DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 792 FL 027 874

AUTHOR	Lacorte, Manel; Canabal, Evelyn
TITLE	Interaction with Heritage Language Learners in Foreign Language Classrooms.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	25p.; In: The Sociolinguistics of Foreign-Language Classrooms: Contributions of the Native, the Near-Native, and the Non-Native Speaker. Issues in Language Program Direction, A Series of Annual Volumes; see FL 027 869.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Influences; *Heritage Education; Higher Education; Language Teachers; *Native Speakers; Preservice Teacher Education; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Social Influences; Sociocultural Patterns; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Heritage Language

ABSTRACT

This paper examines classroom interaction between native and non-native instructors and heritage language (HL) students in regular university foreign language (FL) courses, ranging from beginning to advanced levels. After an overview of FL teaching and HL students in U.S. universities, the paper deals with three areas within classroom interaction: (1) the sociocultural backgrounds of both HL learners and native and non-native instructors; (2) the pedagogical conditions of FL classrooms with HL students; and (3) the affective dimensions of the relationship between instructors and HL students. The paper's analysis of these issues serves as a basis for a pedagogical framework for use by native and non-native instructors teaching a FL that is also the home language of HL learners, as well as for programs of FL teacher education. Finally, the paper offers some suggestions for future research into the multifaceted social, cultural, and pedagogical conditions of FL classrooms with HL learners. (Contains 80 references.) (SM)

Interaction with Heritage Language Learners in Foreign Language Classrooms

Manel Lacorte and Evelyn Canabal

University of Maryland-College Park

Interaction with Heritage Language Learners in Foreign Language Classrooms

Manel Lacorte and Evelyn Canabal
University of Maryland-College Park

As a result of the growth of Hispanic, Asian, African, Arabic, and other ethnic groups in the United States in recent years, most institutions of higher education have experienced significant changes in the composition of their student body, more accurately reflecting the multicultural nature of the country. Logically, as the student population becomes more diverse in general, the population of FL classrooms does so as well. In recent years, there has been an increase in the presence of heritage language (HL) learners, i.e., students from homes where languages other than English are spoken, or who have had in-depth exposure to another language (Campbell 1996; UCLA Steering Committee 2000). Studies in general education and FL teaching and learning have addressed many questions that concern HL learners, such as their range of proficiencies, and the instructional goals and models appropriate for that population. However, little research has been conducted on the social and pedagogical climate of classrooms where native as well as non-native instructors teach a FL which is also the home language of the HL learner. This paper examines classroom interaction between native and non-native instructors and HL students in regular university FL courses, ranging from beginning to advanced levels. After an overview of FL teaching and HL students in U.S. universities, the paper deals with three areas within classroom interaction: (a) the sociocultural backgrounds of both HL learners and native and non-native instructors; (b) the pedagogical conditions of FL classrooms with HL students; and (c) the affective dimensions of the relationship between instructors and HL students. Our analysis of these issues serves as a basis for a pedagogical framework for use by native and non-native instructors teaching a FL that is also the home language of HL learners, as well as for programs of

We would like to thank Maria Carreira, Kim Potowski and Scott McGinnis for their instructive comments on earlier drafts of this article.

FL teacher education. Finally, the paper offers some suggestions for future research into the multifaceted social, cultural, and pedagogical conditions of FL classrooms with HL learners.

Foreign Language Teaching and Heritage Language Learners in the U.S.

The results of the 1998 survey of FL registration carried out by the Modern Language Association (MLA) given in Table 1 indicate that Spanish is the first choice among university students, and that it occupies a significant place in the undergraduate curriculum (Brod and Welles 2000). The statistics also show that enrollment in other traditional FLs is decreasing, and that students are learning a greater variety of languages.

Numerous students—especially in large institutions—have traditionally taken FL courses in order to fulfill part of their requirements in certain academic fields. However, other students enroll in intermediate and advanced language or content-based FL courses, which allow them to obtain honorific mentions or citations in the language, and even pursue a secondary or complementary program of studies—e.g., Spanish and Business, German and Philosophy, French and Diplomacy, Italian and Art History, etc. As mentioned in the introduction, with the recent population shift in the U.S. there has been a widespread increase in the number of students with diverse ethnic,

Table 1
1998 Foreign Language Enrollment in U.S. Higher Education (MLA)

	1995	1998	Percentage change
Spanish	606,286	656,590	8.3
French	205,351	199,064	–3.1
German	96,263	89,020	–7.5
Japanese	44,723	43,141	–3.5
Italian	43,760	49,287	12.6
Chinese	26,471	28,456	7.5
Russian	24,729	23,791	–3.8
Hebrew	7,479	6,734	–10.0
Arabic	4,444	5,505	23.9
Korean	3,343	4,479	34.0
Other languages	17,271	17,771	2.9

Table 2
Profile of American College Population
(U.S. Census Bureau, 1999)

1979		1999	
White non-Hispanic	84%	White non-Hispanic	71%
Black	10%	Black	13%
Other races	2%	Asian/Pacific Islander	7%
Hispanic	4%	Hispanic	9%

cultural or linguistic backgrounds. In 1999, 38% of public school students were considered to belong to a minority group, especially Hispanic (National Center for Education Statistics 2001). According to a population survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau (1999) as reported in Table 2, the race and ethnic composition of college students has also changed during the past two decades.

Many universities and colleges currently implement procedures or policies regulating the placement of HL students in the basic sequence of FL courses focused on the traditional linguistic skills in specialized programs for HL learners (where they exist) or in advanced FL courses dealing with content areas such as literature, cultural studies, or linguistics (Draper and Hicks 2000). These placement policies can be based on a single source or a combination of data from tests, structured or semi-structured interviews, referrals, etc.[1]

For the most part, FL courses are designed for monolingual speakers of English with little or no knowledge about the language or the people and the cultures involved (Campbell and Peyton 1998), even in the case of less commonly taught language courses where enrollments are often dominated by heritage learners (Brecht and Ingold 1998). Lower-level FL courses in medium and large institutions are usually taught by teaching assistants (TAs), lecturers or adjunct faculty.[2] Courses at a more advanced level are generally conducted by tenure-track or tenured faculty members. In contrast to the multisectioned lower-level classes, where TAs and other instructors generally work under the supervision of a course supervisor or a language program coordinator, advanced-level classes tend to fall under the responsibility of the faculty member who has designed, or has been asked to teach the course (Gutiérrez 1990). The following sections of this paper will focus on FL classrooms where heritage learners interact with native TAs (NTAs) and non-native TAs (NNTAs), an area of more immediate interest for FL program coordinators.

Research on Heritage Language Learners

The term "heritage language learner" is a relatively new concept in language education research, which covers a wide range of profiles such as "home background speaker," "native speaker," "quasi-native speaker," "bilingual speaker," "semilingual speaker," "residual speaker," etc. (Draper and Hicks 2000; Valdés 1997). Several volumes on heritage learners of Spanish and Chinese (AATSP 2000; Colombi and Alarcón 1997; Merino, Trueba, and Samaniego 1993; Valdés, Lozano, and García-Moya 1981; Wang 1996; Webb and Miller 2000) discuss the development of this new field known as "teaching of heritage speakers." Up to now, researchers have examined:

- Characteristics of HL learners (Feuerverger 1991; Hidalgo 1997; Roca 1997; Rodríguez Pino 1997; Valdés 1995).
- Role of FL pedagogy in teaching bilingual students and in maintaining minority languages (Brecht and Ingold 1998; Campbell and Peyton 1998; Valdés 2000; Zentella 1986).
- Teaching of dialect, prestige or standard varieties (Carreira 2000; Hidalgo 1997; Porras 1997; Valdés 1998, 1999; Villa 1996).
- Testing and assessment (Liu 1996; Otheguy and Toro 2000; Teschner 2000; Valdés 1997; Wang 1996; Ziegler 1981).
- Curricular and pedagogical issues (Colombi and Alarcón 1997; Mazzocco 1996; Merino, Trueba, and Samaniego 1983; Roca and Gutiérrez 2000; Romero 2000; Sak-Humphrey 2000; Wang 1996).
- Teacher education (Clair and Adger 1999; Gutiérrez 1997; Peng 1996; Roca 1997; Romero 2000; Scalera 1997; Sylvan 2000; Valdés 1999; Villa 1996).
- Perspectives on bilingualism and language loss, teacher attitudes and beliefs (Clair and Adger 1999; Gutiérrez 1997; Roca 1997; Romero 2000; Scalera 1997; Sylvan 2000; Valdés 1999; Villa 1996).

Although most of the research carried out in the U.S. has dealt with Spanish—primarily due to both historical and demographic reasons—the above studies and their findings suggest a need for further research on issues that may affect heritage learners in every language. Much has been written about the teaching needs and practices of the heritage population, not only in relation to what goes on within the classroom, but often about the impact of HL programs in specific communities. Some of these programs, aimed at language proficiency

and cultural heritage maintainance, have slowly but steadily established connections with school districts and universities so that heritage learners may receive academic credits in exchange for their work in community language schools.[3] Furthermore, the increasing awareness of the differences between the teaching and learning of foreign languages, second languages, native languages and heritage languages has opened a Pandora's box of questions that require urgent and careful attention from researchers. In this respect, issues that had frequently been raised through anecdotal descriptions alone—e.g., placement, assessment, materials, and goals—have begun to be analyzed more systematically, addressing Valdés' argument that current practices are not "informed by a coherent set of theories about language learning" (Valdés 1997, p. 17).

Social and Cultural Backgrounds

Research has already demonstrated that "heritage language learners are different from the traditional foreign language student" (Draper and Hicks 2000, p. 20), especially with regard to their sociolinguistic background. It is thus essential to explore the uniqueness of HL learners in order to understand their interaction with native and non-native instructors in the FL classroom. The social and cultural background of HL learners may involve questions such as: How well established is the student's heritage community? How strong is the contact between the heritage community and its country or countries of origin? How well established is the student's heritage community? What are the perceptions toward the specific ethnic group speaking the heritage language? Despite these and other questions, the following variables can be considered as common to heritage learners in every language:

- Age
- Family background
- Socioeconomic background
- Level of education
- Level of competency
- Degree of contact and attitudes toward heritage community
- Degree of acculturation to the mainstream community
- Resources of the HL community (newspapers, TV stations, school programs, community-based activities, etc.)

It is difficult to "match" heritage speakers' individual language abilities in every FL course or to tailor courses to serve HL learners'

needs, especially when some basic questions have not been answered. For example, it is crucial that teachers know how different language skills may transfer to ensure that pedagogical practices will suit the objectives of a course for such diverse group of students. Also, a heritage learner may be fluent in the prestige variety or in the colloquial (and often stigmatized) variety of the target language; he or she may be English-dominant with or without good academic skills; he or she may be a recent immigrant or may be a U.S. born second or third generation bilingual (Valdés 1997). Some may resist enrolling in an academic course on their heritage language after having internalized that their language is defective and needs to be "corrected." Other students are mostly receptive bilinguals conditioned not to "produce" anything in the target language. These learners may often switch languages in the midst of a conversation; they are probably members of speech communities in which more than one language is typically used and, in a classroom context, they often seem unable to understand grammatical explanations about their own heritage language.

The use of TAs in U.S. research universities became a standard practice in the 1960s when the influx of war veterans and a general population growth caused a shortage of instructors at the post-secondary levels (Schulz 2000). Universities appreciated the advantages involved in "offering TA support to attract graduate students and at the same time to hold down the cost of undergraduate instruction" (Guthrie 2001, p. 20). After the 1970s, the number of international teaching assistants (ITAs) started to increase steadily, due to favorable academic conditions offered by U.S. institutions to international students and scholars, and a general interest in new cultural and pedagogic perspectives in higher education (Chalupa and Lair 2001).[4]

While in the 1960s a majority of FL departments did not provide training and supervision for their TAs, preservice and inservice preparation is now widely common in most institutions in a number of formats such as methods courses, TA orientations, pedagogic and professional workshops, resource centers, mentoring programs, etc. Despite the improvements made in professional development of TAs, the literature related to TAs in FL education has pointed to several concerns regarding the personal, academic and professional needs of both NTAs and NNTAs. For example, some writers have argued that TA training may be more related to institutional demands than to the overall education of TAs as professional teachers of language, literature, and culture (Gorell and Cubillos 1993; Kinginger 1995). In addition, the academic culture of FL departments may still reflect an image of language teaching and TA training as subordinate to the teaching of literature and cultural studies (Patrikis 1995). This could

be the case in some departments with a strong literary orientation, where TAs and ITAs may be less interested in teaching FL or—a much more common situation—may be subjected to arduous teaching schedules, high academic expectations, and meager economic conditions of their graduate assistant status, regardless of whether they are teaching monolingual or heritage students.

Other studies have analyzed characteristics of TAs and ITAs concerning the balance between language ability and intercultural and pedagogic skills, the teaching of grammar and other cross-cultural issues in the language classroom, and the process of acculturation to the institutional context. Nelson's (1990) review of literature on ITA research deals mainly with teaching behaviors that might be considered effective instruction, like asking and answering questions, giving explanations, and relating old and new information. The review concludes that college students prefer ITAs who use interactive and interpersonal teaching behaviors and who talk about their native culture in class. Salomone (1998) focuses on the teaching of grammar as a crucial problem for ITAs in American colleges and universities. In contrast to current teaching approaches in the U.S. that emphasize in-class functional language use, the teaching practices of ITAs are typically grammar-based practices. The results indicate that ITAs in this study seemed to be unsure about how to teach grammar, and sometimes unable to explain specific grammatical concepts to their students within a communicative approach to language instruction. Other pedagogic and cross-cultural issues refer to the ITA's concerns over student behavior, students' lack of language background in both English and the FL, student apathy, and differing perceptions of the teacher's role and the student's role (Salomone 1998, p. 558). Chalupa and Lair (2001) examine the situation of ITAs with regard to three distinct categories: language, acculturation, and university policy. As in Salomone (1998), information was collected from ITAs with diverse linguistic and professional backgrounds. The results of this study indicate again the difficulties that ITAs may have in keeping a balance between grammar teaching and a communicative orientation, especially when it comes to explaining complex grammar structures. Cultural differences may arise in the level of formality or informality in the classroom, the dynamics of teacher-centered vs. student-centered instruction, and the personal interaction between students and instructors. Other comments from ITAs about U.S. students concern their "lack of respect and self-motivation, their lack of seriousness with regard to their education despite high tuition costs, their negative reaction to instructor strictness, and the apparent pampering of the students by the educational system" (Chalupa and Lair 2001, p. 135).

Finally, differences between NTAs and NNTAs may also be noticed in terms of their knowledge about the overall U.S. educational system, and institutional policies related to grading, attendance and punctuality, academic misconduct and discipline, and sexual harassment.

Pedagogical Conditions

Research conducted in the second or foreign language classroom has provided teachers with answers to some queries about balancing comprehension and production, teaching grammar, treating errors, etc. (see e.g., Chaudron 2001; Ligthbown 2000; Pica 1994). Finally, the development of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (1996) has pointed to the combination of linguistic and cultural skills as the foundation for proficiency in a FL, and the need to reconsider issues such as the length of the sequences of language study, standards-based assessment, and teacher development (Phillips 1999). These advances have clearly had a positive effect in areas of FL teacher development such as assessment of teacher effectiveness, models for preservice and inservice development, supervisory practices, and data-based studies relevant to teacher development (Schulz 2000, p. 495). However, many problems remain unexplored, especially in regards to the specific social and pedagogical conditions that FL teachers find in their classrooms. This section focuses on pedagogical concerns in courses with HL students, and more specifically on the linguistic competency in English and the target language, the linguistic interaction between the classroom participants, and the techniques and teaching materials commonly used in FL instruction with HL students.

At the secondary level, FL teachers presently face a quite difficult situation, wherein they may have to deal with traditional FL students (monolingual Anglophone students); second- and third-generation heritage students who are largely English-dominant; and newly arrived students possessing little or no knowledge of English and different degrees of schooling from their countries of origin (Valdés 1997). In colleges and universities, the use of linguistic and cultural registers is compounded by the diverse backgrounds of both instructors and students. Newly arrived HL learners generally have high levels of linguistic and cultural competency in their first language, but they may lack second- and third-generation learners' familiarity with the linguistic and cultural characteristics of both English and the heritage language. Likewise, NNTAs often know the language and how to talk about it, while NTAs often have a less structured knowledge of their own language, but are more familiar with the target culture(s). Another group of TAs would consist of HL learners enrolled as graduate

students of their own language. These TAs demonstrate linguistic and cultural competency in both English and the target language, but they have difficulties with regard to the spoken and written variety they use in instruction.[5]

The analysis of linguistic interaction in second language (L2) classrooms has traditionally emphasized the examination of specific characteristics of the discourse employed by the participants such as error treatment, turn-taking routines, and questioning strategies (see e.g., Allwright and Bailey 1991; Chaudron 1988; Ellis 1994). The combination of these features with other pedagogic and cultural aspects—such as roles of teachers and students, differential teacher-student interaction, class size, selection of topics for the instruction—may constitute the basis for a more comprehensive view of FL/L2 classroom discourse. An ongoing discussion about the perceived need to teach an educated, standard variety of the target language (Politzer 1993), and about the notion of "standard variety" itself (Villa 1996), affects not only the linguistic interaction in bilingual settings, but also advanced FL classrooms. In these FL classes, native and non-native teachers (usually speakers of a prestige variety with exposure to other varieties in their professional and social communities) have to maintain a careful balance between the needs and interests of (a) monolingual Anglophone students who either have spent periods of time in a country where (often) a prestige variety of the target language is spoken, or have developed a close contact with heritage communities in this country; (b) newly arrived students, generally educated in what is considered the prestige variety in their country of origin;[6] and (c) heritage learners with a wide range of attitudes toward the standard variety used in the textbook and other course materials, and spoken in the classroom (Danesi 1986; Feuerverger 1991; Potowski 2001).

In the last 30 years, pedagogical materials, techniques and strategies in FL instruction have been transformed due to the increasing influence of communicative language teaching and its emphasis on issues of authenticity, complexity, and appropriateness of instructional topics, tasks, and materials (see e.g., Hinkel 1999; Omaggio 2001). However, these and other concepts (e.g., "proficiency orientation," "collaborative learning," "small-group work," "task-based instruction," etc.) still appear to be directed toward a rather homogeneous audience of administrators, teachers, and students. Recent studies have critiqued the implementation of mainstream language teaching practices in diverse English as a foreign and second language contexts (Canagarajah 1999; Coleman 1996; Holliday 1994). The same critique can apply to the content and orientation of FL teaching materials at any level, which, despite a culturally and politically appropriate design,

often reflect a rather limited view of the varieties of the target language, the cultural identities and practices of the students, and the social and cultural environment in which instruction takes place.

Affective Dimensions

Affective dimensions of the relationship between HL learners and FL teachers should be viewed as interrelated. Furthermore, the exposure to and the interaction between the variety of backgrounds, motivations, attitudes and beliefs that can be found in any FL classroom need to be considered.

Student motivation has long been recognized as an essential factor in FL learning. Motivation has generally been associated with variables like language attitudes, anxiety, self-confidence, language aptitude, learning strategies, and measures of achievement in the language (see e.g., Dörnyei 1990; Gardner et al. 1997). Besides these general variables, HL learners may have different reasons for studying a FL:

- To seek greater understanding of their culture or seek to connect with members of their family (Mazzocco 1996).
- To reinforce the development of their own identity as members of a group with specific cultural characteristics (Benjamin 1997).
- To fulfill a foreign language requirement (Teschner 1983).
- To take advantage of the demand for graduates with professional-level skills in FL (Brecht and Ingold 1998).

The motivation of HL learners toward studying their own language in a FL classroom may also be affected by other variables. HL students may have to deal with unreasonable expectations concerning their knowledge of the heritage/foreign language and their involvement in classroom pedagogic interaction (Potowski, 2001). HL learners may display negative reactions to corrections in the classroom, particularly (a) when they make mistakes in their use of the standard variety usually required in a formal academic context, and (b) when they use certain lexical or syntactic forms common in their heritage community. In both cases, HL learners may perceive these situations as signs of disrespect or disregard for their cultural identity. Another important affective dimension has to do with the interaction between monolingual Anglophone students and heritage students, especially in advanced-level FL courses. The former group tends to feel intimidated by the HL students' more native-like knowledge of the target language.

Also, the Anglophone students may find that NTAs show some degree of favoritism toward HL learners, even if they differ culturally. HL students may feel that monolingual Anglophone students have a better grasp of standard grammatical structures and a wider knowledge of specialized terminology. In other words, HL learners' level of self-esteem can be affected by apparent gaps in their formal knowledge of the foreign language.

Teacher knowledge research claims that what teachers know and how their knowing is expressed in teaching constitutes an essential factor in the understanding and practice of teaching (Connelly et al. 1997). Richards (1998) summarizes the different types of conceptual organization and meaning employed by teachers, and draws a distinction between

- the teachers' implicit theories of teaching—"personal and subjective philosophy and understanding of what constitutes good teaching" (p. 51), and
- the knowledge concerned with subject matter and curricular issues, and the way(s) in which the content can be efficiently presented through unit and lesson planning, activities, materials, techniques, etc.

Teachers' beliefs result from the relationship of (a) the values, goals, and assumptions that teachers have in relation to the content and development of teaching, with (b) the understanding of the social, cultural, and institutional context where teaching takes place (Woods 1996). These beliefs develop gradually over time, have subjective and objective dimensions, and may originate from various sources such as:

- Personality factors
- Own experience as language learners
- Experience of different types of teaching
- Educationally-based or research-based principles
- Attitudes and assumptions toward the language(s) of instruction
- Conceptions about learning styles and strategies
- Beliefs about the program and the curriculum
- Attitudes toward specific individuals or groups learning the target language

Previous sections of this article have referred to these sources when outlining possible contrasts between NTAs and NNTAs in their interaction with monolingual and HL learners. In the case of FL

courses with heritage learners, some authors have mentioned the uneasiness that NNTAs may feel with students who may have the same or even higher ability to use the target language in different communicative contexts (Ariza 1998; Scalera 1997). On the other hand, NNTAs could have it easier than NTAs in interactions dealing with educational, social, and cultural matters specifically related to U.S. life. The lack of shared knowledge could have a negative effect on the communication between NTAs and heritage learners, if NTAs do not sufficiently consider the particular linguistic and cultural characteristics of these students.

Towards a Pedagogical Framework for FL Classrooms with HL Learners

In the previous sections, we have described specific aspects of FL teacher-HL learner interaction in order to emphasize their essential role in the development of a successful pedagogical framework for FL education in multicultural contexts. The three main components of our analysis—social and cultural background, pedagogical conditions, and affective dimensions—cannot be addressed separately, but rather should be considered as interrelated factors within a dynamic community with its own culture defined by multiple identities, roles, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors (Holliday 1994). This section focuses on recent recommendations and initiatives that have captured the significance of such factors at a pedagogical and an administrative level.

With regard to the pedagogical interaction between the classroom participants, the first major recommendation refers to the advantages that FL teachers may find in establishing connections with their students' heritage cultures and dialect varieties (Romero 2000). Respect and interest in the language and cultural experiences that students bring to the classroom may have a positive effect on the overall levels of motivation and attitudes among participants. In addition, all FL teachers are urged to know their students in terms of not only their linguistic and intellectual abilities, but also their personal and academic interests (Ariza 1998; Clair and Adger 1999). This recommendation might even involve a paradigm shift from traditional FL instruction; i.e. students would bring to class what they need to drive the curriculum, so that both curriculum and classroom interaction become more intrinsically interesting and personally relevant to heritage students (Romero 2000). Keeping in mind the difficulties involved in such action, especially in institutions with many teachers, a possible pedagogical compromise could be to incorporate multicultural resources into the instruction (Rodríguez Pino 1997). These

resources could come from the different areas where the target language is spoken, including the heritage community. Students could be exposed to a range of materials so they could develop their receptive and productive skills, while at the same time learning to appreciate some of the essential linguistic characteristics of different varieties. Students could also be asked to participate in the collection of information about their communities beyond what their textbook may offer. This process could involve the use of different ethnographic techniques, such as the development of unstructured and semi-structured interviews by which students could gather data on particular linguistic, social, cultural, historical, and political topics.[7]

Another major recommendation for teaching HL students in FL classrooms deals with using the linguistic diversity of the participants as a learning tool for both teachers and students (Draper and Hicks 2000). As Villa points out in his paper on varieties of Spanish (1996), the crucial issue is now "the goals of the instructor or the academic institution with regard to mastery of the written language," since the issue of imposing any spoken variety has been challenged (p. 198). Further consideration should be given to the use of codeswitching in the FL classroom, especially in advanced-level courses where proficiency in both target and native language may be more balanced. Riegelhaupt (2000) reviews some possibilities for codeswitching as a pedagogical strategy in bilingual methodology. These include: (a) presenting content in one language, and then directly translating the material into the other language, (b) specifying one language for a given subject, and (c) using the two languages interchangeably.

A recent initiative in the field of Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) has been the publication of a monograph by AATSP (2000) intended to assist teachers with the needs of HL speakers of Spanish who may enroll in their classes. This volume brings together several researchers in the field of Spanish-language instruction in order to review its history, and to examine some of the most current initiatives and considerations in areas like varieties of Spanish spoken in the United States, teacher and student motivation, placement tests, assessment of linguistic skills, instructional materials. However, to date, no textbook exists for training graduate students who may be teaching or would like to teach HL students (Carreira, personal communication).

At the administrative level, decisions need to be made as to the goals of any FL program with a significant population of heritage learners, and the professional and material resources to achieve these goals. Recent large-scale projects carried out by teams of researchers, teachers, and administrators have begun to lay the foundations for programs specifically designed to prepare FL teachers to work more

effectively with HL learners. For example, the Hunter College Project (Webb and Miller 2000) gathered successful teaching practices and materials from many teachers who worked with HL learners. These materials were then examined and tested by a number of specialists in assessment, linguistics, and sociolinguistics. This project resulted in numerous recommendations concerning instructional practices, student attitudes toward FL learning, teacher knowledge and beliefs, and assessment and standards for HL learners. In addition, the Hunter College Project sought to establish a model for teacher education based on collaboration and practice, which eventually became a methods course specifically designed for the teaching of HL learners. The new course allows FL teachers to familiarize themselves with rather complex theoretical notions such as language use and variety, bilingualism, and language attitudes. At the same time, teachers have the opportunity not only to examine these notions within the classroom context but also

> to come to their own understanding of issues identified by others and to problematize the assumptions underlying such identification. By allowing participants to reframe questions, to offer new definitions, and to produce a set of guiding principles and goals to guide their practice, project leaders invited teachers to "own" both the challenges and the solutions (Valdés 2000, p. 246).

Further Research on Heritage Language Learners in FL Classrooms

In this paper, we have examined the pedagogical, social, cultural, and political conditions of FL classrooms with HL learners. We have also noted a possible tendency in studies on HL learners toward producing anecdotal reports on instructional practices with this diverse group of students. It is not our intention to disregard the value of these studies, especially considering the extremely positive influence that they have had in the development of successful HL programs and accommodations for HL learners in mainstream FL courses. Rather, our purpose is to suggest other possibilities for inquiry into the complex characteristics of FL classrooms that include a hetereogeneous student population.

The analysis of classroom interaction from different theoretical and methodological perspectives could provide better and more comprehensive explanations of classroom phenomena. In the last 30 years, a growing number of studies in educational research have combined

quantitative and qualitative methodologies, in an attempt to discern the most appropriate methods for particular research questions. The combination (or "triangulation") of diverse methods for the collection and analysis of data on classroom interaction may extend the researchers' view of the area(s) which they investigate, thereby avoiding partial or distorted conclusions. This methodology may allow researchers to apprehend the participants' different views, and to put the whole situation into perspective. Some studies dealing with HL learners have incorporated different research methods and techniques in order to analyze the social and personal context of these classrooms. Apart from the Hunter College Project, in which the school-based research employed classroom observations and interviews, the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (2000) explored possible sociocultural factors in the interaction between Latino language minority students and Latino paraeducators, through the implementation of structured interviews, informal conversations, classroom observation schedules, and extensive ethnographic reports on the HL community.

We hope that the current climate of interest and support provided by institutions like the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), and the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) contributes to further dialogue and collaboration between university administrators and FL departments, between faculty in the areas of linguistics and literatures, and between researchers, teachers, HL students, and the heritage community. This kind of professional interaction could facilitate the development of many other projects, studies of a smaller scope in which teachers and researchers could work together on the identification, analysis, resolution, and evaluation of immediate classroom problems.

A good example of a research study that investigates complex classroom phenomena is the Heritage Language Initiative (HIL) sponsored by the NFLC. This initiative takes into consideration issues concerning linguistic development as well as related public policy issues (McGinnis 2002). A word of caution: any research program seeking to achieve a comprehensive view of FL education and HL learners needs to account for the different levels of interaction between all classroom participant. For us, this has become an essential consideration for our own research agenda which involves the following foci:

- Teachers' discourse strategies to encourage participation or maintain pedagogical control in FL classrooms with heritage learners.

- Social and pedagogical implications of the use of codeswitching by teachers and/or students in advanced FL courses.
- Development of turn-taking and other discourse strategies in group work with heritage and non-heritage students.
- Beliefs and attitudes of native and non-native faculty (teaching assistants, lecturers, instructors, tenured professors) towards HL learners.
- Attitudes of different student groups toward their peers in FL classrooms.
- Awareness among Anglo and HL learners in advanced-level courses toward sociolinguistic issues.

Notes

1. For further information on placement policies, testing and assesment see e.g. Otheguy and Toro 2000; Peale 1991; Teschner 1983, 2000; Valdés 1997; Ziegler 1981.
2. "In Fall 1998, 43% of postsecondary instructional faculty and staff were employed part time as defined by their institution. Instructional faculty and staff at public 2-year institutions were the most likely group to be employed part time (62% versus 22 to 49% at other types of institutions)" (National Center for Education Statistics 2001). Further information about part-time faculty in postsecondary institutions can be found in this and other materials from the U.S. Department of Education.
3. Examples of such connections can be found in M. Wang (1996).
4. A 1997 survey published in the ADFL Bulletin (Welles 1999) indicates that graduate teaching assistants are responsible for 71.4% of all introductory language sections taught in PhD-granting FL departments. In general, the percentage of tenure- and non-tenure track faculty teaching undergraduate courses varies greatly according to the final degree offered; for example, in BA-granting institutions tenured and tenure-track faculty teach 65.4% of all undergraduate courses; in MA-granting institutions they teach 45.1%, and in PhD-granting they teach 29.1%. Welles points that: "The reliance on TAs in PhD-granting institutions and on part-time faculty in MA-granting institutions for the teaching of introductory sequences does not make good educational sense, but not because TAs or part-timers are bad teachers. This staffing pattern exacerbates the separation between upper- and lower-division courses at a time when departments are encouraging students to continue as majors or minors and to gain higher levels of linguistic and intellectual achievement" (p. 68).
5. As Maria Carreira in a personal communication points out, this situation hinges on FL departments being able to attract and train heritage students properly, as well as on the creation of courses and curricula that are relevant

to this population of graduate students. For instance, this means that traditional culture and literature courses may not be the only (or the most) appropriate component of such a curriculum. Other courses concerning the different arenas of use of the heritage languages in the U.S. might be in fact more relevant to such students.

6. In general, the attitudes and notions of the heritage language among its speakers may vary according to ethnolinguistic background. Specifically, group differences may reflect particular local and regional socioeconomic realities, interethnic relations between the dominant and subordinate groups, ethnolinguistic vitality, community expectations, demographic strength, and institutional support (Ramírez 2000, p. 293).
7. In addition, participants could also bring into the classroom materials related to the professional use of the foreign language in the U.S. This could imply a paradigmatic change with regard to what is considered at the heart of the FL curriculum. In the specific case of Spanish, this could also raise the status of the U.S. as a Spanish-speaking country worthy of being studied as such by university students with a major in Spanish. In order for this to happen, there needs to develop a community of scholars interested in HLs as viable means of communication in media, marketing forces, educational institutions, business, etc. (Carreira, personal communication).

Works Cited

Allwright, D., and K.M. Bailey. 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ariza, E. 1998. Role Reversal: The Problems of a Spanish-Speaking Anglo Teaching Spanish to English Dominant Puerto Rican Children. *Foreign Language Annals* 31: 431–436.

American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. 2000. *Spanish for Native Speakers.* Professional Development Series Handbook for Teachers K-16. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

Benjamin, R. 1997. What Do Our Students Want? Some Reflections on Teaching Spanish as an Academic Subject to Bilingual Students. *ADFL Bulletin* 29(1): 44–47.

Brecht, R., and C. Ingold. 1998. Tapping a National Resource: Heritage Languages in the United States. ERIC Doc. No. EDO-FL-98-12.

Brod, R., and E. Welles. 2000. Foreign Language Enrollments in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1998. *ADFL Bulletin* 31(2): 22–29.

Campbell, R. 1996. New Learners and New Environments: Challenges and Opportunities. In *National Stardards: A Catalyst for Reform,* edited by R.C. Lafayette. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Campbell, R., and J. Peyton. 1998. Heritage Language Students: A Valuable Language Resource. *The ERIC Review* 6(1): 38–39.

Canagarajah, A. 1999. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carreira, M. 2000. Validating and Promoting Spanish in the U.S.: Lessons from Linguistic Science. *Bilingual Research Journal* 24: 423–442.

Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence. 2000. Examining Latino Paraeducators and their Interactions with Latino Students. ERIC Doc. No. EDO-FL-00-15.

Chalupa, C., and A. Lair. 2001. Meeting the Needs of International TAs in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Model for Extended Training. In *Mentoring Foreign Language Teaching Assistants, Lecturers, and Adjunct Faculty,* edited by B. Rifkin, 119–142. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Chaudron, C. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms. Research on Teaching and Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2001. Progress in Language Classroom Research: Evidence from *The Modern Language Journal,* 1916-2000. *The Modern Language Journal* 85: 57–76.

Clair, N., and C. Adger. 1999. Professional Development for Teachers in Culturally Diverse Schools. ERIC Doc. No. EDO-FL-99-08.

Colombi, M., and F. Alarcón, eds. 1997. *La Enseñanza del Español a Hispanohablantes: Praxis y Teoría.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Coleman, H., ed. 1996. *Society and the Language Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connelly, F.M., D.J. Clandinin, and M.F. He. 1997. Teachers' Personal Practical Knowledge on the Professional Knowledge Landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 13: 665–674.

Current Population Survey. March 1999. School Enrollment in the United States: Social and Economic Characteristics of Students. *Current Population Reports,* Series P20-533. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Danesi, M. 1986. *Teaching a Heritage Language to Dialect-Speaking Students.* Ottawa: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Dörnyei, Z. 1990. Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign-Language Learning. *Language Learning* 40: 45–78.

Draper, J., and J. Hicks. 2000. Where We've Been; What We've Learned. In *Teaching Heritage Language Learners: Voices from the Classroom,* edited by J. Webb and B. Miller, 15–35. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.

Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feuerverger, G. 1991. University Students' Perceptions of Heritage Language Learning and Ethnic Identity Maintenance. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 47: 660–677.

Gardner, R., P. Tremblay, and A. Masgoret. 1997. Towards a Full Model of Second Language Learning: An Empirical Observation. *Modern Language Journal* 81: 344–362.

Gorell, L., and J. Cubillos. 1993. TA Programs: The Fit between Foreign Language Teacher Preparation and Institutional Needs. In *The Dynamics of Language Program Direction*, edited by D. Benseler, 91–109. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Guthrie, E. 2001. New Paradigms, Old Practices: Disciplinary Tensions in TA Training. In *Mentoring Foreign Language Teaching Assistants, Lecturers, and Adjunct Faculty*, edited by B. Rifkin, 19–39. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Gutiérrez, J. 1990. Overcoming Anarchy in the Advanced Language Class. *ADFL Bulletin* 21 (2): 41–45.

———. 1997. Teaching Spanish as a Heritage Language: A Case for Language Awareness. *ADFL Bulletin* 29(1): 33–36.

Hidalgo, M. 1997. Criterios normativos e ideología lingüística: Aceptación y rechazo del Español de los Estados Unidos. In *La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes: Praxis y teoría*, edited by M. Colombi and F. Alarcón, 109–120. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hinkel, E., ed. 1999. *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holliday, A. 1994. *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kinginger, C. 1995. Toward a Reflective Practice of TA Education. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Foreign Language Study*, edited by C. Kramsch, 61–98. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Lightbown, P. 2000. Classroom SLA Research and Second Language Teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 21: 431–462.

Liu, J. 1996. Awarding Credit Through Testing. The Case of the San Francisco Unified School District. In *A View from Within: A Case Study of Chinese Heritage Community Language Schools in the United States*, edited by X. Wang, 59–61. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Mazzocco, E. 1996. The Heritage versus the Non-Heritage Language Learner: The Five College Self-Instructional Language Program Solutions to the Problem of Separation or Unification. *ADFL Bulletin* 28(1): 20–24.

McGinnis, S. 2002. Our Separate Common Grounds: Reseach Priorities and Curricular Challenges in Heritage Education. Paper presented at The Mini Center for the Teaching and Learning of Foreign Languages, University of Maryland.

Merino, B., H. Trueba, and F. Samaniego, eds. 1993. *Language and Culture in Learning: Teaching Spanish to Native Speakers of Spanish.* London: Falmer Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2001. *The Condition of Education 2001.* NCES Number 97-470. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Nelson, G. 1990. International Teaching Assistants: A Review of Research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Francisco. [EDRS: ED 321 535].

Omaggio, A. 2001. *Teaching Language in Context.* 2nd ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Otheguy, R., and J. Toro. 2000. Tests for Spanish-for-Native Speaker classes. In *Spanish for Native Speakers*. Professional Development Series Handbook for Teachers K-16, 91–98. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

Patrikis, P. 1995. The Foreign Language Problem. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Foreign Language Study*, edited by C. Kramsch, 293–335. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Peale, C. 1991. Spanish for Spanish Speakers (and Other 'Native Speakers') in California's Schools: A Rationale Statement. *Hispania* 74: 446–451.

Peng, Y. 1996. Short-Term Professional Development for Teachers. In *A View from Within: A Case Study of Chinese Heritage Community Language Schools in the United States*, edited by X. Wang, 47–55. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Phillips, J. 1999. Standards for World Languages. In *Foreign Language Standards: Linking Research, Theory, and Practice*, edited by J. Phillips and R. Terry, 1–14. ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: The National Textbook Company.

Pica, T. 1994. Questions from the Classroom: Research Perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly* 28: 49–79.

Politzer, R. 1993. A Researcher's Reflections on Bridging Dialect and Second Language Learning: Discussion of Problems and Solutions. In *Language and Culture in Learning: Teaching Spanish to Native Speakers of Spanish,* edited by B. Merino, H. Trueba, and F. Samaniego, 45–57. London: Falmer.

Porras, J. 1997. Uso Local y Uso Estándar: Un Enfoque Bidialectal a la Enseñanza del Español para Nativos. In *Language and Culture in Learning: Teaching Spanish to Native Speakers of Spanish,* edited by B. Merino, H. Trueba, and F. Samaniego, 190–197. London: Falmer.

Potowski, K. 2001. Educating University Foreign Language Teachers to Work with Heritage Spanish Speakers. In *Research and Practice in LTE: Voices From the Field. Selected Papers from the First International Conference on Language Teacher Education,* edited by B. Johnston and S. Irujo, 99–113. University of Minnesota: CARLA Working Paper Series 19.

Ramírez, A. 2000. Linguistic Notions of Spanish among Youths from Different Hispanic Groups. In *Research on Spanish in the U.S.*, edited by A. Roca, 284–295. Summerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

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

Riegelhaupt, F. 2000. Codeswitching and Language Use in the Classroom. In *Research on Spanish in the U.S.*, edited by A. Roca, 204–217. Summerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Roca, A. 1997. Retrospectives, Advances, and Current Needs in the Teaching of Spanish to United States Hispanic Bilingual Students. *ADFL Bulletin* 29(3): 37–43.

Roca, A., and J. Gutiérrez. 2000. Sociolinguistic Considerations. In *Spanish for Native Speakers*. Professional Development Series Handbook for Teachers K-16, 21–28. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

Rodríguez Pino, C. 1997. Teaching Spanish to Native Speakers: A New Perspective in the 1990s. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin* 21(1). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse for Language and Linguistics.

Romero, M. 2000. Instructional Practice in Heritage Language Classrooms. In *Teaching Heritage Language Learners: Voices from the Classroom*, edited by J. Webb and B. Miller, 135–158. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.

Sak-Humphrey, C. 2000. Technology of Khmer Language Development: A Progress Report on Intermediate Level Khmer Course with CD-ROM. Paper given at The 20th Annual Conference of the National Association for the Education and Advancement of Cambodian, Laotian and Vietnamese Americans. Anaheim, CA.

Salomone, A. 1998. Communicative Grammar Teaching: A Problem for and a Message from International Teaching Assistants. *Foreign Language Annals* 31: 552–566.

Scalera, D. 1997. Teacher Beliefs and the Heritage Language Learner: What Will You Teach your Students? In *Proceedings of the 1996 Annual Meeting*, edited by A. Vogely, 105–112. New York: New York State Association of Foreign Language Teachers Annual Meeting Series.

Schulz, R. 2000. Foreign Language Teacher Development: *MLJ* Perspectives 1916-1999. *The Modern Language Journal* 84: 495–522.

Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the Twenty-First Century. 1996. Yonkers, NY: National. Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.

Sylvan, C. 2000. Teachers' Belief Systems in Exemplary Heritage Language Classes. In *Teaching Heritage Language Learners: Voices from the Classroom*, edited by J. Webb and B. Miller, 159–168. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.

Teschner, R. 1983. Spanish Placement for Native Speakers, Nonnative Speakers, and Others. *ADFL Bulletin* 14(3): 37–42.

———. 2000. Trade Secrets: Advising, Tracking, Placing, and Progressing Through the College-Level Spanish-for-Native-Speakers Sequence. In *Spanish for Native Speakers*. Professional Development Series Handbook for Teachers K-16, 99–108. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

UCLA Steering Committee. 2000. Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report. *Bilingual Research Journal* 24: 333–346.

Valdés, G. 1995. The Teaching of Minority Languages as Academic Subjects: Pedagogical and Theoretical Challenges. *The Modern Language Journal* 79: 299–328.

———. 1997. The Teaching of Spanish to Bilingual Spanish-Speaking Students: Outstanding Issues and Unanswered Questions. In *La Enseñanza del Español a Hispanohablantes*, edited by M. Colombi and F. Alarcón, 8–44. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

———. 1998. The Construct of the Near-Native Speaker in the Foreign Language Profession: Perspectives and Ideologies about Language. *Profession 1998: Perspectives on Ideologies about Languages*, 151–160. New York, NY: MLA.

———. 1999. Nonnative English Speakers: Language Bigotry in English Mainstream Classrooms. *ADFL Bulletin* 31(1): 43–48.

———. 2000. The ACTFL-Hunter College FIPSE Project and its Contributions to the Profession. In *Teaching Heritage Language Learners: Voices from the Classroom*, edited by J. Webb and B. Miller, 235–251. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.

Valdés, G., A. Lozano, and R. García-Moya, eds. 1981. *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic Bilingual: Issues, Aims, and Methods*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Villa, D. 1996. Choosing a "Standard" Variety of Spanish for the Instruction of Native Spanish Speakers in the U.S. *Foreign Language Annals* 29: 191–200.

Wang, C. 1996. Improving Chinese Language Schools: Issues and Recommendations. In *A View from Within: A Case Study of Chinese Heritage Community Language Schools in the United States*, edited by X. Wang, 63–68. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Wang, M. 1996. Optimizing Unique Opportunities for Learning. In *A View from Within: A Case Study of Chinese Heritage Community Language Schools in the United States*, edited by X. Wang, 69–76. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Webb, J., and B. Miller, eds. 2000. *Teaching Heritage Language Learners: Voices from the Classroom*. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.

Welles, E. 1999. Who Teaches What to Whom: The MLA 1997 Staffing Survey. *ADFL Bulletin* 31(1): 60–69.

Woods, D. 1996. *Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zentella, A. 1986. Language Minorities and the National Commitment to Foreign Language Competence: Resolving the Contradiction. *ADFL Bulletin* 17(3): 32–42.

Ziegler, J. 1981. Guidelines for the Construction of a Spanish Placement Examination for the Spanish-Dominant Spanish-English Bilingual. In *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic Bilingual: Issues, Aims, and Methods*, edited by G. Valdés, A.G. Lozano, and R. García-Moya, 211–214. New York: Teachers College Press.

FL CE 78-74

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

BLANKET

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction	
Author(s): Magnan, Sally Sieloff	
Corporate Source: Heinle / Thomson Learning	Publication Date: 11/14/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ☑	Level 2A ☐	Level 2B ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exceptions made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Sean Ketchem, editor
Organization/Address: Heinle, 25 Thomson Place, Boston, MA 02210	Telephone: 617-289-7720 FAX: 617-289-7851 E-Mail Address: sean.ketchem@heinle.com Date: 9/30/03

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	Heinle / Thomson Learning
Address:	25 Thomson Place Boston, MA 02210
Price:	$25.00

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)