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ABSTRACT

SECOND GENERATION LATINOS: EXPLORING LANGUAGE CHOICE

by

Maria de Jesus Hernandez

Master of Social Work

California State University, Chico

Spring 2012

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the correlation of social influence and personal perception on language choice among second generation Latinos. For over a hundred years language has been a cultural characteristic which has been the center of debate politically and socially in the United States. As an emic perspective study, ten second generation Latinos were individually interviewed. Interviews were recorded and transcribed, and a content analysis of data was completed. A comparison of narratives provided understanding and insight in the phenomenon explored. A grounded theory approach revealed thirteen categories which led to the formulation of four themes. The following four themes emerged from the participants’ narratives in correlation to their language choice: 1) External demands which are conveyed and/or imposed by the setting, 2) The demands associated with individuals in their presence, regardless of setting, 3) Negative influences, and 4) Positive events.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language...for but one soul loyalty, and that is loyalty to the American people...” Theodore Roosevelt, 1919.

Although Roosevelt claimed to be in favor of immigrants migrating to the United States, he advocated for conditions to be imposed on new immigrants coming to America:

We should insist that the immigrant who comes here does in good faith become an American and assimilates himself to us he shall be treated on an exact equality with everyone else...If he tries to keep segregated with men of his own origin and separated from the rest of America, then he isn’t doing his part as an American. There can be no divided allegiance. (Theodore Roosevelt Association, n.d.)

The level of acceptance of cultural diversity by the majority of Americans is debatable; tolerance varies based on the experiences and social influences of individuals. Have there been changes in American attitudes in the last 90 years? Yes, but there are historical social and political influences ingrained in Americans which typically lead them to view cultural differences which they do not understand, as un-American. To suggest we have abolished more than a hundred years of recorded biases and discrimination in Americans’ upbringing is to deny current social reality (Sue & Sue, 1999). In fact, Sue and Sue explain it is our preconceived notions of other cultures which can justify Americans’ visible and concealed forms of biases and discriminations.

It is February and I am shopping for my 2011 monthly planner at a local department store. I hear a mother speaking to her child in Spanish on the other side of
the aisle. The child appeared to be approximately four years old and is responding to his
mother in Spanish. Suddenly I hear an assertive voice say, “Speak to him in English. He
needs to speak English.”

The mother replies, “No, he needs to learn Spanish.” The woman ignores the
mother’s response and continues to insist that she should speak English to her son. The
mother attempts to explain why it is important to speak Spanish to her son, but the
woman insists and cuts her short, “Doesn’t he speak English? Do you speak English?”

I stopped searching for my calendar and was stunned by what I was
witnessing. I realize the woman was not allowing time for the mother to articulate her
response. I decided to approach the English-speaking woman and with a calm voice I
explained to her that the mother was doing the right thing in speaking to her son in
Spanish at such a young age. I turn to the mother and congratulate her for speaking-
Spanish to her son (in Spanish). I continue to translate what the mother was trying to say
to the woman, per the mother’s request and together we attempted to provide the woman
with a bit of understanding of the importance of teaching our children their heritage
language.

Children growing up in America will be exposed to English regularly, but the
opportunities to speak Spanish are fewer. The mother explained how she saw her
nephews, whom their parents speak to only in English, without the ability to
communicate with family that only speaks Spanish. As we conclude our conversation the
mother thanks me and the English speaking woman says, “Hmm, you came to her
rescue.”
I left the department store feeling disturbed by what I witnessed. The woman’s bias and final comment reinforced how racism and discrimination is still embedded in our society. Cobas and Feagin (2008) identify what occurred as “silencing,” a control strategy to stop Spanish speakers. They define it as a command from members of the white group to Latinos to not speak Spanish. Furthermore, their interference in a Spanish conversation is an instant way to “silence” the Spanish speakers (Cobas & Feagin, 2008). In the days that follow I shared what occurred with family and friends, who are Latinos -- none were surprised.

Could the lone incident I witnessed occur often enough to Latinos to influence their language choice? Is there a social influence which encourages a Latino to select English over Spanish? The experience led me to explore the phenomenon behind second generation Latinos’ perspective of language choice and their attitudes which influence the loss of Spanish in third and subsequent generations of Latinos.

Background

For over a hundred years language has been a cultural characteristic which has been the center of debate politically and socially in the United States. Following the Mexican-American War the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed in 1848. The treaty declared all legal documents were to be printed in Spanish and English and Mexicans were guaranteed they could keep their culture (Schaefer, 2008). However the reality was that English became the accepted social norm by the dominant group. Several states enforced a “No Spanish” rule in schools (Schaefer, 2008). Any child caught speaking
Spanish at school was punished with detention, physical reprimands, possible fines, and even expulsion, if they continued to repeat the offense.

Currently our United States Constitution does not indicate any language as the official language of our nation, although, there have been attempts as recently as 1997 to establish English as the official language of the United States (Gonzalez & Melis, 2001). Close to half of the states, on the other hand, have officially established official language laws making English their official language (Gonzalez & Melis, 2001). Among the states officially declaring English as their official language was California in 1986.

California and Texas are the two states with the numerically largest Latino populations. California has a recent history of passing state initiatives which influence Latinos’ education and limit the social services they are allowed access to (Barker & Giles, 2004). In 1994 California voters passed Proposition 187 which limited public benefits for undocumented immigrants. In 1997 Proposition 209 restricted affirmative action and in 1998 Proposition 227 banned bilingual education in elementary schools (Barker & Giles, 2004). By California’s voters passing initiatives which limit the resources available to one of the fastest growing ethnic groups residing in the state, it is difficult not to perceive it as institutional discrimination directed against Latinos.

Scope of the Project

According to Suleiman (2003) language is not just a technique to communicate, but it is a method within cultures which allows families to pass on traditions from one generation to the next generation. Common language binds families; the absence of this cultural artifact has the potential to undermine those connections
Limited family cohesiveness due to language barriers has the ability to impact a family’s dynamic e.g. grandchildren unable to express their needs to their grandparents when in their care.

According to the 2010 Census the Latino population accounts for over half (15.2 million) of the 27.3 million population increase between 2000 and 2010. The data indicates that as of April 2010 there are 308.7 million people who reside in the United States and of those people 16 percent (50.5 million) are of Latino origin (United States Census [USC], 2011, pg. 2). The number of individuals of Latino origin grew by 43 percent as compared to the overall United States population that increased by 10 percent.

A dominant characteristic of the Latino culture is language, more specifically Spanish. Research indicates an increase in English-speaking ability over generations among Latinos (Hakimzadeh & Cohan, 2007). In addition, the data showed 23% of first generation Latinos spoke English very well as compared to 88% of second generation and 94% of third and subsequent generations of Latinos (Hakimzadeh & Cohan, 2007).

Many second generation Latinos living in the United States make up a generation which bridges two languages. They maintain a level of fluency in Spanish to communicate mainly in the home and become fluent in English to navigate in an environment which attempts to impose an English-speaking only society. In a study to investigate factors that predict acculturative stress, proficiency in the native language of Latinos was a significant predictor for high acculturative stress (Lueck & Wilson, 2011). A survey conducted in 2006 by the Pew Hispanic Center noted that a large number of
immigrants believe they have to speak English in order to be a part of American society and have an even stronger conviction that their children should be taught English.

This study examined multiple cases in order to understand the commonalities and differences between the participants (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The study allowed for comparison of literal replication (similar results) to gain understanding and insight in the phenomenon being explored (Yin, 2009). For the purpose of this project the term Latino and Hispanic was used interchangeably. Latinos (without an identifying generation) refer to individuals born in Latin America and/or the United States.

Significance of Study

Much of the research regarding Spanish use over generations is quantitative and focuses on multiple generations. By conducting a qualitative study with adult second generation Latinos, the study provided an emic understanding of preference in language choice, including knowledge and awareness of influences in their surroundings which determines their language choice. Language is a dynamic component of acculturation for second generation Latinos. The ability to speak both English and Spanish is highest among this generation (Pew Hispanic Center, 2004). The findings of this multiple case study can contribute insight to the correlation of social influences and personal perspectives of the participants’ language preference.

The knowledge obtained from exploring second generation Latinos’ language choice can provide social workers practicing in county, state, or federal levels, an increase in understanding in the study population’s culture and their behavior. What social influences encourage Latinos to surrender their first language? In an exploratory
study Quiroz (2001) identifies a negative social status associated to bilingual Latinos which reinforces that there is a social influence which can determine Latinos choice of language.

The study contributed significant knowledge about second generation Latinos’ culture through language behavior. According to the Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Work (NASW Code of Ethics) social workers are to promote social and political action which encourages respect for culture and social diversity in the United States (Shebib, 2003). Social workers are also to respect diversity and seek to broaden their culture competence, specifically of their clients (Shebib, 2003). Latinos are recognized to have contributed to more than half of the nation’s population growth in the last decade (USC, 2011). Social workers practicing at any level (county, state, federal, etc.) inevitably will work directly or indirectly with Latinos in the near future.

Definition of Terms

Latino

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary a Latino is a person of Latin-American origin living in the United States (n.d.).

Second Generation Latinos

For the purpose of this study a second generation Latino is defined as a United States native born individual and who has at least one foreign born parent (born in Latin America) who migrated to the United States from Latin America.
First Generation Latino

For the purpose of this study, an individual born in Latin America who migrated to the United States will be defined as a first generation Latino.

Cultural/Language Brokers

Are bilingual individuals who translate and in some cases negotiate with a Spanish-speaking and English-speaking individuals (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991).

To Bridge

For the purpose of this study “to bridge” will refer to second generation Latinos linking communication between monolingual individuals who speak either, English or Spanish.

Heritage Language

The term “heritage language” for this study refers to Spanish (or Dominant Language used in their country of origin).

Spanglish

For the purpose of this study “Spanglish” refers to an informal dialect which mixes Spanish and English words.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review will discuss several concepts which are significant to better understand and gain insight related to the current study. An overview of culture will be reviewed incorporating the influences of acculturation and a bicultural lifestyle can have on the subject culture. This chapter will also examine existing research which discusses the possible effects social class and gender have on an individual’s choices. Existing research will be looked at discussing the existing literature which addresses context in relation to the use of language.

Culture

The population of Latinos consists of various ethnic groups, each with its own heritage and rich culture from numerous countries in the Americas and the Caribbean. In the United States however, they often are perceived as a monolithic group because of their common language, Spanish. Rouse, Wilkinson, and Garand (2010) declare that Latinos are not a homogeneous group, but they are categorized into one single classification because of a common heritage language, Spanish. According to Ruiz-Cameron (1997) Latinos’ heritage language is central to their identity.

Culture is an integrated pattern of human behavior which is transmitted from one generation to another for purposes of individual and societal growth adjustment and
adaptation; it includes thoughts, beliefs, actions, values, customs, communications
(including language), and institutions of racial, ethnic, religious, or social group (Lum,
2011; Marsella, 1988). Therefore, it is practical to cluster individuals into cultural
groupings based on a number of the mutual traits mentioned previously, among them
language (Varela & Hensley-Maloney, 2009).

However, individuals must recognize that culture is not a fixed or static entity
in fact; it is a dynamic pattern which is constantly changing (Lum, 2011). This is seen
when Latin families, migrating to the United States, must transition from being part of the
dominant group in their country of origin to conforming into a minority group in a
foreign country. As an in group they are able to influence social norms and are able to
access services without restraints due to knowledge or language, but as the out group they
have less influence and less access to services. This leads some Latinos to assimilate
altering some culture characteristics (including language) on an individual level, to
resemble those of the dominant group to eventually be accepted by them (Schaefer,
2008). Studies indicate Latinos’ language does adjust to resemble the dominant group’s
language which is English in the United States (Schaefer, 2008; Fillmore, 2000; Lutz,
a new predicament. Considering the importance given to language for identity and
cohesiveness, a Latino who is not Spanish-speaking can become detached from two
cultures because they do not fulfill the main identifying characteristics either culture has,
leading them to feel anxiety.
Acculturation/Bicultural

Lum (2011) suggests acculturation involves the adjustment and adaptation of the individual from their culture of origin to the dominant culture and the impact they have on one another. Furthermore, Lum (2011) describes bicultural integration which occurs to individuals who can access both cultures and connect to them in a way that works for them. A bicultural individual relates to two cultures and can switch to use either of the two cultural standards, equally well, depending upon their situation and context (Conkright, 1975).

Research suggests there are stressors involved with acculturation. Latinos with monolingual Spanish-speaking parents commonly assume the role of culture brokers. Once parents decide their child is well versed in both English and Spanish, regardless of age, they are required to step into the role of language broker. Weisskirch and Alva (2002) examined the feelings of fifth grade Latinos who act as language brokers for parents, relatives, strangers that come to their home, and over the phone. Their study explains that children who become bicultural often assume the demand of responsibilities associated with interpreting both languages and the cultural norms and expectations; therefore, they undergo heightened acculturative stress. Findings of the study indicate that most of the participants who described their brokerage experience as uncomfortable were more likely to be stressed about carrying out their ascribed role (Weisskirch & Alva, 2002). The researchers did note that the acculturative stress the participants in study feel could be related to their level of Spanish and English proficiency. Their fear
and anxiety regarding their ability to transcribe accurately the information could be a factor associated with discomfort.

Translation for monolingual family members can occasionally lead a bilingual individual to experience a sense of responsibility and obligation to bridge both languages, English and Spanish. Translation is not only used in a macro setting, but also within family gatherings. An individual can feel caught between two cultures without fully identifying with either. As Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba (1995) provide insight into a well-known phenomenon, Latinos who have lived in the United States most of their lives feel equally out of place whether they are here in the US or in their heritage country. Regardless of the country they are living in or visiting, as soon as the bilingual individual speaks Spanish, they will be identified as a foreigner.

Other studies looked at factors which contribute to acculturative stress which relates to the psychological reactions of Latino’s to distinctive phases of the acculturation process (Perez, Fortuna, & Alegria, 2008; Lueck & Wilson, 2011). Their findings revealed acculturative stress decreased as participant’s English proficiency increased. Latinos also demonstrated a correlation of higher anxiety levels if they have a higher proficiency in heritage language, Spanish (Lueck & Wilson, 2011). All of which support Weisskirch and Alva’s (2002) speculation that their fifth grade language broker’s level of proficiency in language could be the major variable contributing to their acculturation stress.

Although literature suggests that increased English proficiency lowers acculturation stress in the general community, it also reveals that English acquisition
heightens distress in relation to family cohesiveness (Weisskirch & Alva, 2002). In their study, family demands for language brokerage activities, was perceived by participants, to hinder their development. These studies’ findings demonstrate acculturation stress among Latinos, but fail to provide an in-depth exploration regarding the Latino’s language choice. The likelihood of a correlation between the use of language and acculturation stress is an area to be examined further.

Social Class

Lutz (2006) categorizes social class using two demographic characteristics of a family, their annual income and the parent’s educational background. Furthermore when she studied Spanish maintenance among Latino youth her findings showed that overall as the family’s income increases the probability of the youth speaking Spanish decreased, the rationalization of the outcome was that it could be related to a decrease of participation in ethnic related institutions. The education level of a first generation adult Latino is a key determinant of their ability to speak English and they are likely to speak it at home and at work to increase in fluency (Hakimzadeh & Cohn, 2007).

Risk increases for academic failure among students who are from low social economic status (SES) racial or ethnic minority groups and view school as an alienating institution which creates unequal opportunities (Schmid, 2001). Latino adolescents in the study felt their identities and their language were undermined and not valued by school staff. A teacher’s overemphasis in preparing a bilingual student to acquire dominance of the English language can result in neglect of reaching other educational goals (Vasquez, Pease-Alvarez, & Shannon, 1994).
Gender

Numerous studies have discovered that gender is one of the factors which impact the determination of maintaining high fluency in Spanish proficiency while increasing their English proficiency (Zentella, 1997; Portes & Hao, 2002, Lutz & Crist, 2009). The reasoning is that frequently young girls are expected to assist around the house with siblings, chores, and running errands. A girl’s relatively ease of access to use and hear Spanish dialect among adult females who were monolingual was greater than if they had a brother who would be allowed to be outside with English-speaking peers (Zentella, 1997). By contrast, a boy’s inability to maintain strong Spanish language skills is bound to have difficulties maintaining a cohesive relationship with family and extended family. Lutz and Crist’s (2009) findings show that it was important to maintain strong family ties for students in order to have a positive educational outcome, but more so for boys than for girls.

Language

In the United States overwhelming research confirms that the tendency for English-speaking increases over generations (Proctor, August, Carlo, & Barr, 2010; Hakimzadeh & Cohan, 2007; Hurtado & Vega, 2004; Arriagada, 2005) and among children who acquire it quickly it becomes their common language used (Lutz, 2006). What research suggests is that third or subsequent Latino generations are at higher risk of becoming English monolinguals. Nevertheless, when reviewing literature several studies conclude that children who speak Spanish, live in an environment where language and
family, influence Spanish usage and proficiency, despite their generational status (Arriagada, 2005; Linton & Jimenez, 2009).

Lutz (2006) noted in her findings the impact the home environment and other non-school settings with large Latino populations have on language. More than sixty-one percent of eighth grade Latinos in the study indicated they spoke a language other than English prior to starting school in a nonschool environment; 87 percent stated that by eighth grade they spoke English more often (Lutz, 2006). It appears that in the context of a school setting the participants shifted from Spanish-speaking to English-speaking as their choice of language. Another study identified a negative social status associated to bilingual Latinos in a high school setting (Quiroz, 2001). These findings bring up the possibility of an association between social influence and the determination of Latinos’ choice of language.

Language Proficiency

According to Omaggio proficiency is what allows us to define our competence in a language in the following terms: “1) the functions one can carry out in the second language; 2) the context in which the language user can operate comfortably and adequately; and 3) the accuracy with which those various functions are carried out in a given context” (as cited by Lee, 2000). Individuals who consider themselves proficient in a second language have a higher likelihood of practicing it comfortably and accurately in real life in order to carry out function and conversation.
Context of Language Usage

A study which focused on the contextual determinants of bilingualism among Latinos confirmed that there is a strong relationship between a Latino’s individual choice to be bilingual and the macro-level incentives provided where they live (Linton & Jimenez, 2009). Overall their findings showed that demographics matters; where there is a large population of Spanish-speaking immigrants it will influence the bilingualism among US-born Latinos. Their study focused in metro areas such as Chicago, Los Angeles and five other Southern California districts to examine the specific relationships between contextual factors and bilingualism (Linton & Jimenez, 2009). Results showed bilingualism was encouraged by interpersonal and institutional contact, labor market which provided rewards (bilingual-pay), cosmopolitanism, and variables which indicated there was a continuous size and growth of immigrant Latino population.

The community where a Latino resides can have a bearing on their ability to be bicultural. An environment where Spanish is accepted and rewarded has significant influence on biculturalism among Latinos (Linton & Jimenez, 2009). Unfortunately, not everyone who lives in a social environment within two different cultures is able to find the incentives to be bilingual. For instance, Reyes, an attorney in New York, wrote an article which was published in USA Today in 2007 describing “the dark secret” that was not talked about among his Latin family. He went on to explain that the shame and embarrassment of the family was that his siblings and he did not speak Spanish and what made it even worse was that they did not have any interest in speaking it.
Over 14,000 Latinos who participated in a study stated that they had a higher probability of speaking English in the work place if they felt it was necessary (Hakimzadeh & Cohan, 2007). They adjust to the necessity of their surroundings in order to maintain their employment. In school environments English language acquisition is viewed as one of the most important educational goals for students whose first language is not English, resulting in devastating results (Vasquez et al., 1994). School settings have an overrepresentation of minority students in special education classes (Schmid, 2001). Latino’s are sometimes labeled “as language disabled” by teachers or other professionals. They have difficulty distinguishing the difference between a student who is behind in their English proficiency and someone with a learning disability, language disorder, or underachievement (Schmid, 2001).

Focus of Study

While numerous studies exist which reveal a significant loss of Spanish language usage among subsequent Latino generations there appears to be a gap in exploring the perspectives of solely adult second generation Latinos. Most of the studies focus on Latin youth and their language choice, but either concentrate on first generation youth or incorporate Latinos of all generations into the study. The increase of Latinos in United States and its rapidly changing demographics which indicates that more than half of the countries growth in a decade was attributed to the Latino population (USC, 2011) the knowledge obtained from the perspectives of second generation Latinos is beneficial to society. This study explored second generation Latinos because they are the generation, which research suggests, holds the higher number of bilingual Latinos (Pew
Hispanic Center, 2004). The present study asked the participants in an in-depth interview, what their experiences speaking Spanish was as a second generation Latino, data discovered provided insight into their existing language choice and attitudes.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design of Study

This qualitative study explored the comparability of social influence and personal perception on language choice among second generation Latinos. Qualitative research methodologies focused on understanding the language choice of the participants by exploring and gaining insight on an understudied population by taking into account their description of their lives experience (Maxwell, 1996). The current research effort utilized multiple instrumental case studies described by Stake as cases examined to provide insight into an issue or to refine some theoretical explanation (as cited in Berg, 1998). The case studies are in-depth investigations where all aspects and activities of the subject are detailed with the intention to assist in understanding an external theoretical question (Berg, 1998).

Participants

Study participants consisted of second generation Latinos. For the purpose of this cross-sectional study second generation Latinos are defined as native born individuals who have at least one foreign born parent who migrated to the United States from Latin America. Participants were initially identified by individuals, other than the primary investigator (PI), who had existing knowledge of individuals that met the criteria of the targeted population, generally using a non-probability approach referred to as
purposive sampling (Rubin & Babbie, 2010). Individuals provided PI with contact information of the potential participants. PI then proceeded to select participants using availability sampling, a non-probability approach which allowed already identified participants, to be scheduled for an interview by PI based on availability and interest to participate (Rubin & Babbie, 2010). The study recruited a total of 10 participants.

Data Collection

Data was collected during in-depth, one-on-one semi-standardized interviews which were conducted and facilitated by the PI. The interviews involved a systematic form of asking the interviewee predetermined questions, still giving the interviewer the opportunity to probe beyond the answers to their questions, as described by Berg (1998). All interviews were audio taped and transcribed by the PI for subsequent content analysis. All identifying information was kept confidential.

There were five open ended probes which were asked in a conversational one on one interview in addition to needed follow up and/or clarification questions. The questions were designed to explore factors influencing the participants’ language choice from their personal perspective (see Appendix E).

Participants also completed a “Self-Assessment of Language” questionnaire (see Appendix F). A statistical analysis measuring the strength of association between numerous variables was conducted (Rubin & Babbie, 2010). The questionnaire was composed of four sections. The first section consisted of eleven (11) nominal questions; levels of measurement in which attributes are categorical only (Rubin & Babbie, 2010).
The remaining three sections of the questionnaire contained ordinal levels of measurement utilizing Likert scales.

**Instrument**

At the conclusion of the individual interview, participants were asked to complete a “Self-Assessment of Language” questionnaire composed of four sections with a total of forty-one (41) items. The first section was composed of eleven questions regarding participant’s demographic information. The second section had six questions and was designed to collect data in regards to the participant’s perception of their language proficiency. Using a six point rating scale the participants were asked to rate themselves in their ability to speak and write in English and Spanish. Participants are asked to express their perception on an anchored scale with the following reference points: excellent, great, good, fair, not so great, unable to. The third section was designed for the participant to state their English and Spanish oral language frequency it consisted of fifteen questions, six of which used a five point rating scale (very often, often, sometimes, rarely, never) and nine were multiple choice questions. Finally the fourth section, with nine items, used a seven point agreement scale, (very strongly agree, strongly agree, slightly agree, neutral, slightly disagree, strongly disagree, very strongly disagree) explored the position the participant had on language usage and preservation.

**Confidentiality**

The information provided by participants was kept confidential. Participation in the study was voluntary and there was no anticipated risk to human subjects. Only the PI had access to personal information. Questionnaires and transcripts were assigned a
unique identification code. Name and identity of participants was not disclosed (see Appendix D). The results of the study were used for research learning purposes only. Once the PI’s degree is posted, all recorded data will be destroyed.

Data Analysis Plan

The study used grounded theory which is an inductive qualitative method. This research approach consisted of constantly observing and identifying patterns in raw data, constructing categories, and recognizing common themes across individual interviews (Rubin & Babbie, 2010). The PI analyzed data using content analysis which is completed by using coding frames which are used to organize the data and identify findings into categories (Berg, 1998). Transcripts were carefully reviewed. Data was organized using codes and categories. The analysis of data allowed the PI to identify the common themes in the context of data. Second generation Latinos who participated in the study were assigned a unique identification code to maintain confidentiality. The qualitative data acquired from the in depth interviews was recorded using a digital audio recorder. The data was transcribed using a computer and Microsoft Word 2007.

To ensure credibility triangulation of methods was used. Qualitative data collected from the interviews was compared with quantitative data completed from instrument to substantiate similarities. Using grounded theory both types of data was assessed to identify similar concepts and their relationships. Frequency of concepts identified lead the PI to develop a theory based on the data. Triangulation of data allowed
for comparison, of qualitative discoveries and quantitative measures, increasing the trustworthiness and accuracy of study (Rubin & Babbie, 2010).

Audio taped data collected from open-ended questions was transcribed. The PI also used an analysis technique, memoing, to record meanings, ideas, or important observations which assisted in data analysis (Rubin & Babbie, 2010). Furthermore, a field journal was used by the PI to record observations. Using multiple methods of research enhanced the reliability and validity of study.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sample Description

A total of ten second generation Latinos took part in the study. Potential participants were initially identified by acquaintances and referred to the PI. Participants were then selected by convenience based on their availability and interest response for an individual interview. Nine of the participants identified their national origin to be from Mexico and one participant from Guatemala. There were six females and four males with ages ranging from 18 to 44 years old. All participants reside in three rural Northern California counties (Butte, Glenn, and Tehama). Among the participants one preferred to speak Spanish and another participant only spoke English.

Results

Questionnaire

The majority of participants indicated a greater ability to speak and read Spanish, however in their ability to write Spanish, participants’ ratings were split; half rated themselves as, “unable” or “not so great,” while the other half reported their ability as “good,” “great,” or “excellent.” By comparison the majority of participants indicated the ability to speak, write, and read English with facility.

In regards to media, the majority of group “rarely” or “never” reads or watches Spanish language television, yet the majority also reported they listened to
Spanish radio more frequently. By contrast all participants reported a greater frequency of watching, listening, and reading in English. These results reveal that the group understands and utilizes the Spanish language, but more frequently and independently, functions in an English speaking society.

Appendix A illustrates the frequency of language used by participants based on the individuals they are addressing. A greater part of the participants indicated speaking primarily Spanish to their parents, while with extended family they mainly reported using Spanish or Spanish/English. When speaking with their siblings, children, and their peers, the majority of participants reported English and a combination of Spanish/English is their language of choice. Interestingly, none of the participants reported speaking with their children or with friends most often in Spanish.

Appendix B displays participants’ perception on language use by their rate level of agreement or disagreement. Nine participants to some degree, agree that English fluency is necessary to be accepted by the majority of American society, yet the same individuals indicated that in public they are not embarrassed to speak or to be spoken to in Spanish. However, the majority of the entire group agrees that they prefer to speak English.

All participants reported a level of agreement that it is important for Latinos to be able to speak Spanish. Equally important, they indicated Spanish is necessary to preserve their heritage culture. This corresponds to the “very/strong agreement” reported by nearly all participants in regards to the importance of Latinos speaking Spanish in order to communicate with relatives/family. Providing confirmation of the importance of
language which provides families the method to pass on traditions from one generation to the next (Suleiman, 2003). Furthermore, all participants either expressed a degree of agreement or were neutral, in reference to their belief that Spanish Immersion programs in schools should be available, but even though disagreement was not indicated, there were variations of agreement and disagreements with the view of schools having the obligation of implementing programs to help Latinos preserve their heritage language.

**In-depth Interviews**

The following section will present the results of the qualitative data analysis completed. The data collected during in-depth interviews was transcribed, read multiple times, and individual units of meaning including phrases, sentences and statements were coded. Once the initial process of the analysis was completed thirteen categories were created which in turn led to the formulation of four themes (see Appendix C). A graphic typology of codes, categories and themes, along with participants’ exemplar statements, provided greater understanding of the study results.

Two primary themes were revealed when participants’ provided information about conditions and circumstances (context) where demands exist which impacts personal/professional language choice. The first theme was generated when all participants identified external demands which are conveyed and/or imposed by the setting (location) they are in. The second theme grounded in participants’ expressions of their language choice being impacted by the demand of the individuals present. The following settings associated with categories related to external demands of locations include: urban vs. rural, home, school/work, and intimate gatherings. Related categories
for this theme are demands relative to the presence of individuals were: parents, individuals who compel the participants to bridge and/or to accommodate, individuals who warrant respect, individuals with whom participants commonly utilize both languages resulting in switching/Spanglish, and individuals who typically ‘follow’ the language of the other person with whom they are communicating i.e. responding in Spanish when the subject of their discussion speaks in Spanish and responding in English when the subject of their discussion speaks in English.

The final two themes grounded in the interviews with study participants were the negative and positive events which appeared to influence participants’ language choice. Participants shared both negative and positive occurrences which were linked to the following reoccurring categories: Negative – shame/uncomfortable and dilution of culture heritage; Positive – comfort and advantages/asset.

Location

Urban vs. Rural. Participants who have experienced living in both urban and rural locations at some point in their lives expressed their experiences of going from a relatively diverse, big city to a comparatively small, ethnically homogenous rural town as a “culture shock” where English is deemed essential for “survival.” Their new living/working circumstances challenged their ability to freely and frequently speak Spanish. Participants who have continuously lived in rural areas also linked their living in a “rural town” to influencing their language choice.

Things for me changed when I moved from the big city to this small town of Orland. When I moved here to Orland, what I found is that you had a stigma that you were -- they would call you ‘beaner’ --- if you spoke Spanish. There was a stigma, the
Mexicans against the cowboys or the whites --- it was more of a stigma you were just not wanted or not desired. So you needed to fit in, you acclimated to not speaking as much Spanish and just try to acculturate yourself to speak English. (SGL#05-TFC)

So then we moved from New York, we moved to Red Bluff and that was then a completely different world because when we moved to Red Bluff, there were no Spanish-speaking people so I went from this world where I could speak Spanish whenever I wanted to, to a world where I had to use English that I felt I never knew...I am having to speak English, like I have to speak English for survival, like that’s different because in New York you never have to do that, like ever. (SGL#10-TF)

From Home to School/Work. The majority of the participants also described how expectations of specified settings influenced the language they used. Eight out of the ten participants disclosed that growing up, they mainly spoke Spanish at home and in some cases there were “consequences,” if English was spoken in the home. They also shared challenges and incentives which influenced their language choice selection on the basis of whether they were at school or at work.

. . . so it (English) became the primary language even though we knew Spanish, English became the primary language, but once again when we’d go home we just spoke Spanish to our parents. (SGL#07-TMC)

Where I was from English --- because if you spoke Spanish, they (teacher’s) considered that to be a detriment or almost like a disability. You would be put into a ‘special ed’ class. (SGL#02 – SF)

Like at work people are not comfortable. I don’t really talk to other people in Spanish here (work). It is just little words here and there, but people do not seem to be comfortable just because people do not know what I am saying. (SGL#03-TFC)

Intimate Gatherings. Some participants distinguished their choice of language when they were in intimate gatherings whether they were among family and/or friends.
Participants’ language choice varied by location and by the context of the occasion. One participant stated:

_When we talk Spanish when we get together – during family functions, like baptisms, so when we get together is when we use Spanish to communicate._

(SGL#09-TMC)

And another participant described family gatherings:

_Our family when we communicate we’re loud and we’re going from English back to English and Spanish—like there isn’t no, pause._

(SGL#10-TF)

**Individuals**

All participants reported how the presence of specific individuals affects their language choice. Even though participants are in a locality previously described, if particular individuals are present, they naturally switch/combine their language choice regardless of the setting.

**Parents.** Throughout all interviews participants identified their parents as distinct individuals whose presence incite a specific language for communication. Out of the nine participants who were bilingual, eight reported they speak Spanish to both their parents. Only one among the nine indicated that she speaks both English and Spanish to her father and only English to her mother. Several participants recalled how their parents influenced their language use during their childhood and how their parents’ demands carried over to their current language choice. Further findings related to this category will be addressed in the discussion section.

_Well it was hard for me to speak Spanish because we are from a very rural town in California. If you were Mexican, people were very bias towards you. My mom didn’t want us to have that (experience)….My mom would say, ‘Don’t speak_
Spanish, ’ because they used to put you in ‘Special Ed’ classes if you spoke Spanish.
(SGL#02 – SF)

Bridging/Accommodation/Respeto. All nine bilingual participants were able to recall instances in which they were compelled to respond in one of, or all, three ways as a result of their perception of others. The first is to utilize their language abilities as a bridge to connect the communication between other individuals. For example, participants referred to being a “bridge” for an individual who did not speak the language the majority of the group was speaking. Secondly, participants indicated their choice of language was influenced by providing accommodations for individuals who felt more comfortable speaking Spanish or English. Even the participant who did not speak Spanish shared that now, as an adult, she realizes that everyone always has been really accommodating when she is with family that is bilingual. Finally, a sense of “respeto” (respect) towards certain individuals was revealed by participants. One participant was able to capture all of these influences shared by participants in the following statement:

One of my strengths is that I am a relater. Even if the majority of the group is English speaking, I am the person, the bridge, with the person that may not speak---in this case English, they’re Spanish. So I am actually---I feel---the moderator that actually translates what’s happening with the majority of the group to the one or two individuals that do not speak English and vice versa. Because I like to have people feel included, so I happen to do that bridge. I think that is just a custom based on our family. In my husband’s side of the family obviously it is disrespectful. I am not going to talk to them in English, but I am that moderator with my children so they understand what the elders are saying because I already feel guilty that they are not engaging in the conversation. (SGL#05-TFC)

Not so much the place, it is more the individual. There are some people that I know are bilingual also, but because I know they’re more comfortable speaking Spanish, I will speak to them in Spanish also, just to basically ease the conversation, but not a particular place --- no real place, I think it is more the individual. (SGL#07-TMC)
I figure out what is more comfortable for them and this is the language I use. For example, one of my co-workers her preference is Spanish so I speak mostly in Spanish with her. (SGL#06-TMC)

Switching/Spanglish. The majority of the participants shared how they naturally switch their language to speak with specific individuals regardless of the setting. They switch their language between English and Spanish, with the same individual they are speaking to. Several participants identified these interactions as being conducted in “Spanglish.” Some also noted that they do not speak in this manner consciously it just happens, but it depends on the person with whom they speak. The following statements illustrate this finding:

We go back to the Spanglish throughout college all my friends were Mexican so we went back and forth (speaking Spanish & English) --- you don’t train your brain to have a conversation in English fully, it gets lazy in a sense, so it goes back and forth. So when I started working here it was really hard for me to carry on a conversation (in English). (SGL#03 – TFC)

. . . again it goes to the Spanglish, if it is my sister, I can go either back and forth. I don’t do it knowingly I just go back and forth, so it depends. (SGL#03 – TFC)

A lot of the friends that I still have speak Spanish, so when we are together socially-- or in sports we also speak in Spanish, English--go back and forth. (SGL#06-TMC)

Following. The final situation in which numerous participants reported feeling inclined to speak a specific language is when they are addressed in either Spanish or English. The difference between the previous category noted and following is that when participants utilize switching/Spanglish, they mix both languages with an individual throughout the conversation. In “following” participants commented that they respond in
the language that they are addressed. For instance the following statements of participants express this phenomenon:

We go back and forth but it is kind of different with both the families. If somebody starts talking in English then we are all talking in English and if someone starts talking in Spanish then we all start talking in Spanish. (SGL#03 – TFC)

Well I would switch my languages. I would speak Spanish when I need to and English when I need to. I respond back in the language that they speak. (SGL#04-SM)

The final two themes grounded in the participants’ responses focused on their expressions as to their experiences. Participants’ narratives conveyed emotions and/or beliefs which were repeated throughout the majority of the interviews and formed the following categories.

Negative Events

**Shame/Uncomfortable.** Participants’ capability to speak properly was a factor which was shared by several participants. Participants shared instances in which they had difficulties using a language, whether English or Spanish and as a result, they felt a strong sense of insecurity and self-reproach. Furthermore, others acceptance of the participants’ language choice was related to their comfort level and their determination to speak a specific language. The following expressions by participants support this interpretation:

When I got nervous I stuttered and my accent would get too thick. I was too embarrassed --- that was the only time I kind of felt ashamed (of speaking Spanish) because I couldn’t do it (speak English well). I wasn’t ashamed I was Mexican---I was ashamed I didn’t have the ability to be clearer. When I would do speeches, I would rather get an F then go in front of the class and do it. I felt that I was going to be teased --- that was the hardest. (SGL#03 – TFC)
Growing up, sometimes it was kind of embarrassing—embarrassing is kind of a harsh word, insecure kind of thing—you feel a little lesser, just doing the simple things, like when my parents when my mom would ask me, ‘can you tell them this?’ I would struggle to translate. It was a little insecurity there because I would struggle to translate for her, so it was challenging and it was a little bit of a struggle, but --- you just did what you had to do to try and get by, you know --- at times I hated doing it because I was put on the spot. SGL#07(TMC)

I feel like my Spanish isn’t the best. The only place I really feel comfortable speaking Spanish is with people in the jail because I know that I am the only one --- I am like the best thing they got --- I am okay speaking Spanish there. (SGL#02–SF)

... like at work, people are not comfortable. I don’t really talk to other people in Spanish here (work). It is just little words here and there, but people do not seem to be comfortable just because people do not know what I am saying. (SGL #03-TFC)

Dilution of Cultural Heritage. Participants reported how the result of their language choices impacted their cultural heritage. Participants were either disappointed in their proficiency to speak Spanish or in the fact that they did not pass it on to their children. The following participants:

... I can see the dilution; just in myself I can see how I have diluted my cultural heritage by not moving forward with my language. (SGL#05-TFC)

... my perspective, as I mentioned earlier, I really wish I had that skill (ability to speak Spanish)...I kind of feel it’s part of my heritage, it is a part of who I am, I wish I could speak Spanish --- and if I knew how, I would have still chosen to speak English --- that would have been our primary language spoken in the household...I think it would have been easier to support that thread of our heritage. (SGL#08-TFC0)

Positive Occurrences

Comfort. Participants’ ease of utilizing one language over the other also revealed how it affects their language choice. Depending on their state of mind at a given time, it becomes effortless to speak either Spanish or English. For instance one participant, who is married to a non-Spanish speaker, mentioned that when she is
cooking, if she is thinking salsa she requests ingredients from her husband in Spanish, it just occurs:

\[\ldots if \ I \ am \ making \ salsa, \ then \ in \ my \ head, \ I \ am \ thinking \ cilantro, \ I \ am \ not \ thinking \ 'silawntrro.' \] (SGL#10-TF)

Other participants expressed the following:

\[\text{It is so much easier for the English to continue from work to the house, but yeah, it kind of sounds bad that it (Spanish) is forced – you are more self cautious about it, you think, ‘Oh god I have to speak Spanish at home.’} \] (SGL#03 – TFC)

\[I \ can \ speak \ English \ enough \ to \ defend \ myself. \ I \ feel \ comfortable \ speaking \ my \ language \ (Spanish). \] (SGL #01-SFPs)

\[\text{My husband and I both agree that we have taken the easy path and scape-goated --- not teaching our children Spanish.} \] (SGL#05-TFC)

**Advantages/Asset.** The final category developed as a result of all participants identified benefits in speaking both English and Spanish. In most cases when participants were younger they did not realize how beneficial speaking both languages was and in some cases believed it actually held them back academically. They describe how, now, they know that their ability to speak both languages is an asset or gives them an advantage over another who is only monolingual. It allows them to provide services to a larger population. Participants shared the following:

\[I \ think \ it \ (speaking \ English \ & Spanish) \ is \ a \ real \ benefit. \ I \ just \ think \ it \ makes \ me \ a \ more \ rounded \ person, \ given \ my \ occupation \ and \ living \ in \ California.\] (SGL#02-SF)

\[\text{Being bilingual definitely helps, especially when you are where there is more than one language spoken...so you are a little bit more valuable employee to them.}\] (SGL#07-TMC)

\[\ldots \ right \ now \ in \ my \ job, \ I \ work \ in \ the \ community \ with \ only \ Latino \ families, \ my \ job \ here \ -- \ is \ working \ with \ Latino \ families \ -- \ and \ it \ breaks \ a \ barrier \ for \ the \ non-English parents \ that \ I \ work \ with.\] (SGL#06-TMC)
Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to explore and increase understanding about the correlations of social influences and personal perception of second generation Latinos’ language choice. It appears that most bilingual participants in the study demonstrate what Lum (2011) describes as acculturation, where individuals can access both cultures and connect to them in a way that works for them. School, work, and rural settings appeared to demand a greater use of English among participants. Even for those participants, who rated themselves more proficient in Spanish were inclined to acculturate to meet the demands of their setting, such as to avoid stigma and to complete course work.

Findings of the current study indicate a correlation between an individual’s perception of their ability to speak a language and their language choice. Participants expressed how their lack of comfort, as a result of their ability to speak it, or the lack of others’ comfort, because they do not understand, can impede them from utilizing a language. In most cases Spanish was the language which would be used less. In support of these findings, the majority of participants to some degree agreed, that they preferred to speak English and also indicated that they could read, write, and speak English with greater facility as compared to Spanish. Participants would feel a sense of shame to speak the language that they felt they could not speak competently. These findings support that individuals who consider themselves proficient in a second language have a greater likelihood of practicing it comfortably (Lee, 2000). Weisskirch and Alva (2002) noted in their study that individuals’ fear and anxiety as a result of their inability to transcribe
information can contribute to discomfort. Similarly this study’s participants reported discomfort will influence and contribute to language choice.

The results supported Linton and Jimenez (2009) who noted demographics influences the language choice of individuals, the larger the Spanish-speaking population is, the more influence for Latinos to be bilingual. Participants identified how living in a rural setting placed them in a location where Spanish was not widely used. In some instances they describe the “stigma” that was attached to Latinos. They would avoid speaking Spanish to fit in and to communicate, where English was the dominant language. Schmid (2001) points out how sometimes Latino’s are labeled “as language disabled” by teachers or other professionals. A startlingly discovery was finding that some participants’ statements support Schmid’s findings. In order to avoid being labeled or stigmatized, Spanish was used less frequently in a school setting or not at all. One participant disclosed that even being placed in English Language Development (ELD) classes left her feeling like she couldn’t speak English, which she claims is still one of her insecurities.

Two out of the ten participants shared how one parent prohibited them from speaking Spanish at a young age. Neither parent spoke Spanish but they were both married to someone who did. In one case it was the mother, and in another it was the father who discouraged them from speaking Spanish. In comparison, some households where both parents were Spanish-speaking also disapproved of their children speaking English in the home. It provides an insight of how authority influences language. In each case, the dominant individual with authority was attempting to control and in some cases
eliminate what they did not understand. It is simply convenient and familiar. These incidents are similar to what Cobas and Feagin (2008) identify as “silencing.”
CHAPTER V

Limitations and Conclusion

Limitations

There are several limitations related to the present study. The sample of participant was taken from limited geographic scope which consisted of three rural counties in North California. A larger representation of Latinos throughout California would increase understanding and insight. Secondly, the study included only ten second generation Latin participants of which four were male. Nine of the ten Latinos indicated their country of origin is Mexico. While the study expected to include participants representing several Latin countries, statistics show Latinos of Mexican-origin are the largest group residing in the United States (Lopez & Dockterman, 2011). Of the 50.5 million Latinos counted in the 2010 US Census, 31.8 million reported to be of Mexican-origin followed by the second largest group of Puerto Rican-origin numbering 4.6 million (Lopez & Dockterman, 2011, p. 2). The difference in the numbers from the largest group of origin (Mexican) to the second largest (Puerto Rican) validates additional limitations in the sampling methods. In California, the largest Latino population group is of Mexican origin totaling 81.5 percent, with 18.5 percent of other origin Latino groups (California Department of Finance, 2010). Accessing participants from Latino America countries, other than Mexico was a challenge. In order to generalize findings there needs to be a
more diverse population in sample size, gender, and the variation of country of origin of Latin participants.

Time limitation was also a factor as it was multiple case study and a considerable amount of time and resources was required (Yin, 2009). The time limitation did not allow the ability to complete member checking.

The study explored the perceptions of ten second generation Latinos currently residing in Northern California. Nine of the participants identified their national origin as Mexican and one as Guatemalan. Future research should increase the diversity of the sample of participants by broadening the sample population to include Latinos of a variation of Latin countries of origin. Although, Spanish is the language predominantly used throughout the Latin Americas, individuals’ dialect from other Latin origin can contribute plus broaden the understanding of participant’s language choice.

The population of Latinos is increasing throughout the United States, including rural and urban areas. It would be beneficial and valuable to also increase sample size to include Latinos from urban and rural areas. Including the perspective of second generation Latinos, their parents, and their children can provide insight in the correlation between generations in their language choice.

Conclusion

The Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Work (NASW) provides social workers a guideline based on a set of values, principles, and standards for conduct and decisions making by reminding us of our ethical responsibilities (Shebib,
According to the NASW Code of Ethics a social workers’ primary goal is to help people in need and to address social problems. Furthermore we are to seek understanding of cultural competence and recognize the strengths that exist within cultures. Participants revealed positive influences associated with their language choice. Strengths can be recognized to encourage and support Latino/a families’ well-being. For instance, participants indicated that they were not aware of the value of speaking both languages, in some cases Spanish was demanded not to be spoken. Our society should encourage youth to grasp both languages at a young age; as demonstrated in this study their well-being, self-esteem, and advantages can thus be greatly increased. Outsize social influences exist across the lifespan. There are external demands which contribute to the language choices of second generation Latinos, whether it is the setting and coexistent group culture or the marginalized individual in their midst. These implicit and explicit demands tend to correlate with both negative and positive occurrences which also influenced participant’s language choice.
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APPENDIX A
Language Used Most Often with Specific Individuals

Appendix A: Illustrates frequency of language used by participants based on individuals they are addressing. Question: What language do you speak most often when speaking to the following individuals? (Select only one choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Spanish/English</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Father:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mother:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Older siblings:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Younger Siblings:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Children:</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Extended Family:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Friends:</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Co-workers:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Classmates:</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Participant’s Perception on Language Use

Appendix B: Displays level of agreement of participants’ perception on language use.

Question: How much do you agree with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. English fluency is necessary to be accepted by the majority of American society.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I sometimes feel embarrassed when someone spks to me in Span.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I sometimes feel embarrassed to speak Spanish in public.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I prefer to speak English.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I think Spanish is necessary to preserve my heritage culture.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I think it is important for Latinos to be able to speak Spanish.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I think Span. is important so I can communicate w/ relatives/ family.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I think Span. Immersion program in school should be avail.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I think schools should implement program to help Latinos preserve their heritage language.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagram of Qualitative Data Analysis

(Categories ➔ Themes ➔ Language Choice)

- Comfort
- Advantage/Asset

- Shame/Uncomfortable
- Dilution of Cultural Heritage

- Urban vs. Rural
- Home
- School/Work
- Intimate Gatherings

- Parents
- Bridging/Accomodation
- Respect
- Switching/Spanglish
- Following

- External Demands of Location
- Demands Because of Individuals
- Negative Occurrences
- Positive Occurrences
Consent Form to Participate in a Research Study

Study Title: Exploring Language Choice among Second Generation Latinos

Investigator’s Name: Maria Hernandez
Date of Project Approval: 9/19/2011

INTRODUCTION
I, Maria Hernandez, am completing my Master’s Degree in Social Work at California State University, Chico. I am conducting a research study to explore second generation Latino’s preference of language and how social influences and personal perception can contribute to their choice to speak or not to speak in their heritage language (Spanish).

You are being asked to take part in this study because you have identified yourself or an acquaintance has identified you, as a second generation Latino(a). The study will include only people who freely choose to participate.

If you consent to be a participant you have the right to know about the procedures that I will use in this research study. Please take your time to review this consent form and to make your decision on whether or not you consent to participating in this study. You may discuss it with your friends and family prior to making your decision. If you decide to participate, it will be necessary to give your written consent.

PURPOSE OF STUDY
The purpose of this study is to explore social influences and personal perception on language choice among second generation Latinos.

ANTICIPATED NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
The goal is to survey a total of 10 -12 participants of second generation Latinos.

PROCEDURE
You will be interviewed one-on-one. You will be asked a few questions about social influence and about your perception regarding your use of language choice. All interviews will be audio taped. In addition, you will be asked to fill-out a questionnaire at the end of the interview. All identifying information will be kept confidential.

Participants will be asked if contact can be made at a later time, for the purpose of getting clarification on responses to an interview question, if necessary.
LENGTH OF STUDY
The face to face interview will take approximately an hour. The questionnaire will take approximately ten (10) minutes. The results will be compiled and the research study will be completed by March 2012.

RISKS & BENEFITS
There is not an anticipated risk to you in participating in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may stop at anytime. Please do not hesitate to direct your questions or concerns to the primary investigator.

There is no direct benefit or compensation for taking part in this study. However, the data collected may be of interest to you and other Latinos in your community to gain knowledge of the social influence and personal perception on language choice among second generation Latinos. We appreciate your contribution to the development of knowledge but there is no compensation for participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The information provided by you will remain confidential. Only the principal investigator will have access to personal information. Your survey will contain an ID number. Your name and identity will not be disclosed at any time. The results of this study will be used for research learning purposes only. You can get a copy of the research when it is completed by request.

IF I AM INJURED
It is not the policy of the California State University, Chico to compensate human subjects in the event the research may result in injury. CSU, Chico, in fulfilling its public responsibility, has provided medical, professional and general liability insurance coverage for any injury in the event such injury is caused by the negligence of the CSU system, its faculty and staff. This is not an admission of liability.

RIGHTS AS A PARTICIPANT
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to participate in this study. If you decide to participate, you can change your mind and drop out of the study at any time. You have the right to receive a copy of the results of this study, if you request it.

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS
If you have any further questions or concerns regarding your rights as a participant in this research, and/or concerns regarding the study, you may contact the primary investigator, Maria Hernandez at (530) 828-3951.

For research related questions about the study, or a copy of the completed project, you may contact the primary investigator.
Upon request, a copy of this consent form will be given to you to keep.
Signature

I understand and confirm that the purpose of the research, the study procedures, the possible risks and discomforts as well as potential benefits that I may experience have been explained to me. Alternatives to my participation in the study also have been discussed. I have read this consent form and my questions have been answered. My signature below indicates my willingness to participate in this study.

________________________________________
Name of Participant (Print)

________________________________________
Signature of Participant          Date

Signature of Primary Investigator

Signature of Primary Investigator          Date
Open-Ended Questions: To Explore the Language Choice Among Second Generation Latinos

(In-person Interview)

1. When/Where do you use Spanish to communicate most often?

2. What are your experiences as a second generation Latino in regards to your use of Spanish? (Note: Specify place)

3. What role does your immediate/extended family’s communication play in your use of Spanish?

4. What are your reactions/feelings when you hear people speaking Spanish in a public setting where the dominant language is English, explain?

5. Do you believe your language choice affects/influences your success in America? (It could be in career, academic, & personally)
Self-Assessment of Language Questionnaire: To Explore Language Choice among Second Generation Latinos

Section I: Participants Demo Graphics

1. What is your Latin national origin? ____________
2. What ethnicity do you identify with in the United States? __
3. In what country were your parents born: Father ____________ Mother ____________
4. What is your age? ______
5. What was your highest academic level of completion? (circle one of the following choices)
   - <12th Grade
   - H.S Diploma
   - Some College
   - Associates
   - Bachelor’s
   - Graduate
   - Other
6. What was your mother’s highest academic level of completion?
   - <12th Grade
   - H.S Diploma
   - Some College
   - Associates
   - Bachelor’s
   - Graduate
   - Other
7. What is your father’s highest academic level of completion?
   - <12th Grade
   - H.S Diploma
   - Some College
   - Associates
   - Bachelor’s
   - Graduate
   - Other
8. What is your current occupation? __
9. What is your mother’s current occupation? ____________
10. What is your father’s current occupation? ____________
11. Have you lived in another country besides the United States? (Yes/No)
    a. If yes, Where: ____________ Approx. Length: ______

Section II: Language Proficiency

12. How do you rate yourself in each of the different areas?
   a. Rate your ability to speak Spanish:
      - Excellent
      - Great
      - Good
      - Fair
      - Not So Great
      - Unable to speak
   b. Rate your ability to write Spanish:
      - Excellent
      - Great
      - Good
      - Fair
      - Not So Great
      - Unable to write
   c. Rate your ability to read Spanish:
      - Excellent
      - Great
      - Good
      - Fair
      - Not So Great
      - Unable to read
   d. Rate your ability to speak English:
      - Excellent
      - Great
      - Good
      - Fair
      - Not So Great
      - Unable to speak
   e. Rate your ability to write English:
      - Excellent
      - Great
      - Good
      - Fair
      - Not So Great
      - Unable to write
   f. Rate your ability to read English:
      - Excellent
      - Great
      - Good
      - Fair
      - Not So Great
      - Unable to read
Section III: English & Spanish Frequency

11. How frequently do you carry out the following?
   a. Watch TV in Spanish:
      Very Often ... Often ... Sometimes ... Rarely ... Never
   b. Listen to Radio in Spanish:
      Very Often ... Often ... Sometimes ... Rarely ... Never
   c. Read in Spanish:
      Very Often ... Often ... Sometimes ... Rarely ... Never
   d. Watch TV in English:
      Very Often ... Often ... Sometimes ... Rarely ... Never
   e. Listen to Radio in English:
      Very Often ... Often ... Sometimes ... Rarely ... Never
   f. Read in English:
      Very Often ... Often ... Sometimes ... Rarely ... Never

12. What language do you speak most often when speaking to the following Individuals? (Select only one choice)

   a. Father: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
   b. Mother: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
   c. Older siblings: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
   d. Younger siblings: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
   e. Children: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
   f. Extended Family: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
   g. Friends: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
   h. Co-workers: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
   i. Classmates: Spanish Span/Eng English Not Applicable
Section IV: Personal View on Language Use
(Use the 7 point agreement scale below to rate the following statements)

1= Very Strongly Agree  2= Strongly Agree  3= Slightly Agree  4=Neutral
5=Slightly Disagree  6 = Strongly Disagree  7= Very Strongly Disagree

13. How much do you agree with each of the following statements:

a. English fluency is necessary to be accepted by the majority of American society:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree

b. I sometimes feel embarrassed when someone speaks to me in Spanish in public:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree

c. I sometimes feel embarrassed to speak Spanish in public:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree

d. I prefer to speak English:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree

e. I think Spanish is necessary to preserve my heritage culture:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree

f. I think it is important for Latinos to be able to speak Spanish:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree

g. I think Spanish is important so I can communicate with relatives/family:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree

h. I think Spanish Immersion programs in school should be available:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree

i. I think schools should implement programs to help Latinos preserve their heritage language:
   Very Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Disagree
APPENDIX G
September 13, 2011

Maria de Jesus Hernandez
4405 County Road H 112
Orland, CA 95963

Dear Maria de Jesus Hernandez,

As the Chair of the Campus Institutional Review Board, I have determined that your research proposal entitled "SECOND GENERATION LATINOS: EXPLORING LANGUAGE CHOICE" is exempt from full committee review. This clearance allows you to proceed with your study.

I do ask that you notify our office should there be any further modifications to, or complications arising from or within, the study. In addition, should this project continue longer than the authorized date, you will need to apply for an extension from our office. When your data collection is complete, you will need to turn in the attached Post Data Collection Report for final approval. Students should be aware that failure to comply with any IRB requirements will delay graduation. If you should have any questions regarding this clearance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

John Mahoney, Ph.D., Chair
Human Subjects in Research Committee

Attachment: Post Data Collection Report

cc: Vince Ornelas (550)
APPENDIX H
HUMAN SUBJECTS IN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Post Data Collection Questionnaire

Under Federal law relating to the protection of Human Subjects, this report is to be completed by each Principal Investigator at the end of data collection.

Please return to:  Marshia Osborne, IRRC Assistant
Office of Graduate Studies
Student Services Center (SSC), Room 400
CSU, Chico
Chico, CA 95929-0875
Or Fax to: Marshia Osborne, 358-288-9042

Name: Maria de Jesus Hernandez Chico State Portal #0161161960a
Phone(s): (530) 828-3951  Email: macianvi7@comcast.com

Faculty Advisor name (if student):  Vincent Angeles Phone: 898-5445

College/Department:  College of Behavioral & Social Sciences/Social Work Dept.

Title of Project:  Second Generation Latinos: Exploring Language Choice

Date application was approved (m/o/y): 9/2011 Date collection complete (m/o/y): 2/2012

How many subjects were recruited? 10 How many subjects actually completed the project? 10

*HARM—Did subjects have severe reactions or extreme emotional responses?  No

If yes, please attach a detailed explanation:  

Your signature:  
Date: 3/29/2012

*Final clearance will not be granted without a complete answer to this question.

Approved By:  
John McShane, Chair
Date: 4/5/12

*********************************************************************************************************

VERY IMPORTANT: If you will or have used this research in your project or thesis you are required to provide a copy of this form (with John McShane's signature in place) to your graduate committee.

Do you want a photocopy of this form mailed to you?  Yes
If yes, provide address:  

Orland, CA 95963
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