The Professional Development of Teachers of Heritage Language Learners: A Matrix

Olga E. Kagan, University of California at Los Angeles
Kathleen E. Dillon, University of California Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching, UC Davis

"The linguistic and cultural makeup of our nation and the need for America's [students] to have 'communicative competence' in their own as well as others' languages provide the most cogent argument for taking a new look at second language education" (Tedick & Walker, 1994, p. 300).

According to the American Community Survey 2005-2008, 20% of the U.S. population speaks a language other than English at home. Many teachers who were educated as teachers of foreign languages thus find themselves teaching languages that are not at all foreign to their students. The terms 'heritage language' (HL) and 'heritage language learner' (HLL) were coined and have become mainstream over the past, ten years, but teachers continue to struggle to find successful approaches to teaching HLLs. A pressing need to prepare foreign language teachers to teach heritage languages is broadly acknowledged in the profession. This article presents a series of steps that could be included in teacher preparation courses and programs to better equip future teachers for the contemporary foreign language classroom. These steps constitute a matrix that derives from knowledge and understanding of the heritage language community and heritage learner characteristics, including students' sense of identity and language specific linguistic features.

Introduction: Why Heritage Language Instructors Need Special Preparation

The heritage subfield of second language acquisition developed in foreign language programs in the U.S. beginning in the early 1990's when, because of the rapidly changing demographic composition of the country, students whose home language is not English began to enter college foreign language departments in large numbers. Language teaching faculty reacted with dismay for the most part, finding that these students did not have the same needs or learning objectives as the traditional foreign language students who are learning a second language (L2). Faculty drew different but mainly negative conclusions that the "heritage" students already knew the language and therefore had no place in their classes, or that they were enrolled in the classes solely to get an "A" grade or to place out of a language requirement. All of
these perceptions contributed to the same conclusion in the eyes of the instructor: the heritage students were disruptive and an obstacle to learning for L2 students and therefore had no place in their programs. Over time, instructors did begin to pay serious attention to heritage language learners (HLLs) and to search for effective pedagogical approaches; however, they usually focused on the deficits in HLLs' linguistic knowledge. More recently, we have been emphasizing the assets that HLLs bring to the learning experience. One of the fundamentals of preparing teachers of heritage languages (HLs) is to inculcate positive attitudes.

Lee and Oxelson (2006) discuss how teacher preparation and awareness may be the key elements in determining the quality of language teaching and also are crucial factors in the teachers' attitudes to heritage language speaking students. The researchers found that BCLAD/ESL teachers (The Bilingual, Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Certificate, required for credentialing of foreign language and ESL teachers in California) who were prepared for dealing with HLLs were more positive toward HL maintenance, whereas non-BCLAD/ESL teachers did not feel it was their job to help students maintain their home languages. The authors conclude that "...positive attitudes toward bilingualism and heritage languages" (p. 466) may depend on teacher preparation.

Spanish is by far the most widely spoken language other than English in the United States, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2007): It is therefore not surprising that Spanish departments were the first responders to the "heritage challenge," and they began to open sections of "Spanish for Native Speakers." The pioneers in heritage language research also came from Spanish. Scholars like Guadalupe Valdes, who formulated the original definition of the heritage speaker, were the first to conduct and publish research on the heritage phenomenon and to author heritage language textbooks. Over the course of about 15 years, instructors and programs in Chinese, Russian, Filipino, Vietnamese, and other languages also began to develop materials aimed specifically at HLLs. Nevertheless, it is still true today as it was in 2001 that "[few teacher preparation programs include training in heritage language issues, and those that do find little to guide them in the development of instructional methods and curricula" (Schwartz, 2001, p. 229). The positive current development is that the need for heritage language instruction is now acknowledged by educators and government agencies, as witnessed by the funding of the new National Heritage Language Resource Center (NHLRC) dedicated to expanding research in the field so that instructor training and materials development will reflect a deeper understanding of how the HLLs and L2 learners differ.
Foreign language teachers are trained and experienced in instructing L2 learners. As language programs expand their curricula to accommodate heritage speakers, dedicated teachers struggle to meet these students' needs. Meeting this challenge requires the development of approaches that are sometimes counterintuitive to current practitioners' training and experience with L2 students. Therefore, professional development for the new generation of foreign language teachers, as well as for the experienced ones, should include an emphasis on heritage language teaching as standard practice.

Certainly teachers of languages that attract large numbers of HLLs are in urgent need of training in how to teach these students, either separately or in mixed classes. If teacher educators focus exclusively on non-heritage students, they are handicapping the teachers as well as the students, given the demographic reality that brings HLLs to foreign language classrooms. A key component of a teacher training program ought to be the incorporation of "reflective practices" (Geyer, 2008) of self-observation in the classroom. Teacher educators need to ensure that trainees reflect on the nature of the heritage learner as well as the nature of heritage language learning. Understanding the difference between heritage and non-heritage learners' needs is of paramount importance in educating foreign language teachers. To that end, we have developed the matrix presented in this paper to serve as a guideline for those who are starting to prepare or re-tool instructors to teach HLLs.

The Proposed Matrix

Foundations and Rationale: Learner Characteristics

Our matrix is based on the research that has been conducted thus far on HLLs (e.g., Brinton, Kagan, & Bauckus, 2008; Kondo-Brown, 2006; Peyton, Ranard, & McGinnis, 2001; Potowski, 2002; Roca & Colombi, 2003; Webb & Miller, 2000; *Heritage Language Journal*, 2003-2008) and on our experience in offering heritage teacher training workshops during which participants from various languages posed the questions of greatest concern to them (see Appendix and Endnote 4). Also informing our recommendations are the early results of a large-scale, online national survey of post-secondary HLLs currently being conducted by the NHLRC (National Heritage Language Resource Center, 2009).

The purpose of the online survey is to gather information about HLLs' backgrounds, attitudes, and goals in studying their heritage language so as to better inform the NHLRC's efforts in HL curricular design, production of HL materials, and professional development projects. As of December 2008, more than 1,700 HLLs have participated in the survey.
Polinsky and Kagan (2007) suggest that HLLs can be assigned to one of two categories: broad definition and narrow definition. Broad definition refers to the HLLs' emotional attachment to the language and culture as a connection to their family background and history. Narrow definition describes those who have actual proficiency in the language. Both groups have a familial tie to the language. However, for the purposes of teacher preparation, in this paper we are primarily concerned with the narrow definition of HLLs while also retaining awareness of the significance of "emotional attachment." The survey referred to in this paper was administered to narrow definition HLLs, who are the speakers of immigrant languages (Fishman, 2001).

One of the most significant factors affecting narrow definition HLLs' language proficiency is the age at which they start their education in the majority language. The figure below shows that HL use declines sharply when children enter kindergarten.

**Figure 1: NHLRC Survey: Language Use by Has in Relation to Age**

![Graph showing language use by age](image)

Figure 2 below demonstrates that HLLs are well aware of the strengths and limitations of their proficiencies in the home language. Few of them regard their reading and writing, or even speaking abilities as native-like, and a high percentage of respondents assess their listening
comprehension as the most developed skill. Instructors who teach HLLs generally concur with these perceptions.

**Figure 2: Self Assessment: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing.**

Our proposed matrix derives from this basic understanding about the different starting points. Whether at minimum or high levels of competence HLLs in our classes are building on some knowledge of the target language and culture (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 2006). Studies for several different languages (e.g., those mentioned in Endnote 4) indicate that even HLLs without literacy have speaking proficiencies between Intermediate-Low and Advanced on the ACTFL scale (Kagan & Friedman, 2004; Sohn & Shin, 2007). Classroom experience and students' self-evaluations indicate that listening comprehension ability is generally higher. This is easily explained by the substantial meaningful input that HLLs receive from home and community as well by the amount of their language output up to at least the age of five. The role of the community also explains why HLLs' motivation for taking a course in the language may also be significantly different from the L2 learners'.
As Figure 3 indicates, HLLs are primarily motivated to acquire and improve their language skills by a desire to learn about their cultural and linguistic roots and to strengthen their connections to their families and communities in the United States. Awareness of all these factors must inform the design of a syllabus for a HL class or for a combined HLL and L2 group. As part of the preparation process, we suggest that teachers explore approaches that will raise the students' awareness of their implicit knowledge and its value and then work toward making that knowledge explicit. One of the fundamentals of preparing teachers of HLs is to inculcate positive attitudes a) in the instructor toward the heritage students, communities, and cultures and b) in the HLLs toward their baseline proficiencies and toward their language and culture, as they are encountered in both the home country and in the diasporas.

To be successful in motivating HLLs and in maximizing their chances to increase their proficiency, the instructor needs to be sensitive to the heritage communities and the cultures that are embedded in them. Another factor that must inform a heritage curriculum is awareness of the fact that HL preservation is of great importance and benefit to the heritage community. Members of heritage communities are stakeholders in the enterprise and can become supporters of and participants in it. It is difficult to disagree with Lynch (2008, p. 332) who writes that "HL
Step 1. Building on the Knowledge of the Heritage Learner

The first step in the teacher preparation process is to examine the research. It is essential for HL instructors to know what has been written about heritage speakers in general and what language-specific studies have revealed that can inform the structure of a course syllabus.

Richards (1990) discusses needs analysis in teacher preparation, his first question being "Who are the learners?" (p. 2). The more the instructor knows about the group and the individuals that comprise it, the more connected and successful the teaching will be. This is especially true in HL teaching, where the affective factor has an even stronger impact (see Figure 3 on HLLs' motivations above).

The survey of the narrow definition HLLs indicates that the learners want to learn or relearn the home language because they want to know about their "cultural and linguistic roots" or because they want to be able to communicate better with their family members (Figure 3). Their families (98% according to the survey) also overwhelmingly want them to maintain their home language. The survey provides evidence (see Figure 4 below) that HLLs express mainly positive feelings toward their heritage language. One may argue that these students are enrolled in HL classes and are thus a self-selected group. This may be true, but our matrix is intended for teachers of just such students and for teacher educators whose job it is to train language teachers.
The majority shares the viewpoint that "it is a valuable skill" and "a necessary skill" and finds the language "useful."

**Step 2. Building on Knowledge of Community**

HLLs are situated not only in their families but also in their communities. Demographics as well as the history of immigration must be taken into account in order to meet HLLs' needs. Thus, the notion of the learner-centered classroom and curriculum acquires a special meaning. Patrikis (2007) suggests that instructors need to have a strong background not only in the language but also in the target culture.

The culture of communities speaking a minority language is a culture in contact, and the language spoken by immigrant communities is a language in contact. The baseline of both is different from the monolingual 'national' culture that we tend to consider the target culture. A heritage language instructor needs to be familiar not only with the history and culture of the language in its primary locus, but also with history of immigration and the community's sociopolitical preferences and idiosyncrasies. One of the fundamentals of a successful heritage
language program is that teachers know the heritage community and culture as well as they know the culture from the target country. As Wiley, de Klerk, Li, Liu, Teng, and Yang (2008) explain in their examination of Chinese HLLs, "it is necessary to understand the notion of heritage language among Chinese, first among their home region settings, and secondly within the United States... instruction efforts may be ignoring the subtleties of language varieties, usage, and attitudes that exist in the home region" (p. 72). In her survey of Vietnamese instruction in the United States, Lam (2006) notes that instructors primarily teach the North Vietnamese dialect while the majority of the students come from South Vietnamese families. The conflict is not purely linguistic, as it also reflects Vietnamese history. Instructors who insist on teaching the northern dialect without regard for their students' backgrounds understandably have encountered resistance from students and particularly their families.

A community-based curriculum might include students interviewing family and community members, recording oral histories, researching the history of the country, and the history of immigration. To ensure that heritage language curricula are learner-centered and community-based, a successful protocol for preparing instructors of HLLs should include instruction on how to collect and assess (1) local demographic data, and (2) biographical-linguistic data that include information about place of origin, age at immigration, language/s or dialect's spoken at home, and prior study of the HL. This knowledge will inform the content of the curriculum and the level of instruction. (The NHLRC website provides some information about the use of demographic tools in teaching.)

**Step 3. Building on Prior Knowledge: Assessing the Heritage Learner's Starting Point**

Placing learners into a language course based on a placement examination is a standard procedure in foreign language departments. The tests typically consist of discrete grammatical items that can be supplemented by an essay. Placing HLLs in language courses presents difficulties if the department only offers this type of test HLLs may have no literacy and are thus unable to take the written test. If they have literacy, it is not textbook-based like the literacy of the L2 learners. The same can be said about its' other competencies. It is critical that instructors be taught to measure HLLs' proficiencies in ways different from assessing L2 learners. Since HLLs' background knowledge is more heterogeneous because it typically depends on family background, naturalistic language input, attendance in community schools, and frequency of travel to the country, among other factors, a one-test-fits-all is not likely to be appropriate.
Instructors need to be trained in general assessment techniques (e.g., administering questionnaires) and more global assessments such as Oral Proficiency Interview-like procedures (ACTFL, 1999), that take HLLs' specific abilities into consideration.

For the placement test, a three component instrument can be used (Polinsky & Kagan, 2007). It consists of a short lingua-biographical questionnaire, a written test (if the students are literate), and a short interview for HLLs without literacy. The questionnaire provides information about place of birth, age of immigration, and language use in the home. If the instructor is not familiar with the community and pathways of HLLs' language acquisition and attrition, this information would not be of use. There are ways to 'assign' heritage learners to proficiency groups (Kagan, 2005; Kagan & Dillon, 2001; Kwon & Polinsky, 2005; Valdes, 2001). This can only be accomplished if the instructor already has access to language-specific data on HLLs.

Instructors should also be taught to do error and needs analysis and have a general idea of what kinds of proficiencies and deficiencies can be expected in the HLL populations. In order to facilitate this process, it would be helpful for researchers (and instructors as well) to catalogue typical areas of HL difficulties in a particular language that are the result of incomplete acquisition. Some research has been done and can be used to create such lists (for Russian, see Andrews, 1998; Bermel & Kagan, 2000; Polinsky, 2000; for Spanish, see Montrul, 2004; Roca, 2000; for Korean, see Kim, 2006; for Japanese, see Kanno, Hasegawa, Ikeda, Ito, & Long, 2008). Over the course of HL professional development it would also be useful for teachers to learn how to analyze both spoken and written samples of HLLs and create lists of areas that need improvement. The best approach may be to start with more global areas of difficulties such as gender in Russian (Polinsky, 2008) or register in Korean (Kwon & Polinsky, 2005), then move to morphology and syntax.

**Step 4. Building on Students' Interests and Proficiencies**

Preparing teachers to work with HLLs involves explaining the rationale for an approach that may seem counter-intuitive for teachers of foreign languages. HLLs possess global but imperfect and incomplete knowledge of the language. Many of them sound (almost) like native speakers, and they can produce natural sounding chunks of speech, including word order and tones (Shuhan Wang, personal communication August 27, 2007), but the language disintegrates at the level of lexicon and pragmatics. HLLs typically do not have a repertoire of lexical items for many domains, and their lexical retrieval is slow. By giving HLLs resources to improve their...
overall performance, instructors encourage them to speak more as they gain confidence, which in turn leads to increased input and output and thus more successful and advanced interaction (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). If a course is focused on correcting errors of morphology or spelling only rather than developing the learner's global proficiencies, it may not produce the desired effect since learners would be more aware of their deficits than their assets.

HLLs of all languages surveyed thus far concur that their greatest need is vocabulary development (Table 1). This collective realization indicates an approach that would stress skill development rather than error eradication. While attention does need to be paid to accuracy, constant error correction is not the most efficient way to address HLLs' needs.

Table 1: Respondents’ Goals for Skills Improvement in HL Classes, on Scale of 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Most Important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve speaking</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve listening</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve reading</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve writing</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve grammatical accuracy</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase vocabulary</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not all 1,701 survey respondents answered this question, and total respondents may not have chosen all six skills listed.

HLLs’ self-expressed goals for HL classes. Respondents were asked how important it was for them to accomplish the following goals in their HL class using scale from 1 to 5 (1 being the least important, and 5 being the most important).

Figure 5 indicates that HLLs want to read literature which would certainly lead to the vocabulary growth that the learners are seeking.
It should be noted, however, that the purpose of incorporating reading in a HL curriculum is not to engage in literary analysis. Instead, the goal is for the I-ILLs to understand the history and cultural tradition of both the country of origin and the local community.

Judging from previous experience in HL courses, in planning the reading syllabus, it is helpful to realize that because of their prior exposure to the language, HLLs’ path from acquiring literacy to reading large texts is considerably shorter than what is a typical path of L2 students.

**Step 5. Building on Global approaches: Macro Approaches to Teaching HLLs**

Students indicate in the survey that the most common activities they conduct in their HL are speaking on the phone, watching TV, and watching movies.
The challenge for HL instructors is to translate those activities that are part of HLLs' everyday life at home and in the community into pedagogically sound and motivating tasks, a pedagogical activity that is seemingly unconcerned with the correct use of language as long as the non-linguistic 'real-life' goal has been successfully reached by the learner (Lee, 2001; Nunan, 1989). Preparing HL instructors, therefore, requires training in task-based approaches stemming from what HLLs do in real life outside of class. These tasks should serve to expand students' registers and awareness of interactions in the emigre community and in the home country.

Existing curricula can also be refocused and supplemented to create HL courses that are content-based. In their introduction to the volume on content-based instruction, Stryker and Leaver (1997, p. 3) comment that content-based instruction (CBI) "is a truly holistic and global approach to foreign language education." Because of the HLLs' initial top-down/macro proficiencies, as well as their motivations, the global approach of content based instruction is ideal for HLLs. HL teacher training must also offer guidance in selecting and using authentic materials as the basis for HLLs to increase their proficiencies. The survey highlights the kind of print materials that HLLs are motivated to work with (Figure 5).
Because their language is family based, and because for some students there are also strong connections to an entire heritage community, experiential learning is another approach that TILLs may benefit from. For language-in-community experiences to have strong learning outcomes, instructors need to explore how to make them meaningful and natural both for the students and the community members. Well-planned projects can be powerful tools for the students to authenticate their heritage identity. Ideally, a heritage curriculum would create a need for students to use the HL outside the home and classroom (Beaudrie & Ducar 2005; Weger-Guntharp, 2006).

All of these approaches, task-based, content-based, and experiential, complement each other. They are top-down (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000), or macro approaches (Kagan & Dillon, 2004, 2006) that best fit HLLs' language profiles.

**Teaching Mixed Classes**

In this paper we argue in favor of providing separate classes for HLLs based on their initial proficiencies. We are mindful, however, of the fact that whenever the subject of separate HL classes is raised, language teachers typically want to shift the focus of discussion to strategies for offering instruction in mixed classes. Sometimes these shifts of attention away from separate classes arise out of misunderstanding of the differences between heritage and non-heritage learners, but more often they are prompted by funding and other administrative realities. We can work toward correcting misunderstandings, but there is little hope for overcoming the economic obstacles to providing special classes for HLLs. If only one language class can be offered, what approaches would make the best of the situation? Differentiated instruction provides a partial answer (Carreira, 2007; Tomlinson, 2003). Following this model, instructors would manage to address the different needs of both kinds of students in the same classroom. Instructors using the differentiated learning approach are in need of a toolbox of classroom management techniques that allow the students to progress at their own pace towards higher levels of proficiency. Juggling a class meeting to address the needs of each student is a challenging task, but it can be achieved if there is no possibility of providing separate instruction for HLLs.

With differentiated learning in a mixed classroom, portfolios may be an appropriate assessment instrument. But portfolios make grading difficult, so many instructors would feel a need for more traditional teaching even if they used portfolios. Teacher educators need to work on developing different ways of assessing HLLs.
**Assessment**

What kind of testing is appropriate for HLLs? We have already discussed placement tests that incorporate biographical information and oral interviews. Achievement tests need to focus on those areas that present the greatest difficulties for HLLs and correspondingly show the greatest gains. Vocabulary development is of paramount importance for HLLs of all languages. Teacher educators need to focus on ways to test vocabulary acquisition. Oral testing that is typical of communicative approaches also presents a challenge for teachers. Heritage speakers' fluidity of oral expression is not acquired in the classroom. How then should it be graded? The NHLRC is funding a project with ACTFL to create additional guidelines for testing oral proficiency of heritage language speakers. Once such guidelines have been developed, they will help determine ways to test oral competency of HLLs in order to assess their ability and track their progress more accurately.

**Conclusion**

Preparation of instructors of heritage languages must be based on an understanding of the differences between L2 learners and HLLs, the HLLs' assets, and knowledge and respect for the communities these learners come from. The matrix that we present in this paper can serve as a curriculum framework for teacher preparation programs. To recap the main foci of the matrix, teachers of HLLs should know the learner (Step 1), and the community (Step 2). They should know how to assess HLLs' initial proficiencies and how to build on these proficiencies (Steps 3 and 4), and finally how to use macro-approaches to teaching (Step 5).

We conclude our proposed matrix for training heritage language educators by identifying several areas that remain under investigation and await an infusion from current and future research projects. At this time we can offer no prescriptions for heritage learner assessment. Although we are convinced that some study abroad or in-country experience should be part of a heritage language program, at this time there are no model programs to be imitated, and there is no body of evidence pointing to what makes such experiences successful. We also did not include any templates for actually teaching a heritage language class. There is no "one size fits all" approach to teaching a multiplicity of languages, cultures, and immigration histories. Future research by socio- and psycholinguists and neurobiologists may reveal more about the brain's response to language learning and relearning experiences and provide evidence of the ways heritage language learners process linguistic input. Our matrix is just a starting point for
equipping a new cohort of language teachers for the new generation of language learners who are rich in heritage and potential.
### Notes

1. *Ten languages most frequently spoken at home, the 1990, 2000 Censuses and 2007 Community Estimate: A Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>17,356,952</td>
<td>28,077,853</td>
<td>34,547,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1,294,754</td>
<td>2,001,948</td>
<td>2,464,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>825,391</td>
<td>1,238,232</td>
<td>1,480,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1,905,766</td>
<td>2,085,172</td>
<td>1,355,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>521,053</td>
<td>1,019,889</td>
<td>1,207,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1,556,150</td>
<td>1,366,470</td>
<td>1,104,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>633,078</td>
<td>882,875</td>
<td>1,062,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>243,904</td>
<td>704,697</td>
<td>851,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1,311,820</td>
<td>993,068</td>
<td>798,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>713,759</td>
<td>681,424</td>
<td>638,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,362,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,051,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,509,612</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Languages are listed in descending order of speakers based on 1990 Census figures. French includes French Creole and Cajun. Spanish includes Ladino. Chinese includes Min, Hakka, Kan (Hsiang), Cantonese, Toishan, Mandarin, Fuchow, Formosan, Fukien, Hokkien, Min Nan, and Taiwanese.

2. One of our early workshops, *The 2002 Heritage Language Institute*, held directed discussions that resulted in the adoption of guidelines across UC campuses, which are available online (UC Committee on Heritage Language Guidelines, 2002).

3. Approximately 33 million U.S. residents speak Spanish or Spanish Creole at home; the next most frequently spoken language is Chinese, at 2.43 million.

4. The National Heritage Language Resource Center (NHLRC) funded by the U.S. Department of Education in 2006 is a joint project of UCLA and the UC Language Consortium at UC Davis. Its mission is to propagate the research base for the teaching of heritage languages, develop materials and curricula, and promote preparation of foreign language teachers to teach heritage language learners.
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Appendix

Selected questions asked by instructors of heritage languages at the First Heritage Language Research Institute, July 29-August 2, 2007, UC Davis; and the Second Heritage Language Research Institute, June 23-27, Harvard. For a complete list of questions see http://www.nhlrc.ucla.edu.

1. How can we assess HLLs' achievements in learning their heritage language?

2. How many levels of HLLs are there?

3. How much should be assumed HLLs know when they come to class?

4. What kind of vocabulary did they pick up at home? What is missing?

5. How do we decide what to teach in an HL class and what to include in a textbook?

6. How are we to teach HLLs of different dialects of the same language?

7. How do we teach HLLs with different motivations, such as those who want to know more about their culture versus those who want to use their languages in a career?

8. Why do some people of a certain heritage choose to study the language when they go to college and have this opportunity, and others do not?

9. How do we negotiate for the needs for heritage language learners, such as specific classrooms and curricula, given the enrollment demands and economics of the university bureaucracy and budget?

10. How can one teach mixed classes of HLLs and L2 learners?