

Grammar Teaching Approaches For Heritage Learners Of Spanish

Clara Burgo

Loyola University Chicago

Abstract

Little has been said about the most effective teaching approaches to facilitate the grammar acquisition and development of Heritage Learners (HL). Can those strategies used for L2 grammar acquisition be applied to HL? HL have a clear advantage in processing meaning which would seemingly render L2 grammar teaching techniques more effective for this population. This article explores three L2 approaches that can be implemented in the HL classroom that hold promise in enhancing grammar acquisition: (1) processing instruction, (2) input-output cycles and (3) interactional feedback.

Introduction

According to Potowski (2005), Spanish classes for Heritage Speakers (HS) should be centered on literacy development and grammatical knowledge. Regarding grammatical knowledge, several scholars have identified linguistic aspects that do not seem to be completely acquired by HS (Montrul, 2008), that differed from or are similar to those of second language learners (Montrul, 2007; Silva-Corvalán, 1994) or that are simply different from monolinguals' linguistic knowledge (Cabo, D. Y., & Rothman, 2012). However, little has been said about the appropriate, or most effective teaching techniques to facilitate the grammar acquisition and development of HL. Can those used for L2 grammar

teaching be applied to HL? Perhaps one of the limitations in the use of current teaching techniques is L2 learners' struggle to attend to both form and meaning, particularly at lower and intermediate levels of linguistic development. However, there is an observed HL advantage in the relative ease of processing meaning due to their early naturalistic acquisition (Montrul et al. 2014). Therefore, we suggest that this would render L2 grammar teaching techniques more effective for this population. Under this assumption, we will address the ways in which three well-known L2 teaching techniques for grammar development can be implemented in the classroom for HL: (1) processing instruction, (2) input-output cycles and (3) interactional feedback. We will describe each of the techniques, briefly present their theoretical and empirical rationale and provide examples and guidelines for use in the classroom. We begin with an overview of research on L2 grammar instruction and then report recent findings on Spanish heritage grammar instruction.

Grammar instruction

Explicit knowledge is acquired through conscious processes, but implicit knowledge is acquired through subconscious processes. Whether grammar must be taught explicitly is under debate. Traditionally, grammar teaching involved the explicit presentation and practice of grammatical structures (Hedge, 2001; Ur, 2008, among others). In recent years, much has been written about ways of teaching grammar in a more effective manner that minimizes traditional explicit instruction. Ellis (2006) provides a more holistic definition that summarizes current trends in SLA: "Grammar teaching involves any instructional technique that draws learners' attention to some specific grammatical form in such a way that it helps them either to understand it metalinguistically and/or process it in comprehension and/or production so that they can internalize it." (p. 84)

Does grammar have to be taught explicitly?

Traditionally, grammar has been taught explicitly following the presentation-production and practice model (Larsen-Freeman, 2003). This traditional model is not recommended since explicit presentation of grammar and practice through drills do not engage the necessary cognitive processes for grammar acquisition. More effective ways to teach grammar include comprehensible input that provides students the opportunity to use L2 in meaningful, communicative ways (Fernández, 2011).

According to input processing theory developed by VanPatten (1996, 2003), learners are strategically focused on the target structure(s) while form and meaning connections are emphasized. Students have to be exposed to large amounts of comprehensible input so that acquisition can take place. However, since meaning takes most of their attentional and cognitive resources, there is a limited amount of input that they can attend to and therefore, process, above all, at the beginner levels. At this point, corrective feedback is more advisable than explicit instruction.

What is grammar?

Grammar is “the underlying, implicit, and abstract knowledge that humans have in their minds regarding the morphology and syntactic rules of their mother language(s)” (Fernández, 2011, p. 156). This is the kind of knowledge required for L2 acquisition. Recently, Geeslin and Long (2014) proposed an alternative definition: an understanding of grammar that includes variation, or an, “appropriateness” of forms that are context-dependent.

Grammaring

According to Perez-Llantada and Larsen-Freeman (2007), teachers need to change their conception of grammar teaching. The term “grammaring” was used to convey that grammar should be taught as the fifth skill (added to reading, writing, speaking and listening). In order for students to be able to use grammar accurately (since they need this knowledge to become successful L2 learners), we have to provide students with the opportunity to do so through meaningful and engaging activities. Although knowledge of grammar requires forced output, Perez-Llantada and Larsen-Freeman claim that most of SLA research focuses on input processing. Consequently, there is a need to work on output processing and to make output practice strategically engaging.

Larsen-Freeman (1992) sees grammar as a resource for speakers to communicate in accurate (form), meaningful (meaning) and appropriate (use) ways. “Form” has to do with the morphosyntactic properties of a construction, “meaning” with the semantics of the construction and “use” with the appropriate context for that structure. Larsen-Freeman (2003) maintained that the “use” dimension is the one that teachers must implement through effective pedagogical activities. Teaching grammar as a skill will enhance communicative accuracy and as such the consideration of grammar as a skill will lead to increased communicative competence.. Additionally, grammar cannot be separated from vocabulary and thus the teaching of grammar should seek to extend students’ lexical knowledge. Even though grammar can be acquired implicitly in natural contexts, classroom instruction could accelerate the learning process.

Grammar correction

Regarding oral grammar correction, research has revealed this as largely ineffective even though it is still a common classroom practice and contributes little to the development of grammatical speech (Truscott, 1999). Truscott (1996) further claimed that grammar correction in L2 writing classes should be abandoned because it has been proven to be ineffective and to have harmful effects. Students tend to follow their own intuitions instead of following teachers’ corrections. Teachers’ challenge is to be aware of their limited ability to influence developmental sequences and ineffectiveness of correcting grammatical errors that naturally arise due to developmental sequences. Ferris’ (2004) research disputes Truscott’s claim and supports positive learning effects of error correction

on writing skills.. Students need to notice and attend to their errors so that they can avoid fossilization.

Research Supporting Grammar Teaching

Noticing (attention to form) is necessary for language learning (Schmidt, 1990, 1992; Schmidt and Watanabe, 2001). It has been documented that L2 learners go through developmental language learning sequences. Pienemann (1984) developed the teachability hypothesis, which proposes that certain developmental sequences cannot be affected by grammar teaching but others can benefit from it. This would be the case when grammar teaching coincides with the stage of acquisition. The potential influence of grammar teaching on development sequences supports the strategic and purposeful instruction of grammar in the language acquisition classroom.

According to Mitchell (2000), grammar teaching should be planned and systematic. Grammar teaching should take place often, yet in brief segments that are purposefully redundant. Feedback is important in grammar teaching, as it promotes learners' control of grammar. All of this has to be embedded in meaning-oriented tasks.

Focus on form is necessary specifically if one wishes to develop higher levels of accuracy in the L2. Relying solely on communicative language teaching in the absence of grammatical instruction could be insufficient for achieving higher levels of accuracy (Ellis, 1997). According to Norris & Ortega (2000), explicit instruction of grammar results in important gains in the learning of form, and these gains are durable over time. Nassaji and Fotos (2004) suggest that learners need opportunities in the classroom to produce structures that have been taught both explicitly (grammar lessons) and implicitly (frequent exposure).

Fernández (2011) studied how postsecondary textbooks presented grammar, and she found that some of the textbooks follow several approaches at the same time: 1) acquisition-based approaches, where grammar is learned through input processing, 2) meaningful interaction and 3) product-oriented approaches, where grammar is learned through controlled oral practice. There is a strong tendency towards the latter, which indicates a strong prevalence of traditional instruction with explicit instruction of rules that are practiced in contrived contexts. Most textbooks ignore the central role of input in the development of L2 grammar. This conservatism in the profession has been attributed to instructors' expectations and prior experiences with language learning and does not reflect findings in SLA (Borg, 2003). However, there are some signs of change towards input processing and meaningful interaction (Fernández, 2011).

Teaching Grammar in Spanish for Heritage Speaker Courses

Who are heritage speakers? Differences between heritage learners, native speakers, and foreign language learners: Implications for grammar instruction.

Heritage learners are those students of language who “are raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speak or merely understand the

heritage language, and who are to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language” (Valdés, 2000, p. 1). Heritage language learners are those individuals who work on maintaining or expanding their knowledge of their heritage language in a formal classroom (Kondo-Brown, 2006).

There are some characteristics that HL have in common with second language learners: neither of them are monolinguals so they make the same English transfer errors. However, manner and context of acquisition are different so heritage learners may require less instructional time than second language learners to develop the same skills (Correa, 2011). Regarding Spanish literacy skills, heritage learners have less experience.

Advanced L2 learners and heritage speakers do not differ much from each other but heritage speakers have more advantages at low and intermediate proficiency levels (Au et al., 2002, 2008; Montrul, 2005). All this evidence leads us to believe that some L2 methods can be applied in the heritage learner’s classroom. Montrul (2010) raised the question of whether explicit instruction is also beneficial for these learners.

In terms of skills, heritage learners outperform L2 learners in oral skills and L2 learners excel in written tasks (Montrul et al. 2008). Acquiring a language from birth brings advantages in phonology and morphosyntax. In terms of vocabulary, it is context specific and depends on experience (Montrul, 2010). Regarding grammar, heritage speakers tend to struggle with subject verb agreement, gender agreement in nouns (Lipski, 1993; Montrul, Foote and Perpiñan, 2008), null subject pronouns (Montrul, 2004, Silva-Corvalán, 1994), the subjunctive (Montrul, 2007, Silva-Corvalán, 1994) and the conditional. Research showed that they control the present and past tenses but they confuse aspectual distinctions between perfective and imperfective forms (Montrul, 2002, Polinsky 2007, Silva-Corvalán, 1994). Due to their reduced input conditions and their limited use of the heritage language, their grammatical systems show a tendency toward simplification and overgeneralization of complex morphological forms. Both L2 and heritage learners will benefit from form-focused instruction for better grammatical accuracy. However, L2 learners should be given more opportunities for oral production whereas heritage learners should focus more on written tasks (Montrul, 2011). It has been found that heritage speakers may not have advantages over L2 learners with grammar that is acquired in later stages in life, or that require significant amounts of input (Montrul, 2008). This seems to be the case of the overt subject pronouns as found in a study conducted by Keating, VanPatten and Jegerski (2011). Heritage speakers do not show any advantages in the resolution of pronoun ambiguities but they do in nominal and verbal agreement, or in clitic pronouns (Montrul, 2005, 2006; Montrul, Foote and Perpiñan, 2008) because they have been exposed to the language since childhood.

Even though heritage learners acquire their first language in a naturalistic setting, not all the features they acquire are like native like. In fact, many do not develop the full spectrum of sociolinguistic registers or academic literacy achieved by monolingual native speakers (Valdés and Geofrrion-Vinci, 1998, among others). Some of them are more similar to L2 learners in terms of errors, such

as transfer errors or fossilization. Like L2 learners, they need motivation but also their identity plays a crucial role in the acquisition of the language. Since they are very aware of their weaknesses, many experience shyness tending to avoid interaction with native speakers (Krashen, 1998). Overall, they have high levels of communicative competence but they need to increase their vocabulary and improve their grammar (Montrul, 2010). HS benefit from exposure to instruction on reading and writing while L2 learners have an advantage on these registers as Montrul's work has shown.

How to teach grammar to heritage learners

Jeffries (1985) found that students who begin instruction with some explicit metalinguistic knowledge are most likely to perform as teachers expect in terms of production. The metalinguistic knowledge that students have acquired should be taken into consideration when selecting a teaching approach.

In the same vein, regarding explicit instruction, Colombi (2009) proposes a curriculum that builds on thematic clusters of texts where instruction explicitly focuses on language embedded in a text where the lexico-grammatical features of the text help in the realization of the content. All texts should be authentic and reveal different Spanish dialects to represent the diversity of the Hispanic world. Correa (2011) concludes that beginner level students benefit from explicit and implicit knowledge, but intermediate and advanced learners benefit more from explicit (metalinguistic) knowledge. In fact, acquisition of some linguistic items (complex structures) are best acquired through explicit instruction while others through a more naturalistic exposure with no focus on form (no-complex). (Alderson, Clapham & Steel, 1997) Moreover, Han and Ellis (1998) found that metalanguage plays an insignificant role in general language proficiency but analyzed explicit knowledge might play a more significant role. Thus, teaching explicit knowledge might emphasize the development of analyzed knowledge.

Heritage Learners are usually confused by grammatical terminology but some focus on form might be beneficial for them (Anderson, 2008). However, the goal of grammar instruction should not be the focus for learning a foreign language. Grammar lessons empowered these students to reconsider their feelings for the language (Mikulski, 2006). They are considered tools for reflection, awareness and empowerment. Potowski (2005) proposes that classes for heritage learners should be considered Language Arts courses instead of Foreign Language ones, centered on literacy development and grammatical knowledge. However, according to Lynch (2008) this could be beneficial for advanced students but might be problematic for low proficiency levels since there are linguistic similarities between L2 and heritage learners. He proposes to focus on the verb system, *tú* and *usted* distinction, copula usage, subject-verb agreement, articles, prepositions and pronouns. In terms of an effective teaching approach at this level, he suggests a communicative theoretical framework (input and output) with integrated explicit instruction.

Montrul (2008) explained that heritage language acquisition is an incomplete language acquisition process taking place in a bilingual environment. Therefore, heritage grammar acquisition follows the path of L2 learners. Nonetheless, having

these students in traditional L2 classrooms would be a disappointing experience for them since the heritage classroom deals not only with grammar but also with spelling, accent and vocabulary emphasis in terms of linguistic objectives as well as with important identity and cultural and personal issues (Carreira, 2004).

There are several differences between Language Arts courses and Foreign Language courses that include different points of departure and some focus on form even though students are confused by grammatical terminology.

Correa (2011) compared heritage learners (HL) and foreign learners (FL) performance of subjunctive accuracy and metalinguistic knowledge. FL learners outperformed HL learners in metalinguistic knowledge (MK) and HL learners outperformed FL learners in subjunctive accuracy. As students learn MK in Spanish, some transfer into English might take place. In FL, MK and subjunctive accuracy are related but this is not the case for HL. For FL learners, MK has an impact on their subjunctive accuracy performance. HL, however, do not need to have this MK to perform accurately. This is due to their naturalistic manner of acquisition. By young adulthood, HL's competence resembles that of L2 learners since their grammar has not reached the full attainment of their L1 counterparts. Also, knowing the rules is unrelated to accuracy in actual language production by these learners. What works for FL does not necessarily have to work for HL. Focus on grammar has to be addressed through different approaches. For HL, grammar teaching should reflect how it works from a descriptive perspective versus the prescriptive perspective adopted in FL courses.

Potowski and Carreira (2004) point out that heritage language teaching should respond to more issues than the linguistic ones such as academic deficiencies and affective factors that might negatively influence their study of Spanish. As mentioned before, bilinguals are not like monolinguals so expectations should vary; that is, we cannot expect that they will speak, write and use grammar like monolinguals. Therefore, there are several opinions about what HS should acquire in the Spanish classroom: Valdes (1997) proposes a focus on language maintenance, the acquisition of a prestigious dialect, the transfer of literacy skills from English to Spanish, and the expansion of their range. Others think students should be prepared to confront linguistic and cultural prejudices. Clearly, heritage language learners face a problem of language loss. The main purpose of current textbooks on the market aims to maintain learners' heritage language and to raise awareness about the importance of the language for the cultural health of their nations and students' overall well-being. Therefore, these Spanish classes focus on cultural connections between American and Latino cultures as the path to educational success (Carreira, 2007).

Educators have to decide what grammar uses should be focused on in the classroom and how HL acquire these forms (Carreira and Potowski, 2011). Teachers should have a good understanding of their students as bilingual individuals and not confuse a lack of metalinguistic knowledge with linguistic limitations. According to Montrul (2011), existing theories of L1 and L2 acquisition and bilingualism can be extended to make predictions about heritage language learners' grammar: what they do know and what they have not acquired completely.

Another question that arises among instructors is what dialect of Spanish should be the target language of instruction. According to many researchers, the home variety has to be taught since it is a cultural marker for the Spanish-speaking population in the US (Villa, 1996; Bernal-Enríquez & Hernández Chávez, 2003). The ideal curriculum would offer a heritage track where students could maintain their dialects while acquiring the academic one (Mrak, 2011). However, sometimes there is a struggle between the goals of instructors and students, while instructors want to introduce the standard register, the students may want to reunite with their dialect and culture (Benjamin, 1997).

These students have vocabulary limitations since their terminology is restricted to the domestic domain. Therefore, instructors should provide them with more spheres of use to amplify their knowledge (Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998; Fairclough & Mrak, 2003). Regarding morphology and syntax, students tend to use the most stigmatized forms (Hidalgo, 1997) so they need to compare these forms with the academic ones. Any teaching must be within current teaching approaches in Heritage Language Education, in an environment of additive bilingualism where the home variety is respected and maintained and the academic one is presented as an option for other registers (Mrak, 2011). By involving the students in this process of discovering new dialects this can become a liberating and empowering experience (Colombi, 2009). Instructors' positive attitudes towards students' home dialect will increase language acquisition and the promote the benefits of bilingualism (Tse, 1997). Therefore, instructors trained in linguistic variation are the most qualified to inform these students on the validity of their dialects and to help them extend their linguistic repertoires (Mrak, 2011).

It has been proposed that students' attitudes may be used as a starting point for class planning (Carreira, 2003). Carreira surveyed HLs and found that students associated the English language with employment opportunities and the Spanish language with their Latino identities (diglossia). By assessing students' attitudes, instructors can get feedback from students to be able to accomplish the following goals: to increase the chances for maintenance of the heritage language and reconnecting students with the heritage background. The results showed students have a high regard for the Spanish language, but they had a lack of confidence in their linguistic abilities and the validity of their dialect. Therefore, instructors should aim to create an environment of confidence and one that cultivates pride in their cultural and linguistic heritage.

Current approaches to teaching grammar

Traditional grammar presents rules with a focus on form while communicative approaches present grammar with a focus on meaning and form. Focus on form addresses the students' attention to grammar in communication. According to Long (2000), this approach is effective for teaching grammar because it is learner-centered. What is crucial is to integrate grammar and communication in effective ways. Form- focused instruction involves providing students with explicit grammar by an explanation, or negative evidence as corrective feedback (Sanz and Morgan-Short, 2004).

There are a host of grammatical techniques that are successful for both FLLs and HLLs. As previously addressed, some focus on form, and others focus on natural acquisition of grammar, and still others combine a focus on meaning and form. Since one of the main differences between L2 learners of Spanish and HLLs is the greater ability for HLLs to attend to meaning—it follows naturally that techniques that stress a focus on form will be of particular benefit. What follows are three techniques that can be utilized to explore grammar in the language classroom. These are particularly useful for HLLs, but they can also be utilized by teachers of FLs. These are three of the most important form-focused techniques in grammar instruction: processing instruction, input-output cycles and interactional feedback.

Processing Instruction

Processing Instruction is an input-based technique for grammar instruction. VanPatten is the originator of this approach (1996). The main principles of input processing are the following: 1) Learners process input for meaning before they do it for form. 2) Learners make form-meaning connections so that acquisition occurs (VanPatten, 1996, 2004).

Within this model, structured-input activities are designed to facilitate acquisition by helping input become intake. For example, a multiple-choice question-answer format to teach Spanish direct object pronouns when describing a photo of the relationship between members of a family. Students have to make the referent-pronoun correspondence in order to select the right answer. As Ertürk (2013) revises, learners are not asked to produce the target form during the instructional phase, but they process sentences and interpret them correctly at the same time they are attending to form.

VanPatten et al (2009), researched object pronouns and word order in Spanish using two techniques: processing instruction and dictogloss. They found that processing instruction is generally superior to dictogloss as an instructional technique for these target forms. However, Nassaji and Fotos (2011) note a few limitations: it can only address specific linguistic forms with clear form-meaning relationships and it does not make learners produce output. Lyster and Salto (2010) also caution that processing instruction only allows us to “notice” target forms, it does not necessarily develop certain metalinguistic awareness; students need to have opportunities to elaborate. Teachers may consider the combination of processing instruction with other output techniques such as output tasks or corrective feedback.

In terms of the heritage language classroom research, Potowski, Jegerski and Morgan-Short (2009) examined traditional and input processing techniques to assess L2 and heritage learners of Spanish in the acquisition of past subjunctive. They found improvements in comprehension, production and grammaticality judgments for both groups in both techniques but this technique seemed to be more beneficial for L2 learners since they achieved more gains.

Input and Output cycles

In addition to comprehensible input, comprehensible output is needed for fluency and accuracy. Izumi (2002) researched the noticing function of output of directing attention to form in order to acquire form and meaning in an integrated way. According to Swain (1985), when students are pushed to produce output, they notice the gaps in their ability to express what they want to express.. Input and Output cycles ensure purposeful inclusion of both input and output in the design of instruction.

Input and output cycles consist of activities in which students listen to a text and jot down words and try to reconstruct a text by focusing on form. In input and output cycles, output focuses on attention in carefully planned tasks (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000). Learners are pushed to produce output and compare it to input they previously received (they are exposed to the text again). This way, students are pushed towards paying attention to accuracy in order to convey meaning (Thornbury, 1997).

The basic format of this technique could be a text-reconstruction task or a guided-essay writing task. The reconstruction task seems to be more effective in helping learners to notice the gap when the target is a specific form. For example, 1. Input: Students listen twice to a story of the last trip of a fellow American college student to a Latin American country last summer. Meanwhile, they have to record the main ideas. 2. Output: Then, they have two to three minutes to write with a classmate what they remember of the story in chronological order. 3. Input: Afterwards, they listen to the story again. 4. Output: Finally, they have one more chance to revise and rewrite their reconstruction of the story.

Input and Output Cycling helps learners process input in an efficient way since it becomes an attention focusing device (Leeser, 2008). Pushed output affects learner's noticing of the target grammatical form on the subsequent input (Basterrechea et al. 2014). Re-exposure to input after production makes learners aware of the gaps in their learning.

To my knowledge, there are no studies for Spanish heritage learners using the input-output cycles grammar instruction technique. Future research could test this technique to obtain accurate results and compare the findings to the other two techniques presented in this article.

Interactional feedback

When a teacher provides corrective feedback during a meaningful conversation with a student, he or she is engaging in interactional feedback. Interactional feedback allows teachers to provide students with information about language production while focused on non-linguistic content that motivates them to use the target language (Lyster and Salto, 2010). This strategic provision of feedback is very effective but there are factors to be considered: feedback type, instructional setting, age and linguistic targets. Examples of common feedback are recasts (negative evidence by indicating the error), explicit correction or prompts (positive evidence by providing the correct form).

Table 1. Feedback types: Recasts and Prompts

Recasts: Negative evidence	Student: <i>Tengo una problema.</i> [I have a problem.] Instructor: ¿ <i>Una problema?</i> ¿ <i>Seguro?</i> [A problem? Are you sure?]
Prompts: Positive evidence	Student: <i>Tengo una problema.</i> [I have a problem.] Instructor: <i>51 ¡Ah!</i> ¿ <i>Un problema!</i> [Ah! A problem!]

Oliver (2000) found that younger learners benefited more from interactional feedback while older learners take more responsibility in their learning and consequently benefit from all kinds of feedback. Finally, Lyster and Salto (2010) claim that interactional feedback plays a key role in instructional input. It might work best when combined with other form-focused activities like explicit instruction (Lyster, 2004).

Montrul (2010) examined dative-marking in heritage learners using positive and negative evidence through explicit instruction, practice and corrective feedback. She found some focus on form was beneficial for heritage learners. Montrul and Bowles (2009) found that the omission of the dative marker could be due to the interference of English, or the lack of salience. This marker does not interfere with communication because of its limited communicative value. All these techniques are expected to be effective in the heritage classroom in the same way they are in the second language classroom. However, it appears that more metalinguistic awareness and explicit instruction might be beneficial for HL as stated earlier. Therefore, despite all the benefits of each technique, interactional feedback may be the most beneficial for HL..

Conclusion

Research on L2 grammar instruction found that several techniques with a focus on form have proven effective in the classroom. This article is an attempt to present an overview of three well-known grammar instruction techniques that may prove beneficial for L2 Spanish learners: processing instruction, input-output cycles and interactional feedback., Research has revealed positive findings regarding the integration of input processing instruction in the HL classroom. However, to my knowledge there are no studies of input-output cycles for HL. More research is needed to identify what techniques work best for HLs and how to integrate and implement input-output cycles in mixed classrooms of L2 and HLs.

References

- Alderson, J. C., Clapham, C., & Steel, D. (1997). Metalinguistic knowledge, language aptitude and language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, 1(2), 93-121.

- Anderson, T. (Ed.). (2008). *The theory and practice of online learning*. Athabasca, AB: Athabasca University Press.
- Au, T. K., Knightly, L. M., Jun, S. A., & Oh, J. S. (2002). Overhearing a language during childhood. *Psychological Science, 13*, 238–243.
- Au, T. K. F., Oh, J. S., Knightly, L. M., Jun, S. A., & Romo, L. F. (2008). Salvaging a childhood language. *Journal of memory and language, 58*(4), 998-1011.
- Basterrechea, M., Del Pilar Garcia Mayo, M., & Leeser, M. J. (2014). Pushed Output and Noticing in a Dictogloss: Task Implementation in the CLIL Classroom. *Porta Linguarum, 22*, 7-22.
- Benjamin, R. (1997). What do our students want? Some reflections on teaching Spanish as an academic subject to bilingual students. *ADFL BULLETIN, 29*, 44-47.
- Bernal-Enriquez, Y., & Hernandez-Chavez, E. (2003). La enseñanza del español en Nuevo Mexico: éRevitализación o erradicación de la variedad chicana? In Roca, A., & Colombi, M. C. (Eds.), *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States, research and practice*, 96-119. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: A literature review. *Language Awareness, 12* (2), 96-108.
- Cabo, D. P. Y., & Rothman, J. (2012). The (il)logical problem of heritage speaker bilingualism and incomplete acquisition. *Applied linguistics, 33*(4),450-455.
- Carr and Curran (1994). Cognitive factors in learning about structured sequences. *Studies in second language acquisition, 16*(2), 205-230.
- Carreira, M. (2003). Profiles of SNS students in the twenty-first century: Pedagogical implications of the changing demographics and social status of US Hispanics. In *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States*, A. Roca and M. C. Colombi (eds.), 51-77. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term “heritage language learner”. *Heritage Language Journal, 2*(1), 1-25.
- Carreira, M. (2007). Spanish-for-native-speaker matters: Narrowing the Latino achievement gap through Spanish language instruction. *Heritage Language Journal, 5*(1), 147-171.
- Carreira, M., & Potowski, K. (2011). Commentary: Pedagogical Implications of Experimental SNS Research. *Heritage Language Journal, 8*(1), 134-151.
- Colombi, M. C. (2009). A systemic functional approach to teaching Spanish for heritage speakers in the United States. *Linguistics and Education, 20*(1), 39-49.
- Correa, M. (2011). Advocating for critical pedagogical approaches to teaching Spanish as a heritage language: Some considerations. *Foreign Language Annals, 44*(2), 308-320.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Ellis, N. C. (2006). Selective attention and transfer phenomena in L2 acquisition: Contingency, cue competition, salience, interference, overshadowing, blocking, and perceptual learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 164-194.
- Ertürk, N. O. (2013). Effects of visually enhanced input, input processing and pushed output on grammar teaching. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, 20, 153-167.
- Fairclough, M. & Mrak, N. A. (2003). La enseñanza del español a los hispanohablantes bilingües y su efecto en la producción oral. In A. Roca & M. C. Colombi (Eds.), *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States*, (pp. 198-212). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Fernández, C. (2011). Approaches to grammar instruction in teaching materials: A study in current L2 beginning-level Spanish textbooks. *Hispania*, 94(1), 155-170.
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The “Grammar Correction” Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and here do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime...?). *Journal of second language writing*, 13(1), 49-62.
- Geeslin, K. L., & Long, A. Y. (2014). *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition: Learning to Use Language in Context*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Han, Y., & Ellis, R. (1998). Implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge and general language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(1), 1-23.
- Hawkins, R., & Towell, R. (1996). Why teach grammar. *Teaching grammar: Perspectives in higher education*. London: AFLS/CILT.
- Hedge, T. (2001). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom* (Vol. 106). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hidalgo, M. (1997). Criterios normativos e ideología lingüística: aceptación y rechazo del español de los Estados Unidos. In M. C. Colombi & F. X. Alarcón (Eds.), *La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes: Praxis y teoría* (pp. 109-120). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Izumi, S., Bigelow, M., Fujiwara, M., & Fearnow, S. (1999). Testing the output hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(3), 421-452.
- Izumi, S., & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does Output Promote Noticing and Second Language Acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 239-278.
- Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement and the noticing hypothesis: an experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 541-577.
- Jeffries, S. (1985). English grammar terminology as an obstacle to second language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 69(4), 385-390.
- Keating, G., VanPatten, B., & Jegerski, J. (2011). Who was Walking on the Beach? Anaphora Resolution in Monolingual Natives and Heritage Speakers of Spanish. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 33, 193-221.

- Kondo-Brown, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Heritage language development: focus on East Asian immigrants*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Krashen, S. (1998). Comprehensible output? *System*, 26(2), 175-182.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1992). Consensus and divergence on the content, role, and process of teaching grammar. In J. Alatis (ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1991: Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art* (pp. 260-72). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishing.
- Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen. Volume 1: Directions for Language Learning and Teaching*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Leeser, M. J. (2008). Pushed output, noticing, and development of past tense morphology in content-based instruction. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 65(2), 195-220.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 12(04), 429-448.
- Lipski, J. M. (1993). Y'all in American English: From black to white, from phrase to pronoun. *English world-wide*, 14(1), 23-56.
- Lynch, A. (2003). Toward a theory of heritage language acquisition. Spanish in the United States. In A. R. a. M. C. Colombi (Ed.). *Mi Lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States, research and practice*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Lynch, A. (2008). The linguistic similarities of Spanish heritage and second language learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(2), 252-381.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 26(03), 399-432.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Interactional feedback as instructional input: A synthesis of classroom SLA research. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition/Langage, Interaction et Acquisition*, 1(2), 276-297.
- Long, M. H. (2000). Acquisition and teaching. In Byram, M. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language teaching* (pp. 4-5). London: Routledge.
- Mikulski, A. M. (2006). Accentuating Rules and Relationships: Motivations, Attitudes, and Goals in a Spanish for Native Speakers Class. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(4), 660-682.
- Mitchell, R. (2000). Anniversary article. Applied linguistics and evidence-based classroom practice: the case of foreign language grammar pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 281-303.

- Montrul, S. (2002). Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense/aspect distinctions in adult bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 5(1), 39-68.
- Montrul, S. (2004). Subject and object expression in Spanish heritage speakers: A case of morpho-syntactic convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7(2), 125-142.
- Montrul, S. (2005). Second language acquisition and first language loss in adult early bilinguals: Exploring some differences and similarities. *Second Language Research*, 21(3), 199-249.
- Montrul, S. (2006). On the bilingual competence of Spanish heritage speakers: Syntax, lexical-semantics and processing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 10(1), 37-69.
- Montrul, S. (2007). Interpreting mood distinctions in Spanish as a heritage language. In K. Potowski & R. Cameron (eds.). *Spanish in Contact: Policy, Social and Linguistic Inquiries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 23-45.
- Montrul, S. (2008). *Incomplete acquisition in bilingualism: Re-examining the age factor* (Vol. 39). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Montrul, S. (2010). Current issues in heritage language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 3-23.
- Montrul, S. (2011). Multiple interfaces and incomplete acquisition. *Lingua*, 121(4), 591-604.
- Montrul, S., & Bowles, M. (2009). Back to basics: Incomplete knowledge of Differential Object Marking in Spanish heritage speakers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12(3), 363-383.
- Montrul, S., Foote, R., & Perpiñán, S. (2008). Gender agreement in adult second language learners and Spanish heritage speakers: The effects of age and context of acquisition. *Language Learning*, 58(3), 503-553.
- Montrul, S., Davidson, J., De La Fuente, I., & Foote, R. (2014). Early language experience facilitates the processing of gender agreement in Spanish heritage speakers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 17(1), 118-138.
- Mrak, N. A. (2011). Heritage speakers and the standard: Fighting linguistic hegemony. In *Selected Proceedings of the 13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 161-168).
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126-145.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. New York: Routledge.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language learning*, 50(3), 417-528.

- Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 119-151.
- Pérez-Llantada, M. C., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). New Trends in Grammar Teaching: Issues and Applications: An Interview with Prof. Diane Larsen-Freeman. *Atlantis*, 29(1), 157-163.
- Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 6(2), 186-214.
- Polinsky, M. (2007). Reaching the end point and stopping midway: different scenarios in the acquisition of Russian. *Russian Linguistics*, 31(2), 157-199.
- Potowski, K., & Carreira, M. (2004). Teacher development and national standards for Spanish as a heritage language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(3), 427-437.
- Potowski, K. (2005). *Fundamentos de la enseñanza del español a los hablantes nativos en los Estados Unidos*. Madrid, Arco Libros.
- Potowski, K., Jegerski, J., & Morgan-Short, K. (2009). The effects of instruction on linguistic development in Spanish heritage language speakers. *Language Learning*, 59(3), 537-579.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanz, C., & Morgan-Short, K. (2004). Positive evidence vs. explicit rule presentation and explicit negative feedback: A computer-assisted study. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 35-78.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (1992). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 13, 206-226.
- Schmidt, R., & Watanabe, Y. (2001). Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning. *Motivation and second language acquisition*, 23, 313-359.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S.M. and C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 165-179). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (1997). Reformulation and reconstruction: tasks that promote 'noticing'. *ELT Journal*, 51(4), 326-335.

- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for “The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Tse, L. (1997). A bilingual helping hand. *Los Angeles Times*, p.B7.
- Ur, P. (2008). *A course in language teaching*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Valdés, G. (1997). The teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speaking students: Outstanding issues and unanswered questions. In M. Colombi, F. X. Alarcon & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), *La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes: Praxis y teoría* (8-44). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- 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.
- Valdés, G. (2000). *Spanish for native speakers: AATSP professional development series handbook for teachers K-16* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Harcourt College Publishers.
- VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(1), 45-57.
- VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- VanPatten, B. (2003). *From input to output: A teacher's guide to second language acquisition*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- VanPatten, B. (Ed.). (2004). *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- VanPatten, B., Inclezan, D., Salazar, H., & Farley, A. P. (2009). Processing Instruction and Dictogloss: A Study on Object Pronouns and Word Order in Spanish. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42, 557-575.
- Villa, D. J. (1996). Choosing a “standard” variety of Spanish for the instruction of native Spanish speakers in the US. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(2), 191-200.

