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20 YEARS OF HERITAGE LANGUAGE EDUCATION
Heritage Language Initiative, 1998

• Launched in 1998 by the National Foreign Language Center and the Center for Applied Linguistics;

• Goal: (B)uilding an education system that is responsive to heritage communities and national language needs and capable of producing a broad cadre of citizens able to function professionally in both English and another language (Brecht and Ingold, 2002, p. 5).
(1) What is the state of heritage language (HL) education in foreign language departments? How widespread is HL instruction?

(2) How has HL education changed the field of foreign languages? Have HLs led to a paradigm shift in language education?
The first 20 years of HLS: Vigorous innovation

- Research
- Pedagogy
- Field-level presence
Research

- **HL grammars** (Polinsky 2018; Montrul, 2016; Pascual y Cabo, 2016)
- HL learners’ experiences and aspirational and relational needs (Beaudrie, Ducar, & Potowski, 2014; He, 2010, Leeman, 2015)
- **HL v. L2 Learners** (Bowles, 2011; Bowles, Adams & Toth, 2014; Henshaw, 2016; Torres, 2013, 2018)
- **Functional skills** (Swender et al., 2014; Kagan & Kudyma, 2012)
- **Literacy** (Colombi & Harrington, 2012; Mikulski & Elola, 2011; Schwartz, 2003; Friedman & Kagan, O., 2008)
Building on HL learners’ skills (Valdés, 1997; Kagan & Dillon, 2001) Expanding their repertoires.


Responding to HL learners’ aspirations, experiences, and sociocultural needs (Beaudrie, Ducar, & Potowski, 2014; He, 2016; Porra, 1997; Valdés, 1997) Situated language practices.

Differentiating instruction (Carreira & Hitchins Chik, in press): Diversity
Field-level presence

- Heritage Language Journal (2002);
- NHLRC (2006);
- Conferences;
- Mission statements (ACTFL, MLA, AATs, etc.);
- ACTFL SIGs (Spanish as a HL, HLs, in general);
- Workshops;
- Reports, white papers, etc.
Language education today

Two instructional regimens or tracks

1. L2 track
2. HL track
PRAXIS: WHAT IS THE STATE OF HL TEACHING IN INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING?

Geographical sites:
North and Latin America, Europe, Israel, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and Cambodia.

Educational levels: All (pre-K – 16)

Languages (20):
Albanian, Arabic, Armenian (Eastern and Western), Bengali, Brazilian Portuguese, Chinese, Czech, French, Hindi-Urdu, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Pasifika languages, Persian, Russian, Spanish, Turkish, Vietnamese, and Yiddish
Institutionalization

Framework for answering that question:

“a process through which an organization assimilates an innovation into its structure” (Ekholm & Trier, 1987, p. 13);

**Organizations:** Language departments, field of language teaching as a whole

**Innovation:** HL instruction/education
Four indicators of institutionalization

1. **Acceptance** by relevant participants who see the innovation as **valuable** and as **legitimately belonging**;

2. **Widespread use** of the innovation throughout the institution, organization, district, etc.;

3. **Firm expectation** that use of the practice and/or product will **continue**;
Indicators of institutionalization

4. The innovation is **stable** and **routinized** in the sense that:

   – Continuation does not depend on the actions or motivations of specific individuals but on the culture or structure of the organization or on procedures that have been put in place to support the innovation; and

   – Time, space, personnel, funding, and other resources are **routinely allocated**.

In this presentation

• Focus on the state of HL instruction in the U.S., and within that, higher education (for research on K-12, see Kagan, 2017);
Higher education
(Carreira, 2017)

Online survey of 296 language programs in the U.S. that teach HL learners (+ selective follow up interviews and class visits/observations);

Geographical sites: 34 states;

Institution types:
Roughly two thirds (202/296) of the institutions represented are public and the rest are private. One third (99) are Ph.D. granting institutions, 21.9% (65) are terminal M.A. granting institutions, 16.2% (48) are terminal B.A. granting institutions, and 11% (34) are community colleges
27 Languages

Spanish (76), Chinese (50), Arabic (44), Russian (36), Hindi/Urdu (32), Korean (13), Farsi (11), Vietnamese (5), Japanese (4), Tagalog (3), Hebrew (2), Portuguese (2), Punjabi (2), Serbo-Croatian (2), Yoruba (2), Armenian (1), Bulgarian (1), French (1), Greek (1), Hmong (1), Hungarian (1), Indonesian (2), Italian (1), Polish (1), Tamil (1), Thai (1), Yiddish (1).
Some findings: Programs with HL courses

• Close to half (47%, 141/296) of the programs surveyed have some separate instruction for HL learners (cf. Beaudrie (2011, 2012) for similar numbers for Spanish);

• A significant majority (65.2% 92/142) of programs with an HL track offer one or two levels of instruction. Programs with four or more levels are fairly uncommon (14%).
Typical dual-track program

HL track
1-2 HL courses (intermediate)

L2 track
Full range of courses
Programs without HL courses

• 53% of programs

• Among such programs, roughly half (48%) offer HL instruction in some kind of alternative/out-of-classroom format: independent studies, service learning, tutoring, internships, etc.

• If we factor these into the 47% of programs cited earlier, the percentage of programs that offer HL-specific instruction, in one form or another, rises to 73% (215/296).
Institutionalization?

• On the surface:
  
  Widespread implementation of HL instruction and acceptance of this innovation in foreign/world languages programs.

  But acceptance by whom?

  Administrators? Instructors?
  Students? (mixed picture)
  Society at large? (America’s Languages)
Instructors, administrators

• The availability of HL instruction (HL classes and alternative options) often depends on high levels of volunteerism and initiative by committed faculty rather than institutional support.
• As a result, in many programs the availability of HL instruction fluctuates from one term to another.
• This creates problems of continuity and articulation across the curriculum.
Institutionalization of HL courses in higher ed

1. Acceptance is primarily at the level of instructors, not the institutional level.
2. Limited scope of implementation.
3. High levels of volunteerism.
4. No routine allocation of resources.
This situation contrasts with L2 education

• L2 courses and curricula are a staple of language programs across educational levels

• There is no need to justify them to administrators and resources are routinely allocated for them

➢ L2 teaching is fully institutionalized

➢ HL teaching is not
FACTORS THAT WORK AGAINST HL COURSES
Consider a department with HL and L2 learners and with modest enrollments and resources:

**Options**: L2 class, HL class

**Consideration**: HL learners can “get by” in mixed classes (but L2 learners cannot get by in HL classes).

**Result**: Mixed classes make more economic sense than HL classes, particularly in relatively small departments or where enrollments are an issue.
Lack of HL materials and trained teachers

Consider a department with HL and L2 learners struggling with finding qualified instructors:

Options: L2 class v. HL class

Consideration: More instructors can teach L2 classes than HL classes. Teaching HL classes involves creating pedagogical materials.

Result: Mixed classes make more staffing sense.
Concerns over the integration of the two tracks

Consider a department with HL and L2 learners:

Options: One track v. Two tracks

Consideration: Eventually both tracks merge. At that point, there will be differences between HL and L2 learners that will interfere with the integration of the tracks.

Result: A single track make more programmatic sense than HL classes.
Differences between HL and L2 learners in upper division classes

Study (Carreira, in progress):

• Survey: 201 respondents (164 HLLs, 37 L2Ls);
• Administered to upper division Spanish classes with HL and L2 learners;
Suppose your teacher gives you the scenario below. What is your best guess as to what this activity is trying to review or teach? Please answer below.

Imagine you are crowned king of the world tomorrow and can order anyone to do anything. Complete the following sentences: (1) I insist that everyone...; (2) I want schools to ...; (3) It’s better that all businesses ...; (4) I will not permit parents to...
What’s this activity about?

Teaching the **subjunctive**
CATEGORIES OF RESPONSES BY HL LEARNERS
Category 1: Meaning/content, non-grammar related

• This activity wants to show the different ideas that the students might have about the world;
• Responsabilidad;
• Maybe the teacher wants to know how you think the world should be or how you would run things;
• Esta actividad quiere ver nuestras opiniones, y quiere saber lo que nosotros valoramos.
a. On-point answers:
   – My best guess as to what this activity is trying to review is work on the **subjunctive**.

b. Very general grammar-related answers:
   – This activity is trying to teach how to finish sentences and what phrases or grammar can go into them.
   – Usage of verbs.
c. Off-base grammar-based answers:

– review the tense of the adjectives;
– Preposiciones;
– Using relative pronouns;
– I believe that this activity is trying to review the future tense in a sentence. Because it is something that has not been done yet.
“No sé” (I don’t know) type answers;
HL learners n=55

On point answers:
  Subjunctive: 2/55 (4%);
  Indicative: 2/55 (4%);

Category 1: Focus strictly on content/meaning, not language
  23/55 (41%);

Category 2: Spanish grammar (correct, but vague or incorrect):
  Correct: 9/55 (16%)
  Incorrect: 4/55 (8%)

Category 3: No sé:
  4/55 (8%)

L2 learners n=14

Subjunctive: 12/14 (86%);
  1/14 (7%)

Correct but vague: 1/14 (7%)

0
Intro to Spanish Linguistics (423)

HL learners n=55

On point answers:
  Subjunctive: 2/55 (4%);
  Indicative: 2/55 (4%);

Category 1: Focus strictly on content/meaning, not language
  23/55 (41%);

Category 2: Spanish grammar (correct, but vague or incorrect):
  Correct: 9/55 (16%)
  Incorrect: 4/55 (8%)

Category 3: No sé:
  4/55 (8%)

L2 learners n=14

Subjunctive: 12/14 (86%);
  1/14 (7%)

Correct but vague: 1/14 (7%)

0
This student’s answer...

This activity is trying to review/teach how to complete statements that pertain to what you "the king" would want to do.
Is this student really an L2 learner?

• Why are you studying Spanish?
  I want to learn Spanish because my family members speak Spanish, I want to be able to use it in the professional field.

• Short bio:
  We spoke English almost always, but there was some Spanish too like when relatives stayed with us or when we visited family in Mexico.
What do we learn from this?: Context of learning matters

• HL learners are more focused on content than language (Torres, 2013, 2018);
• HL learners have limited disciplinary literacy – i.e. expertise related language learning in a formal context (Carreira, 2016);
• This is not just a result of their having learned their HL in a naturalistic context, but also a result of HL pedagogy.
• HL instruction – when done correctly - exacerbates the differences between HL and L2 learners, making it harder to manage instruction at the point at which both populations come together in mixed classes
Concerns over the integration of the two tracks

Consider a department with HL and L2 learners:

**Options**: One track v. Two tracts

**Consideration**: Eventually both tracks merge. At that point, there will be differences between HL and L2 learners that will interfere with the integration of the tracks.

**Result**: The single track make more programmatic sense than HL classes.
Recapping

- Mixed classes make more economic sense than HL classes, particularly in relatively small departments or where enrollments are an issue.
- Mixed classes make more staffing sense.
- Mixed classes make more programmatic sense than HL classes.
These factors may create a ceiling effect on the availability of HL classes (widespread use of the innovation) within the current realities of foreign language teaching.
1. What is the state of heritage language (HL) instruction in foreign language departments?

   How widespread is the innovation? Scope: Change in the organization ➔

   HL courses are fairly common, but there are limitations.

2. How has Hls education changed the field of foreign languages?

   Change to the organization (depth).

   Have Hls led to a paradigm shift in language education?
MIXED CLASSES
(CLASSES WITH L2 + HL LEARNERS)
Mixed classes can be more complex than that

- L2 learners +
- HL speakers of the target language (+)
- HL speakers of a language or dialect that is closely related to the language of instruction and/or HL speakers of a regional language that is not genetically related to the language of instruction (e.g. Tamil speakers in a Hindi class);
- Native speakers of the target language or of other related languages (Gambhir, 2008).
In principle

Mixed classes should employ specialized pedagogy for teaching HL and L2 learners together

\[ \uparrow \]

- HL-based instructional practices
  + L2-based instructional practices
  + ????

Mixed classes ≠ L2 classes
In practice...

Many mixed classes are often indistinguishable from L2 classes in terms of practices, syllabi, curricula, etc.
Survey: Respondent comments

I did not give particular consideration to HL--they are usually a very small segment of the class.

(Names of book) does not address the needs of HL but it does a good job at the beginning level where the majority of our students take the (name of language) as a general language requirement and where we have less HL (15%) than at more advanced levels.

In the past five and half years of our program, we only had 2 heritage speakers. So we focus on true beginners, and we don't address the needs of the HL learners.

(Carreira 2014, 2017)
Survey responses (cont.)

- All mixed classes use L2 textbooks/materials.
- No mixed classes use HL textbooks, even when such books exist and HL students are the majority population.
In fact...

- There are no textbooks or materials for mixed classes
  - L2 books will have marginal notes on HL learners
  - HL books do not have similar notes for L2 learners
- There is no established pedagogy of mixed classes

**ALL OF THIS SUGGESTS THAT THE L2 PARADIGM IS THE DEFAULT IN LANGUAGE EDUCATION**
1. What is the state of heritage language (HL) instruction in foreign language departments?

HL courses are fairly common, but there are limitations.

Change in the organization (scope).

2. How has HLs education changed the field of foreign languages?

Change to the organization (depth): Have HLs led to a paradigm shift in language education?

Not really
What would a paradigm shift look like?
Globalization requires us to focus less on predetermined, stable, predictable facts of a linguistic, functional, or cultural nature, and more on such fluid discourse processes as comparison, contrast, analysis, interpretation...If we teach FL not primarily for academic purposes but for their use in the real world by secondary school students and first- and second-year students at colleges and universities, most of them nonmajors, then FL instruction must take into account the discourse skills necessary to navigate this new global world (Kramsch, 2014, p. 308). (see also Firth & Wagner, 1996, LoBianco, 2014)
The contact zones
(Pratt, 1991)

All communities that involve interactions between diverse languages and cultures are contact zones. It is not only that a community is in contact with other communities, adopting changes deriving from this ongoing history of interaction: the community itself constitutes members who bring with them diverse values, identities, and repertoires that are in contact (Canagarajah, 2017, p. 66).
The contact zones

• Many languages spoken in non-Western multilingual communities are in contact zones (Canagarajah, 2017).

• English in many parts of the world inhabits a contact zone, as a *lingua franca* (Canagarajah, 2007).

• All HLs in the U.S. inhabit a contact zone by virtue of the diverse values, identities, and repertoires of the communities of speakers (monolinguals, bilinguals of different proficiency levels, multilingual, etc.).
Canagarajah (2007)

Competencies for the contact zones (professionals)

- Procedural knowledge (the how of communication);
- Exploratory practices and expanding repertoires
- Grammar of practice
- Collaboration to achieve shared meanings and norms
- Diversity

SLA constructs

- Propositional knowledge (the what of communication);
- The primacy of the native speaker;
- Competence of grammar;
- Adhering to fixed forms
- Homogeneity
Alignment with the dual track paradigm

### The HL track
- Procedural knowledge (the how of communication);
- Exploratory practices and expanding repertoires
- Grammar of practice
- Collaboration to achieve shared meanings and norms
- Diversity

### The L2 track (mixed classes)
- Propositional knowledge (the what of communication);
- The primacy of the native speaker;
- Competence of grammar;
- Adhering to fixed forms
- Homogeneity
Tecnología en el campo médico

Spanish 250 / Fall 2016
Aracely Ochoa & Andrea Toyofuku
La tecnología ha permitido muchos avances en el campo de la medicina.

Ejemplos:
- El microscopio compuesto
- El desfibrilador
- Las vacunas
- La técnica aséptica
Es un dispositivo (mecanismo) de plástico y titanio, que puede durar en funcionamiento hasta 10 años.
• **Definición:** Un tratamiento médico que sustituye las funciones renales cuando los riñones fallan.

• En 2015, aproximadamente 468,000 individuos necesitaron diálisis.
IF THIS IS A DESIRABLE COMPETENCY FOR HL LEARNERS, WHY IS IT ALSO NOT SO FOR L2 LEARNERS?
The HL track

• Procedural knowledge (the how of communication);
• Exploratory practices and expanding repertoires
• Grammar of practice
• Collaboration to achieve shared meanings and norms
• Diversity

The L2 track (mixed classes)

• Propositional knowledge (the what of communication);
• The primacy of the native speaker;
• Competence of grammar;
• Adhering to fixed forms
• Homogeneity
Globalization requires us to focus less on predetermined, stable, predictable facts of a linguistic, functional, or cultural nature, and more on such fluid discourse processes as comparison, contrast, analysis, interpretation...If we are teach FL not primarily for academic purposes but for their use in the real world by secondary school students and first- and second-year students at colleges and universities, most of them nonmajors, then FL instruction must take into account the discourse skills necessary to navigate this new global world (Kramsch, 2014)
Mixed classes

• L2 learners +
• HL speakers of the target language (+)
• HL speakers of a language or dialect that is closely related to the language of instruction and/or HL speakers of a regional language that is not genetically related to the language of instruction (e.g. Tamil speakers in a Hindi class);
• Native speakers of the target language or of other related languages (Gambhir, 2008).
A paradigm shift in language education

A common regimen for all students

Developing a competence of practice for communicating effectively in the contact zones, abroad and in the U.S.
What might that look like in practice?

• A lot has been written about new paradigms of language teaching and learning, competencies, languages in a globalized world, etc...

• Little, if any at all, by practitioners. All of it is much too abstract to be of direct application to the classroom context, which is quite complex and varied.

• There is a need for more specificity.
Project-based language learning

• Learning by doing (Dewey, 1966; Stoller, 2006);
• Language instruction is organized around the overarching goal of solving real-world problems or challenges;
• Stages of working with information to create a product that represents that solution
  – Gathering Input
  – Processing Focus on form, meaning connections
  – Presenting Output
Project-based language learning

• Sample project: The medical glossary;

• Not just for higher levels of proficiency

An entire language curriculum configured around increasingly demanding projects. (Much like a piano repertoire)

– Beginning projects: Input oriented products (collecting and using other people’s words, focus on the self and the mainstream school curriculum)

– Intermediate and advanced: Output oriented products. Creating with language, self -> professional fields

– ACTFL Can-do Statements
Mapping a curriculum of projects

ACTFL Performance Descriptors for Language Learners, 2012, p. 13
Advantages of this approach

- Develops competencies for a global work and the contact zones: performance based, real-world communication, grammar of practice.
- A project-based curriculum lends itself to dealing with diversity
  - Makes it possible to attend to the needs of HL and L2 learners in the same class
  - Enables multiple-level classes
- May be a way to expand the range of languages offered in K-16.
Only 1 in 5 Students was enrolled in a foreign language course in 2014-15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>% students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>69.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The National K-12 Foreign Language Enrollment Survey Report
Figure 3. Distribution of High School LCTL Programs by Languages
• Project-based curricula in a wide variety of languages for K-16 can be developed and be made available for use by community schools, parents, afterschool programs, course sharing in high schools and colleges, etc.;

• Technology can play a key role here, providing access to authentic input and opportunities for authentic language use, including exchanges with speakers of the target language outside the US.
To conclude

• The first 20 years of the field HL:
  
  Accomplishments:
  – Foundations of the field and significant implementation of HL courses
  – Change in the field
    
    But issues of continuation, allocation of resources, acceptance, etc. loom large
The Next 20 years

• Change to the field:

Leading the way in the kind of paradigm shift envisioned in Kramsch (2014) and Canagarajah (2007, 2017) and this conference;

Project-based language learning offers a promising way forward.
In memoriam

Olga Kagan
December 25, 1946 – April 6, 2018
Director and Founder of the National Heritage Language Resource Center, UCLA


• STOP HERE
America’s Languages: *Investing in Language Education for the 21st Century* (henceforth America’s Languages)

- Commissioned by a bipartisan group of members of Congress;
- Authored by the Commission on Language Learning of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences
Advocates for building foreign language capacity and outlines a national strategy for expanding language education so as to “improve access to as many languages as possible for people of every region, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background” (viii).
To that end, it recommends building capacity in five areas:

- teacher training
- public-private educational partnerships
- heritage languages
- Native American languages
- study abroad.
To that end, it recommends building capacity in five areas:

- teacher training
- public-private educational partnerships
- heritage languages
- Native American languages
- study abroad.
The United States has a pressing need for multilingual individuals; HL learners can help fill that need by building on their home-based bilingualism and biculturalism through formal instruction and community-based initiatives; Educational settings should provide more language learning opportunities for HL learners.
But...

Back to the future

• Brecht & Ingold (1998);
• Pufahl, Rhodes & Christian (2002);
• 2007 report by the MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages on the changing structure of language education;
• 2012 report by the US Senate identifying the language needs of the Federal Government;
• ACTFL’s 2017 Lead with Languages
(P)roficiency in English is not sufficient to meet the nation’s needs in a shrinking world, nor the needs of individual citizens who interact with other peoples and cultures more than at any other time in human history... Heritage speakers have a working knowledge of a second language even before they enter the classroom. Prior to any educational investments at the local, state, or federal levels, they have a head start in achieving the kind of biliteracy that would be as beneficial to them individually as it would be to the nation as a whole. Undoubtedly, they can only become proficient in their heritage languages through persistent study and ongoing instruction.
The United States has an unprecedented need for individuals with highly developed competencies in English and one or more other languages. Because the United States interacts with virtually every nation in the world, and because U.S. society includes individuals and communities from many of those nations, the need for proficiency in their languages for use in social, economic, and geopolitical areas has never been higher. It is for these reasons that the nation needs a strategy for developing an important, but largely untapped, reservoir of linguistic competence “heritage language speakers”...