Cubans attending private schools had the highest likelihood of reporting as bilingual, at 47%. They wrote that “private school Cuban youth are the children of middle-class exiles who represent the core of this enclave economy. It is not surprising that they have the lowest propensity to give up Spanish” (439). While Otheguy, García and Roca (2000) claim that for the Cuban second and third generation, the Spanish language is merely “the language of la Cuba de ayer” (177), for Lynch (2000) Spanish in Miami is very much the language
of the present, as it “gives them [Cuban immigrant youth] access to a dynamic urban culture that depends on the economic power of the Spanish-speaking world and the linguistic and social power of the continuous influx of Spanish-speaking immigrants, visitors and tourists” (272-273). This research will provide better contemporary insight into how Cubans at a historically Cuban elite private school view Spanish, and whether or not it is the language de ayer or the language de hoy. Furthermore, Lynch and Carter (2015) and Yúdice (2003) identify Miami as a diverse pan-Hispanic and Latin city, which expands the pool of second- and third- generation non-Cuban Latinos in Miami. How Cuban youth relate to, or are influenced by, the second generation Latinos of more recent immigrant groups such as Colombians, Venezuelans, Peruvians, etc. is of interest to this project.

**Tensions between the English and Spanish Languages in the US**

In contemporary politics and society, there is great debate around the English-only movement in the US, arguing that English is an integral part of American culture and identity which needs to be protected. The discourse of this movement stems back to the early 20th century, with President Teddy Roosevelt’s discourse during the onset of World War I, demanding that German immigrants abandon their hyphenated German-American identities and unite as English-speaking Americans (Criado 2004; Nunberg 1997; Portes and Schaufler 1996). However, for a while afterwards, while the English language was considered the preferred language of the US, it was not framed as a political symbol of citizenship and patriotism like it is today. Fishman (1966) commented that, “the English language—as a symbol, as a cause, as a supreme good—does not figure prominently in the scheme of values, loyalties and traditions by which Americans define
themselves as ‘American’...Americans have no particular regard for English, no particular pride in English as an exquisite instrument” (30). Furthermore, he noted that the only reason why people in the US lose command of their heritage languages is due to a mix of educational failure, cultural provincialism and a lack of any pragmatic use for bilingualism (30). Yet as time advanced, the notions that Fishman argued became antiquated, as speaking English in the US transformed into not only an ideological position, but a nonpolitical common denominator or “social glue” binding Americans together (Nunberg 1997, 5; Portes and Schlesinger 1998). Notwithstanding, American English was the language that constituted the democratic and rational ideals of the country, and an essential component for gaining citizenship, especially as the ethnic makeup of the country diversified (Portes and Schlesinger 1994). At the dawn of the 21st century, the US began to fear its cultural plurality, thus cherishing English as an essential component of national identity, especially when influential scholars like Harvard professor Huntington in his publication “The Hispanic Challenge” (2004) feared that increasing Mexican immigration could “divide the United States into a country of two languages and two cultures” (44-45). As an outsider of American culture, Criado (2004) explains the symbolic value that the English language holds in relation to the American identity:

El inglés se instituye así como la (única) lengua ‘útil’, la de la economía, los negocios y la actividad intelectual; la de conocimiento y cultura; el soporte—y garante—de las actitudes y nociones que definen a una sociedad—y mentalidad—moderna, liberal y abierta (146).¹

¹ “English institutes itself as the (only) useful language, the language of economics, business and intellectual activity; knowledge and culture; the support—and guarantee—of the activities and ideas that define a society—and mentality—modern, liberal and open” (146 [author’s translation]).
Criado establishes these innate and deep connections between language, ethnicity and nationalism, noting how Americans began to symbolize English as the language tying them and their cultural values together. To contextualize her viewpoint, although English at this time is not an official language at the federal level, in 2014 five states were considering legislation to make English the official language at the state-level, including New York, a state known for its high immigrant population. These five states would join the thirty-one other states that already have English listed as the official state language, including the state of Florida (Schwarz 2014). Furthermore, in 2010, 87% of Americans in a poll conducted by Rasmussen favored English to become the national language (Schwarz 2014). The ties connecting English to an American national identity cannot be ignored, which undoubtedly influences the strong assimilative push that the native-born immigrant children experience.

Criado attributes the loss or erosion of the Spanish language among Spanish-speaking bilingual immigrant youth to a dynamic interaction between two factors — “una profecía que se autocumple” [“a self-fulfilling prophecy”] and “una predicción que se autoniega” [“a self-defying prediction”] (150). Their decision in large part is swayed by the social stigma that comes in American society with speaking Spanish. Criado (2004) comments on the symbolism of speaking Spanish in the US by saying:

El español es la lengua del recién llegado y, más aún, del indocumentado—aunque entre ellos estén los descendientes de la población nativa del sudoeste, de los antiguos territorios mexicanos—; de los poco instruidos y con menor estatus; dependientes de la ayuda del Estado; apegados a creencias y valores arcaicos; a su identidad e idioma; reacios a asimilarse, a deponer la filiación previa y adoptar—sin cortapisas—la estadunidense; los que no hablan bien inglés—absoluto anatema—y se niegan a aprenderlo (148).2

2 “Spanish is the language of recent arrivals and, more recently, of the undocumented—although among them are the descendants of the native population of the [American] southwest, of the old Mexican
While Spanish use stands in opposition to those processes of Americanization, and comes with a certain sense of pride, for some, especially those of the lower classes, it may come with a sense of stigma or shame. Based on the negative social stigma affiliated with the Spanish language, it is unsurprising that the children and grandchildren of immigrants experience tension in their day-to-day lives when maintaining their English and Spanish speaking abilities, which often leads to their abandonment of Spanish language skills in order to be accepted into American society.

How do tensions between English and Spanish language use manifest themselves in the Cuban-dominated city of Miami? To start, the geographic concentration of the co-ethnic community undoubtedly provides an environment conducive to maintaining the Spanish language. According to Milroy (1982), mother languages remain consistently more in use when there is a pervasive network of people with whom to communicate on a regular basis. By and large, she proposes that ethnic minorities still have a motivation to maintain their home language, even in the face of stigmatization, because fundamentally languages remain a source of pride for people. Living in an area where there is a critical mass of bilinguals increases the odds of bilingualism by almost 50% regardless of other disincentives for bilingualism in a city (Linton 2004). Furthermore, Linton found that “in the case of U.S.-born Cubans, very high geographic concentration combined with positive group identification and relatively abundant community resources (such as bilingual schools) is likely the most salient explanation of Spanish retention” (299). Alba et al. (2002) discovered that language spoken at home and location in an ethnic enclave territories--; from the few educated with less status; dependents of government assistance; devoted to archaic beliefs and values; to their language and identity; opposed to assimilating, dropping the previous affiliation and adopting—no strings attached—the American identity; those that don’t speak English well—absolutely abhorrent—and refuse to learn it” (148 [author translation]).
or hub significantly increases the chances of maintaining the home language; Cuban children in Miami are twenty times more likely to be bilingual. With this in mind, Portes and Schauffler (1996) realized that the community of residence had the second strongest association to home language retention. The strength of Spanish among Cuban Americans is attributed to their concentration in Miami-Dade, as well as their political and economic strength (Lutz 2005; Lynch 2000; Otheguy, García and Roca 2000). Thus, the evidence is illustrated in the literature that Cubans in Miami have created a space that is a unique linguistic and social environment to use the Spanish language. Cubans have used their local Spanish language hegemony to keep their national identity alive, particularly through dominating local politics (Schlesinger 1998). Although Cubans are not the first group to be economically successful immigrants, they are arguably the first group to perhaps resist Anglicization (Nunberg 1997). Likewise, it is argued that “Cuban Americans owe a large part of their success to having turned a deaf ear to the notion that assimilation and dispersion are the keys to success” (Otheguy, García and Roca 2000, 172). Cubans have successfully utilized their strength as a co-ethnic community to create an environment conducive for their children to learn Spanish.

Regardless of the power that Cubans have in Miami, the influence that English has on second- and third-generation Cubans in Miami is irrefutable (Carter and Lynch 2015; Eilers, Oller and Cobo-Lewis 2002; Lynch 2000; Porcel 2006; Portes and Schauffler 1996; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Their connection to the ideals, values and norms of American culture makes their attachment to English inevitable (Resnick 1988; Rumbaut 1994). Even in the case of Miami, English-speaking adaptation is not surprising, as Fishman (1966) proposes: “once they [incoming immigrants] accepted the
goals and values of Americans the immigrants were already on the road to accepting their life-styles, their customs, and their language” (30-31). Cuban exiles migrating to Miami in some way, shape, or form, already agreed with the founding principles of American nationalism, such as an open society, free enterprise and social mobility (Criado 2004; Fishman 1966; Resnick 1988) in order to escape Communist Cuba. Consequently, Cuban second- and third- generation youth may be English-Spanish bilinguals—having proficiency in both languages—but the preference for speaking English is evident, with some scholars even questioning the vitality Spanish in Miami beyond the first generation (Carter and Lynch 2015; Otheguy, Garcia and Roca 2000; Rumbaut 1994).

Theoretical Considerations for Speaking “Spanglish”

The concept of Spanglish has attracted much attention inside and outside of academia. Otheguy and Stern (2011) define Spanglish as a “popular Spanish,” which is “generally reserved for speech in casual oral registers, especially, though not exclusively, when used by Latinos who seldom or never use Spanish or writing” (86). They also assert that Spanglish is a term implying a structural combination of English and Spanish in terms of their lexicon, morphology, phraseology and syntax. Zentella (1997) studied the code-switching and lexical and syntactic constraints underlying the grammar of “Spanglish” speakers in a Puerto Rican neighborhood in New York City. Meanwhile Stavans (2003) views Spanglish through a constructivist lens, basing his perception of the linguistic phenomenon on encounters and interactions he has had with Spanglish speakers. He provides the following definition: “Spanglish, n. The verbal encounter between Anglo and Hispanic civilizations” (5). He believes that Spanglish is more than merely a linguistic phenomenon, rather a social one. For that reason, he argues that
Spanglish is constantly evolving and takes different forms depending on the region and ethnic background of its speakers. He concludes that for the younger immigrant generations, Spanglish is a new and nuanced representation of the self, a representation of home. There are scholars inside of academia, and politicians and other public leaders outside of academia, that praise Spanglish as a way of speaking that celebrates bilingualism and biculturalism (Otheguy and Stern 2011). Pérez Firmat (1994) affirms that “sometimes the American dream is written in Spanglish” (155). Costantini (2000) notes all the signs in Spanglish throughout Little Havana and downtown Miami, like “Watcha rock. Watcha premios. Watcha terra” (43). Thus, Spanglish as a linguistic, and even social phenomenon, is acknowledged in contemporary literature related to Spanish in the US, and more specifically, English/Spanish bilingualism in Miami.

In spite of increased awareness, “Spanglish” is still deemed a dubious concept to report or test empirically. Otheguy and Stern (2011) argue that Spanglish is nothing more than a form of popular Spanish, or Spanish in the United States — in other words, a regional variation of the Spanish language that runs parallel to other regional variations of popular Spanish throughout the Spanish-speaking world. Although it can be argued that there are limited English influences on the Spanish language in the US, empirical evidence from Otheguy and Stern suggests that the structure of oral Spanish overall retains its distinct Spanish grammar, disproving the notion that US Spanish is influenced by English. They look down on the use of the term Spanglish, believing that it undermines ability to speak Spanish. Waltermire (2014) also disregards including Spanglish in his research on English and Spanish language contact in the US, commenting that the term is fraught with issues and nuances that make its study fruitless.
Ultimately, scholars like Otheguy and Stern provide sufficient empirical evidence to suggest that Spanglish as a linguistic concept of a hybrid language merging English and Spanish does not exist.

Nonetheless, if English and Spanish bilinguals recognize Spanglish as a popularized form of Spanish, such as what Stavans (2003) gathered from his numerous conversations with students and colleagues on the subject, its general inclusion in this study is valid. If the youth in my study are inclined to believe that Spanglish is real, then it has social meaning, thus making it a linguistic phenomenon worthy of exploration. Lastly, this study is not trying to further theoretical debates on Spanglish as an emergent language. Rather, it is merely accepting the conceptual framework and choosing to not ignore it when surveying Cuban and Spanish-speaking Latino youth on their Spanish language use and ability, since they may identify with Spanglish as a real phenomenon.

**Ethnic Identity Formation**

Ethnic identity is a critical component of acculturation. Ethnic identity formation is a nuanced sociological and psychological process that has captured the attention of researchers. According to Fishman, “Ethnicity is rightly understood as an aspect of a collectivity’s self-recognition as well as an aspect of its recognition in the eyes of outsiders” (1989, 24). Portes and Rumbaut (2006) state that ethnicity is socially constructed, and is a product of an individual’s traits and surrounding context. Similarly, Phinney (2003) argues the following:
Ethnic identity is a dynamic, multidimensional construct that refers to one’s identity or sense of self as a member of an ethnic group. Ethnic identity is not a fixed categorization but rather is a fluid and dynamic understanding of self and ethnic background. Ethnic identity is constructed and modified as individuals become aware of differences among ethnic groups and attempt to understand the meaning of their ethnicity within the larger setting (63).

Furthermore, Phinney claims that ethnicity is never static, as it constantly fluctuates and is subject to change within new cultural contexts and in different time periods. The fluctuation of ethnicity in a rapidly evolving city like Miami is critical to understand.

Fishman (1989) asserts that ethnicity cannot be fully understood without measuring its relationship to language, both in theory and in practice. He claims that, “By its very nature language is the quintessential symbol, the symbol par excellence…In view of the foregoing, it becomes clearer why language is more likely than most symbols of ethnicity to become the symbol of ethnicity. Language is the recorder of paternity, the expresser of patrimony and the carrier of phenomenology” (Fishman 1989, 32). Indeed, language is a common and shared mechanism used among an ethnic group to frame a national identity, and build a broader sense of community (Criado 2004; Milroy 1982; Nunberg 1997). Empirical evidence validates the relationship that language has to ethnic identity and membership within an ethnic group. In a study of first- and second-generation immigrants from the Caribbean living in New York City, Lamboy (2004) found that Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans generally believed that oral Spanish proficiency was necessary for a sense of belonging in their ethnic group. As a result, the language preferences of the second or subsequent generation immigrant youth are not random and do not exist in a vacuum. While the children and grandchildren of immigrants are pressured to assimilate to mainstream American culture, and opt to
become English monolinguals, they are also often encouraged by their families to retain their ethnic roots and retain their ethnic language. Consequently, there is much debate in the US today around language choice precisely because of how language reflects the ethnic tensions prevalent in modern American society (Criado 2004; Nunberg 1997; Portes and Schauffler 1996).

**Gender Considerations**

Given that the research site for this study is an all-boys school, it is worth noting the significant differences that have been reported on gender, language use and reported ethnic identity among immigrant youth. In numerous studies, women were found to be more likely to maintain their ethnic language and have higher Spanish language proficiency (Arriagada 2005; Lutz 2006; Portes and Schaufler 1994; Tran 2010; Zentella 1997). The likelihood of women being bilingual is debated in the literature. Stevens (1986) discovered that women were more likely than men to transmit the heritage language to their children (cf. Zentella 1997). In more recent literature on English/Spanish bilingualism, women are also found to more likely be bilingual than males (Linton 2004). Women are even found to be more cutting-edge with Spanish language change, according to a study on subject pronoun expression among Hispanics in New York City (Shin and Otheguy 2013).

When analyzing gender differences in language use, causality is difficult to attribute. The differences between women and men in language use have generally been explained as the result of genderized socialization forces during early childhood. According to Portes and Hao (1998), daughters are found to spend more time at home, thus being exposed more to their parents’ language use. Zentella (1997) also attributes
genderized language use among Puerto Ricans in New York City to the roles that girls and boys hold in their neighborhood. Girls are more likely to stay at home with their mothers and tend to domestic duties; boys are more likely to spend time outside the home and participate in activities with peer groups. Empirical evidence supports this notion, as Scheffner et al. (2011) discovered that in a study with preschool-aged children, mothers were shown to speak more Spanish to their daughters as opposed to their sons, concluding that “mothers employed different acculturation styles when interacting with their daughters and sons” (291).

In regards to ethnic identity, women are found to more likely claim a hyphenated identity (Rumbaut 1994), and are more likely to retain their heritage identity than men (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Examining immigrant children, over time boys are more likely to acculturate to American mainstream society than girls (Szapocznik and Hernandez 1988). Zentella (1997) discovered that only girls would argue that English monolinguals could not declare Puerto Rican ethnic identity, which demonstrates the elevated importance that women in her study placed on language and ethnic identity. Similar logic can presumably be applied to gender and ethnic identity as it was to gender and language choice: women may be more sensitive and committed to their dual identities at home versus in the public sphere than men. Thus, all results gathered from this study should be interpreted on the grounds that men tend to report language and ethnic choice differently than females.

Conclusion

All in all, this substantive literature review demonstrates the intricate psychological and sociological forces related to acculturation, particularly those related to
language use and ethnic identity. In the next section, the methodology proposed for the study will be outlined, and will respectively be sensitive to the social complexities associated with acculturation.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Research Design and Methods

This research employs a case-oriented approach to understanding social phenomena (Ragin 1992). The social phenomena under consideration are patterns of acculturation among students, particularly those of Cuban descent, attending a private Cuban Catholic school in Miami. By acculturation, I am interested in understanding how students of Cuban descent have selectively acculturated to American mainstream society, and conversely, the extent to which the students have retained their Cuban culture, norms, and values (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Additionally, the study is interested in examining the acculturation patterns of students of Cuban descent as gauged intergenerationally between students of Cuban descent and parents of Cuban descent, as well as intragenerationally between students of Cuban descent and students of non-Cuban Spanish-speaking descent, to ultimately determine how salient the Cuban identity remains at the school today, given the school’s Cuban heritage. Spanish language usage, self-reported ethnic identities, and language attitudes are good proxy measures for acculturation. Admittedly, these are proxy measures, which simplify a complex sociological and psychological process, and thus cannot capture the full complexity of acculturation processes taking place (Trickett, Persky and Espino 2009).

The case study design is chosen for this research based on the outlier criteria set forth in Yin (2003), which in this case would require that the school is in some way an anomaly. The example used in the current research, the elite Cuban exile community in
Miami, meets one of his criteria by exhibiting an unusual strength for an immigrant group and a unique ability to create a potent atmosphere for fostering students, Cuban and non-Cuban Spanish-speaking Latino alike, to embrace their non-Anglo language practices and attitudes. A more typical case is immigrant youth in US public schools, thus exposing them to mainstream Anglo acculturation processes (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Patthey-Chavez 1993). Likewise, evidence has shown that Cuban students attending private schools, particularly those within the Cuban co-exile community in Miami, are more likely to be proficient in Spanish than Cubans attending public schools (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Thus, the distinct case study here demonstrates how students of Cuban descent attending the school under study experience acculturation processes unique to this community, and is interested in examining to what extent the Cuban identity is salient.  

This study is not intended to make any claim concerning generalization to a population beyond the present population under study. Although the study at times will examine individual cases to identify themes in the research, it is mainly intended to generalize patterns of acculturation among students of Cuban descent (see Ayres, Kavanaugh and Knafl 2003). Following the protocol indicated in Ayres, Kavanaugh and Knafl (2003), the data can be identified and validated based on within case and across case analysis. In this study, the research is immersed within the individual respondents to understand significant concepts relating to the study (i.e., acculturation patterns as measured by intersections of heritage language usage, ethnic identity and language attitudes), as it simultaneously compares across the respondents to identify categories common to all participants. In spite of the limitations of the research proxies, the within
and across case analysis ultimately allows for a comprehensive interpretation of the individual cases and the cases as a whole. Given that this study is case-oriented, as specified in Ragin (1992), a variable-oriented approach is not relevant because the study is not trying to prove correlation or causation. Rather the explanation of the case, and its respective units, are both fluid and deeply intertwined, thus making their operationalization as static variables difficult. Capturing and explaining these units is prioritized over assigning causation between dependent and independent variables.

Although surveys are employed in this study, which is a methodological tool more common in quantitative studies seeking to draw causation between variables, nonprobability quota sampling gathered through the surveys does not allow for causality to be drawn. Thus, this case study is not trying to prove causation between certain variables and acculturation patterns; rather, it is explaining the patterns of acculturation as they are evident in the specific sample chosen.

According to Yin (2003), case studies often fall on the lower tier of the social science research hierarchy, as they are considered to be capable of having only an exploratory, as opposed to explanatory, power. The limits that are often imposed on case studies in social science research typically do not qualify them as being deemed capable of explaining phenomena occurring in the social world. Rather, the emphasis on explanatory studies is placed on experiments and laboratory research. The divide in the social science research hierarchy extends back to debates regarding epistemology, which divided researchers into positivist and interpretivist schools of thought (Furlong and Marsh 2002). In this study, I sustain that there is no possible way that the conditions exhibited in the students, families, and local communities throughout the city of Miami,
as well as nationally in the United States and transnationally across Latin America and the Caribbean, could ever be replicated in a lab. Furthermore, this case study defies the social science hierarchy because it seeks to both \textit{explore} themes related to ethnic identity, language use, and language attitudes among adolescent boys attending the private Cuban Catholic school under study, and \textit{explain} the acculturation patterns in relation to a very specific context.

This study builds upon current efforts at breaking the binary of the two contentious and opposing epistemologies that dominate discussion in the social sciences—positivism and interpretivism (Furlong and Marsh 2002; Green 2002). Specifically, Green (2002) outlines how important it is to develop middle-ground research that embraces a compromised epistemological view. In this case, the research embraces a nonfoundational ontological view, asserting that the social world does not exist independently of our interpretation of it. Likewise, the epistemology is aligned with constructivist thought, recognizing that concepts relating to language and ethnicity are socially constructed and are based on how we interpret them. However, the methodology of the research embraces the survey approach and other strategies which follow traditions that call for the issue of operationalization, quantification, and the use of specific research instruments to better capture the implicit attitudes of ethnic identity and language attitude that are held by the respondents. For instance, this study utilized the Likert-scale, as this question format is used by international organizations such as the Center for Disease Control (CDC) to measure attitudes about particular topics (Losby and Wetmore 2012). In this study, those topics pertain primarily to Spanish language use and language attitudes. Likewise, given that the primary research subject in this study—late
adolescents—are still exiting their identity-formation stage (Erickson 1963), students may not be aware of the implicit language attitudes and ethnic markers that characterize their lives, and thus face difficulty expressing their thoughts on these topics in an in-depth interview. Thus, this research welcomes the challenge to break the binary between positivist and interpretivist epistemologies by embracing a middle-ground approach, which facilitates the creation of pragmatic and creative techniques to conduct innovative research.

The middle-oriented epistemology justifies the use of multiple methods. Tashakkori and Creswell (2007) note that mixed methods research is often considered a hodgepodge of any research that uses quantitative and qualitative data analyses. Creswell (2014) illustrates how mixed methods purpose statements and analysis can be more artfully created, as opposed to merely meshing quantitative and qualitative methods, which often still happens in social science research. This study employs mixed methods for sequential explanatory design. This design is used to further understanding of the distinct acculturation processes occurring within Cuban Catholic schools “transplanted” from Cuba to Miami, first through an exploration of historical archival research, and then through a survey analysis of students and parents associated within one school during the present day. Ultimately, the historical archival research provides context to best analyze the acculturation patterns taking place among students of Cuban descent attending the Cuban Catholic school currently under study.
Procedures Involved

I. Historical Archival Analysis

Analysis of newsprint, scholarly articles, and other historical materials at the University of Miami Cuban Heritage Collection (CHC) was conducted to contextualize the historical, political, economic, and social period of the school under study. The three periods being examined include early Cuban history up to the Revolution (1959), the first wave of Cuban exiles to Miami (1960s), and Miami during the turn of the 21st century. The research will demonstrate 1) the prestige that the private Catholic schools had in Cuba; 2) the prestige that the schools gained in Miami from the 1960s to the 1980s and 3) how the Cuban hegemony is challenged by nativist Anglos, later Cuban arrivals, and beginning in the 1980s, expanding immigrant diversity from Latin America and the Caribbean in 21st-century Miami. The archival research contends that the challenges faced by Cuban Miami, from both nativist and non-Cuban Hispanic populations, are challenges that the Cuban Catholic schools have experienced as well.

II. Surveys

Students and parents at the school were asked to self-report their Spanish language use and ethnic identity. Although self-reporting measures for language proficiency can be scrutinized, they have been shown to be reliable and valid overall because they strongly correlate with actual language ability (Fishman and Terry 1969; Tran 2010). Surveys are a viable tool to measure language attitudes (Agheyisi and Fishman 1970; Porcel 2006). The study replicates in many aspects the study conducted by Solé (1979) and his survey gauging language attitudes among Cuban immigrant youth in Miami. Notwithstanding, within this particular study, given that the target population was adolescents, the anonymity and simplicity of surveys are thought to be a more
precise way of assessing information on language attitudes, as opposed to the in-depth interviews or focus groups employed by interpretivist researchers.

Specifically, a questionnaire survey was administered to students of Cuban descent and students of non-Cuban Spanish-speaking descent currently attending the school (N = 146) in order to conduct a comparative analysis of the two groups (See appendix 2). The questionnaire consisted of seventy-four questions. The questionnaire was distributed in a classroom setting through the help of the teachers in the Social Studies Department. After contacting a gatekeeper to the school, teachers were asked to participate in the study based on snowball sampling. The students were then chosen for the study based on purposive sampling. The format of the questionnaire was written-only and required students to participate in two types of questioning: Short answer questions, and scaled survey questions based on a Likert-scale of one-to-five—one indicating a total disagreement with a provided statement from the researcher; five indicating a total agreement with a provided statement from the researcher. The short answer responses were allotted to provide respondents with more flexibility to record their responses, and intended to create a platform that was sensitive to fluid attitudes towards family history and ethnic identity. Participation in the survey was completely voluntary, and anyone could opt out of the survey at any time. The questionnaire aimed to address the following major themes in the thesis: heritage language use, ethnic identity, and language attitudes.

A separate questionnaire survey was distributed to current students at the school with parents of Cuban descent (N = 56) in order to create an intergenerational analysis of parents and students (See Appendix). The questionnaire consisted of ten questions. Participation in the survey was also entirely voluntary, and participants could stop at any
time. The questionnaire link was emailed to parents from teachers assisting with the study, creating a purposive sample of parents of Cuban descent. The format of the survey was a series of short-answer and Likert-scaled survey questions. The questionnaire aimed to address these major themes in the thesis: language use at home, migration to the US, and the ethnic identities and language use of their sons.

**Limitations**

There are three limitations that must be outlined for this study. First, a limitation is how the participants responded to the survey questions given that the only available language for the survey was English. Second, research related to ethnic self-identification and language attitudes often employs in-depth interviews that allow the researcher to better understand social constructions of language and ethnic identity. This research justifies the use of surveys to measure proxies on language and ethnic identity among the population under study, but it lacks the in-depth analysis of each individual student and parent. Third, while the survey questions asked students to self-report their family history and ethnic-identity, it was impossible in several cases to extrapolate from the data which immigrant generation the students corresponded to. Thus, the students’ generational status was obtained based on estimates from the survey data as to which immigrant generation their parents belonged to.

As illustrated in the methodology, the historical archival analysis will be presented first, followed by the survey analysis. The research will now transition to the archival portion of the study.
Chapter 4  
Historical Archival Research of Cuban Catholic Schools and Cuban Miami  
Overview  

Topics related to language and ethnic identity among students and parents in this study need to be contextualized in the unique social laboratory of Latino “cosmopolitanism” in Miami. The city of Miami is already well documented as an urban metropolis characterized by the Cuban Revolution in 1959, and the series of Cuban migration waves that followed. Cubans in exile turned Miami into their new hometown. David Rieff (1987b) famously coined Miami as the “Second Havana”; Levine (2000) titled his book chronicling the growing influence of Cubans in Miami as Cuban Miami, mimicking the term used by other researchers in the last three decades (Didion 1987; Reiff 1978a; Pérez 1992; Pérez Firmat 1994). Portes and Stepick, in their landmark book City on the Edge (1993), reflect on the future of Cubans in Miami, and they propose that “every year, new parts of Miami become more like Havana, or at least like the nostalgic image that Cubans have of their capital city” (220). Miami, irrefutably, became the city of cafecitos, guayaberas, and José Martí during the latter half of the 20th century.

However, contemporary academic literature is only beginning to report on the challenges that Cuban Miami faces with regards to the growth of a pan-Hispanic population in the city, and the gradual loss of a hegemonic Cuban dominance. There is academic literature regarding the conflicts that Cuban Miami faced with nativist Americans, and even more recent Cuban arrivals (Croucher 1998; Nijman 2011); issues related to language politics are mentioned in this archival analysis. However, the impending growth of non-Cuban Spanish-speaking populations in the city is where more
emphasis is placed in this chapter. Boswell (1994) chronicles the transition from
Cubanization to Hispanicization, claiming that the transition began to occur in the 1980s.
By the 1990s, 41 percent of Miami’s Hispanics was non-Cuban, and 12 Hispanic
nationalities had a population of at least 7,000 in the city by 1990. Pérez Firmat (1994)
prophesized this change by stating, “As I write this in 1993, Miami is more Hispanic than
ever but less Cuban than ten or fifteen years ago” (18). As a follow-up to City on the
Edge, Aranda, Hughes and Sabogal (2014) in Making a Life in Multiethnic Miami report
on the population changes that the city has undergone in the new millennium. They note
that while Cubans were still the dominant ethnic group in the 2000s, their percentage in
the total population declined slightly between 1990 and 2000, while the growth of non-
Cuban Latinos accelerated. Indeed, by the 2000s the city had transformed into a
“Hispanic metropolis” (Aranda, Hughes and Sabogal 2014. 22). Similarly, in 2014 a NBC
News headline read, “Not Just Cubans: Many Latinos Now Call Miami Home” (Sesin).
Miami’s increase in migration not just from Latin America, but from Europe and Asia,
made the city “not just an international metropolis, but a truly global one” (Shell-Weiss
2009; 237). The question then becomes not when Cuban Miami will become more
inclusive, but how it will react to the incoming migratory waves.

The demographic changes are not occurring in a vacuum, as Yúdice (2003) talks
about the making of Miami as an emerging global city. He argues that previous literature
on Miami and Cubans from the mid-1980s onward has lacked discussion of the dynamic
changes occurring in Miami, which he defines as the transformation of Miami through
the growth of the fashion, entertainment, communications, and new media industries.
Some discussion of this topic was beginning to arise in the late 1980s, with Szapocznik
and Hernandez (1988) considering how the growth fueled by Cubans in Miami led to the development of the city as a cultural and economic magnet for all of Latin America. Yúdice (2003) argues that although Cubans led the way for Miami to become business friendly in the 1960s and 1970s, it was ordinances in Miami Beach during the 1990s that gave tax breaks to incoming businesses, thus setting the pathway for Miami to be economically successful and culturally vibrant heading into the 21st century. Nijman (2011) advances this idea in the present day by demonstrating that the Miami music business in particular is one of the fastest growing cultural industries in Miami, now a global center for the production and distribution of Latin music. And in Time magazine, a headline in 2001 read “Miami: the Capital of Latin America,” chronicling the development of a “Latin Hollywood” connected to global music markets, all contained within Miami’s tropical oasis. The article asserts that Hispanicization is a prevalent phenomenon in Miami and that the expansive diversification of the Latino population has made the city undoubtedly “the capital of Latin America,” further stating that Brazilians jokingly refer to Miami as “Brazil’s fastest growing city’ (Booth 2001). Yúdice (2003) concluded that Miami is now the “cultural capital of Latin America” (196) where a marketable and international “Latin” identity is possible. Furthermore, according to Yúdice, the city can now be imagined as a post-Cuban, or even a post-Caribbean, Miami. Nijman (2011) attests that Miami has emerged as a hemispheric city, positioning itself as “the most centrally connected place in the Americas, routing flows of people, capital, goods, and all things imaginable back and forth” (202). Needless to say, Cuban Miami is still at the core of Miami’s success, but the ethnic enclave economy is no longer the driving force of the city’s economic growth.
The archival research in this chapter will explore how the Cuban Catholic schools are incorporated into the city’s transformation from being a Cuban city to a pan-Hispanic city. First, the legacy and prestige of the Cuban Catholic schools prior to the Cuban Revolution will be explained. Next, the schools’ move to Miami, and their sustained importance among the exile population, will be examined. Lastly, the Cuban community’s reaction, and in turn the current school under study, to the Hispanicization of Miami will be explored.

The Catholic School Legacy in Cuba

Cuban Catholic schools have a historical legacy that dates back to 16th-century Cuba and Spanish colonization of the island. Originally establishing educational institutions was not a priority of the Spanish government, but it slowly evolved beginning with the arrival of the Franciscans in 1582. They were the first religious group to initiate any formal religious schools in Cuba. Towards the end of the 16th century, Catholic schools were established in Cuba. Although the Catholic schools were sponsored by the Spanish Crown, only well-established citizens of higher socioeconomic status could have their children attend school and gain any sort of formal education (Ginsberg et al. 2010; Soneira 1997a). In other words, only the well-to-do in Cuban society, typically in developing urban areas, were able to send their children to these religiously affiliated schools. According to Sosa-Ródriguez and Penabad Félix (1997), the schools were designed to prepare students for careers in the clergy and governmental hierarchy, thus targeting this education for upper-class elite male students.

However, Poyo (2007) asserts that the societal division enforced by the Catholic schools was almost damaging to their reputation. The Catholic Church lacked the
strength and influence that it had in other Spanish-colonized countries like Mexico, and was contested by both Afro-Cubans in their allegiance to santería—an Afro-Caribbean religion based on the mixing of Yoruba and Roman Catholic components ("Santería" 2014)—and the likes of José Martí as well as other famous Cuban intellectuals (Ginsberg et al. 2010). The schools had to reinvent themselves in the 20th century, which they accomplished by incorporating more Cuban-born bishops into the church, which became possible after gaining independence from Spain, as well as the re-imagining of Catholic schools. Poyo (2007) cites a document issued by a Eucharist Congress chapter in the dioceses of Havana in 1919, petitioning that men must be integrated more into the moral order of the Church, including organizations for men. Furthermore, these organizations were encouraged through Catholic private schools. Cuba became a country where religious orders wanted to start chapters, and likewise where elite parents wanted their children to study (Ginsberg et al. 2010).

By the mid-20th century, the Catholic schools were on their way towards securing their strength, particularly with the clearance that they received by the government in the Constitution of 1940, which was cited in Soneira (1997) as stating, "'están sujetos a la reglamentación e inspección del Estado: pero en todo caso conservarán el derecho a impartir separadamente de la instrucción técnica, la educación religiosa que deseen'" (21-22).3 Private Catholic schools were thought to be achieving a moral order and giving form to Cubanness, as this quote describes, "La Escuela Privada, al igual que la pública, se inspiraba en un espíritu de cubanidad y de solidaridad humana, tendiendo a formar en la conciencia de los educandos el amor a la patria, a sus instituciones democráticas,

---

3 “They will be subject to State regulation and inspection; but in any case will conserve the right to teach separately from technical instruction, the religious education that they wish” (21-22 [author’s translation]).
todos los que por una y otra lucharon, acorde con el artículo 51 de la Constitución [de 1940]” (A pamphlet: Directorio Magisterial Cubano, 3). However, the public schools in Cuba during this time did not provide an equal opportunity like this quote suggests since they did not have as many educational and fiscal resources as the private schools. In general, those who studied at public schools were members of the lower classes, particularly those residing in rural areas. According to Morales Prieto (1981), although the illiteracy rate decreased from 57% in 1898—after the Spanish American War—to 23.6% in 1953, the absolute number of people that were illiterate increased. Furthermore, the disparity was marked by an urban and rural divide, with 12.6% illiteracy in urban areas in 1959 as opposed to a staggering 41.7% in rural areas. Justiniani, de la Torre and Zayas-Bazan (2011) also contend that in spite of all the expenditures utilized in Cuba on education—which according to a UNESCO report issued in 1958, was the largest apportioned to education in all of Latin America and the Caribbean—divides in education still remained, largely between urban and rural areas. All the while, private Catholic schools represented a definitive extension of the upper class that was soon to be challenged by the onset of communism and Fidel Castro. The Revolution destabilized the security and stability of the private Catholic schools in Cuba. In the beginning, the Church had mixed feelings about Castro’s leadership but in general supported the Revolution on the grounds that social welfare would be extended to the marginalized. However, the political atmosphere of the country changed rapidly since the political rhetoric began to coincide with that of the Communist movement throughout Latin

---

4 “The Private School, like the public, is inspired by a spirit of Cubanness and human solidarity, tending to form in the conscience of educators love for the motherland, its democratic institutions, and all that fought for each other, in accordance with article 51 of the Constitution [of 1940]” (A pamphlet: Directorio Magisterial Cubano, 3 [author’s translation]}
America (Gomez Treto 1987; Poyo 2007). In 1960, the Catholic Church declared its rejection of the Castro regime in a statement issued by *La Circular Colectiva del Episcopado Cubano* on August 7th, 1960 which read as follows:

Condenamos, en efecto, el Comunismo, en primer lugar, porque es una doctrina esencialmente materialista y atea, y porque los gobiernos que por ella se guían figuran entre los peores enemigos que han conocido la Iglesia y la humanidad en toda su historia...Condenamos también porque es un sistema que niega brutalmente los más fundamentales derechos de la persona humana (Gomez Treto 1987, 36).5

The rejection of communism by the Catholic church in Cuba led to the release of anti-Communist propaganda, such as the pamphlet titled “Destrucción de la Escuela Privada Cubana” [“Destruction of the Cuban Private School”], showcasing a Communist emblem overshadowing a private school.

![Figure 4.1: Destrucción de la Escuela Privada Cubana](image)

---

5 “We condemn, in effect, Communism, in the first place, because it is essentially a materialistic and atheistic doctrine, and because the governments that guide it are situated between the worst enemies that the Church has known and humanity in all its history...We condemn it also because it is a system that brutally denies the most fundamental rights of the human person” (Gomez Treto 1987, 36 [author translation]).
The pamphlet, as seen in Figure 4.1, emphasized its anger towards the Communist regime, and documented condemnations and insults like “the rich”, “los niños bitongos” or arrogant kids, and the “privileged that study in private schools” (A pamphlet: Directorio Magisterial Cubano 8). The tension between Castro and the Catholic Church appeared to be almost beyond reconciliation.

The Ministry of Education had a plan to organize the National Federation of Students of Secondary Education and nationalize the private schools, as expressed in the release of *La ley de nacionalización de la enseñaza* [“Law of School Nationalization”] in 1961. Castro’s regime denounced the Catholic Church by stating, “Es evidente y notorio que en muchos centros educacionales privados, especialmente los operados por órdenes religiosas católicas, los directores y profesores han venido realizando una activa labor de propaganda contrarrevolucionaria” (Soneira 1997b, 398). Crespo (1987) asserted that with this law, the economic and social power of the Church was undermined by the state, given that the Church was the proprietor of 132 primary schools, 48 secondary schools, 33 trade schools, 22 secretarial schools, 11 home schools, 4 “high schools” and 3 vocational schools (40). Many Catholic schools closed their doors between 1960 and 1961 and fled in exile primarily to Miami (Crespo 2005). Parents wanted their children to be educated in the United States, free from the Communist doctrine. As Martinez and Vendeja (2011) conclude, “This was not the life middle-class Cuban parents had dreamed of for their children” (47-48). Thus, the Cuban Catholic schools and their subsequent networks were uprooted, remaining physically separated from Cuba to the present day.

---

6 “It’s evident and notorious that in many private educational centers, especially those operated by Catholic religious orders, the directors and teachers have been coming to make an active labor of counterrevolutionary propaganda” (Soneira 1997b, 398 [Author’s translation]).
Cuban Catholic School Transplant in Miami – 1960s

Initially, Miami Dade Public Schools (MDPS) was not overwhelmed with the number of Cuban students because many of them attended private Cuban schools (Beebe and Mackey 1977). The early Cuban exile families that settled in Miami during the 1960s preferred to send their children to Spanish-speaking private schools (Justiniani, de la Torre and Zayas-Bazan 2011; Levine 2000). There was a variety of private schools that enrolled Cuban students. Private Catholic schools and private ethnic schools, such as “las escuelitas” as they were dubbed by Miami locals (García and Otheguy 1985; Poyo 2007), were equipped to manage the large influx of Cuban students and were culturally sensitive to the needs of the new Cuban arrivals. The value of private schools in the community can be shown quantitatively by the enrollment totals of Cuban students in private and public school. Between the years 1960 and 1966, the absolute number of Cuban students that enrolled in Catholic schools gradually rose to slightly over 5,000. More astoundingly, however, is the relative increase of Cuban students in Catholic schools per total school enrollment, which between the years 1960 and 1966 rose from slightly over 5% to almost 25% (“The Cuban Immigration” 1967, 100). The high enrollment rates are not a mystery, as the research asserts: "The Cuban middle class tradition of sending children to private schools and the effort of the Catholic school system to absorb these children made the impact of the Cuban migration on the Catholic schools particularly acute” (“The Cuban Immigration” 1967, 99). The prevalent tradition of Cuban private schools among the 1960s early exile community drove the rapid growth of Cuban student enrollment in private schools. After all, the Cuban exile community held an immense and profound sense of trust for private schools rooted in the schools’ history in Cuba. Schools
like the one currently under study garnered exceptional prestige and respect in the Cuban co-exile community.

Many of the private school administrators emigrated from Cuba and reopened their schools in Miami. Thus, many of the Catholic schools were “transplanted” to Miami through the first wave of the Cuban diaspora (Jorge, Suchlicki and Leyva de Varona 1991). The private Cuban Catholic schools reopened in Miami during the early 1960s with relative ease. A coalition of private Catholic schools that recognized the importance of traditional Cuban education was established. However, Cuban Catholic schools faced one major challenge. Priest Coleman Carroll, an American serving as Archbishop of Miami during the 1960s, required that the Cuban private Catholic schools that settled in Miami must teach children English (Jorge, Suchlicki and Leyva de Varona 1991; Poyo 2007). Henceforth, the enforcement of bilingualism was initiated from the moment that these schools were founded in Miami. A survey conducted in 1974 proved that the majority of these private Catholic schools were still bilingual (Beebe and Mackey 1977). The requirement of bilingualism began not only a struggle to balance English and Spanish in the classroom, but also a struggle between acculturation to American social structures and preservation of Cuban heritage.

In general, the actions of the private Cuban Catholic schools reflected the following belief among the Cuban exile community: Cuban youth could learn English in the formal school setting while preserving both their Cuban heritage and Spanish language skills in the informal learning setting. Although the schools adopted an American-styled curriculum, many of the teachers served as educators in Cuba (García 1990) and were capable of integrating Cuban culture into the lesson plans. Given that the
teachers were Cuban, Cuban families were more trusting of the private Catholic schools because “[the parents] could be assured of a quality education that would prepare them equally well for life in Cuba or the United States” (García 1990, 92). The teaching of Cuban culture was incorporated into an informal curriculum because the Cuban community—school administrators, teachers and parents alike—believed that there was a possibility that they would all return to Cuba. Parents wanted their children to be familiar with both American and Cuban cultures should Castro’s communist government fall. As a result, biculturalism was integrated into the goals of the bilingual curriculum in both the formal and informal settings. Although English was taught in the classroom, Spanish was the preferred language in the hallways, on the playground and especially at home. In addition to speaking Spanish at school, the priests strongly encouraged parents to continue talking to their children in Spanish (Poyo 2007). The following quote emphasizes how Cuban priests wanted Cuban families to speak in Spanish with their children:

También son frecuentes los casos en que se van perdiendo nuestros valores culturales, siendo especialmente lamentable en muchos que viven en Estados Unidos la pérdida del idioma español, tan importante para la conservación de la propia cultura, y que tan fácilmente podrían aprender los niños hablándolo en la casa mientras en la escuela aprenden inglés (Boza Masvidal and Roman 1981, 29).7

The private Catholic Cuban schools aspired for the children to learn English, but not to become ‘Americanized’. Assimilating into American culture and losing touch with their Cuban roots was actively avoided in Cuban private Catholic schools. Learning English was important because it allowed the Cuban community to interact with their

---

7 “What is also normal are the cases in which they are losing our cultural values, the Spanish language loss in many that live in the United States being especially sad, so important for the conservation of our own culture, and the children could so easily learn speaking it at home while they learn English in school” (Boza Masvidal and Roman 29 [author translation]).
non-Spanish-speaking counterparts and ultimately not be isolated as a social group. However, the retention of Spanish and, in turn, Cuban culture, became a primary goal for these schools. As García notes:

> English never surpassed Spanish in importance—at least for this first generation—since Spanish was too crucial to ‘cubanidad’. Spanish never became a private language…Non-Cubans perceived this as a refusal to assimilate; Cubans perceived it as adaptation without relinquishing an essential element of their identity (1990, 90).

Spanish retained its importance because it was deeply connected with Cuban culture. Moreover, the schools wanted to promote Spanish with the hope that Cuban children would not lose their Cuban identity. Even when the hope of Castro’s government toppling disintegrated among the Cuban exile community, the model of bilingual and bicultural education remained in the Cuban private schools, and even MDPS, with the successful pilot bilingual and bicultural education program at Coral Way Elementary in 1963, and the creation of the Bilingual School Organization (BISO) in 1971 (Beebe and Mackey 1990; García and Otheguy 1985). The popularity and proliferation of bilingual private and public schools alike can be exhibited through this GIS map as indicated in Figure 4.2. Combining data from Beebe and Mackey (1990) on the number of declared bilingual public schools in Miami-Dade County by 1973, and private Cuban Catholic and ethnic schools accredited by Council of Bilingual Schools (COBIS) or the Independent Schools of South Florida (ISSF) organization by the year 1980, the Cuban influence on bilingual education proliferated across the county. The bilingualism and biculturalism that the private schools evoked emphasized Cuban customs and traditions. While the private Catholic schools encouraged bilingualism and biculturalism to integrate Cuban children into American society, the ultimate goal was to create a space for the Cuban
exile youth in Miami, uprooted from their homes, to actively engage with their Cuban heritage.

Ultimately, Cubans who attended private Catholic schools were integrated into a culturally rich community that embraced Cuban culture, norms, and values. Parents, teachers, administrators, businesses and community partners alike worked together to improve the private education of Cuban youth. The schools became and remained widely popular in Miami, as Beebe and Mackey (1977) note: “By the mid-seventies, there were still some 30 Cuban-operated private schools accounting for some 15,000 students” (45). The schools’ popularity can be attributed to the familiarity and trust they gained within the exile community. The education was founded upon values and norms rooted in Cuban tradition that many exiled Cuban parents cherished. The private Cuban schools were the centerpiece that facilitated community building processes for the Cuban immigrant community. The Cuban youth may have selectively acculturated during their school experiences and beyond, but in general they maintained their sense of Cubanness and did not lose it through assimilation into the American hegemonic society.

Indeed, Cubans attending the Cuban Catholic schools were incorporated into a bilingual and bicultural environment that was supported throughout MDPS. The fear of the younger immigrant generation’s complete assimilation to American mainstream society was growing. This fear was not restricted to Cuban Catholic schools; it was also prevalent among Cubans throughout Miami. Their fear was based in the weakening socio-political climate supporting bilingualism and biculturalism in Miami. The weakening of this climate began with the onset of the Cuban exile wave of the 1980s known as the Mariel exile. During the summer of 1980, MDPS had an estimated 9,000
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Cuban refugee children enroll in their summer program. This summer program was used to manually process the Mariel children that arrived in the US with no academic or official identification records (Silva 1985). Within the 1979-1980 academic year, the number of Cuban students enrolled in MDPS increased by 5,023, and by June of 1981 there were 15,255 total Cuban students enrolled in MDPS (Silva 1985). Through no fault of their own, the Mariel children were impacted by the stigmatization of their parents. The *Marielitos*, as the Cuban exiles from this time period were nicknamed, were framed by the media and politicians as being criminals, dissidents and delinquents that Castro removed from Cuba (García 1990). The *Marielitos*, who were considered *la escoria* (“the scum”) by the Castro regime, were stigmatized by the American society as well (Nijman 2011). Ultimately, there was a fear among the American nativists living in Miami that Cubans were going to overrun civic life in the city, hence the classic slogan that arose in the 1980s stating “Will the last American in Miami, please bring the flag?” (Huntington 2004, 43).

As a result of the Mariel exile, there was anti-Cuban sentiment that negatively impacted the Cuban exile community in Miami as a whole. The turning point was signified by two major courses of legal action related to bilingualism in Miami. The first was the repeal of the city’s Bilingual-Bicultural Ordinance in 1980 which “made it unlawful to use county votes to ‘promote any language or culture other than that of the United States’” (García 1990, 198). The second was the successful lobby of an English-only provision in Miami in 1980 (Nijman 2011). The English-only provision was only repealed in 1993 as a result of Cuban mobilization in the Miami political sphere (“Board in Miami Repeals” 1993; San Martin 1993). Ultimately, as Cuban Miami advanced
through the 1980s and 1990s, they had to reconcile with the resistance they faced from the nativist population in Miami. Undoubtedly, this anti-bilingual movement had an effect on the Cuban youth attending the private Catholic schools that were transplanted to Miami, simply because avoidance of this movement was virtually impossible. Cuban Miami gained some reprieve from the English-only tension from the nativists as more immigrants from Latin America and the Caribbean settled in Miami, which reinforced the use of Spanish language in the city. However, as the next section will detail, Cuban Miami’s welcoming of other Hispanics into the city was not open-armed.

**Cuban Catholic Schools and the Growth of Pan-Hispanic Miami – 1990s and 2000s**

The transplant of Cuban Catholic schools to Miami marked the historical transition that exiles from the island were making to reestablish themselves after being uprooted by the Cuban Revolution. Indeed, it captured the attention of religious leaders, educators, and county officials alike as they were in awe of the strides that the Cuban exile community was making to rebuild their lives. However, after the schools were transplanted to Miami, virtually nothing else was said about them. As Miami transitioned from a period of Cubanization to a period of Hispanicization beginning in the 1980s (Boswell 1994), the schools remained virtually out of any spotlight. Given that these schools are an extension of the successful co-ethnic Cuban exile community, it is only reasonable to be curious about how the schools have reacted to the growing non-Cuban Hispanic influence in the city.

A contact from the school in this case study offered a statement regarding this transition, which is summarized below:
Fully aware of our competitive nature, we started to make an effort to broaden the scope of the school...more effectively. It was thus inevitable that the overwhelming ‘Cuban Presence’ would be ameliorated (sic) and other dimensions increased. Is the school still Cuban? Yes, we remain true to our roots and take pride in stating that it... has been in the business of teaching uninterruptedly – even in the midst of a Communist revolution and exile...Today, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, France, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, United States, Venezuela.... and Cuba, of course, are represented in our community; other countries as well. I believe that today, we can truly call [the school] a Cosmopolitan Catholic American Educational Institution with a Cuban heritage (Personal correspondence, 2016). 

The statement demonstrates that the school administration was accepting of the new students. In large part they could have been accepting because from an economic perspective, the students were a sign of new growth for the school. However, the acceptance of these new students goes beyond economic gains alone, as it represents the Cuban community’s welcoming of the expanding Hispanic population in the city. In the next section, the struggles and triumphs alike that Cuban Miami has faced with welcoming incoming immigrants from the early 1980s through the 2000s will be chronicled through an examination of newspapers, books and other historical materials. Particularly, a radicalized and satirical exile newspaper that was published in Little Havana, *La Política Comíca*, was examined. Although this newspaper may not reflect the viewpoints of the entire Cuban community, the writers served in many ways as a voice box that represented a particular viewpoint of a segment of the community. What is noteworthy is how the influential proponents of the Cuban Miami identity, particularly the local Spanish radio and print journalists, reacted to the Hispanicization of the city. If the Cuban Catholic schools like the one studied are an extension of the Cuban exile community, then undoubtedly the tensions that the entire Cuban Miami community faced were experienced by the affiliated members of the school.
All things considered, the Cuban co-exile community in Miami has been accepting of the incoming immigrant populations from Latin America and the Caribbean. The first notable group of non-Cuban Hispanics that migrated to Miami was the Nicaraguan exiles in the 1980s who were escaping political violence and persecution. In general, the Cuban community was welcoming to the newcomers on the grounds that they experienced similar turmoil as them—the Cubans had a respect for those fleeing their homeland to escape a leftist regime (Nijman 2011; Stepick and Dutton Stepick 2008). Others followed suit, such as Colombians escaping political violence that erupted in the 1980s, and more recently, Venezuelans fleeing the Chavez regime. Similarly, Argentines, and more recently Brazilians, have steadily migrated to Miami as a result of frequent economic crises (Alvarez 2014). Indeed, increased migration from Latin America has led to new development, as seen by the countless number of buildings currently being constructed in Brickell, and the growth of suburban regions like Kendall and Doral (Alvarez 2014; Nijman 2011). Implicitly, the Cuban community has benefitted from the success of these other migrants, and the success that Miami has garnered as a transnational and global city.

While the Cuban community may embrace the cultural mecca that Miami is becoming, that does not negate tensions that have occurred as the city has increasingly Hispanicized. Little Havana proved to be one of the most significant places of contestation for the Cuban Miami community. Nijman (2011) states Little Havana is unequivocally the most salient socio-political representation of Cuban exile ideology and identity in Miami. Little Havana was Cuban Miami’s attempt to recreate the homeland within their exile community. Such sentiment is expressed with a Miami resident
interviewed in De La Torre (2003): “‘For us, we can express ourselves with all our emotion in this city we helped build for 30 and 40 years. This is our little bit of Cuba, here in Miami, where we can be ourselves’” (132). Nonetheless, tension surrounding the Cubans’ resistance to the forces of Hispanicization began as early as the mid-1980s, when some Cubans opposed the City of Miami’s renaming of “Little Havana” as the “Latin Quarter” (Nijman 2011). One local Miami woman was quoted in an article for the *New York Times* as saying “‘they don’t call Chinatown Asiatown. They don’t call Little Italy Europeantown. We deserve the name [Little Havana]. It’s ours’” (Rimer 1990, A12). The woman quoted in the article certifies that claim, as she states, “After Cuba, Little Havana is my homeland” (Rimer 1990, A12). The tension in Little Havana was very much alive, but efforts made by the County to change the name proved unsuccessful.

In spite of retaining the name of Little Havana, the aftermath left a residual sting. In the following excerpt, an article in the Cuban exile newspaper *La Política Cómica* commented in a political satire about the loss of Cubanness in Miami, and particularly the potential name change of Little Havana: “La Pequeña Habana ahora es la Gran Centroamérica. ¡Te lo advertí cuando te dije que tuvieras cuidado con el ‘Latin Quarter’! Y si me dices: me queda Miami, te contesto: ¡Qué loco estás!” (González 1998, 9).8 Indeed, Little Havana was no longer the only “ethnic” neighborhood in the city, as areas such as Little Managua and Little Haiti were also beginning to emerge (Croucher 1997). Nowadays the streets of Little Havana are filled with Nicaraguan fritangas and churches. Nicaraguans, Hondurans, Colombians and Argentines are some of the faster growing

---

8 “Little Havana now is Big Central America. I warned you of it when I told you to be careful of ‘the Latin Quarter!’ And if you tell me: ‘Miami remains’, I will tell you: How crazy are you!” (González 1998, 9 [author translation]).
populations in the once notoriously Cuban neighborhood (Cordoba 2013). Meanwhile, Cubans were moving to Hialeah, Brickell, Coral Gables, Kendall, and other regions of the city (Lepri 2014). The city was growing, evolving and changing, and the fears that some Cuban exiles had about “losing” Little Havana were founded in this demographic shift that the city was experiencing.

Another area of tension between Cuban Miami and non-Cuban Hispanics was in the local radio and media industry. The Cuban radio waves were a major mechanism for spreading anti-Castro propaganda and ideas, but their hegemony was challenged by non-Cuban Spanish radio companies. Needless to say, the Miami Cuban community did not take these changes positively, especially with the loss of their well-known channel “La Cubanísima” [“The very Cuban”] or WQBA on station AM1140. The radio broadcasting company that owned WQBA, Hispanic Broadcasting Corp, was bought by Univision in the summer of 2002 (Mann 2002). The changes were made to broaden the audience from a more Cuban Miami base to a more pan-Hispanic national one. The change in ownership and the reasons for it did not come as much of a surprise, as they could be anticipated as early as the late 1990s when the radio station dropped the WQBA handle altogether (Shoer Roth and Mazzei 2012). As a response to this news, one of the Cuban exile writers wrote, “Ya perdimos el nombre, ‘La Cubanísima.’ Cuando ya no exista la WQBA, porque la convertirán en un tocadiscos tejano, será la señal más clara y más dolorosa de que, si una vez perdimos a Cuba, ¡ahora estamos perdiendo a Miami!” (“¿Cuánto más debemos perder,” 2002, 22). At around the same time, the Colombians began to gain more traction with Miami listeners with their station owned by Caracol.

---

9 “We already lost the name, ‘La Cubanísima.’ When the WQBA no longer exists, because they will convert it into a Texan record player, it will be the clearest and most painful signal that, if once we lost Cuba, now we are losing Miami!” (“¿Cuánto más debemos perder,” 2002, 22).
The following quote is an example of the frustration experienced in some segments of the Cuban community with regards to Caracol:

Y basta de criticar a las emisoras cubanas por hablar de Cuba: ¿qué hace Caracol, sino hablar de Colombia? ¿Y los haitianos no hablan de Haití? Cada uno defiende lo suyo, pero tal parece que lo único criticable aquí es que la radio cubana defienda a Cuba, el único país del continente cuya espantosa tragedia deberían defenderla también los colombianos, los haitianos y todos los demás latinoamericanos con acceso a los micrófonos aquí. Que tengamos que defender ese derecho en Miami es algo que, francamente, da deseos de llorar (Carapachibey 2002, 22).10

The quote demonstrates that there were some Cubans who were fearful of this incoming presence of non-Cuban Hispanics on local radio. The fear was not so much that the Colombians and the Haitians vocalize their country’s concerns on the radio waves, but that it was happening at the expense of Cuban radio. The ensuing conversations on Cuban radio led to one article about “los ingratos,” [“the ungrateful”], like the other Latinos who were thought to take advantage of the Miami Cuban exile community’s efforts to improve the city’s local economy; and “los traidores” [“the traitors”], like Univision trying to dilute the Cuban influence in Miami. The article then stated that:

Por esa ingratitud y esa traición, también, los cubanos de Miami tenemos hoy menos periódicos, menos teatros, menos organizaciones cívicas y culturales, y menos influencia en los grandes medios de comunicación, al extremo de que ya parece que pronunciar el nombre de Cuba en Miami es una mala palabra (“La ‘descubanización’ de Miami,” 1999, 8)11.

---

10 And enough of criticizing the Cuban radio waves for speaking about Cuba: What does Caracol do but talk about Colombia? And the Haitians don’t talk about Haiti? Each one defends its own, but it seems that the only critique here is that Cuban radio defends Cuba, the only country on the continent whose atrocious tragedy the Colombians, the Haitians and the rest of the Latin Americans with access to microphones here should defend. That we have to defend that right in Miami is something that, frankly, makes one want to cry” (Carapachibey 2002, 22 [author translation]).

11 “For this ingratitude and treachery, also, the Miami Cubans today have fewer newspapers, fewer theaters, fewer civic and cultural organizations, and less influence in the mass media, to the extreme that it seems like to say the name Cuba in Miami is a bad word” (“La ‘descubanización’ de Miami,” 1999, 8).
Undoubtedly, Cuban Miami was feeling a sense of loss, maybe even nostalgia for earlier days when they were the dominant ethnic group in the city. The media industry is where these growing pains to the increasingly multiethnic Miami were most evident.

Perhaps the most notable of these ethnic tensions occurred during the infamous Elián González incident in the spring of 2000. Elián was the son of a mother who attempted to migrate to Miami in 1999. She died at sea, but the boy survived, and he was taken under the custody of his mother’s extended family in Miami. Meanwhile, his father back in Cuba demanded that Elián be repatriated. The legal battle that ensued between Elián’s extended family in Miami, his father in Cuba, and the US government captured the attention of Cuban Miami, as he became a symbol for US-Cuba relations. Ultimately, the US federal court system ruled that Elián be repatriated to his father, and in the early morning he was seized from his home by federal law enforcement. The infamous Pulitzer-winning photo of Elián being taken from his home made national headlines, and infuriated Cuban Miami. The headline, featured in the photo above, displayed in *El Nuevo Herald* read “¡Qué vergüenza!” [“What a disgrace!”] The drama that followed the Elián raid revealed to Miami Cubans the deep rifts that divided them from other ethnic groups, such as non-Cuban Hispanics (De la Torre 2003) and, perhaps, even each other (Brinkley-Rogers and Ponce 2000).

According to Rubén Rumbaut in an interview with the *Miami Herald*, the Elián incident was a cornerstone in the Cuban Miami exile saga, as Cubans became exposed to dissenting views from non-Hispanics across the country, as many of them inside and outside of Miami supported the US government’s decision of repatriation. Rumbaut claimed that Cuban Miami community was taken aback, as they suddenly felt like they
were under attack, and exposed as outsiders (Santiago and Dorschner 2000). Similarly, in another article, Lisandro Pérez, then director of the Cuban Research Institute at Florida International University, was quoted as saying, “If the exiles do eventually lose their bid to keep Elián in Miami, it will be a bitter blow. Cuban-Americans are not used to listening’” (Robinson 2000, 21). As the legal proceedings moved forward, Cuban Miami further isolated itself in its fervent opinions about the case. Latinos polled nationwide were more inclined to agree with the US court rulings than the Cubans were, arguing that the Cubans were overly privileged and bombastic in their defense of the boy (De la Torre 2003; Gonzalez 2000; Navarrette Jr 2000). The rejection that Cuban Miami received from non-Cuban Hispanics inside and outside of Miami was a significant sign for exile leaders that “la lucha” [the fight] against Fidel that had persisted for forty years was losing broader support (De la Torre 2003, 132). In addition, rifts began to form among the Cuban Miami community itself. Elena Freyre, the executive director of the anti-embargo Cuban Committee for Democracy during the year 2000, claimed that the Elián case was driving a wedge between those who preferred the US embargo against Cuba versus those who encouraged reconciliation (Brinkley-Rogers and Ponce 2000). Some Cubans were fearful of being marked as a traitor or as a communist if they vocalized dissenting views (Bragg 2000; Forero 2000). In the end, Elián was successfully repatriated to his father in Cuba, creating a point of weakness for Cuban Miami. The Elián González case serves as an example of how Miami’s urban dynamic was changing, and how the Cuban exile leaders were blind to those changes (Yúdice 2003).
Some sectors of Cuban Miami reacted to the so-called Hispanicization of the city by resisting the newcomers’ influence on their exile community. A persistent theme throughout the Política Cómica newspapers in the late 1990s and early 2000s was this idea of the “descubanización” [de-Cubanization] of Miami (see Figure 4.3). One author challenged readers with the following statement: “I would like to ask this point: Is there anyone that can deny that a movement to de-Cubanize Miami exists?” (Gónzalez 1999, 9). This idea of de-Cubanization did not arise from Miami’s becoming more diverse alone, but rather, from how other immigrant groups were contesting the Cuban-dominated political and economic influence, thus building their own success in the city and challenging Cuban Miami’s hegemony. Indeed, as early as the 1980s, and more evidently in the 1990s, east Little Havana was considered by Grenier and Moebius (2015) to be de-Cubanized.

Although some sectors of Cuban Miami felt that their power and influence in the city was waning, this is not to say that the Cuban co-ethnic community was opposed to the diversification of the population. Indeed, the Cubans felt as though it was their responsibility to unite Latin Americans, particularly those of Spanish-speaking origin, from across the Americas. In their annual festival Grito de Baire [“Shout of Baire”—a tribute to the commencement of Cuba’s War of Independence against Spain in 1895—the Cubans were honored to invite the entire Miami Latino community to the festivities. In
the newspaper ad featured in Figure 4.4, the Cuban, as well as the Peruvian, Nicaraguan, Colombian, Honduran and Venezuelan flags were all adorning the announcement. An article published in the *Política Cómica* exile newspaper remarked on solidarity of Cuban Miami with the rest of Spanish-speaking Latino Miami:

“¡Pero hay un hecho cierto! Los cubanos que arribamos a estas Playas desde 1959—en éste (sic) largo y doloroso Destierro—abrimos el camino a miles de hermanos Latinoamericanos que hoy comparten esta hermosa y progresista Ciudad de Miami. Nuestra amada ‘Pequeña Habana’ es hoy una ‘América Grande’ ¡Compartimos con los Nicaragüenses, los Colombianos, los Peruanos y todos las demás Comunidades hispanas nuestras vidas, nuestros afanes, nuestras luchas! ¡Debemos compartir también nuestras Fiestas Patrias! ¡Recordamos que Martí era cubano pero se tenía como un ‘Hombre América’!” (“¡Grito de Baire!” 2004, 15) 12

Indeed, under the teachings of famous Cuban philosopher José Martí, the Cuban Miami community was encouraging anyone from across the Americas who resided in Miami in exile like them, to unite in a celebration that encouraged pan-ethnic pride and solidarity. However, Cuban Miami was still attempting to characterize itself as the leader of this movement, further establishing Cubans’ acclaimed influence in the city and their ability to create a pathway of success for other Latinos. The Cuban leadership in this movement has received recognition, such as an editorial written by Jorge Ramos, a journalist for Univision and advocate of immigration rights and reform. Ramos was born in Mexico, but has worked as Univision’s lead anchor in Miami for at least a decade. In response to the upcoming 2016 GOP presidential debates in Miami, he made the following statement about the Miami Latino community: “La comunidad cubanoamericana, generosamente, ha ido recibiendo a centroamericanos, colombianos,

12 “But there is a certain truth! The Cubans that arrived to these beaches since 1959—in this long and dangerous exile—we opened the pathway to thousands of Latino brothers that now share this beautiful and progressive City of Miami. Our adored “Little Havana” is now “Great America”. We share our lives, our efforts, our fights with the Nicaraguans, the Colombians, the Peruvians and the other Hispanic communities! We should share also our Patriotic Festivals! We remember that Martí was Cuban but he was like an “American Man!” (“¡Grito de Baire!” 2004, 15 [author translation]).
venezolanos y a cualquiera que huya de la violencia o represión en su país de origen.

Alguien, siempre, te ayuda al llegar.” (Ramos 2016). Ramos’ interpretation of the pathway for success that immigrants like him have experienced in Miami is a result of Cuban Miami’s resilience in spite of the city’s rapid cultural changes. In spite of how much Cuban Miami has feared its receding influence in the city, the legacy that the Cubanization period left behind remains prominent to the present day.

What does the process of Hispanicization in Miami, and the decline of Cubanization, mean for Cuban immigrant youth? On the one hand, they are following the pathway towards shifting to English use and embracing American norms, values and traditions (Carter and Lynch 2015; Eilers, Oller and Cobo-Lewis 2002; Lynch 2000; Porcel 2006; Portes and Schauffler 1996; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Fiedler wrote for the Miami Herald, “Fact is these exiles have raised American-educated children and American-born grandchildren. These generations, though affected by the exile experience, are not themselves exiles. The community’s focus on lives abandoned in Cuba is fast shifting to futures in the United States.” (2000, 4L). As much as Cuban Miami has indeed maintained its Cubanidad, the Cuban youth born in Miami have had extremely little contact with their patria or homeland, if at all (Otheguy, García and Roca 2000). Even if Miami is the cultural and economic gateway to Cuba and the Americas,

---

13 “The Cuban-American community, generously, has been welcoming to Central Americans, Colombians, Venezuelans, and any other group that flees from violence or repression in their country of origin. Someone, always, helps you when you arrive” (Ramos 2016).
children born there undoubtedly are acculturating to mainstream America. On the other hand, there is an exception to this narrative. As is observed in the Elián González example, Cuban immigrant youth became exposed to rhetoric that was perhaps discriminatory and somewhat vindictive towards them as an ethnic group. Santiago and Dorschner comment that “Many younger and more moderate members who had felt completely Americanized are now hearing comments by non-Hispanics that make them believe that they are still outsiders. They are feeling drawn back to what Portes calls ‘the protection of the enclave.’” (2000, n.p.). Yúdice (2003) notes that third-generation Cubans rallied behind the cause, reestablishing a sense of ethnic pride out of defense for the ethnic group. Nonetheless, how much that identity remains salient in a pan-ethnic Latino city remains to be seen, particularly for students of Cuban descent attending a Cuban-rooted school that admittedly, has become an international cosmopolitan American school with now only Cuban heritage, as opposed to a Cuban school situated in exile within American society.

**Conclusion**

The transplant of Cuban Catholic schools from Cuba to Miami, and the transition that the schools were forced to make within the socio-political context of a rapidly diversifying city, are representative of a larger narrative related to the incorporation of Cubans into Miami. The schools are an extension of Cuban Miami, and are intertwined with the conditions that the greater Cuban community faces. Thus, the students of Cuban descent that attend schools like the one under study, even while being protected by the Cuban co-ethnic community, are exposed to the forces of nativism and Hispanicization that affect immigrant youth of Cuban descent throughout the city. In the survey analysis
presented in the subsequent chapters, students of Cuban descent will be examined to
determine to what extent they have maintained a sense of *cubanidad*, and to what extent
they have acculturated to either the American mainstream, or the expanding
Hispanic/Latino environment of Miami. In spite of nativist and Hispanic forces, Cuban
Miami is still relevant today, and if any extension of the Cuban Miami community would
be successful in fostering Cuban nationalist pride against these forces, it would likely be
the Cuban Catholic schools like the one featured in this case study.
Chapter 5

Spanish Language Use

Descriptive Statistics – Students

Students of Spanish-speaking descent from Latin America and the Caribbean were surveyed for this study (N=146). Their age range was between 16 and 18 years, with a mean of 17.5 years old. The majority of students were in the 12th grade, although a small number sampled were juniors. The majority of them were born in Miami, or South Florida, although other birthplaces included Boston, New York City, San Francisco, Houston, and New Orleans, as well as Havana, Santa Clara and San Cristóbal, Cuba; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Mexico City, Mexico; Caracas and Valencia, Venezuela. It is noteworthy that, of the foreign-born, there were more students from Mexico and Venezuela than from Cuba.

Ethnicity was divided into three categories: Cuban, half-Cuban, and non-Cuban descent. These distinctions were constructed based on the students’ family history and the students’ self-reported ethnic identity. Students who considered themselves Cuban-American (i.e. born in the U.S. of Cuban-origin parents) were categorized as being of Cuban descent. For cases where the student’s self-reporting was not completely clear, the language use of their parents was examined to make a distinction between students of Cuban and half-Cuban descent. This issue is in large part due to how some students self-report as Cuban-American even if both of their parents are of Cuban descent. In these cases, if both parents spoke Spanish in the household, they were considered of Cuban descent; if one of their parents was reported as not speaking any Spanish, they were categorized as half-Cuban descent. This measure is not infallible, as a parent of Cuban
descent could speak very little or no Spanish, but based on this sample the likelihood of a parent of Cuban descent not knowing any Spanish is highly unlikely. If no clear determination could be made based on the information provided, a null value was assigned for this category.

A variable for immigrant generation was determined by the immigrant generation of their parents. Students who had at least one foreign-born adult immigrant parent were considered first generation (G1). This would indicate that students comprising the 1.5 generation (i.e. those who migrated to the US as young children) were classified as G1 since, for statistical analysis, it seemed safe to assume that they would have at least one first-generation parent. Similarly, second generation immigrant students are classified as G1, since by default one of their parents would have been foreign-born. Students with second generation parents—or parents that were born in the US to foreign-born parents—were considered G2. Students with the G2 classification are thus third-generation immigrants, indicating that their grandparents were foreign-born but not their parents. There were two students who classified as fourth generation immigrants. As there were only two of them, they were too small of a sample to gain their own variable. However, because the students reported themselves and their parents as having Spanish language proficiency, they were classified as G2 for purposes of statistical testing.

**Reported Spanish Language Use**

Students (N = 145) self-reported their oral Spanish language proficiency on a Likert-scale of 1-5, (1 indicating “poor,” 5 indicating, “excellent.”) Based upon the total responses for “very good” and “excellent,” approximately 50% of the students could be considered as fluently bilingual (see Figure 5.1). For the purpose of this analysis, it is
assumed that since the research site is a private school, and the entire curriculum, unless designated a foreign class, is in English, students are all fluent English speakers.

Figure 5.2 reflects Spanish language use with family and friends. As self-reported Spanish language proficiency increases, Spanish language use with family and friends
also increases. The largest relative increase is observed in Spanish language use with others. Spanish language use among grandparents is the highest, reaching a peak mean of 4.85, or Spanish almost always. Spanish language with friends is the lowest, reaching a peak mean value of 1.61, or some Spanish, mostly English. Figure 5.3 reflects Spanish language use with family and friends by immigrant generation. Among all the categories, Spanish language use was higher with G1 students than G2. The highest relative increase is Spanish language use with parents, specifically mothers. Spanish language use with grandparents remained the highest, with a peak mean value of 4.59 among G1 students, or Spanish almost always. The lowest mean value of Spanish language use was with siblings, reporting a peak mean of 1.44 among G1 students, or English almost always.
Spanish language media consumption was also measured among students as another proxy to measure levels of acculturation. Figure 5.4 reflects consumption of Spanish language music and TV/movies by reported oral Spanish language proficiency. As Spanish proficiency increases, consumption of Spanish language media increases.
Music is most popular among students, but even at its peak mean value of 2.55, indicating music preferences that are half English and half Spanish, the sample tends to listen to more English music than Spanish. Figure 5.5 reflects consumption of Spanish language music and TV/movies per immigrant generation. G1 immigrants consume more Spanish language media than G2 students. G1 students reported higher consumption of Spanish language TV/movies and music than G2 students, with a slightly higher increase evident for Spanish language music. Spanish language music was more popular than Spanish language TV/movies across both G1 and G2. However, Spanish language music had a peak mean value of 1.99 among the G1 students, indicating some Spanish and mostly English.

**Descriptive Statistics – Parents**

Parents of Cuban descent (N=56) were surveyed for this analysis (see Figure 5.6). 32 of the respondents were mothers; 22 of the respondents were fathers; 2 of the respondents were declared legal guardians. Approximately 56% of the parents have a
post-graduate degree, reflecting higher levels of socioeconomic status. Given the higher levels of education, perhaps it is not a surprise that approximately 84% of parents self-report their English-speaking abilities as “excellent”, and the remaining 16% report them as “very good.” Self-reported oral Spanish proficiency rates are more divided, with approximately 36% of the parents reporting an “excellent” Spanish proficiency, and 39% of the respondents self-reporting as “very good.” Approximately 20% self-reported their Spanish proficiency as “good,” with the remaining 4% reporting “poor” or “fair” proficiencies. Figure 5.6 reflects parent self-reported language use with their sons. The most popular response at approximately 43% is mostly English/some Spanish, followed by approximately 39% reporting English almost always. Only 4% use mostly Spanish or Spanish almost always with their children. Indeed, language shift is occurring in the household as evident through parental language use with children. Figure 5.6 also reflects language use based on the gender of the parent. Mothers most popularly incorporate some Spanish into dialogue with their sons as opposed to none. Fathers are staggered as outliers—on the one hand, they are most likely to use English almost always with their sons, but on the other hand are the only gender to report using more Spanish than English with their sons.

**Statistical Analysis**

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests, and a post-hoc Scheffe tests were conducted to understand the relationship between self-reported Spanish language use and ethnicity. There was a significant variance between Cubans and “other ethnicities” (sig = .001) with Cubans using significantly more English. Cross-tabulations on ethnicity and immigrant generation were then conducted, and it was discovered that all of the
respondents that report as non-Cuban (n=28) also report as G1. Thus, the significant variance is likely not between Cubans and non-Cubans, but rather between G1 and G2 youth. This indicates that out of the students currently attending this school, the ones that are non-Cuban are almost definitely 1.5 generation or 2nd generation, as opposed to Cuban students that are almost equally likely to be 2nd or 3rd generation.

Cross-tabulations related to Spanish language use and ethnicity were examined to compare the response frequencies of students reporting full Cuban, half Cuban, or no Cuban ethnicity. On the measure of self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency, the majority of Cuban students responded with a ‘3,’ (n = 31) indicating that their Spanish is “good”; the majority of half-Cuban students responded with a ‘4’ (n = 13) indicating that their Spanish is “very good”; the majority of non-Cuban students responded with a ‘5’ (n = 15) indicating that their Spanish is “excellent.” Although One-way ANOVAs did not prove significant (sig > .05) on measures related to ethnicity, the variances in absolute numbers of the responses show that the majority of the students in the ethnicity sample, Cubans (n = 86) have lower Spanish language proficiencies than their half-Cuban and non-Cuban counterparts. On the measures related to Spanish language use with family and friends, all three groups report similar frequencies in the categories related to grandparents, siblings and friends. Where there is more variance is in the categories related to Spanish language use with their mothers and fathers. While the majority Cuban and half-Cuban students reported a ‘1’ indicating English almost always with their parents, the majority of non-Cuban students reported a ‘5’ indicating Spanish almost always with their parents. Although One-way ANOVAs did not prove significant (sig > .05) on measures related to ethnicity, the variance in absolute numbers of the responses
highlights the increased levels of English shift in Cuban and half-Cuban households that is not prevalent in the households of non-Cuban students.

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine the significance of variance of Spanish language use with family and friends as related to self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency and immigrant generation. All the variables measured in the test on self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency yielded significance under .05. All the variables measured in the test on immigrant generation yielded significance under .05, except language use with friends (sig = .202). It can be speculated that language use with friends, since it extends outside the household and family context, depends more on the individual’s use of oral Spanish as opposed to their ascribed immigrant generation.

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine the significance of variance of Spanish language media consumption as related to self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency and immigrant generation. All the variables measured in the test on self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency yielded significance of .000. Neither of the variables measured in the test on immigrant generation yielded significance under .05. Spanish language media consumption may be related less to immigrant generation and more to the individual Spanish language proficiency of the individual.

Discussion

Several conclusions can be drawn from the results on student and parent language use. First, the high levels of self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency among the non-Cuban G1 youth is supported by studies of language shift. The G1 youth are more likely to speak the heritage language than third and fourth generation youth. Second, students of Cuban and half-Cuban descent in the sample seem to be undergoing English
language shift in the home more so than non-Cuban students are. However, this is likely due to the fact that all the non-Cuban students have first-generation immigrant parents, thus making the statistical likelihood for Spanish language use in those households greater than that in households with second generation parents. Third, parents of Cuban descent also are reporting signs of English language shift in the household. Based on the parent survey it is unclear as to whether or not the parents tried to speak Spanish with their children and their children rejected the heritage language through their adolescent years, or if the parents made the conscious choice to speak to their children predominantly in English. Fourth, in spite of language shift to English among students of Cuban descent, the resilience that the Spanish language has among these students defies the Fishman model of language shift. There are sizeable numbers of second and third generation Cuban youth who are proficient in the language. This study does not research students of Cuban descent in Miami-Dade public schools, but research from Portes and Rumbaut (2001) demonstrated clearly that students of Cuban descent attending private schools were more likely to retain Spanish than those in public schools, and this trend seems to persist today. This may be as well due to youth at this Cuban Catholic school being of higher socioeconomic class, which coincides with the findings of Lambert and Taylor (1996) that differences in social class reflect language use choices. Cubans of higher economic status were more likely to encourage bilingualism, whereas Cubans and other Hispanics of lower socioeconomic class stigmatized Spanish more. Cuban immigrant youth are persistent in their Spanish language use, which defies classic assimilation models, perhaps in large part due to their higher socioeconomic status. Regardless of immigrant generation, all students in the sample appear to be acculturating
to American mainstream society based on their reported Spanish language media consumption. These results are somewhat surprising given that Miami is considered to be the “Latin Hollywood” of the Americas (Yúdice 2003). All in all, the results from this study demonstrate that students of Cuban descent, and their parents, are acculturating to American mainstream society via English language loyalty. Spanish language use among students at the school is elevated in comparison to population of non-Cuban youth, who all have first generation immigrant parents.
Chapter 6

Ethnic Identity Formation

Overview

While a significant amount of research has been conducted on Spanish language use among Cuban youth in Miami, less research has been conducted on how they self-identify with ethnic labels. Phinney (2003) defines the process of ethnic self-identification as “the most obvious and straightforward aspect of ethnic identity, [it] is the group name or label that one chooses for oneself” (66). Generally, sociological research distinguishes ethnic self-identifications according to four categories: national identity (e.g. “Cuban”); additive identity (e.g. “Cuban-American”); pan-ethnic identity (“Hispanic” or “Latino”); and a singular “American” identity. Rumbaut (1994) states that the first two ethnic self-identification categories—national and additive—represent the immigrant experience; they are socially constructed based on influence extending outside the US context. The latter two identities—pan-ethnic and American—represent acculturation and assimilation into the destination country; they are socially constructed based on labels made in the US. In the case of the pan-ethnic labels, the term “Hispanic” was designed by the US federal government in 1977 to monitor the increase of the Spanish-speaking foreign-born in the US. The term “Latino” did not appear until the late 20th century; it was the result of a grassroots movement insisting on the adaptation of a term that better represents the heterogeneous qualities that compromise the foreign-born from Latin America (Oboler 1995; “Review of the Racial and Ethnic” 1997).

Research regarding ethnic self-identification of Cubans has been consistently studied. According to Rumbaut (1994), in the first stage of a longitudinal study of
second-generation immigrant youth in Miami and San Diego in 1992, compared to other Latin American immigrant groups, Cubans were the least likely to report as having a racial or pan-ethnic identity. According to the second stage of the longitudinal study of second generation youth conducted by Portes and Rumbaut (2001) during the 1995-1996 academic year, the most frequently reported ethnic identity of Cubans, and specifically those attending private schools, was an additive hyphenated American identity (e.g. “Cuban-American”) at 70.5%. Interestingly enough, although pan-ethnic labels were not popular among Cuban students in the first stage of the longitudinal study (Rumbaut 1994), in the second stage of the study, the pan-ethnic identities among Cuban students attending private schools had the largest percent of change since 1992, at 15.1% (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). According to Portes and Rumbaut (2001), for Cubans attending private schools, the unhyphenated American identity during the 1995-1996 academic year was reported at 1.2%, decreasing by a rate of 32.9% from the 1992 results.

Regardless, it is speculated that the longer a child has resided in the US, the more likely s/he is to declare an unhyphenated American identity (Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 67) which is clearly not the case with private-school Cubans. The first portion of this chapter will gauge how Cubans and students of non-Cuban Spanish-speaking descent report their ethnic self-identifications.

Research regarding the nationwide popularity of the pan-ethnic labels “Hispanic” and “Latino” has also yielded fairly consistent results. The Pew Research Center has conducted a notable amount of research on this subject. There are two main conclusions. The first is that when asked to choose between the terms “Hispanic” and ‘Latino,’ most respondents do not have a preference. However, the respondents that do have a
preference tend to elect “Hispanic” over the term “Latino” (Lopez 2013; Taylor et al. 2012). Oboler (1995) in her own research conducted in-depth interviews with Hispanics of middle-class and working-class status, and she found that there were differences in attitude about the “Hispanic” term based on socioeconomic status. Middle-class Hispanics did not feel attached to the label at the individual level, but at the broader sociological level, they were able to identify with the term, thus accepting the term as a marker of racial and ethnic identification. However, working-class Hispanics were offended by the term at the individual level because of how much they felt the term stigmatized them. Thus, preference for the term “Hispanic” is nuanced and can be determined by a variety of factors. For instance, Taylor et al. (2012) found that the majority of Hispanics surveyed (69%) do not see Hispanics as having a common culture. And Lopez (2016) reported that most Hispanics surveyed do not believe that speaking Spanish is necessary to declare a “Hispanic” identity. The themes related to pan-ethnic preference, and self-justification for such preference, is examined in the second half of this chapter among Cubans and non-Cuban Spanish-speaking Latino students at the school under study.

**Student Self-Reported Ethnic Identity**

Figure 6.1 reflects student responses to the short-answer question, “How do you define your ethnic background?” (see Appendix 2). Self-reported student ethnic identities (n=146) were coded into five categories: National origin (e.g. Cuban, Colombian, Venezuelan, etc.); Additive Identity (e.g. Cuban-American, Cuban-Colombian, etc.); Pan-ethnic (“Latino” and “Hispanic”); American; and Other/No response.
Figure 6.1: Self-Reported Ethnic Identity

Figure 6.2: Ethnic Self-Identification Based on Immigrant Generation of Parents
Additive identities were the most widely reported (85/146 respondents). Responses indicating national origin were still considerably common, with 44 total responses in that category. Pan-ethnic and American identities combined did not exceed twenty responses,
demonstrating the lack of salience that these identities have among Spanish-speaking “Latino” youth of the present sample. It is important to note that some respondents indicated multiple ethnic identities, such as “Cuban and “Hispanic”.” For purposes of the present analysis, in such cases the identity that was indicated first was coded. The distribution of responses within the national origin and additive identities are provided. Eight respondents indicated identifying as “Hispanic”, and only one stated “Latino”. Similarly, only three individuals reported identifying as ‘American’. Figure 6.2 reflects ethnic self-identification based on the generation variable. It reflects similar trends as the raw data on ethnic self-identification in Figure 6.1, demonstrating across both generations a large preference for additive identities, followed by national origin identities, and a lack of preference for panethnic or American identities. While panethnic identities remain less prevalent across the sample, they are more salient among G1 youth than G2, perhaps indicating a greater popularity for the term among more recent immigrant arrivals. In general, the chart indicates that even as generation increases from G1 to G2, the students’ ethnic self-identification trends do not substantially change. According to Figure 6.3, the distribution of national origin responses indicates that Cubans are the majority at 61%. As Figure 6.4 reflects, an analysis of all students reporting additive identities revealed that the majority of the responses were Cuban-American at 77%. Approximately one-quarter of those responses were not Cuban-American. 14% of the total students that responded were other half Cuban variations, indicated in orange in Figure 6.5. Some of the responses are standard in their format, including two nationalities separated by a hyphen. Three of the ethnic self-identifications were more intricate, with respondents creating tri-
ethnic identities, and some even using slashes and parentheses to report their ethnic identities. Also what is noteworthy is the salience of the identities as indicated through the order that they are listed. For instance, while two respondents reported identifying as Cuban-Colombian, one respondent preferred Colombian-Cuban. The majority of respondents did not include ‘American’ as the primary identity. The sole respondent who indicated being ‘American-Cuban’ wrote in parentheses, “American first, rarely even been to Cuba, how can I call myself Cuban first?” By and large, the order in which respondents indicated their identity markers appears to be very important. Out of all students surveyed, 9% were non-Cuban additive identities. The most popular non-Cuban additive identity was ‘Mexican-American’ (n = 3). With the exception of one student reporting as ‘Puerto Rican-Nicaraguan,’ the students identified an ‘American’ identity (e.g. ‘Mexican-American,’ ‘Argentine-American,’ etc.), indicating the students’ overall acceptance of their American background.

**Figure 6.5: Other Cuban Additive Identities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Cuban Additive Identities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Cuban-Colombian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cuban-Puerto Rican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Colombian-Cuban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chinese-Cuban-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cuban-Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 American-Cuban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cuban-Dominican-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Panamanian/Cuban-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Cuban, Spanish, and French) American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cuban-European</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent Ethnic Identity Trends

Figure 6.6 shows parent responses to the short-answer question, “What do you declare as your ethnic identity?” (see Appendix 3). Parents of Cuban descent (N=56) were asked to self-report their ethnic identity. Like the students, their responses were coded into four main categories: national origin, additive identity, pan-ethnic and American. The parent trends mirrored those of their children, with additive identities being the most common, followed by national origin identities, then pan-ethnic and, finally, American. The parent responses, however, were much more similar than those of the students, in that all who claimed an additive identity referred to themselves as ‘Cuban-American’. Like the students, only one parent identified as “Latino”; the rest all claimed the term “Hispanic”. The parent results are also broken down by the relationship that the respondent has to their son—mother, father, or legal guardian. There was no noteworthy difference in how the mothers and fathers responded to the question, although no fathers identified with pan-ethnic labels while some mothers did.
Student Pan-ethnic Preference

After self-reporting their ethnic identity, student respondents were then asked to answer the following question: “Do you consider yourself “Hispanic” or “Latino”? Please explain.” Student responses to this question are reflected in Figure 6.7. Responses to this question were coded into five categories: Preference for “Hispanic”; Interchangeable identity, embracing both “Hispanic” and “Latino”; Preference for “Latino”; Rejection of “Latino”; and Other/No Response. The most prevalent answer was Preference for “Hispanic” at (n=90), and the second most popular was an interchangeable identity (n=30). The “Latino” preference was much less salient than the “Hispanic” one (Hispanic n = 90; Latino n = 14) and the rejection of both identities least prevalent (n = 3). Within the “Hispanic” preference, 18 respondents self-identified as Cuban, and 52 respondents claimed a Cuban additive identity, thus making the “Hispanic” preference dominated by a Cuban majority. In coding the responses, it was clear that particular themes emerged in
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Figure 6.7: “Hispanic” or “Latino”?
respondents’ explanations or justifications for their claimed identity. These themes are considered in the subsequent sections.

Preference for the Term “Hispanic”

Of those who responded with a “Hispanic” preference, the following five themes were examined in the students’ responses: Geography; Connection to Spain and the Spanish language; Connection to Miami; Family Ties; and Rejection of “Latino” identity.

I. Geography

Student responses representing this theme connected “Hispanic” identity to geographical distinctions between “Hispanic” and “Latino” territories. Generally speaking, students proposed a difference between the Caribbean, on one hand, and Latin America, on the other. A Cuban-American student wrote, “I consider the Latin American countries like Venezuela, Colombia, etc. to be ‘Latino/a’, while Cuba, Dominican Republic, etc. to be ‘Hispanic.’” Another Cuban-American student wrote, “‘Hispanic’ because when I think of ‘Latino’ I think of it as more South American.” These students appear to be attributing the “Latino”-branded ethnic identity as representing those who are from South or Central America. By claiming that “Hispanic” corresponds to the Spanish-speaking Caribbean island nations, the respondents create self-imposed boundaries between Latin America and the Caribbean.

II. Connection to Spain and the Spanish Language

Student responses representing this theme connected “Hispanic” identity to a heritage rooted in Spain and the Spanish language. This theme is likely related to sustained immigration from Spain to Cuba up until the early 20th century. Some of the student responses were matter-of-fact in this justification, such as the following from one
Cuban respondent: “‘Hispanic’. I am a Spanish speaker from a Spanish-speaking country.” However, some of the responses were more detailed and intricate, such as this one from a Cuban-American student: “‘Hispanic’ came from the name of the Roman province Hispania, or Spain. It is also a way to connect to my family’s long roots from Spain.” What is noteworthy of this student’s response is how, even though his self-reported ethnic identity is Cuban-American, his pan-ethnic allegiance is rooted in a long family history dating back to Spain, and is a factor in his current pan-ethnic identification. Also looking back to colonial Spain, one Cuban student justified his “Hispanic” preference by drawing comparisons between Spanish colonization in Cuba and other Spanish colonies. He explained, “‘Hispanic’ is usually associated with Cubans because the majority were originally Spaniards unlike other countries like Mexico, which have a heavy mix with indigenous populations.” Undoubtedly, while this student is excluding the prevalence of the African slave trade, and the Chinese worker trade, which populated the island with a more diverse population, there was a much smaller indigenous population in Cuba as compared to countries like Mexico because the Taíno population in Cuba and the island of Hispaniola was decimated by disease at the onset of Spanish colonization. Regardless, the socio-historical justification offered by this student, like many others, suggests that the preference for the term “‘Hispanic” stems from a shared experience of Spanish colonization vis-à-vis Spanish family heritage and the use of the Spanish language. Likewise, these answers explain why some Cubans specifically prefer the term “Hispanic” over the term ‘Latino.’
III. Connection to Miami

The student responses underlying this theme connect “Hispanic” identity to experiences of growing up in a pan-Hispanic Miami. The responses indicate a sense of comradery that the students feel among different ethnic groups. A Colombian-Cuban student indicated that he is “Hispanic” simply because, in his words, “I was born in Miami.” In other words, the city of Miami consolidates his Colombian and Cuban heritage into the pan-ethnic label that Miami symbolizes to him. Similarly, a Cuban student asserts, “‘Hispanic’. It’s what we say around here,” insinuating a sense a locality formed through interactions with members of different ethnic groups within the Miami context. Apparently, on the other hand, there is no localized sense of identifying as a Miami “Latino”, with the sole exception of one respondent who, when reporting his ethnic identity, wrote “‘Latino’, Cuban-Miamian, Miamian.” Among students attending this school, there seems to be a cross-generational consensus that in Miami, the term “Hispanic” is greatly preferred over “Latino”, following the trends outlined by the research conducted through the Pew Research Center (Lopez 2013; Taylor et al. 2012).

IV. Family Ties

Student responses corresponding with this theme relate “Hispanic” identity to family ties. Some students are socialized by their parents to align themselves with a “Hispanic” identity. One Cuban respondent wrote, “‘Hispanic’, my family has just always told us that we’re ‘Hispanic.’” For some, the connection is less about mimicking what their parents have told them and more about the connections that they themselves have drawn between their family’s heritage and a “Hispanic” identity. One student, who identified himself primarily as Chinese-Cuban-American, explained that he also
considers himself as “Hispanic” because: “I consider myself as ‘Hispanic’. I grew up with my Cuban grandparents always nearby and was raised with Cuban culture.” Given that he chooses not to self-report his ethnic identity as strictly “Cuban,” it appears that he honors his Cuban norms, values and traditions through embracing a generic “Hispanic” identity, as opposed to a strictly Cuban one. Students such as these identify as “Hispanic” based on family influence.

V. Rejection of “Latino” Identity

Responses corresponding with this theme show preference for “Hispanic” because students consider the term “Latino” as somehow derogatory. As one Mexican student wrote, “I consider myself “Hispanic” because it seems less derogatory.” Similarly, a Cuban-American student wrote that he prefers the term “Hispanic” over “Latino” because, “I consider ‘Latino’ to be vaguely derogatory.” This idea of “Latino” being a derogatory term is derived from a broader social context that may not be limited to Miami (Lopez 2013). These findings support what research completed by the Pew Research Center which demonstrates that the term “Hispanic” is more widely accepted by people of Spanish-speaking descent in the US.

Preferences for Other Pan-Ethnic Categories

The themes derived from the remaining identity categories will be summarized in this section.

I. “Latino” Preference

From those who indicated that they were “Latino” (n=14), the justification for some of their responses was mainly based on geography and marked preference for the term “Latino”. With respect to geography, one Cuban-American student indicated that he
preferred the term “Latino” over “Hispanic” because according to him, “My parents come from a Latin American country. So by extension, I am also ‘Latino.’” Similarly, two Cuban students wrote that they identified as Latino because they claimed to have descendants from Latin America. What is noteworthy is that these students’ responses contradict the justifications about geography that students preferring the term “Hispanic” gave. While the students preferring the pan-ethnic term “Hispanic” claimed that the Spanish-speaking Caribbean corresponded with the “Hispanic” label, some students preferring the pan-ethnic term “Latino” believed that the Spanish-speaking Caribbean corresponded with the “Latino” label. Thus, there are clear contradictions to the geographical contextualization of the two pan-ethnic terms “Hispanic” and ‘Latino.’

With respect to preference of the term “Latino” over Hispanic, two Cubans justified “Latino” as a more accurate term to describe their ethnicity. However, the majority of those claiming the “Latino” pan-ethnic term were not of Cuban descent. Those claiming “Latino” descent were more often of Venezuelan, Colombian or Mexican descent. One Colombian student wrote that he prefers “Latino” because, in his words, “I consider Latino a more broad word while ‘Hispanic’ is associated more with Cuban descent which does not apply to me.” Thus, the pan-ethnic term “Latino” is inflated in this sample by non-Cubans, further highlighting how the Cuban students are typically aligning with being “Hispanic” more than being “Latino.”

II. Interchangeable Identity

Responses that were coded as an interchangeable identity varied, but the justifications were all similar. Some students, when answering the question “Do you consider yourself ‘Hispanic’ or ‘Latino’” wrote “Yes,” and simply gave reasons to defend
why they were “Hispanic” and “Latino”; others, when answering the question wrote “Yes,” followed by their reasoning for what characteristics constituted them as “Hispanic” and which constituted them as “Latino”. An example of the first type for this category can be found through the response of one Cuban-American student who wrote, “Yes, because I am of Cuban descent and I’m very true to my Cuban culture. I’m also a very fluent Spanish speaker.” In this case, he sees his relationship to Cuban family heritage, Cuban culture, and to Spanish language use as being characteristics of either pan-ethnic label. An example of the second response type is exhibited by another Cuban-American student who affirmed that, “I consider myself both ‘Hispanic’ (because I’m of Spanish descent) & ‘Latino’ because I am from a Latin American country.” In this particular case, he defends the “Hispanic” pan-ethnic label as a connection to Spanish origin and the “Latino” label based on geography. Although he sees distinctions between the two labels, he does not find them mutually exclusive; in other words, instead of being only one or the other, he can classify himself as both. Whether the terms “Hispanic” and “Latino” blend in the eyes of the participants, or if the respondents accept both terms based on conditions applied to each pan-ethnic label, there are three times more respondents that prefer a “Hispanic” label over embracing both.

III. Rejection of Pan-ethnic Labels

Although responses in this category were limited, the justifications provided by the students were too strongly worded to be placed in the “Other/No Response” category. Likewise, their reasons for rejecting both pan-ethnic labels were rather intriguing. One Cuban-American student wrote, “No, I consider myself Cuban because I don’t like to be called ‘Hispanic’ or ‘Latino.’” As simple as the response is, it indicates that the pan-
ethnic label cannot necessarily substitute for an indicator of national origin. Another student, who identified as half-Peruvian, detailed why specifically he rejects both of the pan-ethnic labels in the following quote: “I do not consider myself ‘Hispanic’ or ‘Latino’ because I see the labels as inventions and not actual ethnicities. I think it’s ridiculous (sic) to group Mexicans and Argentines in the same ethnic group despite racial and ethnic differences.” To a certain extent, there is factuality in this student’s statement as the pan-ethnic labels were fabricated in the US to better categorize in government records the breadth of foreign-born residents in the country (Oboler 1995). All in all, the justifications provided for rejection of these pan-ethnic labels demonstrate that there are students who are willing to challenge the pan-ethnic terms “Hispanic” or ‘Latino,’ and instead, reach for a more inclusive term to incorporate Hispanics and Latinos. These students opt for other forms of ethnic identification outside of the parameters of a pan-ethnic concept or term.

Summary of Cross-Generational Ethnic Identity Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Tabs</th>
<th>&quot;How do you Define your Ethnic Background?&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Do you consider yourself &quot;Hispanic&quot; or &quot;Latino&quot;?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>‘Hispanic’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>‘Hispanic’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>Interchangeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>‘Hispanic’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>‘Latino’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Panethnic</td>
<td>‘Hispanic’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>‘Latino’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>‘Latino’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>‘Latino’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Panethnic</td>
<td>‘Latino’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.8: Summary of Cross-Generational Ethnic Identity Data

To gain a better understanding of the combined complexities that arose from these two sections, cross tabulations were taken to capture patterns in the survey responses. As
shown in Figure 6.8, the results indicated that the majority trend was for students to declare an additive ethnic self-identification; and then prefer the pan-ethnic term “Hispanic” over the pan-ethnic term ‘Latino.’ For students from all four ethnic self-identifications—national origin, additive, pan-ethnic and American—preference was given to the term “Hispanic” over ‘‘Latino.’

Discussion

Several conclusions can be reached from the present data regarding ethnic self-identification. First, this research demonstrates that within the sampled population, Cubans remain the dominant population. In spite of Miami experiencing the forces of Hispanicization, the school retains its particularly Cuban population. Second, national origin appears to remain salient among the students across generations. According to traditional assimilationist models, it would be anticipated that G2 youth would be more likely to declare a panethnic or American identity, thus abandoning identities of national origin or additive hyphenation. However, the students in this case study appear to defy such models, reflecting the resilience that ethnic heritage retains in this school. Second, this research counters the finding that men are hesitant to identify with a pan-ethnic label. It is observed with students and parents alike that men in the sample are more willing to declare a self-ethnic identification as an additive identity than previous studies suggest. Although the students chose a national identity over an additive identity, they elected an additive identity much more than an American identity, which counters the previous research related to gender and ethnic self-identification (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Rumbaut 1994; Szapocznik and Hernandez 1988; Zentella 1997). Third, although it is clear that the Cuban and Cuban-American identities dominate the sample, the prevalence
of non-Cubans in the sample show that the school is not homogeneously Cuban. Likewise, there was a notable number of students who chose Cuban additive identities that were not Cuban-American, demonstrating that some students in this sample are not acculturating to a more standard bicultural Cuban-American identity.

In regards to pan-ethnic preference, a few conclusions can be drawn. First, students and parents of Cuban descent, as well as students of non-Cuban Spanish-speaking descent, are more likely to identify with the term ‘“Hispanic” than ‘“Latino.’ The criteria for defining oneself as “Hispanic”, however, are ambiguous among the students, leaving wide room for interpretation. It seems that the students find their Cuban heritage, as well as the Miami cultural context, as reasons to embrace their ethnic culture, customs, norms and values through the “Hispanic” pan-ethnic term. While some students in this study considered “Latino” as a derogatory term, the term “Hispanic” was never reported as such. These findings coincide with a recent finding from Fernández-Kelly (2014), which claims that in the case of Nicaraguans living in Miami, they align with being Hispanic because, “being Hispanic in Miami means being Cuban, and therefore, respected” (195). It is evident that the pan-ethnic term “Hispanic” has a positive connotation within the city of Miami because the characteristics of being “Hispanic” are positively associated with being “Cuban”. In other words, being Hispanic in Miami is a sign of prestige, and the students in this survey seem to reflect this orientation. Second, among students and parents, the American ethnic label is virtually nonexistent. It could be inferred that in the Miami context, there is simply no need to acculturate to an American ethnic label, as the Cuban and pan-Hispanic forces in the city are considerably influential. Lastly, it is clear in a summary of all the data collected on pan-ethnic
preferences that the context of living in Miami has played, to some extent, a role in the choices that the students made. Unlike national data samples, the great majority of students in this sample did not consider “Hispanic” and “Latino” as synonymous. In other words, they showed a clear preference for the term “Hispanic”, while the majority of national survey respondents indicated having no clear preference for either “Hispanic” or “Latino” (Lopez 2013). The strong preference that the present students had for the “Hispanic” pan-ethnic term is not entirely unprecedented, as Lopez (2013) found that in Texas specifically, people who indicated that they had a preference for a pan-ethnic term chose “Hispanic” over “Latino” by a ratio of around 2:1. The present results counter the national surveys in which people of Spanish-speaking descent generally find the terms “Hispanic” and “Latino” to be interchangeable, and equally associate themselves with both terms. The finding from this sampled population coincides with the previously stated finding that the term “Hispanic” is very salient in Miami, and that people want to associate with the term “Hispanic” because of its prestige.
Chapter 7
Language Attitudes

Overview

Language attitudes as a concept did not become widely established until Lambert et al. (1960) and their experimental study to gauge the situation of English and French in Canada. Then, in the early 1970s, Labov (1972) was researching language attitudes regarding phonological variation in New York, the pronunciation of /r/ and the social stratification that it reflected. From the theoretical perspective, Fishman (1972) started to incorporate language attitudes within the spectrum of evaluative behaviors and beliefs about language. Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) noted that a commonality among all the social psychology theorists at that time was that attitudes are influenced by an individual’s previous experiences and are not permanently enduring. Edwards (1985) considered both affective and behavioral components when assessing language attitudes. According to Edwards, an attitude allows an individual to feel a certain way about a particular object, creating a continuous scale of agreement and disagreement. Woolard (1989), in a study on language attitudes in Catalonia, concluded that language attitudes are norm-enforcers of immigrant values and the overall immigrant identity. She states, “Language values affect language behavior, but their impact is mediated by the individual actor’s sense of the relative authority of these values in his or her life” (137). An individual has agency to choose an attitude about a particular subject, but the collective attitudes of a group dictate the immigrant experience regarding language-use, language shift and language preference. Advancing Woolard (1989), Achugar and Pessoa (2009) define language attitudes as “being constructed socio-historically as the result of
learned patterns of evaluation and identification, consequently making it possible to educate or transform people’s attitudes” (201). And in Lynch and Klee (2005), language attitudes are defined as “una manifestación de actitudes sociales, entramando lo verbal con lo sociopolítico y lo económico” (273). Language attitudes are more than a sociopsychological consideration of an individual: they are grounded in social construction and social meaning.

With this in mind, language attitudes among students of Cuban and non-Cuban Spanish-speaking descent in the school under study will be analyzed and interpreted. Unlike the previous two chapters, less emphasis will be placed on examining differences between Cuban and non-Cuban students. Rather, the objective of this chapter is to consider the general language attitudes of all the sampled students, and to take a snapshot of the students’ predominant language attitudes. These language attitudes will be useful in assessing current and future trends regarding language shift, ethnic identity formation, and thus overall patterns of acculturation among the student body.

**Methods**

Students were asked to respond to a series of fifty-five statements pertaining to implicit language attitudes (See Appendix). The questions represented four different categories: culture in Miami; political and economic aspects of Miami: identity; and Spanish language media. The question order in the survey was random. Responses were recorded using the Likert-scale—a value of 1 indicated total disagreement with the statement; a value of 5 indicated total agreement with the statement; a value of 3 was a

---

14 “a manifestation of social attitudes, framing the verbal with the sociopolitical and the economic” (273 [author’s translation])".
neutral response. The frequencies of these responses were then calculated in SPSS, and the results were then categorized by medians, standard deviation, and Pearson chi-square results. The Pearson chi-square analyses were conducted on the fifty-five language items, testing oral Spanish proficiency variable and ethnic identity as the independent variables. The objective of the Pearson chi-squares was to determine the effect that these independent variables had on the language attitude items. The chi-squares are analyzed based on the significance of their p-values. The oral Spanish proficiency variable yielded more significant p-values, thus it was chosen as the parameter for the study. However, any statement demonstrating significant variation based on ethnicity will be discussed in the “Results” section. Results of Pearson chi-squares are indicated in the tables given below: a designation of three asterisks (****) indicates a significant p-value that equals .000; a designation of one asterisk (*) indicates a significant p-value less than or equal to .05.

There are two notable limitations of the chi-squares tests in this analysis. First, chi-squares are normally used for analyzing nominal variables, as opposed to ordinal variables such as the Likert-scale responses. However, the ordinal variables are still categorical and consequently, noncontinuous, thus validating the usage of chi-square tests. Second, several chi-square tests yielded cell counts that were greater than 5, which violates one of the chi-square test assumptions. It is therefore worth noting that the chi-square results must be interpreted as a preliminary analysis of these attitudinal trends, and would need to be verified further in future studies.
Results

I. Cultural Aspects

Students responded to a series of nineteen statements pertaining to cultural aspects of language in Miami (Table 1). Attitudes that were most pervasive among the students were those that supported English/Spanish bilingualism and Latin culture in Miami. For instance, with a low standard deviation (sd = .53) the students favored the statement that “Miami is a bilingual city (Spanish and English)” (median = 5) (Item 31, Table 1). The majority of students disliked the statement that “Miami would be a better place if everyone spoke only English” (Item 52, Table 1) (median = 1; sd = .81) and mostly agreed that “Latin culture is what makes Miami such a cool city” (Item 5, Table 1) (median = 4; sd = .838). Lastly, there was considerable consensus among the students that “Cuban Miami is the real Miami” (Item 55, Table 1) (median = 4; sd = .98).

Pearson chi-squares were conducted to determine the dependence that reported language attitudes had with self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency. The highest significance in this category was reported for the following statement, “Miami would be a better place if everyone spoke only English,” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 30.02; p = .003$ (Item 52, Table 1). Based on the cross-tabulations, it appears that higher oral Spanish language proficiency is negatively associated with a preference for monolingual English use in Miami. Similarly, high significance was reported for this statement, “Latin culture is what makes Miami such a cool city” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 35.39; p = .004$ (Item 5, Table 1). The data suggests that higher oral Spanish language proficiency is positively associated with a preference for Latin culture in the city. Lastly, the third highest significance was reported for this statement, “People in Miami who don’t know Spanish are missing out on
a lot” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 30.21; p = .017$ (Item 44, Table 1). Spanish language proficiency is positively associated with this statement—the higher the student self-reported their Spanish language proficiency, the more they agreed with the given statement. The chi-square tests suggest that there is notable dependence between oral Spanish language proficiency and cultural attitudes. In general, the higher a student self-reported their oral Spanish language proficiency, the more their attitudes reflect a preference for English/Spanish bilingualism in Miami.

Pearson chi-square tests were also conducted to determine the dependence that student language attitudinal responses have with student ethnicity (“Cuban,” ‘half-Cuban,’ “non-Cuban”). As previously stated, the chi-squares related to ethnicity did not yield as much significance as did Spanish language proficiency, and so results from those tests are not displayed. However, there were two statements in this category that were significant based on ethnicity. The first statement that was significant was “Spanglish is a necessary part of life in Miami” $\chi^2 (8, n = 146) = 17.83; p = .023$ (Item 8, Table 1). There seems to be an association between ethnic background and preference for Spanglish. According to the cross-tabulations, the students reporting a “Cuban” ethnicity were more likely to agree with this statement than “non-Cuban” students. The second statement with significant variation was, “Cuban Miami is the real Miami” $\chi^2 (8, n = 146) = 20.86; p = .008$ (Item 55, Table 1). The tabulated responses indicate that “Cuban” students had a higher frequency of agreeing with this statement than “non-Cuban” students. Thus, the results for ethnicity show that there are trends that indicate that certain cultural attitudes are dependent on ethnicity, and more specifically, between “Cuban” and “non-Cuban” students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The best way to get around in Miami is by speaking Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It would be a bad thing to have a boyfriend or girlfriend in Miami who did not know any Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Latin culture is what makes Miami such a cool city.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>35.39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Spanglish</em> is a necessary part of life in Miami.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>People in Miami are nicer to you if you speak to them in Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hispanic teenagers in Miami who refuse to speak Spanish are ‘sell-outs’.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>28.23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The best places to have fun in Miami involve speaking or hearing Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>26.84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When people elsewhere in the United States think of Miami, they think of people speaking Spanish.

Miami is a bilingual city (Spanish and English).

A Hispanic teenager from Miami who claims not to know Spanish is probably lying.

If you don’t know any Spanish, you should get out of Miami.

On the street in Miami, favors are better asked for in Spanish than in English.

Miami is as much a part of Latin America as it is the United States.

People who speak only Spanish in Miami are annoying.

People in Miami who don’t know Spanish are missing out on a lot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>People give you more respect in Miami if you speak to them in English.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>To be “Hispanic” or “Latino” in Miami, you have to be able to speak Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Miami would be a better place if everyone spoke only English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Cuban Miami is the real Miami.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance ≥ .05 = *

Significance = .000 = 

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance ≥ .05 = *

Significance = .000 = ***
II. Political and economic aspects

Students responded to a series of ten statements pertaining to prevailing Miami-specific political and economic aspects (Table 2). In general, the students’ responses to these statements highlight the support that they show for being bilingual in the workplace and in institutional terms. For instance, students fervently rejected the statement that “Students should not be allowed to speak Spanish on school grounds, except in Spanish class” (Item 7, Table 2) (median = 1; sd = .42). Even if these students are much more likely to use English with their peers than Spanish, as seen in Chapter 2, they remain defensive of the freedom to speak Spanish. Similarly, students tended to disagree with the following statement: “Only English should be spoken in stores and businesses in Miami” (Item 3, Table 2) (median = 1; sd = .87), advocating for the use of Spanish in the business sector. With slightly higher standard deviation among the students, they mostly agreed with the statement that “Spanish is necessary for a good job in Miami” (Item 13) (median = 4; sd = .99), and mostly disagreed with the statement that, “English is the true language of success in Miami” (Item 25, Table 2) (median = 2.5; sd = 1.05). While students are supportive of speaking Spanish in the workplace, they do not seem to be concerned with taking legal action to make Spanish, or conversely, English, official languages. Evidence of this is demonstrated in Item 53, with students neither agreeing nor disagreeing that “Spanish should be the official language in Miami” (Table 2) (median = 3; sd = 1.27), and Item 54, with students only mildly disagreeing that “English should be the only official language in the United States” (Table 2) (median = 2; sd = 1.27).

After conducting chi-squares on these responses according to Spanish language proficiency, the only response that yielded a significant p-value of .000 was Item 15,
which states, “Educated Hispanics in Miami should be fully competent in both Spanish and English” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 46.61$ (Table 2). Students with higher oral Spanish language proficiency were more likely to agree with this statement. The only other statement that yielded a significant chi-square test was Item 3, which is, “Only English should be spoken in stores and businesses in Miami” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 30.23$; $p = .017$ (Table 2). According to the data, oral Spanish language proficiency is negatively associated with a preference for this statement. The chi-square results demonstrate that there is some dependence between oral Spanish language proficiency and political and economic language attitudes related to English/Spanish bilingualism. The results highlight that greater oral Spanish language proficiency correlates with preference for bilingualism in the workplace and other institutional settings in Miami.

Analysis of chi-square tests between ethnicity and language attitudes yielded no dependence. This indicates that no dependence exists between these two variables.

Language Attitudes – Identity Preferences

Students responded to a series of eighteen questions pertaining to broader language attitudes reflecting questions of identity (Table 3). Similar to themes explored in the previous two categories, students overwhelmingly agreed with the statement that, “Being bilingual is a good thing” (Item 37, Table 3) (median = 5; sd = .28). Regardless of self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency, students appeared to be aware of the proven benefits of bilingualism—whether they are cognitive, economic, or cultural. However, the items related to social preferences demonstrate that while students may favor bilingualism, they are otherwise indifferent about preferring English or Spanish.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Only English should be spoken in stores and businesses in Miami.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students should not be allowed to speak Spanish on school grounds, except in Spanish class.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spanish is necessary for a good job in Miami.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Educated Hispanics in Miami should be fully competent in both Spanish and English.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>It’s offensive when salespeople or restaurant servers in Miami speak to customers in Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>English is the true language of success in Miami.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A lack of school instruction in Spanish is the reason that some Hispanic teenagers in Miami are not fully bilingual.</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 ctd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish should be an official language in Miami.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>English should be the only official language in the United States.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance $\geq .05 = *$

Significance $= .000 = ***$
Out of the eighteen statements, eleven yielded a median of “3,” (Items 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 21, 28, 32, 45, 46, and 49, Table 3) which indicates that the students felt neutral about these social preferences for language. When the students are provided statements regarding culture and bilingualism in Miami, they seem to not have a strong loyalty to English or Spanish.

After conducting chi-square analyses testing levels of dependence between identity attitudinal responses and self-reported oral Spanish language proficiency, two statements revealed significance of .000. The first was Item 16, which stated that, “It would be difficult to have a close friend who only spoke Spanish” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 80.73; p = .000$ (Table 3). Students with higher oral Spanish language proficiency scores were more likely to disagree with the statement. The second statement yielding a significant p-value was Item 21, which is “Family values are better expressed in Spanish than in English” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 43.73; p = .000$ (Table 3). Numerous other statements yielded significant p-values, but two worth noting are Items 10 and 37, which are respectively, “When I am older, I want my kids to learn Spanish as their first language” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 40.59; p = .001$, and “Being bilingual is a good thing” $\chi^2 (8, n = 146) = 26.03; p = .001$. The cross-tabulations for both of these items indicate that as oral Spanish language proficiency increases, agreement for these statements increases. Overall, students with higher oral Spanish language proficiency scores were more likely to agree with these two statements. Lastly, two other statements worth mentioning are Items 32 and 40, which both yielded a significance of .009, and are respectively, “Spanish speakers demand more respect than English speakers” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 32.18; p = .009$ (Table 3), and “It would be weird to speak only English” $\chi^2 (16, n = 146) = 32.21; p =$
Similar to the other two items, as oral Spanish language proficiency increases, agreement for these statements increases. This trend is more evident in the cross-tabulations for Item 40 than Item 32, as the responses for Item 32 are more heavily concentrated in the ‘3’ value than any other response, but nonetheless the general trend still applies. All in all, while the student responses were often ambivalent for this category, typically reporting a ‘3’ value, the responses commonly reported significant p-values.

Chi-squares were also conducted to test levels of dependence among the attitudes as per ethnicity. Two statements yielded significant p-values. The statement with the highest significance was “It’s normal to mix Spanish and English when speaking to friends and family” $\chi^2 (8, n = 146) = 16.32; p = .038$ (Item 34, Table 3). The cross-tabulations reveal a potential trend that “Cuban” students were more likely to agree with this statement than “non-Cuban” students. This attitude reflects a similar trend that was previously mentioned about Spanglish in the section related to cultural attitudes, which is a possibility that “Cuban” students are more comfortable with mixing languages than “non-Cuban” students. The second statement that proved to be significant was, “People who switch back and forth between English and Spanish in conversations are more interesting than people who speak the whole time in just one language” $\chi^2 (8, n = 146) = 15.4; p = .05$ (Item 45, Table 3). Similarly, the data reflects a preference among “Cuban” students to agree with this statement than “non-Cuban” students. The chi-square tests show that identity-related language attitudes, particularly those related to language mixing, are associated with some levels of dependence based on ethnicity, especially divisions in responses according to “Cuban” and “non-Cuban” students.
Table 7.3: Language Attitudes – Identity—Differences According to Oral Spanish Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spanish speakers often have more interesting personalities than English speakers.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It’s annoying when people who know Spanish act like they only speak English.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When I am older, I want my kids to learn Spanish as their first language.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>English is a more serious language than Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>It would be strange to live in a city where people did not speak Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>It would be difficult to have a close friend who only spoke Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>80.73</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Swearing and ‘bad words’ sound stronger in Spanish than in English.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3 ctd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Spanish is a more authoritative language than English.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Family values are better expressed in Spanish than in English.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>43.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>It’s easier to make friends in English than in Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Someone who speaks English with no accent and Spanish with no accent appears more intelligent than someone who has a strong accent in one of the two languages.</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Spanish speakers demand more respect than English speakers.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>32.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>It’s normal to mix Spanish and English when speaking to friends and family members.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3 ctd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Being bilingual is a good thing.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>It would be weird to speak only English.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>People who switch back and forth between English and Spanish in conversations are more interesting than people who speak the whole time in just one language.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Spanish is, culturally, a superior language to English.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Joking around is funnier in Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.040*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance ≥ .05 = *
Significance = .000 = ***
IV. Language Attitudes—Spanish Language Media

Students responded to a series of eight questions related to Spanish language media (Table 4). Similar to the category on language attitudes and identity, the majority of the responses to this category, totaling five out of eight provided statements, had a median value of ‘3,’ (Items 2, 14, 18, 29, and 33, Table 4) indicating an indifference towards media preference. Students in this section show a general indifference to Spanish language film, only a slight preference for Spanish language music, and an overall preference for English language media. These findings correspond with the self-reported Spanish language music, film and television that the students consume on a regular basis (see Figures 5.4 and 5.5).

Chi-square analyses testing levels of dependence between media language attitudes and oral Spanish language proficiency yielded two significant p-values. The most significant was for the following statement, “Music in Spanish is better for dancing than music in English” \( \chi^2 (16, n = 145) = 35.27; p = .004 \) (Item 47, Table 4). Students reporting high Spanish language proficiency responded more favorably to this statement. The other statement resulting in a significant p-value was Item 30, which stated, “Spanish language radio in Miami is horrible” \( \chi^2 (16, n = 144) = 28.29; p = .029 \) (Table 4). In general, students that had a higher oral Spanish language proficiency tended to disagree with this statement significantly more than those with lower oral Spanish language proficiency. Thus, some levels of association can be observed between media-related language attitudes and oral Spanish language proficiency. A higher Spanish proficiency level reflects a higher preference for Spanish language music.
Chi-square analyses examining levels of dependence between media language attitudes and ethnicity yielded no significant results, indicating no dependence among the two variables.

**Discussion**

Several conclusions can be drawn from the data on language attitudes. With regards to language and cultural aspects, the students’ responses validate the importance of the Spanish language in Miami. The students appear to have cultural loyalty to their heritage language and believe that it is a major component of Miami’s culture. The students also manifest this loyalty in political and economic language attitudes in Miami, as they embrace the right to speak Spanish. Even if the students are not fluent Spanish speakers, they embrace English/Spanish bilingualism in the city, and feel encouraged to use Spanish outside of the household. They are continuing a long-standing trend in Miami of Cuban-immigrant youth honoring bilingualism (Solé 1979; Lynch 2000). Results from this study may also provide hope to the Miami business community, as there have been concerns regarding the immigrant youth’s ability and desire to be proficient in Spanish (Barry 1996; Fradd 1996; Mears 1997; Solé 1979; Vasilogambros 2016). Meanwhile, the students’ indifference towards making English or Spanish official languages coincides with Lynch and Klee’s (2005) findings, as they speculated that Spanish-speaking youth in Miami did not object to English being an official language since in reality, Spanish will be spoken regardless of which language is official. This apathy is not contradictory according to Lynch and Klee, but rather serves to further emphasize the persisting levels of bilingualism in South Florida. The statements that yielded significant chi-square p-values for ethnicity, while limited, demonstrated that
Table 7.4: Language Attitudes – Spanish Language Media—Differences According to Oral Spanish Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reggaetón is good music.</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>It’s cool when English-language singers like Beyonce and J-Lo do Spanish language versions of their songs.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>22.68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Music videos in Spanish are better than the ones in English.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>It’s fun to watch movies in Spanish.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Spanish language radio in Miami is horrible.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>28.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4 ctd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>It’s cool when Spanish language singers like Shakira and Enrique Iglesias do English-language versions of their songs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>146 3 1.01 15.53 16 .486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Music is better in English than in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>146 4 1.07 20.19 16 .212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music in Spanish is better for dancing than music in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145 4 1.11 35.27 16 .004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance \( \geq .05 = * \)
Significance \( = .000 = *** \)
there are notable differences in acculturation patterns of the “Cuban” and “non-Cuban” groups. “Cuban” students are more accepting of Spanglish and the Cuban-identity of Miami than “non-Cuban” students. The “Cuban” students’ attitudes towards Spanglish, as well as Cuban Miami, validate Otheguy, García and Roca’s (2000) claim that perhaps Cubans in Miami are “transculturating” to a new ethnic identity formed within Miami. This Cuban transculturation is based on an innovative set of traditions, norms, and values that may, for instance, embrace Spanglish as a legitimized “language,” allowing Cubans like Pérez Firmat (1994) to better balance their conflicted Cuban and American identities.

However, the “non-Cuban” students’ resistance to Cuban Miami, as seen particularly in the analysis of items 8 and 55 in Table 1, highlight the growing influence of Hispanicization and the reduced influence of the Cuban exile community in the city. Overall, the results from these two sections suggest that the students, particularly those of Cuban descent, are selectively acculturating—and perhaps transculturating—to a bilingual environment unique to the city of Miami.

Less conviction is expressed by the students on items regarding identity, as the students are more indifferent about their language preferences. The same principle applies to language attitudes and Spanish media. The results for identity and media coincide with the results regarding Spanish language use in Chapter 2. The students seem to prefer communication with their parents and friends to be in English, as well as consuming media in English as opposed to Spanish. Nonetheless, the divide between “Cuban” and “non-Cuban” students on the issue regarding mixing English and Spanish coincides with the debate on speaking Spanglish in Miami. While causality is difficult to attribute, perhaps “Cuban” students embrace mixing the two languages more than ‘non-
Cubans’ because they are more accustomed to living in a bilingual environment, concomitant with lower levels of Spanish language proficiency than ‘non-Cubans.’ As previously stated, all the “non-Cuban” students are G1, as opposed to the “Cuban” students that are both G1 and G2. It is possible that the G2 “Cuban” students, who more familiar with the city of Miami, “a dream city for Spanglish people” (Morales 2002, 243), are more likely to embrace using Spanglish. This data confirms the findings in Portes and Schauffler (1996) that while in their nationwide sample, Cuban immigrant youth in Miami were the most likely to be bilingual, they still preferred English. Given that the present study was conducted over twenty years later, the results show that Spanish has persevered among “Cuban” students. Nonetheless, the overall results indicate that even as the students are influenced by the unique cultural context of Miami, they are still acculturating to English-speaking American society.
Chapter 8

Conclusion

At the time that this thesis research was being conducted, President Barack Obama was meeting with President Raúl Castro in Havana, Cuba to discuss US-Cuba diplomatic relations. In a speech given on March 22, 2016, President Obama affirmed, “In the United States, we have a clear monument to what the Cuban people can build—it’s called Miami” (Miami Herald Editorial Board 2016). Meanwhile, on Sunday, March 21, 2016, members of the Miami Cuban community were marching in protest against President Obama’s trip to Cuba (Ocner 2016). Cuban Miami is reemerging in the national spotlight, and the big question in Miami is, what now? Needless to say, as the political, economic, and social dynamic Miami is in flux, it is important to pay attention to the acculturation patterns of youth, since they will dictate how Cuban Miami will evolve in sociolinguistic terms.

This case study examines one particular school and the selective acculturation patterns of students, particularly of Cuban descent. Cuban Catholic schools are a direct extension of Cuban Miami, and provide a unique opportunity for students of Cuban descent to embrace la cubanidad, or the culture, norms, and values of the Cuban co-exile community in Miami. This study demonstrates that even as students are undoubtedly experiencing language shift to English, as seen through their reported language use patterns, consumption of English media, and general indifference to identity-oriented language attitudes, the students are still maintaining aspects of la cubanidad. Evidence of Cuban identity retention is found in the students’ exceptional oral Spanish language proficiency, their preference for the Cuban-American or Cuban ethnic self-identification
over the pan-ethnic and American labels, their preference for the pan-ethnic term "Hispanic" over "Latino", and their tendencies to value bilingualism. The findings of this case study challenge to a certain extent the findings outlined in Porcel (2006). Contrary to what Otheguy García and Roca (2000) speculated, which was that Cuban youth would identify the Spanish language as \textit{la lengua de ayer} ["the language of the past"] (177), students of Cuban descent appear to be embracing Spanish as a language that is very much a contemporary part of their lives in Miami (Lynch 2000). However, it is also worth noting that the pervasive acceptance of \textit{Spanglish} among students of Cuban descent suggests that the line separating their Cuban-based identities from their American-based ones is not always clear. The acceptance of \textit{Spanglish} is proof of how the students of Cuban descent are not only selectively acculturating to American society, but are perhaps transculturating to a Cuban-American hybrid identity formed within the context of bilingual Cuban Miami.

To make matters more complex, there is an innovative component of their acculturation that is not mentioned in previous literature pertaining to the selective acculturation of Cuban immigrant youth, namely, the influence of pan-Hispanic Miami and the forces of Hispanicization now prevalent in the city. Once seen as a threat to Cuban hegemony in the city, the school currently under study has embraced the entry of immigrant youth from across Latin America and the Caribbean with open arms. These innovative forms of acculturation can be seen in the ethnic self-identification section of this research. There are a select number of students opting for identities that reflect a form of biculturality that excludes an American identity (i.e. Cuban-Colombian). But the components of this pan-Hispanic acculturation process may be less obvious than ethnic
identity alone. As seen in chapter 2, the presence of non-Cuban immigrant youth has
increased the Spanish language use at school. Non-Cuban Spanish-speaking Latino
students in this study are all G1 students, making them either 1.5 or second generation,
and thus more likely to use the heritage language. It is possible that without the steady
stream of Spanish-speaking immigrants from across the Americas, the Cuban immigrant
youth may be less motivated to speak Spanish, and instead, they would have fully
embarked onto a path towards full linguistic assimilation to the US mainstream. I
conclude that even if a Cuban identity remains prevalent among these students of Cuban
descent today, it does so because the incoming immigrant populations have revitalized
the Spanish language at the school, and have helped create a cultural environment that
does not encourage linear assimilation into American society. Although the “Cuban” and
‘non-Cuban students’ do not always agree on the same attitudes, such as the Cubanness
of the city of Miami, or mixing English and Spanish with family and friends, the majority
across ethnic groups agree about the city being bilingual. The forces of Cubanization and
Hispanicization synchronize with each other at this school, and allow students of Cuban
descent to continue being motivated to speak Spanish and embody a Cuban identity.

As Cuban Miami continues to be relevant to this day, the “Cuban presence”
remains in this school under study. The students of Cuban descent are maintaining a
Cuban identity that has formed through the context of a Cuban exile community. Indeed,
the students are slowly Americanizing through embracing the English language and
consequently, mainstream US culture. Nonetheless, they are not showing signs of
relinquishing fundamental components of their Cuban identity, like their ethnic self-
identification and bilingual preferences. Additionally, the selective acculturation
processes that these students are experiencing at this school are complex, and go beyond the binary of Cuban versus American identity formation. The complexity is derived from the Hispanicization of Miami and the pervasive pan-Hispanic influences that encourage young generations to be bilingual and to embrace the city of Miami as a diverse multi-ethnic cultural mecca. The Cuban identity that the students of Cuban descent embody can be no longer seen independently of the Hispanicization of the city. Without the presence of immigrant youth from Spanish-speaking countries, it is possible that the students of Cuban descent would not be as encouraged to embrace their heritage language and ethnic background. The students of Cuban descent are selectively acculturating to a Cuban, American, and pan-Hispanic identity that is formed within the unique cultural atmosphere of Miami.
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Appendix 1: Student Consent Form

Title of research study: Bilingualism, Biculturalism and the Intersections of Language and Ethnic Identities of Students at an All Boys Cuban Catholic School in Miami

Investigator: Grace Slawski

Why am I being invited to take part in a research study?

We invite your child to take part in a research study because your child is either a current student at CONFIDENTIAL School that is Cuban or claims Cuban descent; or your child is a current student at CONFIDENTIAL that is Latino or claims Latino descent (excluding non-Spanish-speaking Latinos).

What should I know about a research study?

- Someone will explain this research study to you and/or your child.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you and/or your child.
- Participation is voluntary.
- You and/or your child can choose not to take part.
- You and/or your child can agree to take part and later change your mind.
- The decision of you and/or your child will not be held against you.
- You and/or your child can ask all the questions you want before you decide.

Who can I talk to?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to the research team by either contacting Grace Slawski at (413) 427-8244 or g.slawski@umiami.edu or Dr. Andrew Lynch at a.lynch@miami.edu

This research has been reviewed and approved by an Institutional Review Board (“IRB”). Please contact the University of Miami Human Subject Research Office at (305) 243-3195 if:

- You and/or your child wish to talk to someone other than the research staff about your rights as a research subject.
- You and/or your child have questions, concerns, or complaints that are not being answered by the research team.
- You and/or your child cannot reach the research team.
- You and/or your child want to provide input concerning the research process.

Why is this research being done?

This research is being conducted to determine several key points. First, we will evaluate English and Spanish oral language usage patterns of current students at home and at school. Second, we will compare oral Spanish language usage of the Cuban students with...
those of their Cuban parents. Third, we will gauge whether Cuban youth attending today have either maintained their Cuban identity or assimilated to the American mainstream society. Fourth, we will compare the oral-Spanish language patterns and language identities of Cuban students with non-Cuban Latino students. Ultimately, there is a large lack of research relating to the Cuban Catholic private schools located in Miami-Dade County and we plan to devote attention to the school as a case study.

**What happens if I say yes, I want to be in this research?**

Your child would participate in a student survey administered during standard school hours. Please read the subsection below.

**I. Student Survey**

Prior to participation in the survey, your child will be required to have one parent or legal guardian sign a consent form. When your child is administered the survey, he will then be asked to read instructions once more of the survey’s procedure and his ability to voluntarily stop the survey at any time. The surveys will ask questions about the following themes: How your child uses Spanish at home; How your child identifies their ethnicity; and how your child ascribes to language attitudes and beliefs.

All students—those that are Cuban or claim Cuban descent, and those that are Latino or claim Latino descent (excluding non-Spanish speakers)—would complete the same survey.

To ensure your child’s protection to the best of the research team’s ability, we will not ask for your child’s name in the survey. Your child’s identity will remain confidential and it will never be disclosed. The name of the school will also be kept confidential to the public and will never be disclosed.

**What happens if I do not want to be in this research?**

You and/or your child can leave the research at any time and it will not be held against you.

**What happens if I say yes, but I change my mind later?**

You and/or your child can leave the research at any time and it will not be held against you.

**Is there any way being in this study could be bad for me?**

While this study poses no physical, social or legal risk to your child, a few issues discussed might cause you some discomfort. Your child can take a moment if he needs it and can skip any question he doesn’t want to answer.
**What happens to the information collected for the research?**

The use and disclosure of your child’s personal information, including research notes and transcriptions, will be limited to people who have a need to review this information. We cannot promise complete confidentiality. Organizations that may inspect and copy your information include the IRB.

**Can I be removed from the research without my OK?**

The person in charge of the research study can remove your child from the research study without his approval.
Signature Block for Children

Your signature documents your permission for the named child to take part in this research.

Printed name of child (REQUIRED)

Signature of parent or individual legally authorized to consent for the child (REQUIRED)

Date (REQUIRED)

☐ Parent

☐ Individual legally authorized to consent to the child’s general medical care (See note below)

Note: Investigators are to ensure that individuals who are not parents can demonstrate their legal authority to consent for the child. Contact legal counsel if any questions arise.

Printed name of parent or individual legally authorized to consent for the child (REQUIRED)

Signature of parent

Date

Printed name of parent

If signature of second parent not obtained, indicate why: (select one)

☐ The IRB determined that the permission of one parent is sufficient.

☐ Second parent is deceased

☐ Second parent is unknown

☐ Obtained

☐ Not obtained because the capability of the child is so limited that the child cannot reasonably be consulted.

Signature of person obtaining consent and assent (REQUIRED)

Date (REQUIRED)

12/7/15

Printed name of person obtaining consent (REQUIRED)

IRB Approval Date
Appendix 2: Student Survey

A questionnaire about language in Miami

Grace Slawski, a graduate student in Latin American Studies at the University of Miami, and Dr. Andrew Lynch, a professor of language and linguistics at the University of Miami, are conducting a research study about how students of Cuban and Latino descent at your school interpret Spanish and English in their everyday lives. Students that are not of Spanish-speaking Latino descent (from Latin America and the Caribbean) will not be eligible to take this survey. We would like to know your opinions and observations. This questionnaire will take about 30 minutes to complete. For each of the statements on this questionnaire, please circle the number that best indicates your opinion. The indications are as follows:

1 = you totally disagree with the statement
2 = you somewhat disagree with the statement
3 = you neither agree nor disagree, do not have a clear opinion on the matter, or feel that it would depend on a lot of different factors
4 = you mostly agree with the statement, although you may still have a few doubts
5 = you totally agree with the statement

If you are confused about the scale, please ask Ms. Slawski for more explanation. Do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire! Your identity will be confidential. This questionnaire is not schoolwork, and will not be ‘graded’ in any fashion. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from completing the questionnaire at any point. If you do not wish to participate, your teacher will give you a separate, class-related assignment to complete while others respond to this questionnaire.

Since your answers to this questionnaire will form part of a study that will be published and read by university scholars, it is important that you respond to each question seriously and thoughtfully. Please be thoughtful and honest in your responses.

>>>Thank you very much for your thoughts and for your time!

First, please provide the following information about yourself:

Age: _____
Grade: _____

Where were you born? (city, state, country)
**If you were born in the US:** Please provide a brief family history indicating when your family members migrated to the US.

**If you were born outside the US:** How old were you when you moved to the US?

How long have you lived in Miami?

How do you define your ethnic background (E.g.: Cuban, Venezuelan, Colombian, Cuban-American, Cuban-Dominican, American, Hispanic, Latino, etc.)

Do you consider yourself “Hispanic” or ‘Latino/a’? Please explain.

---

**PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY EITHER CIRCLING THE NUMBER OR ANSWER THAT BEST INDICATES YOUR RESPONSE.**

> How would you rate your own abilities to speak Spanish?

1. Poor  
2. Fair  
3. Good  
4. Very good  
5. Excellent

> Does your mother speak Spanish?

Yes  No

> What do you estimate to be the percentage of your use of English and Spanish with your mother? (Please CIRCLE)

1. English almost always  
2. Mostly English some Spanish  
3. Half English half Spanish  
4. Mostly Spanish some English  
5. Spanish almost always

> Does your father speak Spanish?

Yes  No

> What do you estimate to be the percentage of your use of English and Spanish with your father? (Please CIRCLE)

1. English almost always  
2. Mostly English some Spanish  
3. Half English half Spanish  
4. Mostly Spanish some English  
5. Spanish almost always
What do you estimate to be the percentage of your use of English and Spanish with your grandparents? (Please CIRCLE)

1 2 3 4 5
English Mostly English Half English Mostly Spanish Spanish
almost always some Spanish half Spanish some English almost always

What do you estimate to be the percentage of your use of English and Spanish with your brothers and/or sisters? (Please CIRCLE)

1 2 3 4 5
English Mostly English Half English Mostly Spanish Spanish
almost always some Spanish half Spanish some English almost always

Do the majority of your friends speak Spanish?

Yes No

What do you estimate to be the percentage of your use of English and Spanish with your friends? (Please CIRCLE)

1 2 3 4 5
English Mostly English Half English Mostly Spanish Spanish
almost always some Spanish half Spanish some English almost always

What do you estimate to be the percentage of English and Spanish in television and movies that you watch? (Please CIRCLE)

1 2 3 4 5
English Mostly English Half English Mostly Spanish Spanish
almost always some Spanish half Spanish some English almost always

What do you estimate to be the percentage of English and Spanish in the music you listen to? (Please CIRCLE)

1 2 3 4 5
English Mostly English Half English Mostly Spanish Spanish
almost always some Spanish half Spanish some English almost always

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER THAT BEST INDICATES YOUR OPINION.

(1) The best way to get around in Miami is by speaking Spanish.

1 2 3 4 5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree I mostly agree I totally agree

(2) Reggaetón is good music.

1 2 3 4 5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree I mostly agree I totally agree
(3) Only English should be spoken in stores and businesses in Miami.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree

(4) It would be a bad thing to have a significant other in Miami who did not know any Spanish.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree

(5) Latin culture is what makes Miami such a cool city.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree

(6) Spanish speakers often have more interesting personalities than English speakers.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree

(7) Students should not be allowed to speak Spanish on school grounds, except in Spanish class.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree

(8) *Spanglish* is a necessary part of life in Miami.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree

(9) It’s annoying when people who know Spanish act like they only speak English.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree

(10) When I am older, I want my kids to learn Spanish as their first language.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree

(11) English is a more serious language than Spanish.
1 I totally disagree
2 I disagree somewhat
3 I neither agree nor disagree
4 I mostly agree
5 I totally agree
(12) It would be strange to live in a city where people did not speak Spanish.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree

(13) Spanish is necessary for a good job in Miami.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree

(14) It’s cool when English-language singers like Beyonce and J-Lo do Spanish language versions of their songs.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree

(15) Educated Hispanics in Miami should be fully competent in both Spanish and English.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree

(16) It would be difficult to have a close friend who only spoke Spanish.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree

(17) Swearing and ‘bad words’ sound stronger in Spanish than in English.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree

(18) Music videos in Spanish are better than the ones in English.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree

(19) Spanish is a more authoritative language than English.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree

(20) It’s offensive when salespeople or restaurant servers in Miami speak to customers in Spanish.

I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree mostly agree
(21) Family values are better expressed in Spanish than in English.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree

(22) People in Miami are nicer to you if you speak to them in Spanish.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree

(23) Hispanic teenagers in Miami who refuse to speak Spanish are ‘sell-outs’.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree

(24) The best places to have fun in Miami involve speaking or hearing Spanish.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree

(25) English is the true language of success in Miami.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree

(26) It’s easier to make friends in English than in Spanish.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree

(27) When people elsewhere in the United States think of Miami, they think of people speaking Spanish.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree

(28) Someone who speaks English with no accent and Spanish with no accent appears more intelligent than someone who has a strong accent in one of the two languages.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree

(29) It’s fun to watch movies in Spanish.
1  2  3  4  5
I totally disagree somewhat nor disagree agree agree
(30) Spanish language radio in Miami is horrible.
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree

(31) Miami is a bilingual city (Spanish and English).
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree

(32) Spanish speakers demand more respect than English speakers.
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree

(33) It’s cool when Spanish language singers like Shakira and Enrique Iglesias do English-language versions of their songs.
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree

(34) It’s normal to mix Spanish and English when speaking to friends and family members.
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree

(35) A Hispanic teenager from Miami who claims not to know Spanish is probably lying.
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree

(36) If you don’t know any Spanish, you should get out of Miami.
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree

(37) Being bilingual is a good thing.
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree

(38) A lack of school instruction in Spanish is the reason that some Hispanic teenagers in Miami are not fully bilingual.
1 I totally disagree 2 I disagree 3 I neither agree 4 I mostly agree 5 I totally agree
(39) On the street in Miami, favors are better asked for in Spanish than in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(40) It would be weird to speak only English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(41) Music is better in English than in Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(42) Miami is as much a part of Latin America as it is the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(43) People who speak only Spanish in Miami are annoying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(44) People in Miami who don’t know Spanish are missing out on a lot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(45) People who switch back and forth between English and Spanish in conversations are more interesting than people who speak the whole time in just one language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(46) Spanish is, culturally, a superior language to English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(47) Music in Spanish is better for dancing than music in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(48) People give you more respect in Miami if you speak to them in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(49) Joking around is funnier in Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(50) To be “Hispanic” or “Latino” in Miami, you have to be able to speak Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(51) Spanish is necessary to be truly successful in Miami.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(52) Miami would be a better place if everyone spoke only English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(53) Spanish should be an official language in Miami.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(54) English should be the only official language in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(55) The dominant culture in Miami is Cuban.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally disagree</td>
<td>I disagree somewhat</td>
<td>I neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>I mostly agree</td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Parent Survey

Please take a moment to review the consent language, seen below, before answering the survey. NOTE: Only parents or legal guardians that are of Cuban descent can participate in this survey.

Hi, my name is Grace Slawski, and I am conducting a research study with Dr. Andrew Lynch at the University of Miami titled *Bilingualism, Biculturalism and the Intersections of Language and Ethnic Identities of Students at an All Boys Cuban Catholic High School in Miami.*

PURPOSE OF STUDY:

A research study is a way to learn more about people. We are asking you to take part in a research study because we are trying to learn more about how you, as a parent, influence your son's Spanish language usage and ethnic identity. If you decide you want to be part of this study, you will be asked to participate in a survey. The survey is ten questions and should take approximately 10-20 minutes to complete.

There are some things about this study you should know. The topics investigated in the survey do not ask you to reveal any information about your personal life beyond language practices and cultural practices. It is assumed that majority of these topics mentioned in the interview you could or already discuss in casual conversation among family or friends. However, there are questions that will ask you to discuss certain aspects of you or your son's Cuban heritage or identity that may be considered culturally sensitive. There are also questions that may ask you to vocalize opinions that perhaps your family, friends or peers would not agree with. We will never force you to respond to any question that you do not feel comfortable responding to. Lastly, no risks or direct benefits are expected for your direct participation in the study.

To ensure your protection to the best of the research team’s ability, we will not ask you to disclose your name. Your identity will remain confidential and it will never be disclosed. The name of the school will also be kept confidential to the public and will never be disclosed.

Your participation is voluntary. You can decline to participate, and you can stop your participation at any time, if you wish to do so, without any negative consequences to you.
By continuing onto the survey questions, this means you consent to participate in the research project.

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to the research team by either contacting Grace Slawski at (413) 427-8244 or g.slawski@umiami.edu or Dr. Andrew Lynch at a.lynch@miami.edu

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact the University of Miami, Human Subject Research Office at (305) 243-3195.

When you are ready you may begin the survey.
1. Please indicate your relationship to your son.

2. What is your educational background?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Some high school or GED</th>
<th>Some college, No degree</th>
<th>Associate's degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Post-graduate degree (MA, MS, JD, MD, PhD, EdD, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To the best of your ability, please indicate when you or your family migrated from Cuba to the United States (No exact dates are necessary, just state the year or approximate time period that the migration took place, and who migrated).

4. How would you rate your own abilities to speak Spanish?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Fair</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Very Good</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How would you rate your own abilities to speak English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Fair</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Very Good</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What do you estimate to be the percentage of your use of English and Spanish with your son at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English almost always</th>
<th>Mostly English some Spanish</th>
<th>Half English half Spanish</th>
<th>Mostly Spanish some English</th>
<th>Spanish almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What do you declare as your ethnic identity (Examples: Cuban, Cuban-American, Cuban-Venezuelan, Latino, Hispanic, American, etc.)?
Feel free to write as little or as much as you want, and to skip questions that you are not comfortable answering.

8. How important is it to you that your son speaks Spanish? Explain.

9. How important is it to you that your son identifies with his Cuban background? Explain.

10. Do you have any other comments that you would like to add? Please write them in the space below.