

Faculty Attitudes Towards Heritage Language and Heritage  
Language Teaching Policy in Washington State Community  
College Spanish Departments

Maria N. Burgess

A dissertation  
submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington  
2015

Reading Committee:  
Betsy Evans, Chair  
Ana Fernández Dobao  
Richard Wright

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:  
Linguistics

©Copyright 2015  
Maria N. Burgess

University of Washington

**Abstract**

Faculty Attitudes Towards Heritage Language and Heritage  
Language Teaching Policy in Washington State Community  
College Spanish Departments

Maria N. Burgess

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:  
Professor Betsy Evans  
Linguistics

Felix (2009) and Potowski (2002) have shown that negative attitudes about Heritage language can impact Heritage speakers in the classroom. This paper describes research carried out to assess the attitudes toward Heritage Spanish held by instructors in a higher education setting. Spanish faculty members in Washington State community colleges were surveyed using a verbal guise (e.g. Lambert, Gardner, Hodgson & Fillenbaum 1960; Zahn & Hopper 1985) to assess their reactions to what they were told were two different varieties of Spanish. Respondents were also asked questions about Heritage language teaching policy. The results suggest that the Heritage guises are viewed as less correct with respect to grammar and pronunciation; however the responses varied with regard to social attributes. Respondents agreed that Heritage Language Teaching Policy is important but their responses varied on implementation of such policies.

# CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Dedication.....	vii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Mexican American Spanish.....	4
1.2 Correctness.....	7
1.3 Ideology and Post-Colonial Varieties of Spanish.....	10
1.4 Heritage Language Instructional Policy.....	17
1.5 Studies About Heritage Spanish Speakers.....	18
1.6 Washington State Community Colleges.....	20
1.6.1 Ethnography of Washington State Community Colleges.....	22
1.7 Attitudes About Mexican and Mexican American Spanish at Community Colleges.....	23
1.8 Habitus.....	24
1.9 Evaluation of Attitudes About Heritage Varieties of Spanish and Language Teaching Policy in Washington State Community College Spanish Departments.....	27
2. Methods.....	29
2.1 Protocol A.....	29
2.2 Protocol B.....	33
2.3 Data Analysis Methodology.....	38
3. Results.....	40
3.1 Subject Demographics.....	40
3.2 Analysis of Speaker Ratings.....	41
3.3 Analysis of Heritage Language Teaching Policy Questions.....	45
3.4 Results Summary.....	46
4. Discussion and Conclusions.....	48
References.....	55
Appendices.....	63

## List of Tables

Table 1: Attributes by Category. ....	36
Table 2: Heritage Language Instructional Policy Questions.....	37
Table 3: Age Range of Respondents.....	41
Table 4: Academic Focus of Respondents.....	41
Table 5: Average Difference Score of All Attributes for All Three Speakers.....	42
Table 6: t-test Pronunciation.....	43
Table 7: t-test Grammar.....	43
Table 8: t-test Sense of Humor.....	44
Table 9: t-test Honest.....	44
Table 10: t-test Confident.....	44
Table 11: Results HLIP Questions.....	45
Table 12: Percentage of Agree Ratings from Burgess (2010).....	49

# Acknowledgements

A dissertation is by no means a solo project. A work of this magnitude is not possible without the assistance and support of many people. I have been quite fortunate in this aspect and therefore have several individuals to acknowledge and thank.

Betsy Evans  
Vilmarí Balaguer Barbosa  
Ana Fernández Dobao  
Richard Wright  
Katarzyna Dziwirek  
Laada Bilaniuk  
Dianne Burgess  
Yudy Moir  
Vilma Barbosa Miranda  
Maria Gillman  
Jessica Erler (WBMW)  
CSSCR (Wen, Stephanie, Shin, Sergio, Will,  
Laine, Carolina)  
HSD (Amanda, Neena)  
David Sánchez Jiménez  
Joyce Parvi  
Mike Furr  
RWC  
Kristen Montague  
Camille Sánchez Meléndez  
Moises Marcano López  
Emmanuel Agosto Pizarro  
Menudo (yes, the music group)  
Claudia Méndez Luna  
Enrique López Cruz  
Cristian López Méndez  
Noelia Arzán  
Galdo Cruz  
Lúa Cruz Arzán  
Guadalupe López (Mali)  
José López  
Elizabeth Salas  
Galen Basse  
Ernan Jacinto  
Wendy Kempf Jacinto  
Nicole Chartier  
Alejandro Lee  
The students of SPAN 314/315 2012-2013  
Toshi Ogihara  
Ileana Rodríguez Silva  
All the participants in this study  
Jaime Friedman  
Angela Ginorio  
Valentina Zaitseva  
Deirdra at Rudy's Capitol Hill  
M, C, P, C  
Jonathan Goodman

My patron saints (St. Jude, St. Padre Pio, St.  
Francis, St. Anthony, St. Rita, St. Joan of Arc,  
Our Lady of Guadalupe, St. Benedict)  
Susie Chase  
Don Chase  
Katherine Elkow  
Claire Bodno  
Margaret Burgess  
William Burgess  
Michael Burgess  
Bill Burgess  
Billy Burgess  
Colin Burgess  
Rebekah Arnits  
Greg Arnits  
Cam Arnits  
Faith Arnits  
Kara Arnits  
César Lugo  
Maraida Balaguer Barbosa  
Daniel Rodríguez Carlo  
Raymond Balaguer Barbosa  
Abuela Saro  
The helpful administrators at WA State  
community colleges  
Soohee Kim  
Emily Curtis  
Russ Hugo  
Hyunjung Sophie Anh  
Lani Phillips  
Phillip Markley  
Avram Blum  
Kati Tremayne  
David Nichols  
David Brodbeck  
Valerie Freeman  
Jennifer Haywood  
Yulia Galper  
Sarala Puthuval  
Katy King  
Gabi Pirralho  
Holly Winters  
Nicole Robert  
Elizabeth Ramírez Arreola  
Norali Rodríguez Coss  
Ángela Durán Real

## Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to the people who made this possible. They each deserve more thank-yous than I could give them in a lifetime, so I hope these words will suffice.

**Vilmarí Balaguer Barbosa:** my ground zero, my air, my sun; the person who has made significant sacrifices for our family in order for me to finish graduate school; the person who inspires me, comforts me, makes me laugh, makes me swoon, makes me decadent desserts, makes me believe in myself; the person who I love more than everything else and who has taught me what unconditional love is; she is the person who makes it all worthwhile. ¡Te amo, mi colibrí hermoso! ¡Juntas, podemos siempre! Eres mi todo.

**Betsy Evans:** the person who brought me to sociolinguistics and has been the best adviser that anyone could ever have; the person who went above and beyond to keep me going through the good times and the bad; the person who never stopped believing in me even when I doubted myself; the person who has heard all my drama and all about my patron saints; the person who took care of my cats; the person who always gave frequent and helpful feedback and revisions; the person who taught me how to be an academic writer; the person that always made time for me; the person who always had my back; the person who made a PhD attainable. You changed my life. I am forever indebted to you!

**Ana Fernández Dobao:** the person who helped me fund graduate school and has been the best boss that anyone could ever hope for; the person who found research opportunities for me; the person who helped me strengthen and adapt this research for the target audience; the person who helped me develop leadership and teaching skills; the person who spent her sabbatical reading through this dissertation and Skyped-in to my defense late at night; the person who helped make the first date with my wife possible; the person who ensured that I had linguistic teaching experience as a graduate student. You also changed my life and I am forever indebted to you, as well!

**Yudy Moir:** the person who opened the Spanish-speaking world to me; the person who thought out of the box in order to foment my interest in learning Spanish; the person who never gave up on me in high school; the person who encouraged me to listen to Menudo for homework; the person who gave me the foundation to carry out the research for this dissertation and to be a Spanish instructor. I hope that Archbishop Murphy High School understands what a valuable resource they have on their faculty. I am so grateful for your continued friendship and support!

**Dianne Burgess:** the person who brought me into the world and has stood by me ever since; the person who has always let her love for me guide our relationship; the person who I admire the most because of her generosity, perseverance, and resiliency; she is the bravest, most hard-working person I know. I love you, mom!

# **Attitudes Towards Heritage Language and Heritage Language Teaching Policy in Washington State Community College Spanish Departments**

## **1. Introduction**

Spanish language use in the United States has steadily grown over the last ten years. Almost half of the Spanish-speaking population was born in the United States. In Washington State, there are more than half a million Spanish speakers (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). This paper is about the attitudes held by faculty in Washington State community college Spanish departments with regard to Heritage varieties of Spanish, and Heritage Language Teaching Policy (HLIP).

Heritage varieties of Spanish can be defined as the varieties of Spanish in the United States spoken by people with a family of origin from Spanish-speaking countries or regions. Their varieties are said to be “Heritage” since the speakers grow up speaking Spanish at home, but participate in the English-dominated U.S. educational system, therefore becoming bilingual at an early age. The term “Heritage speaker” is not limited to Spanish speakers; it also applies to speakers of any other home language that is not English. According to the U.S. Census (2010), there are 34.5 million people who speak Spanish at home, of which 17 million were born in the United States. This varies greatly from the other 20.9 million speakers of languages other than English: 14.4 million of those speakers are foreign born (Shin, Kominski & U.S. Census Bureau 2010). From this data we can conclude that the majority of Heritage speakers in the United States are Spanish speakers (17 million U.S. born Spanish speakers versus 6.5 million U.S. born speakers of other languages).

The Pew Hispanic Center (2009) gives statistics similar to those in the U.S. Census: about 60% of the Hispanic<sup>1</sup> population was born in the United States and that roughly 70% speak Spanish at home. Projections state that by 2050, 30% of the U.S. population will be Latino, with the majority of the growth resulting from natural increase, not immigration (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). In other words, the population of U.S.-born Latinos is projected to increase over the next 36 years. This means an increase in Heritage Spanish speakers, making information about Heritage Spanish and Heritage Spanish speakers critically important in the United States, and in academic dialogues.

Heritage varieties of Spanish are sometimes the target of negative attitudes since they evolve in an environment with little socio-political support (Urciuoli 1998). This lack of support is accompanied by widely held ideas people hold about language, such as the belief that there is a “correct” way of speaking (Milroy & Milroy 1999). This belief is not only found among laypeople, but is also common among language instructors. In academic environments, negative attitudes towards Heritage varieties of Spanish are based on strong language ideologies that exist among instructors in language departments (Valdés, González, López García & Márquez 2008). Research shows that negative attitudes about Heritage language impact Heritage speakers in the classroom (Félix 2009; Potowski 2002). While students also may have strong language ideologies, this is beyond the scope of this paper. Please see (Mrak 2011; Morren López 2008) for further reading on this topic.

Washington State community college instructors were selected as an important population to survey because of the key role of community colleges in Washington state

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “Hispanic” is the terminology used by the U.S. Census, where it is frequently interchangeable with “Latino”. For a discussion of these terms, see Valdeón (2013).

higher education (described fully below). To capture the language regard (Preston 2010) of these respondents, a matched guise study (Lambert, Gardner, Hodgson & Fillenbaum 1960) was conducted at community college Spanish departments. A variety of scholars (Niedzielski 1999; Rubin & Smith 1990; Zahn & Hopper 1985; Giles & Powesland 1975) have shown the matched guise to be successful in eliciting tacit attitudes. The respondents were asked to listen to recordings of Heritage Spanish speakers and rate several personal and linguistic attributes of the speaker based solely on their voice. In three of the six recordings, respondents were told that the speakers were “Mexican”. This was done in order to elicit a response actually comparing *attitudes* about Heritage Spanish and Mexican Spanish, since the six guises are actually the same three speakers. A different response for a Mexican-identified guise and the same guise labeled as “Heritage” can only be explained by a difference in attitude since the linguistic output is the same. This will be discussed in depth in the methods section.

The faculty respondents were also asked about their ability to identify Heritage Spanish speakers and their beliefs about Heritage Language Instruction Policy (HLIP). A HLIP is the policy each Spanish department follows in order to determine placement of Heritage speakers in Spanish classes and appropriate instructional methods for classes for/with Heritage speakers in them. The University of California Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching (UCCLLT), in conjunction with the National Heritage Language Resource Center (NHLRC), recommends “placement exams for HLs be developed to include both oral and written components and to incorporate questions regarding language-relevant biographic information and self-assessment” as appropriate methods for initial language assessment (UCCLLT 2002). In regards to appropriate

curriculum design and instruction, UCCLLT recommends “not only meeting their linguistic needs but also educating them in relevant cultural and sociolinguistic issues” (UCCLLT 2002). In order to assess attitudes about HLIPs in among Washington State community college Spanish department faculty, the survey given to the faculty included a questionnaire asking them about their beliefs about various aspects of HLIPs, their beliefs about who counts as a native speaker and if they believe they are able to identify who Heritage speakers are.

The results of this study show that faculty attitudes about Heritage Language Teaching Policy, belief in their ability to identify Heritage speakers and attitudes about Heritage Spanish vary widely. However there is a general consensus that having a department HLIP is important and that Heritage Spanish is less correct than Mexican Spanish with respect to pronunciation and grammar.

In order to arrive at how and why certain attitudes about Heritage Spanish speakers have come to be, these results are interpreted using the framework of Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of Habitus (1977). Bourdieu’s Habitus asserts that invisible, social ‘laws’, which are the result of individual and collective past experiences, seemingly govern the ways that people think and act. Bourdieu also explains how these thoughts and behaviors are the foundation for creating present experiences. Through the lens of what Bourdieu calls ‘Habitus’, the analysis of the results of this study add another piece to the puzzle about the formation and perpetuation of certain attitudes about Heritage Spanish speakers among faculty in Spanish departments.

### **1.1 Mexican American Spanish**

Scholars have noted that Heritage Spanish speakers who are raised in the United States seem to be treated differently than other Spanish speakers in social and academic environments (Felix 2009; Potowski 2002; Valdés 2001). A Heritage speaker is considered by foreign language instructors to be “ a student who is 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 2001:38).

While “Heritage speaker” is a very heterogeneous label that spans a large spectrum of language use, for the purpose of this study, the term will refer to those Spanish-speakers whom Spanish departments designate as “Heritage speakers” for the purpose of placement into Spanish language classes. As stated above, this definition usually centers on some level of proficiency in Spanish (Valdés 2001), but how to discern that level of proficiency is what varies among departments, as it depends on what their assessment policies are and if, and how, they are implemented.

This varied definition leads to a conflict between student self-identification as a Heritage speaker versus faculty assessment qualifying the student as a Heritage speaker. This is a point of contention in the field of Heritage Language research and policy, and is addressed from multiple points of view. As Beaudrie & Fairclough (2012) have stated, there are usually two distinct elements to be taken into consideration when defining a Heritage speaker: the first is a personal connection to the language and the second is a certain proficiency in that language. Fishman (2001) defines a Heritage speaker as someone with a personal or familial connection to a non-majority language, whereas Valdés (2001) stipulates some level of proficiency in the non-majority language. While

many schools utilize Valdés' (2001) definition of a Heritage speaker, how that proficiency is rated varies among those schools. Unfortunately proficiency can be a very subjective measure with no objective assessment tool to use.

If there is not a clear assessment of who is a Heritage speaker and what class they should be enrolled in, Heritage speakers may end up taking Spanish classes designed for non-Heritage speakers. This is problematic for many reasons, all of which create a classroom environment not optimally suited for learning by any of the students. For instance, the UCCLLT recommends that “HLs would be served best by a coordinated and well articulated sequence of courses specifically designed for them” (UCCLLT 2002). When Heritage speakers are put in Spanish classes designed for Spanish as a Second Language Learners (SLL), some Heritage speakers may be bored with “easy” material in a beginner level class; some may feel pressure to help out non-Heritage speakers in their class; and some may believe that their language ability is “too informal” compared to non-Heritage speakers (Ducar 2012; Montrul 2012; Pinto 2012; Felix 2009; Potowski 2002). None of these scenarios are conducive to a productive learning environment. As the population in Washington State continues to change and more Heritage speakers participate in the higher education system, these are serious issues that must be considered.

A large population of Heritage Spanish speakers in Washington State is of Mexican origin (Mexican American). Literature on Mexican American varieties of Spanish refers to them in many cases as “Chicano Spanish” (Fought 2003; Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci 1998; Reyes 1982; Peñalosa 1980). Much of this literature focuses on varieties of Spanish in the Southwestern United States. “Chicano” is thought to be

synonymous with “Mexican American” by many, but Acuña (2004) states that the term “Chicano” was “adopted during the 1960s as a political term that embraced collective responsibility to bring about social change for their [Mexican American] community and country” (411). Many Mexican Americans continue to identify themselves as Chicanos (males) and Chicanas (females).

However, “Chicano Spanish” as described in the literature seems to be linguistically different from the Heritage varieties of Spanish spoken in Washington State (Burgess 2013). Additionally, it is not a universal term used by speakers of Heritage varieties of Spanish, therefore “Mexican American Spanish” is used here to refer to the variety of Spanish in the present study. It is a broad term used to refer to the Spanish spoken by the children of Mexican immigrants and migrants in the United States and varies by geographical region. For the purpose of this study, Mexican American Spanish speakers are considered to be Heritage Spanish speakers because they are in contact with and in many cases also speakers of Pacific Northwest English (PNWE)<sup>2</sup>.

## **1.2 “Correctness”**

Language instruction frequently centers on what is “correct” language and what is “not correct” in order to teach students. Many varieties of Mexican American Spanish are targeted as “incorrect”: speakers of other varieties of Spanish frequently stigmatize these varieties as “being too influenced by American English” (Carreira 2000; Riegelhaupt & Carrasco 2000). The belief that Mexican American Spanish, among other varieties of Spanish that are stigmatized, are an incomplete mixture of languages or “bastardized” will be discussed later in this chapter.

---

<sup>2</sup> PNWE is a variety of American English spoken in the Pacific Northwest region of the United States. For more info, see Wassink, Squizzero, Scanlon, Schirra & Conn (2009).

There is also a historical bias against post-colonial varieties of Spanish in the United States (Urciuoli 1998). In order to understand why some Spanish speakers feel negatively about these Spanish varieties, it is necessary to understand what language ideologies surrounding “correctness” and hierarchies of linguistic prestige are.

By *language ideology*, this study refers to Wolfram’s (1998) definition: “an underlying, consensual belief system about the way language is and is supposed to be” (109). When a person makes the claim that a certain way of speaking is correct or incorrect, Milroy & Milroy (1999) say that “they are actually making claims about the superiority of one language *system* over another... The assumption is that a particular abstract set of linguistic rules ...is inherently superior to some other abstract set” (33).

The discussion of language ideology must be grounded in a solid understanding of the relationship between language ideologies and language attitudes, or “language regard” (Preston 2010). Myers-Scotton (2006) states that “What unites studies of attitudes and ideologies is that they are both concerned with bringing to light evidence that not all linguistic varieties in any community are equally valued” (109-110). Where they vary is in what fruits their assessments bear. Language attitude study is more focused on “how a person’s language variety is socially meaningful to others” (110), while the study of language ideology emphasizes “how real or fabricated differences in languages (their histories or who is most associated with speaking one as opposed to another) are exploited in the political arena” (110). Following Myers-Scotton, language regard is focused on micro-social issues while language ideologies focus on macro-social issues. This is emphasized in Leeman (2012), in that “language attitude research has its roots in the field of psychology and thus tends to emphasize individual beliefs and to pay less

attention to the politics of language” (43) while “the study of language ideologies, and of the language policies and actions that embody them, has emphasized the connection of ideologies to questions of power” (43). This is a key point in understanding how language ideologies wield power in academic institutions via “standardization”.

An important part of language ideology is “Standard Language Ideology”. The standardization of a variety of a language “consists of the imposition of uniformity upon a class of objects so that the most important property of a standard variety of a language is uniformity or invariance” (Milroy 2006:133). Many people both inside and outside of the educational system believe that there is a “correct” way to speak “although they do not necessarily use the ‘correct’ forms in their own speech” (Milroy & Milroy 1999: 25). Bilaniuk (2005) points out that “The processes of correction that work to maintain a language of power are present everywhere” (26). Thus it appears that educators are not immune to language ideologies and wield a certain amount of power to that can generate and perpetuate language ideologies.

Research on attitudes towards language varieties has shown that these attitudes are often a reflection of the attitude towards the *speakers* of these languages (e.g. Labov 1966; Fasold 1984; Preston 1996; Lippi-Green 1997). This is in part due to the fact that “language may be the most ‘visible’ symbol of a group” (Myers-Scotton 2006: 111) and that language and identity are inextricably linked. This linkage has been the focus of study of much of Preston’s perceptual dialectology work. In 1981 he pioneered what he calls “draw a map” tasks in which he asked people to draw boundaries around perceived dialect areas in a certain geographic space on a physical map. He has consistently found that people are able to illustrate sophisticated and specific dialect boundaries in these

spaces with descriptions of those dialects reflecting their attitudes about the people who live in those areas (Preston 1993, 1989, 1982, 1981). For example, a respondent from Michigan described language in Texas as “hillbilly” speech and that in the Alaska region as “Eskimo” speech (Niedzielski & Preston 2003: 58). It is absolutely no coincidence that these are also terms used to describe people living in those same areas. This same respondent identified the Michigan “dialect area” as “normal”, a common label used for a respondent’s own “dialect area” when they come from a dialect region that is not stigmatized (Niedzielski & Preston 2003: 59). These illustrate the attitudes about people from those areas more than actual linguistic output. In order to understand these attitudes better, the next section will discuss the ideology behind which varieties of Spanish are deemed to be “incorrect” and why those varieties in particular are targeted.

### **1.3 Ideology and Post-Colonial Varieties of Spanish**

The ideologies about post-colonial varieties of Spanish are a legacy of colonialism in which non-European varieties of Spanish are devalued and marked as “impure” based on the belief that contact with African and Indigenous languages of the Americas has “contaminated” them (Urciuoli 1998). The idea that the so-called “original” language is the “best” one or the “most pure” is a common belief, not unique to Spanish language ideologies (Thomas 1991; Williams 1989). In the case of Mexican American Spanish, beliefs about its “impurity” are due to contact with varieties of American English and African American English (Fought 2003).

A general premise in the sociolinguistic study of language contact is that language varieties evolve through the contact and interaction of speakers of different language varieties. As Sankoff (2002) states, “language contact is always the historical product of

social forces” (3). The impact of these social forces in language contact can result in the emergence and evolution of new language varieties that are as natural and systematic as every other language variety (Sankoff 2002). Therefore Mexican American Spanish in Washington State could be considered a variety of Mexican Spanish that has evolved into a unique Spanish variety based on contact with and speaker usage of PNWE. Burgess (2013) found some evidence of this in a study on vowel hiatus resolution in Yakima Valley Spanish (YVS). The vowel hiatus resolution strategies in YVS in this study were found to be more similar to Mexican Spanish vowel hiatus resolution strategies than Chicano Spanish vowel hiatus resolution strategies. Additionally, the YVS speakers were found to have unique vowel hiatus strategies in Spanish that include creaky-voicing, a vocal phenomenon also found in PNWE. However this does not mean that YVS, for instance, should be considered ‘not quite Spanish and not quite English’ or that English is ‘interfering’ with the Spanish of YVS speakers. On the contrary, this study illustrates that YVS adds to the known toolbox of hiatus resolution strategies in different varieties of Spanish around the world. Creaky-voicing has become a tool that YVS speakers have learned to exploit to adhere to the phonotactical rules of Spanish.

This ideology may explain why language varieties such as Puerto Rican English, Puerto Rican Spanish and African American English are often referred to as “bastardized” languages (Rickford 1999: 320; Urciuoli 1998: 35). They are termed “bastardized” because they are considered to be the illegitimate offspring of the “mixing” of two or more languages, of which one originally has “pure” European roots. The racialization of language in this ideology cannot be ignored. Urciuoli (1998) states that “Language differences are routinely attributed to origin differences and in the United

States origin differences are framed as race and ethnicity” (15). “Racializing discourses equate language difference with disorder” which contrasts with “...ethnicizing discourses, [in which] linguistic differences are delegated to venues where difference is carefully contained in folkloric performance, religious expression or ethnic press and broadcasting media” (18). Therefore the language varieties described above could be seen by some as chaotic and dangerous, as well as “illegitimate” when they are used in “inappropriate” venues.

Urciuoli (1998) continues to say that while such judgments appear to be about the specific language or dialect (or people who use it as described above), it appears that they are more closely related to institutional legitimacy, as “language varieties that evolve in colonized circumstances are unprotected from judgment unless and until they are approved by, for example, an elite language academy representing a nation-state” (35). Affiliation with a nation-state gives “legitimacy” to a variety of a language. The institutional power of the entity or entities behind a language variety is what determines its “correctness”: the more powerful the entity, the more “correct” the variety. Therefore “correctness” is quite arbitrary from a linguistic standpoint. Leeman (2012) states that “Notions about which varieties of language are ‘standard’, ‘correct’ or aesthetically more pleasing are not neutral or arbitrary, and they serve to legitimate the accrual of disproportionate privilege, power, and material resources to speakers of preferred varieties while rationalizing the subordination of other language varieties and the people who speak them” (44-45). Lack of affiliation or power in a nation-state renders the language variety “illegitimate” and since “Racializing is defined by a polarity between dominant and subordinate groups, the latter having minimal control over their position in

the nation-state” (Urciuoli 1998: 15), we understand that, in colonial circumstances, “illegitimate” language may be “racialized” language, which is considered “incorrect” and “impure”.

An example of a “legitimized language variety” that is affiliated with a nation-state would be the Spanish associated with the *Real Academia Española* (Royal Spanish Academy) hereafter RAE. The purpose of the RAE is to officially state what is “correct” and “incorrect” Spanish. According to the official website, the RAE was created in 1713 by a Spanish marquis to return Spanish to its “splendor and purity” of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, before its widespread contact with American and African Indigenous languages. In 1714, it was given royal recognition and protection by Phillip V. The original motto still in use today states “*Limpia, fija y da esplendor*” (clean, set and give splendor). The mission statement says “*La misión principal de la Real Academia Española...es evitar que los cambios que experimente la lengua española en su constante adaptación a las necesidades de sus hablantes quiebren la unidad que mantiene en todo el ámbito hispánico. A tal fin, la Academia debe establecer los criterios de propiedad y corrección de la lengua, así como contribuir a su esplendor*” (the principal mission of the Royal Spanish Academy...is to avoid the fracture of the unity that maintains the Hispanic sphere as one from the changes that the Spanish language experiences in its constant adaptation to the necessities of its speakers. For that reason, the academy should establish the criteria of correctness and correction of the language, so as to contribute to its splendor) (<http://www.rae.es>). In this case, ideologies about Spanish language “correctness” are built upon and perpetuated by an official institution headquartered in Spain, which is considered to be the “origin” of the Spanish language. Given that, as

described above, the “original” language is “purest” (Williams 1989; Thomas 1991), it is no coincidence that the “official” body deciding what is “correct” Spanish was established, and is maintained by the Spanish government.

For example, the government of Spain via the “Instituto de Turismo de España” encourages tourism to Spain by way of offering language courses that are promoted by such ideologies. One such announcement on a “learn Spanish” type of website (of many found online) suggests that learning Spanish in Valladolid, Spain is ideal because “In Valladolid you will have the chance to learn the purest kind of Spanish, as this city has been renowned throughout history for the perfect Castilian spoken by its inhabitants” ([http://www.spain.info/en\\_US/reportajes/aprender\\_espanol\\_en\\_valladolid.html](http://www.spain.info/en_US/reportajes/aprender_espanol_en_valladolid.html)). The pervasive ideologies and racialization of language previously discussed illustrate why the word “purest” is used in this advertisement.

In fact, the use of the term “pure” opens the door for the perception of dichotomies in describing language use, for if there is “pure” language, there must be “impure” language. These dichotomies, which would also include “native versus non-native speaker”, have been problematized as “a gesture of othering<sup>3</sup> that operates on an axis of empowerment and disempowerment” (Bonfiglio 2013: 29), similar to the problematization of racializing language. Liu (1999) states that, “the NS/NNS [native speaker/non-native speaker] dichotomy embodies linguistic imperialism” (174). Kubota (2009) discusses how the categories of native speaker and non-native speaker are much more than linguistic categories. She concludes that, “The superiority of the native speaker is not based purely on the linguistic attributes of individual speakers. The question of

---

<sup>3</sup> Spivak (1979) coined the term describing it as “a process by which the empire can define itself against those it colonizes, excludes and marginalizes” (171)

which category one belongs to is determined by a discourse that produces a certain linguistic and racialized profile as legitimate or illegitimate speakers” (Kubota 2009: 236). Bourdieu & Waquant (1992) argue that “Linguistic competence is not a simple technical ability, but a statutory ability. This means that not all linguistic utterances are equally acceptable, and not all locutors equal” (146). This statutory ability gives rise to what Bourdieu (1991) calls “linguistic capital”, a system of linguistic “haves” and “have-nots”. This capital can be “spent” in the “linguistic market” (Bourdieu 1991). While discussing all the ramifications of the political economy of language is beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to remember that the racialization of language or “othering” serves the interests of certain groups at the expense of others. In other words, the Spanish in Valladolid is “pure”, in part, because Puerto Rican and Mexican American Spanish are not.

Discourses of purity about different kinds of Spanish are commonplace. Discussions of “Spanglish” are a case in point for the expression of lack of perceived purity in varieties of Spanish. Mexican author and Nobel Prize winner Octavio Paz told a reporter he thought that “espanglés” (an earlier alternative term for Spanglish) was “*ni es bueno, ni es malo sino abominable*” (it is neither good nor bad, but abominable) (Stavans 2003: 4). The former vice-director of the RAE, Gregorio Salvador, made public statements against bilingualism and particularly “Spanglish” by invoking ideologies about “purity”. He stated that “*hablan una lengua mezclada o contaminan la suya*” (they speak a mixed language or they contaminate their own [language]). He went on declare that “Spanglish” is just “*lo que hablan los inmigrantes que no acaban de hablar inglés*” (what immigrants still learning English speak) (EFE 2004). While this discourse is 11

years old, it continues to the present day: a Google search of the terms “Spanglish” and “pollute”/”incorrect”/”contaminate”/”bastardized” returns thousands of hits. This illustrates that the “bilingualism of dominated groups” (Nieto 1995) is still associated with negativity in public discourse. Regardless, the term “Spanglish” has gained popularity and is a term that is now widely used. For example, the *Diccionario de la lengua española* (DRAE) (2014) chose to include for the first time in this revised edition the term “espanglish”. It gives the definition as “*Modalidad del habla de algunos grupos hispanos de los Estados Unidos, en la que se mezclan, deformándolos, elementos léxicos y gramaticales del español y del inglés*” (a form of speech used by some Hispanic groups in the United States, in which they mix deformed elements of vocabulary and grammar from both Spanish and English) (<http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=espanglish>). Objections have been made to this definition in regards to the use of the term “deform”, as it still implies a type of contamination or perversion of the language. The idea that “Spanglish” is inherently flawed is part of “Standard Language Ideology” (Milroy & Milroy 1999). Salvador adhered to his belief in standardization by stating that language is for “*entendimiento colectivo*” (collective understanding) and “*no para diferenciarse del resto ni como signo de identidad*” (not for differentiating oneself from everyone else nor as a symbol of identity) (EFE 2004). Salvador’s argument in favor of standardization is countered by Urciuoli (2008), “Accents are not simply phonetic variation produced by a speaker’s place or language of origin. Accents are semiotic complexes through which people locate each other” (271). There are many scholarly works that focus on arguments against language standardization and the interconnectedness of language and identity, such as Fishman & García (2010), Norton (2010), Edwards (2009), Mendoza-Denton

(2008) and Bucholtz & Hall (2004), however a full discussion of this goes beyond the scope of the present research.

Adherence to this “Standard Language Ideology” is common in the classroom (Carvalho 2012; Leeman 2012). In fact, “Schools usually promote language standardization, and teachers often promote the monolingual standard language ideology in their teaching, in the belief that they are getting students ready for the real world, where vernaculars are marginalized” (Carvalho 2012: 148-149). Leeman (2012) states that “the educational system plays a central role in reproducing the standard language ideology; with their emphasis on inflexible grammar ‘rules’ and ‘correct’ usage, schools explicitly inculcate the notion that there is a single acceptable way to speak, and they mete out punishment to those who do not conform to the idealized norm” (49).

The impact that these kinds of ideologies can have on Heritage speakers is documented in studies that will be discussed in this next section.

#### **1.4 Heritage Language Instruction Policy**

Language instruction policy could be defined as the rules established and agreed upon by decision-makers in an academic setting about how a language will be taught. These policies are implemented by teachers in the classroom.

Heritage language instruction policies (HLIP) are a unique kind of policy (Carreira 2013; Martinez 2012; King 2009; Valdés 2001) due to the unique nature of Heritage speakers in a language learning classroom environment. The UCCLLT (2002) describes administrative and pedagogical concerns specific to HLIP in regards to students, faculty and pervasive myths about Heritage speakers as language students. Regarding students, “Heritage learners have skills that distinguish them from traditional

foreign language learners” (UCCLLT 2002; 2) in that most Heritage speakers have spoken language fluency to a varying degree, but have not yet gained literacy skills. Recommendations for faculty focus on being specifically trained to teach Heritage speakers and developing materials for such trainings and language courses. Regarding myths that need to be dispelled about Heritage speakers in the language classroom, the first is that the student is there to get ‘the easy A’ while the second is the opposite: the student does not know any appropriate language and must start from the very beginning. While these recommendations were published for the University of California schools, there are other higher education institutions that are following such a model. For example, the policy in place in the Spanish Department at the University of Washington, Seattle is that students who self-identify as Heritage Spanish speakers present themselves to the director of the Heritage language program. The Director talks with the student about their language background, identity and any other relevant information to make the determination if the student is capable of being in a 300-level Spanish course, as there are no 100 or 200-level Heritage Spanish courses at present in this department (personal communication).

Following the UCCLLT (2002) recommendations, having a specific Heritage Language teaching policy in place that is well-understood by all faculty members is important because of the potentially subjective assessment of proficiency and misconceptions about Heritage speakers.

### **1.5 Studies About Heritage Spanish Speakers**

Research on Heritage Spanish speakers who enroll in college level Spanish classes demonstrates that some students have negative experiences in the classroom that may affect their performance and future participation in such classes.

For example, Potowski (2002) interviewed 25 bilingual Latinos in focus groups and then created and administered a questionnaire to all 30 of the bilingual students who enrolled in 100-level Spanish classes (12 of which were returned). She also interviewed Teaching Assistants (TAs) in the Spanish department who self-reported that they had Heritage students in their classes that semester. Some of the bilingual students interviewed showed that they had internalized negative attitudes towards their Spanish varieties by indicating that they believed that their Spanish was inferior to other varieties of Spanish. Potowski (2002) quotes one interviewee who said, "I've always been taught that the way we Puerto Ricans and Mexicans speak has too much Spanglish and it's not proper" (Potowski 2002: 37). Some students reported feeling inferior to "Spanish as a Foreign Language (SFL)" students since the latter had been exposed to grammatical terms and academic Spanish that the Heritage students were unfamiliar with and some students felt that correction by TAs sent the message that their Spanish was substandard.

Felix (2009) explored the experience of Heritage Spanish speakers in beginner and intermediate Spanish classes at a community college. She collected interviews and written questionnaires that centered on two themes: 1) what it means to be an adult Heritage Spanish speaker in the USA, and 2) what is it like to be an adult Heritage Spanish speaker in classes designed for monolingual English speakers. The purpose of the study was "to create new learning spaces to better understand the needs of the adult Heritage Spanish speaker in the USA" (160). Felix discusses respondents' experiences as

Heritage speakers of Spanish in the United States and in the classroom with SFL students. She concluded that in some instances “the classroom experience left them feeling inadequate and embarrassed due to the perception that the language they were used to was somehow inferior to that which was being taught” (158). One participant stated “I felt awkward studying Spanish among Anglo students because many Anglo students had an attitude that they spoke the correct form of Spanish due to the fact that they had studied Spanish in Spain. They looked down upon us because the Latinos in the class spoke Spanish that was spoken in the border” (158).

Instructors’ attitudes are an important issue because positive academic involvement with the Spanish department through Heritage language classes not only can foster feelings of success in Heritage speakers, such as those described previously by Felix (2009), but also can be a “vehicle for personal actualization and self-determination” (159) and “studying Spanish was something that could make them feel successful in the realm of higher education” (158). Negative attitudes may foster shame, ridicule and feelings of inferiority that can be a factor in the loss of Heritage languages (Felix 2009; MacGregor-Mendoza 2000).

## **1.6 Washington State Community Colleges**

The community college system functions as a post-secondary alternative to the university system in that it offers students the same core classes that are offered at the 100 and 200-level in universities in much smaller classroom environments and at a lower cost. Community colleges allow for a variety of students to participate in post-secondary education without having to attend a university. These students may complete a two-year technical degree or career certification. Many students finish the first two years of

required core classes at a community college and transfer to a university for the second two years after completing a transfer degree.

In Washington State alone, there are 34 community colleges and technical schools ([http://www.sbctc.ctc.edu/general/c\\_index.aspx](http://www.sbctc.ctc.edu/general/c_index.aspx)). In the three Seattle community colleges and one vocational school alone, there are more than 51,000 students in attendance for the academic year 2013-2014 ([www.seattlecolleges.com](http://www.seattlecolleges.com)). Demographic information for the 2014-2015 academic year is not yet available. This is greater than enrollment at the University of Washington, which was just under 44,000 for the academic year 2013-2014 (<http://admit.washington.edu/QuickFacts#enrollment>).

Conducting research at community colleges is important because they are a critical piece of the post-secondary education system in the United States (Townsend & Doherty 2006). Research that is limited to universities leaves out a vital piece of the puzzle in trying to understand post-secondary education as a whole.

As a general rule, Washington State community colleges offer Spanish language classes that range from Spanish 101 (entry-level) to Spanish 203 (equivalent to the 6<sup>th</sup> quarter of Spanish) and some colleges offer 200-level literature classes. The challenges then with community college Heritage language teaching policy are: what to do with students who belong in a more advanced Spanish course than Spanish 203 and how to incorporate Heritage language learners in the classroom that might be perceived to have a lower proficiency. In personal conversations with both WA community college students and faculty, they relayed to that the Principal Investigator of this study that these challenges aren't met and both types of students are often told to take Spanish 101.

Whether this is due to lack of training and/or negative attitudes about Heritage Spanish must be investigated.

### **1.6.1 Ethnography of Washington State community colleges**

Interaction with faculty at WA community colleges revealed some interesting differences between 4-year universities and community college campuses. Aspects of the culture and infrastructure of WA community colleges could play a role in the impact they have on Heritage language learners.

In the 29 community colleges with Spanish or World Language Departments that teach Spanish, the departments vary in size from one to seven Spanish-language faculty members, including adjuncts and off-site instructors. In total, 106 faculty members were invited by email to complete the online survey for the present study (described below) on October 13, 2014.

By the end of October 2014, there were only two responses to the survey. Due to the low response rate, the decision was made to visit the campuses in order to meet the instructors in person and ask them to participate in the survey. However, only six faculty members were actually on campus when the visits were done. In a few instances, department administrators provided some information and agreed to pass on the study information. In a final attempt to reach more faculty members to participate in the study, study information was sent via postal mail to 56 faculty members whose physical addresses at their respective schools were available online. The study was designed on the premise that faculty members were more available in person and via email, therefore the low rate of participation was not expected.

After visiting many of the colleges, it became clear that the faculty members are spread out over many teaching locations without frequent campus contact. It was apparent that many faculty members have little to no contact with their colleagues, as branch campuses, evening classes and online classes are common. Most recruiting emails were ignored, so it is possible that email contact is not as widely used among faculty members, as well. In some cases, the office location of faculty members posted online on the school's website was incorrect, and colleagues weren't even sure where their office or cubicle actually was. What emerges from this field contact with the colleges is that there is no central authority for the dissemination of information in the community college Spanish departments that were visited. Therefore it raises the question about whether there is a reliable way to inform faculty about policies or enforce these policies that relate to Heritage language learners. It also suggests that faculty members may be much more independent in regards to language pedagogy in the classroom than their colleagues who teach in universities. It is possible that this independence may play a role in how Spanish department faculty members in community colleges think about Heritage language. This issue is taken up in section 1.8 below.

### **1.7 Attitudes About Mexican and Mexican American Spanish at Community Colleges**

As discussed earlier, the Latino population of Washington State is growing. Latinos made up 7.5% of the population of Washington according to the 2000 Census, which increased to 11.2% in the 2010 Census (U.S. Census 2010; U.S. Census 2001). This steady growth may bring an increase in Heritage Spanish speakers wanting to study Spanish at the post-secondary level. However attitudes about Heritage Spanish specifically in the community college system have not been adequately examined: only

one such study appears to have been carried out (Felix 2009). The present study adds to this emerging field of academic investigation and provides a point of departure for HLIP in this context.

## **1.8 Habitus**

In order to understand the outcome of this study, Pierre Bourdieu's theory of Habitus (1977) will be employed since it helps explain language as a social phenomenon, or "that linguistic relations are always relations of symbolic power through which relations of force between the speakers and their respective groups are actualized in a transfigured form" (Bourdieu & Waquant 1992: 142). This framework is valuable for understanding the present data because it may help clarify how and why community college Spanish departments manage Heritage language classes and learners the way that they do. In addition, it highlights why community colleges should be studied independently from four-year university Spanish departments. As previously mentioned, Bourdieu's concept of Habitus asserts that humans behave according to tacit laws governing social behavior that are based on the structured systems of power that they exist in. Habitus allows scholars studying human behavior to interpret how and why people behave in certain ways in social environments by carefully examining these tacit laws that govern behavior.

Habitus is defined as ways of thinking and acting that facilitate the ability to interpret, react to and re-create the social structures human beings live in. These ways of thinking and acting are built on, or "structured", on past experiences and they tend to "structure" or guide our present and future experiences based on those past blueprints. Bourdieu refers to this continuing construction of the present as the "structuring

structure” (1984: 170), as it is always a work in progress. This is why the notion of Habitus provides a valuable framework for interpreting the data: a solely language ideological framework would not account for the “structured” or “structuring structure” facet of the academic environment, nor the systems of symbolic power at play. This specific type of environment is a socially hierarchical construction that demands an adherence to particular rules, or “how we do things here”. These rules give rise to and are affected by a group mindset of adherents to the rules. This facet is an important factor that neither Standard Language Ideology nor the study of language attitudes satisfactorily explains on their own in the context of a language department.

Different social arenas of people’s lives may have different social rules for participation. Each social arena is associated with an implicit social rulebook, or “Field” (Bourdieu 1984). Each specific Field derives meaning from the social agents, or respondents in the Field, that have structured and continue to structure it. It could be called the unwritten “How we do things here” handbook for new members to the social arena. The “Field” is where ideologies play out, are sanctioned, and then replicated by the social agents in that Field. Bourdieu emphasizes the fact that it represents “a Field of struggle”, in that there are always the dominant establishment members and subordinate challengers. For example in a university setting, suppose a new instructor in a Spanish department may have favorable views towards a “non-standard” variety of Spanish and therefore not have a reason to “correct” students who use this variety. However, these students are chastised by a more senior instructor with unfavorable views towards this variety of Spanish. The students tell this tenured instructor that they have not been corrected for such use by the new instructor. The tenured instructor then mentions this

fact at the next faculty meeting. The majority of the new instructor's colleagues show their disapproval by not asking the new instructor to be on a committee that she had wished to be a member of. This social sanctioning has shown the new instructor that non-standard varieties of Spanish are not acceptable in this department, and those who wish to deviate from this practice will be punished by the majority who set the "rules". The new instructor then has a choice to accept this practice or not. She knows that deviating from rules will likely cause her loss of social capital among her peers and possibly economic loss via unemployment. She has learned that accepting the Field of practice or, "playing by the department rules", is necessary to advance in her career. These "players" in the Field must engage in one of what Bourdieu refers to as the three Field strategies: conservation, succession, and subversion. "Conservation" is the maintenance of the existing rules made and enforced by those with power and seniority in the Field; "succession" is the adaptation of the existing rules by new players in the Field; and "subversion" is the rejection of the existing rules in an attempt to redefine the power structure in favor of those who currently have little to no power in the Field. This framework aims to shed light on what drives social agents in a Spanish department to continue to follow existing rules; create new rules based on a "collective consciousness"; or subvert the old rules and structure of power. This "collective consciousness" within a specific Field, such as an academic department in a post-secondary education institution, is referred to as "Doxa".

Doxa is a Field-specific, shared way of thinking among dominant players in that Field. Whereas each individual has a Habitus, each Field has a Doxa. In other words, a specific Field, such as a Spanish department, is made up of people, each with their own

Habitus. Faculty members that have retained employment in this Field understand “the rules of the game”. Through conservation and succession, a common way of thinking is shared by these “successful” players. This Doxa is emblematic of the symbolic power of faculty in dominant positions.

The independence of community college faculty members observed during the recruitment visits is important aspect of the Field and Doxa in community colleges. It is quite possible that the infrequent contact with peers does not allow for the same kind of Doxa or that these rules have much less power in community college language departments than university language departments. The community college language department may not have a Doxa, or “collective consciousness” since there is no collective to speak of. Therefore an individual’s Habitus in this context may have a more prevalent role in the attitudes towards Heritage language in these departments. If this is the case, we may expect to see a wide variation of responses on the survey by faculty respondents since they may be less influenced by a collective consciousness about Heritage language. These factors are considered in the discussion in section 4 below.

### **1.9 Evaluation of Attitudes about Heritage Varieties of Spanish and Language Teaching Policy in Washington State Community College Spanish Departments**

Given the nature of Habitus and Doxa in academic institutions discussed above, this research is intended to give us information about attitudes towards Heritage Spanish speakers in Spanish departments in Washington State community colleges.

Outlined below are the methods and procedures used to conduct this research (Chapter 2), presentation of the results of the speech and social evaluation study (Chapter

3), and a discussion of the results and an exploration of future directions for this data and research (Chapter 4).

This study contributes to the literature on Heritage language in a new way in that it demonstrates that perceptions may play a role in higher education Spanish departments, and provides information to the fields of language pedagogy and applied methodology. In order to create successful teaching methodologies for language instruction, all those included, from curriculum designers to instructors, need to understand how attitudes regarding language variation play a role in the classroom and educational environments.

## **2. Methods**

In order to answer the research question, “What are faculty attitudes about Heritage language and Heritage language teaching policy in Washington State community college Spanish departments?”, a two-part study was devised. The first part (Protocol A) was to create matched guise stimuli from recordings of Heritage speakers; the second (Protocol B) was to play those recordings for faculty, ask them questions about the voices they heard and then have the faculty answer some language policy questions.

### **2.1 Protocol A**

Protocol A is the creation of guises for Protocol B, to be discussed in detail below. The original goal was to record 12 guises, 6 female and 6 male, all of whom are Heritage Spanish speakers. For uniformity, recruitment of the subjects was among Heritage speakers between ages 18 and 25. Recruitment took place via an email sent out to subjects from a previous study by the P.I. who had expressed interest in being contacted for further studies (see *Appendix I* for text of the email). Recipients of the email were asked to forward its contents to any interested potential subjects, in the hopes that more subjects would be recruited by “word-of-mouth” from their friends and colleagues. The email contained eligibility information, thereby subjects self-selected for qualification and interest by contacting the P.I. directly. Eligibility included: Spanish speaker, child of Mexican immigrant(s), between ages 18-25, and have spent at least half their life in WA State.

After a month of recruiting, six speakers were recorded: five females and one male. Once the subjects were selected and filled out consent forms (see *Appendix II*), they were asked to complete a brief demographic form, asking about their age, gender, where they grew up and Spanish language usage in their daily life (see *Appendix III*). Upon completion, the subjects were asked to tell a favorite childhood story for the recording (Labov 1972) speaking for a total of five minutes. If the childhood story was not long enough, they were instructed to continue speaking telling any story they wish up until the five-minute mark. Since only one male speaker was recorded, only female speakers were used for the guise creation in order to avoid the possibility of gender bias. The final three speakers were between the ages of 21 and 23. They were from Skagit County, King County and Yakima Valley. Their parents were from Hidalgo, Michoacán and Baja California. They were all bilingual and use both languages on a daily basis, indicating that they speak Spanish with older family members, friends, co-workers and customers at work. Two of the speakers had lived their entire lives in Washington and the other speaker had only lived outside of Washington for three years of her life.

The speakers were recorded in the University of Washington Phonetics Lab using an Electrovoice RE20 monodirectional microphone approximately six inches from where the speaker was seated inside the recording booth. The microphone was run through a Shure FP32A Mixer amplifier and M-Audio Profire 610 digital recording interface device connected to an iMac on Sound Studio. The recordings were made in 44.1 kHz, 16-bit rate in WAV format in mono on the left channel.

The stimuli were created on Sound Studio (an application for editing audio files) for a Macintosh operating system. Two 30-second samples from each speaker were

chosen for the least amount of pauses and filler words, following the same story elements. The 30-second samples were selected from the raw sound files. For each selection, the file was down sampled from 44.1 kHz to 22.05 kHz since there is no necessary information at that high of a frequency. Even though the sound levels were adjusted for each speaker prior to making the recordings, the files were high pass filtered at 200 Hz, and RMS leveling was used to ensure that the files played at equivalent loudness and intensity. The files were then compressed to an mp3 format. A lossy audio file was not problematic since no in-depth phonetic analysis was required. The result was six high-quality recordings that had been equally edited to avoid preference of one speaker over another due to audio sample quality.

The stimuli consisted of six samples, two each from the three Heritage language speakers. Respondents were told, however, that three of the samples were Mexican speakers. That is to say, respondents heard the same speaker twice but for one sample, they were told the speaker was Mexican and the other they were told the speaker was a Heritage speaker. The topic content of the stories in the samples was as different as possible in order to avoid the possibility of respondents recognizing that they were listening to the same speaker. This type of stimulus, called a “matched guise” was pioneered in Sociolinguistics by Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum (1960). Lambert et al. (1960) found that English speaking and French speaking respondents in Montreal rated ‘matched’ speakers significantly differently. They concluded that the different ratings were a result of respondents rating qualities of English vs. French rather than qualities of individual speakers. More recently, Niedzielski (1999) asked two groups of subjects from Michigan to rate the speech of a female from Michigan. One group was

told that the speaker was from Michigan and the other was told that the speaker was from Canada. The two groups reported that the same speaker's vowels were different based on where they were told the speaker was from. This study demonstrates that the ratings given to a particular speaker reflect the listener's beliefs about speakers from that area more than the linguistic input they actually are hearing. Nieldzielski's (1999) concluded that "social information is used by listeners to calibrate the phonological space of speakers. In addition it provides evidence that stereotypes about given language varieties affect the way in which listeners calibrate the phonological space of speakers of those varieties" (83). Rubin & Smith (1990) also showed that extralinguistic input can override what the speakers are actually hearing. Their matched guise study explored the linguistic perceptions about non-native English speaking teaching assistants (NNSTAs) among university undergraduates in the United States. Respondents listened to a recording of a native English speaker giving a lecture accompanied by a photo of the speaker. One group saw a photo of an Asian person and another group saw a photo of a Caucasian person. The respondents then were asked to rate a variety of aspects about the speaker. Most importantly, the respondents who saw the Asian photo rated that speaker significantly worse in regards to "accentedness" in spite of the fact that it was the same voice as the group who saw a Caucasian person. The data from the study indicated that the actual accentedness of NNSTA speech had "few direct effects" but the instructor's ethnicity and what they were teaching was the strongest factor determining the undergraduates' choices of avoiding these classes. If the undergraduates believed the NNSTA had a foreign accent, they more often judged them to be worse instructors than those they did not perceive to have an accent. The "priming" of the respondents was what

was crucial, since that was the only difference in the stimuli.

Priming is a methodological tool pioneered by psychologists in which subjects are given information before stimuli in order to find out if that information biases their response toward the stimuli. The speaker samples in the present study are ‘matched’, and the respondents are primed about the speakers’ origin. It can be surmised that if samples from the same person are rated differently, then it is likely that the evaluation is a result of the respondent’s preconceptions about the speaker’s origin rather than linguistic characteristics. This is because those features would not differ, since it is the same person.

## **2.2 Protocol B**

Protocol B was the creation of an online questionnaire that was sent to Spanish department faculty at specifically chosen Washington State community colleges. At the beginning of the survey, respondents were asked demographic questions regarding age range, gender, and Spanish language background (see *Appendices XII and XIII*). These demographic questions were chosen in order to further explore trends in the data by respondent type. For example, separating out the responses by age range, gender and Spanish language background could illustrate the beliefs of smaller subgroups of Spanish department faculty members. Identifying trends in the data based on demographic groups could help paint a more complete picture of the Habitus of faculty members and the Field of Spanish language instruction at Washington State community colleges. Time teaching in higher education, for example, may have an effect on how the respondents rate the guises. Native speaker status and/or country of origin could inform respondents’ language ideologies, as described above, and therefore affect their responses to the guises.

Academic focus was sought in order to compare those categories as respondents with different areas of specialization may demonstrate different language ideologies (Burgess 2010). In addition, any respondent reporting that linguistics is an area of specialization might provide invalid data. How a respondent learned Spanish could also affect their responses to guises, since their Habitus would be structured on these language experiences, as discussed in Chapter 1. Respondents who learned Spanish after their first language were asked which variety of Spanish they learned (i.e. what country or region). It is possible that the Spanish-speakers who taught these respondents passed along their language ideologies and these ideologies may influence how these respondents react to the guises, as well. While there is no reason to suspect that gender or age might impact respondents' results, this information was sought in order to verify a balanced subject pool. Respondents were not asked specifically about their exposure to Heritage speakers because it was assumed that it was inevitable as Spanish instructors in Washington State that they would be familiar with Heritage language and have been exposed to Mexicans and Mexican Americans, if they were not Mexican or Mexican American themselves.

This questionnaire had two main parts: one was to listen to the audio samples from Protocol A and to rate the guises they listened to on a Likert-type scale and the second was to rate their agreement/disagreement on statements about Heritage language teaching policy at their school (described below).

Priming the respondents was carried out by including a statement at the top of the audio sample page that said "Please click here to listen to this Heritage speaker" or "Please click here to listen to this Mexican speaker" before listening to the sample. The respondents were then taken to the rating scale page which said "Please rate this Heritage

speaker that you just listened to on the following characteristics” or “Please rate this Mexican speaker that you just listened to on the following characteristics”.

Following Lambert et al. (1960) and Zahn & Hopper (1985), the attributes for rating the samples were selected to represent categories about speakers’ grammaticality, social characteristics and pronunciation. Zahn & Hopper (1985: 118), created a speech evaluation instrument (SEI) based on in their meta-study of 34 matched guise research projects. They then tested the SEI with university respondents and confirmed that the typical categories that attributes used to measure language attitudes fall into are superiority, attractiveness and dynamism. The category “superiority” includes attributes that are related to “competence and status” ( 116), such as intelligence, literacy, language usage and education (see Table 1 below). The category “attractiveness” includes attributes that are related to “character, benevolence and trustworthiness” ( 116), such as considerate, honest and kind (see Table 1 below). The category “dynamism” includes attributes that are related to liveliness and vigorousness, such as confident, being a leader and energetic (see Table 1 below). The cultural context of the present study was considered in conjunction with Zahn & Hopper’s (1985) SEI so that the categories and attributes would be relevant to the present context. For example, the category of dynamism includes attributes that may not be culturally viewed as positive in a Spanish-speaking subject pool, so this category has fewer attributes than the other two categories. For example, in many Spanish-speaking countries, “ambitious” has variable interpretations (Burgess 2010), therefore it was not included in the present study. Additionally, while the context in the present study is slightly different (i.e. community college language instructors), the attributes are relevant to this subject population, as

Zahn & Hopper (1985) included research on the language attitudes of teachers.

**Table 1:** Attributes by Category

<b>Superiority</b>	<b>Attractiveness</b>	<b>Dynamism</b>
Literate	Nice	Confident
Intelligent	Friendly	Energetic
Cultured	Likeable	Leader
Upper Class	Considerate	
Clear	Honest	
Fluent	Kind	
Correct Pronunciation	Good Sense of Humor	
Correct Grammar	Religious	
Articulate	Trustworthy	
Native Spanish Speaker	Sociable	
Well Off		

Respondents were asked to rate each voice on a five-point scale with poles ranging from “completely disagree” to “completely agree” (*see Appendices XIV, XV and XVI for the complete survey*).

Each respondent was also asked about Heritage language teaching policy at their school. The respondents were asked questions related to department policies, implementation of policies, native speaker status, and ability to identify Heritage speakers (*see Table 2 below and Appendices XVII and XVIII*). These questions were chosen based on previous research in the field (Beaudrie & Fairclough 2012; Ducar 2012; Valdés et al. 2008; UCCLLT 2002) and personal experience in higher education Spanish language contexts (conferences, faculty meetings, personal communication with faculty

members). They were designed to further assess the respondent’s attitudes towards Heritage language through policy and pedagogical beliefs. For example, questions 1 and 8 aim to provide information about respondents’ perceptions of the homogeneity or heterogeneity of HL speakers. That is, answers of ‘strongly agree’ for those questions may suggest a strong ideology of homogeneity and “inherent linguistic deficiency” (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2008) on the part of Heritage speakers. Questions 2 and 3 assess faculty’s openness to input on scholarship about HL speaker needs. Questions 4 and 5 seek to determine faculty’s feelings about placement of HL students in appropriate Spanish classes. Question 6 aims to assess the respondent’s level of commitment to HL issues and level of importance in their Field. Question 7 addresses faculty members’ belief in the “native/non-native myth” (Kubota 2009) as discussed in Chapter 1 and if birthplace is part of their belief construction.

**Table 2:** HLIP Questions

I think...	strongly disagree	disagree	unsure	agree	strongly agree
1. Heritage speakers should enroll in introductory Spanish courses at my school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. It is important to have a formal assessment tool (such as a written test) to place Heritage speakers in the appropriate level Spanish class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. it is important to train faculty about Heritage speakers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. it is acceptable to have Heritage speakers integrated into Spanish classes with non-Heritage speakers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. it is important to create separate Heritage Language classes in the Spanish Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. it is important to have a department policy for placing Heritage speakers in appropriate level Spanish classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. a person can only be a native speaker if they grew up in a Spanish speaking country	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. I can identify who Heritage speakers are when they speak Spanish	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The survey was completed anonymously, as to ensure the respondents their privacy. Each participant received an individual identification code when completing the survey that was traceable only to their survey answers; at no point was their email address or IP address recorded. Respondents were free to opt out at any time.

The survey invitation was emailed to faculty at Washington State community colleges from June 2014 to October 2014. Three emails were sent out with the link to the survey: the first one to announce the survey and the second and third as follow up emails to thank respondents and to let those who had not yet participated know that the survey was still open.

### **2.3 Data Analysis Methodology**

Because there were unequal responses for the speakers the raw data from the survey were unable to be submitted to paired sample t-tests. In order to determine whether the matched guises were evaluated differently, the difference between the ratings for the sample labeled 'Heritage' and for the sample labeled 'Mexican' from each speaker was calculated for each attribute from every respondent. For example, for the attribute "is a leader", the formula for each respondent would be the rating for 'Leader' for Heritage Speaker A minus the rating for 'Leader' for Mexican Speaker A. Suppose a faculty member had rated the Heritage guise for Speaker A "is a leader" as a 3 (out of 5 where 5 is the most positive) and rated the Mexican guise for Speaker A "is a leader" as a 4, then the difference score would be -1 for Speaker A and 'is a leader' from that respondent. For each speaker's attribute, the difference between the Heritage guise score and the Mexican guise score from every respondent was calculated. The average of all

these scores was calculated for every attribute and speaker in order to identify any patterns of rating.

Once the averages of the differences for each attribute by each speaker were calculated, these averages were submitted to a one-sample t-test to compare the scores to zero. If there were no difference in the rating for the matched guises all the scores would be zero. In other words, a score above zero indicates the Heritage guise was rated higher and a score below zero indicates the Heritage guise was rated lower. The one-sample t-test measures these scores against zero to test for significance. As the sample was so small, there was the possibility of a lot of noise in the responses. The scores and results of these tests follow in the next section (3).

### **3. Results**

While the results of the one-sample t-tests indicated that only one attribute was rated significantly different (“has a good sense of humor”), there was a trend of negative rating of the grammar and pronunciation attribute of the Heritage guises. There was one social attribute that was rated more negatively for the Heritage guises and there were two social attributes that were rated more positively for the Heritage guises. The other ratings regarding social attributes were varied. With regard to the questions about HLIPs, there was agreement that departments should have a HLIP, in that faculty should be trained about HLIPs, and that there should be an evaluative tool in place in order to assess Heritage speakers wishing to take Spanish classes. There was also agreement that a person does not have to have been born in a Spanish-speaking country to be a native Spanish speaker. The majority of the respondents did believe that they could identify a Heritage speaker. There was disagreement about Heritage speakers registering for introductory-level Spanish classes, Heritage speakers taking mixed Heritage/Second language learner Spanish classes and whether or not there should be separate Heritage Spanish classes. These results are described in more detail below, beginning with a description of the respondents.

#### **3.1 Subject Demographics**

Of the 21 faculty members who participated, nine reported that Spanish was their first language and twelve reported that Spanish was not their first language. Nine respondents were female and twelve were male. Of the nine who said that Spanish was their first language, three were from Mexico, two were from Central America, one was from South America, one was from the Caribbean and two were from Spain. Of the twelve who said

that Spanish was not their first language, eight reported learning Spanish in school, three through living abroad and one from visiting a Spanish-speaking country. Some respondents reported learning Spanish from multiple regions, and in this case, the first country or region they listed was counted. Five respondents reported learning Spanish from Mexico, one from Central America, three from South America and three from Spain. Their age ranges are broken down in Table 3 below.

**Table 3:** Age Range of Respondents

age range	18-26	27-35	36-44	45-53	54-62	63-70	70+
number of respondents	0	6	3	5	4	3	0

With regards to the academic demographics of the faculty respondents, nine identified themselves as adjunct faculty and twelve as tenured faculty. The majority of the faculty (15 respondents) has been teaching Spanish for over four years. Three reported teaching for one to three quarters, and three reported teaching between one and four years. The academic focus of the participating faculty is broken down in Table 4 below.

**Table 4:** Academic Focus of Respondents

academic focus	Latin American literature	Spanish literature	Comparative literature	Spanish language	Applied linguistics	Theoretical linguistics	Other
number of respondents	7	3	1	15	2	0	4

### 3.2 Analysis of Speaker Ratings

The differences of the Heritage guise ratings and the Mexican guise ratings were calculated for each respondent for each speaker and each attribute (see methods section

2.3, above). The raw differences are found in *Appendices XXV, XXVI and XXVII* and the averages of the differences are found below in Table 5.

There were three attributes that had negative average difference scores for all three Heritage guises. In other words, the Heritage guise was rated worse than Mexican guise for all three speakers. These three attributes were: “correct pronunciation”, “correct grammar” and “good sense of humor” (see Table 5). There were two attributes that had positive average difference scores for all three Heritage guises. In other words, the Heritage guise was rated better than the Mexican guise for all three speakers. These two attributes were “honest” and “confident” (see Table 5).

**Table 5:** Average Difference Score All Attributes for All Three Speakers

Attribute	Speaker A average of differences	Speaker B average of differences	Speaker C average of differences
articulate	-0.368	0.105	0.052
leader	0.056	0.278	-0.158
Clear	-0.333	0.389	-0.056
good sense of humor	-0.263	-0.263	-0.105
religious	-0.167	-0.105	0
fluent	-0.211	0.316	-0.105
intelligent	0.316	0.278	0
native speaker	-0.421	0.105	-0.389
friendly	0.316	-0.053	0
literate	-0.053	0.389	0.053
upper class	0	-0.421	-0.053
correct pronunciation	-0.579	-0.053	-0.053
trustworthy	-0.053	0	0.105
well-off	-0.216	-0.368	0
cultured	-0.316	0	0
nice	0.103	0.053	-0.059
agreeable	0.105	0.053	0
sociable	0.105	-0.211	-0.056
energetic	0	0	-0.368
considerate	0.159	0.111	0
honest	0.056	0.111	0.056
correct grammar	-0.632	-0.118	-0.056
confident	0.105	0.105	0.053
kind	0.167	0.056	-0.053

The five attributes with an all-positive or all-negative average (correct pronunciation, correct grammar, good sense of humor, honest, confident) were tested for significance using one-sample t-tests (see Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). One attribute was found to have a difference score average that was significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) from zero for all the respondents. That attribute was “has a good sense of humor”  $p = .019$ . This result means that all the respondents rated the Heritage guise more negatively on “has a good sense of humor”. These trends, as well as the attributes with no apparent trends, will be discussed in the next chapter.

**Table 6:** t-test Pronunciation (HG-MG average for all three speakers),  $n=21$

<b>One-Sample Test</b>						
	Test Value = 0					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Pronunciation	-1.925	20	.069	-.25397	-.5292	.0213

**Table 7:** t-test for Grammar (HG-MG average for all three speakers),  $n=21$

<b>One-Sample Test</b>						
	Test Value = 0					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Grammar	-1.672	20	.110	-.26190	-.5887	.0649

**Table 8:** t-test for Sense of Humor (HG-MG average for all three speakers) n=21

<b>One-Sample Test</b>						
	Test Value = 0					
	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Humor	-2.564	20	.019	-.24603	-.4462	-.0459

**Table 9:** t-test for Honest (HG-MG average for all three speakers) n=21

<b>One-Sample Test</b>						
	Test Value = 0					
	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Honest	1.284	20	.214	.06349	-.0396	.1666

**Table 10:** t-test for Confident (HG-MG average for all three speakers) n=21

<b>One-Sample Test</b>						
	Test Value = 0					
	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Confident	.400	20	.693	.063	-.2676	.3946

The mean scores, as well as the minimum, maximum and standard deviation for each attribute by speaker can be found in *Appendix XIX*.

### 3.3 Analysis of HLIP Questions

The results from the HLIP questions illustrate that faculty respondents did agree on a few of the questions. For instance, Table 11 below shows that 95% of faculty respondents believe that there should be a departmental HLIP and that faculty should have training regarding HLIP. Additionally, 90% of faculty respondents believe that there should be an evaluative tool in order to assess the placement of Heritage speakers into Spanish classes. These ratings indicate that the respondents are familiar with Heritage speakers and pedagogical issues surrounding Heritage language, and therefore support the assumption about their preexisting exposure to Heritage speakers, as discussed in Chapter 2. There was more disagreement on whether Heritage speakers should register for introductory classes, as 24% of faculty respondents believed that they should take intro classes and 62% believed that they shouldn't. Similarities were found with whether or not Heritage students should be in mixed classrooms: 67% believed that Heritage speakers should be in mixed classes, whereas 19% believed they should not. As to whether there should be separate Heritage classes, 25% disagreed and 65% agreed. The majority of respondents (86%) said that one does not have to have been born in a Spanish-speaking country to be a native speaker of Spanish. Although the majority (62%) said they could identify a Heritage speaker, 29% said they weren't sure and 10% said they could not. These results will also be explored in the next chapter.

**Table 11:** Results of Heritage Language Policy Questions

	Mean	SD	% Disagree (1/2)	% not sure (3)	% Agree (4/5)	N
HS register intro classes	2.24	1.338	62%	14%	24%	21
Evaluative tool	4.10	.700	5%	5%	90%	21
Faculty training	4.43	.746	5%	0%	95%	21

HS in mixed classes	3.48	1.123	19%	14%	67%	21
Separate HS classes	3.75	1.333	25%	10%	65%	20
Department policy	4.29	.561	0%	5%	95%	21
Native Spanish-speaking country	1.95	1.117	86%	0%	14%	21
Can tell who HS are	3.67	.856	10%	29%	62%	21

### 3.4 Results Summary

As the data illustrated in the previous section, with regard to ratings of the guises, the results were varied with a trend towards rating the Heritage guises more negatively for pronunciation, grammar and sense of humor. ‘Sense of humor’ was the only attribute which had a difference score that was statistically significant ( $p=.019$ ). There was also a trend of rating the Heritage guises more positively in regards to honesty and confidence. The HLIP questions trended towards general agreement that there should be a department policy and an evaluative tool for placing Heritage speakers in classes. However the answers varied greatly in regards to whether or not Heritage speakers should take introductory classes, whether or not there should be separate Heritage classes and if a person can only be a native Spanish speaker if they were born in a Spanish-speaking country. There was a trend towards the faculty believing that they could identify Heritage speakers. In this section, the trend of negative ratings for the Heritage guises and the variability in the ratings is explored and interpreted. It is argued that these results reflect the language ideologies and the Habitus of community college Spanish departments (as described above) with special attention to the difference between community college and four-year university Spanish departments.

Although the differences in ratings of matched guises were not significant (except for ‘sense of humor’), the trend of the Heritage guise being rated less positively than the Mexican guise merits some discussion. In fact, because of the social status of Heritage language, it was expected that the Heritage guise would be rated less positively. As described in the first chapter, it is not unique to Spanish department faculty to make assumptions about Heritage speakers’ linguistic abilities based on extra-linguistic factors. However this means that the faculty’s *expectation* of how Heritage speakers will speak Spanish is the actual problem. How faculty create these expectations and act upon them can be clarified by using Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of Habitus (1977), which provides a framework for analyzing community college language departments and ideologies of “standard language” especially in contrast to a university language department.

## 4. Discussion and Conclusions

This study suggests that faculty members at Washington State community college Spanish departments have a negative perception of the pronunciation and grammar of Heritage Spanish speakers when compared to Mexican Spanish speakers. However, their ratings were quite varied and do not suggest a clear trend of negative perceptions in regards to social status and social desirability attributes. Faculty respondents also generally agree that their departments should have a HLIP and should have an evaluative tool for placing Heritage speakers in Spanish classes at their school. However they do not agree on whether or not Heritage speakers should be placed in introductory Spanish classes or whether there should be a separate Heritage track in their department.

Naturally, conclusions from the results must be made with caution. Although the ideal study would have included all Spanish language teaching faculty at Washington State community colleges, only 21 out of 106 participated. More participation may have made more reliable quantitative measures possible and enabled comparisons of informative demographic categories. The website used for the survey did not allow for randomization or reassignment of guises, which may have enabled control for any bias towards speakers or one particular story. As the speakers' stories were different, there is always the possibility of both intraspeaker and interspeaker bias. Additionally, it is important to mention the possibility of "social desirability bias" (Garrett 2010), which is the desire to be seen favorably by others. This is present in language studies when respondents do not want to rate someone poorly because doing so is socially unacceptable, especially if they think they may be identified as doing so by the study investigators. Anonymous questionnaires tend to be the best way to control for this, but it

is not completely avoidable. Each of these issues was mitigated as much as possible, and does not impede an exploration of the data based on the trends.

Sonia Nieto, in her exploration of bilingualism, suggests that for dominated groups such as Heritage language Spanish speakers in WA, “bilingualism is a burden” (1995: 188) because their kind of language, as we have seen in the discussion of language ideology (see section 1.2 above), is considered a substandard version of Spanish. Language teachers commonly have biases against non-standard language in the classroom (Lippi-Green 2004). Thus, it is no surprise that these faculty members might possess such ideologies about Heritage speakers and is consistent with similar studies by other scholars (e.g. Urciuoli 1998; Lippi-Green 1997). In fact, Burgess (2010) found that faculty at a four-year university rated Heritage speakers positively in regards to pronunciation and grammar, but that the faculty believed the Heritage speakers to be from Mexico, Central America and South America in 94% of the responses. This means that the faculty respondents were not rating the speakers as Heritage speakers: they were rating them as Mexicans, Central and South Americans.

**Table 12:** Percentages of Agree Ratings from Burgess (2010)

	Native Spanish Speaker	Correct Pronunciation	Correct Grammar
Mexican American Male	94%	100%	71%
Mexican American Female	89%	94%	88%

This also illustrates that when no social information is given about the speaker being a Heritage speaker, these faculty respondents rated the Heritage speakers’ pronunciation and grammar favorably. However, in the present study, the data seems to illustrate that when respondents are primed with social information that the voice is a

Heritage speaker, they tend to rate the speakers' pronunciation and grammar less favorably (see Tables 6, 7). As described in Chapter 1, these two attributes, pronunciation and grammar, are key in the study of language of regard (Preston 2010) as metalinguistic commentary often centers on the idea of 'correct grammar' and 'correct pronunciation'.

The trend of the Heritage guises being rated more positively in the attributes of "confident" and "honest", (see Table 9, 10), suggests that the respondents believe that the Heritage speakers are more confident and more honest than the Mexican speakers.

"Confidence" could be linked to individualism, which internationally is seen as a U.S. cultural value (Triandis et al. 1986) therefore it is possible that the respondents are assigning an 'American value' to U.S.-born Spanish speakers. It is also possible that the respondents believe that Mexicans are "dishonest", which is a longstanding negative stereotype in racial discourse in the United States used to justify the exploitation of Mexican labor (Anderson 1998; Cruz 1997). Nevertheless, this result doesn't suggest a strong enough pattern to make a clear argument for their meaning. Without interviewing the respondents, it is difficult to interpret the result.

It is worth mentioning the one attribute whose average difference was significant. As shown in Table 8, the Heritage guises were rated significantly more negative for "has a good sense of humor" than the Mexican guises. Some scholars have said that humor is defined by in-group members (Shardakova 2013; Urciuoli 1998) and that outsiders to a shared sense of humor are seen as the "other". In other words, exclusion from group humor is a form of "othering". Other scholars have said that humor is related to social intelligence (Greengross & Miller 2011; Yip & Martin 2006). However, due to the small

sample size, and the diversity of native speaker status of the respondents it is impossible to determine the meaning of this result..

Regarding the 19 attributes that showed no clear trend, the small sample makes it difficult to interpret why the variation appears to be random. One possible analysis is that for these instructors, in the context of language pedagogy, the attributes weren't as meaningful as they are for non-academic subjects who have participated in similar guise studies. As discussed in Chapter 2, these specific attributes from Zahn & Hopper (1985) are from a meta-study that they conducted of multiple matched guise type surveys and stood out as meaningful categories to subjects across studies. Perhaps future studies could pilot these attributes in a pedagogical context in order to refine the selection in the three categories more appropriately for the subject pool. In the case of this study, an additional possible analysis is that the seemingly random variation of attribute ratings may be due to some of the attributes being interpreted differently by this subject population. That is, as described in section 3.1, above, the respondents' home countries vary therefore respondents hailing from different cultural backgrounds may interpret the attributes differently leading to inconsistent ratings. Another consequence of a small subject pool is the inability to further investigate the data based on subject demographics. With only a few subjects in each demographic category, the anticipated comparison of these categories was not possible. The one demographic category with a large number of respondents is 'the amount of time teaching'. The majority of the respondents (71%) have been teaching for four or more years. This amount of time in higher education could suggest career longevity leading to the faculty members being more committed and

involved in the Field than other instructors. This could mean more time to adopt the Doxa of their colleagues.

The overwhelming agreement that a department HLIP is important, that faculty should be trained for Heritage speakers and that there should be a formal evaluative tool in order to accurately place Heritage speakers in the appropriate Spanish classes illustrates that the respondents view having a HLIP favorably. The difference in implementation, such as whether Heritage speakers should be in mixed classes or have a separate track, demonstrates that the respondents don't agree about how policies should apply to Heritage speakers in their departments. Interestingly, the majority of respondents believed that a person does not have to have been born in Spanish-speaking country to be a native Spanish speaker. This contradicts general discourse about beliefs about what constitutes a native speaker (Davies 2003; Kramsch 1997). However, as discussed in the introduction above, the discussion of the dichotomies of "native versus non-native" illustrates more of a statutory ability than linguistic ability or place of birth (Bonfiglio 2013; Canagarajah 2007; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). It may be the case then that the respondents who did not identify Spanish as their first language may not want to imagine themselves in the category of non-native speaker, or as an "illegitimate speaker" (Kubota 2009: 236). Slightly more than half the respondents (62%) believed that they could identify who is a Heritage speaker. However the data suggests that the respondents were able to be successfully misled by priming, which could imply that they are not able to identify who Heritage speakers are. This is important because the concept of Habitus (Bourdieu 1977) described above regarding the creation of expectations (results summary, page 44) seems to be informing the beliefs of 62% of the respondents.

The generation and perpetuation of such ideologies in community colleges can be understood more clearly through the framework of Bourdieu's concept of Habitus (1977). More specifically, if we consider the Doxa of the Field in WA State community college Spanish departments, as described above, the varied responses about Heritage language social attributes and HLIP implementation from the respondents can be understood. That is, the independence and the infrequent contact with peers of community college faculty members is a key aspect of the Field and Doxa in community colleges. Therefore, in this context, members of the Field are bound less by the Field's Doxa than more highly structured academic Fields. So, while individual Habitus helps to understand why these faculty members may have strong individual ideologies about Spanish language use based on beliefs about standard language and language purity, these beliefs may not affect or be affected by the department Doxa. Bourdieu's theories of Habitus, Field and Doxa help paint a more complete picture of how individuals in a social hierarchy negotiate language regard and why in the absence of such a hierarchy, the "rules of the game" are much more open to individual interpretation.

The importance of understanding language regard in language departments cannot be understated, since "Students can never gain genuine linguistic self-respect unless they realize the sociopolitical basis of dialect inequality rather than simply assuming that the basis for dialect differences lies in some inherent linguistic deficiency" (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2008: 321). This means that the faculty who interact with these students must also be aware of the basis of their perceptions of dialect inequality and lack of 'inherent linguistic deficiency' of minority dialects. Although the Doxa of the Field in community colleges does not appear to serve as a norm-enforcement mechanism in the

same way as described in university language departments, there still seem to be negative perceptions of Heritage language among Spanish language faculty, even though the same faculty appear to be open to having a departmental HLIP in place. This research provides an important starting point for exploring these issues in the context of community colleges, an important gateway to higher education for many people.

## **REFERENCES**

- Acuña, R. (2004). *Occupied America: A history of Chicanos*. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Anderson, M. C. (January 01, 1998). What's to Be Done with 'Em?" Images of Mexican Cultural Backwardness, Racial Limitations, and Moral Decrepitude in the United States Press, 1913-1915. *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos*, 14.
- Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. A. (2012). *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Bilaniuk, L. (2005). *Contested tongues: Language politics and cultural correction in Ukraine*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bonfiglio, T.P. (2013) "Inventing the Native Speaker." *Critical Multilingualism Studies* 1:2. pp. 29-58
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Thompson, J. B. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). In Duranti, A. *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Burgess, M. (2010). *Are There Negative Attitudes Towards Heritage Speakers in a University Spanish Department?* Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Washington.
- Burgess, M. (2013a). *Attitudes toward Heritage Spanish in Higher Education*. Unpublished Generals Exam Paper. University of Washington.
- Burgess, M. (2013b). *Vowel Hiatus Resolution in Yakima Valley Spanish*. Unpublished Generals Exam Paper. University of Washington.
- Canagarajah, S. (2007). *Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language Acquisition*.

- Carreira, M. (2013). Teaching heritage language learners - a study of programme profiles, practices and needs in Rethinking In Trifonas, P. P., & In Aravossitas, T. (2014). Rethinking heritage language education.
- Carreira, M. (2000). Validating and Promoting Spanish in the United States: Lessons from Linguistic Science. *Bilingual Research Journal*. 24 (4), 423-42.
- Carvalho, A.M. (2012). Code-switching: From theoretical to pedagogical considerations. In Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. A., Eds. Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Cruz, A.R. (1997). The Mexican-American Community in the United States. In L.L. Naylor, Ed. Cultural Diversity in the United States, 159-175. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Diccionario de la lengua española (2014). La 23.<sup>a</sup> edición. Retrieved on December 8, 2014 from) <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=espanenglish>
- Ducar, C.M. (2012). SHL Learners Attitudes and Motivations: Reconciling Opposing Forces. In Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. A., Eds. Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and identity: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- EFE. (2004, September 7). “Gregorio Salvador alerta sobre los daños que causa el bilingüismo”. *El País*. Retrieved from [elpais.com](http://elpais.com)
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford.
- Felix, A. (2009). The adult Heritage Spanish speaker in the foreign language classroom: A phenomenography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22, 2, 145-162.
- 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). Washington, DC & McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.
- Fishman, J. A., & García, O. (2010). *Handbook of language & ethnic identity*. New York, N.Y: Oxford University Press.

- Fought, C. (2003). *Chicano English in context*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H., Powesland, P. F., & European Association of Experimental Social Psychology. (1975). *Speech style and social evaluation*. European monographs in social psychology, 7. London: Published in cooperation with the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology by Academic Press.
- Greengross, G., & Miller, G. (January 01, 2011). Humor ability reveals intelligence, predicts mating success, and is higher in males. *Intelligence*, 39, 4, 188-192.
- Instituto de Turismo de España (2013). Learning Spanish in Valladolid. Retrieved from [http://www.spain.info/en\\_US/reportajes/aprender\\_espanol\\_en\\_valladolid.html](http://www.spain.info/en_US/reportajes/aprender_espanol_en_valladolid.html)
- King, K. A. (2009). Language education policy for U.S. Spanish speakers: Paradoxes, pitfalls and promises. In J. Leeman & M. Lacorte (Eds.), *Español en Estados Unidos y en otros contextos: Cuestiones sociolingüísticas, políticas y pedagógicas* (pp. 303–23). Madrid, Spain: Iberoamericano.
- Kramsch, C. (May 01, 1997). The Privilege of the Nonnative Speaker. *Pmla: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 112, 3, 359-69.
- Kubota, R. (2009). “Rethinking the superiority of the native speaker: towards a relational understanding of power”. *The native speaker concept: ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects*. Ed. Neriko Doerr. New York: Mouton Gruter.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lambert, W., Hodgson, R., Gardner, R., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 60, 44-51.
- Leeman, J. (2012). Investigating language ideologies in Spanish for Heritage Speakers. In Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. A., Eds. *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2004). Language ideology and language prejudice. In E. Finegan & J. R. Rickford (Eds.), *Language in the USA: Themes for the twenty-first century* (pp. 289-304). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.

- Liu, J. (1999). From Their Own Perspectives: The Impact of Non-native ESL Professionals on Their Students. In Braine, G. Ed. Non-native educators in English language teaching. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- MacGregor-Mendoza, P. (2000). Aquí no se habla Español: Stories of linguistic repression in southwest schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 333-345.
- Martinez, G. (2012). Policy and Planning Research for Spanish as a Heritage Language: From Language Rights to Linguistic Resource. In Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. A., Eds. Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Mendoza-Denton, N. (2008). Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among Latina youth gangs. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1999). *Authority in language: Investigating standard English*. Routledge.
- Milroy, J. (2006). "The Ideology of the Standard Language." *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. Ed. Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell. London: Routledge 133-139.
- Montrul, S. (2012). The Grammatical Competence of Spanish Heritage Speakers. In Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. A., Eds. Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Morren López, M. (2008). "Aqui en los Estados Unidos hablamos ingles ... o, y español tambien": Students' emerging language ideologies and literacy practices in a dual language primary program. The University of Texas at San Antonio.
- Mrak, N.A. (2011). Heritage Speakers and the Standard: Fighting Linguistic Hegemony. In Selected Proceedings of the 13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium. Luis A Ortiz Lopez, ed.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Niedzielski, N. A., & Preston, D. R. (2003). *Folk linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Niedzielski, N. (1999). The Effect of Social Information on the Perception of Sociolinguistic Variables. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 18, 1, 62-85.
- Nieto, S. (1995). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

- Norton, B. (2010). Language and identity. In N. Hornberger & S. McKay (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 349–369.
- Peñalosa, F. (1980). *Chicano sociolinguistics, a brief introduction*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers.
- Pew Hispanic Center (2009). Statistical Portrait of Hispanics in the United States, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/02/17/statistical-portrait-of-hispanics-in-the-united-states-2009/>
- Pinto, D. (2012). Pragmatics and Discourse: Doing Things with Words in Spanish as a Heritage Language. In Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. A., Eds. *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Potowski, K. (2002). Experiences of Spanish Heritage speakers in university foreign language courses and implications for teacher training. *ADFL Bulletin 33 (3)*: 35-42.
- Preston, D.R. (1981). Perceptual dialectology: Mental maps of United States dialects from a Hawaiian perspective. In H. Warkentyne, (ed.), *Methods/Méthodes IV [Papers from the 4th International Conference on Methods in Dialectology]*, 192-98. Victoria, B. C.: University of Victoria.
- Preston, D. R. (January 01, 1982). 'Ritin' Fowklower Daun 'Rong: Folklorists' Failures in Phonology. *Journal of American Folklore*, 95, 377, 304-326.
- Preston, D. R. (1989). *Perceptual dialectology: Nonlinguists' views of areal linguistics*. Topics in socio linguistics, 7. Dordrecht, Pays-Bas: Foris.
- Preston, D. R. (December 01, 1993). The uses of folk linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 2, 181-259.
- Preston, D. R. (1996). Whaddayaknow?: The Modes of Folk Linguistic Awareness. *Language Awareness*, 5, 1, 40-74.
- Preston, D. R. (2004). Language with an Attitude. In *The handbook of language variation and change*, edited by Jack Chambers, Peter Trudgill & Natalie Schilling-Estes, pp. 40-66. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishing.
- Preston, D. R. (June 01, 2010). Language, people, salience, space: Perceptual dialectology and language regard. *Dialectologia*, 5, 87-131.
- Real Academia Española (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.rae.es>
- Reyes, R. (1982). "Language Mixing in Chicano Spanish". In *Spanish in the United*

*States: Sociolinguistic Aspects*, edited by Jon Amastae y Lucía Elías-Olivares, pp. 154-65. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Rickford, J. R. (1999). *African American vernacular English: Features, evolution, educational implications*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers.
- Riegelhaupt, F., & Carrasco, R. L. (2000). Mexico Host Family Reactions to a Bilingual Chicana Teacher in Mexico: A Case Study of Language and Culture Clash. *Bilingual Research Journal*. 24 (4), 405-21.
- Rubin, D. L., & Smith, K. A. (1990). Effects of accent, ethnicity, and lecture topic on undergraduates' perceptions of nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 3, 337-353.
- Sankoff, G. (2002). Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In Chambers, J. K., Trudgill, P., & Schilling-Estes, N. eds. *The handbook of language variation and change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Seattle Colleges (2014). Retrieved from [www.seattlecolleges.com](http://www.seattlecolleges.com)
- Shardakova, M. (2013). I Joke, You Don't. In Kinginger, C. ed. *Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad*.
- Shin, H. B., Kominski, R., & U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *Language use in the United States, 2007*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau.
- Spivak, G. C. (January 01, 1979). Explanation and Culture: Marginalia. *Humanities in Society*, 2, 201-21.
- Stavans, I. (2003). *Spanglish: The making of a new American language*. New York: Rayo
- Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic purism*. London: Longman.
- Townsend, B. K., & Dougherty, K. J. (2006). *Community college missions in the 21st century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Montmollin, G. (December 01, 1986). The measurement of the etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 3, 257-267.
- UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching (2002). *University of California Guidelines on Heritage Language Instruction*. Retrieved from <http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu/white-papers/heritage-language-instruction.pdf>

- University of WA Department of Admissions (2014). Quick Facts. Retrieved from <http://admit.washington.edu/QuickFacts#enrollment>
- Urciuoli, B. (1998). *Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race, and class*. Institutional structures of feeling. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Urciuoli, B. (2008). "Whose Spanish? The Tension between Linguistic Correctness and Cultural Identity". In *Bilingualism and Identity: Spanish at the Crossroads with Other Languages*, edited by Mercedes Niño-Murcia and Jason Rothman. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). Facts for Features. Hispanic Heritage Month 2010: Sept 15-Oct 15. Retrieved April 10, 2014, from [http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/facts\\_for\\_features\\_special\\_editions/cb10-ff17.html](http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/facts_for_features_special_editions/cb10-ff17.html)
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2001). The Hispanic Population: Census 2000 Brief. Retrieved April 10, 2014 from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-3.pdf>
- Valdeón, R. A. (May 08, 2013). The use of Latin American, Hispanic and Latino in US academic articles, 2000-2010. *Terminology*, 19, 1, 112-137.
- Valdés, G., González, S.V., López García, D., & Márquez, P. (2008). Heritage languages and ideologies of language: Unexamined challenges. In Donna Brinton, Olga Kagan, & Susan Bauckus Eds., *Heritage Language Education: A New Field Emerging*, 107-130. New York: Routledge.
- Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage Language Students: Profiles and Possibilities In Peyton, J. K., Ranard, D. A., McGinnis, S., ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, & National Conference on Heritage Languages in America. (2001). *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 37-80). Washington, DC: CAL, ERIC.
- Valdés, G., & Geoffrion-Vinci, M. (1998). Chicano Spanish: the problem of the "underdeveloped" code in bilingual repertoires. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 4, 473-501.
- Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (2014). Retrieved from [http://www.sbctc.ctc.edu/general/c\\_index.aspx](http://www.sbctc.ctc.edu/general/c_index.aspx)
- Wassink, A.B., Squizzero, R., Scanlon, M., Schirra, R., & Conn, J. (2009). Effects of Style and Gender on Fronting and Raising of /æ/, /e:/ and /ɛ/ before /g/ in Seattle English. Paper Presented at NWAVE38 in Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Williams, B. F. (October 01, 1989). A CLASS ACT: Entthropology and the Race to Nation Across Ethnic Terrain. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18.

- Wolfram, W. (1998). Language Ideology and Dialect: Understanding the Oakland Ebonics Controversy. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 26, 2, 108-21.
- Wolfram, W., & Schilling-Estes, N. (2008). *American English: Dialects and Variation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Yip, J. A., & Martin, R. A. (January 01, 2006). Sense of humor, emotional intelligence, and social competence. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 6, 1202-1208.
- Zahn, C. & Hopper, R. (1985). Measuring Language Attitudes: The Speech Evaluation Instrument. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol 4(2), 1985, 113-123.

## **Appendix I: Recruitment Email Protocol A**

Human Subjects Division #46257

My name is Maria Burgess and I am seeking volunteers to participate in a language study I am conducting in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Washington for a degree requirement. I am seeking UW students who grew up speaking Spanish in Washington State to create recordings for a questionnaire.

Criteria for inclusion in the experiment are:

- Over 18 years old
- UW student
- Parents are from Mexico
- Have spent at least half your life in Washington State
- Speak Spanish

If you meet these criteria and would like to participate, I would like you to participate in my study. If you choose to participate I will ask you to come to the phonetics lab on campus and participate in the following activities. First I will ask you to fill out an anonymous questionnaire about language use. Then I will audio record you telling a story in Spanish. At no time will you be asked to give any personally identifying information on the recording. Participating in this study will take between 20 to 30 minutes.

For your time you will receive \$10.

Please contact me at [mapnea@uw.edu](mailto:mapnea@uw.edu) with any questions or for more information about the study. Also, please feel free to forward this information on to anyone you know who meets these criteria and who might be interested.

Please note that I cannot insure the confidentiality of information sent via email. You may contact me via phone at 206-543-8645.

## **Appendix II: Consent Form Protocol A**

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON CONSENT FORM  
SPANISH IN HIGHER EDUCATION  
Human Subjects Division #46257

Lead Researcher: Maria Burgess  
Department of Linguistics, University of Washington  
Telephone: 206-543-8645  
Email: [mapnea@uw.edu](mailto:mapnea@uw.edu)  
Advisor: Professor Betsy Evans  
Department of Linguistics, University of Washington  
Telephone: 206-543-2046  
Email: [evansbe@uw.edu](mailto:evansbe@uw.edu)

*\*Please note that we cannot ensure the confidentiality of information sent via e-mail.*

### ***Investigators' statement***

We are asking you to be in a research study. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether or not to be in the study. Please read the form carefully. You may ask questions about the purpose of the research, what we would ask you to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the research or this form that is not clear. When all your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called “informed consent.”

### **Purpose of the study**

**The purpose of this study** is to help learn more about what people think about different kinds of Spanish.

### **Procedures**

If you agree to be in this study, I will ask you to do two things:

1. A Questionnaire: I will ask you to fill out a short questionnaire about yourself. It asks for basic information about you, such as your age and gender, and very general information about your family, such as how many siblings you have and where in México your parents are from.
2. A Storytelling Task: I will ask you to tell a favorite childhood story. I will audio record you while you do the task. I will keep the audio recordings indefinitely. If you would like me to erase any sections of the recordings please say so and I will. I will erase information in the recording that might identify you personally (for example, names of

real people you mention). The Other Information section below describes the ways I will protect your confidentiality.

The entire session should last between 20-30 minutes. You can skip any questions that you do not want to answer and you can quit at any time.

**Risks, stress or discomfort**

Some people feel that providing information for research is an invasion of privacy. I have addressed concerns for your privacy in the Other Information section below.

**Benefits of the study**

We hope the results of this study will give us a better understanding of what people think about different kinds of Spanish.

**Other information**

Taking part in this study is voluntary. Information about you is anonymous. I will not record your name on the questionnaire, the reading task, or on the audio recording of the session. This signed consent form will be kept separate from your questionnaire. This consent form and your questionnaire will be kept in a locked office and the recorded data will be stored on a password-protected computer. I will not use your name in any reports or presentations of this research. **I will erase information in the recording that might identify you personally (for example, names of real people you mention) within 5 days of making the recording.**

I will keep the recordings indefinitely. I may present them in professional conferences, and for educational purposes.

To compensate you for your time today, you will receive \$10.

---

Signature of investigator	Printed Name	Date
---------------------------	--------------	------

Subject's statement

This study has been explained to me. I volunteer to take part in this research. I have had a chance to ask questions. If I have questions later on about the research I can ask one of the investigators listed above. If I have questions about my rights as a research subject, I can call the University of Washington Human Subjects Division at (206) 543-0098. I will receive a copy of this consent form.

---

Signature of subject	Printed name	Date
----------------------	--------------	------

Copies to: Investigator's file, Subject

## **Appendix III: Demographic Form Protocol A**

### **SPANISH IN HIGHER EDUCATION Human Subjects Division #46257**

**SUBJECT #\_\_\_\_\_**

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Maria Burgess, from the University of Washington Department of Linguistics for a degree completion requirement.

We hope to learn more about what people think of different kinds of Spanish.

**Your participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to stop at any time.**

1. This questionnaire is anonymous so we won't ask you your name but we'd like to know a little information about you. Please answer the following questions. You may skip any question that you don't want to answer.

1. How old are you?
2. What is your gender?
3. How long have you lived in Washington?
4. Where in Mexico are your parents from?
5. Do you have any brothers or sisters? If so, how many and are they older or younger than you?
6. Do you usually speak Spanish with your parent/ parents?
7. If you have siblings, do you usually speak Spanish with them?
8. Do you speak Spanish with other family members? If so, who?
9. Do you speak Spanish with anyone other than your family? If so, who?

## **Appendix IV: Spoken Text Speaker A Heritage Protocol A**

Todos nos subíamos en un van y éramos nueve niños y dos adultos, no queriendo pero también ya listos para salir a ganar nuestro dinero porque esa era la forma que juntábamos para la escuela para comprar nuestro material, mochila...

We would all get in a van and we were nine kids and two adults, not wanting to but also ready to go out and earn our money because that was the way we got together for school to buy our material, backpack...

## **Appendix V: Spoken Text Speaker A Mexican Protocol A**

Cuando me levantaba chiquita, él iba a la cocina a ayudarle a mi mama a preparar las tortas, unas tortas de frijol [ah] frijol, lechuga, lo más básico, pero trabajando en el campo se nos hacía de lo más rico a mí y a mis hermanos...

When I would get up [when I was] little, he would go to the kitchen to help my mom make the sandwiches, sandwiches with bean, [um], bean, lettuce, the most basic, but working in the field, [the sandwich] was the most delicious [thing] for me and my siblings...

## **Appendix VI: Spoken Text Speaker B Heritage Protocol A**

Uno se olvida porque cuando uno está hablando o escribiendo en español y en inglés [ah] va uno tan rápido que no se percata uno que ha cambiado el idioma porque pasa naturalmente, entonces le estaba comentando a mi mamá que eso sería interesante.

One forgets because when one is speaking or writing in Spanish and in English [um] one goes so fast that you don't even notice that the language has changed because it happens naturally, so I was commenting to my mom that that would be interesting.

## **Appendix VII: Spoken Text Speaker B Mexican Protocol A**

[ah] En abril de este año fui en un viaje a Roma [eh] de diez días y pues no sé nada de italiano, todavía no sé nada. Siempre cuando salíamos hablaban los compañeros o hallábamos maneras de hablar.

[um] In April of this year I went on a trip to Rome [um] for ten days and well, I don't know any Italian, I still don't know anything. Whenever we would go out, [our] companions would do the talking or we would find ways of speaking.

## **Appendix VIII: Spoken Text Speaker C Heritage Protocol A**

Y me gustó tanto que quise regresar para mi cumpleaños [um] dos años después [um] en vez de, o sea, mi quinceañera en vez de, de toda una fiesta decidí ir por tres semanas, quedarme allí con mi hermana...

And I liked it so much that I wanted to go back for my birthday [um] two years later [um] instead of, well, my fifteenth birthday celebration, instead of, of a big party, I decided to go for three weeks to stay there with my sister...

## **Appendix IX: Spoken Text Speaker C Mexican Protocol A**

Le gusta divertirse, le gusta ir a los bailes [um] y ella tenía como 21 años [um] en aquel entonces, entonces ella tiene como unos cinco, seis años más que yo y [um] entonces ella tenía su carro [um] ya apenas se había graduado de la universidad...

She liked to have fun, she liked to go to parties [um] and she was about 21 years old [um] at that time, so she is about five or six years older than me and [um] so she had her car [um] and she had just graduated from the university...

## **Appendix X: Information Website Spanish Protocol B**

Spanish in Higher Education

Human Subjects Division #46257

### Declaración Informativa

Usted está invitado a participar en un estudio investigativo conducido por María Burgess del Departamento de Lingüística de la Universidad de Washington, para la finalización de un grado. Mediante este estudio se espera aprender más sobre el español en la educación superior.

Si decide participar, en primer lugar, le pido que conteste varias preguntas sobre usted. Luego será dirigido a una encuesta en línea. Se le pedirá que escuche a seis hablantes relatando parte de una historia y que los califique. Después, debe contestar unas preguntas sobre la enseñanza de la lengua en su departamento. Este proceso no debería tomar más de 20 minutos.

Su participación es voluntaria y si decide participar, puede parar en cualquier momento.

Esta investigación va a adelantar nuestro entendimiento del español en la educación superior, pero no puedo garantizar que usted personalmente recibirá beneficios directos de este estudio.

Los resultados de esta investigación podrán ser compartidos con otros investigadores o usados en establecimientos académicos. Sus respuestas son completamente anónimas. Su identidad no será grabada. El nombre de su institución será cambiado para proteger la identidad de la misma.

Si tiene cualquier pregunta, puede contactar a María Burgess, del Departamento de Lingüística de la Universidad de Washington: 206-543-2046, mapnea@uw.edu. Si tiene preguntas acerca de sus derechos como sujeto participante en una investigación, contacte a University of Washington Human Subjects Division al teléfono 206-543-0098. Esta oficina supervisa todo estudio investigativo en la Universidad de Washington para proteger sus derechos y no está involucrada con este estudio.

Favor de guardar e imprimir una copia de esta declaración informativa para sus archivos.

¡Gracias!

## **Appendix XI: Information Website English Protocol B**

### ***Spanish in Higher Education*** **Human Subjects Division #46257**

#### **Information Statement**

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Maria Burgess, from the University of Washington Department of Linguistics for a degree completion requirement. We hope to learn more about Spanish in higher education.

If you decide to participate, first we'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself. Then you'll be directed to an online survey. You will be asked to listen to 8 speakers telling a story. You will then be asked to rate these speakers. You will then be asked questions about language teaching in your department. This shouldn't take more than 20 minutes.

Your participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to stop at any time.

This research will further our understanding of Spanish in higher education, but I can't guarantee that you personally will receive any benefits from this research.

The results from this research may be shared with other researchers or used in educational settings. ***Your answers are completely anonymous; your identity will not be recorded.*** The surveys are anonymous, the data collected from your answers will be kept on a password-protected computer, and I will not report a constellation of data that could make you or any other participant personally identifiable. The name of your institution will be given a pseudonym upon reporting of data.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Maria Burgess at the University of Washington Department of Linguistics, 206-543- 2046, [mapnea@uw.edu](mailto:mapnea@uw.edu). If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the University of Washington Human Subjects Division at 206-543-0098. This Office oversees the review of the research to protect your rights and is not involved with this study.

Please save and print a copy of this information statement for your records.

Thank you!

## **Appendix XII: Demographic Questions Spanish Protocol B**

Spanish in Higher Education  
Human Subjects Division #46257

Usted está invitado a participar en un estudio investigativo conducido por María Burgess del Departamento de Lingüística de la **Universidad de Washington**, para la finalización de un grado.

Mediante este estudio se espera aprender más sobre el español en la educación superior.

**Su participación es voluntaria y si decide participar, puede parar en cualquier momento.**

Este cuestionario es anónimo así que no le preguntaremos por su nombre, pero nos gustaría saber un poco más sobre usted. Vamos a cambiar el nombre de su institución para proteger la identidad de la misma. Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas, puede saltar cualquier pregunta que no desee contestar.

### **Question 1.**

¿Usted enseña en el departamento de español / idiomas en su institución?

sí     no

### **Question 2.**

Favor de entrar el nombre de su institución:

---

### **Question 3.**

¿Cuál es su posición en el departamento de español / idiomas?

Profesor/a adjunto/a (adjunct faculty)     Profesor/a permanente (tenured faculty)  
 Otra posición (favor de especificar):

**Question 4.**

¿Cuánto tiempo usted lleva enseñando en el departamento de español / idiomas?

N/A  1-3 trimestres  1-2 años  2-3 años  3-4 años  4 o más años

**Question 5.**

¿Considera que el español es su primer idioma?

sí  no

**Question 6.**

Si usted contestó "sí" en la pregunta #5, ¿de qué país y región es su tipo de español? (favor de especificar)

---

**Question 7.**

Si usted contestó "no" en la pregunta #5, ¿cómo usted aprendió español? (favor de especificar)

---

**Question 8.**

Si usted contestó "no" en la pregunta #5, ¿de qué país y región es el español que usted aprendió? (favor de especificar)

---

**Question 9.**

¿Cuál gama de edades le identifica mejor?

18-26  27-35  36-44  45-53  54-62  63-70  70 +

**Question 10.**

5. ¿Cuál es su género?

femenino     masculino

**Question 11.**

¿Cuál es su enfoque académico?

Literatura de América Latina     Literatura de España     Literatura comparada  
 Lingüística aplicada     Lengua española     Lingüística teórica  
 Otra \_\_\_\_\_ (favor de especificar)

## **Appendix XIII: Demographic Questions English Protocol B**

### ***Spanish in Higher Education*** **Human Subjects Division #46257**

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Maria Burgess, from the **University of Washington** Department of Linguistics for a degree completion requirement.

We hope to learn more about how people think about different kinds of Spanish.

**Your participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to stop at any time.**

1. This questionnaire is anonymous so we won't ask you your name but we'd like to know a little information about you. Please answer the following questions. You may skip any question that you don't want to answer. The name of your institution will be changed to a pseudonym.

1. Do you teach in the Spanish Department?

yes     no

2. Please enter the name of your institution: \_\_\_\_\_

3. What is your rank in the department?

Tenured faculty     Adjunct faculty     other \_\_\_\_\_(please fill in)

3. How long have you been teaching in the Spanish Department?

N/A     1-3 quarters     1-2 years     2-3 years     3-4 years     4 or more years

4. Do you consider Spanish your native language?

yes     no

5. If you answered "yes" to #3, what country are you from and/or which dialect of Spanish do you speak?

\_\_\_\_\_ (please fill in)

6. If you answered “no” to #3, how did you learn Spanish?

\_\_\_\_\_ (please fill in)

7. If you answered “no” to #3, from what country (or which dialect) did you learn Spanish?

\_\_\_\_\_ (please fill in)

8. Which age range best describes you?

18-26     27-35     36-44     45-53     54-62     63-70     70 +

9. What is your gender?

female     male

10. What is your academic focus?

Latin American literature     Spanish literature     Comparative literature  
 Applied linguistics     Spanish language     Theoretical linguistics  
 other \_\_\_\_\_ (please fill in)

## **Appendix XIV: Matrix Heritage Guises Spanish Protocol B**

Por favor califique a la hablante de español de herencia ("Heritage speaker") que acaba de escuchar en las siguientes características. Escoja la opción que mejor representa su respuesta.

Esta hablante de español de herencia ("Heritage speaker")...

	discrepo completamente	discrepo	no estoy seguro	estoy de acuerdo	de acuerdo completamente
es articulada	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es una líder	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es clara	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
tiene buen sentido del humor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es religiosa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
tiene fluidez	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es inteligente	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es una hablante nativa del español	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es amigable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es alfabetizada	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es de clase alta	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
pronuncia correctamente	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es fiable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es adinerada	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es culta	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es simpática	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es agradable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es sociable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es energética	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es considerada	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es honesta	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
usa la gramática correctamente	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es segura de si misma	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es amable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **Appendix XV: Matrix Mexican Guises Spanish Protocol B**

Por favor califique a la mexicana que acaba de escuchar en las siguientes características. Escoja la opción que mejor representa su respuesta.

Esta mexicana...

	discrepo completamente	discrepo	no estoy seguro	estoy de acuerdo	de acuerdo completamente
es articulada	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es una líder	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es clara	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
tiene buen sentido del humor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es religiosa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
tiene fluidez	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es inteligente	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es una hablante nativa del español	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es amigable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es alfabetizada	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es de clase alta	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
pronuncia correctamente	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es fiable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es adinerada	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es culta	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es simpático	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es agradable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es sociable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es energética	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es considerada	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es honesta	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
usa la gramática correctamente	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es segura de si misma	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es amable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **Appendix XVI: Matrix Both Guises English Protocol B**

[condensed for both Heritage and Mexican guises- they are separate in *Appendix XIV and XV* in Spanish as they appeared on the survey]

Please rate the Heritage speaker/Mexican you just heard on the following characteristics. Click the box that best represents your answer.

This Heritage speaker/Mexican...

This speaker...	strongly disagree	disagree	unsure	agree	strongly agree
is articulate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is a leader	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
has a sense of humor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is religious	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is fluent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is intelligent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is a native speaker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is friendly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is literate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is upper class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
uses correct pronunciation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is dependable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is well-off	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is educated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is nice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is likeable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is social	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is energetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is considerate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is honest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
uses correct grammar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is confident	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is kind	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **Appendix XVII: HLIP Questions Spanish Protocol B**

Para esta parte del estudio, el término "hablante de herencia" se refiere a una persona que creció hablando español en casa pero ha asistido al sistema educativo K-12 en los Estados Unidos. Por favor, indique si usted está o no de acuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones.

Creo que...	discrepo completamente	discrepo	no estoy seguro	estoy de acuerdo	de acuerdo completamente
los hablantes de herencia deben matricularse en cursos de español introductorio en mi institución	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es importante tener una herramienta de evaluación formal (como una prueba escrita, por ejemplo) para acomodar a los hablantes de herencia en el nivel apropiado de español	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es importante entrenar a la facultad respecto a los hablantes de herencia	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es aceptable mezclar hablantes de herencia con hablantes de español que no son de herencia en las mismas clases de español	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es importante crear clases de español separadas para hablantes de herencia en el departamento de español / idiomas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
es importante tener una política departamental para acomodar hablantes de herencia en el nivel más apropiado de español	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
una persona solo puede ser hablante nativa de español si ha crecido en un país de habla hispana	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
soy capaz de identificar un hablante de herencia al escucharlo hablar español	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **Appendix XVIII: HLIP Questions English Protocol B**

For this study, the term “heritage speaker” will refer to a person that grew up speaking Spanish at home but attended the K-12 system in the United States.

Please use the criteria at the right to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

I think...	strongly disagree	disagree	unsure	agree	strongly agree
Heritage speakers should enroll in introductory Spanish courses at my school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
it is important to have a formal assessment tool (such as a written test) to place heritage speakers in the appropriate level Spanish class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
it is important to train faculty about heritage speakers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
it is acceptable to have Heritage speakers integrated into Spanish classes with non-heritage speakers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
it is important to create separate Heritage Language classes in the Spanish Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
it is important to have a department policy for placing Heritage speakers in appropriate level Spanish classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a person can only be a native speaker if they grew up in a Spanish speaking country	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can identify who heritage speakers are when they speak Spanish	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Appendix XIX: Mean Scores All Attributes All Respondents

### Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Articulate Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	5	3.38	.865
Leader Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	4	3.19	.602
Clear Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	5	3.48	.981
Good sense of humor Heritage Speaker 1	20	2	4	3.05	.605
Religious Heritage Speaker 1	21	1	3	2.86	.478
Fluent Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	5	4.05	.590
Intelligent Heritage Speaker 1	21	3	5	3.67	.577
Native speaker Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	5	4.10	.995
Friendly Heritage Speaker 1	21	3	5	3.76	.625
Literate Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	5	3.24	.700
Upper class Heritage Speaker 1	21	1	3	2.19	.680
Good pronunciation Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	5	3.48	1.078
Dependable Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	5	3.19	.680
Well-off Heritage Speaker 1	21	1	3	2.19	.814
Cultured Heritage Speaker 1	21	1	4	2.67	.730
Nice Heritage Speaker 1	21	3	5	3.67	.658
Likeable Heritage Speaker 1	21	3	5	3.67	.577
Sociable Heritage Speaker 1	21	3	5	3.67	.577
Energetic Heritage Speaker 1	21	2	5	3.38	.805
Considerate Heritage Speaker 1	21	3	5	3.57	.676
Honest Heritage Speaker 1	20	3	5	3.50	.688
Correct grammar Heritage Speaker 1	21	1	5	2.86	1.108
Confident Heritage Speaker 1	20	2	5	3.65	.745
Kind Heritage Speaker 1	21	3	5	3.67	.658

Articulate Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.80	.894
Leader Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	4	3.10	.447
Clear Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	4.10	.788
Good sense of humor Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	3	2.95	.224
Religious Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	3	2.95	.224
Fluent Heritage Speaker 2	20	4	5	4.40	.503
Intelligent Heritage Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.80	.616
Native speaker Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	4.25	.851
Friendly Heritage Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.45	.605
Literate Heritage Speaker 2	19	3	5	3.68	.582
Upper class Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	4	2.80	.523
Good pronunciation Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	4.00	.795
Dependable Heritage Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.35	.587
Well-off Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	4	2.90	.447
Cultured Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.40	.681
Nice Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.55	.686
Likeable Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.55	.686
Sociable Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.35	.671
Energetic Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.25	.639
Considerate Heritage Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.55	.605
Honest Heritage Speaker 2	19	3	5	3.53	.612
Correct grammar Heritage Speaker 2	18	2	5	3.78	1.003
Confident Heritage Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.35	.933
Kind Heritage Speaker 2	19	3	5	3.47	.612
Articulate Mexican Speaker 1	19	2	5	4.16	.898
Leader Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.42	.692
Clear Mexican Speaker 1	18	2	5	4.28	.895
Good sense of humor Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	4	3.26	.452

Religious Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	3	3.00	.000
Fluent Mexican Speaker 1	19	2	5	4.32	.820
Intelligent Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.74	.653
Native speaker Mexican Speaker 1	19	2	5	4.26	.872
Friendly Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.58	.769
Literate Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.79	.713
Upper class Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.26	.562
Good pronunciation Mexican Speaker 1	19	4	5	4.37	.496
Dependable Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.21	.535
Well-off Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.16	.501
Cultured Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.47	.612
Nice Mexican Speaker 1	18	3	5	3.56	.616
Likeable Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.58	.607
Sociable Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.68	.582
Energetic Mexican Speaker 1	19	2	5	3.74	.733
Considerate Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.32	.582
Honest Mexican Speaker 1	18	3	5	3.28	.575
Correct grammar Mexican Speaker 1	19	2	5	4.00	1.106
Confident Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.74	.806
Kind Mexican Speaker 1	19	3	5	3.47	.697
Articulate Mexican Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.65	.875
Leader Mexican Speaker 2	19	1	3	2.84	.501
Clear Mexican Speaker 2	19	2	5	3.79	1.032
Good sense of humor Mexican Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.25	.639
Religious Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	4	3.05	.224
Fluent Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	4.10	.718
Intelligent Mexican Speaker 2	19	3	5	3.47	.697
Native speaker Mexican Speaker 2	20	2	5	4.15	.875

Friendly Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.55	.605
Literate Mexican Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.30	.657
Upper class Mexican Speaker 2	20	2	4	3.20	.616
Good pronunciation Mexican Speaker 2	20	2	5	4.05	.826
Dependable Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.35	.587
Well-off Mexican Speaker 2	20	2	4	3.25	.550
Cultured Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.40	.598
Nice Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.50	.607
Likeable Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.55	.605
Sociable Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.55	.605
Energetic Mexican Speaker 2	19	2	5	3.21	.631
Considerate Mexican Speaker 2	19	3	5	3.42	.607
Honest Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.40	.598
Correct grammar Mexican Speaker 2	20	2	5	3.85	.813
Confident Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.25	.550
Kind Mexican Speaker 2	20	3	5	3.45	.605
Articulate Mexican Speaker 3	19	2	5	3.79	.855
Leader Mexican Speaker 3	18	3	4	3.22	.428
Clear Mexican Speaker 3	18	2	5	3.72	1.018
Good sense of humor Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.21	.419
Religious Mexican Speaker 3	18	3	3	3.00	.000
Fluent Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	5	4.21	.535
Intelligent Mexican Speaker 3	19	2	4	3.26	.562
Native speaker Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	5	4.42	.607
Friendly Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.37	.496
Literate Mexican Speaker 3	19	2	5	3.21	.631
Upper class Mexican Speaker 3	19	1	3	2.26	.733
Good pronunciation Mexican Speaker 3	19	2	5	4.11	.737

Dependable Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.21	.419
Well-off Mexican Speaker 3	19	1	3	2.47	.612
Cultured Mexican Speaker 3	19	2	4	2.89	.737
Nice Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.42	.507
Likeable Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.47	.513
Sociable Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.47	.513
Energetic Mexican Speaker 3	19	2	4	3.26	.653
Considerate Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.26	.452
Honest Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.26	.452
Correct grammar Mexican Speaker 3	19	2	5	3.47	.964
Confident Mexican Speaker 3	19	3	4	3.47	.513
Kind Mexican Speaker 3	18	3	4	3.39	.502
Articulate Heritage Speaker 3	21	2	5	4.10	.889
Leader Heritage Speaker 3	21	2	5	3.24	.625
Clear Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	4.14	.655
Good sense of humor Heritage Speaker 3	21	2	5	3.14	.573
Religious Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	3	3.00	.000
Fluent Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	4.19	.602
Intelligent Heritage Speaker 3	21	2	5	3.67	.730
Native speaker Heritage Speaker 3	20	1	5	3.85	1.040
Friendly Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	3.52	.680
Literate Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	3.81	.750
Upper class Heritage Speaker 3	21	2	4	3.19	.512
Good pronunciation Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	4.29	.561
Dependable Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	3.29	.644
Well-off Heritage Speaker 3	21	2	5	3.14	.573
Cultured Heritage Speaker 3	21	2	5	3.43	.676
Nice Heritage Speaker 3	20	3	5	3.50	.607
Likeable Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	3.52	.680

Sociable Heritage Speaker 3	20	3	5	3.55	.686
Energetic Heritage Speaker 3	21	2	5	3.33	.796
Considerate Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	3.29	.561
Honest Heritage Speaker 3	20	3	5	3.30	.571
Correct grammar Heritage Speaker 3	20	2	5	3.95	.999
Confident Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	3.67	.658
Kind Heritage Speaker 3	21	3	5	3.38	.590
Valid N (listwise)	7				

## Appendix XX: HLIP Results

### Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
HS should register intro classes	21	1	5	2.24	1.338
There should be an evaluative tool	21	2	5	4.10	.700
Faculty should receive training	21	2	5	4.43	.746
HS should be in mixed classes	21	1	5	3.48	1.123
There should be separate HS classes	20	1	5	3.75	1.333
There should be a department policy	21	3	5	4.29	.561
Can only be native speaker if born in Spanish speaking country	21	1	5	1.95	1.117
I can tell who is a Heritage speaker	21	2	5	3.67	.856
Valid N (listwise)	20				

## Appendix XXI : Average Scores for Speaker A Attributes

Attribute	Speaker A Heritage			Speaker A Mexican		
	Total	Mean	Std dev	Total	Mean	Std dev
Articulate	n=21	3.38	.865	n=19	3.79	.855
Leader	n=21	3.19	.602	n=18	3.22	.428
Clear	n=21	3.48	.981	n=18	3.72	1.018
Humor	n=20	3.05	.605	n=19	3.21	.419
Religious	n=21	2.86	.478	n=18	3.00	.000
Fluent	n=21	4.05	.590	n=19	4.21	.535
Intelligent	n=21	3.67	.577	n=19	3.26	.562
Native	n=21	4.10	.995	n=19	4.42	.607
Friendly	n=21	3.76	.625	n=19	3.37	.496
Literate	n=21	3.24	.700	n=19	3.21	.631
Upper class	n=21	2.19	.680	n=19	2.26	.733
Pronunciation	n=21	3.48	1.078	n=19	4.11	.737
Dependable	n=21	3.19	.680	n=19	3.21	.419
Well-off	n=21	2.19	.814	n=19	2.47	.612
Cultured	n=21	2.67	.730	n=19	2.89	.737
Nice	n=21	3.67	.658	n=19	3.42	.507
Likeable	n=21	3.67	.577	n=19	3.47	.513
Sociable	n=21	3.67	.577	n=19	3.47	.513
Energetic	n=21	3.38	.805	n=19	3.26	.653
Considerate	n=21	3.57	.676	n=19	3.26	.452
Honest	n=20	3.50	.688	n=19	3.26	.452
Grammar	n=21	2.86	1.108	n=19	3.47	.964
Confident	n=20	3.65	.745	n=19	3.47	.513
Kind	n=21	3.67	.658	n=18	3.39	.502

\*standard deviations over .750 highlighted

## Appendix XXII: Average Scores for Speaker B Attributes

Attribute	Speaker B Heritage			Speaker B Mexican		
	Total	Mean	Std dev	Total	Mean	Std dev
Articulate	n=20	3.80	.894	n=20	3.65	.875
Leader	n=20	3.10	.447	n=19	2.84	.501
Clear	n=20	4.10	.788	n=19	3.79	1.032
Humor	n=20	2.95	.224	n=20	3.25	.639
Religious	n=20	2.95	.224	n=20	3.05	.224
Fluent	n=20	4.40	.503	n=20	4.10	.718
Intelligent	n=20	3.80	.616	n=19	3.47	.697
Native	n=20	4.25	.851	n=20	4.15	.875
Friendly	n=20	3.45	.605	n=20	3.55	.605
Literate	n=19	3.68	.582	n=20	3.30	.657
Upper class	n=20	2.80	.523	n=20	3.20	.616
Pronunciation	n=20	4.00	.795	n=20	4.05	.826
Dependable	n=20	3.35	.587	n=20	3.35	.587
Well-off	n=20	2.90	.447	n=20	3.25	.550
Cultured	n=20	3.40	.681	n=20	3.40	.598
Nice	n=20	3.55	.686	n=20	3.50	.607
Likeable	n=20	3.55	.686	n=20	3.55	.605
Sociable	n=20	3.35	.671	n=20	3.55	.605
Energetic	n=20	3.25	.639	n=19	3.21	.631
Considerate	n=20	3.55	.605	n=19	3.42	.607
Honest	n=19	3.53	.612	n=20	3.40	.598
Grammar	n=18	3.78	1.003	n=20	3.85	.813
Confident	n=20	3.35	.933	n=20	3.25	.550
Kind	n=19	3.47	.612	n=20	3.45	.605

\*standard deviations over .750 highlighted

## Appendix XXIII: Average Scores for Speaker C Attributes

Attribute	Speaker C Heritage			Speaker C Mexican		
	Total	Mean	Std dev	Total	Mean	Std dev
Articulate	n=21	4.10	.889	n=19	4.16	.898
Leader	n=21	3.24	.625	n=19	3.42	.692
Clear	n=21	4.14	.655	n=18	4.28	.895
Humor	n=21	3.14	.573	n=19	3.26	.452
Religious	n=21	3.00	.000	n=19	3.00	.000
Fluent	n=21	4.19	.602	n=19	4.32	.820
Intelligent	n=21	3.67	.730	n=19	3.74	.653
Native	n=20	3.85	1.040	n=19	4.26	.872
Friendly	n=21	3.52	.680	n=19	3.58	.769
Literate	n=21	3.81	.750	n=19	3.79	.713
Upper class	n=21	3.19	.512	n=19	3.26	.562
Pronunciation	n=21	4.29	.561	n=19	4.37	.496
Dependable	n=21	3.29	.644	n=19	3.21	.535
Well-off	n=21	3.14	.573	n=19	3.16	.501
Cultured	n=21	3.43	.676	n=19	3.47	.612
Nice	n=20	3.50	.607	n=18	3.56	.616
Likeable	n=21	3.52	.680	n=19	3.58	.607
Sociable	n=20	3.55	.686	n=19	3.68	.582
Energetic	n=21	3.33	.796	n=19	3.74	.733
Considerate	n=21	3.29	.561	n=19	3.32	.582
Honest	n=20	3.30	.571	n=18	3.28	.575
Grammar	n=20	3.95	.999	n=19	4.00	1.106
Confident	n=21	3.67	.658	n=19	3.74	.806
Kind	n=21	3.38	.590	n=19	3.47	.697

\*standard deviations over .750 highlighted

**Appendix XXIV: Comparison of All Speakers Heritage to All Speakers Mexican by Rater**

Raters	Speaker A Heritage Mean scores Array 1	Speaker A Mexican Mean scores Array 2	Speaker B Heritage Mean scores Array 3	Speaker B Mexican Mean scores Array 4	Speaker C Heritage Mean scores Array 5	Speaker C Mexican Mean scores Array 6
8158	3.04	2.88	--	3.33	3.29	--
8235	3.26	3.08	3.33	3.33	3.42	3.46
5594	3.67	--	4.50	4.54	4.71	4.29
4753	3.67	3.50	3.46	3.50	3.42	3.50
8782	3.54	3.17	3.50	3.04	3.42	3.21
2137	3.33	3.46	3.58	3.33	3.50	3.83
5490	3.13	3.13	3.63	3.54	3.30	3.17
3782	3.00	3.96	3.82	3.88	4.63	4.54
3271	3.25	2.75	3.52	2.88	3.42	3.74
8915	3.33	3.64	3.42	3.65	3.63	3.54
5960	3.17	3.50	3.67	3.83	3.75	3.92
3448	3.29	3.79	3.71	3.50	3.70	3.87
3169	3.25	3.43	3.43	3.50	3.50	3.21
2691	3.97	--	3.46	3.67	3.58	4.33
8606	3.50	3.58	2.74	3.17	3.35	3.25
7397	3.42	3.46	3.63	3.29	3.63	3.63
3377	3.25	3.17	2.96	3.26	3.08	--
1044	3.17	3.30	3.33	--	3.26	3.33
9031	3.33	3.04	3.54	3.71	3.38	2.96
8047	2.92	3.29	3.00	3.00	2.75	3.54
1528	3.63	3.92	4.00	3.73	4.09	4.09

\*scores varying  $\geq .50$  variance between guises highlighted

## Appendix XXV: Comparison of Difference Between Ratings For Speaker A Attributes

(Rating for “attribute” Speaker A Heritage – rating for “attribute” Speaker A Mexican)

rater	Articulate	Leader	Clear	Humor	Religious	Fluent	Intelligent	Native	Friendly	literate	upper class	Pronunciation	Dependable	Well-off	Cultured	Nice	Likeable	Sociable	Energetic	Considerate	Honest	Grammar	Confident	Kind
8158	1	0	0	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
8235	-	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	1	1
5594																								
4753	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8782	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
2137	-	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	-	1	0	0	1	1	0	-	3	0
5490	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3782	-	3	-	3	-	2	0	0	1	-	3	0	2	-	2	0	0	0	1	-	-	2	1	0
3271	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
8915	-	1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0
5960	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
3448	-	2	-	3	-	1	0	-	2	0	2	2	1	-	1	-	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	-
3169	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
2691																								
8606	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	2	0
7397	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	1	0
3377	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
1044	1	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
9031	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	-	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1
8047	0	-	0	1	0	0	0	0	-	1	1	2	-	1	0	0	-	-	0	1	1	0	1	0
1528	0	0	0	-	1	0	0	-	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	1	0	-	3	0

## Appendix XXVI: Comparison of Difference Between Ratings For Speaker B Attributes

(Rating for “attribute” Speaker B Heritage – rating for “attribute” Speaker B Mexican)

rating	Articulate	Leader	Clear	Humor	Religious	Fluent	Intelligent	Native	Friendly	literate	upper class	Pronunciation	Dependable	Well-off	Cultured	Nice	Likeable	Sociable	Energetic	Considerate	Honest	Grammar	Confident	Kind
8158																								
8235	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5594				-							-			-										
	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4753	-																							
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8782	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
2137												-						-						
	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
5490			-				-								-			-						
	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
3782					-					-	-			-										
	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
3271														-										
	2	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1	0
8915	-							-					-		-								-	-
	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
5960			-					-	-		-	-		-										
	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
3448				-	-								-							-				
	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
3169								-														-		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0
2691	-			-					-		-								-	-			-	-
	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0
8606				-								-		-	-	-	-	-				-	-	
	0		0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0		2	1	0
7397	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
3377	-							-						-								-		
	2	0		0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
1044																								
9031											-			-	-			-						
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
8047	-	-	-								-	-							-					
	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
1528				-																				
	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0			0	1	1	0

**Appendix XXVII: Comparison of Difference Between Ratings**  
**For Speaker C Attributes**

(Rating for “attribute” Speaker C Heritage – rating for “attribute” Speaker C Mexican)

rater	Articulate	Leader	Clear	Humor	Religious	Fluent	Intelligent	Native	Friendly	literate	upper class	pronunciation	Dependable	Well-off	Cultured	Nice	Likeable	Sociable	Energetic	Considerate	Honest	Grammar	Confident	Kind
8158																								
8235	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
5594	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4753	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8782	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2137	-	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
5490	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3782	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
3271	-	1	0		0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
8915	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
5960	-	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
3448	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0		1	1	0
3169	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
2691	-	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	1
8606	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
7397	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
3377																								
1044	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
9031	2	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0
8047	-	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0

## **Appendix XXVIII: Debriefing Statement Protocol A**

### ***Spanish in Higher Education*** **Human Subjects Division #46257**

Lead Researcher: Maria Burgess  
Department of Linguistics, University of Washington  
Telephone: 206-543-8645  
Email: [mapnea@uw.edu](mailto:mapnea@uw.edu)  
Advisor: Professor Betsy Evans  
Department of Linguistics, University of Washington  
Telephone: 206-543-2046  
Email: [evansbe@uw.edu](mailto:evansbe@uw.edu)

#### **Debriefing statement:**

The purpose of this study is to record Heritage Spanish speakers and collect speech samples reflecting Heritage Spanish. This information will be used as recordings to be listened to and evaluated by Spanish department faculty members. Some recordings will be identified as “Heritage Spanish” and others will be identified as “Mexican Spanish”. The purpose of this is to measure if there is a difference in ratings between the same recordings if they are identified as different kinds of Spanish.

This information was not given to you before you were recorded because many times people change how they speak for different audiences. In this case, knowing the audience is Spanish faculty members could cause people to speak in a more formal style or cause nervousness that would change how you normally speak.

If you have any questions, please contact the Lead Researcher, Maria Burgess, at [mapnea@uw.edu](mailto:mapnea@uw.edu) or (206) 543-8645.

“It’s not what happens to you that counts, it’s how you take it”  
-Susie Elkow Chase 1919-2010

