

Developing Minority Language Resources

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM

Series Editors: Professor Colin Baker, *University of Wales, Bangor, Wales, Great Britain*
and Professor Nancy H. Hornberger, *University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA*

Recent Books in the Series

Language Rights and the Law in the United States: Finding our Voices

Sandra Del Valle

Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research,
and Practice in Multilingual Settings

Nancy H. Hornberger (ed.)

Languages in America: A Pluralist View (2nd edn)

Susan J. Dicker

Trilingualism in Family, School and Community

Charlotte Hoffmann and Jehannes Ytsma (eds)

Multilingual Classroom Ecologies

Angela Creese and Peter Martin (eds)

Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts

Aneta Pavlenko and Adrian Blackledge (eds)

Beyond the Beginnings: Literacy Interventions for Upper Elementary English
Language Learners

Angela Carrasquillo, Stephen B. Kucer and Ruth Abrams

Bilingualism and Language Pedagogy

Janina Brutt-Griffler and Manka Varghese (eds)

Language Learning and Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Approach

Margaret R. Hawkins (ed.)

The English Vernacular Divide: Postcolonial Language Politics and Practice

Vaidehi Ramanathan

Bilingual Education in South America

Anne-Marie de Mejía (ed.)

Teacher Collaboration and Talk in Multilingual Classrooms

Angela Creese

Words and Worlds: World Languages Review

F. Martí, P. Ortega, I. Idiazabal, A. Barreña, P. Juaristi, C. Junyent, B. Uranga and E. Amorrtortu

Language and Aging in Multilingual Contexts

Kees de Bot and Sinfrey Makoni

Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (4th edn)

Colin Baker

Bilingual Minds: Emotional Experience, Expression, and Representation

Aneta Pavlenko (ed.)

Raising Bilingual-Biliterate Children in Monolingual Cultures

Stephen J. Caldas

Language, Space and Power: A Critical Look at Bilingual Education

Samina Hadi-Tabassum

Language Loyalty, Language Planning and Language Revitalization: Recent Writings
and Reflections from Joshua A. Fishman

Nancy H. Hornberger and Martin Pütz (eds)

Language Loyalty, Continuity and Change: Joshua A. Fishman's Contributions to
International Sociolinguistics

Ofelia Garcia, Rakhmiel Peltz and Harold Schiffman

For more details of these or any other of our publications, please contact:

Multilingual Matters, Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall,

Victoria Road, Clevedon, BS21 7HH, England

<http://www.multilingual-matters.com>

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM 58

Series Editors: Colin Baker and Nancy H. Hornberger

Developing Minority Language Resources

The Case of Spanish in California

Guadalupe Valdés, Joshua A. Fishman,
Rebecca Chávez and William Pérez

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD

Clevedon • Buffalo • Toronto

The research reported in this book was made possible (in part) by a grant from the Spencer Foundation. The data presented, the statements made, and the views expressed are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Developing Minority Language Resources: The Case of Spanish in California/
Guadalupe Valdés ... [*et al.*]. 1st ed.

Bilingual Education and Bilingualism: 58

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Spanish language—Study and teaching (Higher)—California.

2. Bilingualism—California. 3. Languages in contact—California.

I. Valdés, Guadalupe. II. Series.

PC4068.U5D48 2006

468.0071' 1794—dc22

2006003665

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue entry for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 1-85359-898-4 / EAN 978-1-85359-898-2 (hbk)

ISBN 1-85359-897-6 / EAN 978-1-85359-897-5 (pbk)

Multilingual Matters Ltd

UK: Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall, Victoria Road, Clevedon BS21 7HH.

USA: UTP, 2250 Military Road, Tonawanda, NY 14150, USA.

Canada: UTP, 5201 Dufferin Street, North York, Ontario M3H 5T8, Canada.

Copyright © 2006 Guadalupe Valdés, Joshua A. Fishman, Rebecca Chávez and William Pérez.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher.

Typeset by TechBooks Ltd.

Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd.

Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| Acknowledgments | xi |
| Introduction | xiii |
| 1 Acquisition, Maintenance, and Recovery of Heritage Languages | |
| <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i> | 1 |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Heritage Languages: Meeting the New White Hope | 2 |
| Languages (and Heritage Languages) as Resources | 3 |
| Languages (and Heritage Languages) as Conflicted Resources | 4 |
| The First Intergenerational Ethnolinguistic Continuity Stage: | |
| Early-Childhood Heritage Language Acquisition | 4 |
| The Second Opportunity for Intergenerational Language Acquisition: | |
| The Nursery School and Early Grades | 6 |
| The Third Entry Point for Heritage Languages: In the Early High School or the Early College Years | 8 |
| The Heritage Language Movement: A Focus Both for Students and Adults | 9 |
| The Burden of Heritage Languages in America | 10 |
| Notes | 10 |
| References | 11 |
| 2 Three Hundred–Plus Years of Heritage Language Education in the United States | |
| <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i> | 12 |
| Indigenous Heritage Languages | 12 |
| Colonial Heritage Languages | 13 |
| Immigrant Heritage Languages | 14 |
| Before the Ethnic Revival | 16 |
| After the Ethnic Revival | 17 |
| The Early 1980s | 17 |
| Can the Two Worlds Be Bridged? | 18 |
| Spanish in the 1990s | 18 |
| Other Heritage Languages and the American Public School | 19 |
| Conclusion | 21 |
| Note | 22 |
| References | 22 |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 3 | The Spanish Language in California | |
| | <i>Guadalupe Valdés</i> | 24 |
| | The Current Presence of Spanish in California | 24 |
| | The Early Presence of Spanish in California | 24 |
| | The Imposition of the Spanish Language | 25 |
| | The Imposition of the English Language | 27 |
| | Present-Day California Policies toward the Spanish Language and | |
| | toward Spanish-Speaking Persons | 30 |
| | The segregation of Spanish-speaking students | 30 |
| | Bilingual education policy | 32 |
| | The anti-immigrant propositions | 33 |
| | Services in multiple languages | 34 |
| | The Challenge of Developing Spanish Language Resources | |
| | in California | 36 |
| | Language maintenance and heritage language development | 36 |
| | Maintaining and developing Spanish in California | 37 |
| | The context of hostility toward Spanish | 40 |
| | What kind of Spanish? Perspectives on the Spanish | |
| | of California | 41 |
| | Historical accounts of Spanish in California | 43 |
| | Present-day contact varieties of Spanish in California | 46 |
| | Notes | 49 |
| | References | 50 |
| 4 | The Use of Spanish by Latino Professionals in California | |
| | <i>Joshua A. Fishman, Guadalupe Valdés, Rebecca Chávez and</i> | |
| | <i>William Pérez</i> | 54 |
| | Language Shift and Language Maintenance among Latinos | |
| | in the United States | 54 |
| | The Survey of Latino Professionals | 55 |
| | Personal and professional characteristics of Latino | |
| | professionals surveyed | 57 |
| | Nativity | 57 |
| | Age | 58 |
| | Parent place of birth | 58 |
| | Childhood Spanish language use | 59 |
| | Spanish language instruction | 59 |
| | Current Spanish language use at home | 59 |
| | Spanish language use at work | 61 |
| | Interest in improving Spanish | 67 |
| | Attitudes toward different varieties of Spanish | 67 |
| | Attitudes toward the teaching of heritage language courses | 69 |
| | Recommendations on the teaching of heritage languages | 69 |
| | Spanish Use by Nativity Levels | 71 |
| | Use with monolingual Spanish-speaking clients at work | 71 |
| | Use of Spanish with bilingual work-related clients | 74 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Use of Spanish with monolingual colleagues, employees, and support staff | 75 |
| Use of Spanish at work with bilingual colleagues | 77 |
| Reading Spanish for professional purposes | 77 |
| Writing Spanish among California Hispanic professionals | 80 |
| Claiming Spanish to be needed at work | 82 |
| Where is the best Spanish spoken? | 85 |
| Mexicanness of response pertaining to where Spanish is best written | 87 |
| Analysis Using Multiple Correlation Method | 88 |
| Spanish at work | 88 |
| Interest in improving own Spanish | 94 |
| Mexicanness of where Spanish is best spoken and written | 97 |
| Attitudes toward SNS per se | 98 |
| Summary and Conclusions | 105 |
| Reading, writing, and speaking work-related Spanish | 105 |
| References | 107 |
| 5 The Foreign Language Teaching Profession and the Challenges of Developing Language Resources | |
| <i>Guadalupe Valdés</i> | 108 |
| Educational Institutions and Language Maintenance in California | 108 |
| The place of heritage language instruction in existing programs | 109 |
| Bilingual education programs | 109 |
| Foreign language programs | 110 |
| The New Boundaries of the Foreign Language Teaching Profession in the United States | 117 |
| The teaching of heritage languages | 117 |
| The effective involvement of the foreign language teaching profession in teaching heritage languages | 118 |
| Understanding the profession's new potential student population: A comparison of two different kinds of bilinguals | 119 |
| Pedagogical challenges of maintaining and developing heritage language resources | 127 |
| Heritage language classes and Spanish language maintenance | 129 |
| Notes | 133 |
| References | 135 |
| 6 Secondary Spanish Heritage Programs in California | |
| <i>Guadalupe Valdés, Joshua A. Fishman, Rebecca Chávez and William Pérez</i> | 140 |
| Part I: The Survey of Instructional Practices in Secondary Heritage Programs in California | 140 |
| The survey instrument | 140 |
| Secondary school participants | 141 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Data collection | 141 |
| Secondary school findings | 142 |
| Discussion | 157 |
| Part II. A Closer View: A Qualitative Study of Selected | |
| Secondary Spanish Heritage Programs | 158 |
| Selection of institutions studied | 158 |
| Characteristics of high schools visited | 159 |
| The six high-school Spanish heritage programs | 162 |
| Origin and establishment of heritage language programs | 165 |
| Views of students' proficiency | 166 |
| Placement procedures | 169 |
| Course and program objectives | 171 |
| Instructional practices | 173 |
| Heritage Programs at the High School Level: A Summary | 185 |
| Notes | 185 |
| References | 186 |
| 7 Postsecondary Spanish Heritage Programs in California | |
| <i>Guadalupe Valdés, Joshua A. Fishman, Rebecca Chávez</i> | |
| <i>and William Pérez</i> | 187 |
| Part I: The Survey of Instructional Practices in Secondary and | |
| Postsecondary Spanish Heritage Programs in California | 187 |
| Postsecondary school participants | 187 |
| Data collection | 187 |
| Demographic profile of sample | 188 |
| Number of Spanish language courses offered for | |
| heritage students | 189 |
| Placement procedures | 191 |
| Use of special placement examination for heritage speakers | 191 |
| Curriculum objectives | 193 |
| Instructional practices | 196 |
| Text materials | 199 |
| Satisfaction with existing program | 201 |
| Areas needing improvement | 203 |
| Faculty characteristics | 205 |
| Preparation of lead instructor | 207 |
| Discussion | 209 |
| Part II: The Closer Study of Selected Postsecondary | |
| Spanish Heritage Programs | 210 |
| Selection of institutions studied | 210 |
| Characteristics of colleges/universities visited | 212 |
| Conclusion: The Study of Selected Heritage Language Programs | 233 |
| Notes | 233 |
| References | 234 |

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| 8 | The Teaching of Heritage Languages | |
| | <i>Guadalupe Valdés</i> | 235 |
| | Introduction | 235 |
| | Toward the Development of Theories of Heritage | |
| | Language Development/Reacquisition | 236 |
| | Heritage learners as L1/L2 users | 236 |
| | Approaches to the study of L1 acquisition | 237 |
| | Acquisition in L1/L2 users | 237 |
| | The knowledge systems of heritage learners | 239 |
| | A Research Agenda on Heritage Language Development | |
| | and Reacquisition | 242 |
| | Identifying key differences among heritage learners | 242 |
| | The development of proficiency assessment procedures | 243 |
| | The implementation of a research agenda | 252 |
| | Ideologies of Language and the Teaching of Heritage Languages | |
| | in the United States | 253 |
| | Defining ideology | 254 |
| | The study of language ideology | 255 |
| | Language ideology and the ideology of nationalism | 255 |
| | Ideologies of bilingualism and monolingualism in the United States | 257 |
| | Departments of Foreign Languages in American Universities | 259 |
| | The case of Spanish language departments | 260 |
| | Spanish-speaking intellectuals and departments of Spanish | 262 |
| | The Teaching of Heritage Languages: National Challenges | 264 |
| | Notes | 268 |
| | References | 269 |
| 9 | Imagining Linguistic Pluralism in the United States | |
| | <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i> | 273 |
| | The Impossible Dream? | 273 |
| | Myths and Realities | 274 |
| | What Were the Founding Fathers Thinking About, | |
| | If Not Language? | 275 |
| | The Intellectual World of Our "Fathers" | 276 |
| | 18th-Century France's Political Philosophy | 277 |
| | Mid-18th-Century Great Britain | 278 |
| | Another Place, Another Time | 280 |
| | Cultural Pluralism in the United States | 281 |
| | The Magna Carta | 282 |
| | The National Interest | 283 |
| | Personality Principle, Organizational Principle, and | |
| | Territorial Principle | 284 |
| | The Special Case of Spanish | 286 |
| | Summary | 287 |
| | References | 288 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Methodological Appendix | 289 |
| Survey of Latino Professionals | 289 |
| Identification of existing lists of Latino professionals | 289 |
| Development of a web site describing the project | 290 |
| Development of the telephone survey instrument | 290 |
| Random selection of individuals from the identified lists | 290 |
| Telephone survey of successful Latinos | 291 |
| Data collection | 291 |
| Analysis of survey data | 292 |
| Statistical Procedures | 292 |
| Stepwise regressions: A brief overview | 292 |
| Building models via stepwise regression | 292 |
| Forward selection regression models | 293 |
| Survey of High Schools and Universities with Heritage Language Programs | 293 |
| Identification and request of existing lists of high schools and universities with established heritage language programs . . | 293 |
| Survey instrument | 294 |
| The random selection of schools and universities from the identified lists we attained | 294 |
| Secondary school participants | 295 |
| Postsecondary institution participants | 295 |
| The preparation and follow-up involved in sending the questionnaire via mail and receiving adequate numbers of respondents | 295 |
| Analysis of mail questionnaires sent to schools and universities . . | 296 |
| Preparation and contact with selected schools and universities . . . | 296 |
| Development of the survey instrument | 297 |
| Data collection | 297 |
| Analysis of survey data | 297 |
| Appendix A: Telephone Survey of Latino Professionals | 298 |
| Appendix B: Survey of Spanish Heritage Language Programs in California | 304 |

Acknowledgments

As is the case with most books, the work and the thinking that led to the writing of this book began many years before it was written. There are, therefore, many people to whom we owe a debt of thanks for the role they have played in its writing. We are first of all indebted to Kenji Hakuta for his encouragement and support as we sought funding for this project. We drew energy from his work on bilingualism in California and from his deep interest in the teaching of heritage languages. We are grateful for his wise counsel and his friendship.

We are also grateful for the generous support of the Spencer Foundation for our project and to the anonymous scholars at Spencer who reviewed our proposal and who raised key questions about our proposed work. We profited much from their suggestions and know that our work was greatly strengthened by the changes we made in response to their feedback.

At Stanford University we had the good fortune of working with an outstanding group of graduate and undergraduate students who assisted us in both data gathering and analysis. We owe a special thanks to undergraduates Jose Reséndiz, Yolanda Ochoa, Nati Rodríguez, Gabriel Domínguez, Robert Martínez, Alvaro Soria, and Esteban Galván, who helped us by contacting and interviewing our California professionals, scheduled multiple appointments, patiently made indices of each tape, transcribed interviews, coded interviews, and entered codes into the databases for analysis. They also assisted us during the school survey compiling the envelopes, coding responses and entering the codes into their respective databases. We also wish to thank graduate students Mari Negrón, Ali Miano, Raquel Sánchez, and Martha Castellon, who were part of the team that visited classrooms at the 12 institutions surveyed, and Ben Thomas who transcribed the interviews conducted during these visits. Their deep commitment to Spanish language maintenance and their knowledge of heritage language teaching as well as their careful attention to detail was essential to the work we carried out. We are particularly grateful to Raquel Sánchez for being willing to play multiple roles in both data gathering and data analysis. We deeply appreciate her good cheer in the face of mountains of data as well as her analytical insights and exceptional organizational skills. We also want to acknowledge Ona Andre for coordinating facilities for our project and Christopher Wesselman for his excellent technical support during all phases of the project.

We are very grateful as well for the generous support we received from many individuals in putting together the various lists that we used in drawing our samples of California Latino professionals and secondary and postsecondary institutions with established Spanish heritage language programs. Duarte Silva, the director of the California Foreign Language Project made available to us the list of secondary institutions that offered Spanish heritage language programs and was immensely helpful in providing us information about heritage language instruction in California. David Goldberg of the Modern Language Association generously shared with us data on California institutions of higher education that reported offering heritage programs in Spanish. We deeply appreciate his interest in our project as well as his deep understanding of the challenges surrounding the maintenance of heritage languages in the United States. We are also thankful to the California La Raza Lawyers, Hispanic Business Journal, and the American Medical Association for discounting their lists of professionals so that we could purchase lists for the purpose of our research.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to the California professionals who agreed to participate in the telephone interviews as well as to the faculty members at secondary and postsecondary institutions for responding to our mail survey on the teaching of heritage languages. We are especially grateful to faculty at the six secondary and six postsecondary institutions that allowed us to visit their classes and to the individuals who graciously and generously were willing to talk about their heritage students, the successes they have enjoyed, and the challenges they still face.

Finally, we wish to thank Tommi Grover and Marjukka Grover of Multilingual Matters for their wise counsel, for their interest in bilinguals and bilingualism, and for their enthusiasm for our project. We are grateful as well to Colin Baker and Nancy Hornberger for their comments and suggestions and for their willingness to move forward with this project in spite of their very busy schedules.

Introduction

The Development of Non-English-Language Resources in the United States

The United States is a profoundly English-speaking country. Even before the much publicized activities of organizations such as US English, citizens of this country have imagined themselves (Anderson, 1991) as part of a Christian monolingual nation where individuals from many lands abandon old loyalties and become simply American. As Ricento (1998), has argued, “deep values” within the society have, from the beginning, rejected the idea that the maintenance of either immigrant or indigenous languages is intrinsically, socially, or economically valuable. In spite of the presence of persons who continue to speak non-English languages in this country, our position has been to ignore available non-English-language resources and to assume that the loss of ethnic languages is part of the price to be paid for becoming American. Bilingualism, as Haugen (1972a, 1972b) argued, has been seen not as a characteristic of an educated citizenry, but as a characteristic of the poor and disadvantaged.

Not surprisingly, given national ideologies about the importance of English, Americans have felt strongly ambivalent about the study and teaching of foreign languages in this country, and, as Lambert (1986) and Tucker (1990, 1991) have pointed out, the foreign language competency of most Americans is abysmally low. Few students acquire functional proficiencies in the languages they study. Many reasons have been given for this state of affairs. Some individuals (e.g. Lambert, 1986) have blamed the small amount of time devoted to foreign language study, the relatively low competencies of foreign language teachers, and the lack of agreement about effective pedagogies.

Others have argued that the United States does not produce large numbers of individuals who are fluent and competent in foreign languages because negative attitudes toward bilingualism are deeply embedded in what Schiffman (1996) has termed “American linguistic culture.” According to Schiffman, English has been established as the dominant language in the United States by a “masked language policy” in place from the beginning of the colonial period. Schiffman argues (1996: 234) that covert policies toward language have maintained that English is the language of liberty, freedom, justice, and American ideals; that non-English languages are the

languages of tyranny, oppression, injustice, and un-Americanness; that children cannot learn American ideals through non-English languages, and that bilingualism is bad for children and should be discouraged in schools.

Following language-related controversies in the early part of the century (e.g. *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 1923),¹ educational involvement in language issues has been limited to the teaching of “foreign” (i.e. non-English and not personally linked) languages as academic subjects to students who are monolingual speakers of English. Typically, foreign languages have been studied in high school by college-bound students. They are also studied in colleges and universities as one of several general education requirements. In spite of efforts by some individuals (e.g. Lambert, 1986) who have proposed the development of a coherent strategy designed to augment the capacity of American businesses to be competitive in global markets and increase the effectiveness of our foreign affairs specialists, there have been few fundamental changes in the study and teaching of foreign languages during the past century.

The events of September 11, however, have made evident what Brecht and Rivers (2002) have referred to as a “language crisis” surrounding national security. In the last several years, therefore, there has been an increasing interest by the intelligence and military communities (Muller, 2002) in expanding the nation’s linguistic resources by both teaching non-English languages and by maintaining the heritage or home languages of the 47 million individuals who reported speaking both English and a non-English language in the latest census (US Census Bureau, 2000). For many individuals concerned about language resources, the development of strategic languages can only be brought about by expanding the mission of departments of foreign languages to include the maintenance and expansion of the varieties of non-English languages currently spoken by immigrants, refugees, and their children.

For non-English languages in the United States, these are times of possibility. There has been an increasing interest in the teaching of indigenous and immigrant ancestral or heritage languages not only from language-teaching professionals but also from other educators committed to the maintenance of non-English languages in this country. For the first time, individuals who teach both commonly and less commonly taught languages at both the secondary and postsecondary levels have come into contact with individuals who through immersion programs, dual immersion programs, and community-based language schools are working to develop the next generation’s proficiencies in both indigenous and immigrant languages. For the first time also, professionals engaged in the teaching of such languages as Spanish and French have found themselves in conversations with teachers of what Gambhir (2001) referred to as the “truly less commonly taught languages” such as Bengali, Zulu, and Khmer.

Some individuals dare to be optimistic about the development of a coherent language-in-education policy that can support efforts to revitalize and maintain non-English languages (whether or not these languages are presently strategic) using the resources of existing educational institutions. In spite of Fishman's (1991) cautionary statements concerning the limitations of educational institutions in reversing language shift, many individuals – including newly funded national defense grantees – continue to see educational institutions as a very large part of the solution.

The Study of Heritage Languages in California

In this book we report on a project that has many implications for the development and maintenance of heritage languages in the United States and for the establishment of language policies that can support not only the revitalization and maintenance of indigenous and immigrant languages, but also the dissemination of theoretical insights and pedagogical approaches across very different languages that nevertheless share a common societal context. The study focused on two fundamental questions:

- How can the United States meet the challenge of maintaining non-English language resources?
- How can direct instruction in heritage/immigrant languages be used to reverse or retard the process of language shift?

To answer these two questions, we examined the challenges of developing existing language resources on Spanish, a world language that is currently spoken in California by 8.1 million of California's residents 5 years and over out of a total population in this age group of 33.8 million (US Bureau of Census, 2003). We selected California as the site for our study because California is by any measure the most linguistically diverse state in the United States. Approximately 40% of the population 5 years and over speaks languages other than English. Moreover, as noted in Table 1, California is also home to a disproportionate share of the US population who are speakers of strategic languages, such as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Persian, and Russian.

For example, 40% of the speakers of Chinese in the US, 49% of the speakers of Persian, and 18% of the speakers of Arabic reside in California. California, therefore, is an ideal setting for investigating the issues and problems likely to be encountered in the implementation of educational initiatives intended to maintain and develop language resources for use in economic, diplomatic, and geopolitical arenas. We elected to focus on Spanish because it is both an immigrant language that is seen as a threat to English as well as a "foreign" language taught as an academic subject in high schools and universities. It is our position that important lessons about the dilemmas and difficulties surrounding the development of a coherent

Table 1 Non-English languages spoken at home – United States and State of California

| <i>Language</i> | <i>Number of speakers in the United States</i> | <i>Number of speakers in California</i> | <i>Percentage of US speakers residing in California</i> |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Population 5 years and over | 262,375,152 | 31,416,629 | 0.12 |
| Speak only English | 215,423,557 | 19,014,873 | 0.09 |
| Speak a language other than English | 46,951,595 | 12,401,756 | 0.26 |
| Speak a language other than English | 46,951,595 | 12,401,756 | 0.26 |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 28,101,052 | 8,105,505 | 0.29 |
| French (incl. Patois, Cajun) | 1,643,838 | 135,067 | 0.08 |
| French Creole | 453,368 | 4,107 | 0.01 |
| Italian | 1,008,370 | 84,190 | 0.08 |
| Portuguese or Portuguese Creole | 564,630 | 78,403 | 0.14 |
| German | 1,383,442 | 141,671 | 0.10 |
| Yiddish | 178,945 | 8,952 | 0.05 |
| Other West Germanic languages | 251,135 | 30,796 | 0.12 |
| Scandinavian languages | 162,252 | 28,653 | 0.18 |
| Greek | 365,436 | 28,847 | 0.08 |
| Russian | 706,242 | 118,382 | 0.17 |
| Polish | 667,414 | 23,435 | 0.04 |
| Serbo-Croatian | 233,865 | 23,872 | 0.10 |
| Other Slavic languages | 301,079 | 28,696 | 0.10 |
| Armenian | 202,708 | 155,237 | 0.77 |
| Persian | 312,085 | 154,321 | 0.49 |
| Gujarathi | 235,988 | 33,112 | 0.14 |
| Hindi | 317,057 | 76,134 | 0.24 |
| Urdu | 262,900 | 31,588 | 0.12 |
| Other Indic languages | 439,289 | 112,119 | 0.26 |
| Other Indo-European languages | 327,946 | 37,750 | 0.12 |
| Chinese | 2,022,143 | 815,386 | 0.40 |
| Japanese | 477,997 | 154,633 | 0.32 |
| Korean | 894,063 | 298,076 | 0.33 |
| Mon-Khmer, Cambodian | 181,889 | 71,305 | 0.39 |

(Continued)

Table 1 (*Continued*)

| <i>Language</i> | <i>Number of speakers in the United States</i> | <i>Number of speakers in California</i> | <i>Percentage of US speakers residing in California</i> |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Miao, Hmong | 168,063 | 65,529 | 0.39 |
| Thai | 120,464 | 39,970 | 0.33 |
| Laotian | 149,303 | 41,317 | 0.28 |
| Vietnamese | 1,009,627 | 407,119 | 0.40 |
| Other Asian languages | 398,434 | 76,013 | 0.19 |
| Tagalog | 1,224,241 | 626,399 | 0.51 |
| Other Pacific Island languages | 313,841 | 113,432 | 0.36 |
| Navajo | 178,014 | 1,774 | 0.01 |
| Other Native North American languages | 203,466 | 6,729 | 0.03 |
| Hungarian | 117,973 | 19,231 | 0.16 |
| Arabic | 614,582 | 108,340 | 0.18 |
| Hebrew | 195,374 | 34,647 | 0.18 |
| African languages | 418,505 | 45,471 | 0.11 |
| Other and unspecified languages | 144,575 | 35,548 | 0.25 |

Source: US Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3, Matrix PCT10.

Source: US Census Bureau, 109th Congressional District Summary File (Sample), Matrix PCT10.

language-education policy can be learned in a context in which there are (1) strong anti-immigrant sentiments, (2) established Spanish high-school and university programs for foreign language learners, and (3) an increasing number of new programs designed to accommodate students who have been raised in Spanish-speaking homes and communities.

While particularly important within the United States, the study of Spanish heritage language teaching Spanish in California may also be of value in other contexts in which there is an interest in the reacquisition or development of regional, minority, and immigrant languages and an effort to maintain such languages through established educational programs. Our examination of the role of such programs in promoting the use and development of one widely spoken minority language in the United States has many implications for other areas of the world in which the reversal of language shift is a desired goal. Our study lends direct support to the claim made by Edwards and Newcombe (2005) that in some communities school is not enough. As was the case in Ireland, for example, the

study of Spanish in California suggests that formal education programs do not see their role as providing support for language maintenance.

To answer the research questions posed above, we first conducted a survey of Latino professionals to determine the degree to which Spanish is being maintained by first-, second-, and third-generation Latinos in California. We then carried out a survey of current practices used in the teaching of Spanish as a foreign language at the high-school and university levels to students who, although educated entirely in English, acquired Spanish at home as their first language. Finally, we carried out visitations and observations of 12 institutions that have implemented special programs for these Spanish-speaking students who are known in the foreign language teaching profession as *heritage* speakers.

As part of our work in answering the study's central questions, we focused on the following subquestions:

- Are current goals guiding existing direct instruction for heritage speakers of Spanish coherent with those of successful Latinos working in a variety of professions in which they have experienced a need for Spanish?
- Are current practices used in the teaching of Spanish as a heritage language coherent with existing theories of individual and societal bilingualism?
- To what degree are present programs successful in achieving their own institutional goals as well as contributing to the maintenance of Spanish?
- What features do heritage programs have to include to support heritage language maintenance?
- What kinds of policy recommendations might result in the implementation of educational programs designed to support the development and maintenance of heritage language?

Synopsis of Chapters

To provide a broad context for the study, we begin this book with a chapter written by Joshua Fishman entitled "Acquisition, Maintenance, and Recovery of Heritage Languages: An 'American Tragedy' or 'New Opportunity'?" This chapter problematizes the new interest in *heritage languages* as strategic resources and examines the challenges involved in the cultivation of such resources throughout the lifespan and the role of educational institutions in this effort.

Chapter 2, also written by Joshua Fishman, will focus specifically on the United States and on existing challenges for the United States in maintaining language resources, including enduring ideological challenges (one nation—one language sentiments), pressures to assimilate, etc. It includes

information from Fishman's extensive work on existing language loyalty in the United States.

Chapter 3, written by Guadalupe Valdés, traces the presence of Spanish in California from the time of the conquest to the present. It provides an overview of the segregation and exclusion of Spanish-speaking individuals after the imposition of English in California and a discussion of major state policies directed at Spanish-speaking persons in recent years. In this chapter, Valdés argues that Spanish language maintenance efforts in California are faced with deep ambivalence within the Latino population of the state and with extreme hostility by the anglophone majority.

Chapter 4, written by all four authors, presents the findings of the telephone survey of Latino professionals. In this chapter, we provide information about the personal and professional characteristics of the individuals surveyed, the need and use of Spanish by these individuals in their current professions, their preference for particular varieties of Spanish, and their recommendations for the teaching of Spanish as a heritage language in California. We present evidence that a clear pattern of ongoing language shift among Latino professionals is emerging in California.

Chapter 5, also written by Valdés, provides an introduction to the work of the foreign language profession in the United States and to its traditional work in teaching commonly taught languages to monolingual speakers of English. It describes the profession's more recent efforts to engage in the teaching of commonly and uncommonly taught languages to heritage students. The chapter includes a definition and description of various types of heritage learners, an overview of the bilingualism of proficient heritage language speakers, and a discussion of the questions raised by these particular learners about the acquisition/development of a nondominant, first language.

Chapters 6 and 7, written by all four authors, report on the survey of professional practices in secondary and postsecondary Spanish heritage programs in California and on the observations of heritage language teaching carried out at six secondary and six postsecondary heritage programs. These two chapters provide detailed information about current practices in high schools and colleges/universities that have implemented special programs for heritage speakers. These chapters also describe the challenges and difficulties of maintaining/developing non-English languages through formal instruction in traditional educational settings.

Chapter 8 examines the challenges in the teaching of Spanish as a heritage language in California. Written by Valdés, this chapter argues that in order for post-9/11 efforts aimed at developing existing language resources in this country to be successful, sustained attention must be given to the development of theories of heritage language development/reacquisition and to the examination of the impact of language ideologies on the teaching and learning enterprise.

Finally, chapter 9, written by Fishman, imagines linguistic pluralism and argues that the lack of protected ethnolinguistic pluralism in the United States is a byproduct of its peculiar settlement history and its intellectual parentage. Our Founding Fathers did not oppose Languages Other Than English (LOTEs) nor their cultivation for posterity; they merely operated in a universe of ideas and values that were sociolinguistically uninformed and alinguistic. The massive presence of Spanish in current American life represents a last opportunity to rectify a gap that has needlessly impoverished our internal and our external *modus vivendi*. It represents a last chance for cultural democracy to also become a part (a long-overlooked part) of the American dream and for publicly supported linguistic repair, conservation, and growth to be added to our efforts to save from erosion and firmly establish a proactive policy in behalf of the community languages that still dot our landscapes.

Note

1. In *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 US 390 (1923), the Supreme Court overturned the conviction of Robert Meyer, a parochial school teacher who violated a 1919 Nebraska statute mandating English-only instruction by teaching a Bible story in German to a child. The Court concluded that the state law prohibiting the teaching of foreign languages until the pupil had passed eighth grade was unreasonable because it interfered with the power of parents to control the education of their children and with the calling of foreign language teachers.

References

- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso.
- Brecht, R., and Rivers, W. P. (2002) The language crisis in the United States: Language, national security and the federal role. In S. Baker (ed) *Language Policy: Lessons from Global Models* (pp. 76–90). Monterey, CA: Monterey Institute for International Studies.
- Edwards, V., and Newcombe, L. P. (2005) When school is not enough: New initiatives in intergenerational transmission in Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8 (4), 298–315.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991) *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Haugen, E. (1972a) Active methods and modern aids in the teaching of foreign languages. In R. Filipovic (ed) *Papers from the Tenth Congress of the Federation Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivants* (pp. 1–14). London: Oxford University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1972b) Language and immigration. In A. Dil (ed) *The Ecology of Language* (pp. 1–36). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lambert, R. D. (1986) *Points of Leverage: An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Meyer v. Nebraska* (1923), 262, US 390.
- Muller, K. E. (2002) Addressing counterterrorism: US literacy in languages and international affairs. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 26 (1), 1–21.

- Ricento, T. (1998) National language policy in the United States. In T. Ricento and B. Burnaby (eds) *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada* (pp. 85–115). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schiffman, H. F. (1996) *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Tucker, G. R. (1990) Second-language education: Issues and perspectives. In A. M. Padilla, H. H. Fairchild, and C. M. Valadez (eds) *Foreign Language Education: Issues and Strategies* (pp. 13–21). Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.
- Tucker, G. R. (1991) Developing a language-competent American society: The role of language planning. In A. G. Reynolds (ed) *Bilingualism, Multiculturalism, and Second Language Learning* (pp. 65–79). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- US Census Bureau (2003, October) *Census 2000 Brief: Language Use and English-language Ability* (No. C2KBR-19). Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.

Chapter 1

Acquisition, Maintenance, and Recovery of Heritage Languages

An “American Tragedy” or “New Opportunity”?

JOSHUA A. FISHMAN

Introduction

When it comes to heritage languages (HLs), modern America is as divided today as it was throughout the 20th century. The American mainstream is as convinced as ever that foreign languages are not really necessary in this modern age, when “the whole world speaks English.” If this is true relative to the great languages of the Western and Eastern civilizations and the great religious traditions, all of which have shaped human intellect, spirituality, and morality since the dawn of history, then it is doubly true of the colonial, indigenous, and immigrant languages other than English (LOTES; in Michael Clyne’s usage, 1991: 3) of the United States.

Those scholars, teachers, and educated laymen who have been laboring in the American “language vineyards” for the past generation must feel a certain *déjà vu*. They haven’t thrown in the towel but they, nevertheless, are not consoled when their friends reassure them that owing to the current war and “war prospects” in South Asia, “languages are going to pick up now.” The life and death of cultures, communities, and collective memories cannot be demeaned to the tactics of war. How are the languages of America supposed to function in the daily lives, dreams, and hopes of millions of Americans if they have to constantly worry that they may not be useful to the military or the espionage services? Well, mainstream America isn’t really sure that there are any such LOTEs that should function in the daily lives, dreams, and hopes of its citizenry, or that there should be. Usually most Americans most of the time are convinced that “those folks will work their ways up” – or their children will – and “they will forget all that foreign language stuff” that is regrettably occupying space in their minds.

The view that America need not concern itself with LOTEs is supported by a small cluster of accompanying views: (i) that schools don’t really succeed in teaching languages anyway (“I had four years of French and I couldn’t say a blessed thing then and I certainly can’t do so now!”); (ii) that

raising monolingual English speaking, reading, and writing children is the only decent and patriotic way to socialize children into “the American way of life”; (iii) that a multitude of languages will confuse the American mind as well as American society as a whole and result in lowered GNP, as well as a higher frequency and intensity of Civil Strife; or, even worse, (iv) that fostering multilingualism is tantamount to fostering political unrest, sedition, and other dangers to American stability; and finally, (v) that English is and of right ought to be the national or only official language of the United States (minor exceptions being made for Amerindians, most of which/whom are dying out anyway).

Into this rather inhospitable cauldron of negative views, beliefs, and attitudes we now come to introduce the topic of HLs, a slim read, indeed, in the backwater where FLES (foreign language in the elementary school), bilingual education, foreign language instruction in schools and colleges, language-related day schools, and supplementary afternoon foreign language education are all contending for a smidgeon of social acceptance and dignified stable support. In this chapter we will discuss HLs both in general terms and with special attention to its possible role for Spanish and Hispanics and in the constant context of common biases such as those enumerated here. Can HLs reverse or improve the rather bleak picture of the present and future of LOTE in the United States, or is it merely “more of the same but in a different disguise”? What goes through the minds of Hispanic parents when they ponder whether and when to permit their children to register for “Spanish for Native Speakers”? Do their concerns increase or decrease with the successive developmental stages at which their children can access HL programs and experiences? In general, can HLs possibly enable America to more properly appreciate and use its rich LOTE resource, a resource that is second to none in the world?

Heritage Languages: Meeting the New White Hope

“Heritage languages” is a designation that has fairly recently “arrived” in the United States to indicate languages other than the nationally dominant one that are historically associated with the ethnicity (the ethno-cultural heritage) of particular minority populations. Such languages, by whatever name, are currently, and have for a good long time been, devalued in many settings. It is even crucial to determine not just why they are underacquired, undermaintained, and underrecovered but why it has taken so long to undertake such a basic inquiry. At the beginning of the 21st century it is no exaggeration to say that as America goes, so goes, for better or for worse, the world. Therefore, it behooves us to ask how we can assist America overcome its self-denial of the many benefits that would accrue to it by means of a more positive and fitting regard for HLs, both as public and as particular-group resources.

The sometimes implied contradiction between languages as distinctly human and humanistic *indices of culture* and, simultaneously, as *part and parcel* of the cultures that they express is more imagined than real. All nonmaterial culture serves simultaneously as a carrier, and an essential part, of what it carries. Literature, religion, law and folklore, oratory and negotiation, politics, and celebrations are all examples of linguistic culture that both express the traditional association of the various cultures and help constitute these cultures and the identities they foster. Accordingly, it will be the explicit position of this volume that heritage languages (e.g. Spanish, first and foremost in terms of numbers of speakers) constitute noteworthy resources, material and nonmaterial, for the United States as a whole and for its constituent populations (as groups and as individuals).

Languages (and Heritage Languages) as Resources

The problems of viewing languages as resources (by now, not a new or original metaphor at all) must be brought to the fore at the very outset. Are languages really resources? Do they have tangible, monetary, or “public benefit” value and, furthermore, will the use of the term *resources* in conjunction with *languages* orient our discussion in an overly materialistic direction? Even the humane and humanistic *terra lingua* view that relates linguistic diversity to the diversity in animal and plant life (Mafi, 2003) also tends to deal primarily with material resources. However, “diversity” need not necessarily be valued and evaluated in material terms alone. Environmental impact studies, required throughout the United States before beginning to build a new edifice, highway, or dam are indicative of a modern sensibility for the preciousness of co-territorial life.¹ That preciousness is not necessarily expressible either in monetary terms or in terms of any possible hard-and-fast parallelism with human life. Furthermore, even the widespread positive expectation that languages are resources (and, therefore, are directly translatable into monetary or other power-related terms) not only runs counter to some of our own experiences, but it strikes many threatened cultures as a characteristic Western non sequitur. In much of modern Western culture, “resources” are primarily material and quantitatively expressible (Hinton, 2003) and the overuse of this metaphor in conjunction with matters ethnolinguistic may well tell others more about ourselves than about languages in culture. As it is with other resources, those who control contextually crucial languages have a potential for greater power in relevant human affairs than those who do not; uncommon languages are not, therefore, necessarily more valuable (as Whorf, 1942 once believed). On the other hand, many reasonably widely used languages continue to be powerless and unvalued to this very day (viz. Woloff, Oromo, Quechua).

Languages (and Heritage Languages) as Conflicted Resources

Nevertheless – or perhaps precisely because – language in general and heritage languages in particular are so complexly associated with all other aspects of culture that their propagation and cultivation frequently turn out to be problematic. But, this problematic aspect or attribution is often overdone. Furthermore, there is no aspect of society or culture – ethnicity, religion, education, class, age gender – that cannot become a cause for intergroup conflict. The coauthors of this volume believe that the conflicted aspects of language resources are so often overdone (Fishman 1985), and even given disproportional attention, that in exploring the positive potential aspects of heritage languages we must take caution not to reply in kind and to overlook the negative contexts or co-occurrences entirely. Keeping both in mind is not just an expression of intellectual honesty – something always morally desirable – but it enables us to better understand why the potentially positive contributions of heritage languages in the United States are so often overlooked, unrecognized, and even found to be suspect.

Furthermore, recognition of the problematic nature of heritage languages is necessary in order to understand how to overcome these problems at the societal level and, absolutely so, how to better appreciate their variability from place to place and from time to time. To begin with, therefore, we will look at the language enculturation process throughout the lifespan as a means of appreciating whatever constraints the American scene imposes on the process of HL acquisition, use, and loss.

The First Intergenerational Ethnolinguistic Continuity Stage: Early-Childhood Heritage Language Acquisition

Early childhood is generally any individual's most crucial period of language acquisition. This is the fascinating and brief period of unconscious transition from primarily nonverbal to verbal interaction. No matter how often we have observed language acquisition, even in our own children and grandchildren, it still unfolds miraculously before our very eyes. First language acquisition is also frequently accompanied by national or official language acquisition, although sometimes the opposite sequence obtains. This is so primarily because in multicultural societies with a single national or official language it is the national or official language that is commonly the lingua franca and, therefore, the main language of real power in the community. Minority inhabitants, accordingly, become bilingual during early childhood, frequently in their own homes or family environs.

An HL cannot remain the only language for that proportion of a heritage community that wants or needs to interact (or parents who want their

children to be able to interact) with mainstream society. Nevertheless, even early-childhood bilingualism, in which both languages (HL and national or official language)² are of about equal vintage for a sizable minority population, does not automatically ensure a positive role for the HL in the lives of such individuals. There are, of course, a goodly number of minority individuals for whom there is a clear absence of an HL. Cases of absence of any HL are encountered among African children raised entirely in English or French, Amerindian or Aborigines children raised entirely in English, ethnically Tibetan children raised in Potinguah, or the children of Israeli immigrants who gave up their mother tongues for Israeli Hebrew or the children of Latin American immigrants to the US who gave up their mother tongues "for the children's sake." Similarly far from rare, on the other side, are those children who grow up in ethnically mixed households in which each "side" continues to speak its own HL, doing so precisely in order to enable their children to interact comfortably with both sets of grandparents (not to mention aunts, uncles, cousins, etc.). At this time, in the still brief history of inquiry into HLs in the United States it is not yet known whether each of the etic distinctions vis-à-vis the possible types of HL combinations that exist corresponds to the emic differences either in language facility or attitudes, or whether any differences between them in these respects that may still obtain by adulthood are more related to initial degree and age of mastery.

Turning to factors that may impinge on parental readiness to pass on an HL to their children, we once again find ourselves more in the realm of logical supposition than in the realm of empirical research. We can all, however, surmise that many parents who *could* pass along an HL during the early childhood of their offspring, do not, in fact, do so. The proportion doing so will vary with the local status of the HL involved and, therefore, its public recognition, public valuation, and the sense of security on the part of the parents of newborns. Parents who are insecure about their own ethnic identity are likely to associate that language more with disadvantages than with advantages and, therefore, identify with it less and discontinue using it more often. Languages associated primarily with indenture, or with poverty, or with lack of literacy or schooling; languages that threaten to foreclose their speakers' access to upward social mobility and social acceptance; languages lacking any widely recognized literary or historical role; and languages of small speech communities lacking in potential political prowess will all suffer a relative loss of intergenerational use and transmission in comparison to others that are known or believed to possess these desiderata. Parents often mistakenly believe that they make a far greater contribution to the happiness of their children by denying their children any exposure to their HLs than by exposing these children to the predictable difficulties and satisfactions of a group-identity-related childhood, adolescence, and adulthood like the ones they themselves (the parents) have experienced.

Wherever some ethnoculturally, and therefore ethnolinguistically, identifiable groups are disadvantaged while ethnic group membership generally remains open to voluntary (i.e. self-initiated and self-maintained) membership and to the absence of racially interpreted stigmata, all socially penalized groups will “underperform” (i.e. they will practice socially patterned membership avoidance) insofar as ethnolinguistic continuity is concerned. Early childhood is the earliest point at which parents who have maintained ethnolinguistic continuity with *their* own parents frequently decide whether or not to opt for early disengagement from such continuity for their own offspring. Even such disengagement is not irrevocable, however, because parents can still change their minds during their children’s early childhood, parents are not the only influences on their children’s early language development (grandparents, neighbors, child-contemporaries, churches, and other neighborhood voluntary organizations that aim their efforts at toddlers are also effective in this connection, as the Maori Katango Reo have so amply demonstrated), and because early childhood itself is not the be-all and end-all of intergenerational ethnolinguistic continuity opportunities vis-à-vis minoritized speech communities in the United States (see later). Nevertheless, infancy is the primary age of HL acquisition (or nonacquisition), and that it is marked in the United States by a high degree of “opting out” is a major problem for HL acquisition. The fact that California Hispanics may well opt out (of Mexicanness identity and of HL continuity) less frequently than do others is one of the major forces favoring Spanish as an HL in the United States at this time.

The Second Opportunity for Intergenerational Language Acquisition: The Nursery School and Early Grades

A common feature of HLs is that neither the homes and neighborhoods nor the voluntary neighborhood institutions associated with them are really culturally intact and primarily under their own guiding control. Another problem that “bedevils” the earliest intergenerational language transmission processes is its informality and lack of formal times and places set aside for language in particular. Perhaps *bedevils* is not the right word to use in this connection, since it deals with the unvarnished daily life (and language life) of many HLs. Indeed, it is the very informality, spontaneity, and motivational self-direction of HLs at this point that makes them real mother tongues to begin with and imbeds them in cultural reality and in interpersonal intimacy from the very outset. These are desiderata that courses and other postchildhood formal efforts can never duplicate or replicate. Indeed, the more the time that elapses between the age of informal language acquisition until organized measures are undertaken on behalf of HL acquisition, the less likely it is that full spontaneity, emotional

attachment, and native-like fluency will ever be attained at all (Fishman, 2001).

The downside to the above is the ubiquitous nature of two interrelated mainstream views of Southwestern Spanish and its speakers that its speakers have absorbed, at least in part. The first view is the negative stereotype that minority tongues are not “real” languages, such as those of Europe, but rather a variety of dialects, patois, and gibberish (“Tex-Mex”). The second is that these minority languages cannot be written (“because they are unstandardized”) and have no true literary traditions of their own. Youngsters at the high school level are more exposed to charges such as the above, because it is in high school that serious literacy instruction begins. This is not so much because of interest in literacy per se or in the development of standard (literary) English, as because of the assumption that control of the latter is an asset in the work sphere. The fact that non-Anglos also necessarily speak some dialect or other, and that the latter is not written, any more than is the spoken informal Spanish of local Hispanics, and is often quite unlike the written standard for their region (English, unlike French or German, has no supra-regional standard, nor any institutions for deriving and elaborating any such thing) is lost upon most Anglo-Americans, whether pupils or teachers. Furthermore, the fact that their American counterparts are still learning how to read and write “school English” (because the latter is nowhere fully interchangeable with the English of home, street, and community) and, indeed, will continue doing so for many postschool years to come and that this task is, probably, a much harder task than is learning standard school Spanish (for Hispanics) is never used as a critique of the standard itself or of the learners thereof. These are common facts of language reality wherever two languages of groups of vastly different status meet in the same schools. The classroom per se cannot equalize them, and the status gaps between the languages and their speakers will reappear every occasion in which children of the conquered and children of the conquerors are in close quarters with one another. A little sociolinguistic perspective might be highly desirable, particularly for HL students (of both types).

That being said, there is also no denying that the structured language teaching so common for second-stage entry into an HL effort can and does commonly result in language learning. In many cases, throughout the world, where the informal initial stage is most commonly missed (e.g. for Maori in New Zealand, for Basque in the Autonomous Basque Community, for Andamanese in India, and for Breton in France), the early school-related stage is an invaluable entry stage in the total HL-acquisition process. This stage also encompasses school-sponsored outings, clubs, camps, choruses, teams, and other activities or projects that involve students under “qualified supervision” in after-school and out-of-school life. Indeed, not only can schools *produce* second-entry HL learners but they can do

so more successfully than minority society as a whole can provide for the *absorption*, *maintenance*, and *activation* of such speakers in non-school-related affairs more generally. This *production–maintenance disparity* is a crucial dilemma to ponder because it repeats itself from one entry point in the intergenerational transmission process to another. At each such stage, minority society is often too weak to absorb, activate, and maintain its own partial successes. As a result, parents who initially delayed exposing their children to their HL (for the very reasons that have been suggested at length above), may very well believe that by and during ages 5–10 their children are strong enough to “take it” in terms of a somewhat more formalized exposure, teaching, and learning process within a supervised framework. Nevertheless, the school requires a great deal of help from the surrounding HL society if the HL acquired there is to be maintained.

Unfortunately, leave-it-to-the-school (church, youth group, etc.) approaches often have a higher attrition rate and a lower language maintenance rate than do most of the earlier-mentioned informal processes. I repeat: this is not because schools either do or must fail to teach HLs successfully but because schools cannot reproduce anything like the total sociocultural and interpersonal reality that languages themselves require for postadolescent language maintenance, not to mention linguistically fluid, native-like maintenance. Obviously, middle entry into HL acquisition requires for its success access to the same kinds of privileges and rewards (or their equivalents) that are available to students who are not “burdened” with an HL and its more intensive and crowded total curricular concomitants. Nevertheless, because the school is an omnipotent societal agency, with a staff and budget of its own, it is often (and increasingly) expected to enter these thickets and must have or prepare an approach to acquiring and maintaining HLs that are congruent both with reality and with its own obligations to serve society with professional competence.

The Third Entry Point for Heritage Languages: In the Early High School or the Early College Years

The difficulties faced by adults and children alike vis-à-vis the earliest entry level are primarily ideological and political. The difficulties faced at the intermediate entry level are primarily pedagogical and operational. The next major opportunity to interest a large number of parent and pupils in HL involvement is when the high school to college transition occurs. The problems encountered at this level may include most of those we have encountered before, plus a few others. Chief among the latter are the jurisdictional and pedagogical claims of FL instruction, on the one hand, and of HL instruction, on the other. Assuming that these can be peacefully resolved within a single unified department,³ the major remaining

concerns are more attitudinal/ideological in nature and revolve around issues of identity. Although these transition points arouse anxieties for all students when they enter high school and college, the HL students are somewhat unique in that their choice brings them into interaction with HL peers embarking on a part of their identity that they could have, but elected not to, activate and acknowledge.

Choosing to become or not to become an FL student or teacher is much different for Hispanics than choosing to participate in a long-term involvement with HL events, activities, groups, and community life as a whole. When some of those doing so have twice before passed up (or been forced or persuaded to pass up) opportunities of this same kind and with the same implications, a certain amount of tension related to insecure self-discovery should be expected. Unless this choice is buttressed by a goodly portion of moral support, recognition, and acceptance, it is likely to be terminated before it comes to fruition via political, communal, and ideological identity formation at the adult level. This is a lot to expect as outcomes of educational exposure from the very outset, but it is particularly unlikely in conjunction with HL students in HL courses.

Frankly, the entire educational involvement with HLs in educational institutions, processes, and goals is contraindicated. As long as HL involvement is tied to Spanish courses, we have lost all those who take no such course or who do not perform well or successfully in such courses, and these may well be the majority of youngsters in the Hispanic HL fold. An HL is not a course and not a job program, and we must be careful of proceeding as if it were. Not only that far from all Hispanic youngsters attend institutions offering them an HL link, but most of those that do are pursuing programs that make no demands for HL-language-in-community commitments. Clearly, HL courses offered at the secondary and tertiary entry points must be viewed as merely possible staging grounds, rather than as the basic building blocks of a national program for maximizing the acquisition and maintenance of Spanish as an HL and of Spanish even more holistically viewed. For such a national program to be launched and then optimized, it must provide for students both within and outside the school settings.

The Heritage Language Movement: A Focus Both for Students and Adults

If Spanish as an HL is to become what it should be, both for the country as a whole and for the Hispanic community in particular, it needs to become a youth movement rather than just a school course-sequence, and it must seriously pursue, attain, and maintain home, school, and community outreach. The “movement” must not be defined by age, gender, or

occupational goal. It must be explicitly for focusing a home, school, and community partnership with respect to the intergenerational promise of Spanish as a permanent feature of the American scene.

There are many features of American society that militate against the attainment of goals such as those outlined in this chapter (brief reference has also been made to them in discussing earliest and intermediate entry into HL-friendly efforts). Fears of political and social fractionalization of American life along language lines must be exposed as the remnants of flat-earth thinking that they are, as the recent Indian (South Asia Indian) decision to virtually double the number of indigenous languages that are “scheduled” (i.e. that will receive governmental recognition, support, and functions), with 35 further additions in the offing). Such increased recognition of diversity actually cements national unity and clears the boards for more rapid progress toward English mastery too. If HL efforts ultimately get to be understood as contributing to America’s sense of safety, rationality, and goodwill – as well as to internal HL community feelings of community intergenerational continuity and acceptance – that will be akin to an “ugly-duckling” rebirth of America’s idealistic promise to “crown [its] good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea.”

The Burden of Heritage Languages in America

Thus far we have seen that at every level of entry into HL linkages, there are many members of the HL community who see their HL as something whose cost-benefit analysis must be carefully pondered. It is not an open-and-shut case with benefits clearly seen as outweighing debits. Many of the quandaries introduced to the reader in this chapter will be empirically investigated at a more data-anchored level in Chapter 4. In Chapter 2, we begin by presenting a historical overview of the place of HLs in this country.

Notes

1. New Bird Species Threatened. *Stanford Daily*. January 13, 2004, p. 3. “Scientists have discovered a new bird species in southeastern Venezuela. . . . Males are light grey with blue feathers whereas females are different shades of brown. Currently only three individuals have been sighted. . . . The discoverers had little time to celebrate though since a hydroelectric dam is being built on the Caura River and can destroy the birds’ only known habitat. Conservation International has called on the Venezuelan government to designate the area as a wildlife reserve.”
2. Although the difference between them is often disregarded in practice, “national languages” are those that are native to a people or nationality, whereas “official languages” are those that are employed by state offices or their representatives.
3. There will only be three kinds of programs, teachers, and pupils: (i) those *not* from any appropriate HL background and primarily pursuing FL credits and/or certificates; (ii) those from HL backgrounds who are interested in pursuing FL

credits and/or certificates; and (iii) those from HL backgrounds who are interested in HL credits and/or certificates. Types (i) and (ii) are reasonably combinable into largely similar and traditional treatments, but Type (iii) requires different and more innovative planning, either together with or separate from Types (i) and (ii). There is also a fourth type of HL student, namely, the type that will not show up at all in a Spanish-language course either in high school or in college. The latter type is discussed later.

References

- Clyne, M. (1991) *Community Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, J.A. (1985) Positive pluralism: some overlooked rationales and forefathers. In J.A. Fishman, M.H. Gertner, E.G. Lowy, and W.G. Milan (eds) *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity* (pp. 445–495). Berlin: Mouton Publishers.
- Fishman, J.A. (ed) (2001) *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hinton, L. (1994) *Flutes of Fire: Essays on California Indian Languages*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Press.
- Mafi, Louisa (2004, January 13) New bird species threatened. *The Stanford Daily*, p. 3.
- Whorf, B. (1942) Language, mind and reality. *Theosophist (The Theosophical Society-Madras, India)*, 63 (January), 281–291 and No. 2 (April) 25–37.

Chapter 2

Three Hundred-Plus Years of Heritage Language Education in the United States'

JOSHUA A. FISHMAN

All of us – individuals, societies, cultures, and nations alike – live by our fondest myths, beliefs whose importance transcends their value as truth. One of the myths held in the United States is that our Pilgrim fathers first left England and resettled in the Netherlands, then left the Netherlands for Plymouth Rock because their children were becoming monolingual Dutch speakers and losing their command of English. Whether this is pure myth or has some confirmed truth, it is beyond doubt that since the time of the Pilgrims, millions upon millions of refugees and immigrants have arrived on America's shores with strong hopes of maintaining the ethnolinguistic traditions that defined them to themselves, to their neighbors, and to their God.

If we define HLs as those that (a) are LOTEs (languages other than English), in Michael Clyne's usage (1991: 3), and that (b) have a particular family relevance to the learners, then we will find schools devoted to teaching these languages and to developing literacy and promoting further education through these languages among the indigenous, the colonial, and the immigrant groups that have come to this country by choice and good fortune or by force and the winds of cruel history.

Indigenous Heritage Languages

We have no record of HLs in the United States before the arrival, on foot and by boat, of the Amerindians. Amerindian schools were initially the schools of life, the noninstitutional means by which the young were socialized into the daily rounds, beliefs, and practices that constituted the culture of their parents. Such enculturation still goes on, of course, but increased contact with others (conquerors, settlers, and governmental officials) has led Amerindian educators to create their own brick-and-mortar institutions – formal schools associated with literacy or, as is increasingly common, biliteracy in an Indian language and in English. Given the sad state