Sheryl Bernardo-Hinesley* and Alba Arias Álvarez

Transmigrant identities and attitudes: the case of a Pangasinan-American family

https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2024-0025
Received March 23, 2023; accepted June 12, 2024; published online July 8, 2024

Abstract: Identity plays a crucial role in determining whether diasporic minority communities either integrate into the host country or resist acculturation and assimilation. Since identity is performed and negotiated through discourse, the study of connections between identity and language practices of migrant groups is crucial in understanding how language is used to express their multilayered identities. Using sociolinguistic interviews as the primary data source, this research analyzes how three generations of a Pangasinan-American family negotiate their complex identities and express their attitudes towards English, Filipino, and Pangasinan. Findings show that their Pangasinan-American identity is performed through translingual practices, which enable the portrayal of their membership to their home community and their integration into the host society. Each participant situates their Pangasinan identity in relation to their other identities – Filipino and American – which emerge in the diasporic context. This study contributes to the research on the role of language in the development of community membership and allegiances of bi-/multilingual transmigrants.

Keywords: diaspora; discursive identities; multilingualism; Pangasinan; transmigration

1 Introduction

In the past decade, there has been a notable increase in diaspora research focusing on ethnic minority groups (Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi 2020; Canagarajah 2019; King 2013, among others). These studies have provided insight into how identity plays a crucial role in determining whether diasporic communities integrate into the host country or resist acculturation and assimilation (Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi 2020; Gubitosi and De Oliveira 2020; Ladilova 2015). Migrants are not always willing to return to their home country. Instead, they may plan to settle, usually in previous

***Corresponding author: Sheryl Bernardo-Hinesley**, Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA, E-mail: BernarS3@wwu.edu. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1176-2081
Alba Arias Álvarez, Departments of English Language and Linguistics & Language Studies, University of Sussex, Falmer, UK, E-mail: A.Arias-Alvarez@sussex.ac.uk. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8827-6823

immigrant neighborhoods with a labor market. This leads to the formation of multilayered spaces, which Vertovec (2007) describes as superdiversity. It involves a dynamic interplay of factors among an increasing population of recent, small, and dispersed immigrants, who are diverse in terms of their origins, socioeconomic status, transnational connections, and legal standing.

Migrant families living in the diaspora frequently face communicative challenges. As permeable units (Canagarajah 2008), they are vulnerable to influences and interests from broader social forces and institutions. To navigate these challenges, children are encouraged to employ all their linguistic capacities in their daily lives, rather than rigidly insisting to adhere to the perceived pure language norms of their homeland (Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi 2020). In addition, evaluative responses toward languages and their speakers (Garrett et al. 2003) are also significant factors that contribute to the development of positive or negative relationships within diasporic families. In essence, language attitudes convey one's awareness of the societal status and perceived prestige associated with different linguistic varieties (Edwards 1982), which significantly impact language acquisition within the family in the host society.

Considering the above, the goal of this research is to examine how a Pangasinan-American transnational family builds their multilayered identities through discourse, and how they express their attitudes towards English, Filipino, and Pangasinan.

The article is organized as follows: the subsequent section provides a literature review concerning identity negotiations and language attitudes among diasporic communities. Afterward, we describe the sociolinguistic situation of Pangasinan in the Philippines and in the United States (US). We then introduce our research goal and questions, followed by an explanation of the methodology employed. Subsequently, the discussion of the results, conclusions, and future directions are presented.

2 Research background

2.1 Diasporic communities: identity negotiations and language attitudes

We understand diaspora as the "processes of dispersion and displacement where migrants relocate themselves in a new country in which they build a new imagined community" (Anderson 1991, as cited in Gubitosi and de Oliveira 2020: 89). These communities are not static, but rather evolving groups whose language(s) and cultural traditions are frequently endangered by the majority population of the new country (Ladilova 2015). Given that language serves as a means through which identity self-conceptions are conveyed (Bucholtz and Hall 2005), that is, language is a salient marker that indexes a particular culture (Gubitosi and García Frazier

2012), the analysis of the language practices of diasporic groups is crucial in order to understand how these speakers enact and negotiate their complex identities as they establish and settle in a new space. Since identity is "an interactional accomplishment, produced and negotiated in discourse" (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004: 13), immigrants' are encouraged to shift across various boundaries through language choices, creating new identities or assimilating to the host society (Itakura and Humphreys 2008). Therefore, understanding the relationship between ethnic identity and language is crucial in understanding how minority groups build their notion of community based on language, culture, and identity (Fishman et al. 1985).

Language attitudes, understood as evaluative reactions towards languages and their speakers (Garrett et al. 2003), are a crucial aspect that can be partly responsible for the positive and/or negative relationships in the diaspora. According to Edwards (1982), language attitudes reflect social conventions and preferences, indicating awareness of the status and prestige attributed to these varieties. Positive beliefs towards a linguistic variety lead to acceptance and usage. Negative attitudes towards the minority language and culture can cause cultural alienation, and consequently, language loss (Gubitosi and De Oliveira 2020). Diasporic communities often idealize their cultural artifacts and ethnic characteristics, which allows them to distance themselves from their home culture and (re)produce their imagined community (Gubitosi and De Oliveira 2020) as shown in previous research in the Portuguese diaspora in Rhode Island, US (Gubitosi and De Oliveira 2020), the Colombian diaspora in Catalonia, Spain (Patiño-Santos 2015), and the Puerto Rican diaspora in Western Massachusetts, US (Arias Álvarez 2020).

As a unit, family is observed as "porous, open to influences and interests from other broader social forces and institutions" (Canagarajah 2008: 171). Families who live in the diaspora tend to resolve communication issues, "encouraging their children to use all their linguistic abilities in everyday contexts, rather than compelling them to be loyal to the perceived authentic and purity norms of the language they spoke in their place of origin" (Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi 2020: 17). Language purity, then, loses relevance in a context wherein its members are adapting to a new spatial reality given that the notion of returning to the home community becomes less viable (Canagarajah 2019). As Gubitosi and De Oliveira state (2020), such individuals must find a way to harmonize their daily routines in unfamiliar surroundings and seek out locations that reflect their cultural and linguistic characteristics. This enables diasporic individuals to experience a sense of belonging even when they are far from their place of origin. In this view, then, when immigrants acquire a second, third, fourth, and so on language in the host society, they have multiple ways to convey their layered identities through translanguaging

practices (García and Li 2014), which are dynamic language practices used in multilingual situations (Shin 2018).

Though there is research on the linguistic identities of diasporic communities (Canagarajah 2008, 2019; Gubitosi and De Oliveira 2020) and identity negotiation in the host society (Niño Murcia and Rothman 2008), there has been limited research on the construction of linguistic identities among migrant families (Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi 2020; Capobianco 2022; Ellis and Sims 2022; Fritzler 2023; King 2013; Park 2008; von Essen 2023). Park (2008) examines the intergenerational transmission of cultural values in Korean American families through the analysis of the verb suffix *-ta*. King (2013) analyzes identity construction among three transnational Ecuadorian-US sisters. Data were collected through informal interviews, audio recordings of home conversations, and participant observation. Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi (2020) use sociolinguistic interviews, as well as an ethnolinguistic observation, to examine identity negotiations in a Galician-Asturian migrant multilingual family in Asturias, Spain. Their findings illustrate how three generations of a family use translanguaging practices as a strategy to construct their complex and layered identities to avoid feelings of alienation. Capobianco (2022) finds, through ethnographic vignettes of African families in Japan, that the affective elements that shape parents' language use and the role of child agency are instrumental in shaping family language outcomes. Ellis and Sims (2022), based on the context of New South Wales, Australia, expounds about the connection between family language policy and the parent's linguistic identity, and how it is put into practice in relation to the parent's goal regarding their child's language development and emerging linguistic identity. Fritzler (2023) provides a comprehensive investigation of language practices and identity in the Spanish-speaking community in Israel. By means of individual interviews with family members, results show that a primary driver for these Spanish-speaking families is their interest and emotional need to preserve their language.

The aforementioned studies show how language plays a pivotal role in shaping and negotiating bi-/multilingual identities, shedding light on diasporic individual affiliations. Similarly, the current study examines the linguistic identity negotiations of a transnational family with Pangasinan and American roots. Language plays a crucial role in the creation and negotiation of bi-/multilingual identities as they reveal the allegiances that migrants hold towards their own or other cultures (Itakura and Humphreys 2008). Speakers who belong to bi-/multilingual communities do not switch between languages or varieties. Instead, they use them together as "a single semiotic repertoire" (Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi 2020: 18). According to García and Li (2014), translanguaging strategies allow bi-/multilingual speakers to perform, negotiate, reproduce, and interpret different layered identities, which

includes their ethnic and national identity (Canagarajah 2008). In the 1990s, the term translanguaging was first used to refer to a pedagogical practice in which it "simply means (i) receiving information in one language and (ii) using or applying it in the other language" (Williams 2002: 2). Afterwards, the term was used by Baker (2001) and García (2009) who expanded the concept beyond its initial pedagogical scope (D'Hondt 2018) and extended it to include language practices in the classroom setting. Consequently, García (2009: 44) has advanced translanguaging, defining it as "an approach to bilingualism that is centered not on languages as has often been the case, but on the practices of bilinguals that are readily observable". The author (2009: 44) remarks that translanguaging practices are not distinct or uncommon; rather, they are regarded as "normal mode of communication". With few exceptions in certain monolingual enclaves, this form of communication is typical across communities worldwide.

In this sense, it encompasses "one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages" (García and Li 2014: 2). The language practices of bi-/multilingual speakers are then interrelated, complex, and belong to a creative process wherein there is an engagement of discursive practices of two or more languages. Since migrant people have complex identities, the use of translanguaging practices allow them to show allegiance to both their new home and their birthplace community. Language, then, has an important role in articulating and portraying the identity of oneself since the speaker has at their disposal, various language resources that contribute to highlight specific aspects of their identity depending on the circumstances (Beswick 2014; Joseph 2010; Llamas 2010). Thus, language serves to entail symbolic boundaries of membership or inclusion, as well as non-membership or exclusion.

The present research then investigates the translanguaging practices of a transnational family. Language practices that refer to Pangasinan but also include Filipino and English allow members of the transnational family under study not only to relate to their past, appreciating their home customs and traditions, but also enable them to realize their complex identities precluding sentiment of alienation or displacement.

2.2 Sociolinguistic situation of Pangasinan in the Philippines and the US

Pangasinan is not only the name of a coastal province located in the western area of Luzon, Philippines, but also the designation referring to its people and their

language. Pangasinan is one of the 184 living Philippine languages (Eberhard et al. 2023). It is considered an endangered language spoken in the north-Central region of Luzon, and the eighth largest language in the Philippines after Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilocano, Hiligaynon, Bicolano, Waray, and Kapampangan. A total of 1,240,000 inhabitants are identified as Pangasinan users (Eberhard et al. 2023). It is taught in primary schools through the third grade, and a Pangasinan grammar and dictionary have been published.

According to Bernardo-Hinesley and Gubitosi (2022), the sociolinguistic situation of Philippine languages is best understood through examination of the nation's four-century colonial history, subsequent postcolonial language policies and educational reforms, and the contemporary impact of globalization. With regard to Spanish, Anderson and Anderson (2007) explain that although there were almost four hundred years of Spanish colonization, Spanish speakers never surpassed the 10 % of the total Philippine population as missionaries learned Philippine languages. In contrast, during the American occupation, English became the most important language. It was stipulated as an official language in the 1935 Philippine Constitution used in government offices, educational contexts, and national and international business (Bernardo-Hinesley and Gubitosi 2022). The adoption of textbooks of American origin implied not only the use of English in Philippine schools, but also the content in the curricula, "placing Filipino history, literature, and sociocultural values in competition with those of the United States" (Anderson and Anderson 2007: 8). Subsequently, the 1972 Constitution established both Filipino and English as official languages of the country, and due to nationalistic purposes, initiated a language policy in which Filipino replaced English in the government, business, and schools. In 1985, English continued to be widely used (Gonzalez and Bautista 1986). Currently, both Filipino and English remain the official languages of the Philippines and, along with these, Engalog and Taglish (language contact outcomes) prevail in the media and in everyday conversations in urban areas (Anderson and Anderson 2007).

As to Pangasinan, it is considered the dominant language in the province of Pangasinan, reaching up to 48 % of the province's population in 2000 (Anderson and Anderson 2007). Most of its citizens speak, besides Pangasinan, two or three other languages: Ilocano (a regional language considered to be the lingua franca of Luzon), Filipino (the national language), and English (the co-official language). According to Rafael and Rosario (2011: 4), "the presence of these languages has impacted the speaker's attitudes, perception, and use of the Pangasinan language". As Anderson and Anderson state (2007: 16), "in the Philippine context, we can envision stable situations that may involve several overlapping layers of language use". Hence, for Pangasinan individuals, Philippine English is the logical communicative online tool,

and is used by the Philippine diaspora worldwide. Filipino is the language of the nation's governmental institutions, and national businesses. Ilocano may be used as the regional lingua franca when traveling in northern Luzon while Pangasinan is used in the more intimate settings of home, family, dear friends, religion, healings, funerals, and so on.

Pangasinan, even though considered a major language in the Philippines with regards to its number of speakers, is facing endangerment (Rafael and Rosario 2011). One of the reasons for this is the ongoing partial language shift as Pangasinan is being displaced by Ilocano, Filipino, and English. Following Anderson and Anderson (2007: 9), other causes of attrition in Pangasinan involve "migration, relative cultural prestige, urbanization, interethnic marriage, and changing language use in various communicative settings". Nonetheless, besides this deficient outlook, Pangasinan is considered as the most effective linguistic resource to express identity and affect by its speakers (Anderson and Anderson 2007).

In recent years, Pangasinan people have expressed their concern about the decline of their language, culture, and literature. In fact, in 1988, the organization *Save the Pangasinan Dialect Movement*, alerted that Pangasinan was disappearing, with only a few people committed to preserving it as a cultural heritage (Coronel 1988, in Anderson and Anderson 2007). The same group asked the government that Pangasinan be taught in the province's school system. In an effort to preserve and revitalize the language, different groups were created such as the *Pangasinan Council for Culture and the Arts* in 2003, and the *Association for the Preservation and Revitalization of the Pangasinan Language*, which has published Pangasinan dictionaries, as well as Pangasinan folk literature (Rafael and Rosario 2011).

In the US, as of 2019, there were 4.2 million Filipinos or Americans with Filipino heritage (US Census Bureau 2021). The 2018 US Census Bureau American Community Survey states that the largest populations of Filipinos and Filipino-Americans are in the states of California (1,653,167), Hawaii (367,952), Texas (204,192), Nevada (168,200), Washington (162,658), Florida (158,254), Illinois (156,121), New Jersey (143,845), New York (141,640), and Virginia (117,666).[1] As to the Pangasinan population in the US, Ethnologue shows that there are around 2,270 residents (Eberhard et al. 2023). By the 1920s, many Pangasinan left the Philippines to find agricultural jobs in the US, specifically in Hawaii and the west coast. After 1947, Filipino migration was extended to other areas of the US, and many were recruited into the Navy. Many of these migrants never returned to their home country, as is the case to the Pangasinan-American family examined in the present study.

1 https://usa.inquirer.net/47388/filipino-population-in-u-s-grew-to-nearly-4-1-million-in-2018-new-census-data (accessed 2 July 2023).

Taking into account the Pangasinan diaspora in the US, different organizations were created to promote the cultural interests of the Filipino-Americans of Pangasinan heritage such as the *United Pangasinanes of America* (UPA) based in California. Anderson and Anderson (2007) interviewed some members to better understand the language use of this community. Participants believed that most members of this organization use Pangasinan, even though there are some members that only speak Ilocano and, for official business, use English. Furthermore, for casual conversations and at social functions, Filipino, Ilocano, or Pangasinan are used, depending on who is present (Anderson and Anderson 2007). Filipino is used to accommodate those who may have limited capacity in Pangasinan. Pangasinan (or Ilocano) may be used in conversations in which all the interlocutors are from Pangasinan- (or Ilocano-) speaking regions of the province and Pangasinan (or Ilocano) is their first language. The prevailing attitude is that, as a matter of politeness, members use the most inclusive language, even reverting to English, as necessary. In addition, Anderson and Anderson (2007) also asked UPA members two questions that relate to language attitudes and identity: "Why is Pangasinan important to you?", and "Is there anything you can do with Pangasinan that you can't do with English or Tagalog?". Some of the responses revealed positive language attitudes with regards to the use of Pangasinan, such as: "We can do it all in English. But Pangasinan makes us feel closer. Why should we speak English with those from Pangasinan? It's as though you're keeping your distance. We were raised with Pangasinan. It makes us feel at ease. It makes us feel comfortable" and "Because it gives us a short cut. Words in Pangasinan have emotional meanings. People feel closer to each other when they speak it – a feeling of belonging to one group." The use of Pangasinan, then, is used to show speakers' allegiances to their home country. Pangasinan is used in informal conversations to express emotional meanings, and to show membership to the Pangasinan community.

3 Research methodology

3.1 Research goal and questions

The goal of this research is to analyze how each generational member of a transnational family constructs their complex identities in the discourse and how they illustrate their allegiances to their host and home countries. With this objective in mind, the research questions of the present study are the following:

(1) How do individual family members negotiate their multilayered identities in the diaspora? Specifically, what connections to identity does each member establish with Pangasinan, Philippines and Texas, US?

(2) Considering the different statuses of the languages in the communities, what are the attitudes of each family member towards English, Filipino, and Pangasinan?

3.2 Data

Following Fritzler (2023) and Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi (2020), the present study employed direct and indirect methods to gather extensive data and to verify the consistency of the participants' responses: a sociolinguistic interview, an online survey questionnaire, and an ethnographic observation. In compliance with ethical research conduct, approval for human subject participants was obtained prior to data collection. As to the online survey questionnaire, before the provision of the Adult Consent, Parental Permission, and Child Assent forms through Google Forms, two questions were posed: (1) "Are you currently residing in the US?", and (2) "Are you of Pangasinan heritage? Do you identify as Pangasinan or Pangasinan-American?". If the answer to these two questions were yes, then the third question followed, "Who are you completing this form for?" with three possible responses: "Myself, and I am 18 years old or older", "My child, who is under 18 years old", and "Myself and my child". Subsequently, participants indicated their and/or their child's gender identity, current age, age at arrival in Texas, current work, work in Pangasinan, Philippines, and current place of residence. That is, the survey questionnaire collected sociodemographic information about each family member, which is presented in the following subsection. Afterwards, sociolinguistic interviews, which is the primary data source for this research study, were conducted by phone. Each session lasted approximately 45 min, resulting in a cumulative recorded interview duration of 130 min. The questions primarily centered around topics such as family, friends, language learning/acquisition, community, past experiences, language domains, language attitudes, and language choices. Each interview was transcribed and subjected to qualitative thematic analysis: language learning and language experiences, English as the majority language, Filipino as the language of the US-Philippine community, Pangasinan as the diasporic language, and the transmission of Pangasinan. In addition, the ethnographic participant observation of each family member's language use, which amounts to 320 h, was carried out following the sociolinguistic interviews. To minimize the Observer's Paradox effects, the observation was conducted by the primary investigator, who is part of the participants' community and speaks Pangasinan, Filipino, and English. They were observed in the family's homes which enabled observation of informal communicative interactions. This data allowed a close examination of the ways in which their individual identities were negotiated and expressed through language.

3.3 Participants: recruitment and description of family members

Participants were recruited via snowball sampling. Table 1 presents a summary of information of each individual participant, namely, Agew, Bulan, and Bitewen.[2] The participants are three members of a Pangasinan-American family residing in Texas, US. In line with Rumbaut's (2004) generational classification, Agew is categorized as first generation, Bulan belongs to the 1.25 generation, and Bitewen is identified as of the second generation.[3] A detailed description of every participant is provided after the table.

Agew was born in the municipality of Mangaldan, located in the central part of the province of Pangasinan, Philippines. At the age of 24 years old, Agew married a Pangasinan speaker from a nearby municipality. From this marriage, she became a mother of three children. She, along with her husband and their children, continued to live in Mangaldan as she continued her midwifery practice. At the age of 41, the petition by her husband's sibling for their family to reside in the US was approved. Regardless of her objection to immigrating to Texas, Agew moved overseas in support of accessibility to quality education and advancement for her children, aged 10, 13, and 16 years old at the time. Though she longed to return and reside in Pangasinan after her children completed their university education, that day has not since arrived. She worked as a caregiver until her age of retirement and her children completed their university education. Given this length of residency, they have then

Table 1: Individual family member sociodemographic information gathered from the survey questionnaire.

Pseudonym	Generation	Family member	Current age	Age of arrival to Texas	Birthplace
Agew	1st generation	Grandmother	65	41	Pangasinan
Bulan	1.25 generation	Mother	38	13	Pangasinan
Bitewen	2nd generation	Granddaughter	13	Not applicable	Texas

2 For purposes of confidentiality, they are referred to using the pseudonyms shown in Table 1.

3 Rumbaut categorized the 1.5 generation as individuals who immigrated before the age of 12, a distinction commonly employed by economists to separate childhood immigrants from the first generation. Additionally, he delineated the 1.25 generation as those who arrived between the ages of 13 and 17, with or without their parents, and identified the 1.75 generation as individuals who arrived before the age of 5 and completed their education in the US.

developed their roots in the town of Flower Mound, located northwest of Dallas, Texas. At present, she, along with her husband, lives with their eldest child in the same house they began to live in Flower Mound.

Like Agew, Bulan was born in the municipality of Mangaldan, and resided there until the age of 13 years old. She attended middle school, secondary school, and completed tertiary education in North Texas. She has only visited Pangasinan once with Agew for her 18th birthday, a traditional Philippine coming-of-age celebration, since their arrival to Texas. Like her mother, at the age of 24, she married a man born and raised in North Texas. From this marriage, she became a mother of four: Bitewen, Kumpapey, Sibaweng, and Bayaong.

The second generation participant, Bitewen, was born in North Texas. She is the eldest child of Bulan, and is currently 13 years of age, which is the age when Bulan arrived in Texas. Presently, she is attending middle school.

4 Data analysis and discussion

The following subsections are presented according to the qualitative thematic categories derived from the sociolinguistic interviews. Through the excerpts, it is illustrated how each generation of the Pangasinan-American family utilizes translanguaging practices enabling the articulation of their multilayered identities, in line with Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi (2020), King (2013), and Park (2008). These language practices encompass not only the use of Pangasinan but also the incorporation of Filipino and English, enabling each family member to connect with their past and fostering an appreciation for their cultural customs and traditions. Our participants employ translanguaging not only as a means of communication among themselves but also as performative discourses, facilitating the expression of their complex identities, thereby averting feelings of alienation or displacement.

4.1 Identity ties and language knowledge

When asked as to the languages she speaks, Agew states that she knows Pangasinan, Ilocano, Filipino, and English. In Example (1), she enumerates the domains in which she began learning Pangasinan while simultaneously underlining the *purity* of the language in this community during this period.

(1) Agew: Wherever you go, *puron Pangasinan nen saman ya panaon* […]. *Syempre narerengel ko may salita. Sikatoy impakaaral ko tan* through interaction *ed* other people […]. *Na*develop *ko la dyad pamilya, singa at-ateng kan tura o singa agagi* or *dyad kakaabay, dyad* relatives. *Ta sikato may nangel ya puron salita mi.* ['Wherever you went, you encountered pure Pangasinan then […]. Of course since I was hearing the language (Pangasinan). That is how I learned it and through interaction with other people […]. I developed it from my family, such as my parents or my siblings or from our neighbors, from our relatives. Our pure language is what I heard.'][4,5]

Agew indicates that in the town wherein she was born and raised, she was widely exposed to and interacted in Pangasinan. We notice her use of *pure* in describing Pangasinan in this space and time alluding to the absence of translanguaging practices, which she readily exhibits as observed in her response. She employs both Pangasinan and English as a single repertoire discussing her language knowledge. Aside from the inner domains of Pangasinan use, she adds that in her place of work, Pangasinan was spoken broadly by her colleagues (see Example (2)).

(2) Agew: *Aramay ka*midwife*an ko, kyen* doctor, municipal health officer *mi, say nurse mi, insan saray ka* co-midwives *ko* […]. Yeah, mostly *nen saman*, mostly *Pangasinan*. ['My co-midwives (colleagues), the doctor, our municipal health officer, our nurse, and my co-midwives […]. Yeah, mostly then, mostly are Pangasinan.']

(3) Agew: *Agangano ak na atutoy Ilocano ed saray* classmates *ko* […]. *Nen syempre amay nen mandedevelop nen saman, et nen makapannenengneng ka lay TV, matuto ka met lay arum na* dialect, *singa Tagalog kuwan to ra ya, kyen e insan nu arum narengel mo met so Ilocano kan to. Kalkalna ya kyen, e* especially *nen amay manaral ak lay* college. ['I easily learned Ilocano from my classmates [...]. When it was developing then, and you were able to begin to watch TV, you then learn other dialects, for example, Filipino, and sometimes you also hear Ilocano (within the community). You gradually learn it, especially when I began (to study) college.']

Agew further states the ease of learning Ilocano and Filipino in Example (3). Filipino, the national language, was widely taught in schools. In addition, she was also exposed to the language through the advent of television during her childhood, and

4 All translations are of the primary author, unless otherwise indicated.

5 For the presentation and discussion of the excerpts from the sociolinguistic interviews, refer to the following textual formatting: italics = Pangasinan; italic large caps = Filipino; plain text = English; underlining to draw attention; translation in square brackets; parenthesis for translation notes.

through her elementary and high schools in the 60s and 70s. In these same educational contexts, as well as college, she also learned English. With regards to Ilocano, the language that has been displacing Pangasinan, she learned it through the individuals who attended the same provincial college as her. Through inquiry, she was able to learn the language.

In comparison, Bulan states that the languages she knows are Pangasinan, Filipino, and English. She remembers hearing both of her parents speaking Ilocano with their friends and a few relatives during her childhood, but she conveys that she does not speak it. She expresses in Example (4) that she learned Pangasinan from her family, and Agew's patients.

(4) Bulan: From my parents, I would have to say our relatives, so grandma and grandpa, uncles, you know, aunts, our older cousins, and really anybody who would visit our house because mom was a midwife and she gets a lot of patient visitors seeking her attention.

Like Agew, Bulan learned Filipino from exposure to television. She also learned it during elementary school and her first year of high school in Mangaldan, Pangasinan. In the same way, English was learned in school; however, she conveys that the language that was widely used by her, her family, and relatives growing up is Pangasinan.

Compared to her grandmother and mother, Bitewen indicates that the only language she knows is English, indicating that on her father's side of the family, her relatives speak only English, which is the majority language spoken in their community of residence.

(5) Bitewen: I know a little bit, but not enough to speak it, but I can because my grandma speaks it. And so, when she's (her mother Bulan) talking to her side like my grandma, my aunt, my uncle, she speaks it to them.

Since her birth and before attending school, Bitewen was cared for very often by both of her maternal grandparents. In Example (5), Bitewen states her limitations in her knowledge of Pangasinan in that she is able to understand more than she can speak it, which illustrates her ingrained monolingual view of bilingualism. According to Shin (2018), there is a common assumption that *true* bilinguals are individuals who possess equal proficiency in both of their languages, with a level of competence in each language that is similar to that of monolingual speakers of those languages. This does not reflect the communicative opportunities in which bi-/multilingual individuals encounter in their contexts, as well as the language(s) and language practices used in discourse by such individuals in particular interactions. As observed, aside from being exposed to the language from her grandparents, mother, uncle, and aunt, she also interacts to some extent with

her second cousins and cousins once removed in phone conversations and video telephony.

(6) Bitewen: Oh, no, not like full sentences. I know a couple of words, but I don't use them. I know *kabaw* [forgetful] which is, like, forgetful. I know, like my grandma calls me *apo* [grandchild] or however you say it. I think that means like a grandchild or something. I know some words that I can't really think of right now. You know, hello, goodbye. You know, like *kumusta* [how are you] and stuff.

Despite her knowledge of Pangasinan, she has never traveled to the province or the Philippines. In Example (6), Bitewen underscores her inability to speak Pangasinan in complete sentences. Though she does not recognize herself as a speaker of the language, the primary investigator observed instances in which Bitewen not only understood her grandmother entirely but responded in Pangasinan.

4.2 Embodying identity complexity, and language attitudes in the host society

4.2.1 English, the majority language

To contextualize the host society, the language of prestige in their town and state of residence is English, which, as previously illustrated and discussed, has a substantial impact in the way each family member conveys themself. In the 2019 tabulation of the Migration Policy Institute,[6] 64.4 % of the over 27 million total household population of Texas speak only English. World Population Review illustrates that the town of Flower Mound 2020 population is 83,854, and 80.8 % of its residents speak only English.[7] That is, Pangasinan and Filipino are minoritized languages from which they can draw upon as semiotic resources to portray their community membership and allegiances.

Given the high percentage of the town and state population who speak only English, it is of no surprise that to find positive attitudes towards this majority language by the participants. Each family member conveys its value and prestige in the new community. In Example (7), Agew clearly indicates that in their new place of residence, the overwhelming dominant majority speak English. As a result, she finds herself speaking English in every aspect of the host community.

6 https://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/language/TX (accessed 24 July 2023).

7 https://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/flower-mound-tx-population (accessed 15 July 2023).

(7) Agew: *Dyad America pamilyak on, tan saray* relatives […]. *E syempre, maslak Inglis – manugang ko et Inglis,* surroundings *ko et Inglis, e di Inglis na amin.* ['In America (I speak Pangasinan) with my family yes, and also relatives […]. Well of course, with many I speak English – my (sons)-in-law speak English, my surroundings speak English, then everything (I speak) is English.']

When asked about changes in her language use since living in Texas, Agew mentioned that she adapts her language choice depending on the individual(s) to which she is interacting, showing her willingness to use the majority linguistic variety, English. Expanding on her response, she explains that it would not be beneficial for her to speak Pangasinan and/or Filipino in their English-dominant community. In the following excerpt (Example (8)), she uses both Pangasinan, Filipino, and English, clearly exemplifying a translingual practice, which illustrates her affiliation with her home community and her integration into the host society. Her use of *pakisalamuhan* [social interaction], which is Filipino, is striking in her response.

(8) Agew: *Depende ed amay* PAKISALAMUHAN*, amay arapen mo ya too* […]. *Kasi nu agda anta may kaarap kon too may Pangasinan,* it will not help me. ['It depends on the social interaction, the person in front of you […]. Because if the person in front of me does not know Pangasinan, it will not help me.']

Much like Agew, when asked about changes in her language practices, Bulan expressed her deliberate attempts to use more English driven by her desire to regain a sense of community akin to what she had experienced prior to immigrating to North Texas. She notes, using English and Pangasinan, that a relative placed further pressure towards her decision to speak more English (see example (9)).

(9) Bulan: I preferred to speak English because I wanted that sense of belonging again. I felt like I was a stranger in a foreign country as soon as I attended school here. It doesn't help also that my aunt was very critical, so it made me very, what is the word *nababaingan ak* [I felt embarrassed].

While she holds Pangasinan language and culture in high regard, she highlights that its use is not fruitful in the host community, predominantly composed of English speakers. She also makes a comparison of the English she learned in the Philippines to the English spoken in her new environment. In line with Ellis and Sims (2022), parents' experiences of languages impact and shape their children's language practices by bringing to bear their values and beliefs as can be observed in the excerpt by Bitewen in Example (10).

(10) Bitewen: And so, on my dad's side, they all speak English, on my mom's side they speak Pangasinan. So yeah, it's like half of me.

From her environment, Bitewen perceives that English, the majority language, is of value than her heritage language. She makes a similar comment about the number of people who speak English in their place of residence as Agew and Bulan, and how it is not useful that she speaks Pangasinan, underlining English as a more valuable language.

4.2.2 Filipino, the lingua franca of the Filipino diaspora

In the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington metropolitan, among the Filipino and Filipino-American community, the language employed as lingua franca in social exchanges is Filipino, as observed in Example (11). That is, with the family under study, there is an increased usage of Filipino in informal conversations in the new community. In comparison, before Agew and Bulan immigrated to Texas, Filipino was not as widely used in their home community.

(11) Agew: *Nu walay na*meet *mo dya ay ed* grocery store *et Pilipino ka kuwan da, e di Tagalog so pantungtung yo.* ['If you meet someone here at the store and they ask you if you were Filipino, then you all speak in Filipino.']

In Example (11), Agew mentions that when she meets someone who confirms that they are from the Philippines at the store, they then communicate in Filipino. She then explains that afterward, she inquires about the specific area of their hometown to determine if they might be from Pangasinan, too; however, it is uncommon for her to encounter someone from Pangasinan with whom she could potentially converse in Pangasinan.

(12) Bulan: And if you do meet Filipinos here, since Filipinos have so many dialects, we all kind of choose to speak Tagalog.

Likewise, in Example (12), Bulan relates a similar account, stating that given the diversity of Philippine languages, in the host society, Filipinos use the Filipino language in their conversations. She details a particular memory during her early years living in the US wherein she attended church with family and relatives, a common Philippine practice, and the language used for communicative exchange was Filipino. Bulan expresses her delight hearing Filipino spoken in her new community.

4.2.3 Pangasinan, the ethnic Filipino language in the diaspora

Capobianco (2022) states that factors that impact family language policy include educational and socialization practices, parents' economic resources, their language

proficiency, and their willingness to utilize cultural and economic resources. When questioned about how useful Pangasinan is in the host community, Agew emphasizes the importance of context and the individual with whom she is interacting in that community. She notes in Example (13) that considering that it is the language of her place of birth and upbringing that it is valuable to maintain its use, particularly, when she engages with someone who speaks Pangasinan. It enables a more profound level of understanding of one another, which is in line with Anderson and Anderson (2007). Notably, her response highlights her approach to socialization and her openness to using her language and cultural resources.

(13) Agew: *Ta abangunan mo, di syempre ag di sikato* […]. *Walay* advantage *to nu parad syak. E* at least *antak so mansalitay Pangasinan. Tan nu saray kadumog mon kaparam na Pangasinan, makapitalusan ka. Nu antumay* point *yo, nu antomay pantutungtungan yo, makapantutungtung kayo, makapantalusan kayo*. ['Since you were born and raised with it, then one must continue with it (speaking Pangasinan) […]. In my opinion, it has an advantage. Well, at least I know how to speak Pangasinan. And if the people you interact with are Pangasinan, you are able to understand them. Whatever point you want to convey, whichever is the topic of conversation, you are able to talk to each other and understand one another.']

In the host community, we observe the very limited usage of Pangasinan by Agew, confined to inner language domains such as her husband, her children, and her sister-in-law and family (see Example (14)). She mentions that they are the only ones she converses with in Pangasinan. This denotes that Pangasinan is not as valuable as it was in her home community. Against this same backdrop, though she teaches Pangasinan to her grandchildren, she states that they are not as conversant in the language as they are in English.

(14) Agew: *Ay anggapo ta anggapoy Pangasinan dya ay, pamilyak labat la, hahaha, di ayrok, hahaha, aray* in-laws *nu nakatungtung mo ed Pangasinan, pero ta dya ay et anggapo, di Inglis, Inglis iray apok. Nu arum ibangat ko ra balet et san-sakey.* ['Well, there is no one (with which to speak Pangasinan here) since no one speaks Pangasinan here, only my family, hahaha, my sister-in-law and her family, hahaha, my in-laws if you were to speak with them in Pangasinan, but here there is no one so I use English, my grandchildren are English-speaking. Sometimes I teach them but one word at a time.']

(15) Agew: *San anta da, nu nansalita ray amay sankailin salita singa kyen,* class *ira. Ya atagey ira, kato tay kyen* […]. *Awey daray untutumbok na ray at-ateng. Sananey so pananaw da.* ['They (Pangasinan-speaking community in Mangaldan) think if they spoke a foreign language, they are sophisticated. That they are of higher class, that is the reason […]. I do not know with the newer generation of parents. They have a different way of thinking.']

In Example (15), Agew articulates her attitudes towards English, which she calls *a foreign language*. Regarding parents who do not teach their children Pangasinan in her previous community, she characterizes them as pretentious. This strongly signifies her deep appreciation for Pangasinan as an integral part of her identity. A similar perspective is also noticeable in her high frequency use of Pangasinan within the isolated context of her family.

Comparable to Agew, Bulan also expresses that in the host society, she only speaks Pangasinan with her parents, her brother, and her sister (see Example (16)). She then discloses that due to frequent use of English with her husband and her children, she has become accustomed to speaking the language. She remarks that given exposure to Pangasinan from her family, her four children are likely to understand the language.

(16) Bulan: No. Pangasinan is definitely not used unless I see my family, my mom, my dad, my brother, and my sister […]. And even then, I have gotten used to speaking in English.

(17) Bulan: When you do hear people speaking Pangasinan, to me, it's the most special because that means that they are, you know, they've been to where I'm from and that they have a better understanding of me as a person.

Like Agew, she values the Pangasinan (see Example (17)) as it facilitates a more profound understanding of her individual identity, her culture, and her sense of place in a community wherein she experienced a deep connection. She recognizes that due to her use of English since moving to the host society and with her own family, and the language of her workplace being English, she has become accustomed to primarily speaking the language. Yet, to foster a better understanding between her and her parents, she speaks to them in Pangasinan. Interestingly, she refers to its usage as *old culture*, which is an idealized cultural attribute in line with Arias Álvarez (2020), Gubitosi and De Oliveira (2020), and Patiño-Santos (2015). Such affective facet shapes her language use.

(18) Bitewen: No, I don't really hear outside complete strangers speaking it. It's not very common like other languages like Spanish where you hear them speak it a lot.

(19) Bitewen: I don't think that, you know, just because they're in America, means that they can't speak their own language, because they know English, they just have that, too.

Bitewen states that outside of the home, Pangasinan is not a common language spoken in the community wherein she has grown. In Example (18) she comments on Spanish, also a minority language in this context, which is spoken by several residents and taught at her school. It is evident from her response in Example (19) that she values Pangasinan as well as her family's use of it. Bitewen asserts that residing in America should not preclude migrant individuals from speaking their first language(s) simply because they are proficient in English. She emphasizes the possibility of embracing multiple languages, highlighting the linguistic and cultural diversity of the host society. In this context of superdiversity, then, language plays a pivotal role, representing the varied heritage of the population.

Aside from hearing Pangasinan from exchanges between her grandparents, her uncle, her aunt, and her mother, Bitewen notes that even her mother speaks to her in Pangasinan and prompts her to respond to speak it. Remarkable is the management and negotiation of language practices and language use, which shape the maintenance of Pangasinan as a heritage language in this transnational Pangasinan-American family. Through sociolinguistic interviews and observation, it is apparent that in their language use and practice, Pangasinan is widely used to convey underlying emotions or experiences, as well as references to Pangasinan cultural food products.

4.2.4 Family language maintenance

Family language policy is without a doubt pertinent concerning language use and child or heritage language acquisition. It refers to the ways in which languages are managed, learned, and negotiated within families (King et al. 2008). Language ideologies play a vital role in shaping language practices within similar families, such as the Pangasinan-American family under study. That is, such policies significantly influence children's language developmental outcomes, which subsequently impacts heritage language maintenance and the future of the minority language.

In Example (20), Bulan indicates her desire for her children to speak Pangasinan by expressing a desire for her parents to persist in conversing with her children in this minoritized language. She also emphasizes the relationship between language and identity. Bulan encourages their children to embrace their multilayered identity, emphasizing that they are not only Americans but also Filipinos, and more specifically, Pangasinan.

(20) Bulan: I do, I want them (her parents) to continue speaking to my kids in Pangasinan. I want my kids to know and be proud that they speak it or that they can understand even if it's just a few words, a different language. I usually tell them to be proud that you are not just an American, but you're also Filipino, and not just a Filipino, but you're from Pangasinan.

She acknowledges the significant likelihood of the language facing extinction, reflecting her family's current sociolinguistic context and sociocultural norms. She may have strong desires in maintaining the language; however, given the dominance of the majority language and the value given to it, she believes that it is not likely that it will be passed on. She questions who the responsible family member would be tasked with such a function. This clearly portrays the hegemony of English within the family's place of residence, furtively placing value on English.

When asked about the likelihood she would take a course in Pangasinan if it were to be offered at her school, Bitewen's response in Example (21) aligns with her mother's value towards English. She holds the belief that her heritage language should not be taught in schools due to its uncommon usage in their area of residence, therefore deeming it not practical. This shows how children manage the juxtaposition of the majority-minority language reality.

(21) Bitewen: I feel like it doesn't need to be taught in schools […] because it's not one of those most commonly used languages here.

(22) Bitewen: I think that it would definitely be an advantage if I can learn the language, you know. I would be able to communicate with people (cousins in the Philippines) who I've never been able to fully communicate with and that'd be really cool.

Conversely, Bitewen conveys in Example (22) that learning Pangasinan could be beneficial, enabling her to communicate more effectively with her cousins rather than the limited interactions she has with them over the phone or through video calls.

(23) Agew: *Walad sikara tan. Matuto ra lamlamang nu gabay da. Nu agda gabay, pero depende met siguro nu umbaleg la ra. Sikaray man*decide *nu gabay da.* ['It is up to them. They will eventually learn if they want to. If they do not want to, but maybe it depends once they are grown. They are the ones to decide if they want to.']

Clearly, explicit and overt planning of language use within the home can be observed in the accounts and translanguaging practices of each member of the transnational family under study. In Example (23), Agew states that she tries to teach Pangasinan to her grandchildren, but they are not as enthusiastic about learning it. They imitate

Pangasinan when it is being used as a means of communication between Agew, her husband, and her three children. As the three generations of the family place value on English, Agew indicates that it is her grandchildren's individual decision if they wish to learn their heritage language, which illustrates the way this Pangasinan-American family's language management is conducted at home. These accounts bring to light the dynamic and evolving nature of family language policy, which then shapes language practices and language use in the family's negotiation of their agency and expression of their multifaceted identities as a multilingual transmigrant family.

5 Conclusion

Identity plays a vital role for diasporic communities to either integrate into the new country or resist acculturation and assimilation (Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi 2020; Gubitosi and De Oliveira 2020; Ladilova 2015). As identity is negotiated through discourse, it is fundamental to examine the language practices of migrant groups to understand how they convey their layered identities. The present study analyzes how each generational member of a Pangasinan-American family residing in Texas, United States perform and negotiate their multilayered identities, and how they express their attitudes towards English, Filipino, and Pangasinan.

Regarding the first research question about how each family member manages their complex identities in the diaspora and the connections they establish with Pangasinan and Texas, the data discussed demonstrates a decreasing trend in language use from the first to the 1.25 generation, in line with Arias Álvarez (2020). Pangasinan is primarily used when recounting memories and making associations that are tied to their previous community's cultural values and customs. In the host community, they reproduce their past in an imagined way (Anderson 1991) using Pangasinan when referring to cultural food artifacts as well as individual affect or emotions obviating feelings of displacement and alienation (Gubitosi and De Oliveira 2020). The first and 1.25 generations use Filipino as a means to illustrate allegiance with those in the Filipino-American community in North Dallas.

As to translanguaging practices, they are used by each family member in varying degrees to articulate their complex identities in their discourse (Canagarajah 2008). Each generation uses translanguaging practices not only as a means to communicate with one another in intimate domains, but also a performative practice which enables them to encapsulate their multilayered identities. Not only does this practice facilitate the reconciliation of their identities, but it allows them to simultaneously position each one that emerges in the diaspora in their discourse all together.

With respect to the second research question, English is perceived as the prestigious language in the host society. As a result, Agew, Bulan, and Bitewen, in this order, have increasingly used it outside of the home and in their communicative interactions with residents who do not speak Filipino or Pangasinan. Bitewen's substantial use of English demonstrates her deeper level of integration and embedding in the host community. Filipino and Pangasinan are minoritized languages in the diaspora, each held with differing statuses by the participants under study. Filipino is regarded as the lingua franca among Filipinos and Filipino-Americans in the diaspora, serving as the means of communication with those who may speak different varieties of ethnic Philippine languages. In comparison, Pangasinan is limited in intimate domains of language use. Its usage among our participants is more restricted, mainly confined to communicative interactions with immediate family members, rendering the language as less valuable within the new community.

Given participants' attitudes towards the different languages and the decreased communicative domains, there is a gradual decline in language proficiency in Pangasinan across successive generations, concomitant with a recognizable increase in English language use, the majority language. This is in line with previous studies examining the practices of diasporic communities (Arias Álvarez and Gubitosi 2020). According to Canagarajah (2008), families are susceptible to the prevailing interests and influences of dominant social institutions. In circumstances where social acceptance, economic stability, and legal status are urgent priorities, families often prioritize the preservation of heritage language to a lesser degree. As evidenced in the present research, family as a unit is not autonomous in maintaining their heritage language (Canagarajah 2008). This is because socialization practices, socioeconomic resources and needs, and educational institutions exert influence and impact their identity articulations. Though marginally positioned, Pangasinan language is the most effective discursive resource utilized by the Pangasinan-American family to convey their identity and affect, which is in line with Anderson and Anderson (2007).

To conclude, considering the language contact situation in the US experienced by the transnational Pangasinan-American family under study, a paramount contribution of this research is its insight into multilingual reality experienced in this country. It portrays the first study analyzing identity negotiations of a transmigrant Filipino-American family with access to more than two minority languages that function as semiotic resources to perform, negotiate, and interpret their layered identities. It enables the reproduction of their imagined, former community through translanguaging practices (García and Li 2014). Despite being a case study, the present findings contribute to the research on the role of language in shaping the identity, community membership, and allegiances of bi-/multilingual transmigrants in host societies.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback and helpful suggestions. We would also like to express our special thanks to the editors for their valuable comments.
Ethical approval: The conducted research obtained ethical approval from the Western Washington University (WWU) Institutional Review Board (IRB).
Statement of human subjects and rights: All procedures in this research involving human participants were in accordance with the institutional ethical guidelines approved by the Western Washington University (WWU) Institutional Review Board (IRB) (protocol number: 4793EP22).
Statement of informed consent: Written electronic consent, parental permission, and child assent were obtained from all participants involved in this research for their anonymized information.

[Correction added after online publication, 17 December 2024: Figure 1 with the caption "Pangasinan province in the Philippines." has been deleted. Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Ph_locator_pangasinan.svg]

References

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
Anderson, Victoria & James Anderson. 2007. Pangasinan – an endangered language? Retrospect and prospect. *Philippine Studies* 55(1). 116–144.
Arias Álvarez, Alba. 2020. Rhotic realizations of the Puerto Rican community in Western Massachusetts and Puerto Rico. In Wilfredo Valentín-Márquez & Melvin González-Rivera (eds.), *Dialects from tropical islands: Research on Caribbean Spanish in the United States*, 7–34. New York: Routledge.
Arias Álvarez, Alba & Patricia Gubitosi. 2020. Shaping of L1 and L2 linguistic identities in a migrant family. *I-LanD Journal of Identity, Language, and Diversity* 1(1). 16–36.
Baker, Colin (ed.). 2001. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Bernardo-Hinesley, Sheryl & Patricia Gubitosi. 2022. Linguistic landscape and the struggle for survival: The case of Cavite Chabacano. In Seyed Hadi Mirvahedi (ed.), *Linguistic landscapes in South-East Asia: The politics of language and public signage*, 114–138. London: Routledge.
Beswick, Jaine. 2014. Borders within borders: Contexts of language use and local identity configuration in Southern Galicia. In Dominic Watt & Carmen Llamas (eds.), *Language, borders and identity*, 105–117. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall. 2005. Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7(4–5). 585–614.
Canagarajah, Suresh. 2008. Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(2). 1–34.
Canagarajah, Suresh. 2019. Changing orientations to heritage language: The practice-based ideology of Sri Lankan Tamil Diaspora families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 255(1). 9–44.

Capobianco, Paul. 2022. Intergenerational communication and family language policy of multicultural families in Japan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2022(276). 145–168.
Coronel, Manny V. 1988. Department of Education, Culture and Sports urged to revive Pangasinense dialect. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, 3 July.
D'Hondt, Charlotte. 2018. *Translanguaging practices in different socio-linguistic contexts: A comparison between Belgian and South African primary classrooms*. Ghent: Ghent University MA Thesis.
Eberhard, David, Gary Simons & Charles Fennig (eds.). 2023. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*, 26th edn. Dallas: SIL International.
Edwards, John. 1982. Language attitudes and their implication amongst English speakers. In Ellen B. Ryan & Howard Giles (eds.), *Attitudes towards language variation*, 20–33. London: Edward Arnold.
Ellis, Elizabeth & Margaret Sims. 2022. "It's like the root of a tree that I grew up from …": Parents' linguistic identity shaping family language policy in isolated circumstances. *Multilingua* 41(5). 529–548.
Fishman, Joshua, Michael Gertner, Esther Lowy & William Milán. 1985. *The rise and fall of the ethnic revival: Perspectives on language and ethnicity*. Hawthorne: Walter de Gruyter.
Fritzler, Marcela. 2023. Migrant language and identity in the Spanish-speaking community in Israel. *Journal of World Languages* 9(1). 68–88.
García, Ofelia. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
García, Ofelia & Wei Li. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.
Garrett, Peter, Nikolas Coupland & Angie Williams. 2003. *Investigating language attitudes: Social meanings of dialect, ethnicity and performance*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
Gonzalez, Andrew & Maria Lourdes Bautista. 1986. *Language surveys in the Philippines (1966–1984)*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
Gubitosi, Patricia & Judy de Oliveira. 2020. (Re) Negotiation of the cultural and linguistic identities of the Azorean Portuguese in Eastern Massachusetts. *Diaspora Studies* 13(1). 89–108.
Gubitosi, Patricia & Elena García Frazier. 2012. (Mis)use of pronouns as an index of bicultural identity. In Paul Miller, John Watzke & Miguel Mantero (eds.), *Readings in language studies: Language and identity*, 3rd edn., 177–190. Grandville: International Society of Language Studies.
Itakura, Hiroko & Gillian Humphreys. 2008. Coping with isolation in negotiation of identities: The role of language view. *Readings in Language Studies* 1. 193–210.
Joseph, John. 2010. Identity. In Carmen Llamas & Dominic Watt (eds.), *Language and identities*, 9–17. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
King, Kendall. 2013. A tale of three sisters: Language ideologies, identities, and negotiation in a bilingual, transnational family. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 7(1). 49–65.
King, Kendall A., Lyn Fogle & Aubrey Logan-Terry. 2008. Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(5). 907–922.
Ladilova, Anna. 2015. Language and identity of migrants: The role of the heritage language in the process of collective identity construction in a migration situation. *Language and Dialogue* 5(1). 176–193.
Llamas, Carmen. 2010. Convergence and divergence across a national border. In Carmen Llamas & Dominic Watt (eds.), *Language and identity*, 227–236. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Niño Murcia, Mercedes & Jason Rothman. 2008. *Bilingualism and identity: Spanish at the crossroads with other languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Park, Eunjin. 2008. Intergenerational transmission of cultural values in Korean American families: An analysis of the verb suffix *-ta*. *Heritage Language Journal* 6(2). 173–205.

Patiño-Santos, Adriana. 2015. On being a Latin American in La Sagrada Familia: The negotiation of identities and the construction of authenticity. In Rosina Márquez Reiter & Luisa Martín Rojo (eds.), *A sociolinguistics of diaspora: Latino practices, identities and ideologies*, 102–121. Abingdon: Routledge.

Pavlenko, Aneta & Adrian Blackledge. 2004. Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation in multilingual contexts. In Aneta Pavlenko & Adrian Blackledge (eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*, 1–33. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Rafael, Ria & Francisco C. Rosario, Jr. 2011. On language shift and revitalization: The case of Pangasinan. Paper presented at the International Conference on Humanities 2011, School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 14–16 June.

Rumbaut, Rubén. 2004. Ages, life stages, and generational cohorts: Decomposing the immigrant first and second generations in the United States. *International Migration Review* 38(3). 1160–1205.

Shin, Sarah J. 2018. *Bilingualism in schools and society: Language, identity, and policy*, 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.

US Census Bureau. 2021. Asian American and Pacific Islander heritage month: May 2021. https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2021/asian-american-pacific-islander.html (accessed 20 August 2023).

Vertovec, Steven. 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6). 1024–1054.

von Essen, María Clara. 2023. Identity, language socialization, and family language policies in dialect contact: The case of Argentinean immigrants in Malaga, Spain. *Journal of World Languages* 9(1). 133–160.

Williams, Cen. 2002. Extending bilingualism in the education system. *Education and lifelong learning committee ELL-06-02*. https://business.senedd.wales/Data/Education%20&%20Lifelong%20Learning%20Committee%20-%20First%20Assembly/20020320/Agenda/ELL%2006-02(p.4)%20Dr%20Cen%20Williams%20paper.pdf (accessed 10 June 2023).