ABSTRACT: The “intergenerational transmission” of heritage languages (HLs) is crucial to the vitality of heritage language communities (especially for indigenous communities, where immigration is not a source of new speakers). We know, however, that HLs in the United States often do NOT survive well from one generation to the next as the shift to English takes place. In conjunction with the Second National Conference on Heritage Languages in America, a small group of researchers met to discuss priorities for research on intergenerational transmission of languages. Each of the ten researchers who participated prepared a short paper, posing research questions with some commentary to guide future research. Those papers form the major part of this article, covering topics related to language ecological patterns (in communities, families, and institutions), language ideology, measurement issues, and literacy.

Introduction

Heritage languages in the United States are sustained and grow in several ways. One vehicle is through newcomers who immigrate to this country where their language resources refresh heritage communities. Heritage languages (HLs) also grow through transfer of language knowledge from one generation to the next within communities and families. This “intergenerational transmission” of HLs is crucial to the vitality of heritage language communities (especially for indigenous communities, where immigration is not a source of new speakers). We know, however, that HLs in the United States often do NOT survive from one generation to the next (or they gradually, or not so gradually, diminish). Veltman (1983) and other demographers note a typical three-generation shift to English in heritage language families. Among immigrant language minorities the characteristic pattern has been that the first generation acquires some English while remaining strongest in the native tongue; the second generation usually becomes bilingual with more developed literacy skill in English because English is the language of instruction; and the third generation has a tendency to become English speaking with little or no capability in the language of their grandparents. Some say this
pattern is inevitable in this country under current (ideological and social) conditions. The pattern is not evidenced in all communities, of course, but it is pervasive. We need to understand what contributes to or impedes transfer of language from one generation to another, so that, where possible, HL maintenance and development can be better supported.

In October 2002, in conjunction with the Second National Conference on Heritage Languages in America, a small group of researchers came together for a day to discuss the priorities for research needed to address the question of intergenerational transmission of languages. As noted at the meeting, important insights into language loyalty and language shift in the United States are available from investigators such as Fishman (1966, 1991), Veltman (1983) and Kloss (1998), but much more remains to be learned about the mechanisms of and influences on intergenerational transfer. The goal of the discussion was to bring together multiple perspectives on the problem and to pose a set of research questions with some commentary to guide future research. Our distinguished invited participants were asked to generate the kinds of research questions that need to be defined and addressed and that might, in some instances, help break this unfortunate chain that leads to the ultimate loss of huge national, community, and personal resources in the form of heritage languages.

The ten researchers who participated each prepared a short paper on some aspect of intergenerational transfer of HLs. They brought drafts to the meeting and then revised them in light of the comments made. Those short papers form the major part of this article. Although the topics covered in the papers encompass diverse perspectives and themes, during the discussion, four primary categories, or clusters, of research directions emerged. These clusters are elaborated by Joseph Lo Bianco in the next section. Following that commentary are the ten short papers.

This important topic deserves attention from current and future researchers. Our hope is that the agenda presented here will lead to many valuable public and private research and development projects, and that what is learned as

---

1 We are grateful to the University of Maryland for supporting this meeting and to the organizers of the conference, the Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Foreign Language Center, for facilitating meeting arrangements. In particular, the contributions of Scott McGinnis, Catherine Ingold, and Joy Peyton were greatly appreciated. We also extend our thanks to Kay Moon, of the University of Maryland, College Park, who served as recorder for the meeting and provided a very helpful summary of the discussion.
a result will help future generations conserve and transfer the rich heritage language resources they possess.

Clusters of Research Areas

Joseph Lo Bianco
Language Australia

The discussion of researchable fields related to intergenerational transfer of heritage languages led to the identification of four clusters or topic categories. These are not suggested to be exhaustive in any way, but they organize the topics covered in this article fairly well. Some of the short papers focus primarily on one or another of the areas; others range across several.

Language Ecological Patterns

For HL students, the varying communicative loads carried by English, HL, and other languages used or learned by them (or required of them by education institutions) constitute the linguistic profile of their lives. For the HL, in particular, this representation reflects degrees, rate and depth of language shift (with total language extinction its extreme end) or maintenance.

The cluster of issues within the rubric of the ecology of languages covers (among many other issues) the role of the school system and other institutions, the historical experiences of particular language communities, the unique circumstances involved in the adoption by some communities or individuals of proxy HLs as part of the complex multiple identities of contemporary life, and the specifiable impact of a language ecological pattern over the life cycle of individuals and families. This cluster also includes the understandings of proficiency that might emerge from community-based notions of correctness and from norm setting in complex sociolinguistic contexts of multiple language knowledge, multilingual code-switching practices, and multiple local identities. Identified as particularly relevant to researching this cluster of variables is the collection of personal and familial biographies.

A discrete component of the ecology of HLs concerns the infrastructures within specific communities that are entrusted with HL revitalization or preservation and their relation with the institutions of mainstream society (e.g. the schools). The particularities and dynamics of local, social, and political conditions in specific communities need to be described and compared so that differential
cultural evaluations of HL and other factors that promote or impede successful intergenerational HL retention can be better understood. Researchable features of a broad language ecology pattern that were identified included: residential settlement patterns; concentrations of speakers and the proportion of youth; community institutional density; frequency of encounters with naturalistic use of the HL; and community control of children's socialization.

Under the rubric of language ecology and its impact on HL issues, specific fields nominated for research attention included: the shifting kinds of identities as invoked by language use and learning; the re-acquisition of HL; the identity impact on the learner and his/her social network of affiliation; and descriptive accounts of the genres of literacy and discourses of belonging particular to individual communities and their community schools or cultural settings where HL learning is encouraged, or HL use occurs.

Language Ideologies

Intergenerational transmission of HLs is clearly affected by language ideologies as they interact with the specific circumstances and prospects of HL acquisition, maintenance, and re-acquisition. We need to understand the ways in which some ideologies become hegemonic, or sustain that status, and how ideologies of language operate in specific contexts, differently or similarly for different languages. A key question concerns how language-specific ideologies, or specific linguistic cultures (Schiffman 1996) relating to particular languages, affect practice in our schools and universities and how these in turn impact on the learning, loss, re-acquisition, literacy elaboration, or community-appropriate proficiency of HLs in mainstream institutions.

Ideologies of language are intimately connected with culture ideologies and histories of given language communities. How these relate to institutional discourses, as represented in the policies and practices of such institutions, requires examination of these interconnections. The communicative expectation of young people involves at least English and English literacy, academic language competence and attitudes toward the study of foreign languages, as well as knowledge about language in general. The influence of the dominant mainstream expectation, a wider language ideology, may serve to repress interest and motivation in HL, especially indigenous HL, with respect to English, public culture in American society, and citizenship expectations.

In the discussion, a number of the questions identified for research related to the operation of language ideologies, in particular school practices, in the
articulation between schools and other institutions (such as the labor market and higher education) and between HL speaking families. These contexts (community, school, work) form the major settings for socialization of young HL speakers, and it is important to understand how these various phases and segments of socialization articulate and how their messages become internalized by HL communities as hegemonic patterns.

Under the rubric of ideology and its impact on HL issues, specific nominations for research attention were examinations of language policies, comparatively over time and across different state and national contexts.

**Measurement**

A cluster of factors related to measurement was a recurring theme of research identified as important. In order for research on HLs to be feasible and valid, it must be possible to measure HL ability in a valid and reliable manner. Existing language assessments do not discriminate among aspects of proficiency that are relevant to many HL speakers. For example, a common profile of an HL speaker includes very high levels of oral proficiency with more limited skills in literacy. Few assessments extend to these high levels of oral proficiency. Furthermore, HL speakers may have a range of dialects of the HL in their repertoire that are not recognized by existing assessments. The field needs measures of proficiency attainment that are both situationally sensitive and relevant for mainstream institutional use. The notion of measurement engages with a variety of important issues, including: community authenticity; norm setting and ‘policing;’ purism in use and code switching; and settings, contexts and environments for the display of particular kinds of HL mastery or use. For mainstream institutional use, measurements need to predict and describe language skills in fair and valid ways that are helpful for tracking, placement, and for the completion of requirements of those institutions.

**Literacy**

The specific impact of literacy attainment and the pattern of community literacy practices constitute a specific cluster of research topics and issues. Biliteracy in relation to HL practices requires attention to Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester (2000) and Hornberger’s (2002) four nested and interconnected components of continua for literacy, viz, Context, Content, Media and Development. This notion of continua of biliteracy usefully organizes researchable questions in relation to each other in an ecological framework for community understanding, educational intervention and social practices. Contexts
are framed by level of specificity, between micro and macro, by oral and literate continua, and by literate capability in one or more languages. Content describes elements of majority/minority, vernacular-oral/formal literate, and levels and degrees of contextualization. Media frames simultaneous/successive exposure, similarity/dissimilarity in structure and divergence/convergence in scripts.

It is inevitable that literate practice will be involved in HL attainment, re-acquisition or transmission beyond the intimate settings of home and immediate family with the young. Its relation to subsequent literacy, English and third languages is also a field of considerable HL research importance.

INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

Paper #1
Learning from History
Terrence Wiley
Arizona State University

Two broad questions related to intergenerational heritage language transmission in the United States, or the lack thereof, draw from some of the major empirical, historical, and theoretical literature related to language assimilation and retention. These questions are framed broadly to draw on and critique extant literature as a starting point for more specific research.

Language demographer, Calvin Veltman (1999), has argued, “the rates of language shift to English are so high that all minority languages are routinely abandoned, depriving the United States of one type of human resource that may be economically and politically desirable both to maintain and develop” (p. 58). Language loss is also prevalent among speakers of Spanish, the nation’s second major language. Explaining why language loss should be the norm appears to be problematic because, “many U.S. immigrant groups have shown characteristics

2 A portion of this paper was presented in the paper “Overcoming the Legacy of Language Policies that Engender Language Shift: An Important Role for the Universities,” presented at the University of California Language Consortium Heritage Language Institute at UCLA, June 22-26, 2002, and was summarized in UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching, 2(1), 1-2.
that should have been favorable to the maintenance of ethnic languages” (Veltman, 1999, p. 60). Thus, the problem of explaining language loss in a nation in which a substantial portion of the population traces its origins to immigrants or indigenous peoples who once spoke other languages merits closer scrutiny. German, for example, which once was the nation’s number two language, provides an interesting case for reflection.

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries German initially enjoyed conditions favorable for language retention along with the development of English bilingualism. These included both a steady flow of immigrants and institutional support both from churches and schools. A century later, however, German, as the 1990 U.S. Census revealed, was on the decline. Of the “Americans who reported their ethnic ancestry, 58 million people claimed German ancestry in whole or part, whereas German was only spoken by 1.5 million people” (Veltman, 1999, p. 60). To what can this remarkable loss of heritage language be attributed? One of the major historians of American bilingualism, Kloss (1998), saw it to be largely a result of the “absorbing power” of American English.

It is possible to view language shift to English as a mindless mechanical process. It is, however, more useful to consider the social, political, and historical contexts of language immigration and language contact to understand some of the challenges confronting the maintenance of heritage languages. In the case of German, for example, although many people of German ancestry acquired English, German bilingualism was thriving in the United States until the entry of the United States into World War I. German was widely used in public and private schools, churches, and local newspapers. As the United States entered the war in Europe against German, there was a widespread xenophobic attack on all things German, which was accompanied by a fundamental shift in educational language policies. German requirements for college were dropped, and in some cases, German departments at universities were closed (Wiley 1998). The use of German and other foreign languages was outlawed in 34 states between 1917 and 1999. German enrollments plummeted. Between 1915 and 1922, German language instruction in high schools declined from a peak of 324,000 students in 1915 to fewer than 14,000 students in 1922, and between 1915 and 1948, German dropped as a subject from nearly one-fourth of all high school students to less than one percent (Leibowitz 1971).

The German language lost ground rapidly for three major reasons: (1) given two world wars between the United States and Germany, the language became stigmatized, which resulted in (2) restrictive languages policies. In
addition, (3) German immigration declined significantly (Wiley 1998). Even as German declined, Spanish was on the rise. Spanish, however, did not surpass German as the major second language in the U.S. until the 1970 U.S. Census, when over 7.8 million reported speaking Spanish compared to the nearly 6.1 million who retained German. However, Spanish too felt the impact of the attack on German. The Americanization movement (1914-1925), with the restrictive English-only policies that accompanied it, also had a significant impact on other language groups. Speakers of most European languages were affected as were those who spoke Asian languages such as Japanese (see Tamura 1993). Spanish-speaking people of Mexican-origin were particularly targeted in a climate of intolerance toward any use of their native tongue (see Menchaca and Valencia 1990).

After three decades of allowing a modest use of mother-tongue education to facilitate the transfer to education in English, we are witnessing a return to a restrictive policy climate toward the use of HLs in public schools in many states, particularly in California with its passage of Proposition 227, and in Arizona with Proposition 203, with a similar restrictive ballot measure in Massachusetts. Nevertheless, there continues to be interest in maintaining HLs in the United States. Even as Spanish-English bilingual programs are attacked in a number of states, amidst a K-12 policy climate that is increasingly unfriendly to building on the language resources that HL speakers have, the universities can play a major role in offering a second change to individual learners, while helping the nation rebuild its linguistic resources. By so doing, they can play a major role in reversing the legacy of policies that have engendered language loss.

The unique features of the circumstances lending themselves to maintenance and loss among speakers of German and Spanish in the United States are perhaps better understood than most, but even so, they warrant further study. All the more, the conditions affecting many other HLs in the United States likewise merit historical case analyses.

Question 1: Given the extent of immigrant and indigenous language diversity in the U.S., currently and historically, why have some language groups been more likely to retain their languages, or retain them longer, than others? More specifically, what can we learn from a comparative study of case histories and the contemporary experiences of various groups (immigrant and indigenous) that might better inform educational language policies in promoting HLs today?

What are the factors that have promoted or hindered the retention of language diversity across generations among various groups?

What stance have various language minority groups had toward the retention of their own HLs (Kloss 1998; Leibowitz 1973; Tamura 1993; Wiley 1998, 2000)?

What role might intra-group “folk theories” of success have in influencing language minority groups’ language retention (Gibson and Ogbu 1991; Ogbu 1982)?

**Question 2:** Veltman (1983, 1988, 1999) offers a compelling empirically supported argument, which concludes that rapid language shift and linguistic assimilation into English occurs, without exception, across language minority groups in the United States. What are the major policy implications of his argument and evidence for the prospects of promoting HLs in the U.S.?

What assumptions regarding language use and dominance does Veltman make in framing his research?

What additional factors might be considered in addition to those offered by Veltman?

The value of HLs as perceived by governmental agencies and the public at large tends to vary greatly based on a variety of issues that are both internal and external to the HL groups themselves. Case histories within the broader context of the history of U.S. language policies help to explain the contexts in which HL retention has been valued or opposed. The differential treatment (positive, negative, or indifferent) of past, and recent, language minority groups, as well as their responses to various treatments is instructive in helping us to understand those factors that promote or inhibit the retention of their heritage languages.

**Paper #2**

*External Pressures on Families*

Lily Wong Fillmore

University of California, Berkeley

**The Problem**

In recent years, languages other than English have been placed in greater jeopardy than ever before in the United States. In the past, the pressures against
their maintenance tended to be internal rather than external ones except in the case of indigenous languages. Government policies forcing the linguistic and cultural assimilation of American Natives were major factors in the erosion and loss of the languages of many groups, and the pressures to assimilate were clearly external ones.

For immigrant groups, however, heritage languages were more often given up rather than taken away. Immigrants have had to acquire and use English to survive educationally or economically. But there was nothing prohibiting the use of their HLs at home or in the immigrant community. Giving up these languages were matters of personal choice for most immigrants. The pressures to stop speaking a heritage language in the past tended to be internal ones: the desire not to be different from one's peers; the desire to put some distance between oneself and one's immigrant origins (consider, for example, the epithets used by immigrants to describe recently arrived members of their own groups: “FOBs” (fresh-off-the-boat), “Mojados” (wetbacks), etc.); the belief that English is more useful, more powerful, and more socially beneficial than the HL is. There were, of course, external pressures acting on immigrants in the past. Children who did not speak English well were often placed in low track classes in school or in special education, simply because they were in the process of learning English and not because they had other learning difficulties. Recently, however, there have been external pressures that may in fact exacerbate the internal ones exponentially.

What are those external pressures? Consider the changes in educational policy, both at state and federal levels. In states like California, Arizona, and Massachusetts, voters have passed public referenda (Proposition 227 in California in 1998, Proposition 203 in Arizona in 2000, and Question 2 in Massachusetts in 2002) ending bilingual education as an educational treatment of choice for immigrant children who need linguistic assistance getting access to the school’s curriculum. There are ongoing efforts to ban bilingual education in numerous other states as well. Most importantly, there are educational policies at the state and federal level (No Child Left Behind Act, Public Law 107-110, January 2002), requiring that all students, irrespective of language background and educational status, meet adopted curricular standards as measured by standardized assessments in English. These are tests with a bite—students do not get promoted to the next grade level unless they pass muster on the annual academic achievement tests given in most schools; the schools can be subject to restructuring if the students do not make acceptable gains each year in test scores; there are financial rewards in some states for teachers whose students perform well on the tests, and demerits (or worse) for teachers whose students do not perform well. Finally, with the high school exit examinations that have now been adopted by 30 states, there are some serious, lasting consequences for not
performing well in these educational tests, which are given in English. Students who do not pass this test leave high school with a "certificate of attendance" instead of a high school diploma, even if they have taken and passed all required coursework. High school exit examinations vary across the states that have adopted them, with some covering more ground than others, but all of them test English language and literacy skills, mathematic skills, and reasoning—in English, of course.

Teachers, parents and students alike are aware of the consequences of not doing well on these tests. There is little wonder that their concerns are being transformed into pressure to abandon work on the HL whether in bilingual or language development classes, and to concentrate on strengthening English language skills. On the Hopi reservation in northern Arizona, for example, parents are asking why the schools are even thinking of teaching the HL when there is so much evidence that the children are not doing well in English (Bielenberg 2002). Shouldn't they be getting more English instead of Hopi, which so few tribal members speak anymore? And with the passage of Proposition 203 by Arizona voters, they ask, "are such programs legal?" Even in places where bilingual education is possible, parents and students are choosing English-only programs out of fear that any use of the children's primary language at school will delay or prevent the mastery of English. In two-way bilingual programs, this may mean that the only parents who would place their children in such a program are English monolinguals who are so confident that their children will continue to develop and use English at home that they do not worry about them being schooled in a language other than English. Parents of children who speak the minority language are more likely to worry about whether their children will learn English quickly enough and well enough in such a program to handle the tests they have to take.

Research Priority

That, then, is the problem, and I propose that the effects of the present societal pressures on children to master English on bilingual education (regular bilingual programs and two-way programs), and HL teaching programs of all sorts, be investigated and documented. How are the pressures influencing parental decisions? How are they affecting student participation in HL programs? How do they affect teaching practices—are teachers so worried that their students may not be spending enough time in English that they are reducing the time spent teaching in the HL? Are children more reluctant to use the HL in school or in social interactions outside of school? How do these pressures affect student attitudes towards the HL and participation in HL programs?
Among our discussions at the meetings in October, it was noted that some government agencies are concerned about improving our foreign language teaching capacity in the universities, since there is a lack of highly proficient speakers of languages such as Korean, Arabic, Serbo-Croatian, etc., to work in intelligence agencies and in foreign service. This presents a major paradox. At a time when our society has a greater than ever need to develop our language resources, we have adopted educational policies that are undercutting the most important source of powerful speakers of the very languages we need: children who learn those languages at home.

PAPER #3
The Role of Schools in Language Maintenance and Shift
Reynaldo Macías
University of California, Los Angeles

The inter-generational transfer of heritage languages can be viewed in a number of significant settings and through many lenses. I would like to propose the schools as a setting and a lens that provides a view of the school as an institutional mechanism that supports or hinders this inter-generational transfer. In particular, I propose a macro look at curricular articulation of heritage language instruction K-16 and the role of teachers in this process. I suggest that this is merely one dimension of the more complex modeling of language maintenance and shift (or language demography) of these HLs. There are obviously other dimensions such as contextual issues (particularly ideologies), and the micro level issues of what goes on within classrooms. How the organizational/institutional pieces of maintaining and developing the HL through the schools across the years, amongst those who natively acquire it, is the principal focus of this question.

Research Question

What role do the schools play in assisting or hindering the inter-generational transmission of HLs in the nation?

Subsidiary questions

?? What is the scope of (heritage) language teaching and learning in the country as reflected in enrollments of bilingual education and foreign language courses?

?? What (oral and literate) proficiencies result from these forms of (heritage) language teaching?
What are the curricular alignments across the years (K-16) that promote or hinder HL development?

What specific role do teacher characteristics (membership in a HL community, proficiency in the HL, language attitudes, etc) play in the development of HL proficiency?

What are the effects of different types of schools (public, independent, mother-tongue schools) on the transmission of HLs?

**Importance of the Question**

The success of transmitting HLs intergenerationally with institutional support rests more on the policy and the arrangement of institutional parts than on the improvement of single classroom instruction. If the course of study is not taken by the students, there is no benefit derived for the transmission of the language. If the curricular articulation is such that there is no accumulated language development and improved language proficiency, then we recycle introductory levels of language teaching that do not result in maturational development and proficiency. Students learn the days of the week and “hola paco” extremely well!

Knowing how the institutional school parts are or could be organized and the impact of this organization on HL transmission and development provides for policy options as well as curricular planning that otherwise is lost to the existing curricular fragmentation of language teaching that is designed to fail the language learner. We have an occasional national survey (Branaman and Rhodes 1997) but no regular data collection on this issue. There are standards and assessments for foreign language education but there has not been adequate focus specifically on the various forms of HL teaching reflected in bilingual education and foreign language instruction. While there are national counts of speakers of non-English languages (presumed to be native speakers of these languages), we don’t have a sense of how many non-native speakers of these heritage languages successfully learn these languages. I would posit that the number of non-native speakers of these languages has an effect on the maintenance and shift of these languages amongst native speakers.
Introduction

There is much speculation about the purported positive role played by participation in Heritage Language education programs on the development of target language proficiency, but surprisingly little robust data on the topic. The purpose of our brief paper is to outline a procedure for collecting quantitative and qualitative data that will illuminate the relationship among variables such as Saturday-school participation, ethnic identity, subjective ethnolinguistic vitality, attitudes and motivation, and Japanese language development among a cohort of second-generation HL students residing in the Los Angeles area. We believe that a series of planned-variation studies on this topic systematically examining factors, such as those described below, would be useful and informative.\(^3\)

General Research Questions

In this section, we identify two major research questions that address the relationship between participation in HL programs and Japanese language development for second-generation HL students. For each we specify several assessment issues that need to be addressed in order to respond to the question, and we suggest potential data-collection instruments. In the following section, we describe a procedure that we believe will be useful for examining this general topic.

**Question 1:** How does participation in a Japanese HL program in the Los Angeles area affect second generation Japanese teen-age students’ ethnic identity, attitudes and motivation toward the learning of Japanese, and development of, or changes in, Japanese proficiency?

- How can one accurately and adequately assess ethnic identity among Japanese teen-age students? We believe that a modified form of the

\(^3\) The first of such studies is currently being conducted by Kiyomi Chinen (Heritage Language Development: Understanding the Roles of Ethnic Identity, Attitudes, Motivation, Schooling and Community Factors, doctoral dissertation in progress, Carnegie Mellon University).
Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (Phinney 1992) is a useful measure for this purpose.

- How can one accurately and adequately assess attitudes and motivation among Japanese teen-age students? We believe that the short form of the modified Attitude and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) that has been developed by Gardner and his associates (1999) and used widely throughout the world will be useful for these purposes (see also Masgoret 2002).

- How can one accurately and adequately assess Japanese language growth among Japanese teen-age students? We believe that a modified form of self-assessment such as that developed by Clark (1981), Lambert (1994) or Lee (2002) might be useful, particularly if supplemented by the classroom teacher’s use of the FLOSEM (Padilla and Sung 1999). However, this is the part of the study that poses the most uncertainty and greatest concern for us since we believe that the language education profession has yet to grapple successfully with the issue of the valid and reliable measurement of the language development of HL students from diverse backgrounds.

Question 2: What socio-cultural, demographic or other factors should be examined in order to situate and describe appropriately the contribution of participation in the HL program to the teen-age students' Japanese maintenance? We propose that it would be desirable to collect information about variables such as ethnolinguistic vitality and community patterns of language use and support.

- How can one measure the “vitality” of the Japanese community in which the students reside? We believe that a modified form of the Subjective Vitality Questionnaire developed by Bourhis, Giles and Rosenthal (1981) and further adapted by Allard and Landry (1986) is a useful tool for this purpose.

- What types of background information should be collected from students, teachers, school administrators, parents, grandparents and other community members to adequately and accurately describe patterns of language use and language support in the school and in the community as a backdrop against which to interpret data from Q1? We propose that a modified form of the Language Contact Profile developed by Dewey (2002) will be a useful tool for this purpose.
Illustrative Methodology

The following study is one approach to addressing the research questions. The general plan would be to collect information such as that described above from a representative sample of 50 second generation Japanese HL students who participate in a Saturday-school program operated under the aegis of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. This student information would be collected through use of bilingual (Japanese and English) questionnaires as well as through personal interviews. A stratified sample of students could be selected for further in-depth personal interviewing. Information would also be collected from the parents and the teachers of these focus students. An attempt would be made to describe in some detail the community, home and school environment in which these students were living and studying and then relate this information to the students’ maintenance or development of Japanese. (In an ideal situation, it would be possible to identify a cohort of “twinned students” in which one child was participating in the Saturday-school program, and the other was not; but such a design is not likely to be feasible in reality.) A variety of regression analyses could be performed with the quantitative data (e.g., looking at the effects of variables such as ethnic identity, attitudes and motivation, etc. on HL development). The qualitative data could then be used to enrich and to inform our understanding of the community and the results of the quantitative assessment.

Limitations of Such a Study

It is obvious that there would be many limitations to such a study as that proposed here (e.g., an examination within the Japanese community rather than the Chinese or Korean communities; an examination of one particular community, Los Angeles, as opposed to many others in which the actual or perceived salience of the group might be different; the choice of this school which offers a particular approach to HL instruction (there are in fact at least five different models of Japanese schools active in the United States and this study would only examine the effects of one such model), etc.). Nonetheless, we believe that a series of studies along the lines of the one proposed here might well contribute to our general understanding of the phenomena of HL development or maintenance.
Parents are perhaps the single most significant source of heritage language input for immigrant children. In fact, research shows that parental use of the HL is crucial in children’s HL development and that children who maintain fluency in the HL into adulthood often come from homes where the HL was spoken as a matter of policy (Bayley, Schechter, and Torres-Alaya 1996; Cho and Krashen 2000; Hakuta and D’Andrea 1992; Kondo 1998; Portes and Hao 1998). Because English has such a powerful and overriding influence on children’s linguistic repertoire once they begin attending school, some parents institute a household ban on English to protect the use of the HL. However, insisting on using the HL at home is an enormously difficult task as children protest being made to speak and learn a language that they perceive as having little value in school and society. In the most common scenario, children learn English at school and start speaking it at home to parents and siblings, and parents also switch over to it at least when they are addressing the children. As more English is used at home, children get fewer and fewer opportunities to hear and speak the mother tongue, which contributes to HL loss.

Research shows that immigrant parents generally favor HL development in children (Shin and Krashen 1998). While parents are quite aware that children must have strong English skills to be academically successful, many also want them to retain full use of the HL as the language of social interaction in the ethnic home and community. However, a positive attitude toward the HL does not always translate to actual support for the HL for a variety of reasons (Schecter and Bayley 1997). As Wong Fillmore (this article) argues, some of these reasons may be internal (e.g., immigrants may choose to stop speaking their languages because they may not want to be perceived as being different from the mainstream population) while others are external (e.g., educational policies that focus on students’ development of English skills push parents and children to abandon work on the HL). One crucial issue that has received little attention in this discussion, however, is how the decision made by parents to switch to English is motivated by their lack of knowledge about the facts and myths of bilingualism.
There are many myths surrounding bilingualism that are particularly damaging to HL development. One such myth is that a bilingual is two monolinguals in one person. It is often assumed that ‘true bilinguals’ are those who are equally fluent in their two languages, with competence in both languages comparable to those of monolinguals of those languages. In reality, however, bilinguals will rarely have balanced proficiency in their two languages. Terms such as ‘full bilingual’ and ‘balanced bilingual’ represent idealized concepts that do not characterize the great majority of the world’s bilinguals. Rarely will any bilingual be equally proficient in speaking, listening, reading or writing both languages across all different situations and domains. However, the monolingual view of bilingualism is so entrenched in popular and scholarly thinking that bilinguals themselves may apologize to monolinguals for not speaking their language as well as do the monolinguals, thus accepting and reinforcing the myth.

In educational circles, the term ‘semilingual’ has been used to describe bilingual students who appear to lack proficiency in both languages (Martin-Jones and Romaine 1986). There is evidence that young immigrant children momentarily lag in grammatical development in both of their languages when compared to their same-age monolingual counterparts (Pfaff 1992, 1993; Shin and Milroy 1999; Verhoeven 1988; Verhoeven and Boeschoten 1986; Verhoeven and Vermeer 1985) but the errors usually disappear as they grow up. However, findings such as these have been misinterpreted as saying that it is counterproductive to the child’s welfare to develop and maintain proficiency in more than one language. Similarly, tests that are designed for monolinguals are often used to compare bilinguals’ proficiency in either of their languages with that of monolinguals. These assessments often do not take into account that bilinguals use their two languages with different people, in different contexts and for different purposes. They also do not take into account the fact that bilingualism is never static and that children are continuously developing in their two languages.

The ‘semilingual’ view also maintains that there will be negative consequences for cognitive processing for bilinguals, because of the potential confusion between what monolinguals perceive as two underdeveloped languages. For example, in many monolingual societies, immigrant parents are routinely advised by doctors, speech therapists, teachers and counselors to forbid any other language, apart from English, to be used in their home so as not to “confuse” the children with input from two languages. The argument that bilingual input confuses children is not valid, however, since most children growing up in bilingual or multilingual societies (e.g. India, Singapore, as well as many Asian and African countries) learn to use two or more languages with no
apparent negative consequences to their cognitive development. This view is not supported by empirical sociolinguistic evidence either.

Informing parents of the facts and myths of bilingualism and teaching them specific strategies to support HL development, then, would provide them with the necessary ammunition to withstand the overwhelming internal and external pressures to switch to English. This line of thought leads to several key research questions:

1. What is the best way to present the facts and myths of bilingualism, as well as the process of normal language development (in L1 and L2), to anxious parents who want their children to get a head start in English?
2. Does parents’ fear that their children will not know English adequately (and will fall behind in school) motivate their shift to English? How significant is this fear?
3. How can we best reach parents about ways to promote HL development and maintenance? Would testimonials of successful HL speakers help? Could teachers be trained to inform parents and children of these? What about the use of the media and community organizations?
4. What set of criteria should be used to measure changes in parental behavior toward HL development?

These questions concern producing fundamental changes in parental behavior. What is at stake is not how parents’ attitudes are improved but, rather, how their actual behavior toward HL maintenance is changed as a result of such education.

PAPER #6
Native American Heritage Languages
Christine P. Sims
University of New Mexico

In a recent resolution prepared by the North Slope Borough School District in Alaska, a critical concern about indigenous heritage language survival is expressed in light of recent U.S. federal mandates to implement the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001:

As American people embark on the journey to implement the 'No Child Left Behind Act,' the First Peoples of our nation are forced to face, yet again, another challenge to the survival of our languages and our cultures. As indigenous peoples, the struggle to maintain the vitality of our languages and our cultures against the
powerful mainstream odds of assimilation becomes a critical issue. Our very identity, our cultures, our worldview, the expression of who we are as Native people hangs in the balance. (North Slope Borough School District Resolution No. 2003-03)

In yet another state, a recent article published in an Arizona newspaper reports that 28 teaching assistants will be removed from the Tucson Unified School District's Title I schools, including native Yaqui speakers who provide instruction in their ancestral Yoeme language (Duarte 2002). The move comes as a result of new paraprofessional certification requirements contained within the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act.

What do recent developments such as these bode for the survival of America's HLs in general and Native American languages in particular? Such questions are beginning to emerge and recent developments such as those just mentioned are cause for concern in light of the rapid erosion of Native American languages taking place today. As well, these questions are significant to the growing efforts being initiated by various Native American tribes to stem the loss of their native languages (Cantoni 1996; Hale and Hinton 2001). Research regarding these efforts and how they impact language transmission processes has yet to be fully examined and studied. This brief paper suggests several broad areas of research that may be useful to researchers and practitioners as well as Native American educators, tribal leaders, and Native American communities.

**Policy Implications for Native American Languages**

Implementation of national policies and local school programs driven by ideologies of linguistic uniformity can unwittingly result in discouraging circumstances for many Native American youngsters attempting to learn their native languages. Simply put, this can mean having to choose between learning one's Native HL or struggling to maintain parity with monolingual English speaking peers based solely on academic assessments of English. Such choices have been and continue to be subtly forced upon fragile HLs as the emphasis on English literacy and English-based assessments increases at earlier age levels each year (Wong Fillmore 1991a, 1991b). Research that investigates policy implications for the long-term survival of Native American languages is critically needed to better inform not only the research community, but just as importantly those who play key roles in advocating, developing and administering education programs for Native children. Some possible research questions are:
1. What barriers and challenges do federal and school policies pose for tribes wishing to pursue programs of Native language instruction in school settings?

2. What are the internal boundaries that institutions place on Native language teaching and how are these influenced by factors such as: non-Native teacher and administrative attitudes towards Native language teaching and English; involvement of tribal communities in curricular decision making; assessment issues related to the evaluation of Native language learners.

Motivations for Native American Language Renewal and Heritage Language Transfer

Maintaining Native American languages is considered by many tribes to be an integral part of distinct tribal identities. To lose language is to lose oral histories, unique worldviews, common spiritual beliefs, and all the collective expressions that identify each tribe as separate from others (Fishman 1991, 1996).

Some of the first efforts to address Native American language maintenance have been influenced to a great extent by school-based models of bilingual education or formal institutional initiatives (Arviso and Holm 1990; Boyer 2000; Dale 2000; Holm 1993; Johnson 2000; McCarty 1994, 1998, 2002; McCarty and Zepeda 1995; Mistaken Chief, Sr. 2000). More recently, Native American language revitalization efforts being implemented in other tribes are utilizing community-based language initiatives as their starting point in an attempt to address the need for re-strengthening language use in communities and creating younger generations of Native language speakers (Benjamin, Romero, and Pecos 1997; Blum-Martinez 2000; Blum-Martinez and Pecos 2001; Blum-Martinez, Hinton, and Sims 2001; Hale and Hinton 2001; Kipp 2000; Sims 1996, 1998, 2001). In these latter cases tribal members in their various capacities as fluent speaking elders, Native traditional leaders and parents have taken up the responsibility of Native language teaching and language renewal. As Fishman has argued, language revitalization efforts situated solely in school settings may have limited results in terms of mother tongue transfer (Fishman 1991). Drawing from this argument, it would be well to understand more precisely how some of the following aspects influence the course of language renewal efforts being pursued in various Native American communities:

1. What is the nature of motivations for language renewal in Native American communities and to what extent do these motivations contribute to effective practices in language transfer?
2. What are the implications for language initiatives that are designed as school based and community based programs? What are the outcomes with regard to producing new generations of Native speakers?

3. What are the dynamics of Native communities that motivate internal leadership of language renewal efforts? To what extent and in what ways do such aspects serve to help or hinder long- term language transmission?

4. What types of internal resources of home and community do tribal communities utilize to bring about intergenerational uses of language?

A sub-set of linking questions might also include the following:

5. To what extent do school-based practices that largely emphasize the acquisition of English literacy and the use of English-based assessments impact the critical development and attitudes towards Native language and cultural learning that are situated in homes and tribal communities?

6. What is the role and impact of literacy as a social construct in the lives of traditional Native American language communities and to what extent is it perceived as a necessary part of language renewal and intergenerational language transmission? How do current language revitalization efforts mirror or reflect these perspectives and attitudes?

7. What has been the impact upon language transmission in given communities where Native American language programs and initiatives have developed Native literacy models as part of their strategies for language revitalization?

8. In what ways do models of English literacy serve to influence or change former sociocultural traditions of orality that have been the basis of language transmission in many Native American societies? How are such traditions influenced, supported, or changed with respect to language initiatives being implemented in various tribal communities?

For Native American tribes, their unique status as America's indigenous people encompasses a number of factors that make their languages unlike other minority language groups in this nation. Native American languages, for example, are not exactly the same as "world" languages in the sense that one can find these spoken in other parts of the world. Secondly, many Native American languages have existed and some still function primarily within a sociocultural and socioreligious community context (Suina 1990; Blum-Martinez 2000). As well,
indigenous languages are primarily rooted in long standing traditions of orality rather than literate traditions (Hale and Hinton 2001; Hornberger 1989).

Historically, every Native American tribe has experienced overt pressures to assimilate, alter or otherwise abandon former ways of traditional life (Adams 1995, 1998; Reyhner and Eder 1989; Reyhner 1992). Estimates provided by the linguist Michael Krauss indicate that approximately 210 indigenous languages are still extant in the United States and Canada. Of these, Krauss estimates that 35 are being spoken by parent generations and older; 84 are being spoken only by grandparent generations and older; and the remaining 57 are spoken by only a handful of speakers who are most likely the oldest generations from a given language group (Krauss 1998).

The Native American Languages Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-477) passed by the U.S. Congress recognized in its provisions the unique status that tribes have in the United States as sovereign entities through treaties and acts of Congress (Cohen 1982). Yet, they are under increasing pressure to defend their unique political status as well as their cultural and linguistic heritages. The Act supports Native American language restoration and maintenance efforts and encourages school entities to work with tribes and schools in implementing Native language programs of instruction. To what degree such acts influence national and local policies or how this will in fact contribute to the maintenance and transmission of Native American languages is yet to be seen or fully realized. The more immediate contribution that research can make, in the meantime, is to explicate the "what" and "how" of effective practices for language transmission in Native American communities. These are areas of much needed information that can better inform tribal leaders and their communities as they make choices and decisions that affect the long-term vitality of their languages.

PAPER #7
Language Ideologies
Norma González
University of Utah

One area of interest that has not received adequate attention in considering the intergenerational transfer of heritage languages is the concept of language ideologies. In particular, it is important to investigate the role that language ideologies play in schools and in children’s interest in maintaining their HLs and developing biliteracy skills.
As a construct that emerged from linguistic anthropology (Woolard, Schieffelin and Kroskrity 1998), the concept of language ideologies is related to the concept of “regimentation.” Regimentation refers to the fact that utterances do not have their meanings easily available for decoding, but are regimented or framed by larger "metadiscourses" or ideologies (González and Arnot-Hopffer 2002). The articulation between micro-level interactional and macro-level patterns can be studied in schools and communities by examining, on the one hand, what HL learners say about language, who they say it to and under what circumstances, and on the other hand, circulating metadiscourses about language, the purpose and use of language, learning about language, and learning through language. The term “regimentation,” however, might imply a lock-step unilinear correlation between particular micro-interactional instances and corresponding macro-level discourses. This, of course, is not the case, especially in the borderlands area where the complexities of language use are undergirded by social and historical landscapes (González 2001).

Our first challenge would be to differentiate how various studies in language ideology use the term "ideology". Some conceptualizations adopt an Althusserian (1971) take on ideology, that is, that ideology "interpellates" or "hails" individuals within social structure. This type of ideology is unconscious and it functions to maintain social stratification and becomes evident in particular speech practices. Other conceptualizations do not refer to social stratification, instead seeing ideology as simply tacit or explicit metalinguistic discourse, or a body of assumed notions (See Woolard 1992 for an interpretive framework tracing "ideology" and its conceptual underpinnings). Despite these different conceptualizations, as Woolard notes, "What most researchers share, and what makes the term useful in spite of its problems, is a view of ideology as rooted in or responsive to the experience of a particular social position..." (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994: 58). What also appears to be shared is that "ideology" implicates power, the exercise of power, and the reproduction of dominant/subordinate relations.

The operationalization of the term language ideology in this context, and its relationship to HL learners can present us with methodological dilemmas. One area of tension in studies of language ideology concerns the problem of the alternate sitings of ideologies (Woolard 1998). Are ideologies discoverable in language practices themselves? Is metapragmatic discourse—talk about how language is used—the window to how we think about language? Or must studies of language ideologies focus on what is unsaid, that is, the implicit framing of texts that does not always rise to discursive consciousness? If we assume that language ideologies both constitute and are embedded in social practices, that is,
in actual activity, then they can be observed, recorded and subjected to analysis. They can also be connected to an array of semiotic systems at work within the institution of the school and within the larger community. Thus, in order to capture the breadth and depth of possible ideological sittings and to read across multiple layers of language use, both explicit and implicit, we can concentrate on multiple sites of data collection (González and Arnot-Hopffer 2002).

Another area of tension between theories of ideology and the context of HL learners is the relevance of such theory to the language ideologies of children. Locating sites of children's language ideologies can be a complex research endeavor. Can the theoretical constructs that have emerged in studies of adults be transferred to children? Do results obtained in studies of adults apply to children? What is the effect of public discourses on children in a Dual Language or HL program? How can we capture children's words and worlds and frame them within adult conceptualizations? Children are exposed to an array of overt and covert language ideologies through media, politics, parents, peers and schooling. They must engage with what even adults are not able to untangle: contradictions and ambiguities about who typically and normatively speaks what language to whom and under what circumstances.

Theoretically, we consider children's utterances concerning language use as a kind of apprenticeship, a trying out and trying on of language ideologies. This theoretical orientation can lead us to investigate a variety of data sources, including household interviews, classroom observations, and children's own utterances. While we cannot pretend to freeze the shifting social landscapes on which children's linguistic formations develop, we can attempt to grasp the multidimensional phenomenon by gathering data from multiple sources.

The research questions that I would pose, then, would be:

? How can we trace the formation and transformation of language ideologies within school settings? Do these ideologies change over time, and if so, how? How do language ideologies influence the implementation of dual language programs?

? How can we study the formation and transformation of children’s language ideologies? How do these ideologies influence HL Learners in formal and informal contexts? How are language ideologies related to literacy ideologies? How do language ideologies intersect/impact the development of biliteracy for HL learners?
PAPER #8:  
*Language Ideologies and the Teaching of Heritage Languages*  
Guadalupe Valdés  
Stanford University

**The Study of Language Ideology**

Within recent years, a number of researchers (e.g., Woolard 1998) have suggested that the study of language beliefs, representations and assumptions is important because it allows us to understand how such ideologies mediate meanings for social purposes, how everyday interactions in institutional settings reproduce and legitimate the social order, and how deeper messages about how the world operates are co-constructed and conveyed. Arguing that ideologies of language are not about language alone, Woolard (1998, 3) maintains that these beliefs enact ties of language to identity and underpin “the very notion of person and the social group, as well as such fundamental social institutions as religious ritual, child socialization, gender relations, the nation-state, schooling, and law.”

**Research on Language Ideologies within Spanish Departments**

Drawing from work carried out by Phillips (1998), which argued that some institutional settings (e.g., educational settings, media production enterprises) are centrally involved in the production of state hegemony, recent work on ideologies of language in Spanish departments (Valdés et al. in press) maintains that views about non-English languages that are part of the American cultural dialogue contribute in important ways to the disinterest exhibited by most monolingual American students toward acquiring foreign language proficiencies and to the attitudes of immigrant-origin students toward their heritage languages. Focusing on a total of five different departments of Spanish, Valdés et al. (in press) report that they uncovered a dominant discourse constructed around the notion of the monolingual, educated native speaker and strong beliefs about correct and appropriate language that helped justify the place and status of members of the department. Beliefs about language that were articulated by members of these departments revealed strong negative evaluations of the Spanish spoken by US Latinos. US Latinos, in turn, expressed strong resentments about the evaluation of their Spanish by members of the department. The discourse surrounding the notion of the monolingual, educated native speaker permeated all seemingly neutral departmental interactions. Both native speakers and foreign language learners expressed a fear of language transfer and contamination, of diminished strengths in one language if another was used well, and a sense of loss.
of native-speaker legitimacy if English was spoken too well. The term *bilingual*, moreover, was used narrowly to describe rare instances of equivalent proficiencies in two languages or employed as a dismissing euphemism for US Latinos. Everyday interactions in the department transmitted consistent messages to students: Monolingual-like behavior in Spanish is the ideal, and few students not natively born to the language achieve this standard. US Latinos face greater difficulties than foreign language learners in acquiring the types of Spanish valued by the department.

**Language Ideologies and Research Priorities**

For the HL teaching profession, the research conducted by Valdés et al. suggests that ideologies about monolingualism and bilingualism within institutions of higher education and more specifically within departments of foreign languages relate in important and yet unexpected ways to nationalist ideologies about language. It is important to examine these settings because, as Woolard (1999) has pointed out, the understanding of both language maintenance and language shift requires more than the traditional socio-psychological study of individual attitudes or the macro-sociological study of events. Similarly, the understanding of attitudes toward the acquisition of non-dominant languages requires more than the study of instrumental versus integrative motivation. Both require the examination of the inculcation of hegemonic beliefs about both monolingualism and bilingualism as they are encountered in seemingly neutral and even counter-hegemonic activities and practices.

Unfortunately, to date, academic departments in institutions of higher education have received very little attention by researchers. As Wisniewski (2000) points out, those who study educational institutions have decided to avert their gaze and to pretend that there is not much that they can learn about education in these instructional settings. For those concerned about the study and teaching of HLs, however, the study of language departments in American universities and the examination of the ways in which departmental ideologies and practices interconnect with the broader social, political, and economic elements that are present in both the university and national contexts will directly contribute to our understanding of the role that higher education can or cannot play in the intergenerational transfer of HLs. Particular attention needs to be directed at the following questions.

1. What is the language background of members of foreign language departments?
• How many individuals are native speakers of the language who were raised in foreign countries? How many of these individuals speak English fluently? What is their position in the departmental hierarchy?
• How many individuals are non-native speakers who learned the language as a second language? What levels of proficiency have they attained in the language? What is their position in the departmental hierarchy?
• How many individuals are heritage speakers (American born bilinguals)? Are these individuals considered native or non-native by members of the department? What is their position in the departmental hierarchy?
• What role do language ideologies play in the establishment of the departmental hierarchy?

2. What sets of beliefs about language do faculty and students articulate in departments of foreign languages?
• What views do they have about the type of language that should be taught in the department?
• What views do they have about speakers of different types of language (e.g., standard language, colloquial language, popular jargon, regional varieties, class varieties)?
• What kinds of understandings do they have about societal and individual bilingualism?
• To what degree are language practices in particular language departments colored by a nationalist aesthetic (Thomas 1991) that is concerned with the characteristic features of the original national language and culture?

3. What perceptions do members of the department have about heritage speakers?
• What is their experience with heritage speakers both inside and outside the educational institution?
• What views do they have about the barriers facing heritage students in developing and maintaining their HLs?
• What beliefs do members of the department have about heritage speakers as future teachers of the language?

PAPER #9
Research Priorities: Heritage Languages in Policy Texts
Joseph Lo Bianco
Language Australia

While analyzing efforts to support threatened languages, Fishman (2001) notes that maintenance of heritage languages often seems like anti-modern
parochialism in contrast to the dominant discourses of western modernity. Intergenerational transfer of minority languages within families and public institutions runs counter to the discourse in policy texts and to prevailing attitudes in public life. In English-dominant societies, the discourses of western modernity mediated by English are more acute. Do English-speaking nations share an underlying broad English “linguistic culture” (Schiffman 1996) or do particular national characteristics and national policy styles have more impact? The linguistic demography of the major English-speaking societies has some similarities. The societies share the global meta-lect, most have experienced extensive non-English speaking immigration, most have indigenous languages communities, and all have foreign language interests and needs.

The representation of these languages (immigrant, indigenous, foreign) in policy contexts, alongside dominant English, would constitute an interesting research project and promise to cast light on the challenges and prospects for policies that are supportive of heritage language maintenance. Although Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States differ in relation to socio-legal context, the examination would test the extent of shared underlying attitudes and ideologies towards multilingualism that derive from English philosophical tradition. Three related studies arise from these points and are proposed for research:

1. A comparative analysis of policy texts across education systems of Australia, the US and the UK.

   In previous work (Lo Bianco 2001a), I focused on broad national policy texts speculating that a shared inheritance of political philosophy may flow through to views and practices of linguistic culture.

   I suggest examination of major policy texts with a matrix of key words and associations to identify how minority language issues are actually taken up in national policies, using a critical discourse framework for the study. Another option is for controlled contrasts governed by a particular time period (say the 1990s in which global population movements accelerated, contributing to anxiety around national symbols, like English) and jurisdictional domain, such as early schooling or higher education.

2. A study of the claimed benefits for language learning as proposed in mainstream policy texts.
This study would compare and contrast prevailing categories of benefits of language learning, so that associations would be revealed concerning where policy texts imagine learned languages are used, with what interlocutors, and for what purposes. It is likely that interesting information concerning differential evaluations of bilingualism would emerge, such that the language ideologies of bilingualism coming from immigrant language maintenance (Zelasko 1991; Lo Bianco 2001b) compared to bilingualism from acquired foreign languages can be tracked in policy discourses and texts. A matrix for examining these texts would be needed and the claimed benefits (e.g. cultural insight, enhanced metalinguistic awareness, practical use of an additional language, better acquisition of English etc.) could be correlated to other prevailing policy texts, or discourses, about education in general.

For example, in Australia during the late 1990s, two major discourses about language issues were prominent. First, the teaching of Asian languages was premised on overarching policies of economic integration with “the region” (North and Southeast Asia), alongside a politically controversial “crisis in English literacy” discourse based on the need for small economies to invest in human capital for the increasingly cut-throat globalized economy. These two “meta” policy goals (Asia-literacy for all/English literacy for economic competitiveness) produced considerable reaction from parents and teachers, many of whom regarded them as contradictory.

A similar pattern occurred in Britain with the introduction of the National Curriculum. Though largely motivated by demands to raise English literacy standards, the National Curriculum came to impact directly on languages. Increasing European integration produced pressure for teaching official European languages, while advocates of immigrant and indigenous languages were required to reconstruct their case.

3. A study of the policy culture and process.

It has long struck me (as an Australian traveling and working in the United States and in Britain) that we actually mean different things when we discuss rights in general and language rights in particular (concepts like multiculturalism, diversity, multilingualism, English as the national language, as well as the role of policy making, of courts, of law, and compulsion/choice). A major difference is the expected or appropriate role
of the state and the role and meaning of litigation and legislation as policy processes.

Foundational national ideologies make the relative construction of many issues different. Language-planning studies need to be more sensitive to the various modes of social change and reaction. It would be useful to contrast what the word “heritage” language implies and what sense it carries across different legal and social contexts, by looking at specific programs of HL maintenance and regeneration, the policies that have generated these programs, and the discourse and attitudes that accompany them.

PAPER #10

Biliteracy and Heritage Languages
Nancy H. Hornberger
University of Pennsylvania

The two research questions I propose for heritage languages and their speakers are the same ones I have consistently posed for minority languages and their speakers over the last two decades. Namely:

Question 1. What global, societal, and local factors encourage and promote intergenerational transfer, maintenance, revitalization and development of HLs?

Question 2: What educational approaches--policies, programs, and practices--best serve HL learners and the intergenerational transfer of their languages?

These are large and encompassing questions, which I seek to answer, with the collaboration of students and colleagues, through comparative ethnographic policy research in multilingual settings in the United States and in other parts of the world. This research links highly detailed, microlevel, ethnographic data on multilingual classrooms, schools, and communities to macrolevel language and education policies, discourses and ideologies.

Key to this work is a unifying, coherent, conceptual framework, which I call the continua of biliteracy (Hornberger 1989, 1990, 2002, 2003, forthcoming; Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester 2000; Hornberger and Wang, forthcoming). The continua model of biliteracy offers a framework in which to situate research, teaching, and language planning in linguistically diverse settings. The model uses the notion of intersecting and nested continua to demonstrate the multiple and complex
interrelationships between bilingualism and literacy and the importance of the contexts, media, and content through which biliteracy develops. Specifically, the continua model depicts the development of biliteracy as it intersects with continua of first language-second language, receptive-productive, and oral-written language skills; through the medium of two (or more) languages and literacies whose linguistic structures vary from similar to dissimilar, whose scripts range from convergent to divergent, and to which the developing biliterate individual’s exposure varies from simultaneous to successive; in contexts that encompass micro to macro levels and are characterized by varying mixes along the monolingual-bilingual and oral-literate continua; and with content that ranges from majority to minority perspectives and experiences, literary to vernacular styles and genres, and decontextualized to contextualized language texts.

The notion of continuum conveys that all points on a particular continuum are interrelated, and the intersecting and nested relationships among the continua convey that all points across the continua are also interrelated. The model suggests that the more that learners and users are allowed to draw from across the whole of each and every continuum by their learning contexts and contexts of use, the greater are the chances for their full biliterate development and expression. Implicit in that suggestion is recognition that there has usually not been attention to all points and that movement along the continua and across the intersections may well be contested. In educational policy and practice regarding biliteracy, there tends to be an implicit privileging of one end of the continua over the other such that one end of each continuum is associated with more power than the other (e.g. written development over oral development). There is a need to challenge the traditional power weighting by paying attention to, granting agency to, and making space for, actors and practices at what have traditionally been the less powerful ends of the continua.

Following is an illustration of how the continua of biliteracy model can serve to situate research questions on the intergenerational transfer of HLs, using sample questions selected from the rich array posed in the preceding papers. The questions on the context and media continua have more to do with the first question above about the languages, while the questions on the development and content continua relate more directly to the second question above about the learners. In every case, my hypothesis would be, based on the continua model, that the more policies and practices pay attention to the traditionally powerless ends of the continua, the more conducive they will be for intergenerational transfer of the HL.
Context of Biliteracy (e.g. Socio-cultural Factors, Policies, Ideologies, Community, Classroom)

What can we learn from a comparative study of case histories and the contemporary experiences of various groups (immigrant and indigenous) that might better inform educational language policies (e.g. factors promoting or hindering retention, disposition of dominant societies, stance of language minority groups, folk theories of success)? (Wiley, this article, question 1)

What are the effects of the present societal pressures on children to master English? How are the pressures influencing parental decisions? Levels of student participation? Teaching practices? Are children more reluctant to use the HL in school or in social interactions outside of school? How do these pressures affect student attitudes toward the HL and participation in HL programs? (Wong Fillmore, this article)

How can we trace the formation and transformation of language ideologies within school settings? Do these ideologies change over time, and if so, how? How do language ideologies influence the implementation of dual language programs? (González, this article, question 1)

What is the composition of foreign language departments? What sets of beliefs about language do faculty and students articulate in departments of foreign languages? What perceptions do members of the department have about heritage speakers? (Valdés, this article)

How are Native American tribes and their respective language initiatives being affected by recent federal mandates and educational policies that focus on student achievement of national standards and standardized assessments? What new pressures have such policies begun to place on indigenous systems of language transmission in the home and in the community? (Sims, this article, question 4).

What can be revealed by comparative analysis of policy texts across national systems, as to their characterization of heritage/community languages, national attitudes and identity, and the claimed benefits for language learning? (Lo Bianco, this article, studies 1 and 2). Likewise, what can we learn from comparative analysis of policy culture and process across national systems? (Lo Bianco, this article, study 3).
Content of Biliteracy (e.g. Identities, Ideologies, Attitudes, Affiliations, Genres, Discourses)

How does participation in a Japanese HL program in Los Angeles affect second-generation Japanese teen-age students’ ethnic identity, attitudes, and motivation toward the learning of Japanese? (Chinen and Tucker, this article, question 1a)

How can we study the formation and transformation of children's language ideologies? How do these ideologies influence HL Learners in formal and informal contexts? How are language ideologies related to literacy ideologies? How do language ideologies intersect/impact the development of biliteracy for HL Learners? (González, this article, question 2)

Media of Biliteracy (e.g. Media of Instruction and of Communication, Sequencing of Language Acquisition, Codeswitching, Multiliteracies, Hybridity)

What drives some parents to insist on the use of the HL and others to shift to English? (Shin, this article, question 1)

How can information about language acquisition be communicated positively to anxious parents who want their children to get a head start in English? (Shin, this article, question 2)

What are the curricular alignments across the years (grades K-16) that promote or hinder HL development? (Macías, this article, question 1.3)

Development of Biliteracy (e.g. Expertise, Proficiency, Skills, Transfer)

How does participation in a Japanese HL program in Los Angeles affect second-generation Japanese teen-age students’ development of, or changes in, Japanese proficiency? (Chinen and Tucker, this article, question 1b)
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