

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

---

5-2020

## Meeting the Needs of Students in a Communicative Classroom

Rachel J. Singer  
*Utah State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), and the [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Singer, Rachel J., "Meeting the Needs of Students in a Communicative Classroom" (2020). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 1443.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/1443>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



MEETING THE NEEDS OF STUDENTS IN A COMMUNICATIVE CLASSROOM

by

Rachel J. Singer

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

---

Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan  
Major Professor

---

Dr. María Luisa Spicer-Escalante  
Committee Member

---

Dr. Sarah Braden  
Committee Member

---

Dr. Bradford J. Hall  
Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2020

Copyright © Rachel J. Singer 2020  
All rights reserved

## ABSTRACT

Meeting the Needs of Students in a Communicative Classroom

by

Rachel J. Singer: Master of Second Language Teaching

Utah State University, 2020

Major Professor: Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan

Department: Languages, Philosophy, and Communication Studies

This portfolio is a compilation of written pieces which highlight what the author believes to be key issues and perspectives in the field of second language teaching. The content of the portfolio is centered in second language acquisition theory and is framed by the author's diverse teaching experiences as a university Arabic instructor, ESL aide, and middle school Spanish teacher.

The portfolio contains three sections: (1) teaching perspectives, (2) research perspectives, and (3) an annotated bibliography. The teaching perspectives section contains the author's teaching philosophy statement which emphasizes communicative language teaching, target language use in the classroom, and the role of can-do statements in grammar instruction and assessment. The last two sections explore research related to second language identity negotiation, heritage language learner instruction, and first language use and willingness to communicate in the language classroom.

(100 pages)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am extremely grateful for the professors who have guided and supported me during my time in the MSLT program. Each one of my committee members has been instrumental in my development and growth as a language teacher. First, I would like to thank Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan for chairing my committee. Her constructive feedback and wisdom during my time in the MSLT program pushed me to critically reflect on my teaching perspectives and practices. I am grateful for Dr. María Spicer-Escalante for the professional opportunities she has shared with me and for supporting me throughout my language teaching journey. I am also thankful for Dr. Sarah Braden for her inspiring example as an educator and for her invaluable support and advice in helping me advocate for my students.

I would also like to thank family for their love and support, especially during the difficult transition period which led to my career change and subsequent entrance into the MSLT program.

Lastly, I would like to thank the dedicated language teachers who I was fortunate enough to have during my long and many language journeys.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	v
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
TEACHING PERSPECTIVES.....	2
Professional Environment.....	3
Teaching Philosophy Statement.....	4
Professional Development through Teaching Observations.....	14
RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES.....	20
LANGUAGE PAPER.....	21
Purpose & Reflection.....	22
Meeting the Needs of HLL in Specialized and Mixed Classes.....	23
CULTURE PAPER.....	38
Purpose & Reflection.....	39
Language Learner L2 Identity Negotiation .....	40
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	55
LOOKING FORWARD.....	65
REFERENCES.....	66

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACTFL = American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages  
CA = Critical Approach  
CALL = Computer-Assisted Language Teaching  
CBI = Community-based Instruction  
CBI = Content-based Instruction  
CLT = Communicative Language Teaching  
DLI = Dual Language Immersion  
ELL = English Language Learner  
ELP = English Language Proficiency  
ESL = English as a Second Language  
FL = Foreign Language  
HL = Heritage Language  
HLL = Heritage Language Learner  
IBP = Inquiry-based Projects  
L1 = First Language / Native Language  
L2 = Second Language  
L2L = Second Language Learner  
MSLT = Master of Second Language Teaching  
NHLRC = National Heritage Language Resource Center  
NNS = Non-native Speakers  
OPI = Oral Proficiency Interview  
TBLT = Task-based Language Teaching  
TL = Target Language  
WIDA = World-class Instructional Design and Assessment  
WTC = Willingness to Communicate

## INTRODUCTION

This portfolio is the culmination of my studies and experiences during my time in the MSLT program at Utah State University. The centerpiece of the portfolio is the teaching philosophy statement (TPS). The TPS presents my beliefs and knowledge about language teaching and learning. My TPS addresses communicative language teaching, the components of communication (comprehensible input, meaningful output, and negotiation of meaning), and the role of can-do statements in assessment and grammar instruction.

In the research perspectives and annotated bibliography sections I explore topics based on specific challenges that I have encountered as a language learner and teacher. In my culture paper, I explore L2 identity negotiation and the factors that facilitate and hinder this process. The language paper outlines the needs of heritage language learners and how to meet these needs in specialized classes and mixed class environments. The annotated bibliography investigates the role of first language use in the classroom and the variables that influence students' willingness to communicate.



## TEACHING PERSPECTIVES

## PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

I was motivated to enter the field of language teaching after volunteering as an ESL aide at Logan High School in Logan, Utah. From the start, I found myself being required to take on the role of a language teacher despite not having any kind of language education training. Because of the strong Spanish language foundation I developed in high school and college, I could communicate with the Spanish speaking English language learners (ELLs) and I connected with them very quickly. I wanted to do everything in my ability to support them in their English language development, but I felt powerless to help them without the proper training in language teaching pedagogy. I entered the MSLT program with the goal of developing the skills necessary to help my ELL students succeed.

Since starting the MSLT program I've had diverse experiences as a language teacher; I've taught college level Arabic as well as middle school Spanish, English Language Development, and Spanish for Native Speakers. The topics I address in this portfolio reflect the research that I have relied upon to meet the linguistic needs of these different populations.

## TEACHING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

### **Introduction**

I was motivated to enter the field of language teaching after volunteering as an ESL aide at Logan High School in Logan, Utah. My job was to accompany the ELL students to their content class and provide translation for both Arabic and Spanish speakers. My experience at Logan High School opened my eyes to the reality of the growing linguistic diversity in the United States and to the daily language negotiations that take place between speakers of different languages. Students in the halls seamlessly transitioned between English and their home languages. Bilingual students interpreted between monolingual students and teachers. Some teachers learned phrases in Spanish in order to communicate with their Spanish speaking ELLs. Other teachers with a high school Spanish background accepted assignments completed in Spanish and could assess some of what their students understood using the little Spanish they remembered. I watched language being used as it is in the real world—as a means of communication. I believe that the language classroom should aspire to mirror real world use of language to the greatest extent possible.

In this Teaching Philosophy Statement, I will present the key pedagogy behind my vision of a communication-based classroom. The first section will discuss communicative language teaching (CLT) and branches within this approach—task-based language teaching (TBLT) and content-based instruction (CBI). The second section will address the components of communication and ACTFL’s recommendation of 90% target

language (TL) use in the classroom. Finally, the third section will address can-do statements and their relationship to assessment and grammar instruction.

### **Communicative Language Teaching**

I use communicative language teaching (CLT) in my classrooms because of its philosophy that learners acquire language during communication, specifically in efforts to understand meaning during communication (Canale & Swain, 1980; Lee & VanPatten, 1995, 2003; Nunan, 1991; Savignon, 1987, 2000; VanPatten, 2017). VanPatten (2017) defines communication as “the expression, interpretation, and sometimes negotiation of meaning in a given context. Communication is also purposeful.” Two approaches of CLT that I use in my instruction are content-based instruction (CBI) and task-based language teaching (TBLT). Each approach operates within a different context and purpose. While both can be used with FL students and ELLs, TBLT and CBI respectively provide certain advantages to these two groups in the K-12 context, where I am currently employed.

#### *CBI*

CBI is an approach that focuses on teaching language through a content subject. It is most commonly used in immersion language programs, but can also be used in K-12 ESL programs. CBI is an alternative to traditional language-focused ESL classes, which better prepares ELLs to succeed in their mainstream content classes (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994; Crandall & Kaufman, 2002). Traditional pull-out language-focused ESL classes fail to prepare ELLs with the language and academic skills necessary to succeed

in their mainstream content classes (Crandall & Kaufman, 2002; Cummins, 2000; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2013; Gibbons, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Vogt, & Short, 2000). The primary goal of CBI is to help ELLs develop academic English language and meet English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards by focusing on content that will be covered in the mainstream classes during the school year and using supplemental materials (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2013). CBI lessons are guided by coinciding content and language objectives that support each other. These objectives include the content and language demand alongside the means and conditions by which students will meet the objective.

### *TBLT*

TBLT is important in the FL teaching context because it prioritizes communication functions for a communicative purpose and reflects the situations in which FL students are likely to encounter the language. In TBLT, instruction is centered around participation in tasks. A task is “a classroom activity or exercise that has (a) an objective attainable only by the interaction among participants, (b) a mechanism for structuring and sequencing interaction, and (c) a focus on meaning exchange” (Lee, 2000, p. 32). VanPatten (2017) argues that tasks are different from exercises and activities in that they involve both “the expression and interpretation of meaning” and “have a purpose that is not language practice” (Tasks in the Language Classroom, para. 1). Activities are partially communicative through the exchange of meaning—however, they lack a communicative purpose—while exercises do not involve any expression or interpretation of meaning and their sole purpose is to practice language. Within a unit

theme, several small, short tasks can be linked together in progression and build up to a cumulative task that brings together all the elements of the previous tasks (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001).

### **TL Communication**

ACTFL advises that teachers and students communicate in the TL for 90% of all components of instruction time (2010). Teacher TL use has the most impact on student gains in the FL classroom, particularly on beginning language learners (Vyn, Wesely, & Neubauer, 2019). If students do not have opportunities for both TL input, output, and negotiation of meaning in the language classroom they cannot learn the language.

#### *Comprehensible Input*

Language students require comprehensible input in the TL. A common sentiment is that language learners “absorb” the language while in an immersion setting. Having been an ESL aide I can attest that learners do pick up the language in the immersion setting of an American high school, however, it is not a result of their mere presence in the immersion setting. If students cannot comprehend the input of their teachers and peers, they will not acquire the language (Krashen, 1985). The problematic nature of the idea that learners can just absorb the TL in an immersion setting becomes immediately clear when the roles are switched—when English speakers are put in the foreign language classroom. After syllabus day, I taught my Arabic 1010 class entirely in Arabic and many of the students were frustrated with my methods. The problem was twofold—not only had the students never been exposed to immersion teaching before, but I was also a

novice language teacher who was not well trained in executing ACTFL's 90% TL recommendation. From this experience I learned that I cannot just expect my students to understand what I am saying when I speak entirely in words unfamiliar to them, similarly, teachers of ELLs cannot expect those students to just "absorb" English by existing in the presence of English dialogue. When using the TL in the classroom, teachers must provide students with some kind of support so they can put meaning to the sounds they hear.

Teachers must provide appropriate scaffolding to help students comprehend beyond their current abilities (Vygotsky, 1978). Scaffolding is "the interaction between the expert and novice in a specific problem-solving task" and is necessary for learners to be able to communicate beyond their current abilities (Shrum & Glisan, 2016, p. 26). For this reason, VanPatten (2017) defines input as "language that learners can hear or see in a communicative context" (p. 48). Scaffolding can take the form of exaggerated gestures or speech, the use of images or videos, modeling, and role-play. These techniques provide additional input so students can hear the word used several times in several different ways. Moreover, teachers can give students the oral skills necessary to solicit scaffolded input: "Learners cannot simply listen to input, but they must be active conversational participants who interact and negotiate the type of input they receive in order to acquire language" (Shrum & Glisan, 2016, p. 22).

### *Negotiation of Meaning*

The negotiation of meaning consists of "exchanges between learners and their interlocutors as they attempt to resolve communication breakdown and to work toward

mutual comprehension” (Pica, Holliday, Lewis & Morgenthaler, 1989, p. 65). Language acquisition is a result of participation in the negotiation of meaning (Swain, 1985).

Firstly, the breakdown of communication and its eventual resolution teaches the learner about “the correctness and, more important, about the incorrectness of their utterances”

(Gass & Mackey, 2015, p. 183; see also Gass & Mackey, 2007; Swain & Lapkin, 1995).

Likewise, producing the TL with an interlocutor “forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning” (Swain, 1985, p. 249). Communication in a purposeful context forces students to make their output comprehensible—required alongside comprehensible input for language acquisition—and provides them with immediate feedback from teachers and peers through the negotiation of meaning when output is not comprehensible (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Swain & Lapkin, 1995).

The critical nature of negotiation of meaning to the acquisition of the TL suggests that teachers should encourage students to conduct meaning negotiations in the TL, rather than resort to explanations in the common L1. As a teacher, I set the expectation for TL negotiation of meaning by answering questions and resolving misunderstandings with the students in the TL. I used this approach with my first-semester Arabic students. It also provides a model to students for how they can scaffold while negotiating meaning with their peers. I have watched several of my Arabic students mimic many of the techniques I used to negotiate meaning with them. Teachers must also scaffold in order to facilitate the negotiation of meaning in the TL. I have done this in my class by providing sentence frames for clarification phrases such as, *did you say \_\_\_\_\_?*, *what does \_\_\_\_\_ mean?*, *I*



*don't understand, and could you repeat that?* By modeling meaning negotiation myself and providing scaffolding through sentence frames for students to use as they negotiate meaning with each other, I can facilitate negotiation of meaning in the TL.

### *Meaningful Output*

Output is also essential. Mastery of different language skills comes from using the TL. TL output helps students 1) discover the gap between what they want to be able to do and what they can actually do, 2) try and experiment with rules, 3) reflect actively on their understandings of the TL system (Swain, 1985, 1995, 2000). Language acquisition is stage-like and developmental and evolves as students use the language:

...all aspects of language are worked on simultaneously in small bits in language acquisition. While learning to mark tense, for example, learners are also working on the quality of vowels and consonants, syllable structure, sentence prosody (stress, rhythm, pitch), vocabulary, meaning, discourse (how sentences relate to each other in terms of meaning), and so on. (VanPatten, 2017, *Some Basics about Second Language Acquisition*, para. 10)

As with input opportunities, teachers must support learners with appropriate scaffolding for students to participate in output opportunities. I provided scaffolding to my first semester Arabic students through sentence frames. After the first day of instruction, the students were able to give their name and ask other students for their names in Arabic, despite not knowing any Arabic grammar, with the sentence frames I provided.

## **Can-Do Statements**

Communicative curricula and lessons are guided by can-do statements. Shrum and Glisan describe can-do statements as “...progress indicators but expressed in learner-friendly terms” which “...enable learners to describe what they can do with the language as they improve their proficiency...” (p. 52; ACTFL, 2012c; see also ACTFL 2017).

Can-do statements informed by performance indicators can help students build up to the next proficiency range. The ACTFL Performance Descriptors for Language Learners (for FL students) and the WIDA Performance Definitions (for ELLs) provide guidelines that help teachers determine in which performance range their students fall (ACTFL, 2012a; Gottlieb, 2016; Shrum & Glisan, 2016; WIDA, 2012). Because these performance indicators reflect the developmental progression of language learning, they also help teachers know what skills they need to teach to prepare students for the next range. For example, my beginning Arabic students can talk only about contexts and content relating to themselves. The Performance Descriptors indicate to me that the sequential step in their development is the ability to communicate about their immediate environment. I can prepare them for this step by teaching them to speak about family members and friends with appropriate scaffolding to help them reach this next proficiency range.

### *Role in Assessment*

As teachers, we shape students’ beliefs regarding the nature of language learning by how we assess them. When we teach *and* assess students within the framework of communicative language goals, we communicate to students that meaning making, rather

than grammatical accuracy, is most important (Sandrock, 2010). Rather than relying on traditional methods such as “translation of vocabulary words and fill-in-the-blank verb conjugations within disconnected sentences,” students should be tested on their performance of the can-do statements used in class (Shrum & Glisan, 2016, p. 361). This requires teachers to begin curriculum design with the end in mind through backward design by 1) determining desired performance goal for students, 2) determining acceptable evidence of meeting said goal, and 3) planning learning experiences that will enable students to meet said goal (Adair-Hauck et al, 2013; Sandrock, 2010; Shrum & Glisan, 2016). Using assessments within the backwards design framework helps to ensure that assessments are an accurate reflection of what happens in the classroom (Clementi & Terrill, 2013; Gottlieb, 2016; Sandrock, 2010; Shrum & Glisan, 2016).

#### *Role in Grammar Instruction*

Grammar instruction should not be the *goal* of the classroom, but rather *supplementary* to the communicative goals which dominate the classroom. Teachers should limit grammar instruction to that which is essential which Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001) describes as “simple, to-the-point, and helps students achieve the stated communicative goal” (p. 37). In this way, grammar instruction supports communicative functions and teaches students the role grammar plays in making meaning. When the instructor focuses on a certain structure’s function, students can then use the language “for meaning-making rather than [for] rule-based procedures to apply to a contrived and predictable mechanical exercise” (Shrum & Glisan, 2016, p. 214).

**Conclusion**

These are the main principles that shape the way that I teach in the language classroom. Since adopting a CLT approach, I have seen my students gain confidence in themselves and progress linguistically. As I continue to learn and grow as I teacher, I hope to continue making language acquisition a reality for my students.

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH OBSERVATION

### **Introduction**

Communicative language teaching (CLT) made a lot of sense to me when I first learned about it; I agreed with the principles of comprehensible input, meaningful output, and negotiation of meaning. Despite this, I experienced a steep learning curve in trying to apply CLT practices to my own teaching. Much the of difficulty I experienced was in envisioning how these principles would play out in the language classroom. I struggled to come up with communicative activities for my class because I had seen very few examples. As a graduate student, I have benefited from observing how other language teachers employ CLT in their classrooms. These observations have provided me a model from which to develop my own classroom instruction. Through my observations of what teachers did and did not do, I have learned how to design lessons that provide ample comprehensible input and opportunities for meaningful output as well as how to assess students' progress towards the communicative language goals.

### **TL Communication**

#### *Comprehensible Input*

I learned a lot about vocabulary instruction from the three dual language immersion (DLI) classes that I observed. The DLI teachers taught new vocabulary within a content lesson by pre-teaching and calling attention to the recently learned vocabulary throughout the instruction.

When introducing new vocabulary, these teachers always provided multiple visual cues and representation. Teachers presented the new word in written form along with multiple images to represent the meaning of the word. Providing multiple images for a single word was important so that students could see the scope of the word's meaning. Teachers would read the word aloud and sometimes follow along the words with their finger and then have students repeat the new word with them three times in a row. Giving students the opportunity to repeat the word aloud in unison helped students to become comfortable pronouncing the unfamiliar word and to do so in the comfort of a group. Many teachers also used accompanying hand motions when saying a new word and would use the same gestures in all subsequent uses of the word. After learning the new word, DLI and English Language Development (ELD) teachers would have students record the word in a special place, either in a personal dictionary or in a class graphic organizer, so that students could situate the new word in the context of other vocabulary that they had learned.

DLI teachers also supported student recall of previously introduced vocabulary by integrating old and new vocabulary within the lesson and calling attention to its use. Many of the DLI teachers point out the use of recently taught vocabulary and grammar in their PowerPoints through input enhancement techniques such as bolding and/or using special font colors. One Spanish teacher used this technique to call attention to previously taught verb conjugations by using a specific font color for certain tenses and moods. Some teachers explicitly focused their students' attention on previously taught vocabulary. One DLI teacher explicitly reminded students that they had learned the word

*alegria* a month earlier while learning a Christmas song. The teacher then sang that particular part of the song and had the students join her in singing.

### *Meaningful Output*

DLI teachers also modeled how to provide immediate opportunities to use newly introduced vocabulary in meaningful ways through input- and output-oriented activities and tasks. One DLI teacher taught her students the word *fireworks* in a lesson on Chinese New Year. Immediately after, the teacher implemented an input-oriented task by asking students to raise their hands if they liked fireworks. Then the teacher instigated an output-oriented task by having them talk with a partner about when they see fireworks and then share their response with the class. Another teacher in a lesson on biomes introduced the word *tree* and then implemented an input-oriented activity by having students identify what they saw in a photo of a forest—one of the possible answers being *tree*. After, the teacher showed a picture of a redwood tree and began an output-oriented activity by having students discuss the height of the tree. Teachers of higher proficiency students employed the similar techniques within longer discourse levels by providing sentence frames to support students' use of new vocabulary.

I knew that oral communication was necessary, but I didn't know how to balance it with the other modes of communication. Observing a few of the foreign language (FL) classes, I saw how teachers integrated the four modes of communication together and combined communication tasks with assessment. One teacher had students write out questions that they wanted to ask their peers before proceeding to interview their classmates. At first I saw this as a crutch that limited student opportunity for spontaneous

speech, but I later realized that the written part of the activity served as a formative assessment for the teacher. The teacher could assess the students' abilities to form sentences in Spanish while still providing an opportunity for spontaneous speech through their oral responses to their peers' questions.

### **Can-Do Statements**

#### *Role in Grammar Instruction*

The teachers I observed who provided ample opportunities for output limited the time allocated to teacher instruction to only that which was necessary. When introducing the future perfect, one teacher instructed students to work in pairs and write 5 sentences about what they hope will have happened by the year 2030. He also provided a simple sentence frame that allowed students to complete the task at hand. The teacher's instruction took maybe a minute and then the students had about ten minutes to work on the task.

#### *Role in Assessment*

I learned a lot about the importance of checking for comprehension by observing the consequences of teachers failing to assess comprehension. I especially noticed this when students were left to individual and group work—at which point students would look around the room to other students in hopes that someone else understood the task at hand. Some students continued despite their confusion and would do the activity incorrectly. Others tried to make it look like they were on task while they waited out the



activity. In all my observations, very few students asked the teacher for clarification of the instructions.

During these times, teachers did not circulate to check on students' progress in the activity. In fact, many teachers either sat at their desks for the duration of the activity or waited at the front of the classroom for students to finish. As a result, teachers were unaware that students struggled with the new concepts and as such the teachers overestimated their students' proficiency levels. I learned that meaningful output activities are not only important for students, but also for teachers if they use these activities as an opportunity to conduct formative assessments and to provide differentiated instruction in response to those assessments. Teachers that I observed who understood this would circulate to each group during output activities and check in on their progress and sometimes even participate quickly with the students. By being actively involved with students during individual and group work, teachers maintained an accurate assessment of their students' abilities.

Comprehension checks during input-oriented activities are just as important. Several teachers I observed paused to assess comprehension while watching videos or reading texts as a class. One DLI teacher would pause a video at important informational parts to reiterate the points made in the video, evaluate students' understanding by asking comprehension questions, and to preview the next topic that the video would address. Especially with videos, it is important for teachers to pause regularly and recap because language students often struggle to retain all the information until the end of the video.

Moreover, teachers can confirm and correct students' interpretation of the video's content so students can more appropriately anticipate and understand the later parts of the video.

### **Conclusion**

Being a language teacher is more than just knowing language acquisition theory—it is being able to successfully implement the theory that one knows. These observations have been an important part of my education in the MSLT program. By observing other language teachers, I have been able to visualize how to provide opportunities for TL communication and leverage communicative goals in my classroom. As I continue in my career as a teacher, I hope to make observation a regular part of my own professional development.

## RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

LANGUAGE PAPER

## PURPOSE AND REFLECTION

I started teaching middle school Spanish at Clarke N. Johnsen Jr. High in August 2019. I was surprised to find that there were several students in my Spanish 1 classes that were already conversational in Spanish and regularly spoke Spanish at home. Even more surprising to me was that at back to school night about half of the parents that came to speak with me were the parents of these students. Their parents expressed their concern over their student's Spanish proficiency and their reluctance to speak Spanish at home. The parents wanted to know if their child's needs would be met in my class. The honest answer was no. While supporting the needs of heritage language learners is an issue that is important to me, I realistically knew that as a first year teacher—let alone a teacher without any training in meeting the needs of heritage language learners—that I would not be able to provide the necessary differentiation for the heritage language learners in my class.

Because I wanted to be able to better meet the needs of my HLL students, I decided to research heritage language teaching pedagogy and how to best teach HLL alongside second language learners as well as in classes of their own. With the knowledge I have gained from writing this paper, I was able to create a heritage language Spanish class at the school and develop a curriculum based on my findings.

## MEETING THE NEEDS OF HLL IN SPECIALIZED AND MIXED CLASSES

**Abstract**

Heritage language learners (HLL) are a growing population in the United States. HLL are those who speak a minority language (the heritage language) at home in addition to English. The linguistic needs of HLL are different from native speakers of their language and second language learners. Despite the differing needs of HLL and their growing numbers in US schools, the majority of HLL find themselves in language classes designed for second language learners.

This paper explores the linguistic and socio-affective needs of HLL and the practices that support these needs in the classroom. First, I explore the definition of an HLL and how they are different from native speakers of the language and second language learners. Then, I identify the unique linguistic and socio-affective needs of HLL. Lastly, I summarize the current literature in the field on how to meet these needs in specialized and mixed classes.

*Key words:* heritage language learners, macro-based teaching, community-based instruction, mixed classrooms, critical approaches

## **Introduction**

Currently in the US, 1 in 5 school aged children speaks a language other than English at home (Kids Count Data Center). These children are heritage language learners (HLL) meaning that they are bilingual in the majority language where they live as well as a minority language that is spoken at home (the heritage language). HLL have different linguistic and socio-affective needs than their second language learner (L2L) and native speaker peers. Despite this, HLL frequently find themselves in language classes designed for L2L with teachers with little to no training in how to meet the needs of HLL. Even when HLL-specific classes are available to students, teachers feel unprepared to meet the needs of this demographic.

HLL benefit most from HLL-specific language classes with flexible, community-based curricula that build up reading and writing skills from HLL's existing speaking and listening skills. In mixed classrooms, all students benefit from strategic heterogenous and homogenous HLL and L2L groupings that target the unique needs of both groups while also providing opportunities for reciprocal learning.

## **Who are HLL?**

Scholars have proposed several definitions of an HLL, which Polinsky and Kagan (2007) categorize into "broad" and "narrow" definitions (Fishman, 2001; Van Deusen-Scholl, 2003; Valdés, 2001). Narrow definitions of a HLL are limited to an individual "raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language" (Valdés, 2001, p. 38). In this narrow definition, a heritage language (HL) is "a language that is spoken at home or otherwise readily available to

young children, and crucially this language is not a dominant language because of the larger (national) society” (Rothman, 2009, p.156). Broad definitions, on the other hand, incorporate all individuals who “...have familial or ancestral ties to a particular language” (Hornberger & Wang, 2008, p. 27). Individuals under this broad definition include those who speak the HL at home as well as L2L who share a cultural heritage with their L2. The linguistic profile of individuals within the narrow definition of HLL, however, is different from a L2L. This paper will use the narrow definition of an HLL.

HLL are diverse in their proficiency of the HL from those with near-native speaking ability to those who can barely speak the HL (Polinsky & Kagan, 2007). Several factors influence HL proficiency: generation status, age of English acquisition, order of English and HL acquisition, the language(s) spoken at home, and the amount of schooling and input received in the HL (Carreira & Kagan, 2011). The narrow definition of HLL includes first generation incipient bilinguals, second and third generation HL dominant and English dominant, and fourth generation English dominant—the last of which may only be a receptive bilingual meaning that they can understand the HL but cannot produce it (Valdes, 2000).

The order and age of HL and English acquisition also influences the HLL proficiency. Sequential bilinguals—learners who are exposed first to the HL in the home and later acquire the majority language when they transition into formal schooling—experience less L1 attrition than simultaneous bilinguals—learners who are exposed both to the HL and the majority language since birth (Montrul, 2010; Silva-Corvalán, 2003). This is because the earlier a child is exposed to the dominant language, the less access to HL input the child has during the critical period for language acquisition when the child’s



grammatical system is developing (Carreira, 2001). The child needs sufficient input before the closing of the critical period for the grammatical system to reach full maturity and prevent attrition (Carreira, 2001; Montrul 2006, 2008). For the same reason, the language(s) spoken at home also influence HL proficiency—for example, children who speak only Spanish at home have stronger proficiency than those who speak both Spanish and English at home (Mueller, 2002; Silva-Corvalán, 2003).

HLL differ from TL speakers in the country of origin. Once HL input declines with increased exposure to the majority language, language acquisition begins to deviate from that of children in the country of origin (Carreira & Chik, 2018; Carreira & Kagan, 2011; Montrul, 2012, 2016). Moreover, because native speakers are exposed to their L1 in multiple domains, they develop a range of linguistic competencies while HLL typically only develop home-language (Lynch & Polinsky, 2018; Polinsky & Kagan, 2007; Spicer-Escalante, 2005). The exception to this would be those who immigrate as pre-teens or teens—referred to as generation 1.5—who typically experience some overlap with native speakers due to their increased exposure in various domains through formal schooling in the HL (Carreira & Chik 2018; Colombi, 2009).

### **What are the needs of HLL?**

A person's HL development begins in early childhood and is largely limited to the family and minority speech community. This makes HLL different from L2L—whose L2 development is centered around school—and native speakers—whose L1 development takes place in the home and the majority speech community. According to He (2006) ethnic identity is “the centerpiece rather than the background of HL development” (p. 7).

The centrality of the home and the minority speech community in linguistic development and usage causes HLL to have unique linguistic and socio-affective needs.

### *Linguistic*

HL use in the home is primarily oral and aural meaning that HLL frequently have little reading and writing skills, even those with well-developed speaking and listening skills (Chevalier, 2004; Spicer-Escalante, 2005). HLL fall behind L2L in their proficiency in academic Spanish—the latter receiving formal instruction in academic Spanish in school (Beaudrie, Ducar, & Potowski, 2014; Montrul, 2010; Parodi, 2009; Spicer-Escalante, 2005, 2015). Spelling and in particular the use of accent marks is difficult for HLL of Spanish because they receive no formal education in these areas (Carreira, 2002). Moreover, literacy requires familiarity with a variety of genres and the conventions used within each genre (Chevalier, 2004).

While HLL tend to acquire basic grammar structures, HLL tend to overgeneralize and simplify grammar in complex structures (Montrul 2009, 2016; Montrul & Bowles, 2010; Polinsky 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2011). HLL of Spanish demonstrate high error rates with gender marking ranging from 5% to 25% error, particularly with feminine nouns and nouns with irregular gender (Montrul 2010; Montrul, Foote, & Perpiñán, 2008). HLL of Spanish also have poor control of the subjunctive mood as well as the conditional (Montrul, 2007; Silva-Corvalán, 1994).

HLL's weak command of academic Spanish and complex grammar structures makes it difficult for HLL at the Intermediate and Advanced OPI levels to reach higher proficiency levels. HLL at the Intermediate level struggle to speak beyond autobiographical topics, produce text with connectors and organization, demonstrate

control of major time frames, and initiate Advanced-level tasks that involve past narrations and a situation with a complication (Martin, Swender, & Rivera-Martinez, 2013). HLL at the Advanced level struggle to discuss topics at an abstract level, support an idea or hypothesize, and use precise vocabulary (Martin et al., 2013; Parodi, 2009).

### *Socio-Affective*

Tse (2001) argues that “group membership” or “the allegiances we feel with particular-language-speaking groups and the attitudes and feelings that flow from being associated with them” is equally important as language exposure in learning a language (p. 60). Carreira’s (2011) survey of HLL found that families and communities play a critical role in HL instruction; “communicating with family and friends in the United States” was listed among the top three reasons for studying their HL and open-ended responses indicated that students valued being part of a community of speakers (p. 59).

However, the centrality of family and the community in HLL development can be a double-edge sword. Many young Hispanics report being embarrassed of their Spanish (Spicer-Escalante, 2005). Their language skills are frequently mocked by family members when they visit them abroad (Clachar, 1997; Parodi, 2009). They are also embarrassed when nonnatives develop higher proficiency than them.

HLL may speak a non-standard variant of Spanish, many of which are stigmatized. Spanish variants are even devalued by other Latinos. De Genova and Ramos-Zayas (2003) found that Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Chicago both devalued Puerto Rican Spanish. In New York City, Zentella (1990) similarly found a hierarchy of Spanish dialects related to race, education, and class; Spanish spoken by Cuban and Colombians—who were middle-class, well-educated, and lighter-skinned—was not as

stigmatized as the Spanish spoken by Dominicans and Puerto Ricans—who were poorer and darker-skinned.

These attitudes are also reflected in the classroom. Showstack (2012) found that students valued what they saw as standard Spanish while stigmatizing nonstandard varieties of Spanish and individuals who did not fit into their essentialized views of linguistic and cultural identity. Carreira and Beeman (2014) quote the experience of a young Latino HL struggling with a bilingual identity:

In high school I was one of very few Latinos. My friend and I were called the American kids. This was always funny to me because my Dad's family always told me I was American. In school I was labeled Mexican, but to the Mexicans, I am an American. I am part of each, but not fully accepted by either.... You may never be fully embraced by either side. That's why you seek out other people like yourself. Socializing with people who share a common experience helps you deal with this experience (p. 88).

HLL require a space where they can negotiate their identities as bilinguals and HLL with those who are like them.

### **Specialized Classes**

#### *Addressing Linguistic Needs*

Because HLL come with a background in the HL, they benefit from macro-based (top-down) teaching which starts at the discourse level and teaches grammar and vocabulary as it emerges from discourse-based activities (Carreira, 2016; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Kagan & Dillon, 2001). With speaking and writing, HLL attempt more complex output from the start, focusing on content and then addressing cohesiveness

(Carreira, 2016; Carreira & Chik, 2018). With listening and reading, HLL begin with large, complex texts in the form of authentic materials and then break down vocabulary and grammar as needed (Carreira, 2016; Carreira & Chik, 2018).

Macro-based teaching can present some challenges to HLL who fall at the lower end of the proficiency spectrum since it requires processing and producing authentic, complex content from the beginning. Kagan's (2011) from-to principles help scaffold macro-based content (Carreira & Chik, 2018). Kagan (2011) proposes 5 principles of HL teaching that build on HLL's skills and background knowledge: from aural to reading, from spoken to written, from home-based register to general and academic registers, from everyday activities to classroom activities, and from HLL's identity and group membership motivations to content. The model argues that listening and speaking skills are the starting place for reading and writing skills respectively and that formal registers should be built up from the home register. Examples of this include listening to an audiobook before/while reading the book (Kagan, 2011).

Chevalier (2004) presents a literacy curriculum framework that aligns with Kagan's from-to principles. The curriculum is divided into 4 stages that begins with simple, conversational discourse and progresses to more complex and formal genres: Stage I: Conversation, Stage II: Description & Narrative, Stage III: Evaluation & Explanation, and Stage IV: Argument. Each stage begins by developing students' metalinguistic awareness of the forms and function of the genre and the strategies for composing such discourse through the use of model texts. The model text is used and analyzed extensively as an instructional tool to prepare students for writing assignments.

Inquiry questions help students make the connection between linguistic forms and their function in the model text.

Stage I instructs students in orthographic and grammatical rules in preparation for writing dialogues or interior monologues. Stage II instructs students in descriptions, adjectival and verbal morphology, and paragraph structuring and sequencing in preparation for writing personal family histories, stories, or fairy tales. Stage III instructs students on strategies for expressing opinions and explaining causal relations in preparation for writing reviews, critiques, news articles, summaries, and reports. Stage IV instructs students on discourse features of argumentation in preparation for writing a persuasive argument.

*Addressing Socio-Affective Needs (Critical Approach)*

Kagan's (2011) fourth and fifth principles support a community-based and service-based approach where student motivation and socio-affective needs drive the content of the class. A community-based curriculum with a critical approach meets both of these principles.

Community-based instruction (CBI) puts teaching in community environments and focuses on developing skills that students need to function in real-world activities in the community (Carreira & Kagan, 2011). Carreira (2011) argues that, "HLL come to the classroom from the community with their language and cultural knowledge being rooted in the community. They need to continue to be able to function in the community while also enhancing their academic and linguistic skills" (p. 59). CBI connects the learner with the local community through units that have students interview family and other members of the community, record oral histories, and research the history of the country of origin

and of the experience of immigrants (Carreira & Kagan, 2011). The connection between the students and their community addresses students' socio-affective needs as they interview family and community members on experiences of immigration, minority identity, bilingualism and biculturalism, all of which are part of many HLL identities (Belpoliti & Fairclough, 2016).

Several CBI protocols, including inquiry-based projects (IBP), have been developed to integrate HLL' linguistic and socio-affective needs. IBPs are part of a student-centered approach where students formulate their own questions, conduct their own research, and synthesize their findings which they present in written and oral formats. IBPs in the form of cultural projects allow students to explore a variety of topics that are of interest to them, related to their own communities. Scaffolding of IBPs begins in the family and moves out to the broader community (Belpoliti & Fairclough, 2016).

NHLRC (2012) developed the Abuelos (Grandparents) Project in which students interview an elderly member of their HL community and present their discoveries to the class. Reading materials about the HL community later in the unit are then connected to the findings from the projects. At the end of the unit, students synthesize all sources of information to develop their own project. Similar interview projects have been recommended (Belpoliti & Fairclough, 2016; Duran-Cerda, 2008; Roca & Alonso, 2006).

The benefit of IBPs is that they integrate all communicative modes in addition to grammatical, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic domains (Belpoliti & Fairclough, 2016). Moreover, the recorded interviews and formal presentations of research follow Kagan's (2011) from-to principles by naturally transitioning students from a colloquial speaking style to a more formal register as they "translate" the informal interview recording into

formal speech for their presentation. Students develop their writing at an individual level by writing a report of their research findings. The projects allow for the needed differentiation of a heterogeneous HLL classroom and highlight what students have learned as well as the next step in their language and cultural development (Belpoliti & Fairclough, 2016). The projects themselves can be differentiated for groups of students with differing language proficiencies by altering the social context and task complexity (Belpoliti & Fairclough, 2016). This also requires students to rely on several linguistic repertoires—from more colloquial language during the interview to formal language for the presentation components.

The CBI curriculum can be infused with a critical approach (CA) which teaches HLL “about the functions, distribution, and evaluation of dialects and raising awareness of language, power, and social inclusion” (Carreira, 2015, pg. 164; see also Fairclough, 2005; Leeman, 2005; Martinez, 2003; Webb & Miller, 2000). Instead of taking a deficit approach to HL instruction, CA frames HL instruction as teaching a second variant (Fairclough, 2005). It addresses grammatical gaps by validating students’ home variant and then highlighting differences between the dialect and academic language, using contrastive analysis as a framework (Fairclough, 2005). Moreover, CA provides students with the tools to identify and analyze the power relations embedded in the messages they hear (Freire, 2005; Parra, 2016).

### **Mixed Classes**

Although specialized HL classes offer the best learning environments for HLL, it is common for HLL to be put in foreign language classes with L2L due to low HLL enrollment, lack of resources and trained instructors, and inadequate faculty and



administrative support (Beaudrie, 2011, 2012; Carreira, 2014; Ingold, Rivers, Tesser, & Ashby, 2002; Valdés, Fishman, Chávez, & Pérez, 2006). The topics of instruction, methods, and materials in mixed classes are often indistinguishable from L2 classes and are foremost directed to the needs of L2L—even in cases where HLL made up over 75% of the students (Carreira, 2014). There tends to be the expectation that HLL will adapt to the traditional L2 classroom rather than the other way around (Valdés, 1997). The sad reality is that white, middle-class students are the target audience of language education in the US and little to no thought is given to the linguistic needs of their non-white peers.

#### *Challenges of mixed classes*

HLL who start in advanced-level L2 classes face additional disadvantages. While HLL are highly fluent in discussing familiar, everyday topics and using home vocabulary, they will struggle in comparison to their L2 peers who have developed literacy skills and proficiency in academic language in the classroom (Carreira, 2015). L2L will have advantage over HLL in disciplinary literacy including grammatical terminology and grammar drills (Carreira, 2015; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). While HLL benefit from macro-based teaching, L2L require micro-based (bottom-up) teaching in which instruction starts with discreet instruction of grammar and vocabulary and slowly progresses in complexity to the discourse level. Form-focused instruction drives students towards more complex language use (Carreira, 2016). L2 classes are typically micro-based (bottom-up) and HLL tend to be confused by explicit grammar explanations and activities that require students to manipulate grammar rules (Beaudrie, 2009; Beaudrie, Ducar, & Potowaski, 2014). While L2L are able to identify the grammatical concepts

being tested in class activities, HLL focus on the meaning that is being communicated in an activity in order to complete the task (Canagarajah, 2013).

Mixed classes can take a toll on HLL's socio-affective needs. HLL can get negative attention for being in an L2 class with students and teachers assuming that HLL hoping to get an easy A while at the same time being seen as deficit Latinos for not knowing Spanish (Beaudrie, 2009; Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005; Carreira & Beeman, 2014; Potowski, 2002). The language variety spoken by heritage learners often differs from the so-called "standard" variety commonly taught in schools, which can exacerbate negative ideologies about their own language variety (Ducar, 2012; Leeman, 2012).

#### *Heterogenous Pairings*

Many of the needs of HLL can be met through reciprocal learning. HLL can benefit from L2L's strong literacy skills, orthography and accentuation skills, familiarity with formal registers, explicit grammatical knowledge, and disciplinary literacy (Carreira, 2015). On the other hand, L2L can benefit from HLL's strong oracy skills, native-like pronunciation, familiarity with informal registers, use of spontaneous language for everyday conversations, and cultural knowledge and experience (Carreira 2015).

Carreira (2015) identifies 3 steps in designing activities for HLL-L2L dyads: identifying the linguistic goal of the task, assigning the task to the learner who will find it more challenging, and including an additional task to challenge the other learner. Bowles (2011) designed information gap activities for HLL and L2L pairs which contain tasks which requiring spontaneous used of TL and home vocabulary as well as explicit linguistic knowledge and writing—the former being easy for HLL and challenging for L2L and the latter vice versa. The task design required the HLL and L2L pairs to rely on

each other and made learners aware of the strengths and weaknesses of each partner. Another activity example could use a cloze activity where the L2L is tasked with deciding on how to manipulate the verb that goes in the blank while the HLL is tasked with writing the answer with a focus on correct spelling and accentuation (Carreira, 2015).

This same type of pairing can be used to explore cultural topics from the perspectives of HLL and L2L. Carreira (2015) suggests creating discussion prompts for readings such as, “one thing that many people in the United States don’t realize about Latin American cuisine is...,” and, “one thing that many Spanish-speakers abroad (or U.S. Latinos) don’t realize about American cuisine is...” (p. 167).

#### *Homogenous Pairings*

In regard to socio-affective needs, Carreira (2015) argues that it is important to create “HLL-only niches in mixed classes to provide a safe and comforting environment for HLL to engage with [identity] issues” (p. 169). Carreira (2015) also suggests using mini-lessons in homogenous groups prior to HLL-L2L dyad activities to address specific needs of HLL, in particular, in teaching grammatical terminology and drawing their attention to form-meaning connections. Mini-lessons can also work with reading activities where HLL try a reading on their own while the teacher works with L2L on pre-reading instructions followed by L2L then working on the reading on their own while HLL work on a mini-lesson. Later, the 2 groups come together for reciprocal learning activities. Mini-lessons can also target HLL need to understand how form-focused activities connect to authentic material tasks and overall learning objectives (Carreira, 2016). Carreira (2015) argues that the mini-lesson/reciprocal learning structure creates a

sense of community between HLL and L2L while addressing issues of access and engagement; the two groups have the opportunity to learn together while also receiving the differentiated instruction they need without losing the interest of the HLL or overwhelming the affective filter of the L2L.

### **Conclusion**

HLL have unique linguistic and socio-affective needs that warrant targeted instruction. Even in situations where specialized HL classes are not possible, the needs of HLL can be met in the L2 classroom. With the growing HLL population in the US, it is important for language educators to make themselves aware of these best practices.

CULTURE PAPER

## INTRODUCTION AND REFLECTION

I wrote this paper during my second semester for LING 6900: Pragmatics. I was motivated by my own experiences as an Arabic student in Amman, Jordan. Since studying abroad for a semester is a requirement of the Arabic program at Brigham Young University, pragmatics instruction is heavily integrated into all the language classes. When I went to Jordan, I knew how to act appropriately and to interpret the behavior of the people there. But it was hard. As a woman in the Middle East, I did not know how to express myself in a way that was both true to my identity and appropriate for the culture.

In addition to knowing cultural perspectives and practices, it is important for students to learn how to construct authentic L2 identities. In this paper I explore how language learners develop L2 identities when they are confronted with L2 pragmatics that conflict with their L1 values. I also address the limitations of L2 identity negotiation that come with being a language learner.

## LANGUAGE LEARNER L2 IDENTITY NEGOTIATION

**Abstract**

Metapragmatic awareness is necessary for language learners to be active participants in the construction of the L2 identities. In cases where TL pragmatics parallels those of the L1 or reflects an ideal unattainable in the L1, the adoption of TL pragmatics is relatively easy for the learner. However, in many cases the learner may find that TL pragmatics contradicts their L1 values and as a result it can be difficult for learners to construct an authentic L2 identity.

This paper explores L2 identity negotiation in the L2 pragmatic environment and the factors that facilitate and hinder this process. First, I introduce Dörnyei and Ushioda's (2013) model of the ideal L2 self and how it motivates the adoption of L2 pragmatics. Then, I address Dörnyei and Ushioda's (2013) model of the ought to self and show how learners will adopt L2 pragmatics despite conflict with the ideal self using Bourdieu's (1986) theory of capital and investment. Next, I present the concept of a third space as an alternative to constructing an L2 identity. Lastly, I explore the limitations that learners experience in L2 identity negotiation.

*Key words:* second language identity negotiation, ideal l2 self, ought to l2 self, cultural capital, social capital, third space,

## **Introduction**

The primary goal of language learning is to eventually use the target language (TL) in one form or another among a community of speakers—either as a tool for communication or as “an avenue to information and interpersonal relations” (The National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015, *Lifelong Learning*, para. 1). When language learners finally engage with the TL community, many are not prepared for the identity negotiation that inevitably occurs in linguistic interaction. Block (2007) explains that, “when individuals immerse themselves in new sociocultural environments, they find that their sense of identity is destabilized and that they enter a period of struggle to reach a balance” (p. 864). Metapragmatic awareness is necessary for language learners to be able to actively and consciously construct L2 identities that are recognizable by members of the TL community. Van Compernelle and Kinginger (2013) define metapragmatic awareness as “the knowledge of the social meaning of variable second language forms, how they mark different aspects of social contexts or personal identities, and how they reference broader language ideologies” (p. 284).

Failure to successfully construct a recognizable identity may result in TL community members imposing an undesirable identity onto the learner, such as being socially inept. However, it can be difficult for learners to adopt an L2 identity when they feel that such an identity conflicts with their L1 values, particularly, those of gender and social equality. Learners will invest in an L2 identity when they believe that doing so in that particular context will increase the resources—or capital—available to them (Block, 2012; Bourdieu, 1986; Norton, 2000; Norton & McKinney, 2011; Norton Peirce, 1995). Learners will adopt target like pragmatics despite conflict with the ideal self 1) when it



permits them to join an imagined community in certain contexts which yield capital, and 2) when they feel it is possible to construct an authentic L2 identity.

### **Successful Negotiation of the Ideal L2 Self**

When language learners use their L2 in interaction, they actively engage in identity construction (Norton, 2000). They do this by positioning themselves within an identifiable social role which both reflects and determines the narrative and speech acts present in an interaction (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & van Longenhove, 1991). When L1 and L2 pragmatic behaviors parallel each other or when L2 pragmatic behavior reflects an ideal self unattainable in the L1, learners can more easily construct an L2 identity and position themselves in an identifiable social role. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2013) define the “ideal L2 self” as the “L2-specific facet of one’s ‘ideal self,’ which is defined by Higgins (1987, 1998) as “your representation of the attributes that someone (yourself or another) would like you, ideally, to possess (i.e., a representation of someone’s hopes, aspirations, or wishes for you)” (1987, p. 320). Dörnyei (2005) argues that “the ‘ideal L2 self’ is a powerful motivator to learn the L2 because of the desire to reduce the discrepancy between our actual and ideal selves” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013, p. 86; see also Dörnyei, 2009). If a student can successfully create an ideal L2 self for themselves, it then “promotes the development of a person’s learning agenda and then a more articulated learning plan, experimentation and practice with new behaviour, feelings and perceptions” (Boyatzis & Akrivou, 2006, p. 628). This is exemplified in female L2 learners of English from Spanish, Polish, and Japanese backgrounds who easily adopted certain English pragmatic norms because they found the L2 pragmatics liberating in comparison to the more restrictive gendered norms that they were subjected to in their

L1's (Pavlenko, 2001). An additional example can be found in a student who studied abroad in Argentina and adopted Argentine specific vernacular while learning how to make lewd jokes, which enabled him “to express his personality as he would in his native English” (Fernandez, 2018, p. 446).

### **The Ought-to L2 Self**

In some cases, learners feel unable to construct an ideal self that aligns with target-like L2 pragmatics. This occurs when L2 pragmatics are viewed in opposition to L1 values, particularly, those of gender and social equality. A learner will not invest in the language practices of a given community that they view as racist, sexist, elitist, etc., despite being highly motivated to learn the language (Norton & Toohey, 2011). The use of honorifics can be difficult for American language learners. Honorifics are “direct grammatical encodings of relative social status between participants, or between participants and persons or things referred to in the communicative event” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 1979). Many English-speaking North Americans feel uncomfortable using these polite forms, which they associate with social distance and which clash with their L1 values of friendliness and social equality (Iwasaki, 2011).

### *Investment & Capital*

Learners must decide whether adhering to L2 pragmatics is worth sacrificing their L1 values, in other words, will the sacrifice yield an increase of capital available to the learner. Here, capital does not only refer to the traditional definition of economic capital (e.g. money, property, etc.), but also cultural and social capital which Bourdieu (1986) argues can be exchanged for economic capital. Cultural capital is the set of cultural competences—knowledge, skills, and attitudes—acquired by an individual which carry

value in a certain context (Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). Bourdieu divides cultural capital into three types: the embodied state, the objectified state, and the institutionalized state. Embodied cultural capital is that which is expressed by one's person—for example, the accent in which one speaks or the linguistic repertoires one employs. Accents associated with the upper class are respected and valued in society while those associated with the lower class are often delegitimize the speaker. Objectified cultural capital refers to the material objects that an individual has access to and has the knowledge necessary to appreciate and use them. Examples include having access to works of art through museums and having the training and background knowledge necessary to appreciate and understand the significances of the works and their artists. Institutionalized cultural capital refers primarily to academic qualifications such as high school diploma or college degree. Qualifications from highly respected institutions such as Ivy League schools carry high value while institutions that are relatively unknown or unrecognized by the society may not carry any value at all such as international universities. Social capital refers to social networks or group memberships that facilitate otherwise inaccessible opportunities. For example, during study abroad language learners frequently try to make friends with native speakers to increase their speaking opportunities. When learners feel unable to construct an ideal L2 self, they are motivated to adopt L2 pragmatic norms by the ought-to L2 self and their desire to participate in a TL community in certain contexts which yield social and cultural capital. As opposed to the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self is “the attributes that one believes one ought to possess to meet expectations and to avoid possible negative outcomes” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013, p. 86).

In professional contexts, L2 users may establish a recognizable identity that violates their L1 values for the sake of gaining social and cultural capital that would grant them professional success. Kim (2014) noticed that Korean international students were only willing to fully adopt target-like responses to compliments when speaking with professors, while using humbler, L1-like responses with friends:

[learners were] creating a sense of who they are and how they stand in relation to others and society. In particular, learners chose to follow the target norm if they perceived it was a better investment for their social identity in the target community, even though it may conflict with their ethnic identity. (p. 97)

It is more important to the students that their identities as competent and confident students were recognizable to their professors than it was for them to express their identities as humble Koreans. Similarly, the L2 Japanese male professionals in Itakura's (2008) study struggled with Japanese masculine speech. Traditional masculine speech in Japanese culture is blunt and direct and is generally more aggressive than neutral speech registers (StrutzSreetharan, 2009). Despite not agreeing with the social values behind traditional Japanese masculine speech, some participants in the study chose to use it anyway as a means of forming close relationships with their colleagues and of achieving general success in Japanese business.

Learners are also motivated by their desire to participate within a community. Carlos, a Colombian migrant in London, chose to adopt behavior more target-like for the context of his workplace for the sake of participating within the community of his working-class co-workers (Block, 2006; 2012). Carlos was a well-educated man with sophisticated cultural interests and a middle-class social circle. Although he rejected

adopting the working-class practices and the non-standard Cockney English variety of his co-workers, Carlos was willing to participate in football banter on his own terms and in doing so, negotiated his identity for the sake of social capital (Block, 2012). Likewise, several students in Kim's (2014) study accommodated to pragmatic norms after their American friends mocked their modesty; results from the study revealed that 87% of the students were aware of the TL complement norms and chose to use them, "feeling pressure from the L2 community" (p. 96).

Even when learners are motivated by the acquisition of capital, it can still be emotionally draining to maintain an L2 identity that they feel conflicts with their L1 values. Participants in Higgins (2011) study described how they struggled to maintain appropriate TL behaviors in emotional situations. One woman, Tatu, noted the inner struggle she experienced of wanting to resort to her L1 pragmatics behaviors during a frustrating experience with a car mechanic. Tatu reported having to "block [her]self" from yelling at the car mechanic who was slow to help her fix her tire (p. 180). Another woman in the study, Kate, also struggled with restraint and "lost it" when the support staff at her workplace put valuable textbooks on the floor (p. 181). Both women cite knowing the behavior that was required in each situation, but struggled to perform the L2 identity that was required of them.

Language learners will not adopt TL pragmatic norms if they do not perceive that they will yield social or economic capital. Some of the Korean ESL students in the Davis (2007) study felt that Australian vernacular was not globally accepted enough to motivate them to learn Australia-specific phrases. The students preferred the North American English variety, which was motivated by their familiarity with it and its pronunciation,

the global acceptance of North American English, awareness of the unintelligibility of Australian English outside the country, and what they perceived as “unnaturalness” of Australian vernacular (p. 626). Some students in the Fernandez (2018) study felt that learning *lunfardo* (the urban slang of Buenos Aires) had little long-term benefits; as one student, Harry, said “people at home aren’t going to understand me” (p. 447). Sometimes this attitude is even encouraged by language institutions; Melanie's previous formal education setting caused her to focus on learning "invariable target-like forms" (van Compernelle & Williams, 2012, p. 244).

### **Third Space**

An alternative to adopting L2 pragmatic norms is to enter into what is called “a third space”, which Kramersch (1993) describes as “a culture of the third kind in which [L2 users] can express their own meanings without being hostage to the meanings of either their own or the target speech communities” (p. 13-14). In other words, the third space is a middle ground between the L1 culture and the TL culture.

Negotiating this third space requires intercultural competence to perform *and* interpret these identities during communication, otherwise the learners’ L1 cultural identity will impede the learner’s development of pragmatic competence and effective communication (Fantini, 2009; Kramersch, 1993; Liddicoat, Crozet, & LoBianco, 1999; Liu, 2016; Schumann, 1978). Greta, a study abroad student in Spain, adapted to Spanish service encounter norms by ceasing to engage in pre-service small talk exchanges without understanding the Spanish cultural perspective leaving her to assume that that Spaniards were unfriendly (Shively, 2011). However, she failed to realize that Spaniards engage in friendly small talk exchanges post-service. Greta also struggled to view Spanish requests

from the TL perspective and characterized Spaniards as “authoritarian” rather than “clear and direct” in their communication of their needs (p. 1830). Similarly, an English-speaking North American learner of Spanish in Colombia noted that Colombians frequently used the phrase *qué pena* (what a pity) instead of more formal apology expressions, which the student attributed to Colombians not wanting to admit fault (Liu, 2016).

On the other hand, developing intercultural competence allows language learners to adopt pragmatic practices that would otherwise clash with their L1 identities and values. A Chinese learner of Spanish recalls how she struggled with the service encounter custom of saying *eres muy amable* (It’s very kind of you) after thanking workers (Liu, 2016). The practice clashed with the learner’s L1 culture in which good job performance was an expectation that was not worthy of praise. However, understanding the point of view of Colombians helped the learner accept the practice:

...my husband explained to me that you can get your job done with a friendly attitude or an unpleasantly attitude, so we Colombians praise people for doing their jobs with a positive and service-oriented attitude. I started to think it makes sense, after accepting their point of view, I feel more comfortable using this phrase (Liu, 2016, p. 142-143).

Similarly, another student related how she was initially confused and offended when Colombians employed the phrase *a la orden* (at your service) in response to requests that they did not intend to accept. She noted that the pragmatic expression clashed with her L1 Chinese culture that values people keeping their word. However, the student was able to

later recognize the pragmatic purpose of the phrase as a statement of courtesy that should not be taken seriously.

When language learners have the metapragmatic awareness to interpret and perform L2 behaviors, they then have the agency to negotiate a third space identity. Korean students in Kim's (2014) study negotiated between their L1 norms of responding to compliments with humility and L2 identities of accepting compliments. Students accepted compliments with "thank you" followed by an expression of humility when talking with friends which "made them feel truer to themselves...In this way, learners negotiated between the L1 and target-language norms, finding a middle ground that made them feel more comfortable" (p. 96). Similarly, English-speaking North American and Chinese-speaking learners of Spanish resorted to their L1 pragmatic norms for apologies despite noticing that Colombians did not apologize as much or as directly (Liu, 2016). Battaller (2010) reports similar findings among English-speaking North American learners of Spanish where a student used her L1 request strategies despite being told that it made her sound like a foreigner. Additionally, while the students did not adopt Colombian terms of endearment such as *amor* (love), *corazon* (heart), and *preciosa* (precious) in their own speech, they came to recognize the pragmatic meaning of the phrases and appreciate their use by others. Arabic learners of English attempt to imitate the beauty of the Arabic language in their speech by using eloquent speech in informal contexts (Al-Issa, 2003). Furthermore, they used English translations of religious expressions in their speech to express their identities as good Muslims. One participant in Kim's (2014) study, Min-Jung, rejected the "polite forms" she witnessed American mothers using with their children, such as "would you like...?" (p. 97). She instead chose



to assert her subjective position as a Korean mother and employed direct requests with children, which while not pragmatically inappropriate, was contrary to the pragmatic norms.

### **Limitations on L2 identity construction**

Learners can also feel limited in their ability to construct a L2 ideal self when doing so feels inauthentic. Feelings of inauthenticity can come from learners' own concept of the ought-to self or by native speaker-imposed restrictions. In both cases, the learner's L2 identity is limited to that of the foreigner, which causes learners to refrain from adopting more target-like pragmatics.

#### *“Rights” of Non-Native Speakers*

Davis (2007) notes that native speakers and non-native speakers have “different rights” when it comes to using region-specific phrases. Korean ESL students studying in Australia did not feel it was appropriate for them to use Australian-specific colloquialisms. Davis (2007) explains:

...recent arrivals who go out of their way to use such phrases might be judged as 'trying too hard' to sound or be Australian. NNSs, aware of these kinds of implicit prohibition, might avoid certain aspects of the L2, realizing that they do not enjoy the same entitlements as NSs. (p. 634)

These rights have also been acknowledged by language learners from other backgrounds, including Arabs and Americans. An Arabic-speaking learner of English mentioned in an interview that he used the phrase, "what's up," with a classmate and was sure that the classmate was making fun of him whenever he greets him with that phrase now because "he thinks [he's] being too American" (p. 595). Harry, a student studying abroad in

Argentina similarly felt that using slang and taboo words “can make you sound kinda stupid (.) sometimes” (Fernandez, 2018, p. 448). However, he was also conflicted by “not want[ing] to become the stereotypical *boludo extranjero* [foreign dumbass] unable to communicate using the language as locals use it” (p. 448). Similarly, some students reject adopting L2 pragmatic norms because they feel that it would be inappropriate for them as non-native speakers (Davis, 2007; Kim, 2014; LoCastro, 2001). In Kim’s (2014) study, 33% of English-learning students who had lived in the US over four years called their professors with whom they had a close relationship by their first name only, while none of those who had been in the US less than three years did so. Students stated that they felt “awkward” calling their professors by their first name because it would look like they were pretending to be American.

Other restrictions are imposed by native speakers themselves. While observing that honorifics were important to L1 speakers of Japanese, students in Iwasaki’s (2011) study were aware that L1 Japanese speakers did not expect foreigners to use them, especially not English-speaking North Americans, of whom Japanese had expectations to be informal and friendly (p. 83). Students felt that Japanese L1 speakers set the bar lower for them from the start and readily engaged with them informally from the start. One participant, Greg, stated, "There is not a lot of situations where, as a foreigner, I felt compelled to use polite speech even though I know there were situations where it would have been more polite" (p. 84). Iwasaki contends that the participants’ pragmatic speech was influenced by what they felt most comfortable with and their perception of how L1 users of Japanese expected them to speak as a foreigner.

The participants also found that certain expressions they had been taught to avoid because they were considered vulgar, were actually used among their male peers to express friendliness and affection amongst each other and even used with their spouses or girlfriends (Iwasaki, 2011, p. 85). One student, Sam, found that he was not "allowed" to use this vulgar male language and was reprimanded by his host-brother when he reciprocated the use of the more vulgar expression *gomen na* (sorry) (p. 85). Many of the students decided to play it safe by sticking to more neutral language rather than to navigate the contradicting messages they received regarding the use of impolite language from their surroundings and previous instruction.

The desire to fit in influences students to either adopt or avoid more target-like speech. So while the participants in the Japanese study abroad chose language they perceived as less "risky," although less native-like as a result of their desire to fit in, Melanie's desire to fit in encouraged her to adopt more native-like speech (Iwasaki, 2011, p. 87; van Compernelle & Williams, 2012).

#### *Unvalued Social and Cultural Capital*

Sometimes language learners find more social capital in maintaining identity ties to diasporic populations of their home language. In the case of Carlos, maintaining identity ties with the local community of Spanish-speaking professionals allowed him to maintain a higher socio-economic status than was afforded to him by the white, working-class community among which he worked (Block, 2006). Carlos found it hard to create an L2 identity for himself that reflected his educated background as a university philosophy lecturer in Colombia. Felicia, a Peruvian immigrant to Canada, similarly saw adopting an L2 identity as a threat to the upper-class status she held in Peru (Norton,

2013). While Felicia had a career as an elementary school teacher in Peru, she could only get low-skill, part-time jobs in Canada such as delivering newspapers and babysitting. She instead adopted the identity of “a foreigner person who lives here by accident” and maintained a social network among other wealthy Peruvians in Canada (p. 94). Felicia believes that immigrants from a lower socio-economic background can more easily integrate themselves in Canada:

Canada can be a good country for some kinds of immigrants; people who lived in countries under communism are happy here or people who never had anything in their countries. Here, they can work in any kind of work and get things. But professional people and wealthy people lose a lot coming to Canada. (Norton, 2013, p. 94)

For both Carlos and Felicia, the cultural capital that they brought with them was not valued in their new countries.

Likewise, Eva, a Czech immigrant in Canada, positioned herself as a European in Canada as a means of subverting the subject position as a “‘stupid’ person, only worthy of the ‘worst kind of job’” (Norton, 2013, p. 103). Eva’s experience in Canada opened her eyes to cultural capital she possessed that would be valued by the TL community. Her self-positioned identity as a European in Canada was accepted by her co-workers who mentioned in passing that they didn’t like working with non-Canadians except for Eva.

## **Conclusion**

L2 identity negotiation can be a struggle for language learners. While some learn to balance discrepancies between L1 and TL values, others are denied L2 identities by TL

community members altogether. It is important for teachers to prepare their students for identity negotiation by exposing them to the identities available to them in the L2.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## L1 USE AND WTC IN THE FL CLASSROOM

### **Introduction**

Target Language (TL) use is critical for second language (L2) development. ACTFL recommends that the TL be used by teachers and students 90% of the class (ACTFL, 2010). While teachers can control their own TL use in the class, they have much less control over the language used by their students. Studies show that students fall back on their shared first language (L1) during communicative tasks (Carless, 2008; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Tognini & Oliver, 2012). This has been my experience as a middle school Spanish teacher. I have also noticed a lack of willingness to communicate (WTC) in Spanish even by my most motivated students, not to mention the less motivated students. MacIntyre et al. (1998) define WTC as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2” (p. 547). Knowing how important TL output and negotiation of meaning are for L2 development, I wanted to investigate how to set appropriate, research-based expectations for TL use in the classroom and how different variables influence WTC.

### **TL and L1 Use**

**Macaro (2009)** advocates for an “optimal use of code-switching” in which teachers make an informed decision about the benefits and detriments of using the L1 or the L2 in a given situation (p. 38). “Optimal use of codeswitching” must occur within a communicative language classroom in which the TL is the primary form of communication and instruction. While his study does not provide evidence that codeswitching is better than L2 exclusivity in comprehending a L2 text, it also does not provide evidence that codeswitching limits lexical acquisition. In fact, Macaro offers

evidence that some vocabulary is better learned through L1 equivalents because it activates deeper semantic processing than does L2 definitions or phrases.

**DiCamilla and Antón (2012)** acknowledge that for some tasks, particularly at beginning levels, L1 use is necessary to make task completion possible for learners. The authors report that first-year students collaborating on writing tasks relied almost exclusively on their L1 due to their low L2 proficiency being insufficient for communicating on the task. The L1 was necessary for collaboration; in particular, it helped students with task management and interpersonal relations. At this point in their language development the “L2 was the object of study, the system to be learned, not the system to be used for learning” (p. 183). In a communicative task-based classroom, collaboration is necessary for students to complete tasks—but for novice learners using the L2 for task management and interpersonal relations can be too much. I have seen this in my classroom. When I have tried to get students to only communicate with each other using the Spanish they know, they became overwhelmed and gave up.

Not all tasks prompt the same amount of L1 use by learners. **Azakarai and Mayo (2015)** found that L1 use and its functions are task dependent. In their study, learners relied on their L1 more while completing collaborative tasks with a writing component, compared with tasks that required only oral communication. L1 use in collaborative writing tasks dealt with grammar issues, while in speaking tasks the L1 was used to search for vocabulary.

**Swain (2013)** argues that collaborative dialogue itself is language learning in process. Swain (2000) defined collaborative dialogue as “dialogue in which speakers are engaged in problem solving and knowledge building” (p. 102). It involves identifying and



working to solve linguistic problems that learners encounter while attempting to produce language. The implication is that important language learning can occur, even though the L2 is not being used exclusively by students. Swain (2013) also argues that allowing students to participate in collaborative dialogue in the L1 permits teachers the opportunity to listen to learners' dialogue and understand how they are processing collaborative tasks and if they are learning the TL and what language knowledge they need to continue developing.

**Tognini and Oliver** (2014) demonstrated that teacher-learner L1 use limited L2 learning opportunities while peer-peer L1 use supported L2 learning. They observe that L2 use by teachers was limited to predictable and basic exchanges, and that teachers frequently resorted to L1 use for more complex interactions instead of exploiting them as opportunities to engage in negotiation of meaning with students. Because negotiation of meaning is difficult for students to carry out in the L2 at the novice level, it is critical for teachers to provide these opportunities for students. On the other hand, L1 use in peer interactions allowed students to scaffold each other's language production, facilitate task completion, and reflect on and resolve language difficulties.

**Thompson and Harrison's** (2014) examined the impact of teacher- vs student-initiated code-switching on class TL use in beginning and intermediate language classes that adhered to ACTFL's 90% TL use recommendation. Their findings show that teacher-initiated code-switches prompted students to use the L1 and to use it at a higher percentage. Even brief teacher use of the L1 seemed to have given students implicit permission to use the L1. This suggests that maintaining 90% TL use alone is not enough—reducing the number of codeswitches is just as important. The majority of

teacher-initiated code-switching at the beginning level was to explain grammatical concepts, while at the intermediate level teachers most frequently code-switched to translate new words and expressions. However, while beginning level teachers believed that students would not understand TL grammar explanations, the data shows that students usually code-switched to discuss grammar only when teachers initiated the discussion in English.

On the other hand, **Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher’s** (2009) study shows how teachers can promote the primary goal of learning and practicing the L2 without eliminating the L1 and the important communicative and cognitive purposes it allows. The German teacher in the study communicated the importance of TL use to her students by resisting code-switching herself. While L1 use was permitted in the content-based classroom, the teacher used German more than 90% of the time indicating to students that input and output in German was valuable and important to learning. Moreover, the teacher responded to students’ English questions in German. By not mirroring the student’s use of English, the teacher conveyed her belief that her students understood German. The teacher also repeated student utterances in German in conversations in which students used English which prompted some students to switch into German. This suggests that the student sees the teacher’s reformulation as encouragement to practice the TL.

The authors also argue that the reason for L1 use in the FL classroom is different for teachers and for students. Teachers often code-switch as a scaffolding technique as they anticipate student difficulty comprehending. Students, on the other hand, code-

switch to facilitate task management and peer relationships. For this reason, classroom policies regarding L1 and L2 use should be different for students and teachers.

Establishing by whom and for what purposes a certain language is acceptable aligns with **Levine's (2012)** recommendations for instituting classroom language use expectations. He argues that L1 use is an inevitable part of L2 learning and that rather than seeking to eliminate it from the classroom, teachers should focus on optimizing the learning and meaning-making potential of L2 use while exploiting English (or the L1) use such that it creates more opportunities to use the L2. He recommends that, instead of imposing language usage rules, teachers co-construct language usage expectations with students. This involves first raising learner awareness of how they use the L1 to complete activities in the TL and critically reflecting on the extent to which L1 use is necessary for successful task completion. The discussion of language use expectations should analyze current classroom conventions and then establish what language is acceptable to use by whom and in what situations.

**Swain and Lapkin (2013)** propose three guiding principles for L1 use. Like the previous two articles, they recommend that teachers set clear expectations of L1/L2 use in the classroom. Second, they advise that learners be permitted to use their L1 during collaborative dialogue or private speech in order to mediate their understanding and production of complex language and ideas. They contend that these activities should result in an end product in the TL. Lastly, they argue that any use of the L1 by teachers should be purposeful and necessary such as in highlighting cross-linguistic comparisons or to define abstract vocabulary items to mediate L2 development in TL Zone of Proximal Development activities.

### **Willingness to Communicate**

**Cao's (2014)** study found that WTC was influenced not by a single variable, but by an interrelationship between individual, environment, and linguistic variables. Environmental factors include topic, task type, interlocutor, teacher, and group size. Individual factors include self-confidence, personality, emotion, and perceived opportunity to communicate. Linguistic factors include language proficiency and reliance on L1. Moreover, WTC varied from lesson to lesson and even from task to task within a single lesson. Learners in the study reported individual factors such as emotion and perceived opportunity to communicate as factors that influenced their WTC in the classroom.

**Shirvan et al (2019)** identified three high-evidence correlates related to WTC—perceived communicative competence, language anxiety, and motivation. They conducted a meta-analysis of studies published between 2000 and 2015 investigating the average correlation between L2 WTC and the three variables, and found that perceived communicative competence has the largest effect. I have seen in my own classroom that students frequently hold themselves to linguistic expectations that are too high for where they currently are in their studies. Talking with students about appropriate expectations for their linguistic development is important to help students accurately appraise their communicative competence.

**Bernales (2016)** found that students who failed to participate as much as they had originally planned pointed to insufficient L2 knowledge. Learners estimated the percent of their thoughts related to class in the TL that they would verbalize in class and then reflected on the accuracy of these estimations after class. At the beginning of the study

learners misjudged their speech in class and outperformed their expectations; as the study continued, learners better predicted their participation, however, they participated less. As students engaged with more complex grammar and vocabulary later in the semester, they struggled to formulate what they wanted to say in the TL in time to keep up with the class conversation. One learner shared, “I was thinking, ‘How would I say this in German?’ By the time I was ready to respond, the conversation had ended...I thought, ‘I would have liked to say this’” (p. 6). At the same time, learners’ abilities to think in the TL increased; however, their oral abilities were not able to keep up such that they could express them verbally. Learners expressed that there were times when they wanted to express their thoughts in the L2 but chose not to because they felt that they did not have the L2 proficiency to express their ideas accurately. Students who were confident in their L2 skills and imagined themselves as proficient L2 speakers participated more in class. Students also mentioned linguistic self-confidence as a factor increasing their participation.

**Eddy-U (2015)** explored learner self-reporting of variables influencing their WTC. Learners expressed that task partners significantly influenced task WTC. Mutual motivation had the most positive influence on WTC, while mutual demotivation and a demotivated groupmate among motivated groupmates decreases WTC for all members. Participants described good groupmates as being motivated to learn the TL, taking initiative, being responsible, and being talkative in the TL. Bad groupmates were described as not talkative and uninterested in participating. Heterogeneous ability groupings were motivating for the weaker learner but demotivating for the stronger

learner. In some cases for the stronger learner, the desire to communicate outweighed desire to practice the L2 and partners completed the task in the L1.

Eddy-U provides three recommendations for motivating students to participate in group tasks. First, teachers need to be thoughtful in their group pairings. As mentioned earlier, heterogenous ability pairs may demotivate stronger proficiency students. Secondly, teachers should strive to foster a positive classroom environment that encourages student camaraderie. Lastly, teachers should prepare activities with differentiation options so that learners at all levels can be engaged.

**MacIntyre and Legatto (2011)** found that learners' WTC depended on their WTC from the preceding task, meaning that poor performance or discouragement on one task carried over to the following task. This suggests that ordering tasks by increasing difficulty could help learners sustain WTC over tasks. The ease of vocabulary retrieval and familiarity of the task strongly influenced WTC. Despite this, a change in task type can recover WTC. When learners experienced a quick decline in WTC at the start of a task, they ceased communication. One take away is that taking time to familiarize students when presenting new task types and reviewing relevant vocabulary in warm-up activities to stimulate recall can help deter decrease in WTC.

**Pawlak and Mystkowska-Wiertelak (2015)** found that learners' WTC decreased when the communication began to break down. Difficulty in understanding the message of their interlocutor or in recalling desired vocabulary adversely affected learners' willingness to speak. Furthermore, as the conversation progressed, learners' WTC decreased as they became bored with the topic—even when the discussion questions dealt with controversial engaging issues. Factors found to increase WTC include the topic, a

partner's contribution, and agreeing/disagreeing with the partner. While linguistic difficulties hinder WTC, the opposite does not appear to increase WTC. Rather, the degree of interest and contribution opportunities is what appears to drive WTC. This suggests that teachers should design communicative activities that are of interest to the learners and that provide opportunities for students to build on each other's comments to increase WTC throughout the conversation. The researchers do note that students may need to be trained in how to conduct discussions with a partner, including how to present arguments and counterarguments and how to be an engaged listener to their partner's opinions.

### **Conclusion**

The reality is that many students enrolled in K-12 language courses are not there voluntarily. Some schools require foreign language classes for graduation and others have such limited elective options that students have no other choice. Finding ways to engage all students in increased TL use is important for a successful language class. The studies reviewed in this paper provide great insight into the reasons for L1 use and decreased WTC in the classroom as well as provide helpful recommendations to encourage TL use.

## LOOKING FORWARD

At the end of my time in the MSLT program, I feel confident and capable in my abilities as a language teacher. I am fortunate to have had a variety of language teaching experiences while in the MSLT program which have allowed me to learn and grow as an educator. As I plan the next steps in my career, I anticipate teaching high school ESL in the United States.

I look forward to developing my skills and knowledge as I continue in the field; it is important to me that I continually improve myself and grow as an educator so I can better help my students. I plan to do this by regularly attending national and local conferences for language teachers as well as connecting with and learning from colleagues in the field.



## REFERENCES

- ACTFL (2010). Use of target language in the classroom. Retrieved February 8, 2020, from <https://www.actfl.org/news/position-statements/use-the-target-language-the-classroom>
- ACTFL (2012a). ACTFL performance descriptors for language learners. Retrieved December 14, 2018, from <https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/ACTFLPerformance-Descriptors.pdf>
- ACTFL (2012b). ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2012. Retrieved December 7, 2018, from [https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_FINAL.pdf)
- ACTFL (2012c). NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do statements: Progress indicators for language learners. ACTFL. Retrieved December 7, 2018, from <https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/ncssfl-actfl-can-do-statements>
- ACTFL (2014). World-readiness standards for learning languages. Retrieved December 7, 2018, from <https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/publications/standards/World-ReadinessStandardsforLearningLanguages.pdf>

ACTFL (2017). NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do statements. Retrieved April 7, 2020.

<https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/ncssfl-actfl-can-do-statements>

Adair-Hauck, B., Glisan, E., & Troyan, F. (2013). *Implementing integrated performance assessment*. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Al-Issa, A. (2003). Sociocultural transfer in L2 speech behaviors: Evidence and motivating factors. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 581-601.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(03\)00055-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00055-5)

Azkarai, A., & García Mayo, M. (2015). Task-modality and L1 use in EFL oral interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(5), 550-571.  
<http://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541717>

Ballman, T. L., Liskin-Gasparro, J. E., & Mandell, P. B. (2001). *The communicative classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Bataller, R. (2010). Making a request for a service in Spanish: Pragmatic development in the study abroad setting. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, 160-175.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2010.01065.x>

- Beaudrie, S. (2009). Receptive bilinguals' language development in the classroom: The differential effects of heritage versus foreign language curriculum. In M. Lacorte & J. Leeman (Eds.), *Español en estados unidos y otros contextos de contacto: Sociolingüística, ideología y pedagogía* (pp. 325–346). Madrid, Spain: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Beaudrie, S. (2011). Spanish heritage language programs: A snapshot of current programs in the southwestern United States. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(2), 321–337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2011.01137.x>
- Beaudrie, S. (2012). Research on university-based Spanish heritage language programs in the United States: The current state of affairs. In S. M. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field* (pp. 203-221). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Beaudrie, S., & Ducar, C. (2005). Beginning level university heritage programs: Creating a space for all heritage language learners. *Heritage Language Journal*, 3(1), 1–26.
- Beaudrie, S., Ducar, C., & Potowski, K. (2014). *Heritage language teaching: Research and practice*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2013). *Teaching for biliteracy: strengthening bridges between languages*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

- Belpoliti, F., & Fairclough, M. (2016). Inquiry-based projects in the Spanish heritage language classroom: Connecting culture and community through research. *Hispania*, 99(2), 258-273. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2016.0045>
- Bernales, C. (2016). Towards a comprehensive concept of willingness to communicate: Learners' predicted and self-reported participation in the foreign language classroom. *System*, 56, 1-12. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.11.002>
- Block, D. (2006). Globalization and migration. In D. Block (Ed.), *Multilingual identities in a global city. Language and globalization* (pp. 1-20). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230501393\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230501393_1)
- Block, D. (2007). *Second language identities*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Block, D. (2012). Class and SLA: Making connections. *Language Teaching Research*, 16, 188–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811428418>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. F. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory of research for sociology of education* (pp. 241–58). Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bowles, M. (2011). Exploring the role of modality: Second language–heritage learner interactions in the Spanish language classroom. *Heritage Language Journal*, 8(1), 30-65.

Boyatzis, R., & Akrivou, K. (2006). The ideal self as the driver of intentional change.

*Journal of Management Development*, 25(7), 624-642.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710610678454>

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*.

Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). Theorizing a competence for translingual practice at the contact

zone. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and*

*bilingual education* (pp. 78–102). New York, NY: Routledge.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to

second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>

Cao, Y. (2014). A sociocognitive perspective on second language classroom willingness

to communicate. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(4), 789-814.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.155>

Carless, D. (2008). Student use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. *ELT*

*Journal*, 62(4), 331-338. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm090>

Carreira, M., & Chick, C. (2018). Making the case for heritage language instruction: A

guide to meeting the needs of learners in the classroom and beyond. In S. Bauckus

& S. Kresin (Eds.), *Connecting across languages and cultures: A heritage*

*language Festschrift in honor of Olga Kagan* (pp. 3-25). Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.

Carreira, M. (2002). When phonological limitations compromise literacy: A connectionist approach to enhancing the phonological competence of heritage language speakers of Spanish. In J. H. Sullivan (Ed.), *Literacy and the second language learner* (pp. 239-260). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Carreira, M. (2014). Teaching heritage language learners: A study of program profiles, practices, and needs. In A. Themistoklis & P. Trifonas (Eds.), *Rethinking heritage language education* (pp. 20-44). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Carreira, M. (2015). A general framework and supporting strategies for teaching mixed classes. In Y. C. D. Pascual (Ed.), *Advances in Spanish as a heritage language* (pp. 159-176). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Carreira, M. (2016). Supporting heritage language learners through macro-based teaching: Foundational principles and implementation strategies for HL and mixed classes. In M. Fairclough & S. Beaudrie (Eds.), *Innovative strategies for heritage language teaching: A practical guide for the classroom* (pp. 186–215). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Carreira, M., & Beeman, T. (2014). *Voces: Latino students on life in the United States*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- 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>
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chevalier, J. F. (2004). Heritage language literacy: Theory and practice. *Heritage Language Journal*, 2(1), 1–19.
- Clachar, A. (1997). Ethnolinguistic identity and Spanish proficiency in a paradoxical situation: The case of Puerto Rican return migrants. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18(2), 107–124.
- Clementi, D., & Terrill, L. (2013). *The keys to planning for learning: Effective curriculum, unit, and lesson design*. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F. & Hamayan, E. (Eds.) (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Colombi, C. (2009). A systemic functional approach to teaching Spanish for heritage speakers in the United States. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(1), 39–49. <https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2009.01.004>

- Crandall, J. A., & Kaufman, D. (2002). *Content-based instruction in higher education settings*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Dailey-O’Cain, J. & G. Liebscher (2009). Teacher and student use of the first language in foreign language classroom interaction: Functions and applications. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O’Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 131-144). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x>
- Davis, J. (2007). Resistance to L2 pragmatics in the Australian ESL context. *Language Learning*, 57, 611-649. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00430.x>
- De Genova, N., & Ramos-Zayas, Y. (2003). *Latino crossings: Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and the politics of race and citizenship*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- DiCamilla, F., & Antón, M. (2012). Functions of L1 in the collaborative interaction of beginning and advanced second language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 160-188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2011.00302.x>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner. Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.



- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-42). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2013). *Teaching and researching motivation*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ducar, C. (2012). SHL learners' attitudes and motivations: Reconciling opposing forces. In S. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the US: State of the field* (pp. 161–178). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Duran-Cerda, D. (2008). Strengthening “La identidad” in the heritage learner classroom: Pedagogical approaches. *Hispania*, 91(1), 42-51.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/20063622>
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Eddy-U, M. (2015). Motivation for participation or non-participation in group tasks: A dynamic systems model of task-situated willingness to communicate. *System*, 50, 43-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.03.005>
- Ellis, R. (1991). *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, M. (2005). *Spanish and heritage language education in the United States. Struggling with hypotheticals*. Madrid, Spain: Iberoamericana.
- Fantini, A. E. (2009). Assessing intercultural competence: Issues and tools. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 456-476). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fernández, J. (2018). “I think I sound stupid if I try to use those words”: The role of metapragmatic awareness in the study abroad language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(2), 430-454. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12345>
- 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. 81-89). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Herder and Herder.
- Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories of second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 175–199). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2015). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories of second language acquisition: An introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 180–206). New York, NY: New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Glaser, K. (2013). The neglected: A case for explicit-inductive instruction in teaching pragmatics in ESL. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(SI 7), 150–163.  
<https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v30i7.1158>
- Gottlieb, M. (2016). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges to educational equity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Harré, R., & Van Langenhove, L. (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 21, 393-408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1991.tb00203.x>
- He, A. (2006). Toward an identity theory of the development of Chinese as a heritage language. *Heritage Language Journal*, 4(1), 1–28.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, 319-340.

- Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 1-46.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60381-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60381-0)
- Higgins, E. T. (2011). *Identity formation in globalizing contexts: Language learning in the new millennium*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Wang, S. C. (2008). Who are our heritage language learners? Identity and biliteracy in heritage language education in the United States. In D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 3-35). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ingold, C., Rivers, W., Tesser C. C., & Ashby, E. (2002). Report on the NFLC/AATSP survey of Spanish language programs for native speakers. *Hispania*, 85, 324–329.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/4141093>
- Itakura, H. (2008). Attitudes towards masculine Japanese speech in multilingual professional contexts of Hong Kong: Gender, identity, and native-speaker status. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29(6), 467–482.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630802147932>
- Iwasaki, N. (2011). Learning Japanese “politeness” and “impoliteness”: Young American men’s dilemmas during study abroad. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 45, 67-106.

- Kagan, O. (2011, July). Teaching heritage language learners. Paper presented at the 2011 STARTALK/NHLRC Teacher Workshop, Los Angeles. Retrieved from <http://www.international.ucla.edu/media/files/olga.pps>
- Kagan, O., & Dillon, K. (2001). A new perspective on teaching Russian: Focus on the heritage learner. *Slavic and East European Journal*, 45(3), 2001, 507–518. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3086367>
- Kennedy, T. (2006). Language learning and its impact on the brain: Connecting language learning through the mind through content-based instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 471-486. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02900.x>
- Kids Count Data Center. (n.d.). *Children who speak a language other than English at home in the United States, 2009-2018* [Data table]. The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Retrieved January 26, 2020, from <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/tables/81-children-who-speak-a-language-other-than-english-at-home#detailed/1/any/false/37,871,870,573,869,36,868,867,133,38/any/396,397>
- Kim, H. (2014). Learner investment, identity, and resistance to second language pragmatic norms. *System*, 45, 92-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.05.002>

- Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 262-273. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2004.tb08283.x>
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and the pedagogical imperative in L2 education*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Lee, J. F. (2000). *Tasks and communicating in language classrooms*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Leeman, J. (2005). Engaging critical pedagogy. Spanish for native speakers. *Foreign Language Annals, 38*(1), 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02451.x>

- Leeman, J. (2012). Investigating language ideologies in Spanish as a heritage language. In S. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the US: State of the field* (pp. 43–59). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Levine, G. (2012). Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 332-348.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498>
- Liddicoat, A. J., Crozet, C., & LoBianco, J. (1999). Striving for the third place: Consequences and implications. In J. LoBianco, A. J. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 1-20). Canberra: Language Australia.
- Liu, Y. (2016). Cultural collision: The interference of first language cultural identity on pragmatic competence of the target language. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 13, 131-147. <https://doi.org/10.26817/16925777.323>
- LoCastro, V. (2001). Individual differences in second language acquisition: Attitudes, learner subjectivity, and L2 pragmatic norms. *System*, 29, 69-89.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(00\)00046-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(00)00046-4)
- Lynch, A., & Polinsky, M. (2018). Native speakerhood in heritage language research. In S. Bauckus, & S. Kresin (Eds.), *Connecting across languages and cultures: A heritage language festschrift in honor of Olga Kagan* (pp. 143-162). Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.

- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46, 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring ‘optimal’ use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O’Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35-49). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- MacIntyre, P., & Legatto, J. (2011). A dynamic system approach to willingness to communicate: Developing an idiodynamic method to capture rapidly changing affect. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(2), 149-171. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq037>
- MacIntyre, P., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x>
- MacIntyre, P., & Mercer, S. (2014). Introducing positive psychology to SLA. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4, 153–172. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.2>



- Martin, C., Swender, E., & Rivera-Martinez, M. (2013). Assessing the oral proficiency of heritage speakers according to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2012 – Speaking. *Heritage Language Journal*, 10(2), 211–225.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12098>
- Martinez, G. (2003). Classroom based dialect awareness in heritage language instruction: A critical applied linguistic approach. *Heritage Language Journal*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Met, M. (2008). Paying attention to language: Literacy, language and academic achievement. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.). *Pathways to multilingualism evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 49-70). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.52.2.1>
- Montrul, S. (2006). Incomplete acquisition as a feature of L2 and bilingual grammars. In R. Slabakova, S. Montrul, & P. Prévost (Eds.), *Inquiries in language development: Studies in Honor of Lydia White* (pp. 335–359). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Montrul, S. (2007). Interpreting mood distinctions in Spanish as a heritage language. In K. Potowski & R. Cameron (Eds.), *Spanish in contact: Policy, social and linguistic inquiries* (pp. 23–40). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

- Montrul, S. (2008). *Incomplete acquisition in bilingualism. Re-examining the age factor*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Montrul, S. (2009). Incomplete acquisition of tense-aspect and mood in Spanish heritage speakers. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13(2), 239–269.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006909339816>
- Montrul, S. (2010). Current issues in heritage language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000103>
- Montrul, S. (2012). Is the heritage language like a second language? *Eurosla Yearbook*, 12(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eurosla.12.03mon>
- Montrul, S. (2016). *The acquisition of heritage languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Montrul, S., & Bowles, M. (2010). Is grammar instruction beneficial for heritage language learners? Dative case marking in Spanish. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(1), 47–73.
- Montrul, S., Foote, R., & Perpiñán, S. (2008). Gender agreement in adult second language learners and Spanish heritage speakers: The effects of age and context of acquisition. *Language Learning*, 58, 503–553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00449.x>

- Mueller, V. G. (2002). Grammatical gender in monolingual and bilingual children. An English morphosyntactic distinction. In D. K. Oller & R. Eilers (Eds.), *Language and literacy in bilingual children* (pp. 175–206). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- NHLRC National Heritage Language Resource Center (2012). *Abuelos Model Curriculum*. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.international.ucla.edu/media/files/abuelos.5units.pdf>
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587803>
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B., & McKinney, C. (2011). An identity approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 73-94). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, 44, 412-446. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000309>

- Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 279–295. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587464>
- Parodi, C. (2009). Stigmatized Spanish inside the classroom and out. In S. Bauckus, O. Kagan, & D. Brinton (Eds.), *Heritage language learning: A new field emerging* (pp. 199-214). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Parra, M. (2016). Critical approaches to heritage language instruction: How to foster students' critical consciousness. In M. Fairclough & S. M. Beaudrie (Eds.), *Innovative strategies for heritage language teaching: A practical guide for the classroom* (pp. 166-190). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (2001). Transformations of gender performance in second language learning. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning and gender* (pp. 231–254). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pawlak, M., & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A. (2015). Investigating the dynamic nature of L2 willingness to communicate. *System*, 50, 1-9.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.02.001>
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N. and Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 63-90. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310000783X>

- Polinsky, M. (2006). Incomplete acquisition: American Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 14(2), 191–262.
- Polinsky, M. (2008a). Heritage language narratives. In D. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp.149–164). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Polinsky, M. (2008b). Gender under incomplete acquisition: Heritage speakers' knowledge of noun categorization. *Heritage Language Journal*, 6(1), 40-71.
- Polinsky, M. (2008c). Without aspect. In G. Corbett & M. Noonan (Eds.), *Case and grammatical relations* (pp. 263–282). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Polinsky, M. (2011). Reanalysis in adult heritage language: New evidence in support of attrition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 33(2), 305–328.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226311000077X>
- Polinsky, M., & Kagan, O. (2007). Heritage languages: In the 'wild' and in the classroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(5), 368-395.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2007.00022.x>
- Potowski, K. (2002). Experiences of Spanish heritage speakers in university foreign language courses and implications for teacher training. *ADFL Bulletin*, 33(3), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.33.3.35>

- Roca, A., & Alonso, H. (2006). The Abuelos Project: A multi-disciplinary, multi-task unit for heritage and advanced second language learners of Spanish. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish (AATSP), Salamanca, Spain, June 28-July 2.
- Rothman, J. (2009). Understanding the nature and outcomes of early bilingualism: Romance languages as heritage languages. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13(2), 155-163.
- Rupley, W., Logan, J., & Nichols, W. (1999). Vocabulary instruction in a balanced reading program. *Reading Teacher*, 52(4), 336-346.
- Rutherford, W., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness-raising and universal grammar. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 274–292. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/6.3.274>
- Saito, K., Dewaele, J., Abe, M., & In'nami, Y. (2018). Motivation, emotion, learning experience, and second language comprehensibility development in classroom settings: A cross-sectional and longitudinal study. *Language Learning*, 68(3), p. 709-743. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12297>
- Sandrock, P. (2010). *The keys to assessing language performance: A teacher's manual for measuring student progress*. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

- Savignon, S. (1987). Communicative language teaching. *Theory into Practice*, 26(4), 235–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405848709543281>
- Savignon, S. (2000). Communicative language teaching. In M. Byram (Ed.), *New York, NY: Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 125-129), New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schumann, J. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Scott, V., & Jose de la Fuente, M. (2008). What's the problem? L2 learners' use of the L2 during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 100-113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00689.x>
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40–59. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.78.1.v62444321p602101>
- Shirvan, M., Khajavy, G., MacIntyre, P., & Taherian, T. (2019). A meta-analysis of L2 willingness to communicate and its three high-evidence correlates. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 48, 1241-1267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-019-09656-9>

- Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1818– 1835.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.030>
- Showstack, R. (2012). Symbolic power in the heritage language classroom: How Spanish heritage speakers sustain and resist hegemonic discourses on language and cultural diversity. *Spanish in Context*, 9(1), 1–26.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.9.1.01sho>
- Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E.W. (2016). *Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language contact and change. Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (2003). Linguistic consequences of reduced input in bilingual first language acquisition. In S. Montrul & F. Ordoñez (Eds.), *Linguistic theory and language development in Hispanic languages* (pp. 375–397). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.
- Sousa, D. (2006). *How the brain learns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Spicer-Escalante, M. (2005). Writing in two languages/living in two worlds: A rhetorical analysis of Mexican-American written discourse. In M. Farr (Ed.), *Latino*



*language and literacy in ethnolinguistic Chicago* (pp. 217-244). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Spicer-Escalante, M. (2015). Exploración de las narrativas bilingües orales y escritas en español e inglés. *Revista del Instituto de Estudios en Educación Universidad del Norte*, 23, 18-30. <https://doi.org/10.14482/zp.23.6509>

Stoller, F. L., & Tedick, D. J. (2003). Methods for promoting the acquisition of content and language. *The Bridge (ACIE Newsletter)*, 7(1). Retrieved from [http://www.carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol7/bridge-7\(1\).pdf](http://www.carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol7/bridge-7(1).pdf).

SturtzSreetharan, C. L. (2009). Ore and omae: Japanese men's uses of first- and second-person pronouns. *Pragmatics*, 19(2), 253–278. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.19.2.06stu>

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2011). The inseparability of cognition and emotion in second language learning. *Language Teaching*, 46(2), 195-207.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000486>
- Swain, M. (2013). The inseparability of cognition and emotion in second language learning. *Language Teaching*, 46(2), 195-207.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000486>
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 371-391. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.3.371>
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01209.x>
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 251–274.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400304>

- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 101–129. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.05swa>
- The National Standards Collaborative Board. (2015). *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). Author.
- Thompson, G., & Harrison, K. (2014). Language use in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(2), 321-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12079>
- Tognini, R., & Oliver, R. (2012). L1 use in primary and secondary foreign language classrooms and its contribution to learning. In E. Alcon Soler, & M. P. Safont Jorda (Eds.), *Discourse and learning across L2 instructional contexts* (pp. 53–78). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi.
- Tse, L. (2001). *Why don't they learn English?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- 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: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.
- Valdés, G., Fishman, J., Chavez, R., & Perez, D. W. (2006). *Developing minority language resources: The case of Spanish in California*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- van Compernelle, R. A., & Kinginger, C. (2013). Promoting metapragmatic development through assessment in the zone of proximal development. *Language Teaching Research, 17*(3), 282-302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813482917>
- van Compernelle, R. A., & Williams, L. (2012). Reconceptualizing sociolinguistic competence as mediated action: Identity, meaning-making, agency. *Modern Language Journal, 96*, 234–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01334.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. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327701JLIE0203\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327701JLIE0203_4)
- VanPatten, B. (2017). *While we're on the topic on language acquisition and classroom practice*. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vyn, R., Wesely, P., & Neubauer, D. (2019). Exploring the effects of foreign language instructional practices on student proficiency development. *Foreign Language Annals, 52*(1), 45-65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12382>

- Webb, J. B., & Miller. B. (Eds.). (2000). *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom*. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1997). Student motivation in middle school: the role of perceived pedagogical caring. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 89(3), 411-419.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.89.3.411>
- WIDA. (2012). 2012 Amplification of the English Language Development Standards, Kindergarten–Grade 12. Retrieved April 28, 2019, from  
<https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/resource/2012-ELD-Standards.pdf>
- Zentella, A. C. (1990). Lexical leveling in four New York City Spanish dialects: Linguistic and social factors. *Hispania*, 73(4), 1094–1105.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/344311>