RAISING AWARENESS ABOUT HERITAGE LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN THE L2 SPANISH CLASSROOM: TEACHER BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES

LA TOMA DE CONCIENCIA SOBRE EL APRENDIZ DE LENGUA DE HERENCIA EN CLASES DE ESPAÑOL COMO SEGUNDA LENGUA: CREENCIAS Y ACTITUDES DEL PROFESOR

Angela George
University of Calgary, Canada
angela.george@ucalgary.ca

Francisco Salgado-Robles
College of Staten Island-CUNY, U.S.A.
francisco.salgado@csi.cuny.edu

With the growing number of English language learners throughout the United States enrolled in the foreign language class representing their heritage language, it is increasingly important for foreign language methodology courses to address how to plan for, instruct, and assess the diverse needs of these students in the K-12 foreign language classroom. Their needs as heritage language learners are different than those of second language learners. Therefore, in order to teach these language learners, teachers should possess specific competencies, not typically evident in foreign language teaching methodology courses. The present study is a preliminary effort to integrate a module on teaching heritage language

learners into a foreign language teaching methodology course and to evaluate the development of teacher candidates' declarative knowledge, beliefs, and conceptualizations about heritage language learners and heritage language instruction. Participants (N=30) are pre-service 9-12 Spanish teachers at two postsecondary institutions in the Eastern United States. The results demonstrate that teacher candidates move beyond conceiving heritage language learners as similar to second language learners and proceed toward perceiving them as culturally and linguistically diverse learners of Spanish, as evidenced through surveys and lesson plans.

Key words: *teacher education, language teacher development, Spanish heritage language learner, bilingualism*

Con el creciente número de aprendices de inglés en los Estados Unidos matriculados en clases de lengua extranjera que representan su lengua de herencia, es cada vez más importante que los cursos de métodos de enseñanza lenguas extranjeras aborden cómo planificar, instruir y evaluar las diversas necesidades de estos estudiantes en el aula de lengua extranjera en la educación pre-universitaria. Sus necesidades como aprendices del idioma heredado son diferentes a las de los aprendices de una segunda lengua. Por lo tanto, para enseñar a estos aprendices de lengua, los profesores deben poseer competencias específicas, las cuales normalmente no son evidentes en los cursos de metodología de la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras. El presente estudio representa un esfuerzo preliminar para integrar un módulo sobre la enseñanza de aprendices de lengua de herencia en un curso de métodos de la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras y evaluar el desarrollo del conocimiento declarativo y las creencias de estudiantes para maestro y conceptualizaciones sobre el aprendiz de lengua de herencia y la pedagogía de lenguas de herencia. Los participantes (N=30) son profesores de español en formación inicial de educación secundaria de dos universidades en el este de los Estados Unidos. Los resultados demuestran que los profesores en formación inicial van más allá de concebir a los aprendices de lengua de herencia similares a los aprendices de segunda lengua y de percibirlos como aprendices de español cultural y lingüísticamente diversos, conforme se evidencia en encuestas y planes de lecciones.

Palabras clave: *formación del profesorado, desarrollo profesional en profesores de lengua, aprendiz de español como lengua de herencia, bilingüismo*

1. Introduction

There is a paucity of empirical research focusing on teacher education and development, particularly in comparison to studies on the teaching and learning of a foreign language (FL) (Geyer, 2008). This remains true in the current decade as Johnson (2015) calls for the need for empirical research in second language (L2) teacher education courses. One unanswered question deals with how teacher candidates (TCs) develop their understanding of heritage language learners (HLLs) and conceptualize how to teach FL classes with HLLs as a result of instruction on this topic in L2 teacher preparation. While courses reserved for HLLs are ideal, they unfortunately are not available in all schools and instead HLLs are placed in FL classes with L2 learners (Potowski & Carreira, 2010). Teachers are then faced with teaching these two distinct populations which themselves are not homogenous (Carreira 2016; Parra, 2017). The aim of the current paper is to determine the effectiveness of a module on issues surrounding teaching these mixed courses and if such a module can increase awareness about HLLs and their needs. Although literature on this subject has provided a variety of definitions of HLLs, the one used in this paper falls most in line with someone "who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or at least understands the language, and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English" (Valdés, 2001, p. 38). The bilingual and multilingual community in the United States is on the rise. In other words, there are notably more bilinguals and multilinguals than monolinguals (Tucker, 1999). Teacher education programs in the United States devote only a limited amount of time to educating TCs about HLLs or leave out this topic completely (Potowski & Carreira, 2004), despite a call for all FL teacher preparation programs to include instruction on HLLs (Scalera, 2000). More recently, both pre- and in-service K-12 Spanish teachers expressed the fact that they had not received any instruction on teaching HLLs in their undergraduate teaching methodology courses (Russell & Kuriscak, 2015).

Despite this large and growing population of HLLs, the majority of textbooks used in methodology courses that train current and future FL teachers devote only a few pages to HLL instruction (Potowski & Carreira, 2004). Exceptions include the textbook for TCs, titled *Heritage Language Teaching: Research and Practice*, by Beaudrie, Ducar, and Potowski (2014), and the free online teacher modules devoted to heritage language

(HL) instruction found at http://startalk.nhlrc.ucla.edu. Not surprisingly, relatively little class time is spent on how to instruct such a population as, in Schwartz's (2001) words, "[f]ew 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" (p. 229). This has not changed in recent decades (Fairclough, 2016; Potowski, 2016).

Beaudrie et al. (2014) list 12 competencies teachers should possess in order to teach HLLs, noting that the majority are not evident in FL teaching methodology courses. Due to this lack of instruction and knowledge on teaching HLLs, it is not surprising that the manner in which teachers instruct HLLs has been shown to be problematic and in many cases even detrimental to Spanish maintenance by HLLs (Harklau, 2009). For example, many teachers expect HLLs to behave like native speakers (NSs), and when teachers encounter HLLs in their world language classrooms, they often negate the importance of their cultural and linguistic diversity, thus losing the confidence and participation of their HLLs (Harklau, 2009; Russell & Kuriscak, 2015). As the population of HLLs continues to grow steadily in U.S. schools, so too does the need to educate TCs on how to successfully incorporate this population into their FL classes. In summary, while little is known about the effects of instructional modules on HLLs in teacher preparation programs, previous research has addressed the need for such instruction (Potowski & Carreira, 2004; Russel & Kuriscak, 2015; Scalera, 2000). Due to teachers being largely unprepared to work with HLLs in spite of their growing presence in foreign language classrooms (Parra, 2017), the present study seeks to determine TCs' beliefs about defining HLLs and including HLLs in FL courses with L2 learners before and after a module on the teaching of HLLs in the FL classroom. This module is explained in section 4.

2. Literature Review

Because the needs of HLLs differ from those of L2 learners (Beaudrie et al., 2014; Fairclough & Beaudrie, 2016; Valdés, 2005), it is not sufficient to group these learners with L2 learners who were never exposed to the target language (TL) prior to entering the classroom. According to Kagan and Dillon (2009), instruction of HLLs "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" (p. 169). This instruction should enhance HLLs awareness of formal and academic registers and work on changing their implicit knowledge about their HL into explicit knowledge. In addition, "[e]ducators need to accommodate instructional materials and methodologies in order to address their needs appropriately" (Beaudrie et al., 2014, p. 16). In classes with both HL and L2 learners, differentiated instruction is a must (Kagan & Dillon, 2009). Furthermore, research on teachers of HLLs provides some insight into the knowledge base and strategies for teaching HLLs. This involves teacher's declarative cognition about HLLs including their beliefs about HLLs and best practices for teaching HLLs, both of which will be discussed next.

2.1. L2 vs. HL Learners

The greatest difference amongst L2 and HL learners relates to the contact they have had with the TL. While the majority of L2 learners have had contact with the language mainly through formal instructional settings (e.g., school), HLLs, conversely, have grown up hearing or using the language in a natural context, such as in the home or community. Age, learning context, language variety, connections to the language, connection to the culture, and language proficiency are the categories that have been found to distinguish L2 from HL learners and are addressed subsequently.

Normally, in the U.S., many L2 learners begin studying a language around the age of 14, which tends to be associated with the critical period, i.e., the closer children are to puberty, they are less likely to have access to their innate biological capacity to acquire a new language (Singleton, 2005). Although L2 learners may possess advanced proficiency, they are far more unlikely to eventually acquire a native-like end state (particularly in phonology). Conversely, as Beaudrie et al. (2014) acknowledge, "it remains a tenable hypothesis that many HL learners can reach native-like end states in the HL" (p. 46). Unlike many L2 learners, HLLs begin acquiring the language from an early age. As a result, their pronunciation, informal knowledge of informal vocabulary, and certain syntactic structures are more complex than those of L2 learners. Even HLLs with low proficiency levels have advantages in aural and pronunciation abilities over L2 learners of similar proficiency levels (Parra, 2017).

Beaudrie et al. (2014) explain the difference between HL and L2 learners. They state that L2 learners usually learn the TL in a formal setting (e.g., classroom). Furthermore, they claim that L2 learners typically focus on learning a standard variety taught via an explicit text-based approach or other communicative L2 methodologies and therefore often possess metalinguistic skills and are able to explain the rules of the TL. On the contrary, they identify HLLs as having typically been raised hearing and using the TL in a natural environment, such as the home, and typically produce native-like oral language yet often struggle to produce native-like written language. It is worth noting that HLLs are not a homogenous group and are to varying degrees bilingual (Valdés, 2001), so the previous generalization will not apply to all HLLs. Unlike L2 learners, they are typically not familiarized with the instructional use of the language which takes place in classrooms (Parra, 2017).

L2 classroom learners have distinct views of what it means to study the TL (Beaudrie et al., 2014). For many L2 learners, a FL course in the TL represents an additional subject worthy of study (Beaudrie et al., 2014); however, for HLLs, this course represents more than just a subject: it usually signifies a strong attachment to the HL roots which can symbolize an important part of that HLL identity (Carreira & Kagan, 2011). As Beaudrie et al. (2014) claim, "in many heritage language classrooms, students represent a wide array of 'homeland' and U.S. culture, so the teaching of culture ('big C' and 'little c') is quite challenging due to the diversity of learners" (p. 59). When teachers associate ethnic groups with certain characteristics, it may be of no means to the L2 learner, but it may offend the HLL (Beaudrie et al., 2014).

The last comparison between HL and L2 learners entails language proficiency. Montrul and Perpiñán (2011) demonstrated that some HLLs are more proficient than L2 learners especially due to the fact that they have grown up with the TL. While dealing with L2 learners, educators can pinpoint with greater ease the level of the student, since instructors often follow a curriculum where certain parts of the language have to be taught first in order for students to advance to the next stage (Beaudrie et al., 2014). However, what is not yet clear is how to assess the level of HLLs in order to design an appropriate course, primarily due to the large variability in skills that HLLs possess (Beaudrie et al., 2014). Beaudrie et al. (2014) highlights five dimensions in which HLLs can differ, which are historic,

linguistic, educational, affective, and cultural differences. These dimensions can impact learner proficiency and motivation as well as influence each other, making it difficult to manage the needs of HLLs in terms of language development.

2.2. Teacher Beliefs on Defining HLLs

Teacher beliefs can be defined as "information, attitudes, values, expectations, theories, and assumptions about teaching and learning" (Richards, 1998, p. 66). Such a perspective is part of teacher cognition, which entails "understanding what teachers think, know, and believe" (Borg, 2009, p. 1). In this respect, Kubanyiova and Feryok (2015) assert that "language teacher cognition research needs to focus more sharply on how the inner worlds of teachers shape how their learning in formal settings, development over their careers, and teaching make a difference to their engagement with and influence on student learning" (p. 442). This research on language teacher cognition includes working with students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds such as HLLs. Little research is available on L2 teachers' cognition in the K-12 setting, with most previous studies focused on university learners (Borg, 2009). It is unclear if the conclusions about adult HLL college students can be compared with K-12 student HLLs due to the differing needs and motivations of adults and K-12 students.

Based on Johnson's (2015) reasoning, "teacher cognition emerges out of participation in external forms of social interaction (interpsychological) that eventually become internalized psychological tools for teacher thinking (intrapsychological)" (p. 516). Teachers' preconceived knowledge can be beneficial or can negatively impact cognitive development (Miller, 2001). In this case, if teachers think HLLs already know everything about their HL, they may treat them as experts in the classroom and adjust their teaching strategies accordingly (Russell & Kuriscak, 2015). This could be beneficial, in the case of using differentiation strategies to reach all learners in the classroom, or unconstructive, if HLLs become bored and create classroom management issues (Russell & Kuriscak, 2015) or if they are not experts (Beaudrie et al., 2014).

In order to lower the affective filter in the classroom, FL teachers should exhibit positive attitudes toward HLLs (Kagan & Dillon, 2009).

This involves developing HLLs overall proficiency instead of solely focusing on spelling and morphological errors (Kagan & Dillon, 2009). Additionally, negative attitudes toward the target culture of HLLs can adversely impact classroom experiences and the ability to expand TL knowledge (Harklau, 2009).

3. Research Questions

Given the previous studies on teacher attitudes towards HLLs and teacher beliefs in general, the current study addresses the following research question: How do TCs' beliefs about how HLLs are defined and teaching HLLs change as a result of an instructional module during a foreign language teaching methods course?

4. Methodology

4.1. Context of the Study and Participants

The 30 participants came from identical semester-long foreign language methodology courses taught by the authors of this article and were teaching candidates in an undergraduate foreign language education program in one of two large higher education institutions in the Eastern U.S. Participants were completing their bachelor's degrees in Modern Languages and Cultures with an emphasis on World Language Education (Spanish). Sociodemographic background information about each candidate is provided in Table 1. Participants (20 females; 10 males) were between the ages of 19 and 45 ($x = 22.8$). As to the type of learner, while L2 means that they first learned Spanish primarily in school setting, HL means they were raised in a Spanish-speaking household in the U.S.

Participant	Partner Institution	Sex	Age	Type of Language Learner
1.	1	F	22	L2
2.	1	M	21	L2
3.	1	F	19	L2
4.	1	F	23	HL
5.	1	M	20	L2
6.	1	F	20	L2
7.	1	F	21	HL
8.	1	M	24	HL
9.	1	F	45	L2
10.	1	F	20	HL
11.	1	F	25	HL
12.	1	M	19	HL
13.	1	F	22	L2
14.	1	F	30	L2
15.	2	F	21	L2
16.	2	F	20	HL
17.	2	M	21	HL
18.	2	M	26	HL
19.	2	F	20	HL
20.	2	F	21	L2
21.	2	F	22	HL
22.	2	M	21	HL
23.	2	F	26	HL
24.	2	M	23	HL
25.	2	M	22	HL
26.	2	F	21	HL
27.	2	F	20	L2
28.	2	F	22	HL
29.	2	M	25	HL
30.	2	F	22	L2
Totals	1 = 14 2 = 16	F = 20 M = 10	22.8	HL = 18 L2 = 12

Table 1. Sociodemographic background information of participants.A

4.2. Procedure

A variety of tools were used to collect data. First, prior to receiving any explicit instruction on HLLs, participants completed Questionnaire 1 (see Appendix) to ascertain their beliefs and perceptions about HLLs. This questionnaire consisted of open-ended questions, true/false questions, and Likert-scale statements. Participants completed this as homework prior to attending a two-hour class session addressing the teaching of HLLs. In addition to this questionnaire, participants were assigned reading materials pertaining to the instruction of HLLs in order to prepare for the class session. These included a White Paper on Heritage Languages as found on the National Heritage Language Resource Center's (NHLRC) website. This paper defines HLLs and ways they may diverge from NSs. Participants then read selections from Potowski and Carreira (2004), which included the goals of HLL instruction, the required teacher competencies needed for teaching HLLs, and the connections between language arts teaching and teaching HLLs. Candidates were also required to read the [State] Performance Standards for Spanish for Native Speakers Levels 1 and 2 as well as the suggested skills and themes for these levels. Participants completed a 30-question true/false online reading quiz in order to guide their reading and hold them accountable for completing the reading. Again, this was all completed prior to the class session on the teaching of HLLs.

After completing Questionnaire 1, and the assigned readings and accompanying comprehension quiz over the readings, participants received in-class instruction for one hour and 15 minutes on HLLs from the researchers, who were knowledgeable in the area of second language acquisition as well as HL pedagogy. Both researchers had previously conducted workshops on this topic for local teachers. The two hour instruction involved a lecture with active participation using information from the NHLRC as well as relevant research articles. The topics discussed included definitions of HLLs, registers, varieties, using oral skills to build literacy, differentiated instruction, authentic texts, grouping strategies, mixed classes, and assessments.

During the first five minutes of the lecture, TCs responded to three true or false questions and then discussed the answers as a class (see Appendix, Questionnaire 1, Part C, Questions 1–3). Next, different definitions of HLLs were provided and discussed. These included definitions by Valdés (2001, p. 1), Fishman (2001, p. 81), and Van Deusen-Scholl (2003, p. 222) as well as

descriptions from Polinsky and Kagan (2007). Then, a video from the NHLRC was shown, which further described young HLLs and their characteristics.

Following this part of the lecture, participants discussed a multiple-choice question, taken from the NHLRC website, about the best ways to promote bilingualism in HLLs aged 6 or older. Later, the results of a survey completed by HLLs and reported in Carreira and Kagan (2011) were discussed. These questions pertained to how competent the HLLs felt in their HL and the languages they spoke the most. This was followed by a definition on language registers and dialects, or varieties, of a language. Then, using a chart from Carreira (2012), four necessary stages to building literacy using oral skills were discussed. To assess comprehension of this chart, participants identified the appropriate stage for four sample writing tasks. Subsequently, three sample HLLs were described and participants identified the most appropriate type and level of FL class for each student. Following this, differentiation was defined and discussed as well as why a one-size-fits-all approach will not work with HLLs, particularly in the context of mixed classes, or those with L2 and HL learners. A short video from the NHLRC website was played detailing key aspects of differentiation for HLLs. Grouping strategies were also discussed, including a description of an activity that could utilize a jigsaw technique. Finally, formative and summative assessment of HLLs was briefly discussed. To complete the lesson, participants reviewed the suggested themes for Spanish for HLL courses and then the instructors presented the lesson assignment (See Lesson Plan Assignment in Appendix) which was completed outside of class after the lesson. Participants were instructed to describe an activity they would use to teach both L2 and HL learners in the same classroom and then to write a short reflection about their activity. Such reflective practices have been proven to help TCs learn (Geyer, 2008).

Immediately following in-class instruction, the participants completed Questionnaire 2 in order to determine how explicit instruction changed their perceptions of HLLs (see Appendix).

4.3. Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using a variety of methods. The open-ended questions and reflections written about the activity created for HLLs were analyzed using descriptive codes. Descriptive coding is effective for

multiple types of data (Saldaña, 2009) and for assessing change over time (Saldaña, 2008). In this case, the data came from two sources before and after instruction. Pattern Coding was then used to categorize the descriptive codes into major themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For the Likert-scale statements on the Questionnaires, averages were calculated and then differences over time from Questionnaire 1 to Questionnaire 2 were analyzed in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) using paired t-tests in order to show development over time and changes in beliefs about HLLs. The results of the true or false statements were analyzed based on accurate responses, and improvement over time was also explored.

5. Findings

Two main themes emerged after analyzing the various instruments. First, the participants more fully understood what constitutes an HLL. Second, the participants believed they were more prepared to teach HLLs while at the same time acknowledged the challenge of teaching both HL and L2 learners in the same classroom. Both of these themes will be discussed in more detail.

5.1. What Constitutes an HLL

Both the true/false statements and the open-ended questions resulted in more accurate definitions of HLLs by some participants.

Statement	Number Incorrect	
	Pre	Post
1. Heritage language learners always have two parents at home who speak the heritage language most of the time. (False)	6	8
2. Heritage language speakers are born outside of the United States. (False)	2	2
3. Heritage language learners have a cultural and/or linguistic connection to a non-U.S. culture and language. (True)	0	0
4. Heritage language learners are neither native speakers of the target language nor second language learners of that language. (True)	14	4

Table 2. Responses to true/false statements.

As Table 2 shows, 16 participants correctly responded to a true/false statement (HLLs as neither NSs nor L2 learners of that TL) prior to the module, while 26 responded correctly after the module, resulting in

33 % improvement. The module did not result in improvement for four participants who believed HLLs always have two parents at home that speak the language. While it is fairly common to think that HLLs have parents at home that speak the HL, many times it can be the grandparents or other relatives or caretakers. All but one participant consistently believed that HLLs could be born in the U.S. All participants consistently believed that HLLs have a linguistic connection to a non-U.S. culture and language.

When participants responded to an open-ended question on how HLLs differ from L2 learners, improvement from the module was also noted. Prior to the module, 63 % (19/30) of participants knew that HLLs had prior exposure to the language at home, but could not explain beyond that how they differed from L2 learners. After completing the module, nine of these same participants gave specific examples of how HLLs differed from L2 learners, including that HLLs are "code-shifters" (Participant 11, Questionnaire 2), to some degree bilingual, more advanced in speaking and listening, but not necessarily in reading and writing, better at informal registers, and struggle with explicit grammar. One participant did not know how HLLs differed from L2 learners. After the module, this participant was able to more fully describe some differences, recognizing that HLLs have previous exposure to the language and are to some degree bilingual.

Prior to the module, the remaining 11 participants mentioned specific skills in which HLLs have advantages over L2 learners, including vocabulary, speaking, listening, and culture. These participants believed that HLLs can "communicate with ease" (Participant 5, Questionnaire 1) and exhibit higher proficiency levels than L2 learners, particularly with speaking skills. One participant expanded to state that "they usually can speak fluently in the target language without much trouble or confusion" and several stated "more vocabulary knowledge than typical L2 learners. However, heritage speakers usually tend to be less fluent and understanding regarding the grammar rules and writing of their language even though they can speak it fluently" (Participant 25, Questionnaire 1). Following the module, the participants were able to expand on their original definitions, mainly mentioning how the HLLs could still benefit from classroom learning despite their personal connection to the TL.

5.2. Teaching HLLs

The participants felt significantly more prepared to teach a class of all HLLs and a class with both HL and L2 learners, after completing the module, as showed in Table 3.

Statement	Pre	Post	Pair t-test
1. I feel prepared to teach a Spanish high school class with only heritage or native speakers of the target language.	4.14	5.05	$t(21) = -2.95$ $p = .004*$
2. I feel prepared to teach a Spanish high school class with heritage/native speakers of the target language and non-native speakers of the target language.	5.27	5.86	$t(21) = -2.890$ $p = .0045*$
3. I am interested in teaching both heritage/native speakers of the target language and non-native speakers of the target language.	6.68	6.41	$t(21) = 2.027$ $p = .028*$
4. I am interested in teaching high school Spanish.	6.63	6.50	$t(21) = 1.142$ $p = .133$

Table 3. Responses to Likert-scale statements and statistical significance.

However, their interest in teaching a mixed class decreased significantly after completing the module. This could be because they realized how time consuming and difficult it can be to design effective lessons for a mixed class, which could have overwhelmed them as teaching candidates with the majority possessing limited experiences in the classroom.

Prior to this lecture, the majority of participants could list specific skills in which HLLs are more advanced than L2 learners as well as areas where HLLs are less advanced in terms of classroom TL learning. Only two participants expressed the need to differentiate in mixed classroom prior to the module. However, after the module, in open-ended responses on the questionnaire, over half the participants, 20 out of 30, mentioned differentiation as a strategy for helping HLLs learn their HL in a classroom setting. For example, one participant noted that HLLs "need more of a challenge regarding speaking and listening comprehension but more scaffolding when it comes to reading and writing" (Participant 2, Questionnaire 2). In addition, the challenging assignments will allow HLLs to "not get bored or distracted because they already have the knowledge about a lesson that non-native speakers don't have" (Participant 28, Questionnaire 2). More specifically, grouping strategies were mentioned by four participants, with one mentioning "the heritage speaker can help the second language speaker with conversation and understanding"

(Participant 6, Questionnaire 2). Using HLLs as leaders or teachers was mentioned by three participants.

On the lesson plan assignment that the participants completed as a final assessment to the module, 19 participants (63 %) noted the need to differentiate. More specifically, nine participants (30 %) described the use of strategically grouping students and four (13 %) mentioned allowing for flexibility in the completion of assigned activities to allow HLLs to make use of their cultural backgrounds. Other topics stated only once, each time by a different student, included addressing the needs of all students, allowing them to express themselves without focusing explicitly on grammar, permitting HLLs to write full sentences instead of individual words, focusing on improving writing by using topics familiar and interesting to HLLs, and utilizing authentic textual material.

On the open-ended responses after completing the module, eight participants described HLLs as potential cultural ambassadors in their classroom to benefit both their students and the participants' own limited knowledge of the various TL cultures. In this way, HLLs would "lead discussions on aspects of their culture we may be unfamiliar with" (Participant 23, Questionnaire 2) and teachers would be "sensitive to aspects of [their] culture and language" (Participant 27, Questionnaire 2) and "open to their contribution" (Participant 19, Questionnaire 2). One participant mentioned the need to "transfer their literacy skills" and "use activities to expand [their] linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence" (Participant 15, Questionnaire 2).

The two main themes, defining an HLL and teaching HLLs, were evident in participant responses on the questionnaires in both open and close ended questions. Prior to the module, most of the participants spoke in generalities about HLLs, with one even admitting a lack of knowledge on HLLs. After the module, all participants more fully described generalities about HLLs and offered various strategies for teaching HLLs in mixed classrooms with L2 learners, the most common being differentiation and the use of HLLs as ambassadors of their cultures and leaders in the classroom.

6. Discussion

The research question addresses how TCs' beliefs and attitudes about how HLLs are defined and teaching HLLs change as a result of an instructional module on this topic. The findings indicate evidence of changing teacher beliefs in terms of how HLLs are defined, attitudes towards HLLs, and how to address the needs of HLLs in mixed classroom with L2 learners.

The participants believe that HLLs have more TL background in the TL than their L2 counterparts. They view this as positive, with a few participants even mentioning learning from HLLs, particularly in regard to culture. Whether or not these positive views will transfer to actual classroom practices will still need to be investigated. Previous research has shown negative attitudes toward HLLs and their cultures by high school Spanish teachers with no prior training on instruction of HLLs (Harklau, 2009).

The participants in the current study possess interest and a certain level of knowledge about the backgrounds of HLLs, which should result in more meaningful classroom experiences for HLLs (Kagan & Dillon, 2009). The participants do not frame HLLs as being deficient in the language, but rather many overestimate their abilities or mention specific areas where weaknesses occur only in comparison to L2 learners. While Lee and Oxelson (2006) found that teachers with no training exhibited negative or indifferent views of HLLs, the TCs in the current study demonstrated their positive attitudes toward HLLs, particularly in their lesson plan and reflection, where they pointed out the contributions the HLLs would make and the mutual benefit of HLLs and L2 students. Carreira (2016) explains how HL and L2 learners can use their strengths to develop intercultural understanding where each type of student can use their strengths to more fully understand certain concepts and ideas. The module in the current study helps TCs more fully understand the complexity of HLLs as well as understand how their needs differ from L2 learners.

Participants better portrayed the needs of HLLs in the TL classroom as well as a few strategies for achieving those needs. Differentiation was mentioned, with the most common specific strategies dealing with grouping, the use of HLLs as cultural leaders, and assessment. However, it must be noted that not all HLLs are experts on their heritage culture(s), or they are experts to varying degrees (Carreira, 2004), so care must be taken when

positioning HLLs as experts, since L2 students and HLLs both benefit from content on the heritage background itself.

Teacher beliefs changed after the module in that participants were able to express their beliefs about the specific needs of L2s in a more in-depth manner and addressed how they could utilize HLLs for the level of expertise they possess and backgrounds in the foreign language classroom. The opportunity to self-reflect allows participants to implement changes (Geyer, 2008). These changes are evident in their lesson plans. The participants understand that they must differentiate (Kagan & Dillon, 2009) for HLLs and demonstrated this in their lesson plans and written reflections on these plans.

7. Conclusions

7.1. Limitations and Future Studies

This study is not without limitations. First, the number of participants is not large, although it is reflective of two mid-size universities in the Eastern United States with a relatively small World Languages Education Programs. A future study could delve deeper into the background of the participants, ascertaining more information about their previous FL teaching experiences, particularly with any HLLs.

A follow-up study to the current one might shadow these TCs into the field to determine if their beliefs about teaching HLLs carry over to their future classrooms. It might also elicit feedback from HLL students along with other measures to determine the effectiveness of the instruction. Semi-structured interviews with the TCs could also shed more light on their views and ideas for instructing and assessing HLLs. Data from both HLLs and TCs could help further illuminate areas TCs are lacking in with regards to instructing mixed classrooms, so that future instruction could address such areas.

7.2. Pedagogical Implications

As the population of heritage speakers continues to grow in the U.S., so too does the number enrolled in U.S. schools. Therefore, it is imperative that all current and future teachers are informed about how best to teach such a

population and that teacher educators are also cognizant of this issue in order to instruct their TCs. In addition, there are resources available to them, e.g., the textbook *Heritage language teaching: Research and Practice* (Beaudrie et al., 2014), as well as the materials on the National Heritage Language Resource Center's website, http://www.nhlrc.ucla.edu/nhlrc, including their free self-paced workshop and materials (National Heritage Language Resource Center). The participants in the current study were unaware of this organization until it was presented to them in class, thus we must continue to inform current and future teachers about the resources available to them as well as how best to use them.

7.3. Final Conclusions

Teachers' limited knowledge on HLLs can be rectified by including relevant topics in FL teaching methods courses. This could be integrated in to other topics such as corrective feedback, SLA principles, affective factors, explaining how HLLs may differ from L2 learners. Teacher candidates of world languages could benefit from a module on teaching HLLs in their teacher preparation programs. Future research will determine the long-lasting effects of these modules to determine if this new knowledge results in the development of more informed classroom practices.

Acknowledgments

References

Beaudrie, S., Ducar, C., & Potowski, K. (2014). *Heritage Language Teaching: Research and Practice*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Borg, S. (2009). Language teacher cognition. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 163-171). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term "heritage language learner." *Heritage Language Journal*, *2*, 1-25.

Carreira, M. (2012). Meeting the instructional needs of heritage language learners: Approaches, strategies, and research. In S. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a Heritage Language in the US: State of the Science* (pp. 223-240). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Carreira, M. (2016). A general framework and supporting strategies for teaching mixed classes. In D. Pascual y Cabo (Ed.), *Advances in Spanish as a Heritage Language* (pp. 159-176). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Carreira, M., & Kagan, O. (2011). The results of the national heritage language survey: Implications for teaching, curriculum design, and professional development. *Foreign Language Annals*, *44(1)*, 40-64. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2010.01118.x

Fairclough, M. (2016). Emerging trends with heritage language instructional practices. In D. Pascual y Cabo (Ed.), *Advances in Spanish as a Heritage Language* (pp. 221-235). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Fairclough, M., & Beaudrie, S. (2016). *Innovative Strategies for Heritage Language Teaching: A Practical Guide for the Classroom*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Fishman, J. (2001). 300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource* (pp. 81-98). Washington, DC & McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.

Geyer, N. (2008). Reflective practices in foreign language teacher education: A view through micro and macro windows. *Foreign Language Annals*, *41(4)*, 627-638. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03321.x

Harklau, L. (2009). Heritage speakers experiences' in new Latino diaspora Spanish classrooms. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *6(4)*, 211-242. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427580903118689

Johnson, K. E. (2015). Reclaiming the relevance of L2 teacher education. *Modern Language Journal*, *99*, 515-528. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12242

Kagan, O., & Dillon, K. (2009). The professional development of teachers of heritage language learners: A matrix. In M. Anderson & A. Lazaraton (Eds.), *Bridging Contexts, Making Connections: Selected Papers from the Fifth International Conference on Language Teacher Education* (pp. 155-175). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, The Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.

Kubanyiova, M., & Feryok, A. (2015). Language teacher cognition in applied linguistics research: Revisiting the territory, redrawing the boundaries, reclaiming the relevance. *The Modern Language Journal*, *99(3)*, 435-449. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12239

Lee, J., & Oxelson, E. (2006). "It's not my job": K-12 teacher attitudes toward students' heritage language maintenance. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*, 453-477. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2006.10162885

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, R. (2011). *Vygotsky in Perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Montrul, S., & Perpiñán, S. (2011). Assessing differences and similarities between instructed L2 learners and heritage language learners in their knowledge of Spanish tense-aspect and mood (TAM) morphology. *Heritage Language Journal*, *8(1)*, 90-133.

Parra, M. L. (2017). Resources for teaching Spanish as a heritage language. *Informes del Observatorio*, *32(6)*, 1-27. https://doi.org/10.15427/OR032-06/2017EN

Polinsky, M., & Kagan, O. (2007). Heritage languages: In the 'wild' and in the classroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1, 368-395. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818X.2007.00022.x.

Potowski, K. (2016). Current issues in Spanish heritage language education. In D. Pascual y Cabo (Ed.), *Advances in Spanish as a Heritage Language* (pp. 127-141). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Potowski, K., & Carreira, M. (2004). Teacher development and national standards for Spanish as a heritage language. *Foreign Language Annals*, *37(3)*, 427-437. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02700.x

Potowski, K., & Carreira, M. (2010). Spanish in the USA. In K. Potowski (Ed.), *Language Diversity in the USA* (pp. 66-80). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond Training: Perspectives on Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Russel, B., & Kuriscak, L. (2015). High school Spanish teachers' attitudes and practices toward Spanish heritage language learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, *48(3)*, 413-433. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12145

Saldaña, J. (2008). Analyzing longitudinal qualitative observational data. In S. Menard (Ed.), *Handbook of Longitudinal Research: Design, Measurement, and Analysis* (pp. 297-311). Burlington, MA: Academic Press.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. London, UK: Sage.

Scalera, D. (2000). Teacher beliefs and the heritage language learner: What will you teach your students? In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching Heritage Language Learners: Voices from the Classroom* (pp. 71-82). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Singleton D. (2005) The critical period hypothesis: A coat of many colours. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *43*, 269-285.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). (2013). 2013 edTPA field test: Summary report. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Schwartz, A. M. (2001). Preparing teachers to work with heritage language learners. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource* (pp. 229-254). McHenry, IL, & Washington, DC: Delta Systems & Center for Applied Linguistics.

Tucker, M. F. (1999). Self-awareness and development using the overseas assignment inventory. In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.), *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-Cultural Training Methods* (pp. 45-52). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). The Condition of Education 2015 (NCES 2015-144), English Language Learners.

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource* (pp. 37-77). McHenry, IL, & Washington, DC: Delta Systems & Center for Applied Linguistics.

Valdés, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *The Modern Language Journal*, *89(3)*, 410-426. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00314.x

Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2003) Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *2(3)*, 211–230.

Appendix

Questionnaire 1 (Completed before instruction)

Part A:

1.   What is a heritage learner of Spanish?
      (Note, there are no right or wrong answers, just write what you think,
      without looking anything up.)
2.   How does a heritage learner of Spanish differ from other learners in
      the foreign language classroom?
3.   In your own words, explain what it means to be "bilingual."
4.   Do you think there is some overlap between a "heritage language
      learner" and a "second language learner"? Does it depend on their
      proficiency?

Part B:

For the following statements respond on the following scale of 1 (strongly
disagree) 2 3 4 5 6 or 7 (strongly agree)

[Note: the option to choose 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7 will be visible]

1.   I feel prepared to teach a Spanish high school class with only heritage
      or native speakers of the target language.
2.   I feel prepared to teach a Spanish high school class with heritage/
      native speakers of the target language and non-native speakers of the
      target language.
3.   I am interested in teaching both heritage/native speakers of the target
      language and non-native speakers of the target language.
4.   I am interested in teaching high school Spanish.

Part C: What do you know about heritage learners of Spanish?

1.   Heritage language learners always have two parents at home who
      speak the heritage language most of the time. (False)
2.   Heritage language speakers are born outside of the U.S. (False)
3.   Heritage language learners have a cultural and/or linguistic
      connection to a non-U.S. culture and language. (True)

4.   Heritage language learners are neither native speakers of the target language nor second language learners of that language. (True)

Questionnaire 2 (Completed after instruction)

Part A:

1.   How are heritage/native speakers different than non-native target language speakers?
2.   How would this affect your teaching? In other words, if you had a class with some heritage/native speakers, how would you teach differently than if you had a class of only non-native target language speakers?

Part B:

For the following statements respond on the following scale of 1 (strongly disagree) 2 3 4 5 6 or 7 (strongly agree)

[Note: the option to choose 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7 will be visible]

1.   I feel prepared to teach a Spanish high school class with only heritage or native speakers of the target language.
2.   I feel prepared to teach a Spanish high school class with heritage/ native speakers of the target language and non-native speakers of the target language.
3.   I am interested in teaching both heritage/native speakers of the target language and non-native speakers of the target language.
4.   I am interested in teaching high school Spanish.

Part C: What do you know about heritage learners of Spanish?

1.   Heritage language learners always have two parents at home who speak the heritage language most of the time. (False)
2.   Heritage language speakers are born outside of the U.S. (False)
3.   Heritage language learners have a cultural and/or linguistic connection to a non-U.S. culture and language. (True)
4.   Heritage language learners are neither native speakers of the target language nor second language learners of that language. (True)

Lesson Plan Assignment

Design an activity that aligns to the standards for heritage learners. This will be for a mixed class. Include the assessment of the activity. State what kind of assessment it is. Be sure to include the rubric or other assessment instrument.

NOTE: You may take something from your lesson plan or micro-teaches and adapt them to work in a 'mixed' classroom with both heritage/native speakers and non-native speakers.

Your name:
1. Pick a theme/topic
2. Fill out the chart below (also in a word document in D2L content). Include the national (5Cs) and state standards. State standards for native speakers:

[Website will be provided at a later stage.]

Standards	Steps	Assessment	Materials

3. In 1-3 paragraphs (350-400 words approximately), describe how your activity is appropriate for a mixed class. You could discuss differentiation and/or grouping here, among other ideas.

First version received: June, 2018

Final version accepted: November, 2018