

# The Use of Linguistics to Improve the Teaching of Heritage Language Spanish

A thesis submitted

by

Siena Leslie

to

the Department of Linguistics  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honors

## Acknowledgements

No academic work is created in a vacuum. This thesis would not have been possible without the insight, assistance, and support of a great many people. The first and greatest debt I owe is to my advisor, Maria Polinsky. She has been there for me every step of the way since the conception of my thesis. Through suggesting readings and correcting countless drafts, she has proved fundamental to the construction of this thesis, and it would not exist without her. I am constantly grateful for her insight and overwhelming support.

I also am deeply indebted to María Luisa Parra, who read and commented on multiple drafts of my problem sets. Her advice was invaluable and greatly appreciated. Additionally, I owe thanks to her and to Julio Torres for providing me with information about HLLs from the perspectives of Spanish teachers, and to Kim Potowski for helping me discover which questions to ask. I am likewise grateful to the heritage speakers who were willing to share their experiences with me.

I owe much to Jeremy Rau and Andreea Nicolae, who ran Linguistics 99b with great enthusiasm. Between late-night emails and midday meetings, you were both pillars of stability among the madness, as well as a good-natured pair of guiding forces.

Last but certainly not least, I owe a mention to my family and friends, who read my drafts, fixed my flaws, suggested new angles when I was stuck, and generally supported me and cheered me on. You kept my writing sharp and my spirits high. Gracias, obligada, and thank you.

Any remaining errors are my own.

## Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1 What Makes A Heritage Speaker?</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2 The Current State of Heritage Language Spanish Education</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3 The Argument for Sociolinguistics in a HL Classroom</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4 Linguistic Exercises for a HL Classroom</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1.1 Introduction . . . . .	37
4.1.2 Rationale for using linguistic thinking in an HLL classroom . . . . .	37
4.2.1 Introduction to Problem Sets 1 & 2: Influence from English . . . . .	43
4.2.2 Problem Set 1: Code-Switching . . . . .	46
4.2.3 Problem Set 1: Teacher’s Guide . . . . .	48
4.2.4 Problem Set 2: Borrowings, Semantic Extensions, and Calques . . . . .	51
4.2.5 Problem Set 2: Teacher’s Guide . . . . .	55
4.3.1 Introduction to Problem Set 3 . . . . .	61
4.3.2 Problem Set 3: Dialectal Variation . . . . .	62

4.3.3 Problem Set 3: Teacher's Guide .....	65
4.4.1 Introduction to Problem Set 4 .....	68
4.4.2 Problem Set 4: The Use of <i>A Personal</i> .....	70
4.4.3 Problem Set 4: Teacher's Guide .....	74
<b>5 Steps for the Future</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Appendix A: Questionnaire for Teachers</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>86</b>

## **Abbreviations**

**HLL** – Heritage Language Learner

**HL** – Heritage Language

**FL** – Foreign Language

**L2 Learner** – Second Language Learner

## **Abstract**

In this thesis, I examine how linguistic knowledge and methodology can be used to improve the teaching of Heritage Spanish. Heritage Spanish is Spanish that was incompletely acquired by a speaker as his or her first language, but which is not the speaker's dominant language due to bilingualism. Many such speakers try to recover their incompletely acquired first language (L1) through re-learning later in life, and have been shown to have some advantages over second language (L2) learners (Au et al. 2002). Previous research has suggested that it is beneficial for many heritage language learners (HLLs) to be taught in special "heritage language tracks" (Peyton 2008). I argue that in HLL classrooms, sociolinguistic research and linguistic exercises should be used to supplement the curriculum. Several observations support this proposal. HLLs rarely speak standard Spanish, due to a lack of schooling in the language. As a result, HLLs often emerge from foreign language classrooms with a damaged sense of linguistic identity, believing that the type of Spanish they and their families use is "wrong." HLLs should be taught that the many dialects and registers of Spanish are all linguistically correct, and that language variation should be viewed in terms of linguistic prestige, not "correctness." Thus, dialectal variation and registers are vital topics. Next, HLLs can learn to develop their incipient grammaticality judgments, which is often characteristic of bilinguals (Benmamoun et al. 2010), into a stronger meta-linguistic awareness. With this goal in mind, I propose the use of supplementary problem sets that encourage HLLs to think about structural patterns in their daily use of Spanish so they can learn to generalize linguistic patterns. Overall, the proposed model language can be used as a starting point to create similar curricular supplements for heritage languages other than Spanish.

## Introduction

Linguists use the term “heritage speaker” to refer to anyone whose first language is no longer their dominant language. The quintessential example of a heritage speaker in the United States is the child of immigrants who hears one language in the home and then becomes dominant in English after attending school. Other paths to becoming a heritage speaker are also possible, for example if the child is also an immigrant, or had a caretaker who spoke a different language while raising the child.

Although often thought to be “native” speakers of their language, heritage speakers often exhibit systematic gaps in their abilities, indicating imperfect acquisition of the language. They tend to have near-native pronunciation, but may have problems with complex grammar forms and the use of advanced registers and vocabulary. Of course, heritage speakers have individual strengths and weaknesses depending on their unique linguistic histories, so it may be misleading to refer to them as a cohesive group.

Heritage speakers often re-discover their home language in their teen years or as young adults, sometimes when they try to re-learn it in an instructed setting. As the trend of re-learning of heritage languages continues to grow, an important question in language education is what to do with the heritage speakers of a language in a classroom setting. Heritage language students may encounter difficulty in standard foreign language classrooms. The teacher, whose goal is often to promote a standard, may not be familiar with a student’s familial dialect, and the student may become discouraged at being told that the way they use their language is “wrong.” Often, they already have well-formed instincts about the language, but they are not taught in a way that capitalizes on this

advanced knowledge, as they are being taught with students who are learning the skills for the first time. It therefore makes more sense to have them taught in a separate classroom setting, a fact that I will later address in greater detail.

In this thesis, I will propose the use of linguistics as a tool to improve the teaching of HLLs of Spanish. While I believe that linguistics may be used to help instruct speakers of all heritage languages, within the scope of my thesis I have chosen to focus my attention on heritage language Spanish due to its prevalence in the United States. I discuss a two-tier approach for using linguistics in a classroom: overt instruction of sociolinguistics, and linguistic exercises to improve specific skill sets in Spanish. Spanish heritage speakers, as discussed, come from many different dialectal backgrounds. By including discussions of dialectal variation and register differences in classroom instruction, we will both empower the speakers of less prestigious dialects and encourage them to deepen their knowledge of the Spanish language in its many variations. Likewise, specific linguistic exercises can be used in the classroom to build specific skills, such as with comparisons of language forms derived from English influence, demonstration of dialectal variation, and use of *a personal*. These exercises will focus on using students' pre-existing instincts about their languages and linguistic techniques to expand students' knowledge about the structure and variance of Spanish language.

In my first chapter, I will discuss the definitions that will be relevant in my thesis, highlight some of the traits and characteristics of heritage language speakers, and explain the focus on heritage language Spanish. In my second chapter, I will start out by discussing the state of heritage language education in general, and move on to focus on

the specifics of heritage language education in Spanish, as well as distinct, relevant features of heritage language Spanish and its heritage speakers. In my third chapter, I will demonstrate the problems in heritage language education that can be solved by overt sociolinguistic instruction, and lay out the methodology to do so. In the fourth chapter, I will address specific ways in which linguistic exercises have been used to great effect in the past, and offer sample problem sets that can be incorporated into a preexisting heritage language classroom in order to solve specific issues that heritage language Spanish speakers tend to have. In the last chapter, I will discuss steps that can be taken in the future to improve the field of heritage language teaching in general, with emphasis on how the methods discussed in this thesis may be generalized to other languages, and may have independent linguistic value.

## Chapter 1

### What Makes a Heritage Speaker?

What exactly makes a “heritage speaker?” There have been multiple definitions in the past, but this thesis follows Polinsky & Kagan (2007: 369-370) in defining a heritage speaker as someone who learned one language – the “heritage language” – from birth, but whose dominant language eventually became a different language. The textbook example of a heritage speaker in the U.S. is the child of immigrants who grows up hearing his or her parents’ language in the home, but speaks English everywhere else, often even with siblings. Of course, this is only one example of a heritage speaker; anyone whose first language is not their dominant language falls under this category, regardless of how strong or weak their language skills may be. Other common examples might be a child who has just moved from another country, a child that has been adopted, or a child who has been exposed to a different language by a caretaker.

Any human language can become a heritage language, as long as at some point in the speaker’s development a different language became the dominant one. Typically the resulting heritage language is not a “full language,” i.e. a language that was completely acquired, and the heritage speaker may lack the complete control over all grammar points and registers that a native speaker has (Polinsky 2008; Polinsky & Kagan 2007). On the other hand, they tend to have excellent pronunciation, sometimes close to that of a native speaker; Au (2008: 347) notes that “[s]peaking a heritage language for a few years during early childhood seems sufficient to help adult re-learners speak with good, if not entirely native-like, pronunciation.” They are often best at aural comprehension (Polinsky &

Kagan 2007: 370). Polinsky (2008: 162) notes that perhaps heritage language skills do not simply freeze, leaving the heritage speaker with the same linguistic skills that they had as a child. Instead, their skill level actually declines, as “their limited mental representations of the heritage language may undergo reanalysis in concordance with universal linguistic rules and constraints.”

This is unsurprising, given that in the human brain, both connection building and connection pruning occurs – crucial connections continue, and unused ones drop away. The brain of a child has more plasticity, meaning that it is easy for children to make and strengthen new connections. The “incomplete acquisition” we see with heritage speakers occurs when there is insufficient exposure at the right time: synaptic connections are not made, or are not made strongly enough to be maintained (Oblor 2011).

There has been some dispute about whether or not the first language (L1) and subsequent languages (L2s) are processed in the same way and at the same place in the brain; Perani et al. (1998) suggest that the reason for the conflicting data is that it is the final proficiency with the L2 determines whether or not the two languages are processed similarly. Late-acquiring, low-proficiency L2 speakers had differences in the way they processed the second language; high-proficiency learners did not. The significance of language aptitude is so notable that it even affects the location in the brain in which it was processed.

Heritage speakers can vary widely in ability as well. For the purposes of specificity, it can be helpful to sort heritage speakers into rough levels corresponding with their mastery of the heritage language. Polinsky & Kagan (2007: 371) suggest

adopting the terminology of creole linguistics and referring to the most competent heritage speakers as “acrolectal,” the least competent as “basilectal,” and the remaining as “mesolectal.” They emphasize that the baseline language against which the heritage speakers are measured should not be an idealized form of the language, as might be found in a textbook, but rather the sociolectal variation of the language that they were exposed to as a child – the “baseline language.” For example, if a child is born to Chilean parents, and exposed only to their dialect of Chilean Spanish, the competency of the child’s Spanish should not be tested based on a dialect of Spanish spoken in Spain. There are several ways to test how close to the baseline a speaker is, such as speech rate tests, which have been found to correlate nicely with the speaker’s likelihood of committing systematic grammar mistakes (Polinsky & Kagan 2007: 372; 374-376).

What kind of mistakes do these heritage speakers make? Of course, the basilectal speakers, who often only “overheard” the language instead of speaking it, or who switched languages before age five (Polinsky & Kagan 2007: 377), make many errors, but acrolectal and mesolectal heritage speakers will also have non-native aspects of their language. For example, as mentioned above, heritage speakers may be phonologically very similar to native speakers, but they are not 100% the same (Au et al. 2008). Heritage speakers tend towards eliminating irregular morphology and overgeneralizing grammar forms. They also may appear to have a better mastery of grammar than they actually do, due to the presence of “fossilized forms” in their language. A fossilized form is any form, often used in a high-frequency expression, that the heritage speaker has memorized without being able to command the grammar forms used in that expression in other situations (Polinsky & Kagan 2007: 378-380). Another common problem is that

they may have a certain part of the grammar partially or fully acquired, but may not know how to produce it in any formal setting – for example, if someone asks a Spanish heritage speaker to describe the uses of the subjunctive, they may not know how to respond, or even know what the subjunctive is, regardless of whether or not they are able to use it on a regular basis (Potowski 2005: 52).

Furthermore, even when a speaker is using correct language, they might not be speaking natively. For example, heritage speakers with English as their dominant language may tend towards using fixed word order, even when the heritage language, as with Spanish, has a fairly flexible word order. They also tend to have problems with syntactic gaps, putting in pronouns instead (Polinsky & Kagan 2007: 382-383).

A distinction can be drawn between heritage speakers and HLLs. A heritage language learner is defined by Hornberger & Wang (2008: 6) as anyone “with familial or ancestral ties to a language other than English who exert their agency in determining if they are HLLs of that language.” It is important that heritage speakers make this additional effort in order to preserve their family’s language. Although traditionally heritage language loss happens over three generations, recently in the United States heritage languages are being lost in only two (Au 2008: 337). Fortunately for HLLs, it is much easier to relearn a language than it is to learn one from scratch, and even components of a childhood language that have “become inaccessible” can be helpful for HLLs (Au 2008: 339-340).

For this thesis, I will be focusing on heritage speakers of Spanish. Why Spanish? Notably, it is highly prevalent, with 34.5 million speakers in the United States – and that is excluding Puerto Rico. One out of ten households in the United States is Spanish-

speaking (Potowski & Carreira 2010: 66; 68). Furthermore, it has a significant history in North America: in fact, Spanish, not English, was the first European language spoken on what is now the continental United States. Before Spaniards arrived in present-day Mexico, Ponce de León had landed in Florida in 1513 (Balestra et al. 2008: 4; 8). Many places where Spanish speakers are most prevalent in the United States today were once under Spain's control, such as Texas and California. Although Spain lost its territory eventually, its influence is evident in the history of the states that were once under Spanish control.

Territory is not the only thing that has been lost. Today in the United States language loss, not language maintenance, is the norm. Potowski & Carreira (2010: 70;76;78) note, "there are many factors that appear to favor the maintenance of the Spanish language in the USA, yet despite its strong presence in the media and many educational efforts, the shift to English is clearly happening by the third generation." The children of the immigrants are classic heritage speakers, often able to communicate in their home language with apparent ease, but failing to develop "age-appropriate levels of literacy, vocabulary," and grammar. Although it may seem that Spanish is alive and well in the United States, "demographic trends indicate that the presence of Spanish in the USA is being bolstered by the new arrival of monolingual immigrants, but not by those who are the grandchildren of these immigrants." Potowski & Carreira point out that Latino heritage is becoming disassociated with the language - "most studies point to the belief that one can be equally Latino whether one knows Spanish or not" – and conclude that "with Latino birthrates rapidly outpacing immigration rates, the number of Spanish speakers will undoubtedly decline over the course of the century."

Additionally, the immigrants that are largely responsible for the maintenance of the Spanish language are from different Spanish-speaking countries, and therefore are bringing very different linguistic varieties with them to the United States. In 2005, 59% of the Latinos were Mexican, 10% were Puerto Rican, 4% were Cuban, and the remaining were descended from other Spanish-speaking countries (Potowski 2005: 11). This is not to say that all of these people have had access to Spanish; instead, the important thing to observe is that the Spanish spoken in the United States has many source countries. As will be discussed in the latter portion of this thesis, this diversity of dialectal variation has great significance for the teaching of heritage language Spanish, and it is important to take into careful consideration the origin of the Spanish being taught or discussed.

During the research process for this thesis, I had some discussions about heritage language identity with three college-age heritage speakers of Spanish, whose parents had moved to the United States from Mexico. All three fit the prototypical model of a heritage speaker's use of Spanish versus English: all spoke Spanish with one or both parents and occasionally some extended family, but with siblings and friends English was overwhelmingly the language of choice. This was even the case for Student A, who attended Cristo Rey Jesuit High School in Chicago, a school that was designed specifically for heritage speakers of Spanish.<sup>1</sup> He reported that despite their common language ancestry and classes, he and his fellow students almost always spoke to each other in English, explaining, "I think we all got the idea that Spanish was this very formal

---

<sup>1</sup> Cristo Rey, according to Student A, only admits students who can prove that they have a strong background in Spanish. Students are required to take some of their normal academic classes in Spanish, as well as Spanish language and literature courses. The rest of their coursework is conducted in English, although all teachers are native speakers of Spanish.

thing that we learned and that we presented on, but we liked to relax and enjoy ourselves with our friends and speak English.” Because he received extensive schooling in the Spanish language, it was no longer just the casual language of home, but also the formal language of school. His self-reported Spanish skills were accordingly very strong.

In sum, I have chosen within the scope of my thesis to construct a model of pedagogy only for Spanish because it is a well-studied language with many easily accessible heritage speakers. Additionally, Spanish is wide-spread as a foreign language in the United States, meaning there are many resources available to meet the growing need of L2 learners (although this is less true for HLLs). Unfortunately, this also means that HLLs are often shunted into preexisting foreign language programs that do not address their needs as unique language learners. It is my hope that the model proposed in this thesis will be extrapolated into programs for other heritage language classrooms.

## Chapter 2

### The Current State of Heritage Language Spanish Education

In this chapter, I will discuss the ways in which heritage language Spanish education is carried out in the United States. At first it may be best to examine the issue with a broad scope: what motivates HLLs to learn their language at all? Douglas (2008: 217) posits that there are two types of motivation to learn a language: integrative and instrumental. Integrative motivation applies when there is an interest in the language or culture, such as when the speaker wants to use the language with family, etc. On the other hand, instrumental motivation relates to the ways in which the language can be important for the career. The first motivation hints at the fact that the community is very important for the bilingual education of HLLs. However, Lynch (2008: 322) notes that “[i]n addition to the support of the community, HL programs usually need the support of some funding entity external to the community, e.g., a federal, state, and/or local government agency.” Additionally, “majority community bilingualism” is usually given more credence, praise, and support than “heritage language-based bilingualism” – that is to say, when speakers of English acquire a second language, it is viewed as a sign of intelligence, but when speakers of other languages work to learn English, it is generally not viewed as anything special – even if English is a third or fourth language for them (Lo Bianco 2008: 54).

Before proceeding, it is important to examine why, precisely, heritage language education matters. The HLLs already have some ability in the language, and even if it is limited, they live in a country where English is the dominant language. Why, then,

bother to focus on teaching languages to HLLs at all? There are several rebuttals to this line of thinking. The difference between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation were outlined briefly above, and while these both of these refer to an individual's motivation to learn a language, they can also be useful conceptual tools when examining reasons to teach heritage languages. There is of course the cultural aspect: it is important for HLLs to be reconnected to the culture of their families, and for inter-generational communication to be promoted. But there are also reasons that lie closer to the concept of instrumental motivation: in this increasingly global world, the ability to command a foreign language is a significant asset to both the individual and to the country. If taught correctly, HLLs can learn to command their heritage language with far less schooling than L2 learners can, making them a national resource (Polinsky & Kagan 2007; Benmamoun et al. 2010). Providing heritage language education makes sense on a personal level, a cultural level, an academic level, and a national level.

Although there are many different kinds of bilingual programs, both for heritage speakers and for non-heritage speakers, for the purposes of this thesis I will for the most part focus my attention on programs for heritage speakers of Spanish. There are, however, some strategies that have been employed in other bilingual programs that could be useful for heritage language programs. Cohn & Gómez (2008: 289-293) discovered that within many such immersion programs, “students’ use of [...] *academic language* [...] is not as developed as their overall L2 proficiency would suggest [...] it has been observed that immersion students in upper grades tend to use the everyday or vernacular language when discussing academic content.” They suggested the use of “inner voice” in the bilingual programs, as well as that teachers model the use of academic language, both of

which they found to improve students' use of academic language. It would be easy to include this in programs for heritage speakers of Spanish, who, as mentioned before, also tend to use the vernacular. Heritage speakers have already been shown to benefit from bilingual education programs. For example, Duff (2008: 76-77) found that many students in Canada's government-supported bilingual program are heritage language speakers of French, who "outperform those who have either not maintained their HL or who are Anglophones without a HL other than English."

HLLs may also benefit from some types of teaching in a foreign language classroom. In a study by Beaudrie (2009) that examined HLLs in a heritage language track, HLLs in a foreign language track, and foreign language learners (FLLs) in a foreign language track, she found mixed results with improvement among the groups (340), suggesting that some (though certainly not all) pedagogical techniques found in foreign language classrooms might be helpful. In particular, she focused on the plight of "receptive bilinguals," extremely basilectal HLLs who often have severe gaps in their grammatical knowledge and very limited ability to produce Spanish, but who have a moderate level of comprehension (especially within context). In forward-thinking programs that sort between heritage language and foreign language tracks, these receptive bilinguals often pose an issue. Some scholars believe that they should be put in heritage language classrooms because of their "attitudes, needs, and cultural background." (326-327). But if their abilities in Spanish are so basilectal, might it not make more sense to put them in a foreign language classroom, rather than with their mesolectal and acrolectal peers? Beaudrie logically concludes that those attempting to teach the receptive

bilinguals should use pedagogical methodologies developed both for foreign language and for heritage language classrooms (342).

What are the classic forms of HL education? The principle forces thus far have been HL teaching in foreign language classrooms, indigenous language rehabilitation programs, immersion camps, and K-12 bilingual education systems. Unfortunately, the U.S. policy towards heritage language education tends to be focused on English as a replacement for heritage languages, even in bilingual programs, which tend to phase out the minority language instead of strengthening it alongside English (Hornberger & Wang 2008: 11-12), despite the many studies showing that the continuation of the language leads to better performance in school overall. Even today many bilingual education programs in this country, despite this long history, are under attack from various sides. For example, California's Proposition 227, in the words of Sohn & Merrill (2008: 283), "in essence eliminated bilingual education programs" in the state. No Child Left Behind has pressured schools into focusing heavily on testing in English, so "Spanish language educational services for Spanish-speaking Latino students have sharply declined in recent years" (King 2009:305). Despite the fact that many parents want to raise their children bilingual, it is likely that "Mexican immigrants arriving to Southern California today can expect only 1 in 20 of their grandchildren to speak fluent Spanish" (King 2009: 307-312).

Indeed, the occasionally unwelcome environment towards non-English languages in the United States even bleeds into such bilingual programs: HLLs are often called LEPs (Limited English Proficient), and although many bilingual education programs focus on language as a right, English is still given the main focus. Unfortunately, when only English is used in school, the child's heritage language skills cease to advance and

instead begin to diminish, leading to problems in advanced “adult” settings later on (Hornberger & Wang 2008: 11-12). Conversely, when the language minority student “has had an opportunity to develop a high degree of bilingual proficiency,” they have been demonstrated to reap “cognitive, social, personal, and economic benefits... when compared with a monolingual counterpart” (Hornberger & Wang 2008: 11-12).

It should be noted that there are, in fact, some bilingual education programs available for Spanish-speaking and minority language students that aim to maintain and develop the heritage language while English is added. They have been called “maintenance bilingual programs,” “developmental bilingual programs,” and, recently, “dual language education.” One form is “two-way immersion education,” in which “English-dominant and heritage-language-dominant students are integrated for all or most of the instructional day and are given content instruction and literacy instruction in both languages.” There are two models: 90/10 and 50/50. 90/10 starts out in mostly Spanish and proceeds to a 50/50 balance of Spanish and English. 50/50 starts out as a balance of Spanish and English and continues that way (Christian 2008: 260-261). A study of 300 children in Spanish/English maintenance bilingual programs at 11 schools found that “the native Spanish speakers are orally fluent by grade 3 with little room for improvement on the measure used through grade 5.... [T]he levels are slightly higher in the 90/10 program where Spanish is used most of the instructional day in the early grades. The native English speakers lag behind a bit, but are reasonably fluent in oral language by grade 5.... both groups of students were near the top of the scale in English as well” (Christian 2008: 262-263). Sometimes a private school that caters to HLLs of Spanish, like Cristo Rey, will emerge. However, aside from such programs, the state of

heritage education in the United States has a long way to go. Despite their benefits, according to Potowski & Carreira (2010), heritage language Spanish classes are offered in “only 18 percent of US colleges and universities” and in only nine percent of high schools.

Clearly, it is important that HL speakers become HLLs in order to gain maximum linguistic competence and ability. But how should they be taught? Frustratingly, in the social climate of the United States, heritage language education sometimes meets resistance, since, as Lo Bianco (2008: 55) observes, “advocating for language maintenance is seen as competing with the replacing language, opposed to social mobility, and as parochial and anti-modern” by some. But the full knowledge of a heritage language can be extremely useful even for citizens of the United States: interviews with bilingual speakers of Spanish and English revealed that all used their Spanish language in their jobs, for many different purposes in many different situations (McGroarty & Alfredo Urzúa 2008:137). Additionally, members of heritage language communities in the United States have a great stake in heritage language education “to maintain connections between the immigrant generations and their offspring” (Benmamoun et al 2010: 78). Some groups set up “Sunday school” classes for their children, but for whatever reason, these do not seem to be particularly effective (Polinsky & Kagan 2007: 377), and this is not a common strategy employed by speakers of Spanish (Potowski & Carreira 2010: 74).

While it may seem that the logical place for HLLs would be in foreign language classrooms, with most students who are trying to learn a new language, HLLs and foreign language learners exhibit many differences in the way they learn. Instructors may not be

equipped to deal with HLLs and the incomplete mastery of the language that they bring to the classroom. Benmamoun et al. (2010: 76) suggest that “instructors need to have a keen awareness and appreciation of the vast linguistic diversity that characterize particular groups of heritage language learners.” There may also be problems inherent in the design of the curriculum; for example, in a study by Beaudrie (2009), HLLs were often confused by the explicit grammar instruction that was present in FL classrooms (341). It is not the case that all forms of instruction found in FL classrooms adversely affect HLLs; on the contrary, some findings (Montrul & Bowles 2010; Potowski, Jegerski, & Morgan-Short 2009) have discovered that some explicit grammar instruction may improve the skills of HLLs, at least in the immediate short-term, although it is possible that it benefits FL learners more. Some textbooks for HLLs have been developed, although they are not extremely common (Ducar 2009). Kagan & Dillon (2008:149;151) state that for teaching HLLs, a macro-approach, meaning an approach that “builds on learners' initial abilities in speaking and listening”, is likely to be the most helpful. This is in contrast to the micro-approaches that build “competency from the bottom up, by isolating the elements of the language and gradually increasing in complexity,” which have traditionally been used to teach L2 learners. However, they also note that “[t]here is as yet no standard approach to teaching heritage languages. Some approaches have been suggested by various researchers and practitioners, but sufficient data have not been gathered to determine their efficacy.” It is still a field open to significant examination.

Parodi (2008: 200) points out that the attitude of the teachers may pose a large problem. There are many dialects of Spanish, some of which the teacher may not

recognize and which may not correlate to the dialect being taught in the classroom, and there are even some that are combinations of various dialects. For example, the dialect of Chicano Spanish spoken in Southern California is a *koine*, a composite of varying language varieties, which in this case is composed of several different regional dialects from small villages in Mexico. This is a well-documented variant of Spanish, which is spoken in Los Angeles even by children of Spanish-speaking immigrants who are not originally from Mexico (Parodi 2008: 201). Many teachers “try to force their bilingual students to speak standard Spanish only” (Parodi 2008: 203). However, they may sometimes correct non-standard Spanish forms that the HLLs use, believing them to be “mistakes.” When this occurs, it may be difficult for the HLL to accept, given that the non-standard Spanish is the variety of the language that they have been speaking their entire life (Benmamoun et al. 2010: 79). This may be especially true when the corrections are made by a non-native TA (Hornberger & Wang 2008: 25). Likewise, the tests and materials may be in a dialect with which the HLL is not familiar (Hornberger & Wang 2008: 20). Peyton (2008: 243) remarks, “when Spanish-speaking students are placed in[...] foreign language Spanish classes and the language skills that they already have are not recognized or developed, they may become bored or frustrated and lose their motivation to continue their Spanish studies.”

In classes taught by native Spanish speakers, HLLs may be frowned upon because while they seem to be native speakers in some respects, many “code switch from Spanish to English and incorporate loan words into Spanish” (Parodi 2008: 202). These teachers may expect too much from HLLs due to the students’ background in the language: Parodi (2008: 203) notes that “it is not uncommon for Spanish teachers to expect bilingual

speakers to know all registers of standard Spanish at almost all levels of competence” even though it is rarely the case that HLLs do. Valdés et al. (2008: 118) found that many native-speaker teachers “expressed a negative opinion of the Spanish spoken by U.S. Latinos and considered that they face almost insurmountable challenges.” The interaction with the foreign language learners in the classroom may also sometimes be strained. Class participation may be skewed: non-HLLs might feel that it is unfair because it is much harder for them, and HLLs may feel that the teachers expect too much of them (Duff 2008: 79). In an interview, college professor María Luisa Parra commented that there were several patterns she had noted in the interactions between the HLLs and the L2 learners in her classroom: at first the L2 learners were intimidated by the HLLs, but in higher level foreign language classes they often had an advantage over the heritage speakers because they had experienced more formal instruction and knew the terminology, grammar, and structure of Spanish, whereas the HLLs did not. She commented that sometimes such HLLs “feel that they should know more, but realize that they don’t... it’s hard for them.” Of course, if the heritage speakers had taken formal Spanish classes previously, they usually took the lead once more.

For all of these reasons, colleges and universities sometimes offer separate programs and tracks for HLLs. Indeed, this is what Peyton (2008: 247) recommends for heritage speakers of Spanish, in order to best facilitate their development of language skills. One of the three heritage speakers that I spoke with, Student A, had gone to a rare school intended entirely for heritage speakers: Cristo Rey Jesuit High School. Now a student at Brown University, he felt that his background of classes for heritage speakers at Cristo Rey had prepared him exceptionally well for the rigorous Spanish classes that he

took at college for his Comparative Literature major. When he described his ability to write and express himself in Spanish he did so with great confidence, and attributed much of his success with Spanish to his time at Cristo Rey. He believes that this expertise will aid him in his future career as an English teacher for Hispanic students, as he hopes to bridge a language gap. He has clearly benefited from his heritage language program.

Unfortunately, some HLL programs “face tremendous challenges fueled by the scarcity of instructional materials grounded in research on the linguistic profile of the heritage learners” (Benmamoun et al. 2010: 75-76). This is partially due to the fact that it is a relatively new field, although there are various training opportunities available for teachers (Peyton 2008: 247-248). Another problem facing the institution of these programs is the fact that sometimes administrators resist programs on the grounds that the heritage speakers already know Spanish (Potowski 2005:35). As of 2009, the estimate was that “68% of U.S. post-secondary institutions do not offer any heritage language courses” (King 2009:311). A personal communication with María Luisa Parra emphasized some of the challenges of getting HL programs established in Spanish Language classrooms: scattered efforts, lack of materials, confusion about the purpose, and “concern about appropriate pedagogies and content.” Additionally, even in cases when heritage learners are tracked, they are often only left in separate classes for one or two years before being returned to L2 tracks. Kagan & Dillon (2008) explain that, “The rationale is that after one or two years heritage learners can be taught together with foreign language learners. Experience indicates that this practice is deficient and that the needs of heritage learners remain different from the needs of foreign language learners.” In short, HLL tracks still face many challenges to their existence.

It should be noted that sometimes HLLs may initially resist being identified and separated into these heritage language tracks. They may lack confidence in their linguistic abilities (Hornberger & Wang 2008: 14) or perceive that they are being unjustly segregated from their peers. However, with a good program catering to their needs, both concerns should be assuaged. Due to the unique skills and abilities of HLLs, it is highly logical for them to be placed in a separate track.

What should be taught in a heritage language classroom? Many have strong opinions on this front. Peyton (2008: 249-252) discusses several recommendations for Spanish heritage language courses, including that states and organizations make training for teachers of heritage language Spanish readily available; that “[l]istening comprehension should reflect the language varieties and cultures of heritage Spanish speakers”; that tests be developed specifically for HLLs of Spanish so that they do not have to be evaluated with skill tests intended for foreign language learners of Spanish; and above all, that separate heritage language classes be offered, not just at the college level but also in secondary school. Additionally, rather than presenting dry textbook grammar, most of the focus in schooling should emphasize naturally occurring literary texts, possibly even including code-switching literature and poetry. There is a wide array of texts that can be brought into the classroom for this purpose.

An emphasis on knowledge of linguistics has also been discussed: Potowski (2005) mentions that Webb & Miller (2000) emphasize the fact that teachers of HLLs should be familiar with theories of cognitive, social and linguistic processes relating to bilingualism and languages in contact (43), and that Valdés (1997) goes so far as to list four objectives for HLL classes:

- 1) The preservation of the Spanish language of the HS
- 2) The acquisition of standard Spanish
- 3) The expansion of “espectro bilingue” (the bilingual spectrum)
- 4) Transfer of reading and writing skills in English to formal learning in Spanish.

(Potowski 2005:30)

Potowski also has opinions about what should be taught in heritage language classrooms. She suggests that many reading strategies that are useful for L2 learners can also be useful for HLLs, but that in situations involving grammar, it is important to teach heritage language students the names of the things that they are already able to control so that they can apply them in academic settings. This differs from an L2 classroom, where the focus would be on learning the grammar for the first time. In general, Potowski’s focus is on how to make all lessons as communicative as possible, to highlight the strengths of the HLLs. Of course, many teaching practices will have to vary based on the age and level of the students (Potowski 2005: 34,49,52,54).

Scholars recognize that there are a variety of methods for use in heritage language classrooms, as well as multiple types of materials that are essential for HLLs to improve their speaking, listening, and literary skills. The goal of this thesis is to add linguistic problem sets to the available materials that may be employed in a HL classroom. This addition is intended to broaden the scope of heritage language teaching by appealing not only to listening, speaking, and literary skills, but also by allowing students to improve their meta-linguistic skills, by developing analytical thinking in an area that has not yet been exploited in this field.

## Chapter 3

### The Argument for Sociolinguistics in a HL Classroom

Sociolinguistic education is of vital importance in a heritage language classroom. For one, HLLs may have issues selecting vocabulary that is appropriate to the register of discourse (Parodi 2008: 208). For the purposes of this thesis, “register” refers to the level of formality present in a certain form or phrase structure. For heritage speakers in the United States, the high register is often dominated by English only, whereas the low register contains a mix of Spanish and English. This is not the case for native speakers from Spain or Latin America. Furthering the problem is that for some heritage speakers the baseline Spanish may already be lower register, due to demographics of the immigrants who are their parents (Valdés et al. 2008: 109-110). It is crucial that students understand the existence of multiple registers in every language, and that it is possible – in fact, normal – to command multiple registers. This way, they will understand that lower-register forms they use in the home are completely correct, but sometimes inappropriate for every situation. In this way, they will be able to maintain their linguistic pride while still gaining access to the prestige that can be commanded by understanding and utilizing higher-register forms of the language.

Multiple scholars have agreed that sociolinguistics, in particular dialectal variation and the use of registers, needs to be taught in heritage language classrooms. Traditionally there has been an emphasis on teaching “standard” Spanish, but recently this tradition has fallen into disfavor. Many scholars question whether such a thing as a “standard” Spanish even exists (Potowski 2005:36). Recently it has become much more

common to see discussions of sociolinguistics when instructors debate which Spanish to teach.

Parodi (2008: 211-212) acknowledges this fact when she writes, “[c]ode switching, lexical borrowing, and semantic extensions are typical of bilingual speech, and students should be aware that monolingual speakers tend to stigmatize these features. Heritage students need to know when it is appropriate to use these features and how to deal with the stigma attached to them[...] The instructor should present grammar as a meta-linguistic and analytical subject.” She agrees that sociolinguistic education for HLLs is important, emphasizing “basic principles of regional and social variation, language change, diglossia, standardization, the use of registers, language attitudes, code switching, borrowing, and semantic extensions.” Parodi envisions a classroom in which “[i]nstructors will explain to them how languages are acquired by natives, the advantages of being bilingual, and the notion of linguistic intuition.” Hornberger & Wang (2008: 18) likewise suggest the use of “hybridity” – when both students and teachers use and accept varying languages and registers. Potowski (2005:55) also believes that it is ideal to explore the connection between power and language with students in a heritage language classroom, demonstrating the ways in which a linguistic variety is inherently linked to the people who use it.

Some go even further than this, emphasizing not only the importance of covering dialectal variation spoken in other countries, but also the oft-ignored variety of Spanish spoken in the United States. This U.S. Spanish has in many ways become its own linguistic dialect with unique vocabulary and phrasal structure, which are often built around widely accepted borrowings from English. There is some evidence that when

English-dominant heritage language speakers engage in transfer, it is not between their spoken dialects, but rather from English (Benmamoun et al. 2010: 77). In fact, some even believe that the imposition of exocentric norms upon the communities of U.S. Spanish-speakers constitutes in and of itself a form of linguistic repression. After all, criticisms towards the type of Spanish that heritage speakers use can be perceived as direct criticisms not only at them, but also at their parents and even their entire communities (Potowski 2005:55-56). Leeman (2010: 312) argues similarly that “[b]y ignoring or denigrating the varieties of Spanish spoken in the U.S., as well as the language practices typical of bilingual speakers and contact situations, mainstream approaches to L2 Spanish teaching have been complicit in the portrayal of the language of HL speakers, their families, and their communities as less ‘authentic’ and less valuable.”

In discussions I had with two heritage speakers from Los Angeles (Students B and C), I found a similar pattern. Both had taken Spanish 1 and Spanish 2 to fulfill their Spanish requirements at Hamilton High School in Los Angeles. (B also chose to continue into an AP Spanish class, in order to improve her Spanish further.) Although they reported that the vast majority of the students in their Spanish classes were Latino and spoke Spanish at home, Hamilton High does not offer any heritage speaker class, so they were taught from a foreign language textbook. Dialectal variation was discussed only briefly and generally in their classes; both reported that they had been warned that certain words had different meanings in different countries, and Student C was able to recall the word for ‘ferris wheel’ in Castilian Spanish (*noria*) and compare it to his familiar word from Mexican Spanish (*rueda*).

However, they were not able to connect dialectal variation or variation in register with the differences that they perceived between the Spanish in their textbooks and the Spanish they spoke on a daily basis. Instead, they both strongly asserted that the textbooks contained the correct version of Spanish, whereas the Spanish they spoke was merely slang. B reported that in the textbook, there were “words I’d never even heard of. Like the proper word to use....Like I would say it one way, but the proper way of saying it was a certain way.” C agreed, “The textbook uses the *proper* Spanish... for example, in Spanish, we could say *carro* but the correct word in Spanish would be *auto*.... So the Spanish we learned as kids was kinda like... you could say slang in English, it would be slang, so we could speak quicker and understand faster.” When asked if their teachers, all native Spanish-speakers from Mexico or Columbia, had explained why it was that the words in the textbook were different, both subjects confirmed that the teachers had merely emphasized that the textbook’s Spanish was “the correct way of saying it.” Nonetheless, C did have an intuited knowledge of register and linguistic prestige. He reported that the reason it was better to use the textbook Spanish was to sound more educated, and recalled that he had used the formal Spanish instead of “regular” Spanish when meeting his girlfriend’s parents for the first time, in hopes of impressing them. Both B and C agreed, however, that they overwhelmingly used the Spanish that they spoke at home when they interacted with other Spanish-speakers, even when the Spanish-speakers were not familiar to them. Instead of having language variation explained to them in a cohesive way, they had instead internalized only that their families’ version of Spanish was not the correct one, and had not been given any useful sociolinguistic tools to help them manipulate register.

It is problematic that many teachers of HLLs often have the belief that certain forms within language variation are “wrong” and should be corrected (Leeman 2010:313). In many cases, the forms are perfectly valid, but more acceptable in some registers than others. There is some evidence that HL Spanish speakers in the U.S., like C, have or are in the process of creating some kind of formal register. A study of intra-speaker variation in heritage speakers found that code-switching occurred mostly in casual conversation settings and less so in formal ones; lexical creations, on the other hand, occurred often in the more formal settings as well, suggesting that they were grouped differently. Likewise, fillers in English, such as ‘you know’ or ‘I mean’ were found to be fairly common in the more casual conversations but less so in presentations (Sánchez-Muñoz 2010: 344;349-350).

Sometimes, even when a teacher is sympathetic to discussing sociolinguistics in the classroom they are prevented from doing so. Neither of the Spanish professors that I interviewed for this thesis, Julio Torres and María Luisa Parra, had the opportunity to teach separate lessons on dialectal variation in their Spanish classes for L2 learners, even when HLLs were in the classroom. They brought up dialectal variation only when a variant was addressed in a text or a similar opportunity presents itself. This may be because both taught classes aimed for L2s, in which it may be less critical for the students to have a full explanation of dialectal variation. Neither of them had been able to teach a class exclusively for HLLs, although both affirmed that they believed there should be separate tracks for such students, and María Luisa Parra explained that she had been trying to start such a track at Harvard University, without success.

Standard practice in teaching about register differences involves listing appropriate and inappropriate contexts for certain forms of dialectal variants; however, this practice is not without controversy. Ducar (2009:347), for example, charges that it leads to further marginalization of U.S. varieties of Spanish. Nonetheless, given that linguistic prejudices are unfortunately the norm in our society, I believe that it is important for HLLs to understand the differences in prestige and register that different varieties connote, as long as it is emphasized that no linguistic variety is necessarily better or worse than any other.

It is true that linguistic loyalty to a certain dialect can run deep: one study of language attitudes found that “51% chose their own country of origin as having the best Spanish.” But linguistic prejudices are also deeply ingrained. Many participants listed “the Spanish of Columbia and Spain among those countries with the best Spanish,” and when participants were asked “where the worst Spanish is spoken, the Caribbean was chosen by a vast majority of her consultants, followed by the Spanish spoken in the United States” (Anderson 2010:294). This maps very neatly onto the fact that Spain’s dialect is portrayed as the finest and most authentic Spanish in many classrooms (Leeman 2010:312), and the fact that U.S. Spanish is widely disparaged.

A common fallacy supporting this linguistic dominance is that there is something inherent in the Spanish of Spain that lends it its purity and power – after all, it was the first of the Spanish-speaking countries, a fact evident even in the name. In reality, the Spanish of Spain is a variety like any other, and it has changed and developed many new features of its own. In fact, Spain has had to work very hard in order to maintain its linguistic primacy. Paffey & Mar-Molinero (2009:161,170) explain that Spain has been

actively pursuing “a series of language policies which will guarantee Spain’s place both in the Spanish-speaking world and in the international linguistic marketplace.” For example, the Real Academia Española is renewing “efforts to standardize a ‘total’ Spanish which forms the structural and ideological basis” of the Instituto Cervantes, the Spanish language and cultural center endorsed by the Spanish government, “as well as a reference for mother tongue speakers of Spanish.” That Spain is at the center of such policies may seem a bit ridiculous when we realize that Spain represents only 10% of the Spanish-speaking world.

Spain’s work has paid off. In a study by Ducar (2009) of the few Spanish heritage language textbooks that are available, she discovered that most textbooks intended for HLLs “continue to promote a Castilian-based dialectology of Spanish, and thus both obliterate and invalidate other dialects of Spanish” despite the diversity of their intended audience (350). For example, only 16% of textbooks analyzed so much as mention the pronoun *vos*, though the countries where this is dominant, including Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay, have a combined population of over 69.1 million people. On the other hand, it was extremely common to find the *vosotros* form described in full, despite the fact that this is a linguistic form used exclusively in Spain, which has only 39.1 million people (350). Another flaw in many of the heritage language textbooks that Ducar surveyed was that they did not focus on the crucial difference between established borrowings and nonce borrowings, instead grouping them together (353). An established borrowing is a valid component of U.S. Spanish and is not likely to cause confusion except to a foreigner, just as Spain’s unique, Arabic-borrowed word for ‘olive’ (*aceituna*) might give other Spanish-speakers pause. On the other hand, a nonce

borrowing has not been incorporated into the language as a whole. It may be viewed more as an incorrect intrusion into the language, causing confusion among native speakers from all or most backgrounds. Treating the two types of borrowing identically in a classroom setting is not recommended, although the line between the two may be blurry. There is a need in the future for more studies examining the relationship between explicitly taught register manipulation and language skills, as it is an important ability for any fluent speaker to possess.

## **Chapter 4**

### **Linguistic Exercises for a HL Classroom**

#### **4.1.1 Introduction**

In the previous chapter, I explained reasons that overt sociolinguistic instruction should be used in the classroom. In this chapter, I will first describe reasons that overt linguistic instruction, in the form of problem sets, should be incorporated into the heritage language classroom. They are important not only for the HLLs themselves, but also to aid teachers of HLLs. Next, I will give a few sample problem sets. It is my hope that these problem sets will be incorporated as a component of a heritage language course with an otherwise standard structure. They are not intended to stand on their own, nor are they intended to be comprehensive. I hope that my problem sets will become only the beginning of a series of problem sets that can be created using linguistic theory to address the specific needs of the HLLs in that particular classroom setting. The ones presented in this thesis are intended for students in high school and college.<sup>2</sup>

#### **4.1.2 Rationale for using linguistic thinking in an HLL classroom**

It should be noted that in the current climate of teaching L2 learners, the explicit teaching of rote grammatical rules is being eschewed in favor of a broader, more comprehensive form of teaching, in which the students are presented with natural

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that these problem sets may also be appropriate for advanced middle-schoolers; indeed, this is a very promising age group for this method because they are closer to baseline and less used to conventional methods of schooling. However, because it is extremely rare to find a HLL class for the middle-school age range, I have not prepared these problem sets for that demographic. As always, they are subject for modification where the teacher deems appropriate.

paragraphs and expected to generalize specific rules after learning from context. In some ways this is similar to the goals of these problem sets, in that generalization is necessary from a given set of data, and critical thinking about the language on the part of the students is required. However, in these problem sets I have used much more focused, tailored data, because the goal is to have the students not only learn about an aspect of grammar, but also to gain increased meta-linguistic awareness. Meta-linguistic awareness is generally higher in bilinguals than in monolinguals (Bialystok 1999; Benmamoun et al. 2010), so HLLs are excellent candidates for its targeted development in the classroom. Its development will later help them when they engage in macro-approach lessons featuring natural input such as literature and conversation, as they will be able to apply their new strategies for a much more in-depth analysis of their language. In sum, my proposal is to add problem sets that allow HLLs to think analytically about their heritage language, both as an additional component of their classroom instruction and outside the classroom in their daily lives.

These problem sets are addressed not only to the students who will be using them, but also to the teachers who will be incorporating them into their curricula. Before the HLLs can learn to think linguistically and to appreciate their oft-stigmatized language forms, their teachers must learn to re-examine their own language from this same standpoint. By teaching the teachers, we will create a true foundation for linguistics in HL classrooms. Teachers should be able to promote and support the development of metalinguistic awareness among their students, but first they must develop it in themselves.

Using linguistic exercises to teach something other than linguistics itself is not a novel concept. Honda & O'Neil (1995: 233-234) used linguistic exercises to teach the scientific method to middle school and high school students. Their goal was to use linguistics to make students think about their native language in a discerning, scientific way, so that they could use the same methodology in their science classes. They felt that by tapping into "natural mathematics," which they defined as "the simplest mathematical ideas[...] implied in the customary lines of thought of everyday life," the students would find the method more approachable and intuitive.

Most significant for our purposes was their point that, because all students are fluent in at least one language, they have all the examples that they need - their intuitions can be harnessed. They used a series of basic English linguistic exercises, such as the varying plural in English (/s/, /z/, /iz/), anaphor binding, and rules of "wanna" and "is" contraction. They concluded that the experiments were a success for the children, with the students able to successfully solve the answers, and with positive reports from science teachers that enthusiasm for the scientific method carried over into science classes.

Surely if linguistics can be used to teach the scientific method, it is not unthinkable that it could improve the teaching of a language by helping students to think about that language. There were, of course, a few problems, some of which may be very significant in the application of linguistic exercises to heritage language classrooms. First, older students tended to be more hesitant about making grammaticality judgments (Honda & O'Neil 1995: 245). It is easy to imagine that a heritage speaker might have similar doubts, particularly a basilectal speaker. For this reason, the difficulty of the linguistic exercises should be tailored to the approximate level of the heritage speakers in

question. This will also ensure that the aspect of the language that is being demonstrated is one that is relevant to the student's level. It is also important to emphasize in the classroom that it is fine if the judgments that the students produce are not necessarily correct – that is why the teacher is there to serve as a guide. Of course, in the event that multiple students do not feel that a “correct” sentence is grammatical, that becomes a lesson in its own right (albeit a more traditional one).

Honda & O’Neil are not the only ones who have used linguistic exercises in non-linguistic classes. O’Connor (1980) wrote a book which uses linguistic-based phonology exercises to improve the English pronunciation of non-native English speakers by giving them a fuller sense of the underlying rules governing the patterns and distributions of sounds. He starts out generally, explaining how languages sort sounds by using a box metaphor: people make pronunciation mistakes when trying to speak a new language because they are trying to fit it into one of their “boxes.” He also talks about dialects of English as an explanation for how there will be differences in trying to pronounce English, focusing on respect for all dialects – a very important lesson in heritage language classrooms, as discussed above. The book then examines specific linguistic terminology, comparing Spanish and English allophones, to explain the differences between allophones and minimal pairs, the way that they may vary based on languages, and the difficulties this may cause for the learner when two languages have divergent rules. There are many linguistic exercises, including having students come up with minimal pairs in their own language and determining whether or not vowel length is relevant; in one section, concrete linguistic rules are given for how to use each type of

intonation in English, with examples (O'Connor 1980: 2;5;7;12;88;120). Obviously, the idea of using linguistics in language teaching is not revolutionary.

Before specific linguistic concerns are brought in, there are some basic factors that should be taken into account. Heritage language classrooms should focus on what the HLLs already know and their own home languages as a starting block; placement tests are absolutely crucial, but textbook ones can be problematic because HLLs often don't fit the textbook level of knowledge, since they did not learn from a textbook (Polinsky & Kagan 2007: 384-386). Polinsky & Kagan (2007: 387) suggest using a three-tier testing method: an oral test, an essay (if literate), and a "biographic questionnaire" – as well as possibly a lexical proficiency test.

Another factor to bear in mind in the use of linguistic exercises in HLL classrooms has to do with grammaticality judgments. As mentioned above, L2 instruction does not focus explicitly on such judgments. In addition, heritage speakers are known to be extremely hesitant to provide grammaticality judgments, and research on heritage speakers has consistently avoided them (Benmamoun et al. 2010, a.o.). This is further confounded by issues of dialectal variation: in some cases, the grammaticality judgment of the student's dialect may not match the one laid out on the page.<sup>3</sup> The hypothetical confusion that could result from such a situation can be minimized by a lesson on dialectal variation (see below) and a clear understanding and labeling of which dialect the example comes from. It may also be important to include one or two exercises that

---

<sup>3</sup> Even in the field of linguistic analysis, the use of grammaticality judgments is not uncontroversial. Spectrums of grammaticality may be blurry, and sentences used to elicit information may be stilted and wholly unnatural. It is not uncommon for two fluent speakers to disagree over the grammaticality of a given form or sentence. This should be kept in mind when the problem sets are used in the classroom. However, because HLLs often have systematically different grammatical judgments than native speakers, the use of data informed by grammaticality judgments may be of importance for the HLLs in that it can easily and quickly juxtapose their language forms with a different data set. However, given the controversy, in no place are they asked to make explicit grammaticality judgments on the established data.

specifically compare the acceptability of various sentences in various dialects. All in all, it is better to couch the discussion of linguistic data in terms of relative acceptability rather than black-and-white (un)grammaticality.

To reiterate, these problem sets are not expected to occur in isolation or in lieu of other activities. Because the macro-approach and communicative activities are so vital for HLL programs (Kagan & Dillon 2008), a focus on naturalistic literature and communication is crucial. These problem sets are a perfect jumping-off point for a traditional literary analysis exercise: students can take their new meta-linguistic awareness and apply it to given texts. Polinsky & Kluender (2007:274;276) suggest that within the field of linguistics it is necessary to use not only naturalistic data and discourse data, but also minimal pairs and grammaticality judgments; they should complement, not conflict. I concur and have used this as a guiding principle in the construction of these problem sets. They are intended to be composed primarily of maximally contrastive data to aid in the formulation of linguistic rules, under the presumption that naturalistic and discourse data will be provided to the HLLs within the literature and conversation that is integral to a HLL classroom.

When linguistic exercises are introduced, they should play to the HLLs' strengths as well as their weaknesses. Spanish-speaking HLLs tend to be quite good with pronunciation, but with complex grammar may have difficulty "when they speak about topics that are not commonly discussed at home." (Parodi 2008: 205-206). Beaudrie (2009: 341) found that explicit grammar instruction often confused HLLs because they only see language "in natural contexts where only authentic interactions take place". Linguistics can take these natural environments and make them into a useful tool for

understanding the difference between the grammar taught in a classroom and the grammar innate in one's head. This is an example of playing to the strengths of the heritage speakers so that they can comfortably adjust to the use of linguistic exercises. It is my hope that, in providing HLLs with the tools to think critically about their own languages by examining patterns and generating rules, they will be able to become active explorers of their own language, rather than passively absorbing grammar rules set forth in a classroom. Additionally, as HLLs sometimes perceive a social stigma attached to their language variety, these problem sets will help to equip them to understand and value their own linguistic varieties.

For this thesis, I have chosen to include four problem sets. The first problem set covers code-switching. The second examines and compares borrowing, semantic extension, and calques. The third problem set is an exercise in dialectal variation, and the fourth problem set focuses on the often-problematic *a personal*. Each problem set will be preceded by a brief introduction to contextualize the problem set for the teacher, and will be followed by a discussion/solution guide. In many cases, the examples given in the problem set have incorporated partial data or full examples from other sources; these sources are cited within each problem set. In all cases many of the examples are my own.

#### **4.2.1 Introduction to Problem Sets 1 & 2: Influence from English**

The first two problem sets presented have to do with influence from English, which is a common linguistic feature of the Spanish spoken in the United States. These problem sets are intended to be paired. The goals of these problem sets are as follows:

- a. Introduce students to the linguistic concepts of code-switching and borrowing, and demonstrate how they apply to their everyday language.
- b. Have students begin to think critically about their everyday language, discovering that there is a logic and cohesion even in language that is stigmatized.
- c. Explore some of the ways that English influences the Spanish spoken in the United States, opening the floor for examination of varieties of Spanish that are less-influenced.

The first problem set focuses on code-switching. Linguists use the term “code-switching” to refer to a kind of language mixing. Martín (2011:1) explains that it “involves the mixing of phonologically distinctive elements into a single utterance” and notes that, “like monolingual language, code-switching is also patterned, rule-governed behavior —while some switches naturally occur in bilinguals, others are never found and are judged to be ill-formed.” The judgments that speakers have for code-switching forms the basis of the first half of the problem set, and will be used to expose the fact that even when using language that is conventionally thought of as incorrect, students have very strong intuitions about what is natural and what is not – grammaticality in the linguistic sense rather than the textbook sense. Furthermore, Potowski (2005:48,51) points out that there have been studies suggesting that the use of code-switching between English and Spanish in the classroom can be very beneficial for HLLs, and that the use of English should not be penalized, because they may get frustrated by their limited vocabulary and not want to say anything. For this reason, it might be wise to expand their understanding the ways in code-switching can be used. Pountain (2005) lays out the following two rules that govern the use of code-switching: the Free Morpheme Constraint and the

Equivalence Constraint. The Free Morpheme Constraint states that there can be no code-switch within the middle of a word (e.g. constructions such as \*run-*eando*, from ‘running’, are ungrammatical). The Equivalence Constraint states that the “[o]rder of the elements before and after the switch point must be grammatical in both languages” (e.g. ‘*el siguiente* play’ is fine, but ‘\**la pared* red’ is not). Pountain also notes that code-switching has a strong connection with culture, often “seen as a badge of identity by young Hispanics” and used in literature, poetry, and rap. This makes it an excellent subject for classroom investigation, as authentic literature may be brought in to the classroom and analyzed.

The second problem set focuses on other types of linguistic influence from English, including borrowings, semantic extensions, and calques. Martín (2011:1) defines borrowing as “the full phonological and morphological integration of a word from one language into another.” Borrowing is ubiquitous in all human languages that are in contact with others; many of the words that we use in English, for example, were originally borrowings. It may be useful to discuss some of the borrowings that can be found in English with your class to contextualize the concept.

It is important to examine the difference between a “nonce borrowing” and an “established borrowing.” An established borrowing is entrenched in that variety of the language; a good example would be Spain’s *aceituna*, ‘olive’, which is an established borrowing due to the contact with Arabic. A nonce borrowing, on the other hand, is not established and may lead to confusion if it is used in conversation. The line between an established borrowing and a nonce borrowing may be blurry, but students should at least be given the concept that not all borrowings are automatically anathema. Pountain (2005)

points out that over the course of its history, Spanish has borrowed from a myriad of languages, including Basque, Visigothic, Arabic, Provençal, Italian, French, and English. Many of these borrowings are now so firmly established in the language that it is impossible to imagine Spanish without them.

A semantic extension is what occurs when a word that already has a meaning in Spanish, like *librería*, ‘bookstore’, has its meaning extended to cover another concept, ‘library’. This may occur due to several factors (for example, the existence of a false cognate). Finally, the problem set covers calques, which are word-for-word translations of an English phrase directly into Spanish, instead of using the original Spanish expression or compound noun (e.g. *tener un buen tiempo* ‘to have a good time’ instead of *pasarlo bien*). Together, these are some of the major types of English influence that occurs in U.S. Spanish.

#### 4.2.2 Problem Set 1: Code-Switching

*Introduction.* A common linguistic feature of the dialect of Spanish spoken in the United States is the prevalence of code-switching and borrowing from English. **Code-switching** occurs when a speaker switches from one language to another mid-sentence or even mid-phrase, such as in the following sentence:

(1) *No quiero* the red toy; I want the green one.

Speakers of Spanish who employ code-switching are usually told that it is an incorrect way of speaking. Despite this, linguists have found that there are hidden rules that can help predict when or if a Spanish-speaker will start to speak English mid-sentence. By looking closely, we can figure out what some of these hidden rules are!

QUESTION 1. Examine the following sentences, which have been shown to be “natural” sentences with code switching. (Again, remember that while these sentences might not be considered correct in a formal or scholastic situation, they are occurring in casual conversation among speakers who know both Spanish and English, where it is normal to switch back and forth!)

- (2) I want to go to *la tienda*.
- (3) *Quiero ir a* the store.
- (4) *No creo que son* fifty-dollar suede shoes.
- (5) I want him to come *para que no voy a sentirme sola*.

(Some data from Poplack 1980)

Now examine the next set of sentences. These sentences have been judged “unnatural” – you would never hear them, even in a casual conversation. (The asterisk represents this fact.)

- (6) \**Quiero ir* to the *tienda*.
- (7) \*I want him to come *para* that *no voy a sentirme sola*.
- (8) \*I want him to come *para que no* going to *sentirme sola*.
- (9) \*I want to *ir a la tienda*.
- (10) \**Estoy comiendo*-ing right now.
- (11) \*I’m *eatiendo ahora*.
- (12) \**Quiero que él venga para que no* I am going to feel lonely.

1A. What do all of the “natural” sentences have in common?

1B. How are the “unnatural” sentences (6)-(8) different from the natural sentences?

Make up a rule that explains when a code-switch can naturally occur and when it cannot.

1C. Now look at the unnatural sentences (9)-(12). Does your rule still apply? Modify the rule to explain why these sentences are unnatural.

1D. As seen above, even the practice of code-switching, which is generally stigmatized and judged to be an incorrect, illegitimate form of language, has rules that govern its use.

What does this tell us about the way our brains handle language? What might be some of the reasons for code-switching?

### **4.2.3 Problem Set 1: Teacher’s Guide**

*1A. What do all of the “natural” sentences have in common?*

At this stage, students may have a variety of answers. If the data suggests their answer is correct, even if it is incorrect, do not correct them at this stage. Some sample answers might include things like: “They only switch languages once.” “Only a noun and the article preceding it change languages.”

*1B. How are the “unnatural” sentences (6)-(8) different from the natural sentences?*

*Make up a rule that explains when a code-switch can naturally occur and when it cannot.*

Here, answers should be guided to become a bit more thoughtful. An answer like “The language switches twice” is a good start, but push students to think about the types of words being changed. Aim for a focus on prepositions. Let the students come up with their own rule. This rule will change throughout the problem set, so don’t worry if it is a little off at this stage.

*1C. Now look at the unnatural sentences (9)-(12). Does your rule still apply? Modify the rule to explain why these sentences are unnatural.*

This step should get rid of any rule tying the naturalness of the sentence to the number of times the language switches. The goal should be to have the students begin to think about the way verbs are expressed in English versus Spanish. For example, the sentence \*I want to *ir a la tienda* is redundant – in English the infinitive of a verb is expressed with ‘to’ added on (ex. ‘to go’) but in Spanish the infinitive is self-contained (ex. *ir*). The hope is that students will recognize that this doesn’t make structural sense. If they are truly stuck, you may prompt them to consider the fact that maybe language occurs in “chunks” (ex. ‘We went to the party’ – ‘We’ is a chunk, ‘the party’ is a chunk, and ‘went to the party’ is a chunk). Linguists refer to these chunks as “constituents” and there has been some evidence that while switching between Spanish and English, constituents cannot be broken (Mateu Martín 2011: 2).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> One easy way to test for constituency is by using a substitution test. For example, it is clear that ‘the party’ is a constituent because it can be substituted by the pronoun ‘it’. Likewise, ‘went to the party’ can be substituted by the verb ‘do’. However, there is no way to substitute anything for ‘went to the’, so ‘went to the’ is not a constituent. There are other tests that can be used, but it is not necessary to detail them here.

*ID. As seen above, even the practice of code-switching, which is generally stigmatized and judged to be an incorrect, illegitimate form of language, has rules that govern its use. What does this tell us about the way our brains handle language? What might be some of the reasons for code-switching?*

Lead the class in a discussion to gauge their opinions on the topic. They may come up with their own innovative conclusions. There are, however, some important points that need to be brought up here, which you can work into the discussion:

- Languages have rules that govern them that extend far beyond the grammar that is written in books. Although this grammar may be a helpful guide, all aspects of language, even those aspects that are stigmatized, follow certain patterns and can be explained using a rule-based system.

- Reasons for code-switching have been discussed by several linguistic experts. Studies have found that it occurs overwhelmingly in informal registers (Sánchez-Muñoz 2010:338). It also may have to do with identifying oneself as part of a group that is bilingual in Spanish and English, and in fact, García (2009:140,152) even believes that they are not considered to be codes at all by true bilinguals, but are instead a normal mode of speech. You may also want to share this interesting point about the psychology of bilingualism: Bialystok (1999) observed that, in the brain, even when a speaker is fluent in a language (like Spanish), if a different language is their dominant language (like English), their brain will engage the centers associated with their dominant language while they are performing lexical processing tasks in their less dominant language. These areas of the brain are active when bilinguals are code-switching.

#### 4.2.4 Problem Set 2: Borrowings, Semantic Extensions, and Calques

QUESTION 1. Previously, we discussed how the influence of English on the Spanish spoken in the United States is sometimes manifested as code-switching. Another type of linguistic interference from English that is present in the variety of Spanish spoken in the United States is **borrowing**. Below are some examples of sentences involving borrowing from English. In all cases, the borrowed word has been bolded.

(1) *Tienes un **nickle**?*

‘Do you have a nickel?’

(2) *Voy a **guachar** la televisión luego.*

‘I’m going to watch television later.’

(3) *Él tiene que conducir la **troca** al supermercado.*

‘He has to drive the truck to the supermarket.’

(4) *Me llamó por **teléfono**.*

‘He/she called me on the telephone.’

(5) *Voy a buscarlo en el **internet**.*

‘I’m going to look it up on the internet.’

(6) *Tengo que pagar mis **tajaciones**.*

‘I have to pay my taxes.’

(7) *Vas a tomar tu **medecín**?*

‘Are you going to take your medicine?’

(8) *Me gradué de **jáiscul**.*

‘I graduated from high school.’

(9) *Vivimos en una **sobmarina** amarilla.*

‘We live in a yellow submarine.’

(10) *Puedes pagar el **cheque**?*

‘Can you pay the check?’

(11) *Este **trampe** no tiene hogar.*

‘That tramp doesn’t have a home.’

(12) *Ésta es un juego de **chanza**.*

‘That is a game of chance.’

(Data from Potowski & Carreira 2010, Potowski 2005, Clegg 2010)

1A. What are the words in “standard” Spanish for the borrowings listed above? What are the English words being borrowed?

1B. Why might a word be borrowed? How is this similar or different to code-switching?

1C. Sentence (2) actually has two borrowings from English – *guachar* and *televisión*.

What are the differences between these two borrowed words? List other Spanish words borrowed from English that are more like *televisión* than *guachar*, both in the sentences above and from your daily life.

QUESTION 2. A second way in which English influences the Spanish spoken in the United States is through **semantic extension**. Below are some examples of semantic extension, in italics, paired with sentences that do not exhibit semantic extension (no

italics). Examples of semantic extension are bolded, whereas words that are not semantic extension are not.

(14) a. *El acuerdo se aplica solo a los estudiantes.*

‘The agreement only applies to the students.’

b. *Voy a **aplicar** para un trabajo.*

‘I’m going to apply for a job.’

(15) a. *Lo escribiré en tu carpeta.*

‘I will write it in your notebook.’

b. *Aladino tiene una **carpeta** mágica.*

‘Aladdin has a magic carpet.’

(16) a. *Ella compró sus libros en la librería.*

‘She bought her books in the bookstore.’

b. *Se tiene que estar muy callado en la **librería**.*

‘You have to be very quiet in the library.’

(Data from Clegg 2010)

2A. What is a semantic extension? How is it different from the examples of borrowings given above?

2B. Explain why you think semantic extension occurred in each of the above cases and rewrite the Spanish sentences with semantic extensions.

QUESTION 3. A third way in which Spanish in the United States is influenced by English is through **calqued phrases**. Below are some examples of **calques** in bold.

(17) *Algún día voy a **correr para presidente**.*

‘Someday I am going to run for president.’

(18) *A la fiesta vamos a **tener un buen tiempo**.*

‘At the party we’re going to have a good time.’<sup>5</sup>

(19) a. *Dani está comiendo una manzana.*

‘Dani is eating an apple.’

b. ***Comiendo frutas es buena para la salud.***

‘Eating fruit is good for the health.’

(20) a. *No puedo ir a la fiesta porque estoy estudiando ahora.*

‘I can’t go to the party because I’m studying right now.’

b. *No me gusta **estudiando** para nada.*

‘I don’t like studying at all.’

3A. What is a calque? How is it different from a borrowing? How is it different from a semantic extension?

3B. Explain how the calques above draw from English, and, if you can, rewrite the Spanish sentences so that they do not have English influences.

3C. How might the motivations for calques and semantic extensions be similar to the motivations for borrowings and code-switching? How might they be different?

---

<sup>5</sup> From Pountain (2005)

3D. Sentences (19) and (20) use gerunds (words with the ‘-ing’ ending in English and the *-ando/iendo* ending in Spanish). How are these words usually used in English? How are they usually used in Spanish? What does the existence of the calques in (3b) and (4b) tell you about the overlap – or lack of an overlap?

3E. Can you think of any other examples of borrowings, semantic extensions, and calques in Spanish?

#### **4.2.5 Problem Set 2: Teacher’s Guide**

*1A. What are the words in “standard” Spanish for the borrowings listed above? What are the English words being borrowed?*

Your students may know other words beside the ones listed below. They should be encouraged to share those words and write them alongside the words listed below, even if the words belong to a non-standard dialect of Spanish.

(1) borrowing: *el nicle*/standard: *el níquel*

English: ‘nickel’

(2) borrowing: *guachar*/standard: *mirar*

English: ‘to watch’

(3) borrowing: *la troca*/standard: *la camión*

English: ‘truck’

(4) borrowing: *el telefón*/standard: *el teléfono*

English: ‘telephone’

(5) borrowing: *el internet*/standard: *la red*

English: ‘internet’

(6) borrowing: *las tajaciones*/standard: *los impuestos*

English: ‘taxes’

(7) borrowing: *el medicín*/standard: *la medicina, el medicamento*

English: ‘medicine’

(8) borrowing: *el jáiscul*/standard: *la escuela secundaria*

English: ‘high school’

(9) borrowing: *la sobmarina*/standard: *el submarino*

English: ‘submarine’

(10) borrowing: *el cheque*/standard: *la cuenta, la adición*

English: ‘check’

(11) borrowing: *el trampe*/standard: *el vagabundo*

English: ‘tramp’

(12) borrowing: *la chanza*/standard: *el azar*

English: ‘chance’

*1B. Why might a word be borrowed? How is this similar or different to code-switching?*

Some major points to hit are the fact that borrowing is most often associated with some sort of unfamiliarity on the part of the speakers. Clegg (2010: 226-227) summarizes some of the motivations very succinctly. First, the speakers might not know the original word in “standard” Spanish. This should be a fairly simple reason for your students to figure out. You should also prompt them to consider some of Clegg’s other reasons, as well: she

notes that sometimes if a word loses “its expressive force[...] a new word, which more forcefully conveys the former concept, may be borrowed.” Have your students decide which of the examples on the list might fit this pattern; one example would be *trampe* vs. *vagabundo*. Potowski (2005:26) brings up a context-specific example, which is that in many New York varieties of Spanish, *edificio* refers to smaller buildings, while enormous buildings are sometimes called *bidin*. Clegg puts it neatly when she says, “These bilingual speakers want to express a new cultural reality and choose the term that best expresses it” (235).

Potowski (2005:25) brings up the excellent point that in some cases of English influence, whether it is code-switching or borrowing depends on the pronunciation of the word. You may want to steer your students towards this as well. If/when your students bring up this point (or a similar one), you can share the following example with them:

- (21) a. *Quiero llamarle con mi nuevo telephone.*  
 b. *Quiero llamarle con mi nuevo teléfono.*  
 c. *Quiero llamarle con mi nuevo teléfono.*

In the above examples, (13a) is an example of code-switching, (13b) is an example of nonce borrowing, and (13c) is a case of standard Spanish (actually also a case of borrowing, historically – this is an established borrowing).

*1C. Sentence (2) actually has two borrowings from English – guachar and televisión.*

*What are the differences between these two borrowed words? List other Spanish words borrowed from English that are more like televisión than guachar, both in the sentences above and from your daily life.*

This is an excellent time to expose and establish the differences between a nonce borrowing and an established borrowing. As mentioned in the introduction to this problem set, you might want to have a discussion with students about ways in which certain pairs are very similar to each other. Bring up the point that the line between a nonce borrowing and an established borrowing is sometimes blurry; for example, Sánchez-Muñoz (2010:340-342) feels that *'troca'* has become widespread and generally accepted. If you wish to put borrowings into a historical context, you can emphasize that they occur in every language, citing some examples from English, as well as some classic Spanish words. For example, you could explain to your students that both Spanish *favorito/a* and English 'favorite' are originally borrowed from French *favori/ite*.

*2A. What is a semantic extension? How is it different from the examples of borrowings given above?*

A semantic extension is a case in which a pre-existing word is given a new meaning. Students may have varying answers for the second half of the question; you may judge their accuracy for yourself. The most significant point that should be brought up is that a borrowing involves the adoption of a brand new word, whereas a semantic extension uses a word already in the language and applies it to a novel concept.

*2B. Explain why you think semantic extension occurred in each of the above cases and rewrite the Spanish sentences with semantic extensions.*

Again, student answers may vary. Encourage answers that display an analogy between the English words and the semantic extension.

Some standard Spanish words are given below. If students supply other words, examine those as well.

(14) semantic extension: *aplicar*/standard: *solicitar*

(15) semantic extension: *carpeta* /standard: *alfombra* (Note: this is a great opportunity to tell students that *alfombra* is an established borrowing from Arabic!)

(16) semantic extension: *librería*/standard: *biblioteca*

*3A. What is a calque? How is it different from a borrowing? How is it different from a semantic extension?*

A calque is a literal, word-for-word translation from the English expression. This often occurs with idiomatic expressions. Students may offer multiple correct reasons that a calque is different from a borrowing/semantic extension; the most important is that it involves a full phrase that has been literally translated, not just an individual word. It may be compared to a semantic extension at the phrasal level, in that both take words already in the lexicon and give them a new meaning.

*3B. Explain how the calques above draw from English, and, if you can, rewrite the Spanish sentences so that they do not have English influences.*

Students should give answers that reflect an understanding of the literal-translation nature of calques. Below are some sample rewrites with standard Spanish; if students come up with other rewrites, they should be considered as well.

(17) calque: *correr para presidente*/standard: *presentarse como candidato a la presidencia*

(18) calque: *tener un buen tiempo*/standard: *divertirse, pasarlo bien*

(19) b. calque: *comiendo*/standard: *comer*

(20) b. calque: *corriendo*/standard: *correr*

*3C. How might the motivations for calques and semantic extensions be similar to the motivations for borrowings and code-switching? How might they be different?*

As always, encourage discussion. Some important points might be highlighting the fact that calques and semantic extensions will likewise be driven by ignorance of standard linguistic forms and analogy with English, but they differ in that they are drawing directly from the Spanish vocabulary words already known, using them in concert with English to fill in a gap in meaning.

*3D. Sentences (19) and (20) use gerunds (words with the ‘-ing’ ending in English and the -ando/iendo ending in Spanish). How are these words usually used in English? How are they usually used in Spanish? What does the existence of the calques above tell you about the overlap – or lack of an overlap?*

Many HLLs will calque English gerunds into Spanish, so if this is something you have noticed in your class before – using the gerund in places where Spanish would use the infinitive – you might want to spend extra time on this question. Students may have some insights that can be accepted, but the biggest point that needs to come up in discussion encompasses the fact that there are some situations where we use gerunds in

English, but the infinitive should be used in Spanish: namely, with generalizing statements. Try to resist presenting this as a rule to your class unless they are really truly stumped; like all else in these problem sets, the goal is to have them generate the rules themselves.

*3E. Can you think of any other examples of borrowings, semantic extensions, and calques in Spanish?*

Students may very well have difficulty thinking of some on the spot. This is therefore an excellent question to assign for homework. Tell students watch out for and write down calqued phrases, semantic extensions, and borrowings that they observe over the course of a week, and bring them into their classroom for discussion. Encourage linguistic thinking!

### **4.3.1 Introduction to Problem Set 3**

This problem set is not designed to be a substitution for a full lesson or unit on dialectal and sociolectal variation, but rather one aspect of such a unit; it is designed to be one of many supporting pieces. Although dialectal variation encompasses pronunciation and sentence structure as well as vocabulary, Question 1 includes only reference to vocabulary. Sentence structure variation should be addressed in the preparations for Question 2, and if the exercises are read aloud, pronunciation may also come into play. Of the sample problem sets presented in this thesis, this is the one that is most traditional, as well as the one that is most variable, depending on the backgrounds of the students.

Question 1 is intended to be based in classroom discussion, and Question 2 is intended to be homework.

The goals of this problem set are as follows:

- a. Have students compare their own language forms amongst themselves, to gain a heightened understanding of their own dialects and the comparison with other dialects of Spanish that exist
- b. Lend validity to less prestigious varieties of Spanish while emphasizing the importance of register in usage.

### **4.3.2 Problem Set 3: Dialectal Variation**

*Introduction.* Every language contains differences depending on where it is spoken – even within the same language! The English spoken in Australia is significantly different from the English spoken in the Northeast United States, just as the English spoken in England is quite separate from the English spoken in Texas. None of these forms is any less correct or grammatical – they only differ in terms of linguistic prestige. Spanish is no exception to this norm. In this problem set, we will be examining the dialectal variation represented by the students in this classroom and by various Spanish-speaking countries.

#### **QUESTION 1.**

Take a survey of the linguistic backgrounds of your class.

1A. Where does the Spanish you speak originate? What dialects are most familiar to you?

1B. With your class, come up with all of the words you can think of for the following words:

(1) cake

(2) buddy/friend/guy/dude

(3) 'What's up?'

(4) cute

(5) cool

(6) sweater

1C. Now make a rough linguistic map. Which words are used in many countries? In only one country? Don't forget to include the variety of Spanish spoken in the United States!

1D. In the introduction to this problem set, it says, "None of these forms is any less correct or grammatical – they only differ in terms of linguistic prestige." What do you think this means? What might be the linguistic prestige of the dialect of Spanish that you speak?

1E. Do you think Spanish only varies by country? How might it vary within a country? Can you think of any examples?

QUESTION 2. Translate the following paragraph (from *Don Quijote*) into your own dialect of Spanish. Try to use country-specific words if you have them! If you know a native speaker, ask them for help. Remember, the result should sound casual and authentic.

“En un lugar de la Mancha, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme, no ha mucho tiempo que vivía un hidalgo de los de lanza en astillero, adarga antigua, rocín flaco y galgo corredor. Una olla de algo más vaca que carnero, salpicón las más noches, duelos y quebrantos los sábados, lentejas los viernes, algún palomino de añadidura los domingos, consumían las tres partes de su hacienda. El resto della concluían sayo de velarte, calzas de velludo para las fiestas con sus pantuflos de lo mismo, los días de entre semana se honraba con su vellori de lo más fino. Tenía en su casa una ama que pasaba de los cuarenta, y una sobrina que no llegaba a los veinte, y un mozo de campo y plaza, que así ensillaba el rocín como tomaba la podadera. Frisaba la edad de nuestro hidalgo con los cincuenta años, era de complexión recia, seco de carnes, enjuto de rostro; gran madrugador y amigo de la caza. Quieren decir que tenía el sobrenombre de Quijada o Quesada (que en esto hay alguna diferencia en los autores que deste caso escriben), aunque por conjeturas verosímiles se deja entender que se llama Quijana; pero esto importa poco a nuestro cuento; basta que en la narración dél no se salga un punto de la verdad.”

(Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quijote de la Mancha*)

### 4.3.3 Problem Set 3: Teacher's Guide

*1A. Take a survey of the linguistic backgrounds of your class. Where does the Spanish you speak originate? What dialects are most familiar to you?*

The linguistic make-up of your class will determine the slant of the rest of the problem set. If you have only a few dialects represented in your classroom, you may have to rely on some of the data provided below, and you will have a more direct teaching role. If you have many dialects, your role during this component will be more of a mediator.

*1B. With your class, come up with all of the words you can think of for the following words.*

Several sample dialectal variants are included below for classrooms that may be lacking in data. Always give preference to student-generated forms.

(1) cake

- a. España: *la tarta*
- b. America Latina: *el bizcocho, el queque*
- c. México: *el pastel*
- d. U.S.: *el queic*
- e. Cono Sur: *el bizcochuelo*

(2) buddy/friend/guy/dude<sup>6</sup>

- a. Todo: *amigo*
- b. México: *compinche, tipo*
- c. España: *tío*

---

<sup>6</sup> Note that some of these words are closer to 'buddy' whereas some just mean 'guy.' If desired, you can have a conversation with your class about the various connotations.

d. Perú: *pata*

e. Costa Rica: *maje*

(3) ‘What’s up?’

a. Esp./Todo: ‘¿*Qué tal?*’, ‘¿*Qué pasa?*’

b. México: ‘¿*Qué onda?*’

c. Chile: ‘¿*Qué hubo/Quihubo?*’

d. Cuba: ‘¿*Y qué?*’

(4) cute

a. España: *mono/a*

b. Colombia: *cuco/a*

c. México: *lindo/a*

(5) cool

a. Puerto Rico: *chévere*

b. España: *guay*

(6) sweater

a. México: *suéter*

b. Perú: *chompa/chomba*

c. España: *pullover/jersey*

*1C. Now make a rough linguistic map. Which words are used in many countries? In only one country? Don’t forget to include the variety of Spanish spoken in the United States!*

If you want, you can make a table on the board and tally up the results, or you can group them graphically. This part of the lesson should be very collaborative and creative!

*1D. In the introduction to this problem set, it says, “None of these forms is any less correct or grammatical – they only differ in terms of linguistic prestige.” What do you think this means? What might be the linguistic prestige of the dialect of Spanish that you speak?*

This is the crux of the problem set. Linguistic prestige is wholly separate from grammaticality. From a linguistic point of view, a language is grammatical and “correct” if native speakers of that variety of Spanish judge it to be grammatical and correct. Linguistic prestige, on the other hand, is directly related to how the language is perceived. Many factors combine to generate linguistic prestige, including history, linguistic dominance, and linguistic loyalty. It is subjective, and the opinions of your students will likely reflect this. This is a good opportunity to debate in Spanish or English.

*1E. Do you think Spanish only varies by country? How might it vary within a country? Can you think of any examples?*

Obviously, it does not! Language can vary within any type of social groups: even those living in the same area may speak different varieties. Linguists tend to use the term “dialect” to refer to language variance based on place, and “sociolect” to refer to language variance based on social group. If your students can’t think of any examples, point them towards register differences by hinting that they think in terms of formal and informal speech.

2A. Translate the following paragraph (from *Don Quijote*) into your own dialect of Spanish. Try to use country-specific words if you have them! If you know a native speaker, ask them for help. Remember, the result should sound casual and authentic.

Again, this is a student-driven exercise. The final work may be recited. It should not be corrected for grammar, since it is by nature an exercise in dialectal variation and register variation. An additional component of the exercise, if desired, is to assign the students to explain why they chose some of the words and phrases that they chose. You may be required to assist with the complicated Spanish vocabulary of the *Don Quijote* paragraph, depending on the skill level of the students. If you feel that it is too complicated a language sample, you should also feel free to substitute it out for a language sample that is more appropriate to your students' level.

#### **4.4.1 Introduction to Problem Set 4**

One of the areas of Spanish grammar that persistently plagues HLLs is the use of *a personal*. Although it is a ubiquitous feature in native Spanish, studies have shown persistent problems for HLLs in both the production of *a personal* and grammaticality judgments of sentences containing it (Montrul & Bowles 2009:374-379). Montrul and Bowles (2010) have had some success at improving HLLs' linguistic abilities with *a personal*, at least on a short-term basis, through explicit teaching. Although their study was only preliminary, it indicates that it is an area in which ability gains can readily be made. It is intended that this problem set will involve a similar teaching, except that the students will be discovering the patterns and rules themselves before being given explicitly taught confirmation.

The preposition *a* is used in many different contexts in Spanish, and heritage speakers are better at some of these contexts than others. For example, they are often used to mark indirect objects in the dative case, as in the following example:

- (1) *Roberto (le) regaló un anillo a Patricia.* ('Roberto gave a ring to Patricia.')
- (Montrul & Bowles 2009:364-365)

In indirect object constructions, the preposition *a* is required regardless of whether or not the indirect object is animate. It is also always required with experiencers of such verbs as *gustar*, *encantar* etc., again without regards to the animacy of the experiencer. On the other hand, in sentences involving direct objects, the *a personal* is only required if the direct object is animate or definite, whereas all non-animate and/or indefinite direct objects are ungrammatical with the use of *a personal* (Montrul & Bowles 2009: 365-367). For example, the sentence *Carla conoce a mi hermana* ('Carla knows my sister') requires the preposition *a* because the direct object is animate, but the sentence \**Carla conoce a un lugar bonito* is ungrammatical: since *lugar*, 'place' is not animate, the grammatical sentence would be *Carla conoce un lugar bonito* ('Carla knows a pretty place'). Likewise, the sentence *Sara quiere besar al hombre* ('Sara wants to kiss the man') requires the *a personal*, as it is both animate and definite, but the sentence \**Sara quiere besar a un hombre* is incorrect, because although the direct object is animate, it is also indefinite and therefore violates the definiteness rule.

There are also a few special cases, listed by Montrul & Bowles (2009: 365); "First, nonspecific negative quantifiers like *nadie* 'nobody' always require *a* (*No vi a nadie* 'I didn't see anybody'). Second, inanimate objects can be marked with the preposition *a* if the subject is also inanimate (*La calma precede a la tormenta* 'The calm precedes the

storm’). Third, with animal direct objects, use of the preposition *a* is optional (*Mató el/al mosquito* ‘He/she killed the mosquito’).<sup>7</sup> Montrul & Bowles note that some of the features determining when *a personal* can and cannot be used can get very particular and are still not entirely understood by linguists, for which reason this problem set will focus its attention on more basic uses.

HLLs have been shown to have significant gaps in their command of *a personal*. These gaps are subject to specific constraints: *a personal* is well maintained in the indirect object position but is not maintained with direct objects. HLLs often fail to mark specific and animate direct objects, and have been found to consider sentences without *a personal* in those contexts grammatical. Thus, they clearly had difficulty comprehending semantic constraints on the use of the *a personal* with animate and inanimate direct objects. They similarly had problems with marking the subject experiencers of verbs like *gustar* (374; 377). Clearly, this is a topic that needs to be addressed in a heritage language classroom.

The goal of this problem set are as follows:

- a) Have students examine sample sentences to generate rules about when it is grammatical to use *a* and when it is ungrammatical to do so.

#### **4.4.2 Problem Set 4: The Use of *A Personal***

*Introduction.* Prepositions can be some of the trickiest parts of speech when you’re speaking another language. In this problem set, we will be examining the Spanish

---

<sup>7</sup> The grammaticality of the example *la calma precede a la tormenta* has been questioned by some Spanish speakers, with the corrected phrase being *la calma que precede a la tormenta*, so I have excluded it from this problem set.

preposition *a* to try to uncover some of the rules that govern its use. Remember that English preposition rules might not apply!

QUESTION 1. Examine the following sentences using the preposition *a*, which have been judged grammatical by native speakers.

- (1) a. *Juan (le) mandó dinero a su madre.* ('Juan sent money to his mother.')
- b. *Juan (le) mandó dinero a la escuela.* ('Juan sent money to the school.')
- c. *Ángela envió regalos a su novio.* ('Angela sent gifts to her boyfriend.')
- d. *Ángela envió regalos a la iglesia para el programa de Navidad.* ('Angela sent gifts to the church for the Christmas program.')

Now examine the following sentences that have all been judged ungrammatical. (The asterisks in front of them indicates this.)

- (2) a. *\*Juan (le) mandó dinero su madre.*
- b. *\*Juan (le) mandó dinero la escuela.*
- c. *\*Ángela envió regalos su novio.*
- d. *\*Ángela envió regalos la iglesia para el programa de Navidad.*

1A. Create a rule that can explain why sentences (1a)-(1d) are grammatical, but sentences (2a)-(2d) are not.

QUESTION 2. Now examine these additional sentences judged by native speakers to be grammatical.

- (3) a. *Carla conoce a mi hermana.* ('Carla knows my sister.')
- b. *Carla conoce un lugar bonito.* ('Carla knows a pretty place.')
- c. *Gabriela vio a su amiga.* ('Gabriela saw her friend.')
- d. *Gabriela vio la estatua.* ('Gabriela saw the statue.')
- e. *Marina busca a la mujer.* ('Marina looks for the woman.')
- f. *Sara quiere besar al hombre.* ('Sara wants to kiss the man.')
- g. *Marina busca la casa.* ('Marina looks for the house.')
- h. *Marina busca una casa.* ('Marina looks for a house.')
- i. *Marina busca una mujer.* ('Marina looks for a woman (any woman).')
- j. *Sara quiere besar un hombre.* ('Sara wants to kiss a man.')

In contrast, the following sentences were found ungrammatical by native speakers.

- (4) a. *\*Carla conoce mi hermana.*
- b. *\*Carla conoce a un lugar bonito.*
- c. *\*Gabriela vio su amiga.*
- d. *\*Gabriela vio a la estatua.*
- e. *\*Marina busca la mujer.*
- f. *\*Sara quiere besar el hombre.*
- g. *\*Marina busca a la casa.*
- h. *\*Marina busca a una casa.*
- i. *\*Marina busca a una mujer.*

j. \**Sara quiere besar a un hombre.*

2A. Does your rule need to be revised to encompass this new data? Rewrite the rule so that it also explains why sentences (3a)-(3j) are grammatical, and sentences (4a)-(4j) are ungrammatical.

2B. What is the difference between the sentences in Question 1, where the *a* was always required, and the sentences in Question 2, where the *a* is only occasionally required?

2C. This form of the preposition *a* is referred to as the *a personal*. Why might this be the case?

QUESTION 3. Now examine the following sentences. (The ungrammatical sentences are marked with asterisks.)

(5) a. *A Juan le gusta el helado.* ('Juan likes ice cream.')

b. \**Juan le gusta el helado.*

(6) a. *A Héctor le encanta bailar.* ('Hector loves to dance.')

b. \**Héctor le encanta bailar.*

(7) a. *A Nina le molesta la música jazz.* ('Jazz music annoys Nina.')

b. \**Nina le molesta la música jazz.*

Now examine the following set of grammatical and ungrammatical sentences.

(8) a. *No vi a nadie.* ('I didn't see anybody.')

b. \**No vi nadie.*

(9) a. *No espero a nadie.* ('I'm not waiting for anybody.')

b. \**No espero nadie.*

(10) a. *Mató el mosquito.* ('He/she killed the mosquito.')

b. *Mató **al** mosquito.* ('He/she killed the mosquito.')

(11) a. *Mi hermana ordeña la vaca cada día.* ('My sister milks the cow every day.')

b. *Mi hermana ordeña **a** la vaca cada día.* ('My sister milks the cow every day.')

3A. Do the sentences (5a)-(7b) fit into your rule? Can they be added on, or should there be a new rule?

3B. The sentences (8a)-(11b) seem to be special cases. What is it about these sentences that might prompt ambiguities?

#### 4.4.3 Problem Set 4: Teacher's Guide

1A. Create a rule that can explain why sentences (1a)-(1d) are grammatical, but sentences (2a)-(2d) are not.

Sentences of this type, in which *a* is used with indirect objects, tend to be easy for heritage speakers. The rule that they form here is a preliminary one, so allow them some freedom if they make slightly misguided judgments that are nonetheless supported by the

given evidence. They may, for example, draw analogies with the English preposition ‘to’, which is required in the translation of these sentences.

*2A. Does your rule need to be revised to encompass this new data? Rewrite the rule so that it also explains why sentences (3a)-(3j) are grammatical, and sentences (4a)-(4j) are ungrammatical.*

There are two factors that are highlighted by this new data that should come to light, namely that both animacy (the property of being alive) and definiteness (definite articles vs. indirect articles) play a role in the use of the preposition *a*. When a direct object is both definite and animate (specifically, referring to a person), *a* is required. On the other hand, inanimate objects do not require *a*, nor do indefinite animate objects. If your students are having difficulty, you might want to suggest that they examine the first four sentences in isolation to find a commonality, and then proceed from there.

*2B. What is the difference between the sentences in Question 1, where the *a* was always required, and the sentences in Question 2, where the *a* is only occasionally required?*

This question is attempting to point students towards the distinction between sentences with indirect objects, in which *a* is always necessary, and sentences with direct objects, in which case the *a personal* is used as described above. If your students are having difficulty, encourage them to think about the relationship between the verbs and the objects in the sentence. If they are really stuck, let them count the objects.

2C. This form of the preposition *a* is referred to as the *a* personal. Why might this be the case?

Your students may have a variety of theories, many of which can be accepted. At least one of these answers should focus on the animacy requirement. If someone has a plausible answer based around the specificity requirement, you can accept that, too.

3A. Do the sentences (5a)-(7b) fit into your rule? Can they be added on, or should there be a new rule?

The sentences (5a) – (7b) all feature verbs like *gustar*. Your students may debate whether or not a new rule is necessary; it does not matter if they choose to make a new rule that accounts for all verbs like *gustar* (have them list others if they can), or loop it in to the clause about indirect objects. The key thing is that they identify that with verbs of this sort, the *a* is always used before the indirect object (in these sentences, the name of the person).

Some useful examples of verbs like *gustar* that you might highlight and practice with the preposition *a*:

(12) *aburrir* – ‘to bore’

(13) *fascinar* – ‘to be fascinating to’

(14) *bastar* – ‘to be sufficient’

(15) *importar* – ‘to be important to’

(16) *caer bien (mal)* – ‘to (not) suit’

(17) *dar asco* – ‘to disgust’

(18) *picar* – ‘to itch’

(19) *interesarse* – ‘to be interested in’

*3B. The sentences (8a)-(11b) seem to be special cases. What is it about these sentences that might prompt ambiguities?*

There are two types of special cases here: *a personal* with *nadie*, which is always required, and the optional use of *a personal* with animals. It is important that your students understand the types of the sentences listed and can generalize the patterns that cause their ambiguity. They may have various theories about why exactly the ambiguity exists; encourage the use of logic.

## Chapter 5

### Steps for the Future

As discussed above, the problem sets presented in this thesis are not meant to be comprehensive, but rather to serve as a jumping-off point for future problem sets that can be constructed using linguistic methodology. Research has shown many weak points for heritage speakers that can be made into the basis of problem sets. Potowski (2005:27), building on work by Silvina Montrul, lists several systematic problems that often plague HLLs, noting that they often struggle with confusing the preterite and the imperfect tenses, with using the gerund instead of the infinite in general statements (touched upon briefly in Problem Set 2, above), and with the use of *ha* instead of *he* in statements such as *Yo no ha visto esa película* ('I have not seen that movie'). In my interview with Spanish Professor Julio Torres, he indicated that the HLLs in his classes often had trouble with the subjunctive mood and with gender agreement.

Shin & Otheguy (2009) have also done some excellent work analyzing the factors that determine whether or not overt subject pronouns are used in the speech of heritage speakers from New York City. They discovered that “[b]ilinguals born or raised in NYC are less sensitive to continuity of reference in first- and second-person singular verbs, but in third-person singular verbs they are like monolingual newcomers,” possibly because heritage speakers have higher rates of overt pronoun use in general (111; 133). Any one of these problem areas would prove an excellent subject for a problem set.

Dialectal variation can make a repeated appearance in problem sets, as well; there are a myriad number of speech patterns to be analyzed. Consider, for example, the second-person endings of the preterite. Ducar (2009:358) notes that HLLs often add an

-s to the second-person endings of the preterite (e.g. *dijistes* instead of *dijiste* ‘you said’). Although this is often cited as a mistake, it is actually a phenomenon that occurs in monolingual parts of Spanish-speaking countries, too. This would be an excellent example for a problem set that gives the standard definition of whether or not to use a form with added -s, then cites examples from different countries, monolingual and bilingual, with questions about sociolinguistics. Additionally, problem sets of this style, citing examples of language and encouraging the development of rules, may be constructed as needed to assist with the particular problem areas of a specific class.

In this thesis, the focus has been on using linguistic research and methodology to aid HLLs whose heritage language is Spanish. However, the model proposed, in which linguistic variation (e.g., dialects, registers) is highlighted and linguistic thinking is encouraged through the use of problem sets, need not be confined to heritage language classrooms. Many languages are spoken within the boundaries of the United States, and they all have heritage speakers who might wish to reclaim their own language. Language variation is not unique to Spanish, and struggles with linguistic identity are not unique to Spanish-speaking HLLs. Similar problem sets can be created to emphasize the difficulties that HLLs of other languages experience. Because these problem sets are created to supplement traditional lessons, not replace them, they are by nature flexible, and can be adapted as needed, regardless of their language. Of course, an important prerequisite to such exercises is the knowledge of the students’ baseline language. As discussed above, this language will usually not be the ‘standard’ language found in textbooks, and in many cases may deviate significantly. In order for the problem sets to be effective, this must be taken into consideration when they are constructed.

Linguistics problem sets could even be created to help bilingual students with their English. Let us return to Spanish-speakers for a moment. Dressler et al. (2011) had a successful study in which heritage speakers of Spanish were taught to access their knowledge of cognates between English and Spanish in order to improve their reading comprehension in English, highlighting the fact that such Latin-derived cognates are often found in academic English. Accordingly, studies have found that Spanish-speaking ELLs with knowledge of how to exploit Spanish cognates have far more success in English reading comprehension than their less savvy counterparts. This awareness, however, needed to be taught explicitly (244). This would be an excellent candidate for a time to expand linguistic thinking from beyond the heritage language classroom. Of course, all curriculum topics should be subject to research. Kagan & Dillon (2008:149) point out that this is in fact a vital need for all issues related to HLLs and heritage language education. They note that “[t]he most pressing issues include policy formulation and implementation, curriculum and materials development, the adaptation of foreign language methodology to heritage language teaching, placement, and assessment.”

One final point that may be of interest to theoretical linguists as well as educators is that there is even a possibility that, if the language in question is not well studied, the act of creating such problem sets may spark better linguistic analysis of the language’s structure. In short, the field of linguistics need not only be a tool in the process of aiding heritage speakers to maintain and regain their language, but rather may itself benefit, in a symbiotic process.

## Conclusion

In this thesis, I have presented an argument that linguistic exercises should be used as supplemental teaching tools in HLL classrooms. I have argued for an explicit teaching of sociolinguistic variation as well as the linguistic analysis of some grammatical phenomena. Although HLLs are able to learn using some conventional methods found in foreign language classes, classes for L2 learners are often not an ideal place for them because they have different starting skills and different cultural needs. Many come to the classroom already speaking a dialect of Spanish that often differs from the “standard” Spanish found in textbooks for L2 learners. This may confuse them and lead them to devalue their own variety of Spanish. In a heritage language track, this can be counteracted by teaching students about dialectal variation and variance in register, and by emphasizing that varieties of Spanish do not vary in grammaticality but rather in prestige.

Furthermore, in a heritage language classroom, HLLs’ incipient grammaticality judgments can be developed into a stronger meta-linguistic awareness by the use of problem sets designed not to teach grammar through explicit instruction, which has sometimes been shown to be confusing, but instead by encouraging the students to examine examples of Spanish sentences and to develop their own rules. The hope is that they will begin to think about structural patterns in their daily use of Spanish so they can learn to generalize linguistic patterns.

This method of using linguistics was inspired by the success of Honda & O’Neil (1995), in their experiment on the use of linguistic exercises to help students learn to employ the scientific method. I have noted their progress and pitfalls while designing my

own problem sets, and their methodology has been foundational in the design of this work. These problem sets are intended to be supplemental to a well-established curriculum for HLLs, involving conversation, speaking exercises, and literature. In some cases, they may be used as a bridge or introduction to more traditional classroom activities.

Although within the scope of this thesis the focus has been on the HLLs of Spanish, there is no reason to suppose that the combination of explicitly taught sociolinguistics and problem sets designed to encourage linguistic thinking should only be beneficial to the HLLs of that language. Similar programs can be developed to benefit HLLs of other languages, in order to help them maintain and regain the language of their families, for both personal and societal benefit.

## Appendix A

### Questionnaire for Teachers

QUESTION	María Luisa Parra	Julio Torres
1. How long have you been teaching Spanish as a Foreign Language?	<b>15 years</b>	<b>12 years</b>
2. What is your past experience in Spanish?	<b>Native speaker from Mexico with a PhD in Linguistics. Her dissertation was on how children understand Spanish grammar and how to teach SNS. She came to Harvard as an exchange TA, which led her to become more aware of Spanish as a language.</b>	<b>Grew up speaking Spanish, and has a M.A. in Spanish from St. Louis University, and a M.S. from Georgetown University</b>
3. What classroom materials do you use on a regular basis? Include textbooks, visual materials, and literature.	<b>Currently using the textbook <i>Sol y Viento</i>, but about to change it.</b>	<b>Textbooks, youtube, music, art, literature, field trips to cultural events/plays...</b>
4. On average, what percentage of your students in Foreign Language Classrooms are heritage speakers (i.e., grew up in Spanish-speaking homes or had a Spanish speaking caretaker)?	<b>Generally, there are about 1 or 2 heritage speakers out of every 15-18 students. Not every classroom will have a heritage speaker in it.</b>	<b>5%</b>
5. What are the most apparent strengths of these heritage speakers? What are their greatest	<b>Better pronunciation; accent not as marked. Sometimes they want to take an easy class; also, their vocabulary might all</b>	<b>Their strengths are their pronunciation &amp; comprehension skills. Their weaknesses are lack of vocabulary and</b>

weaknesses?	<b>be lower-register, “familiar” terms.</b>	<b>problematic grammatical structures – subjunctive, gender agreement are a couple of examples.</b>
6. How do they interact with students who are learning Spanish as a foreign language in the classroom?	<b>The pattern is often that at first the L2 learners are intimidated by the heritage speakers, but often at higher levels there is a reversal, and the L2 learners have an advantage over the heritage speakers because they have more formal instruction and know the terminology, grammar, and structure. Of course, if the heritage speakers have studied things formally, they are miles ahead of everyone else! Sometimes they “feel that they should know more, but realize that they don’t... it’s hard for them.”</b>	<b>They seem to interact well, especially, if as the teacher, you create a safe environment.</b>
7. Have all the heritage speakers you’ve taught been at about the same level? If they were not, describe the differences in the levels of the heritage speakers.	<b>Differing levels! Some are proficient orally, but can’t read and write; others may have more trouble expressing themselves, etc.</b>	<b>No. Levels differ in use of vocabulary &amp; fluency.</b>
8. If they were not at the same level, which were the easiest to teach? Which were the most difficult to teach? Why?	--	<b>It seems that the students with higher proficiency were easiest to teach.</b>
9. Have you ever	<b>She has not yet taught a</b>	<b>“I haven’t taught such a</b>

<p>taught a class exclusively for heritage speakers? If not, why not? Do you believe it is useful to separate heritage speakers into separate tracks?</p>	<p><b>Heritage Spanish class, although she would like to do so. She has had some trouble getting one started at Harvard.</b></p>	<p><b>class but yes I believe that heritage speakers should have separate tracks.”</b></p>
<p>10. If you have taught a class exclusively for heritage speakers, how does your teaching method differ from how you teach in a foreign language classroom? Have you had professional training/development in teaching Spanish for Native Speakers?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>11. To what extent do you discuss dialectal variation – that is to say, the differences in Spanish as it is spoken in different places -- in foreign language classrooms? If you do, please describe methodology and the reasoning behind it.</p>	<p><b>She makes it very clear to her students that the Spanish that she teaches is the Spanish from Mexico City, but they have TAs from many different places, including Spain, Argentina, and Peru. When there is a word in the textbook that has dialectal variants that she knows, she teaches them to her students as well.</b></p>	<p><b>“I don’t teach formal lessons on dialectal variation in language classes (I have only done so in linguistic courses); however, I’m aware of it and tell my students when the opportunity comes up.”</b></p>
<p>12. To what extent do you discuss dialectal variation in heritage classrooms (if applicable)? Please describe methodology and the reasoning behind it.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

## Bibliography

- Anderson, Tyler K. 2010. Attitudes towards Spanish language variation among Latinas. In Rivera-Mills & Villa, 291-305.
- Au, Terry Kit-Fong. 2008. Salvaging heritage languages. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 337-351.
- Balestera, Alejandra, Glenn Martínez, and María Irene Moyna. 2008. *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic linguistic heritage: Sociohistorical approaches to Spanish in the United States*. Houston: Arte Público Press.
- Beaudrie, Sara M. 2009. Receptive bilinguals' language development in the classroom: The differential effects of heritage versus foreign language curriculum. In Lacorte & Leeman, 325-345.
- Benmamoun, Elabbas, Silvina Montrul, and Maria Polinsky. 2010. White paper: Prolegomena to heritage linguistics. Online: <http://scholar.harvard.edu/mpolinsky/publications/white-paper-prolegomena-heritage-linguistics>.
- Bialystok, Ellen. 1999. Cognitive complexity and attentional control in the bilingual mind. *Child Development* 70. 636-44.
- Brinton, Donna M., Olga Kagan, and Susan Bauckus. 2008. *Heritage language education: A new field emerging*. New York: Routledge.
- Cacoullos, Rena Torres, and Catherine E. Travis. 2010. Variable *yo* expression in New Mexico: English influence? In Rivera-Mills & Villa, 185-206.
- Christian, Donna. 2008. School-based programs for heritage language learners: Two-way immersion. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 257-268.
- Clegg, Jenn H. 2010. An analysis of the motivations for borrowing in the Spanish of New Mexico. In Rivera-Mills & Villa, 223-237.
- Cohen, Andrew D., and Tania Gómez. 2008. Enhancing academic language proficiency in a Spanish immersion classroom. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 289-300.
- De Cervantes, Miguel. 2012. *El ingenioso hidalgo de Don Quijote de La Mancha. Capítulo I*. Online: <http://www.elmundo.es/quijote/capitulo.html?cual=1>
- Douglas, Masako O. 2008. A profile of Japanese heritage learners and individualized curriculum. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 215-226.

- Dressler, Cheryl, Maria S. Carlo, Catherine E. Snow, Diane August, and Claire E. White. 2011. Spanish-speaking students' use of cognate knowledge to infer the meaning of English words. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 14 (2). 243-55.
- Ducar, Cynthia. 2009. The sound of silence: Spanish heritage textbooks' treatment of language variation. In Lacorte & Leeman, 347-367.
- Duff, Patricia A. 2008. Heritage language education in Canada. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 71-90.
- García, Maryellen. 2009. Code-switching and discourse style in a Chicano community. In Lacorte & Leeman, 137-156.
- Honda, Maya, and Wayne O'Neil. 1995. Triggering science-forming capacity through linguistic inquiry. *The view from building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Samuel J. Keyser and Ken Hale, 229-255. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Hornberger, Nancy H., and Shuhan C. Wang. 2008. Who are our heritage language learners? Identity and biliteracy in heritage language education in the United States. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 3-35.
- Kagan, Olga, and Kathleen Dillon. 2008. Issues in heritage language learning in the United States. *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol 4), ed. by N. Van Deusen-Scholl and Nancy H. Hornberger, 143-156. New York: Springer Science + Business Media.
- King, Kendall A. 2009. Spanish language education policy in the U.S.: Paradoxes, pitfalls, and promises. In Lacorte & Leeman, 303-321.
- Lacorte, Manel, and Jennifer Leeman. 2009. *Spanish in the United States and other contact environments: Sociolinguistics, ideology, and pedagogy*. Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- Leeman, Jennifer. 2010. Introduction: The Sociopolitics of Heritage Language Education. In Rivera-Mills & Villa, 309-317.
- Lo Bianco, Joseph. 2008. Policy activity for heritage languages: Connections with representation and citizenship. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 53-69.
- Lynch, Brian K. 2008. Locating and utilizing heritage language resources in the community: An asset-based approach. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 321-333.
- Mateu Martín, Victoria. 2011. Code-switching in Spanish-English Relative Clauses. Manuscript, UCLA.
- McGinnis, Scott. 2008. From mirror to compass: The Chinese heritage language education sector in the United States. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 229-242.

- McGroarty, Mary, and Alfredo Urzúa. 2008. The relevance of bilingual proficiency in U.S. corporate settings. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 131-146.
- Montrul, Silvina, and M. Bowles. 2009. Back to basics: Differential object marking under incomplete acquisition in Spanish heritage speakers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 12, 3. 363-83.
- O'Connor, J. D. 1980. *Better English Pronunciation*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Obler, Loraine. 2011. Neurolinguistic approaches to study of heritage language speakers. Lecture presented at the Fifth Heritage Language Institute, UCLA, June 2011.
- Paffey, Darren J., and Clare Mar-Molinero. 2009. Globalization, linguistic norms and language authorities: Spain and the panhispanic language policy. In Lacorte & Leeman, 159-173.
- Parodi, Claudia. 2008. Stigmatized Spanish inside the classroom and out: A model of language teaching to heritage speakers. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 199-214.
- Perani D., E. Paulesu, N. Sebastian-Galles, E. Dupoux, S. Dehaene, V. Bettinardi, et al. 1998. The bilingual brain: proficiency and age of acquisition of the second language. *Brain* 121. 1841-52.
- Peyton, Joy Kreeft. 2008. Spanish for native speakers education: The state of the field. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 243-256.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2008. Heritage language narratives. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 149-164.
- Polinsky, Maria, and Olga Kagan. 2007. Heritage languages: In the wild and in the classroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1/5. 368-95.
- Polinsky, Maria, and Robert Kluender. 2007. Linguistic typology and theory construction: Common challenges ahead. *Linguistic Typology* 11. 273-83.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL": Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18, 7/8. 581-618.
- Potowski, Kim. 2005. *Fundamentos de la enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes en los EE.UU.* Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Potowski, Kim, and Maria Carreira. 2010. Spanish in the USA. *Language diversity in the USA*, ed. by Kim Potowski, 66-80. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Potowski, Kim, J. Jegerski, and K. Morgan-Short. 2009. The effects of processing instruction on subjunctive development among Spanish heritage language speakers. *Language Learning* 59. 537-79.

- Pountain, Chris. 2005. Spanglish: myths and realities. School of Modern Languages, Queen Mary, University of London. Online:  
<http://webspace.qmul.ac.uk/cjpountain/spanglish.pdf>
- Rivera-Mills, Susana, and Daniel Villa. 2010. *Spanish of the U.S. Southwest: A language in transition*. Norwalk: Iberoamericana Vervuert Publishing Corp.
- Sánchez-Muñoz, Ana. 2010. Different words for different contexts: Intra-speaker variation in Spanish as a heritage language. In Rivera-Mills & Villa, 337-352.
- Shin, Naomi L., and Ricardo Otheguy. 2009. Shifting sensitivity to continuity of reference: Subject pronoun use in Spanish in New York City. In Lacorte & Leeman, 111-136.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S., and Craig C. Merrill. 2008. The Korean/English dual language program in the Los Angeles Unified School District. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 269-287.
- Valdés, Guadalupe. 1976. Code-switching in bilingual Chicano poetry. *Hispania* 59, 4. 877-86.
- Valdés, Guadalupe et al. 2008. Heritage languages and ideologies of language: Unexamined challenges. In Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 107-130.