Universidad de las Américas Puebla
Escuela de Artes y Humanidades
Departamento de Lenguas

Perspectives on Learning Spanish as a Heritage Language in Mexico: Four Chicana Case Studies

Tesis profesional presentada por
Tracy Rollins McLaughlin

Para obtener el grado en
Maestría en Lingüística Aplicada

Jurado Calificador

Vocal y Director: Dr. Patrick Henry Smith Ashmore
Sinodal: Mtra. Rebecca Ashley Withers Wallers
Sinodal: Dra. Virgina Belle LoCastro Hodgkinson

Cholula, Puebla, México a 14 de mayo de 2001.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my Lord Jesus Christ for always teaching, always providing and always supplying strength.

Thank you Darin, Dad, Mom and Papa Dos for your love and support through the telephone lines.

Thank you friends and family in the U.S. and Mexico for your cheers and prayers. Thank you to the Ramírez, Lere, and Galí families for providing calor familiar in Mexico.

Thank you Patrick, Virginia and Ashley for your suggestions and encouragement throughout the thesis process.

Thank you Fresno Rotary for helping to make my education in Mexico possible

Table of content

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 STUDY ABROAD IN MEXICO AS AN EXTENSION OF SPANISH HERITAGE LANGUAGE LEARNING

Heritage language learning is the study of the language of one's family heritage. A heritage language learner is a student who learns the language of his/her home or ethnic background. For example, third generation Chinese Americans who may only speak some Mandarin with their grandparents may study Mandarin as a heritage language in high school or college. Chicanos (Mexican-Americans) may have the opportunity to study Spanish, which they may speak at home with their parents, from elementary school to college. The previous illustrations give only two of the many types of heritage language learners (also referred to as background language learners or native language learners in this study) within the United States. Since language is associated with identity (Fishman, 1999; Giangreco, 2000; Liebkind, 1999; Pavelenko & Lantolf, 2000), one might seek to learn the language of one's home/background to further define oneself. This is the case of many Chicano students who choose to formally study Spanish as their heritage language. The Chicana university students in this study go one "valiant" step further than the U.S. classroom, seizing the opportunity to study in Mexico and to immerse themselves in the culture and language of their heritage.

Although Mexico is the land of their background, it is important to note that Chicanos and Mexican nationals are different culturally and linguistically. Culturally, Valdés (1996) defines Chicanos as those whose ties to Mexico are weakened, who live exclusively in the U.S, who are aware of discrimination against Mexican-origin people, and who identify themselves as Americans because they know they are unlike Mexican nationals. Linguistically, Chicanos tend to speak a variety of Spanish that has characteristics of rural Mexican Spanish. With these differences in language and culture, studying in Mexico can be a linguistic and cultural shock for

a Chicano student. A student who studied abroad in Mexico summarized his experience: "in the U.S., I have to prove that I'm American; now in Mexico, I have to prove I'm Mexican." (Manuel Hernández, personal communication, September, 2000). This study explores experiences like Manuel's and analyzes perspectives on the Spanish learning of Chicana students in Mexico.

The study is composed of a set of case studies of Chicana Spanish heritage language learners who decided to study abroad in Mexico for one term of their undergraduate college career. The study took place over the course of 10 weeks at the Universidad de las Américas-Puebla in Mexico. The Chicanas', Mexican peers' and professors' perspectives toward the Chicanas' Spanish learning in Mexico are the focus of the study, along with a description of the students' Spanish language features, and awareness of their Spanish skills and ethnic identity. The specific research questions are as follows:

a. What are the Chicana students' attitudes toward their Spanish skills over 10 weeks of study abroad in Mexico?

b. What are the Chicana students' perspectives on their Spanish language features, awareness of their Spanish variety and ethnic identity?

c. What are the Mexican professors' perspectives on their Chicana students and their Spanish learning?

d. What are the Mexican peers' perspectives on the Chicana students and their Spanish learning?

This study is organized into four chapters. Chapter 1 includes a review of the literature on the history of the Spanish language in the U.S., heritage language learners, the Chicano Spanish variety, attitudes towards language, and the connection between language and ethnic identity. It also mentions methodological precedents from the literature. Chapter 2 reviews the methodology used in the study, including participants' language background and their U.S.

university context and study abroad programs, and the Mexican university history and study abroad program. Chapter 2 also discusses the study instruments and procedures. Chapter 3 reports on the results from the instruments and procedures in chapter 2. Finally, chapter 4 discusses themes, conclusions, and implications gleaned from a cross-case analysis of the results in chapter 3.

1. 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Section 1.2.1 of the literature review looks at the history of the Spanish language and treatment of its speakers in the United States. Section 1.2.2 reviews characteristics of heritage language learners and their language classes, and section 1.2.3 looks specifically at Spanish heritage language learners and their sociolinguistic experience. Section 1.2.4 examines studies on language acquisition in the study abroad context. Section 1.2.5 discusses theoretical perspectives, and sections 1.2.6 establishes methodological precedents for the case studies.

1.2.1 THE HISTORY OF THE SPANISH LANGUAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Emigration to another land involves taking one's language to the new place. Valdés (1995) discusses immigrants as “language minorities.” The immigrants are labeled language minorities because their language is either the language spoken by few people, and/or is not the official language in the new land. This is the current situation in parts of North America, with French and Spanish as minority languages in Canada and the United States, respectively. Churchill (as cited in Valdés, 1995) divides minority language speakers into three categories: indigenous people (such as U.S. Native Americans), established minorities (such as Chicanos in the U. S.), or new minorities (such as recent Mexican immigrants to the U. S.). Majority language populations have often dealt with minority languages by ignoring them and expecting the newly immigrated or colonized indigenous people to assimilate culturally and linguistically

on their own. When this does not happen, governments may develop education systems with goals to assimilate the minority language populations. Historically, the United States has dealt with their Spanish-speaking minority in such a manner (Sánchez, 1997).

Spanish has been an established minority language for over half of the United States' independent history. When the U.S. gained Mexico's northern territory (today's states of California, New Mexico, and Texas) through the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and Arizona in the Gadsen purchase in 1857, it also gained new Spanish-speaking citizens.

Sánchez (1997) recounts why the U.S. government was not concerned with the new minority (formerly the majority in Mexican territory) language population until the early 1900's. The Spanish speakers were isolated and had an agrarian economy, while the East Coast of the United States enjoyed integration and economic and industrial prosperity. Due to geographic separation and the infrequent economic interactions when the Southwest received materials from the East Coast, there was little contact between the two areas and therefore little need for the Spanish speakers to learn English, and vice versa.

The U.S. government was generally not concerned about the health, education, economy or politics of its Southwest Spanish speaking citizens until the early 1900s. Additionally, public schools were not widely available to anyone in the Southwest during this time. However, World War I, Roosevelt's New Deal, and World War II brought economic boosts to the Southwest and required military service of its young men. These circumstances created more contact and unity between Spanish speakers and the rest of the country. Although increased contact helped to linguistically integrate the already existing Spanish speakers into the country, there remained the constant flow of "new minority" Mexicans into the United States, which supported the continued use of Spanish in the Southwest. To summarize Sánchez (1997), the United States

showed little regard for their Spanish-speaking citizens until the country needed military forces. Only then did the U.S. concern itself with the Spanish- speaking minority of the Southwest.

In the 1940's, the move to involve Spanish minority language speakers in the majority political system and economy lead to top-down education planning with an emphasis on acculturation for Spanish speakers in the Southwest, not to mention all non-English speakers across the United States. Bilingual education using Spanish as a resource to teach English was the result. The idea of acculturation through the minority language demonstrates a language ideology that views the minority language as less because it is only a temporary aid towards speaking the more prestigious, majority language. The language ideology just described is "structural functionalism," according to Rippberger (1993).

The 1960's saw a shift in ideology from thinking solely about the interest of the majority population in educating language minorities to considering the needs of Spanish speaking minority students themselves. In 1968, the Bilingual Education Act obligated schools to meet the needs of their minority language students. Educational planning and policy still came from the dominant U.S. culture, however. Rippberger (1993) described this ideology as "conflict theory" which recognizes the minority language as useful, but still as a subordinate language.

Throughout the 1970's and 1980's, educators searched for better methods to teach minority language speakers. U.S. school boards asked for native Spanish speaker parents' and educators' input and involvement in the language education planning process, and more bottom-up policy was created as comparted to earlier education planning. Higher education research commenced study on better ways to educate minority language speakers in their home and school languages as compared to decades before. As a result, heritage language learning programs (discussed in section 1.2.2) were developed. During this time and up to the present, minority language

speakers have been involved in the development of such programs. According to Rippberger (1993), this is called "interpretive theory," an ideology that recognizes, puts value on, and incorporates the minority language and its speakers in the social environment.

Despite the shift in ideology in the United States, Chicanos continue to experience a language ideology that considers the language minority's needs, but does not incorporate language minority perspectives, and/or an ideology that does not support or respect their language.

1.2.2 *HERITAGE LANGUAGE LEARNERS*

As discussed in section 1.2.1, the 1960's was a time when educators realized they needed new methods to educate minority language speakers as the old methods were not developing language skills as hoped (National Education Association [NEA], 1966; Spolsky, 2000). And in the 1970's and 1980's, bottom-up policy planning included language minority speakers themselves in designing curriculum for language minority speakers, or heritage language learners.

Thus began the discovery of heritage language learner (HLL) characteristics and search for programs and pedagogy to teach HLL. The HLLs bring more language knowledge to the foreign language classroom as compared to their non-native speaking counterparts. Although language skill levels vary for HLL students (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Hidalgo, 1993; Scalera, 2000; Valdés, 1995), they usually speak an informal variety of their heritage language (Feliciano, 1981) and have low literacy skills in their native language. Students' language variety is often stigmatized, which creates low self-esteem regarding their native language (Mercado, 2000). Due to this aural/oral knowledge and lack of reading/writing skill development, heritage

language learners have different needs, and therefore, require distinct language instruction (Feliciano, 1981; Hidalgo, 1993; Valdés, 2000).

Foreign language teachers often teach heritage language learners as they would any other language learner in a traditional, grammar-based curriculum. In Draper & Hicks' (2000) review of HLL research and instruction, and Scalera's (2000) recount of her first HLL classroom experience with secondary students in New York, they explained that foreign language teachers tend to become frustrated as their native speakers do not seem to perform well within a traditional curriculum. Gonzalez-Berry (1981) created a syllabus for university Spanish HLL students, keeping in mind that native speaking students are often bored and unchallenged when taught in such a grammar-based way. Scalera's (2000) students performed poorly on her grammar-based tests and homework. It was then she realized her students needed alternative instruction, and she needed to develop an alternative way of viewing teaching heritage language learners. Scalera's experience, representative of many others, demonstrates that teachers' beliefs and goals, curriculum design, and instruction and assessment require a change from traditional foreign language teaching to the unique teaching of heritage language learners.

Effective heritage language teachers have been described as coaches who are knowledgeable about the language variety of their HLL students (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Gonzalez-Berry, 1981; Scalera, 2000; Webb & Miller, 2000). At the same time Scalera (2000) sensed her HLL students were not responding well to what she thought they should know (i.e.: spelling), she began to understand the value of being a language coach in the classroom and she listened to students identify their needs and desires. She commented:

> to be successful as a heritage language teacher, one must first help his or her students perceive their heritage language skill as assets, recognize what they already know, and provide a forum for each student to fill his or her own gaps in usage. (p. 81)

Teachers are encouraged to understand the linguistic, motivational, academic, cultural, emotional, and societal background of the students. An excellent framework of questions to learn about HLL students is given in Webb & Miller (2000, p. 48-54), a collection of educators' writings about their experiences and research with HLL. The framework, along with other research (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Gonzalez-Berry, 1981), suggests teachers understand the social ramifications of the variety the learners bring with them to the language classroom. Hidalgo (1993) reminds teachers that correcting the language that their family members use might be hard on heritage language learners. To summarize, the teacher of the heritage language is not the sole giver of language knowledge, as is often the case in a regular language classroom; rather, he/she is a coach and facilitator between what students already know and what they desire to learn.

Clear goals and curriculum design are pertinent to teach heritage language classes. However, there are no HLL teaching standards nor "clear educational policy than can guide the goals of language instruction for heritage-language-speaking students in the light of the current and future economic and social goals" (Valdés, 2000, p. 242). Notwithstanding, through research and praxis, some guidelines have been developed. Valdés (1995), in her discussions of Spanish heritage language learners in particular, suggests four areas or instruction which can be applied to heritage language learners in general: 1) language maintenance, 2) the acquisition of the prestige variety of language, 3) bilingual vocabulary expansion and 4) the transfer of literacy skills. In their discussion of language standards and assessment, Mercado (2000) and Giacone (2000) suggest that expectations should be high while sensitive in addressing the four goals.

Care should be taken to maintain the students' language variety while teaching the prestige variety, numbers 1 and 2 of Valdés' four areas. Language maintenance should include

sensitivity toward the students' language variety and no attempt to "replace" it (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Gonzalez-Berry, 1981; Hidalgo, 1993; Orrantia, 1981; Valdés 1995). The prestige variety should be considered an addition to the HLL's language repertoire. Another addition to language knowledge should be a sociolinguistic awareness that allows students to distinguish between prestige and non-prestige varieties as well as when to use each appropriately (Draper & Hicks, 2000).

Bilingual vocabulary expansion and the transfer of literacy skills (goals 3 and 4) include instruction not unlike an English language arts curriculum that offers literacy development through literature. Heritage language learning is unlike learning a foreign language because students already have highly developed communication skills; what they likely do not have is developed literacy or vocabulary in the heritage language. Thus, literacy should be developed in the HLL. However, Draper & Hicks (2000) and Hidalgo (1993) warn against lofty goals of bringing the heritage literacy level to meet the English literacy level. To fully develop literacy skills in both languages, they argue, heritage language instruction should commence in elementary school. Nonetheless, it is possible to make literacy advancements at a later point in education.

To make such advancements, the HLL curriculum should challenge students with rich literature and writing practice as would be proposed in a language arts curriculum for native speakers. The literature should be pertinent to and of interest to the students, at the same time heightening students' cultural awareness (Feliciciano, 1981; Giacone, 2000; Merino, Trueba, Samaniego, 1993; Scalera, 2000; Stovall, 1981). In Feliciano's (1981) HLL syllabus design for Puerto Rican university students and Stovall's (1981) HLL syllabus design for native Spanish speaker university students in San Antonio, Texas, they created syllabi that did not give explicit

grammar instruction a high priority in literacy transfer. Rather, as Scalera (2000) found, students will likely recognize and inquire about grammar points while involved with rich literacy instruction. Students should leave with a "deep and lasting understanding" and an increase in vocabulary from a language arts focused curriculum.

Heritage language teaching and assessment ideas will be reviewed from the research (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Feliciano, 1981; Gonzalez-Berry, 1981; McCallister, 2000; Mercado, 2000; Orrantia, 1981; Stovall, 1981). Teachers are challenged to instruct to the varying language abilities of heritage language learners. Suggestions include organizing a variety of class groupings and teacher-student interactions (Draper & Hicks, 2000; McCallister, 2000), allowing students to read self-selected literature (McCallister, 2000; Scalera, 2000), designing individual work packets (Feliciano, 1981), and creating specific goals for learning, as proposed in Orrantia's (1981) syllabus design for mostly Puerto Rican college students. Heritage language classes can be given in a series, with each section or semester concentrating on a specific skill (Orrantia, 1981; Stanford University, 2000a).

Assessment ideas for HLL classes include pre, during, and post assessment. Pre-tests accompanied by an interview to assess student background and language abilities have been used to place students in appropriate classes (Feliciano, 1981; Mercado, 2000; Stovall, 1981). Throughout the semester, students' attitudes, behavior, and performance should be constantly assessed so the teacher may hold students accountable to behavior and learning standards (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Mercado, 2000). Mercado (2000) suggested providing socioaffective support to help students control their emotions during their language experience. Post assessments include reviewing and grading assignments and tests students have gathered in a portfolio over the semester (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Mercado, 2000). Although the previous

methods may be used in any foreign language classroom, HLL classrooms should accommodate to a wide range of language skills and focus on HLL backgrounds and cultural interests.

As the research has shown, heritage language learner classrooms are special places where learners' language is further defined and refined by being exposed to the prestige variety, rich literature, and dynamic language instruction. Teachers have a responsibility to know their HLL students' sociolinguistic and affective needs. However, heritage language learners have the most important role: taking the initiative to maintain and expand his or her first language (Draper & Hicks, 2000). Hidalgo (1993) suggests that not all learners will have such motivation to add to their native language. After all, it is students' "effort, not aptitude, that determines success" (Giacone, 2000, p. 109).

1.2.3 SPANISH HERITAGE LANGUAGE LEARNERS

1.2.3.1 SPANISH HERITAGE LANGUAGE LEARNER PROGRAMS

Spanish heritage language learner (SHLL) programs make up the majority of the background language programs in the United States. One can find Spanish heritage language programs at the elementary, junior high, high school and university levels. Merino, Trueba, & Samaniego (1993) discuss three main types of programs in the United States. First, there is transitional bilingual education where both English and Spanish are used in instruction, with Spanish eventually phased out by the third grade and at most by the sixth grade. Second, a two-way bilingual program uses both languages in instruction time to teach native and non-native speakers. Third, mother tongue instruction is provided to Spanish speakers only. The latter program is not common in either primary or secondary levels.

Most elementary programs are transitional bilingual. Fewer bilingual programs can be found at the middle school level. Students may be offered a Spanish language course, and at

most one content course in Spanish. A 1997 survey given by the Center for Applied Linguistics showed that only 7% of U.S. secondary schools offer heritage language courses (Draper & Hicks, 2000), most of them in Spanish. More often than not, native Spanish speaking students must enroll in Spanish language courses with non-native Spanish speakers, who are likely to have a low speaking ability, but good grammatical knowledge.

Students have limited opportunities to study their background language at the university level. In 1997, only 22.2% of all U.S. universities had developed language programs for SHLL (Brod & Huber, as cited in Valdés, 2000). Valdés (1995) further explains that teaching native Spanish speakers may provide a challenge for the university Spanish professor. SHHL often come to the university with a high level of fluency in spoken Spanish, but with low levels of proficiency in Spanish reading and writing (Hernández Pérez, 1997; Marrone, 1981; Teschner, 1981; Valdés 1995). In Hernández Pérez's (1997) study of university SHLL, participants reported feeling that Spanish writing was their weakest skill. Also, students' spoken Spanish variety might be stigmatized because it shares some of the same linguistic features as rural Mexican or Puerto Rican Spanish. To make matters more complicated, professors must teach to a variety of Spanish skill levels and varieties of Spanish in one classroom.

1.2.3.2 *CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHICANO VARIETY OF SPANISH*

This section begins with a description of the Spanish of Chicano SHLL, what I will call Chicano Spanish, and the origins and experiences of its speakers. Chicano Spanish has linguistic characteristics similar to rural Mexican Spanish, but with a limited Spanish vocabulary repertoire and influence from English. Then, attitudes toward Chicano Spanish will be described in both the United States and Mexican contexts.

The United States' closest Spanish-speaking neighbor is Mexico, to which the highest percentage of non-European U.S. Americans trace their origin. Chicanos (Mexican-Americans) make up 65% of the 32 million Hispanics in the United States. Because Chicanos can trace their cultural and linguistic roots to Mexico, their Spanish is most similar to Mexican Spanish (Hidalgo, 1987; Sánchez, 1983). The speakers have been described as using a rural variety of Mexican Spanish (Hidalgo, 1987; Sánchez, 1981, 1983, 1993; Teschner, 1981; Valdés, 1988), which is characterized by distinctive vocabulary, archaic terms, irregular verb forms, aspiration of labiodental fricatives, and epenthesis and metathesis. An archaic term as well as an example of epenthesis (adding an extra sound in the middle of the word) is "*muncho*," (standard is "*mucho*" ("much") which can be traced to Spanish literature from the 16th century (Sánchez, 1981). One may hear this word in both the Chicano home in the U.S. and the small, rural town in Mexico. Adding an extra *–s* to the standard second person singular verb, as in "*fuiste*" ("you went") to make "*fuistes*" is an irregular verb form commonly found in both Chicano Spanish and rural Mexican Spanish (Hidalgo, 1987, 1993; Sánchez, 1981, 1993; Valdés, 1988).

While Chicano Spanish is most similar to rural Mexican Spanish, there are two characteristics that distinguis these Spanish varieties. The first difference is the limited Spanish vocabulary repertoire of many Chicano speakers (Valdés, 1988). Although Spanish skills vary greatly, first exposure to Spanish usually takes place in the home during the preschool years for Chicano children. Then they enroll in the U.S. school system where, though Spanish may be supported, English is the language of instruction and learning. The home remains one of the few places to develop their Spanish and, therefore, Chicano Spanish speakers tend to have a lexicon limited to the home and informal contexts (Hidalgo, 1993; Sánchez, 1993; Solé, 1981).

Two studies illustrate the tendency of Chicanos to have a limited Spanish lexicon. Galindo (1995) interviewed thirty teen-aged Chicanos from two communities in Austin, Texas who related that most of their Spanish was spoken in the home. They spoke English or a mix of Spanish and English in other domains such as school and with friends. In a second study Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci (1998) compared the oral academic Spanish register of ten Chicano students at an elite U.S. university with that of seven Mexican students at the Universidad Autonoma de Ciudad Juárez. Both groups of students were first generation college-goers and about the same age. The researchers found that, although both groups of students had developing academic Spanish registers, the Chicanos lacked appropriate fillers and some Spanish terminology that the Mexicans employed. For example, the Mexican college students used more phrases like "*como mencionaba"* ("as was mentioned") or "*particularmente"* ("particularly") to cover pauses and connect statements. University Chicanos had a smaller Spanish repertoire by which to express their ideas in Spanish (Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998). Hernández-Chavez (1993) labels the smaller repertoire a "lexical gap," meaning there is a gap in the Chicano students' Spanish academic vocabulary. Sánchez (1993) further explained that "unfortunately, the academic terms that we learn, whether to discuss government, politics, technology, literature, scientific topics or even cultural subjects, are generally in English" (p. 79).

Inserting English words in spoken discourse is a common strategy to express not only a word that is missing from their Spanish lexicon, but also to use adequate language to describe the surroundings (ie., Chicanos living in the U.S. culture (Smead, 1998)). This brings up the second difference between Chicano Spanish and rural Mexican Spanish: English. Valdés (1988) described three ways in which English has had an influence on Chicano Spanish and Smead (1998) added a fourth. First, there is the semantic extension, where the meaning of the Spanish

word is extended to the English word concept. Valdés gave the example of the Spanish equivalent. In Mexican Spanish it means a maid or housekeeper who takes care of the children. In Chicano Spanish, it has come to mean "babysitter," a U.S. concept that does not have an exact Spanish word to match it. Second, there are “borrowings,” or what Smead describes as “loanwords,” which are English words with Spanish morphemes and pronunciation. For example, the English word "sweater" is pronounced as "*suera*" in Chicano Spanish. A borrowing is a typical characteristic of a language in contact with another (Draper & Hicks, 2000).

Third, code-switching, or what Smead labels as lexical switches, is when one uses the English word and pronunciation instead of a Spanish word and/or pronunciation. English use in Chicano Spanish speech is common, and it is the individual speaker’s decision, given the social circumstances, whether to code switch to English or use words influenced by English. Changing languages has been found to be a purposeful, social phenomena (Gardner-Chloros, 1997; Liebkind, 1999; Smead, 1998). Code-switching to English is not a sign of the lack of complete knowledge of Spanish or English as some believe; rather, it often represents the natural phenomena of languages in contact. However, a lexical gap in some Spanish HLL (i.e., formal Spanish) indeed necessitates a switch to English. Smead adds a fourth category, the phrasal calque, which is a direct translation of a phrase from English to Spanish. For example, the Chicano Spanish phrase “*venir para trás*” is a literal translation of “come (*venir*) back (*para trás*)” in English. Users of standard Spanish would say “*regresar*” (return, come back).

To summarize, Chicano Spanish has been found to be similar to rural Mexican Spanish, to have a Spanish lexicon limited to the home domain, and to be influenced by the English language. These combined characteristics have social consequences that result in attitudes

toward Chicano Spanish by Chicanos themselves and Mexican nationals in general, as will be discussed below.

1.2.3.3 PERSPECTIVES ON CHICANO SPANISH

Perspectives toward Chicano Spanish will be discussed from the standpoint of the United States environment and of the Chicanos in the Southwest and of Mexico. In the 16th century, the Spaniards brought their language to what is now the Southwestern United States, and today one still hears Spanish spoken throughout the region. The almost 500 years of Spanish maintenance is a result of various factors subsequent to Spanish colonization. Sánchez (1983) attributes Spanish maintenance (after the 1848 U.S. takeover of one-half of Mexico's land) to constant immigration from Mexico, ethnic segregation of neighborhoods and workforce, and racism. Valdés (1988, p. 113) explains Spanish maintenance resulting from the "density of the population; the number of short-term, cyclical, and long-term immigrants; the history of the community; the relationship between the Mexican-American community and Anglo populations; and the proximity of the community to the Mexican border." Hidalgo (1993) adds that Spanish speakers have also maintained their language for interpersonal reasons.

Today, Spanish and English coexist in the Southwest and occupy different language registers. A register is the preferred variation of language used within a given context and language condition (Romaine, 1994). For Chicano Spanish speakers, Spanish is often used for interpersonal communication in the home context, a "low" register. Conversely, English is often used for discourse in academic contexts, which are classified in the "middle" and "high" registers. The fact that English tends towards the middle and high registers and Spanish tends towards the low register makes the Southwest a diglossic environment. Diglossia is where there is a high language and a low language, which possess high and low prestige respectively; it is a

common phenomena in societies throughout the world (Ferguson, 1959). For most minority language speakers in the U.S., the environment is diglossic because they cannot speak about all topics in their ethnic language (Fishman, 1999). In the case of the Southwest, English is a high, prestigious language and Spanish tends to be a low, non-prestigious language.

As a consequence of low prestige, Chicano Spanish is also stigmatized (Hidalgo, 1997; Sánchez, 1993). This stigmatization is the result of the sociopolitical environment especially in the Southwestern United States. Hernández-Chavez (1993) discusses the existence of xenophobia as represented in the development of English-only language policies since the late 1800's, and the anti-immigrant policies since the early twentieth century. In a discussion of language policy in the United States, Bourhis & Marshall (2000) explain that in the U.S. "the prevailing attitude was that patriotism demanded assimilation, and assimilation was signaled by the sole use of English" (p. 248). In this environment, minority languages, including Spanish, were seen as irrelevant in education (Fishman, 1999). Classrooms and schoolyards in Texas and other states prohibited their native Spanish speakers from speaking Spanish. During that time "many school children, experiencing embarrassment and shame in their desire to be accepted, reject the use of their native language and even deny their ethnicity" (Hernández-Chavez, 1993, p. 65). This sentiment mirrors the feelings that many Chicano students feel today within an environment that still gives little prestige to their heritage language.

At the university level, it is not uncommon for Chicano students to encounter expectations to produce academic Spanish. However, as Valdés & Geoffrin-Vinci (1998) discussed in their study on the academic register of Chicano Spanish speakers, students are often uneducated or unaware of academic Spanish. Spanish language professors have been found to lack respect for non-standard language varieties and to have negative attitudes toward the use of

Chicano Spanish in particular (Hidalgo, 1993; Marrone, 1981; Sánchez, 1981). This contributes to an environment of linguistic insecurity for the Chicano Spanish heritage language learner. Researchers report that Chicanos often feel their Spanish is inferior to that of the standard variety taught in the university classroom (Marrone, 1981; Sanchez, 1983; Teschner, 1981; Valdés, 1995). Valdés asserts that students are sometimes "confused and, on occasion, even ashamed about the lexical selections that they have acquired in their home or community" (1995, p. 118). Sánchez (1983) reported that a Chicana student from New Mexico admitted that she could no longer function within a Spanish-speaking context and was uncomfortable with her Spanish. Due to these types of experiences combined with the special linguistic needs to further develop their Spanish, there is a push to create Spanish heritage language courses for Chicanos seeking to improve their Spanish language skills (see section 1.2.2 for more on heritage language classes).

In the United States Chicano Spanish is perceived as low, irrelevant and a language with little prestige. The school system characteristically has not given value to Chicano Spanish from elementary to the university levels. As a result, Chicanos may understandably be self-conscious about their language. The following section presents studies about Chicano attitudes that are associated with a variety of factors, the greatest being with Chicano identity.

Chicano attitudes toward their Spanish correlate with gender, family decisions, view of correct Spanish, and the need for interpersonal communication. First, gender appears to influence attitudes toward Chicano Spanish in that women have been found to have a more affective and positive attitude toward their Spanish dialect. Galindo (1995) found that the female teen-agers in her study had more positive attitudes and stronger language loyalty to Spanish than their male counterparts. In a quantitative study including Chicano professionals and university students in the Rio Grande Basin in Texas, Mejías & Anderson (1988) found women to have

more sentimental attachment to Chicano Spanish than men, who had a more instrumental attachment than women.

Second, attitudes tend to be developed within one's family. Often, Chicano parents were punished for speaking Spanish in schools while growing up, so they did not want their children to experience the same and did not emphasize the learning of Spanish in the home (Galindo, 1995; NEA 1966). Children were told that speaking their home language was bad, which sometimes caused them to reject their own Spanish. This engrained negativity not only prevented the earlier generation from speaking Spanish, but also created a fear of discrimination against their Spanish-speaking children. Thus, Spanish was not passed down to following generations in some families.

Third, Chicano Spanish is pertinent to interpersonal communication. Mejías & Anderson (1988) looked at attitudes toward Chicano Spanish across gender, age and generation in almost 300 Mexican-American professionals and university students. Participants overwhelmingly felt their Spanish was highly useful in interpersonal communication. In Barker's (1975) study of language and social structure in the Mexican-American community in Tucson, Arizona, a city 60 miles from the U.S.-Mexico border, he found that the use of the variety of Spanish in interpersonal communication was necessary for solidarity within the socialeconomic groups in the community. Chicano Spanish was used in family and intimate relationships and other informal relations.

Fourth, Chicanos seem to be aware of standard Spanish, which may create a feeling of inferiority about their own Spanish dialect. Chicanos feel that correct Spanish is the standard variety that comes from Mexico (Barker, 1975; Galindo, 1996). In Barker's (1975) 6-month observation of Spanish use across Chicano social groups in Arizona, he observed that the

residents seem conscious of the dialectal differences between their Southern Arizona Spanish (also considered Chicano Spanish) and standard Spanish forms. “Conscious of ‘errors,’ they seek to substitute standard Spanish forms wherever possible” (Barker, 1975, p. 179) when communicating with Mexican nationals or those in the community who speak standard Spanish. They felt their Spanish variety forms to be less correct, hence the accommodation toward the standard Spanish. When asked what Spanish was the most correct and formal, the ten Chicana university women in Galindo’s (1996) study felt that it comes from Mexico City and Nuevo Laredo (the Mexican side of Laredo, Texas). They described their Chicano Spanish as a combination of English and Spanish, and acknowledged that it was not positively perceived. Some signaled self-confidence while others talked about their linguistic insecurity and expressed self-criticism regarding their Spanish variety.

Although Chicano Spanish, which includes Spanish-English code-switching, may be perceived as less prestigious by Chicanos themselves, it is strongly connected to their identity as Americans of Mexican heritage. Chicano Spanish is an identity marker vis-à-vis monolingual English speakers of the United States and monolingual Spanish speakers across the border in Mexico. Chicano Spanish fulfills the need for self-expression and a separate identity from the Anglo-American, and the English features separated them from Mexicans speakers (Galindo,1995, 1996; Hidalgo, 1993, 1997).

> The homogeneity that often exists in the physical attributes of both Chicanos and Mexicans motivates individuals to search for other discriminating means of establishing a unique identity and eventual segregation from the out-group. Language facilitates separation of one group from the other. (Galindo, 1995, p. 97)

Hernández-Chavez (1993, p. 66) writes language “encodes the customs and traditions of ethnicity.”

On the other side of the border, Mexicans also show attitudes toward Chicano Spanish, especially related to their perspectives and expectations of the Chicanos. There is a general belief that as masses of Mexicans emigrate north of the U.S.-Mexico border, the border-crossing process is degrading and "involves not only economic exploitation but also the loss of the national language and cultural values" (Hidalgo, 1986, p. 210). In general, Mexicans do not seem to be very sympathetic to their emigrant compatriots.

For example, one Mexican professor who participated in the pilot study expressed her sentiments about Chicano students who study at her Mexican university :

> *Que finalmente no son Mexicanos . . .hay una idea especial para los Chicanos, sobre todo en el Norte. 'Pues es este día que te fuiste, te volviste norteamericano, lo cual quiere decir que eres norteamericano . . . no?" Ya son Chicanos . . . ellos también lo demuestran: "Soy Méxicano porque me gustan las tortillas, me interesa lo méxicano; pero mis impuestos están allá; pero critico todos los defectos de los Mexicanos."* (Evelin Jacob, personal communication, November 28, 2000)
>
> (That after all they are not Mexicans . . . there is a special idea about the Chicanos, especially in the North [of Mexico]. "Well, the day that you left, you turned American, which means you are American . . . right?" They are already Chicanos . . . they also show it: "I am Mexican because I like tortillas, I like what is mexican; *but*, my taxes are there; *but* I criticize all the defects of the Mexicans.")

The professor's perception of her Chicano students was that they are not Mexicans and when they travel south to study in Mexico, they are there to "*buscar algo*" (look for something), meaning their Mexican roots. Therefore, her perception of their search for their roots creates her expectation that the Chicano students will need extra psychological support, which she tries to give them.

In a study that took place in Guanajuato, Mexico, Riegelhaupt and Carrasco (in press) found that an upper middle class family had linguistic expectations of their Chicana teacher homestay guest that, when not fulfilled, resulted in negative attitudes on the part of the Mexican

nationals. They demonstrated harsh reactions toward the Chicano Spanish of their Chicana homestay guest. The family expressed negative attitudes and was shocked that a teacher, educated at a U.S. university, would speak what they considered to be a "rural, uneducated" variety of Spanish. Riegelhaupt and Carrasco developed an expectations paradigm that illustrates the Mexican hosts' concept of their Chicana guest:

> If you are a "Mexican-American, Chicano, Latino, Hispano" university student or professional born or raised in the United States: 1) your Spanish language should reflect that of an educated person (i.e., standard-like Spanish is expected), and 2) social and cultural knowledge (etiquette, knowing how to behave appropriately in social settings, etc.) is also expected. (in press)

Mexican attitudes toward Chicano Spanish have their root in Mexicans' perceptions of Chicanos, which in turn create expectations of the Chicanos. This study will further explore this point.

1.2.4 LANGUAGE LEARNING IN A STUDY ABROAD CONTEXT

Much has been written about the language experience of heritage language learners in United States classrooms (Hernández-Chavez,1993; Valdés,1995; Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci,1998) and perceptions of Chicano Spanish within the United States. However, little is known about the Chicano language experience (language acquisition, language attitudes, identity) during study abroad programs. Study abroad is the term found in the literature to describe the experience of 1% of American university students that study for a semester or more in a different country each year when they study (Freed, 1998b). The study abroad setting provides a different target language encounter from that of the foreign language classroom or the heritage language classroom. Advocates of the study abroad experience, which usually entails language immersion complemented with in-class instruction, believe that one who studies abroad in the target language will dramatically improve one's language skills (Freed, 1995, 1998a; Pellegrino, 1998; Wilkinsin, 1998).

The study abroad research takes into account the plethora of variables influencing and resulting from the study abroad experience. In his review of methodology in study abroad research, Huebner (1998) recommends considering student age, aptitude, gender, motivation, previous language learning experience and learning strategies when discussing differences in language acquisition during study abroad. Further, in a longitudinal study of U.S. students of Russian studying in Russia, Brecht & Robinson (1995) discovered variables such as level of pre-departure language training (especially reading and grammar skills), age, and previous immersion in another country to be predictors of language success.

Along with the factors influencing linguistic progress as stated above, Pellegrino (1998) mentions, in her review of articles that portray student perspectives on study abroad, that students' perceptions have an influence on their individual experiences. Students bring their own theories about how languages should be learned which can help or hinder learning. Brecht and Robinson (1995) studied journal reflections on in-class and out-of-class experiences of students studying Russian. Their mixed opinions of each setting's usefulness showed that their perceptions influenced their attitudes and motivation toward in-class and out-of-class experiences. Pellegrino (1998) and Wilkinson (1998) agree that perceptions of interactions with native speakers of the target language bring up social, cultural, and conceptual issues that hinder or help interaction.

Wilkinson's (1998) case studies of two American college students' four-week study in France are examples of the great variation among individual study abroad encounters. Wilkinson sensed that Molise and Ashley, the two U.S. college student case studies, appeared to have a similar language level and openness to culture and language before their study in the same program. However, during their time abroad, Molise showed evidence of more openness than

Ashley, who turned to spending time with friends from the United States after having difficult relationships with the French. Due to Molise's comfort with her study abroad family, she learned and used French often. On the other hand, Ashley reported speaking "maybe three sentences a day in French with my family" (Wilkinson, 1998, p. 133). The differences in relationships and openness during their study abroad affected the students' language practice. This study shows that, even with similar backgrounds, two people can have dissimilar study abroad experiences with the language. Wilkinson proposes that it is nearly impossible to generalize from one study abroad experience to another.

Although the linguistic gains made during each study abroad experience varies, studies have discussed general themes of progress towards native-like speech. Native-like speech features include a high rate of speech and quantity of words, fluency and fewer mistakes (Freed, 1998a). Due to the nature of study abroad settings, where students are surrounded by speakers of the target language, many opportunities arise to use the target language, and it is no surprise that studying abroad generally provides more opportunities for fluency development (Freed, 1995). In Regan's (1998) review of sociolinguistic features in the study abroad research, she affirms despite movement toward native-like speech, study abroad does not seem to result in complete native speaker competence for the language learner.

The following studies are examples of native-like speech gains. In his study with Spanish language learners from varying language backgrounds (but no Spanish heritage language learners) in a 7-week summer language training program in Guadalajara, Mexico, Yager (1988) discovered that students developed a more native-like accent than they demonstrated before the program. This was measured by the native speaker raters. Their progress correlated with an integrative attitude toward Spanish. Yager also noted that general

improvements in language are made because of informal, or out-of-class interaction. In a study comparing Spanish native-like communicative strategy use in role-plays between beginning students in the study abroad context versus students in the foreign language classroom setting, Lafford (1995) found that the study abroad students possessed a larger repertoire of native-like communicative strategies than did their classroom counterparts.

There are other linguistic aspects that change in the study abroad language learner. Grammar improvement in advanced students is positively correlated with non-interactive, informal, out-of-class contact with books, radio, and television (Freed, 1995). Freed (1998a) reports that students develop a more varied target language vocabulary than before they studied abroad. Linguistic awareness also seems to increase. Pellegrino (1998) reports students being conscious of native speakers' reactions toward their language, and Brecht and Robinson (1995) and Freed (1998a) discuss students' awareness of their own language.

The study abroad research reviewed above suggests that there are many factors that influence language acquisition during study abroad programs, and the students tend to gain native-like target language features, along with other linguistic characteristics. Freed (1998a) gives a linguistic profile of students after they study abroad:

> Those who have been abroad appear to speak with greater ease and confidence, expressed in part by a greater abundance of speech, spoken at a faster rate and characterized by fewer dysfluent- sounding pauses. As a group, they tend to reformulate their speech to express more complicated and abstract thoughts, display a wider range of communication strategies and a broader repertoire of styles. It is equally clear that their linguistic identities extend beyond the expected acquisition of oral skills to new self-realization in the social world of literacy (p. 50).

It is worth observing that the study abroad research discussed here was conducted with non-native speakers learning the target language in the study abroad context. To my knowledge no study has been completed that includes the continued language acquisition of a heritage

language within the context of a university study abroad program. Keeping the previous research in mind, the present study attempts to take a qualitative look at the language experiences of university heritage language learners of Spanish while studying abroad in Mexico.

1.2.5 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Mercado (2000) mentioned that "language, identity, and motivation are inseparable within the context of heritage language instruction" (p. 213). Spanish heritage language learners are the focus of this study, so it is important to understand their attitudes (which are a base for their motivation) and identity. The following are theoretical perspectives on language attitudes and the connection between language and identity.

1.2.5.1 LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

McGroarty (1996) defines attitudes as representing a person's values and beliefs that promote or discourage choices made. Attitudes are abstract ideas that may seem difficult to measure, but researchers began to assess attitudes toward language beginning in the 1950's. Early on, psychometric approaches (psychological tests to measure attitudes toward language) were used. Gardner and Lambert (1972) used self-report data from questionnaires that conveyed feelings toward the target language, study abroad, and the language in general.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) studied attitudes and motivation toward language learning of high school students of French in Louisiana, Maine, Connecticut, and English in the Philippines. They discovered that language learning is not just dependent on intelligence and aptitude, rather, on attitudes toward the ethnolinguistic group and individual members. Motivation to learn the language is determined by these attitudes. Gardner and Lambert described two types of motivation. One motivation is "instrumental," which views language

learning as practical, while the other type of motivation is “integrative,” which views language learning with interest and emotional attachment to the target language group.

French heritage language learners (FHLL) were included in the participant group of the Gardner and Lambert (1972) study. The researchers analyzed attitudes and motivation of these native FHLL apart from the rest of the participants and found a variety of attitudes. First, FHLL expressed strong pro-ethnic attitudes which did not necessarily correlate with strong French language competence. They found that the FHLL who felt positively about their ethnic group and had a high proficiency in English also possessed a comfort with both of their cultural and linguistic sides, achieving biculturalism and bilingualism. On the other hand, they found other FHLL to have what appeared to be a conflict in identity: while they had a strong ethnocentric and sympathetic attitude toward French-American culture, they still showed a preference for the American way of life as compared to the European French way.

Baker (1992) also discussed young people’s attitudes toward their ethnic language. In a study of the Welsh language, Baker found that between the ages of 13 and 14 integrative and instrumental attitudes were less favorable. Nonetheless, he discovered that the more Welsh a young person spoke, the more favorable the attitude and the more aware he/she was of the minority language and its instrumentality.

Language attitudes are evident when one responds to the speakers of the target language. For example, accommodation theory describes how an interlocutor changes some aspect of their speech because of the social reference of the other person (Giles, 1973). There are two types of accommodation. The first is “convergent” accommodation, when speech is changed because of desired solidarity with the other person. For example, Baker (1975) found that speakers changed their use of their southern Arizona Spanish dialect towards standard Mexican Spanish when

speaking with Mexicans or other speakers of standard Mexican Spanish. The second type of accommodation is “divergence”, when speech changes away from the co-particpant to emphasize a different social identity. For example, Chicanos often use code-switching to distinguish themselves from Mexican nationals (Galindo, 1995, 1996: Hidalgo, 1997), which is a form of divergent accommodation. McGroarty (1996) adds that attitudes can be related to other variables such as confidence, personal and academic self-esteem, and the ethnological environment.

Fishman (1999) discusses language attitudes within social context. He states that if a language is viewed as functional, then there will likely be positive attitudes toward the language. On the other hand, negative attitudes may arise if the language is not seen as useful within a particular social context. For example, in the United States, English is viewed as a functional language but Spanish is not perceived to have such a functional value. Hence, attitudes tend to be more positive toward English than they are toward Spanish in the U. S. context. However, attitudes toward language use also depend on group beliefs. If a group, such as Spanish speakers, views their ethnic language as having a strong vitality with status, demographic strength, institutional support and control, then their attitudes will tend to be positive toward their ethnic language. The opposite occurs if the group views the language with weak vitality.

In summary, these studies demonstrate the variety of attitudes toward language and the beliefs about the ethnic language and its members. There are instrumental and integrative motivations spurred by beliefs that a language is functional and/or there is an emotional connection to the ethnic language and ethnic group. Divergent or convergent accommodation takes place according to the desire to create solidarity or separation with the target language group (Giles, 1973). Positive and negative attitudes also depend on the perspective of a language’s vitality within a social context. It was found that as young people use their heritage

language more, the more they were aware and believed in its instrumentality. Young people also have been shown to have a variety of attitudes toward their heritage language, which in turn has an effect on their identity. The following section will further discuss the correlation between language and identity.

1.2.5.2 THE CONNECTION BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

This study draws on the sociocultural theory of language, in which language is seen as a dynamic tool in constructing identity within context. Lantolf (2000) explains that language is a tool that is used to mediate relationships. Human beings have the unique ability to communicate using language, and this is a primary means by which we interact with other humans and make sense of our social context. Language comes from the past and is passed down to us by our family. However, language must change to fit the communicative and psychological needs of present speakers (Lantolf, 2000). Thus, language is constantly in a state of change as its speakers adapt it to their needs and at the same time construct their own identity.

Liebkind (1999) mentioned that language is often a symbol of an ethnic group, even though not every member may speak the language. For example, in the United States, Spanish is not spoken by every Chicano, but it still symbolizes those of Mexican heritage, not to mention the broader Latin American community in the United States. According to Fishman (1999), identity changes according to time and social context. Liebkind adds that "language use influences the formation of group identity, and group identity influences patterns of language attitudes and usage" (p. 144).

Pavlenko & Lantolf (2000) and Giangreco (2000) discuss effects of second language learning on identity. In a review of literature authored by women transitioning into a new language and culture, the researchers found that they struggled and were dissatisfied with how

they expressed their identity using another language (Pavelenko & Lantolf, 2000). A dual role developed within the women: on one hand, the women constructed their new identity as they acquired another language; on the other hand, they were marginalized as second language learners.

In as account of his experience as a second language learner of Italian, Giangreco (2000) describes his Italian identity as connected to his language. The more comfortable he felt around those with whom he spoke, the more fluent his Italian seemed to be. As the author felt more comfortable with his own identity and language competence, his "need for native-like pronunciation diminished." (p. 63). He stated that the Italian language and culture and interaction with the other influences in his life helped to create his emerging identity. Thus, Identity and language interrelate over time and in and different contexts, and this study will attempt to describe how the case study participants' identity and language interrelate in the Mexican context.

1.2.6 SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGICAL PRECEDENTS

The present study is designed to assess the Chicano students' and their Mexican professors' and peers' perspectives toward Chicano Spanish during a 10-week study abroad semester in Mexico. The methodological precedents come from earlier studies and from a pilot study conducted by the researcher. The following section is a discussion of the literature that influenced the methodology design.

This study is designed to provide a qualitative, descriptive view on attitudes and the environment surrounding the case study participants. A case study format was selected to give such a holistic view of student experiences (Nunan, 1992; Van Lier, 2000). Five student journal reflections from each Chicana student were the backbone of this study, based on the following

literature. Riegelhaupt and Carrasco (in press) asked that their Chicana teacher case study keep daily journal entries about her language experience in Guanajuato, Mexico. The content of Brecht & Robinson's (1995) study of students studying abroad in Russia was extracted purely from student diaries and reflections on the value of formal classroom instruction. The authors recognized that their narrative data could not give a complete qualitative perspective on the topic; therefore they suggest that future studies triangulate data more completely by conducting interviews, carrying out self-reports, and participant and non-participant observations. Following these suggestions, the present study also includes non-participant observation carried out by the researcher in class observations, and self-report rating data in the questionnaires.

Additionally, interviews were an important data source for the study, and were based on the recommendation by Brecht & Robinson (1995) and the following studies. Galindo (1995) used tape-recorded interviews featuring open-ended questions as a primary data source, as well as others' casual conversations as additional data when conducting a study with adolescent Chicanos' attitudes toward Spanish and English dialects. The current study also includes some data from casual conversation. Hidalgo (1986) and Galindo (1995) interviewed the participants in their studies regarding attitudes toward Chicano Spanish. Wilkinson (1998) also used interviews while conducting two study abroad case studies in France.

The previous section reviewed methodological precedents for this study design. Chapter 2 will explain the methodology particular to this study.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

To better understand the study participants and their environment, their U.S. and Mexican university contexts and study abroad programs will be examined, followed by a description of the study materials and procedures.

2.1 CONTEXT AND PARTICIPANTS

The participants featured in this series of case studies were four university Spanish heritage language learners and their Mexican roommates and professors during a 10-week study abroad program in Puebla, Mexico. Pseudonyms are used for all participants in this study to maintain confidentiality. The four Spanish heritage language learners are the focus of the case studies and will be described in depth.

The four case study participants were young women who ranged in ages from 20 to 22 years old. All were from the Southwestern United States and at the time of the study were attending three elite, private universities in three regions within the United States (see Table 1 for student background). The Chicana students' backgrounds, U.S. universities and study abroad programs will be described, followed by an account of their Mexican university context and host exchange program.

2.1.1 GRACIE FROM BROWN UNIVERSITY

The first case is about Gracie, a pre-medicine student who grew up in Lasara, a small town in south Texas where suspicions of illegal immigrants run rampant. She recounted how she always carries her social security card so that she could prove she is a U.S. citizen if the border patrol were to ask. In this environment, Gracie recounted, Mexican-Americans spend much time denying their Mexicans heritage in order to prove they are from the United States; speaking

Table 1. Chicana Student Background

	Birthplace/ Generation	Spanish in Family	Spanish in School	*University* /Major	Undergrad Student population/ % Latino or Chicano	Involvement with Chicano/Mexican community	College Spanish Experience (SHLL= Spanish heritage language learner)
Gracie	Raymond-ville, Texas/ 2nd generation	Learned Spanish from housekeeper	Junior High & High School	*Brown*/ Ethnic Studies (Pre-med)	7,300/ 7% Latino	Active in MEChA	Took non-SHLL lower level Spanish class, felt professor from Spain insulted her Spanish
Leila	Corpus Christi, Texas/ 2nd generation	Learned Spanish from grandmother & ninera, Spanish dominant until 3 years, English dominant after that, spoke "Spanglish" to her family	1-2nd grade, Junior High and High School	*Notre Dame*/ Manage-ment Informa-tion Systems	10,000/ 11% Latino	Some, but mostly involved in school and soccer; member of Mexico's national women's soccer team	Took two non-SHLL Spanish classes, said they were " elementary" and unchallenging
Mikaela	Fresno, California / 4th generation	Learned Spanish from her family, spoken to in Spanish but responds in English	Elementary through High School	*Stanford*/ Human Biology (Pre-med)	6,500/ 9% Chicano, 1% other Hispanic	Involved in UNIDAS, Chicanos for Medical Health, Ballet Folklórico, (at Stanford Chicano center)	Took one non-SHLL Spanish conversation class, did not think it improved her Spanish
Brooke	Greenville, Texas/ 2nd generation	Learned Spanish at home, but spoke mostly English	High School	*Stanford*/ Political Science & Spanish		Mentor/coordinator for Barrio Assistance; Ballet Folklórico (at Stanford Chicano Center)	Took two SHLL Spanish courses which gave her confidence in reading & writing; attended summer Spanish for bilinguals courses in Guadalajara

English without a Spanish accent is key. Gracie's grandmother was reprimanded for speaking Spanish at school and did not teach her son, Gracie's father, to speak it. Consequently, her father learned English first, and after that, Spanish; he now has English-accented Spanish.

Gracie did not begin to learn Spanish until she shared a bedroom with a live-in housekeeper and friend of the family. Even though Gracie's mother, also from Texas, is a Spanish teacher and encouraged her daughter to learn Spanish, she did not take an active part in teaching Spanish to Gracie. However, life in Texas provided a bilingual Spanish-English environment where, Gracie included, people switched back and forth between the two languages. Gracie's first school experience with formal Spanish was in obligatory Spanish classes in junior high.

At the time of this study, Gracie was a Pre-medicine and Ethnic studies major at Brown University, located in Providence, Rhode Island. An Ivy-league school that was founded in 1764, Brown is one of the oldest and most prestigious universities in the United States. The university had a student population of around 7,300, 7% being Latino. Gracie was one of only three Latinos in her class in the prestigious eight-year Program in Liberal Medical Education (PLME) that integrates study in medicine and liberal arts. She was an active member of the campus MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán), a support and advocacy group for Chicanos. She was also a student representative from Brown for the East Coast Chicano Student Forum. To Gracie, "Chicano" was a word that describes one who has strong ties to the Mexican culture, lives in the United States, and is trying to raise awareness about social issues related to their people.

At Brown, Gracie "recognized the necessity to understand and speak Spanish" and enrolled in a Spanish course. She did not take the lower level Spanish class (SP 60) or 100-level

Spanish literature course that were, according to Brown, suitable for native Spanish speakers. Instead, she enrolled in a class (SP 50) which, Gracie reported, was taught by a Spaniard who insulted Gracie's Spanish. Although not an important part of her academic program, Gracie used Spanish socially. She spoke Spanish with Latino peers because it connected them culturally.

Gracie decided to further her formal study of Spanish in Mexico through the Brown Office of International Programs. She wanted to learn more about Mexican geography and culture, and search for her family roots in Mexico. After completing one lower level Spanish course, Gracie qualified to apply for the program. The Brown Office of International Programs gives students the choice of staying in the dormitories or with a Mexican homestay family. Gracie chose to live in the Mexican university dormitories in order to socialize and live with Mexican students.

Although Gracie was motivated to spend a semester abroad in her heritage country, she did not receive support from her father or friends who did not seem to understand her desire to study in Mexico. She reports that "they were disappointed that I was traveling to a country that wasn't very popular, or safe. Especially since my Spanish, in their eyes, was extremely poor."

2.1.2 LEILA FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

The second student in this case study series is Leila, a Notre Dame student and native Texan who learned Spanish as her first language. Leila's maternal side of the family has been in Texas for many generations, while her paternal grandmother came to Texas from Cuba and her paternal grandfather from Mexico. Her closest connection to Mexico is through her paternal grandfather, qualifying her for dual Mexican-United States nationality and to play for the Mexican national women's soccer team, formed 3 years prior to this study.

Born in Corpus Christi, Texas, to a family of professionals, Leila started life hearing Spanish from her grandmother and "*niñera"* (nanny). She was dominant in Spanish until 3;0 when the *niñera* left the household and English became Leila's dominant language. She continued to use Spanish with her family, mixing in her dominant English. Leila spoke English to the maternal side of her family and both Spanish and English to her paternal grandparents. "With my family it's 'Spanglish' . . . a different language in itself. We switch back and forth, like five or six times in one sentence."

Leila started her classroom study of Spanish at an early age, and after a break from third to seventh grade, continued through college. She studied first through third grade in an elementary school for gifted and talented students that offered 4 1/2 hours of Spanish per week. Junior high was her next Spanish classroom experience, which continued through high school until she took two Spanish classes in college.

At the time of this study, Leila was attending the prestigious Catholic mid-western University of Notre Dame. She was one of the few Latinos who made up 11% of a predominantly Anglo student population of 10,000. She commented that the Latino community is close-knit, although she does not spend much time with them because of her academic and soccer commitments. To be unique and retain her Mexican identity at Notre Dame, however, Leila adds a Spanish word to her English with her friends. "It makes me funny/unique. Among my friends I am the 'dirty Mexican' so I have to act like it . . . and I am okay with this."

Leila originally majored in Spanish but felt dissatisfied with her college Spanish classes as there was little verbal interaction and the course material was "elementary." Notre Dame offered only one Spanish course specifically for heritage language learners, in which Leila never enrolled. She changed her major to Management Information Systems.

Around this same time, Leila was recruited to play for the Mexican national women's soccer team. Still wanting to develop her Spanish skills, she hoped that being with the Mexican team would improve her Spanish. It did, although not without struggle since her Mexican teammates

> at first used to laugh and make fun whenever [my American teammates and I] would . . . say something wrong or say something funny, and they were all talking real fast and we never knew what it was that we would say wrong. So we would just stop talking Spanish.

Two years later the opportunity arose to study with Notre Dame's then newly established study abroad program in Puebla, Mexico. Leila eagerly took the opportunity and was one of five students from Notre Dame to study Spanish and other content courses for the second trial semester of the Puebla program. The program was open to all students regardless of their Spanish proficiency. Students were given the option of living in the dormitories or with a family, and Leila chose to live in the dormitories. Leila was motivated by the chance to increase her Spanish fluency and practice with her Mexican national soccer team in Mexico City, two hours northwest of Puebla. At the beginning of the study Leila explained, "I love Spanish and I'm not going home until I pass for a native."

2.1.3 MIKAELA FROM STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Mikaela is one of the two Chicana students from Stanford participating in the present study. A fourth generation Mexican-American from Fresno, a medium-sized city in the agricultural Central Valley of California, Mikaela grew up hearing Spanish at home but responding in English to family members. Mikaela took Spanish classes from elementary through high school. The fact that she knew most of the Spanish taught in her elementary school for gifted and talented students gave Mikaela confidence in her Spanish language abilities, a

catalyst that motivated her to continue formal Spanish instruction through her junior year of high school.

At the time of the study, Mikaela attended Stanford University, a private and elite research university located in the San Francisco Bay Area in California (and whose campus the researcher visited prior to this study to meet and talk to faculty). Mikaela was majoring in Human Biology with aspirations to become a pediatrician. Chicano student make up 9% of the 6,500 undergraduate student population. Mikaela commented that

> Stanford has what I think is a strong Latino community, and that's my Stanford community . . . I feel comfortable within my community . . . I don't always feel comfortable in my classes . . . on top of that, I'm pre-med . . . [and there are only] five in my classes that are Latino and pre-med. Which means in my classes . . . I'm [usually] the only [Latina].

Mikaela finds much of this "community" at the Stanford Chicano Center, which is the home of over 18 different service organizations and her "second home". The mission statement for the Stanford Chicano center is to "catalyze Chicanos and Latinos at Stanford into a proactive community that creates an environment which celebrates and promotes the history, contributions, intellectual heritage, education, growth and empowerment of all Chicanos and Latinos here and beyond" (Stanford University, 2000c). Mikaela was involved with organizations such as Chicanos for Medical Health and UNIDAS, a Latina organization dedicated to peer support, community service and networking. She was also a dancer in the Ballet Folklórico de Stanford group.

Mikaela decided to continue her Spanish learning at Stanford. Although Stanford offers a series of six classes for Spanish heritage language learners (SHLL), she took a non-SHLL Spanish conversation course where she was the only SHLL student. Sensing little linguistic gain from this course combined with a three-year hiatus from Spanish study before that, Mikaela felt

she had lost ground in her academic Spanish proficiency. She was especially unsure of her writing abilities, but remained confident of her spoken Spanish.

Listening to her friend Brooke, a Chicana student case study described in section 2.1.4, encouraged Mikaela to study abroad through Stanford's Overseas Studies Program (OSP) at the Universidad de las Américas-Puebla (UDLAP) in Mexico. Mikaela qualified for the program which requires at least one year of college-level Spanish and two years if students are interested in taking economics or international relations courses. The OSP in Puebla also requires all students to "enroll in a writing course that allows them to continue to work on their language skills in coordination with their writing assignments from class" (Stanford University, 2000b). The course is essentially a writing workshop where students meet one-on-one with a writing counselor for a half an hour each week. Each student is assigned to live in the college dormitories, typically with Mexican students.

The OSP in Puebla was started in 1997 and at the time of the writing of this study, it had been reported that Stanford Chicano students had experienced cultural and linguistic clash while studying at the UDLAP. Due to these experiences, a Stanford professor cautioned Mikaela that UDLAP professors and students might be critical of her Spanish variety. Keeping these comments in mind, Mikaela continued to prepare for her study abroad to Mexico, which she envisioned as a unique opportunity to "improve my Spanish skills and get to know 'my' people and culture."

2.1.4 BROOKE FROM STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The next case is about Brooke, the Stanford student who proposed the idea of studying abroad in Mexico to Mikaela. Brooke is a second-generation Mexican American from Greenville, a northeastern Texas city. Her paternal grandmother immigrated to Texas from

Jalisco in 1916 during the Mexican Revolution. Her grandmother and father attended U.S. schools that forbade them to speak Spanish, Spanish was the language used at home. She described her home environment:

> When I was younger . . . I'd always try to get my parents to only use Spanish in the house. They would always do it for *un ratititito* [a little while] and then switch back to mostly English at some point.

Brooke spoke English with her siblings as well. In her teen-age years, however, she used Spanish in cultural, religious, media, and work-related activities, although she also code-switched often, reportedly using Spanish and English in the same sentence. Spanish became a part of Brooke's academic world starting when she was a teenager. Her first formal Spanish language classes were in high school.

Once at Stanford University, while a Political Science and Spanish major, she became involved in the Stanford Chicano Center. Brooke was a mentor and coordinator for Barrio Assistance, a tutoring and mentoring program for minority children at a local school; and, like Mikaela, she danced in the Ballet Folklórico de Stanford dance group.

As a student at Stanford, Brooke "started taking classes [in Spanish] because for me I've always been annoyed that I can't speak fluently and it's important to me to retain Spanish in my family." She enrolled in two of the six SHLL classes Stanford offers. Stanford has what appears to be a strong heritage language program for home-background speakers. Intermediate and advanced Spanish courses are offered to "develop and accelerate the written and oral linguistic skills of students who come from homes/backgrounds where Spanish is spoken" (Stanford University, 2000a). Additionally, the course "Issues and Methods in the Teaching of Spanish as a Heritage Language" is offered through the Spanish and Portuguese department to

train teachers in instructing SHLL. There are also courses offered for home-background speakers of Chinese (Stanford University, 2000d).

Brooke reported that the SHLL courses at Stanford provided a comfortable environment that helped Brooke with her self-confidence and skill development in reading and writing Spanish. Six months before her study abroad time in Puebla, Brooke took a 5-week course for Spanish bilingual speakers at the Centro de Estudios Para Extranjeros (CEPE) at the University of Guadalajara, which, along with her Stanford classes, provided a "comfortable" environment in which to learn her Spanish heritage language. Then she decided to study Spanish even further through the OSP program in Puebla. She explained why:

> Number one that being here is really the only way I'll attain a level of fluency that I can be happy with, and number two, because this is where my family is originally from so I really wanted to spend time here and experience Mexican culture, as opposed to my Mexican-American/Chicano culture.

2.*1.5* *LA UNIVERSIDAD DE LAS AMÉRICAS-PUEBLA*

This section describes the Mexican university and international program that received the four Chicana university study abroad students. The Universidad de las Américas-Puebla (UDLAP) is located in the state of Puebla in Central Mexico. Like Stanford, Notre Dame, and Brown, it is also a private, elite university.

UDLAP historian Edward Simmen (2000a, 2000b) gives a brief history of the UDLAP. Originally named Mexico City College (MCC) and run by U.S. educators, the college opened in 1940 in a Mexico City basement with five students, five professors, and five liberal arts courses. U.S. World War II veterans were allowed to study at MCC starting in 1946 because their GI Bill benefits were valid at the college. Students studying on the GI Bill made up more than half of the student population until 1953, at which time MCC had awarded 711 bachelor's degrees and 232 master's degrees. In 1959, the college received full membership in the Southern

Association of Colleges and Schools, and in 1968, MCC's name was changed to the Universidad de las Américas. Another campus was opened in Cholula, Puebla, where classes began in 1970 and when, for the first time since 1942, Mexican student enrollment outnumbered the U.S. student enrollment.

At the time of the study, the UDLAP had a population of about 7500 students. It was comprised of 37 undergraduate programs and 17 master's programs within its five schools. There were 250 full-time professors who were researchers and instructors, which was "more full-time professors per student than any other institution of higher learning in the Mexican Republic" (Simmen, 2000a, p. 6).

Exchange programs to the UDLAP started with nine Ohio State University students at MCC in 1946, and at the time of this study the Office of International Affairs was hosting 150 exchange students from various countries around the world. The UDLAP has the largest number and greatest variety of academic exchange programs of any Mexican university, currently overseeing active exchanges with over 60 institutions in the United States, Canada, Australia, Great Britain, France, Germany, other European countries, Japan and Latin America (Simmen, 2000a).

Among the large numbers of exchange students are students of Mexican heritage, mostly from the United States, who have participated in the UDLAP programs for the past 10 years. Many students come to find their Mexican roots, but also find a different Mexican culture than they know in the U.S., especially because of the elite, academic nature of the UDLAP campus (Joaquín López personal communication, October 18, 2000). Some Chicanos have experienced clash with the Mexican culture, and some find it to be a defining time for their ethnic identity. A

Chicana from Notre Dame summed up her experience while studying abroad at the UDLAP prior to this study:

> I tend to think of myself as a Mexican because I was raised with Mexican ideals and have been surrounded by its culture; yet, I realize that I have an American influence because I grew up in the U.S. and this is what distinguishes me from a native Mexican. To the Mexicans I am a "*gringa*" because I am from the States or a "*pocha*" because I am of Mexican descent born in the United States and speak Spanglish, a mixture of Spanish and English. (Ibañez, 2000)

In order to organize educational and cultural programs for the international students, the UDLAP Department of International Affairs has nine full-time staff members and several volunteer "*amigos internacionales*" ("international friends"). *Amigos internacionales* are UDLAP students who act as tour guides and friends for the new international students; the researcher was a part of this welcoming group. The International Affairs department hosted 150 international students at during semester of this study, four of whom were the Chicana students in this study. The orientation program was conducted in Spanish. It was a week packed-full of tours of Puebla, Cholula, and the UDLAP campus; trips to shopping centers and a picnic in Atlixco, a near-by town; a welcome speech given by the UDLAP President and the Dean of International Affairs; other information meetings regarding UDLAP facilities, academic and recreational programs; academic placement and course advisement; a luncheon where the *amigos internacionales* gave student-to-student advise; a bonfire and dinner complete with a mariachi band; and a final dinner in an up-scale Mexican restaurant. During the welcome meeting the Dean of International Affairs challenged students to step outside of their observer role, integrate themselves into the Mexican community in and outside of the university, and become a Mexican for a semester, seeing things from a Mexican perspective.

Along with the welcome week just described, Notre Dame and Stanford conducted programs to orient their students to study abroad at the UDLAP. The Notre Dame orientation, in which Leila participated, included special meetings and luncheons with the Notre Dame-Puebla study abroad program director. Throughout the semester, Notre Dame students continued to receive special attention from their director, a visiting professor from Notre Dame, who met with every student at least once a week and with the whole group once every 2 weeks. The Notre Dame program also organized three cultural trips to various sites in central Mexico.

Like the Notre Dame students, the four Stanford study abroad students (Mikaela and Brooke included) also received special attention. Two staff members from the Department of International Affairs were in charge of special programs, in which Stanford is included. The two staff members were dedicated to working specifically with Stanford students. For example, during orientation week Stanford students were picked up at the Puebla airport by one of the staff members, where the other international students were picked up in a bus by the *amigos internacionales* in Mexico City. Stanford students were given a meeting and luncheon with their perspective professors and the Dean of the International Affairs. At this meeting, the Dean of International Affairs informed them that they were "*estudiantes muy, muy, muy especiales*" (very, very, very special students). The students and staff proceeded to discuss all that would be made available to the Stanford students throughout their 10 weeks of study.

First, they were offered classes in a special 10-week syllabus designed to accommodate the Stanford winter quarter, while the rest of the UDLAP classes had a 16-week syllabus. Along with the Stanford students, these shortened courses were also made available to international students from Yale, Brown, Notre Dame, and some Mexican national UDLAP students. The special classes were given by some of the UDLAP's top professors, including an economics

class conducted by the university president. The Stanford students were also given a one-on-one writing workshop to improve their academic Spanish writing (as described in section 2.1.3), access to professors to help with their independent study projects, and a volunteer opportunity to work at a near-by orphanage. Like Notre Dame, Stanford students were given two cultural trips paid for by Stanford. Brown students, Gracie included, did not receive such a special program either from their own university or from the Department of International Affairs.

2.2 MATERIALS

The materials used in the case studies included two participant consent forms, three background questionnaires, a journal prompt, a class observation protocol, and three protocols for interviews. All participants had the option of completing the forms and interviews in either Spanish or English.

Informed consent provides participants with information about the means and expected end product of the research in which he/she is involved before the research takes place. The social science fields, just like the medical fields, are responsible for "full disclosure, to the best of their ability, …[about] issues affecting participants regarding methods, use, or publication of research" (Fluehr-Lobban, 1994, p. 6). Therefore, two consent forms, one for the Chicana students (see Appendix A) and the other for their professors and peers (see Appendix B), were created to familiarize participants with the nature of this study by explaining the purpose of the proposal and requesting use of participants' testimonies in the study. The consent forms were modeled after forms used in a study of language use and schooling in a Mexican-American barrio in the U.S. (Smith, 2000). The Chicana student consent form entailed specified requirements of participation not asked of the professors and peers. For example, the Chicana students were asked to write a journal but their professors and peers were not.

Pellegrino (1998) suggests using questionnaires in collecting qualitative data for study abroad situations, and self-report language attitude data has been used since the late 1950's, reporting feelings and attitudes toward the target language (Gardner and Lambert, 1972). The Chicano background questionnaire included four sections in which students were asked to report on themselves (see Appendix C). The first section asked for biographical data. The second section asked participants to identify family origins to determine where in Mexico the family is from, as Spanish varies by region (Ramos-Pelicia, 2000). Also in the second section were tables where participants filled in their bilingual background information. The first table elicited the percentage of Spanish and English used at school, with friends, and at home during the elementary through college years. The second table elicited information on Spanish language use in a variety of domains from 12 years of age to the present. These tables were created to understand the formal and informal use of Spanish and the functions of language during the school years (Baker, 1992; Grosjean, 1997).

The third section contained an English skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing) self-rating scale, a Spanish skills self-rating scale, and two bilingualism language proficiency self-rating scales. All scales were based on Hall (1997) and were used to understand how the Chicana participants view their own language proficiency. The scales were also used on a form given to the Chicana students at the end of this study to assess any change in their self-rating of Spanish skills. The third section also asked if, when, and how often the Chicana student code-switched between English and Spanish, and for student opinions of possible social, academic and professional implications of code-switching. Adapted from Hernández Pérez (1997), the questions elicited information and perspectives on code-switching.

Linguistic awareness is a suggested area of study for Spanish heritage language learners (Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998). Therefore, the fourth section asked for definitions of "standard" Spanish and "non-standard" Spanish to glean the linguistic awareness of each participant. The last question asked for additional comments the Chicana student would like to include about their Spanish.

The peer questionnaire included three sections (see Appendix E). The first section elicited biographical data, background on previous contact with Chicanos to understand any awareness of language learning and/or Chicano students, and a description of the time spent with their Chicana suitemate. The second section contained four language rating scales (the same scales from the Chicana student questionnaire) to elicit peer ratings of the Chicanas' Spanish. The third section asked about their suitemates' code-switching frequency, their opinions about the social and professional implications of code-switching, and their ideas about "standard" languages (this section is the exact same as that of the Chicana student questionnaire). The professor questionnaire is similar to the peer questionnaire, only slightly modified to slant questions toward the academic setting (see Appendix D).

Diaries provide a chance for writers to generate and reflect on ideas, feelings and thoughts (Brecht & Robinson,1995; Nunan,1992; Richards & Nunan, 1990; Pavelenko & Lantolf, 2000). Therefore, journal entries were used in the study to allow the Chicana participants to reflect on their language experiences and feelings, and to make comments on attitudes toward their Spanish variety. The journal prompt, the third instrument, was used to guide the Chicana students in their writing (see Appendix F). The prompt listed the guidelines for each journal entry, writing topics, and due dates for each journal entry. During the study, the

Chicana participants were asked to type five one-page journal reflections using the following writing topics:

1. How are you feeling about your Spanish?
2. Explain any change in your Spanish, citing some examples.
3. Reflect on others' attitudes toward your Spanish and write them down. Please illustrate this with examples of circumstances and/or interaction.

The journal prompt listed journal due dates in fifteen-day increments so the students would have two weeks worth of experiences about which to write, and so their reflections could be analyzed over time.

Triangulation enhances internal validity in that it uses multiple data sources to confirm findings (Merriam, 1998). Two instruments were used to triangulate data from journal entries and questionnaires. One was the class observation protocol, the fourth instrument used in this study (see Appendix G). Following a pilot study, the class observation protocol was developed to obtain information from class proceedings. The protocol included questions about class demographics, class proceedings, Chicana student's participation, and Chicana-teacher interactions and/or Chicana-student interactions. Once complete, it was a resource from which to generate an understanding and more questions about the academic environment, later posed in the interview. A fifth instrument, the interview protocol, was used as a guide to ask questions that allowed participants to confirm or deny patterns noted in previous data. Additional questions were added to the interview protocol according to the researcher's questions for each participant. Three protocols were created: a Chicana student interview protocol (see Appendix H), a professor interview protocol (see Appendix I), and a peer interview protocol (see Appendix J). A second interview was held with the four students to focus discussion on a few themes

gleaned from previous interviews. Therefore, a focus group interview protocol was created as a prompt for follow-up discussion (see Appendix K).

The materials described above in section 2.2 and the procedures mentioned below in section 2.3 were piloted with three Chicano participants, one German-Mexican, and two Anglo-Americans who studied abroad at the UDLAP in the semester previous to this study. Any changes in material or procedures were due to an evaluation of the pilot study by the researcher.

2.3 PROCEDURES

The instruments were applied over 2 1/2 months of the four Chicana students' study abroad program at the Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, Mexico (see Table 2). Prior to the data collection period I acted as an UDLAP *amiga internacional* (see section 2.1.4 for further description) by welcoming students, giving tours, and participating in various activities alongside the new international students, particularly with Stanford's special welcome activities. As a result, I came to know Brooke, Mikaela, Leila, and Gracie. At the end of the orientation festivities, I informed them of my study and invited them to participate.

Nine days after their arrival in Mexico, the Chicana students were given the journal prompt (see Appendix F), asked to fill out the two consent forms (see Appendix A) and one background questionnaire (see Appendix C). Gracie was given this same information twelve days after her arrival as she was unable attend the previous meeting.

During the ninth and tenth weeks of the study I held separate interview appointments with the Chicana students, their suitemates and their professors. Prior to the interviews, I asked each Chicana student which professor and suitemate they would prefer me to interview so that the Chicana students would feel as comfortable as possible with whom I interviewed. The researcher then contacted the professors and asked permission to observe a class and afterward

Table 2. Chicana Case Study Procedures and Materials

Time	Procedures	Materials
1st week	Orientation week: Chicana students and researcher met and began to know each other	
9 days after arrival	Leila, Mikaela, and Brooke were informed of the nature of the study, consented to participate and filled out the Chicana questionnaire	- Journal prompt (Appendix F) - Chicana consent form (Appendix A) - Chicana questionnaire (Appendix C)
12 days after arrival	Gracie carried out the same procedures as above	- Same as above
1st – 10th weeks	Chicana students used journal prompts to write journal entries every two weeks	- Journal prompt (Appendix F)
9th –11th weeks	Researcher asked Chicana students which professors and peers they preferred her to interview; contacted professors, asked permission to observe their classes; conducted observations, adjusted interview protocols	- Class observation protocol (Appendix G)
10th-11th weeks	Researcher contacted suitemates for interviews; conducted individual interviews with Chicana students, their professors and peers; conducted focus group interview	- Spanish skill self-rating scale (Appendix C) - Chicana interview protocol (Appendix H) - Professor/Peer consent form (Appendix B) - Professor questionnaire (Appendix D) - Professor interview protocol (Appendix I) - Peer questionnaire (Appendix E) - Peer interview protocol (Appendix J) - Focus group interview protocol (Appendix K)
12th week	Gracie reviewed and commented on group interview	

meet with him or her for an interview. All accepted and the interviews took place after the class observations so I could adjust each interview protocol to include questions that arose from the class observations.

The interviews were conducted in the 10th through 12th weeks of the study. All interviews were semi-structured in nature (Nunan, 1992; Merriam, 1998) and audio-recorded. The interview length and location varied. The professors and peers filled out consent forms (see Appendix B) and the questionnaires (see Appendix D and E) before their interview. The researcher quickly reviewed the questionnaire and used it as a discussion tool for the interview, along with the interview protocols for the professor (see Appendix I) or the peer (see Appendix J). The peer and professor interviews lasted from 10 minutes to 1/2 hour.

The Chicana student interviewees were asked to fill out another Spanish skill self-rating form (see Appendix C), which was used as a discussion tool to talk about changes in ratings and perceived improvements in their Spanish skills. The Chicana interview protocol (see Appendix H) further guided the interview. The Chicanas' individual interviews lasted from 40 minutes to 1 hour and 15 minutes. After the Chicana students' first interviews, their interview data were cross-checked by asking questions from the focus group interview protocol (see Appendix K). The focus group interview lasted 1/2 hour. Gracie could not attend the focus group interview, but read and made comments on the researcher's questions and notes on participants' responses during the group interview. Her comments were also audio-recorded. Selected segments of all interviews were transcribed.

All interviews were conducted on the UDLAP campus in offices, library cubicles, meeting rooms, and dormitory rooms. Interview locations were selected according to optimal,

private, and/or neutral environments, as well as at the convenience of both the participant and myself.

Now that participants and context have been introduced and data collection instruments and procedures have been discussed, Chapter 3 will relate the results from the study methodology.

3.0 RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study, which are reported by individual case and discussed in four sections per case. First, the Chicana student's perceptions of her own Spanish language features, others' attitudes toward her Spanish, and her own feelings toward her Spanish are described. Second, the student's professor gives his/her account and reactions toward the Chicana's Spanish and third, the suitemate and other peers relate their perception of the Chicana suitemate's Spanish. Fourth, a short summary of each case concludes the individual case study results. In the final section of the chapter a series of questions that emerged from the results are presented. These questions serve as guidelines by which the case studies are further compared in chapter 4.

3.1 GRACIE

3.1.1 GRACIE'S PERSPECTIVE

Gracie described her Spanish language development over the 10 weeks. She had never taken a Spanish writing course, so she enrolled in a writing class because she desired to improve her writing skills. Gracie noticed her unfamiliarity with Spanish grammar rules right away. Nonetheless, she was satisfied with her accent and pronunciation. When she could not say something in Spanish, she tried "hard to change an English word into a Spanish word by just giving it a little twist." She reported that her translation tactic seemed to work for her and that she was "surviving."

In the following weeks Gracie mentioned the Spanish features with which she had most difficulty. She had trouble conjugating verbs, particularly the second person preterite verb form. Gracie observed that she always added an extra "s" (i.e.: "*trajites*" instead of "*trajiste*" (you brought)). She also noticed she directly translated Spanish from English:

> I can't help but automatically say something in a direct translation. For example: *el me habló para atrás,* (pronounced *patrás* really quickly) when I am saying that "he called me back." Obviously, this is not correct in Spanish. I should say that: *el me regresó la llamada*.

Also, Gracie reported using new vocabulary, especially colloquial language, and to place emphasis on certain words when speaking. Although she was learning new vocabulary, she still had difficulty communicating what she wanted to say with her limited Spanish repertoire.

Toward the end of the data collection, Gracie recounted using many of the same Chicano Spanish features as she used in the beginning: "today my suitemate told me that I am still 'eating my s's' and she explained to me that I need to remember that past tense verbs only have one 's' . . . . I wonder where that comes from?" She also mentioned other features: "sometimes when I ask the girls if I look okay I will say, '*miro bien*?' or '*miro gordita*?' I forget the 'me' before and I was informed that the proper way is to use the words '*veo, me veo bien*?' '*me veo gordita*?'" Finally, Gracie mentioned having trouble with articles (*el, la, los, las*); she also commented on spelling:

> When you look at a word, you recognize, hey, first of all that's the way it's spelled . . . . like '*jamás,*' I would have thought it's spelled with an 'h' but it's spelled with a '*j*'?

Reflecting on her 10 weeks of study, Gracie described her improvements. She sensed the most improvement in writing because she wrote faster, especially when summarizing a reading. However, when Gracie was asked to write her opinion in Spanish, she could not find the words to express herself with the same level of formality she used in English. She sensed improvement in her accent. Gracie rated her Spanish skills at the same levels as she did in the beginning of the semester, but she also mentioned: she was "more critical" of her Spanish skills.

Gracie perceived others' reactions toward her Spanish. Three weeks into the semester, Gracie and her suitemates became good friends and she "enjoy[ed] the moment" with them, while they thought Gracie was "*mona*" ("cute") as she practiced the colloquial words they taught her. They seemed to "enjoy it when [she used] . . . slang words properly." Her roommates and others corrected her Spanish which Gracie appreciated; she felt it helped her improve. Gracie did not always feel support from her suitemates, however: "I remember my girlfriends laughing at me . . . because I always [said] things backwards." She also recounted the evening her suitemates imitated the way she spoke; she "wanted to cry" from embarrassment.

Gracie reported on people outside the suite and their reactions to her Spanish. She went to a McDonald's and, upon ordering a hamburger with an American English pronunciation, the attendant gave her a confused stare.

> Sure, I still get plenty of looks, since my phenotypes are exactly like every other Mexican woman . . . often after I ask for something at a restaurant or in a store, attendants pause, stare and then question where I am from. This is because once I have opened my mouth and shared my accent, then people ponder about my origin . . . [and] ask where I am from and once I say "*Tejas*" . . . they understand.

Gracie's accent sometimes worked to her disadvantage. While she and her mother were negotiating with a vendor, Gracie felt that "once I opened my mouth" the vendors knew she was not Mexican and they charged her more than a Mexican national would be charged. Back on the UDLAP campus, however, Gracie sensed that her professors give her special treatment because she is Mexican-American. One of her professors had her present a class topic alone, as was the policy for the two Mexicans in the class but not for the other international students.

Gracie discussed her feelings toward her Spanish over the 10 weeks. When she first arrived with her Brown schoolmates, she was embarrassed that they, as Anglo Americans, received better scores on the Spanish assessment test than she, a Mexican American. This was

only momentary discouragement, as the beginning of her study abroad was “wonderful” and she became close with her suitemates. Then, the frustrations began. In her enthusiasm to speak, she would often become discouraged when trying to discuss important issues in Spanish and she realized she could not articulate herself in Spanish. Gracie began to express “guilt . . . that I should know Spanish, I should be able to communicate” and she had not learned more Spanish while growing up. By her second journal entry Gracie gained confidence to converse in Spanish with individuals, groups, and in the classroom. The next journal showed disappointment in her lack of improvement, particularly with Spanish verbs. She considered practicing her conjugations more and wondered why she repeatedly said the “incorrect” verb forms. By journal 5, Gracie reported being a confident tour guide to her friends and commented, "confidence, it's everything" for Spanish improvement.

3.1.2 PROFESSOR PERSPECTIVE

Gracie’s professors reflected on her Spanish at the end of the ten weeks. Gracie’s Writing Communication professor had previously worked with Chicano students and knew that their Spanish language abilities vary. He described her Spanish as a classic case where a bilingual student speaks and understands almost perfectly, but does not read and write as well as they do in the language in which they were educated. Her Spanish “*suena bastante bien . . . también presenta los rasgos típicos [de un bilingue]: su pronunciación es perfecta . . . y te hace creer que su español es mucho mejor de lo tu crees que es*.” (sounds rather good . . . also, she has the typical Chicano Spanish features: her pronunciation is perfect . . . and then she makes you think that her Spanish is much better than it is). The writing professor rated her listening and speaking abilities as 5 (native level) and her reading and writing as 4.

The writing professor commented that Gracie was an extremely outgoing and open person. She enjoyed talking and asking questions about language situations not necessarily related to the class topic but, nonetheless, related to her language experience during her study abroad period. She was accustomed to expressing her opinions and ideas in English, and got frustrated when she could not do the same in Spanish. Gracie used English words to fill in the missing Spanish terms throughout her class. "*De repente se desespera . . . y no encuentra la palabra, y sabe que le voy a entender, entonces se siente más cómoda usando la palabra en inglés*" (All of a sudden she gets impatient and does not find the word she wants, and she knows that I will understand her, so she feels more comfortable using English words). Gracie's professor perceived her to be comfortable with corrections. He suggested that she improve her use of subjunctive verb forms, academic vocabulary, and her academic writing style.

Gracie's Art professor (also Brooke's professor) adds that Gracie "*es pura pasión*" (is pure passion) and had an easy time speaking. However, "*Gracie tiene un español como . . . gente más rural. No lo sé, tal vez es mi impresión, por ejemplo 'más pa trás' . . . a mí me parece que su grupo, con que convive, debe de hablar así*" (Gracie has a Spanish like . . . people who are more rural. I don't know, maybe it is my impression for example '*más pa trás*' . . . to me it seems that the group with whom she spends time probably speaks like that).

3.1.3 PEER PERSPECTIVE

Gracie's suitemate, Ana, also commented on Gracie's Spanish. Gracie had a good relationship with all of her suitemates, particularly Ana, who had just spent a year learning English in Boston. Ana recounts the first time she met Gracie:

> *Empezó hablar conmigo normal . . . . . Como a los cinco minutos de estar hablando con ella fue cuando me dijo que era de Tejas . . . su español, no se oye mal, se oye bien, y no me di cuenta que era Tejana. Y más por mis*

> *amigos que la conocen, a principio piensan que es mexicana y hasta [tiempo después de estar] hablando con ella, se dan cuenta.*
>
> (She started speaking to me naturally . . . . After we were talking for five minutes she told me she was from Texas . . . her Spanish, it doesn't sound bad, it sounds good, and I didn't realize she was from Texas. And the more my friends know her, at first they think she is Mexican until after a while of talking with her, they realize [she's not].)

Gracie and Ana spoke Spanish together unless they were discussing important themes such as politics and social issues when Gracie "*quiere opinar . . . o cuando se molesta es cuando empieza a hablar en inglés*" (wants to give her opinion . . . or when she gets upset is when she starts to speak in English). Ana reported that, fortunately for Gracie, most of the suitemates understood her when she spoke English. Others, however, thought Gracie switched to English to show off or to be bothersome. Ana recalled that when they went into a restaurant and Gracie ordered with an English accent, from that point on the waitress gave them poor service. "*Porque habrá pensado, porque parece mexicana . . . porque me viene . . . a hablar . . . inglés? La gente pensé que era pesada . . . pero no sabían que ella era Americana*" ([The waitress] probably thought, because [Gracie] looks Mexican . . . why does she come . . . and speak . . . English? People thought she was annoying . . . but they didn't know she was American).

Ana admitted that sometimes she and the suitemates laughed at Gracie when she pronounced words incorrectly. Gracie's three closest friends in the suite took the initiative to correct her, although they were embarrassed to do so during the first 2 weeks of school. Ana reported that Gracie appeared comfortable with the corrections. The suitemates especially corrected features which Ana recognized as being from the north of Mexico.

> *Estos errores que tiene, ni siquiera es la forma en que decimos nosotros, es más . . . del norte . . . la troca, la huerca . . . de dónde lo sacó? Por qué lo dice así si a nosotras no nos oye decir estas palabras? . . . . Lo está*

> *traduciendo . . . tal como lo piensa en inglés lo dice en español. Me llamó pa' tras . . . en lugar de decir 'me regresó'.*
>
> (These errors that she has, they aren't even the way we talk, it's more…from the north . . . *la troca, la huerca* . . . she is translating . . . just how she thinks in English she says it in Spanish. '*Me llamó pa' tras*' . . . instead of saying '*me regresó*.')

Ana commented that by the end of the 10 weeks, Gracie had improved her accent, especially when she used coloquial expressions like "*¿qué onda?*" (what's going on?) and "*¡qué padre!*" (how cool!) as compared to the beginning of the semester. Ana explained, "*está más fluído su español, pero los mismos errores los sigue teniendo*" (she is more fluent in Spanish, but she continues to have the same errors).

3.1.4 SUMMARY

In summary, the comments from Gracie, her professors, and her suitemate described Gracie's Spanish language, others' attitudes toward it, and Gracie's feelings about it. Her peers and professors perceived Gracie's pronunciation to be close to perfect. At first, people assumed she was Mexican because of her looks, until they heard her speak for an extended period of time. Her Spanish was sprinkled with features that her peers and professor perceived as words from the country or from the north of Mexico. Gracie and her suitemate assumed she directly translated from English, and they both wondered where she had learned the forms. If the conversation (or writing assignment) got to a point where Gracie wanted to express herself, she switched to English due to a lexical gap in her Spanish.

Attitudes toward Gracie's use of Spanish were mostly supportive, except when she caused laughter by mispronouncing words, or when people were rude when the assumed she was a Mexican national showing off her English. Each participant commented on Gracie's openness and friendliness. Finally, Gracie felt disappointment in her perceived inability to avoid

stigmatized verb forms. However, as her course of study progressed, she gained confidence in speaking with people in a variety of circumstances. She continued to rely on English when expressing herself, which made her realize how much English was a part of her identity.

3.2 LEILA

3.2.1 LEILA'S PERSPECITVE

Leila described her language with a particular focus on spoken Spanish and vocabulary learning. Before classes started at the UDLAP, Leila stopped over in Mexico City to see her soccer teammates. It had been 6 months since she had trained with them, and she struggled to speak Spanish, especially with her pronunciation and tendency to translate from English to Spanish. After her arrival at the UDLAP, she reported being in an "observant state" and noticed the importance of inflection in Spanish speech. Four weeks into the study, she noted using more colloquial expressions, and found "I speak better when I turn my brain off and just speak."

During the sixth and eighth weeks, Leila discussed her effort to speak more quickly and her strategies for vocabulary learning. She noticed that while trying to speed up her speech, she became "tongue-tied." She showed efforts to slow her speech and noticed the "quality of my Spanish has improved." Leila discussed her tendency toward visual learning and reported starting a Spanish vocabulary list from her classes and conversations. The list especially helped her while reading a 400-page novel in Spanish for her Comparative Literature class. Toward the end of the study, Leila mentioned her continued use of the vocabulary list and used it for writing, but not for speaking.

In general, Leila noted improvement in her reading and writing. On the self-rating scale, she rated herself a point higher than in the beginning of the semester in reading and writing, while she rated herself the same as the beginning ratings for listening and speaking. She

reported putting the most effort into speaking Spanish, but felt the greatest improvement in her listening skills. At the end of the 10 weeks she reported understanding native speakers better than she could at the beginning of her stay.

Leila recounted how she perceived others' reactions to her Spanish at the UDLAP, during her travels and soccer training. When Leila visited her soccer teammates in Mexico City before traveling to Puebla, they made fun of her Spanish. However, she credited her teammates with doing "a really good job at trying to help me." Her UDLAP suitemates did not correct her Spanish until Leila requested it. However, Leila reported that "my roommate will sometimes correct me and kind of laugh . . . she'll make little snooty remarks sometimes or make a joke with her boyfriend."

Four weeks into her study abroad period in Puebla, Leila felt skeptical regarding a compliment on her Spanish from an Anglo American friend who did not know any Spanish. However, Leila welcomed the compliments from her Mexican national friend with whom she regularly practiced Spanish. She felt free from intimidation in this friendship and considered him a support to her Spanish language learning.

Leila reported that the semester was beneficial for relationships on her soccer team. While she often spoke English on the UDLAP campus, she was forced to speak Spanish with her teammates in Mexico City. A sports psychiatrist was assigned to the Mexican national women's team to help foment unity, especially across Spanish-English language barriers. Therefore, this semester Leila was paired up to help a teammate with her English. Leila felt that being with the team this semester was important for her Spanish improvement and for her teammates' support of her Spanish language.

Leila expressed her feelings about her Spanish throughout the 10 weeks. In the first journal, Leila showed an intensity in her "quest for bilingualism." Her determination for improved Spanish skills helped her combat the jokes and snickers from her teammates and roommate. She told herself to "not let the remarks get to you. Just learn from each mistake and move on." She felt encouraged by little language successes:

> The highlight of my week about two days ago [was] when my roommate's boyfriend called and after one or two sentences he goes, "oh, [Leila], hi, I didn't know that was you. Your Spanish has gotten good.". . . It is the little triumphs like those that will feed me the confidence I need to keep on.

The second journal showed frustration in not improving her Spanish as she expected:

> I would say that after one month of being in Mexico, my Spanish is definitely improving, just not as fast as I would like . . . . Over the last two weeks, I have been more frustrated than anything else. I am expecting too much of myself, I guess. I won't be happy until I am accepted as a native.

Leila's journal entries showed her frustration level decrease after her fourth week in Mexico. She realized that she must remain patient and take "one step at a time" in her language progress. Leila grew more relaxed, comfortable and at ease while using her Spanish. This carried over to her relationships with her suitemates: "my Spanish also I think has gotten better . . . that makes me more comfortable in talking to them and I've gotten to know them better as well." Leila also felt positive about her Spanish when she was "forced" to use it:

> Well, the past two weeks, I dealt with all the cabs, the hotel arrangements, changing plane tickets, getting to and out of the jungles of Xilitla. . . I did feel quite confident (I had to, otherwise we may have never made it out of the jungle) with my Spanish.

3.2.2 PROFESSOR PERSPECTIVE

Leila's professor gave his impressions of her Spanish, although he admits not having interacted with her nor taken much notice of her Spanish skills. He teaches Business Communication in Spanish to Leila and twelve other international students for 2 1/2 hours a

week. The students completed presentations, weekly assignments, and exams in Spanish. Leila's professor had had experience teaching Chicano students and while comparing Leila to them, he described Leila as "*muy Americana*" ("very American"). He saw her as dedicated to her work, but not making extra effort in her classwork. "*Yo la percibía totalmente Americana . . . e incluso a la hora de hablar español . . . construye como cualquier Americano . . . no como cualquier hispanohablante*" (I see her as totally American, including when she speaks Spanish . . . she constructs [Spanish] like any other American . . . not like any Spanish speaker). He mentioned that her Spanish had English logic and structure, similar to the dominant English speakers in the class. However, he noticed she expressed herself well in a class presentation and she had an "acceptable competence." Leila's professor rated her at a 3 on every Spanish skill, even though he had not extensively evaluated her abilities as the other professors had through language assessment and/or conversation.

3.2.3 PEER PERSPECTIVE

Leila's suitemate, Estela, evaluated Leila's Spanish skills as well. Estela was an 18-year-old freshman from the Mexican state of Morelos. She had a Chicana friend back home, with whom she got along well. Leila and Estela spent about four hours together a day in the suite, speaking in Spanish about their days, classes and exams. Estela rated Leila's Spanish abilities high: a 5 for speaking and writing, and a 5 for listening and reading.

Estela described Leila and her Spanish. Estela reported Leila as friendly and open, often inviting the suitemates to play soccer. Estela mentioned that at first, she and the other suitemates laughed at the way Leila said something. After Leila's request, they corrected her and felt as though they were doing it for Leila's good. She took the corrections well. Estela described Leila's Spanish as "*muy bueno porque . . . tiene mucho conocimiento del significado de cada*

palabra. En ocasiones . . . tratamos de explicarle" (very good . . . she has much knowledge of each word's meaning. Sometimes we have to explain words to her). After reading Leila's composition the week earlier, Estela also complimented Leila's writing. Although Estela felt that Leila needed to improve her pronunciation, she noticed Leila's hard work put into learning Spanish. "*Digo que empeño y esfuerzo porque, pues, se pone a leer y a escribir; palabras que no entiende nos pregunta o consulta en su diccionario, así constantemente*" (I mean determination and effort because, um, she makes the effort to read, write; she asks us or consults her dictionary for words she doesn't understand).

3.2.4 SUMMARY

In summary, Leila approached the study abroad period determined to gain Spanish fluency especially to use with her soccer team. Over the 10 weeks she struggled to speak quickly and accurately and felt her soccer teammates and suitemates tease her but did not let their comments deter her language learning. However, Leila was encouraged by compliments from others and the language practice with her friend. Although her professor, with little on which to base his observations, saw her as typical "American" in her language characteristics, her suitemate complimented Leila on her efforts to learn Spanish. At the end of the 10 weeks, Leila reflected: "I may not leave Mexico as fluent as I would like, it is at least comforting to know that I can get around this country just fine on my own . . . and with patience and a little more work, the fluency will come."

3.3 MIKAELA

3.3.1 MIKAELA'S PERSPECTIVE

Mikaela discussed features in her Spanish language over the ten weeks of her study abroad. She reflected in the first journal that "the Spanish I speak at home with family or friends

is usually very common language, words that were probably made up by my friends or grandmother, and Spanglish words." She differentiated between her family Spanish and the "proper" Spanish she learned at the UDLAP. After four weeks, Mikaela mentioned using new vocabulary, improving the use of the Spanish articles "*el*" and "*la*," indirect and direct objects "*la, le, lo*", and knowing where to accent Spanish words.

In her remaining journal entries and interviews, Mikaela discussed her verb tenses and language style shifts. First she commented on her verb usage: "it's not the verb that I can't conjugate, it's just that I feel like I don't know the rules of Spanish, the rules of speaking or the rules of what tense." She wrote about confusing the verbs "*acordarse*" (to remind oneself) and "*recordar*" (to remember). Eventually she recognized improvement in her verb tenses. Second, she reported on language style: "I also noticed that I speak differently with my friends and suitemates here, than with say, [my professors] or other [administrators]." She used colloquial language with her suitemates, but not with anyone else. "I'm able to change my style appropriately. I've learned to speak in a more formal or 'respectful' way also." Her Spanish writing workshop professor seemed to help Mikaela recognize the differences in style because she was the one who suggested Mikaela use more formal Spanish than forms such as "*no más*" (colloquial for "nada más" (nothing more)) and "*en vez de*" (colloquial for "*en lugar de*" (in place of)).

Mikaela perceived that her Spanish language prompted negative attitudes, and she explained her perception of them. In the first journal entry, Mikaela wrote:

> Sometimes I feel like the faces of the people that I'm talking to become distorted as I talk as if to say, 'what are you doing with MY language?' This is what I expected so I may also be imagining critical looks when they aren't really there. I don't think my Spanish is all that great so I was expecting a lot more of this and no compliments at all.

When she first arrived at the UDLAP, Mikaela felt that her Mexican national suitemates saw her as an Anglo-American international student and not Mexican, which is why they complimented her on her Spanish. She grew skeptical of their compliments, which was evident throughout her journal entries. Mikaela was pleased, however, when Mexican nationals she encountered in her travels thought she was a Mexican national. Also, while on vacation, Mikaela reported a conversation with Canadian nationals who were baffled by the fact that a young woman, so Mexican in appearance, spoke both Spanish and English. She informed them that, indeed, one can be Mexican and live in the United States at the same time. Overall, Mikaela perceived that people had positive attitudes toward her Spanish, although they were often confused about her identity. She added that the professors who she thought would be critical and judgmental of her Spanish were "very nice, very helpful."

Mikaela discussed her feelings about her Spanish skills throughout the 10 week study abroad period. She arrived at the UDLAP with confidence in her spoken Spanish. After the first two weeks she reported that "I started talking to other [Mexican] students or the administrators . . . I started to realize there was a lot . . . I didn't know . . . then my confidence was just shot." However by the fourth week, Mikaela described increased confidence in her writing and feeling as though she had recuperated the Spanish language skills she thought she lost since high school. She sensed no improvement in her speaking. About half-way through her stay, she wrote: "I feel like my Spanish is getting worse lately . . . I'm not here for very much longer and I want to have improved my skills."

Although Mikaela described a Spanish "slump" in the first half of her journal entries, she recounted encouragement while interacting with both native English and native Spanish speakers: "this weekend was a very fulfilling one for me, in terms of speaking, it was a very,

very nice feeling to be able to communicate with everyone and even be able to help out translating for others!" The last two journal entries showed positive feelings about her Spanish as Mikaela commented that "I can finally say that my Spanish has improved a little bit" after spending more time with her roommates. The last journal showed comfort with and acceptance of her Spanish: "I think that I feel very comfortable with my Spanish now . . . I've accepted the fact that there is always going to be some word that I don't know."

3.3.2 PROFESSOR PERSPECTIVE

One of the "helpful" professors Mikaela mentioned was the President of the ULDAP, who taught a course on the economy of Mexico and offered his perspective on Mikaela's Spanish. Over the ten weeks, the President not only served as a professor but also as confidant and father figure when Mikaela struggled with homesickness and depression. He perceived Mikaela as comfortable with her speaking and felt that she spoke well. He described her Spanish as non-native but similar to Mexican Spanish. The president did not have a sense of Mikaela's Spanish writing, but she told him that she had difficulties reading the economics articles in Spanish (approximately 75% of the total class readings). The President perceived Mikaela's difficulties with economics terminology and attributed it to her lack of background in economics.

> *Habla muy bien. Tengo dudas en que tanto entiende, pero por el otro lado, hay que entender que su campo de estudio no es la economía, y por eso tampoco puedo esperar que comprenda todo . . . ella me da la impresión que se ha preocupado por estudiar el español bien.*
>
> (She speaks very well. I question how much she understands, but on the other hand, we need to consider that economy is not her field of study, and because of this I cannot expect her to understand everything . . . she gives me the impression that she has concerned herself with studying Spanish.)

The University President considered Mikaela as someone who possessed a stronger Spanish language base than other Chicanos he had in previous classes. He categorized Chicano students

as belonging to one of two types. He perceived that one type of Chicano student is someone who does not care to improve his/her Spanish, and the second type makes an effort to study Spanish. He felt that Mikaela was of the second type as she was someone who cared to learn her heritage language, Spanish.

3.3.3 PEER PERSPECTIVE

Mikaela's roommate, Dyana, gave her perception of her Chicana roommate's Spanish. At the same time Mikaela reported feeling criticized by her suitemates, Dyana recounted seeing little of her new roommate, but remembered being impressed with how well she spoke Spanish. Mikaela explained to Dyana that her great-grandparents were from Mexico. Perhaps Dyana, having had experience with international students staying in her family's home in Tlaxcala, considered Mikaela as another international student. Dyana described her interaction with Mikaela: . . .

> *Es que con Mikaela casi nunca hablamos inglés . . . y de hecho, cuando hablamos inglés, es cuando ella no sabe una palabra, pero sólo me dice la palabra y yo le digo como se dice en español y ella sigue hablando español. Y siento que tiene mucho vocabulario, y . . . es fluída al hablar.*
>
> (Mikaela and I never speak in English . . . and in fact, when we do, it is when she does not know a word, but she only says the word and then I tell her how to say it in Spanish and she continues to speak in Spanish. I feel as though she has much vocabulary, and . . . has fluent speech.)

Dyana discussed her perspective on Mikaela's language development over the semester. She felt Mikaela made a point to learn vocabulary words, including more complex and formal words, and informal words spoken with the suitemates. Their conversations deepened when discussing family, friends, relationships, home and school; thus, Mikaela needed complex Spanish words which she elicited from Dyana.

Dyana described features of Mikaela's Spanish that she perceived as errors. Mikaela pronounced "*pues*" as "*pos*" and she reports: "*no creo que mucha gente lo diga en la universidad. Ha de ser muy poca gente . . . no sé porque lo dice así por falla o por modismo*" (I don't think that many people say it at university. There are probably very few who do . . . I'm not sure if she says it because of error or because it's colloquial). Dyana corrected Mikaela's errors from the beginning of their interaction, which Mikaela did not seem to mind. The other six suitemates also corrected Mikaela, but refrained from correcting verb tenses if she used the correct semantic case of the verb. Dyana reported that Mikaela was careful to correct herself.

Dyana felt that Mikaela's Spanish started to improve from the first part of the study abroad and sensed that for Mikaela, it was important for her to learn Spanish.

> *Siento que ha estado practicando, y ella ha aprendido . . . yo siento que al estar acá, se le ha obligado a conocer muchas palabras . . . usa un lenguaje muy propio, muy adecuado, y no tan informal como lo ocupamos nosotros al hablar.*
>
> (I feel that she has been practicing, and she has learned . . . I feel that, being here, it has obligated her to know more words . . . you learn a very proper and appropriate language, not like the informal way of speaking that we use.)

3.3.4 SUMMARY

In summary, Mikaela's and other participants' comments on her Spanish language throughout the 10 weeks illustrated her development of formal and informal Spanish, and difficulties with certain verb forms. While the Stanford Chicana student perceived critical attitudes toward her Spanish and was herself critical toward others' compliments, she realized that her suitemates and her professors supported her in her Spanish language learning. Mikaela reported explaining her identity as a Mexican in the United States, which was instigated by people's confusion about her high language abilities in both English and Spanish. Mikaela went

from feeling that her confidence in her Spanish was “shot” to being comfortable with it and finding satisfaction with her Spanish language progress while studying abroad in Mexico.

3.4 BROOKE

3.4.1 BROOKE’S PERSPECTIVE

Brooke described her Spanish over her study abroad time, with an emphasis on her speaking skills. During her first weeks, she noticed that she had learned new vocabulary, but reported “I don’t like using words or phrases that are super new to me. I’m more about picking stuff up over time.” As she read for her classes and came upon new words, she used her dictionary to decipher them and then wrote them down. She noticed that sometimes her spoken Spanish flowed, and other times she did not seem to speak fluently. About mid-way through the 10 weeks in Mexico, Brooke reported using her Spanish verbal skills in a unique way: speaking to strangers. “It was a sign of progress for me to willingly have a conversation with a stranger in Spanish, it’s something I was mortally afraid of before I came.” She also felt that interviewing another stranger, a Mexican artesian, for her Art class was a “milestone.”

By the end of her stay, Brooke enthusiastically related that her Spanish listening skills improved so much that she could completely understand native Spanish speakers, as well as sing along with Spanish songs because she could distinguish the lyrics, something she had never been able to do. Brooke admitted that she still felt her speech was “choppy” as she was still conscious of using the correct grammatical form, but had hopes of acquiring grammar rules to such a point that they would come to her automatically. With her writing, she sensed an improvement in grammar because she had fewer correction marks on her compositions. She had the most difficult time with using the subjunctive and conditional verb forms. Brooke rated herself a half-point higher in every area on the self-rating scale at the end of the study abroad as compared to

the beginning. She rated herself a full point higher in listening, the skill in which she sensed the most improvement. In general, Brooke perceived a Spanish skill improvement over time. Although she felt that her speaking skills might have sharpened had she made the effort to communicate more with Mexican students than she did, she reported having "stronger control of [her] Spanish skills."

As Brooke's Spanish skills changed over the semester, so did her perception of the attitudes around her. She expected more critical attitudes than she actually perceived. From the beginning she reported that she was weary of others' opinions of her Spanish, especially after Mikaela relayed the Stanford professor's warning. In journal 1 Brooke mentioned what she believed there to be criticism toward her Spanish-English code-switching: "I think that others might think I'm lazy with my Spanish."

She was surprised to receive compliments on her Spanish proficiency. Her Mexican roommate, having lived 5 years in Texas, mentioned that she could relate to Brooke because she spoke both English and Spanish. Regarding her roommate Brooke commented, "its one thing for *me* to think I can speak Spanish, but when other people, Spanish-speakers, think I can, I'm shocked for some reason, or pleasantly surprised." About half way through the study abroad period, Brooke spent a weekend with friends in Mexico City, who "seemed to be impressed that I was American and I still knew Spanish . . . I didn't feel any judgment from them." Nor did she perceive judgment from her professors or other Mexican students during the semester. "If anything, all the professors I have had here have been very understanding of . . . my Spanish abilities. And I haven't really had any Mexican students make any comments to me about my Spanish." Even though she received corrections, she was open to them and felt that they were necessary for her learning. Brooke also questioned the perception from which the compliments

were given. "I think all that depends on people's perspective on whether I'm Mexican-American or I'm just an American."

Over the 10 weeks of study, Brooke experienced wavering feelings toward her Spanish. At the beginning of the study abroad at the UDLAP, she realized she was not as confident about her spoken Spanish as she had been six months earlier at the CEPE. Brooke reported being

> nervous and really worried because of the academic setting and the dorm living situation (not quite as nurturing as a motherly host-mom)! Anyway, I have found that here I don't feel like I'm speaking as comfortably as I was in Guadalajara (this could all be in my head of course).

Four weeks into the study abroad, Brooke still felt displeased and expressed feeling self-conscious around her Mexican suitemates. Brooke intentionally avoided them because she was intimidated about speaking with them. Finally, half-way through the study abroad period she reported being encouraged after her Guadalajara host family noticed her improvement in her Spanish speaking ability from the previous summer. She also related another out-of-town experience where she felt comfortable and, as a result, spoke Spanish fluidly as she was less concerned with her mistakes. As a result of these triumphs, Brooke felt less intimidated and self-conscious, but admitted her feelings were still up and down. Brooke commented that once she was comfortable, she would often be "humbled" in one way or another. By the end of her time, Brooke wrote:

> Right now I feel comfortable with my Spanish. It's still not as advanced as I'd like it to be and it still doesn't come as easy as I'd like but I feel like it's now on a very workable level, a level from which I can definitely reach my Spanish goals.

3.4.2 PROFESSOR PERSPECTIVES

Brooke practiced her Spanish skills outside of class and refined them inside of class. Two of her professors commented on Brooke's Spanish skills and motivation. Brooke took the

History of Popular Art in Mexico with a professor who had been teaching at the UDLAP for thirteen years at the time of the study, which included 10 years of experience teaching Chicano students. The Art class was composed of one-third international students and two-thirds Mexican national students. Brooke completed two 10-page essays and two 10-page written exams in Spanish.

Brooke's Art professor commented about her class and Brooke specifically. She emphasized equal treatment of all her students, whether they were Mexican nationals, Chicanos, or other international students. "*Es mi alumno y ya*" (One is my student, and that's it.) The professor concentrated on the content and the meaning behind what the students said, not their language: "*me doy cuenta en la preparación . . . en ésto me fijo más que si como es su lenguaje*" (I focus on their preparation . . . I focus on this more than how their language is). With this ideology, the professor complimented Brooke on her writing and speaking organization and preparation. She added that Brooke's writing was not native, and that she had trouble with verb-subject agreement and subjunctive verb forms. Brooke did not speak much in class, like any other student who did not speak unless they had something personal to share. The Art professor suggested that Brooke practice her speaking to become more fluent. Regarding Brooke's Spanish skills, the professor ranked her speaking, listening, reading, and writing as 3, 4, 4, and 3, respectively; the same rankings Brooke assigned herself.

When discussing the class' reaction to Brooke's spoken Spanish, the Art professor said that people were generally unresponsive toward others' language, and were more likely to react strongly to the content of what someone said. However, in a class observation, the researcher noted four female Mexican national students snickering when Brooke started to read a passage

aloud. Brooke's professor recognized this, but noted that those particular female students will make fun of anyone who is different, not just Brooke.

Brooke and Mikaela took a writing workshop that consisted of one-on-one assistance time with their writing workshop professor to review essays and discuss style and writing tips from an academic point of view. The writing workshop coordinator had worked with Stanford Chicano students for the 4 years prior to this study and was sensitive to their language needs. She explains:

> *Yo les aclaro mucho que las observaciones que hago no quiere decir que ellas estén mal que ellas no . . . puedan decirlo así . . . pero voy a hacer las observaciones en referencia a mi dialecto[ya] . . . que creo que es el estándar al menos en México.*
>
> (I make it clear that my observations do not mean that they speak poorly or they cannot use a term in that way . . . but I will make observations with reference to the dialect . . . that I think is the standard, at least in Mexico.)

The writing coordinator first commented on both Mikaela and Brooke's language characteristics as Chicanas and then on Brooke's work. When describing the two Stanford Chicana students' Spanish, the writing workshop coordinator mentioned they used archaic Spanish terms, anglicisms, and non-academic Spanish discourse.

> *Cuando yo las escuché o cuando leí su composición, mi reacción fue [que] tienen que aclarar conceptos del uso del vocabulario . . . que su sintaxis, su discurso, al nivel académico . . . no era muy fuerte, muy sólido . . . Expresiones como "na más."*
>
> (When I hear them or when I read a composition, my reaction was that 'they need to clarify concepts and their vocabulary usage . . . that neither their syntax nor their academic discourse was very strong or solid . . . expressions like '*na más*' (no more).)

While both Chicanas needed help with their vocabulary, syntax, and overall sophistication in writing, Brooke seemed aware and motivated to improve in these areas. From her workshop coordinator's point of view, she analyzed and adapted her writing to the corrections the coordinator made.

3.4.3 PEER PERSPECTIVE

Brooke's roommate, Fernanda, reported on Brooke's Spanish language features, efforts in learning, and the suite environment. Fernanda, born and raised in Mexico City until she and her family moved to Plano, Texas, five years before this study, had known and clashed with Chicanos in the United States. After being weary of having a Chicana roommate, she realized that she and Brooke had much in common, and was impressed that Brooke made such an effort to learn Spanish formally when many other Chicanos do not. Fernanda mentioned:

> *Porque en verdad, Brooke ha aprendido el español por decisión propia. Porque en su casa . . . predomina el inglés . . . y también porque ya tiene muy establecida su identidad, y bueno dijo 'necesito aprender el español' . . . . Es muy valiente esto.*
>
> (In reality, Brooke has learned Spanish by way of her own decision. English is the dominant language . . . in her household . . . and because she is very established with her own identity, she said 'okay, I need to learn Spanish' . . . . This is very admirable.)

When speaking about the rest of their suitemates, Fernanda commented: "*ellas simplemente la vean Mexicana, y asumen que ya sabe español*" (they simply see her as Mexican, and assume she can already speak Spanish).

Fernanda, who spoke English with Brooke because that was the language with which they felt the most comfortable in their interactions, described Brooke's Spanish and how it was perceived in their suite. Brooke's spoken Spanish was slow, and sometimes she had to think a while before saying a word. She did not seem bothered when she could not communicate something or people did not understand her. Brooke used English when she could not find the right words in Spanish. Fernanda regretted not speaking more Spanish so that Brooke could have practiced more than she did. She ranked Brooke's speaking abilities as a 3, her listening

and reading skills as 4 and 5 respectively, and did not rank her writing because she had not seen it. Regarding Brooke's Spanish skills and expectations, Fernanda mentioned:

> *Yo creo que ella traía una meta muy muy alta . . . ella creía que por venir y estar aquí tres meses su español ya tenía que ser excelente . . . yo no dudo que ha mejorado porque el ambiente que la rodea es en español . . . tal vez, no es tan, tan, tan fluído como ella desearía . . . y desea tener más vocabulario y . . . mejor gramática.*
>
> (I think that she had set a very, very high goal . . . she thought that by coming and being here for three months that her Spanish would be excellent . . . I don't doubt that she has improved because she is surrounded by Spanish . . . perhaps she is not so, so fluid as she would like to be . . . and wants to have a larger vocabulary and better grammar.)

3.4.4 SUMMARY

In summary, Brooke's journal entries, interviews, professors, and peers provided comments that illustrated Brooke's experience with her language during her 10-week study abroad in Mexico. Comments about her writing included that it had non-native characteristics but improved as she made the effort. Brooke mentioned that her previous writing courses at Stanford gave her a good base for her writing work at the UDLAP. Brooke, Fernanda and Brooke's Art professor all mentioned that Brooke should have practiced her Spanish speaking more than she did. The practice increased over the semester as Brooke made steps to talk to strangers and felt more comfortable around the people with whom she spoke, including her suitemates. She thought she would be criticized more than she was because of her Spanish, and instead found her professors to be helpful. Her roommate was especially sensitive to Brooke as a Chicana and expressed her admiration for Brooke's Spanish learning.

Brooke began the study-abroad as nervous and self-conscious about her Spanish, and ended it being satisfied with what she achieved. Overall Brooke felt proud of herself for taking another step in her Spanish language learning. "I'm really grateful to have had this experience

and I'm really proud that I made it happen . . . I really want to be fluent and I know I won't stop improving on my Spanish until I am."

3.5 QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS

The study results were presented according to the researcher's study questions (see Chapter 1). The following questions surfaced during the analysis of each case:

1. What linguistic features appear in the Spanish of all the Chicana students?
2. What are the patterns of Chicana students' feelings toward their Spanish language over time?
3. How do professors' and peers' knowledge/lack of knowledge of Chicano Spanish and identity influence their attitude toward the Chicana students' Spanish?
4. What strategies and efforts do Chicana students demonstrate during their study abroad?
5. How does change in language affect change in identity?

These questions will guide the discussion of themes across cases in Chapter 4.

4.0 DISCUSSION

The intent of this study was to document informant, professor, and peer perspectives on the Spanish learning of the Chicana study abroad students in Mexico. As established in chapter 3, each student was different in her Spanish language background, and life experiences; however, as Spanish heritage language learners of Mexican descent studying in the country of their heritage, there were similarities across the four cases. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to provide an analysis across the case studies and discuss such topics as language features, general patterns in attitudes toward the Chicanas' Spanish skills, efforts in learning Spanish, and views on ethnic identity during their study abroad in Mexico.

4.1 CHICANA STUDENTS' SPANISH LANGUAGE

During the 10 weeks of study, some attitudes were the reaction to features manifested in students' Spanish as well as their perceived Spanish language improvement. The students showed convergent accommodation as they made efforts to speak the formal Spanish appropriate to the academic environment (Giles, 1973). Still, there remained distinguishing Spanish features from formal Spanish. This section discusses the Spanish language features and improvements observed in and by the four Chicana Spanish heritage language learners.

4.1.1 FEATURES IN CHICANAS' SPANISH

The Chicanas, their professors, and their suitemates described the Chicanas' Spanish characteristics. Each student possessed different Spanish language characteristics and Spanish language education (see Chapter 3 for an explanation of each student case). These differences in language background are expected since heritage language learners have been found to have varying language skills (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Hidalgo, 1993; Scalera, 2000; Valdés, 1995). Research in the study abroad context (Brecht & Robinson, 1995; Freed, 1998; Huebner, 1998)

has also found that there are a plethora of variables that language learners bring with them to the study abroad setting. Nonetheless, the study results show that there are some similarities in Spanish language characteristics. Chicana students' rural Spanish features, English influence, and verb errors in their Spanish will now be illustrated.

Mikaela and Gracie showed typical Chicano lexical characteristics as described in the literature (Hidalgo, 1987; Riegelhaupt & Carrasco, in press; Sánchez, 1983; Smead, 1998; Valdés, 1988) (see Table 3 for a chart of all features mentioned in the results). Both their professors and peers associated the features with the North of Mexico or with rural Mexican Spanish, and not being a variety heard on the university campus. For example, Gracie reported that her suitemate constantly corrected her for using an extra "s" on the end of second person singular past tense verb form. "*Dejiste* (sic), I seem to add an s and pronounce it like dijistes." This is a typical feature in rural Mexican Spanish (Hidalgo, 1987; Sánchez, 1983, 1993; Valdés, 1988). Both Gracie and Mikaela use the non-standard Spanish word "*pos"* instead of the standard Spanish form *"pues"*("well") (Hidalgo, 1987; Valdés, 1988). Mikaela's writing professor suggested she use "*nada más,*" ("nothing/no more") the standard form for "*na' más,*" because the former sounds more "respectful." The latter is an apocope, or loss of the final sound in the word, and is a typical rural Mexican form (Sánchez, 1983).

Another feature of Chicano Spanish is its English influences. Valdés (1988) mentions loanwords and Smead (1998) lists examples of the phrasal calque as influences from English in the Spanish of Chicanos. Only Gracie reported using these types of words. For example, she uses "*daime*" ("dime") and "*troca"* (truck) which is an English loanword (Sánchez, 1983), and "*llamar pa' trás*" ("call back") which is an English phrasal calque (Smead, 1998).

Table 3. Chicano Spanish Features Used By Chicanas Studying Abroad in Mexico

Chicana student	Chicano Word	English translation	Explanation of Variation	Found in Mex. Span.	Who reported variation	Biographical Reference
Gracie, Mikaela	***Llamar pa(ra) (a)trás***	Call back	English Phrasal Calque	no	Gracie, Ana, Art Professor	Smead, 1998; Sánchez,1983; Reigelhaupt & Carrasco, in press
Gracie	***huerca***	little girl	common	yes	Ana	Sánchez, 1983
Gracie	***daime***	dime	English Loanword	no	Gracie	Smead, 1998
Gracie, Mikaela	***Pa'***	To	Apocope: loss of final sound	yes		Hidalgo, 1987; Sánchez, 1983
Gracie	***Pusistes, (urban) Pusites (rural) (*** standard: ***pusiste)***	To put; 2nd person singular	–s addition to the 2nd person singular	yes	Ana, Gracie	Hidalgo, 1987; Valdés, 1988; Sánchez, 1983
Gracie, Mikaela	***Pos (pues)***	well	Reduction of dipthong; common informal variety	yes	Ana, Writing Professor	Hidalgo, 1987; Valdés, 1988
Gracie	***Truje (traje)***	I brought	Archaic term; part of español culto	yes	Ana	Hidalgo, 1987; Valdés, 1988; Sánchez, 1983
Mikaela	***muncho***	much	Archaic term (old case of epenthesis)	yes	researcher	Reigelhaupt & Carrasco, in press; Hidalgo, 1987; Sánchez, 1983
Mikaela	***este***	Um…	Discourse marker	yes	Mikaela	Valdés, 1988
Mikaela	***Na' más No más (nada más)***	No more	Apocope: loss of final sound	yes	Writing professor, Mikaela	Sánchez, 1983
Leila			Intrasentential switches	no	Leila	Smead, 1998
Gracie	***troca***	truck	English Loanword	North Mex.	Ana, Art professor	Sánchez, 1983
Gracie	***Me miro mal? (Me veo mal?)***	Do I look okay?	Dialect difference	North Mexico	Gracie, Ana	Reigelhaupt & Carrasco, in press

The students reported intra-sentential and intra-sentential code-switching to English when speaking Spanish, another characteristic of Chicano Spanish (Smead, 1998; Valdés, 1988). The Chicana students' primary reason for code-switching was to say in English what they did not know in Spanish. This seems to represent a limited Spanish lexical repertoire characteristic of Spanish heritage language learners (Hernández-Chavez, 1993; Sánchez, 1993; Valdés, 1988; Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998). For example, while observations were carried out in their writing workshop and welcome meeting with UDLAP faculty, Brooke and Mikaela appeared to code-switch to English when they did not know words in Spanish. Gracie was reported to code-switch often, because, as her professor explained, "*de repente se desespera . . . y no encuentra la palabra*" ("all of a sudden she gets impatient, and she cannot find the word") so then she switches to English. However, Brooke's roommate reported that Brooke was generally careful not to code-switch, except when talking with her roommate and Mikaela. In this case, Brooke's code-switching does not appear to occur because of a lack of Spanish lexicon, but rather, as a form of social expression characteristic of languages in contact, as explained in Gardner-Chloro (1997) and Smead (1998). Code-switching with another individual who can also understand both languages expresses solidarity and group identification.

Finally, all four Chicanas expressed problems with verb forms throughout the study abroad period. They seemed to know a verb, but conjugated it incorrectly. They expressed problems with conjugating the subjunctive verb form which is a common difficulty for most Spanish language learners and not characteristic of Chicano Spanish. Brooke even avoided using the subjunctive forms. Mikaela pointed out that "it's not the verb that I can't conjugate, it's just that I don't feel like I know the rules of Spanish." This is typical of SHLL who enter into a Spanish class with little formal academic schooling in Spanish. At the end of the study abroad

period, Brooke felt she had improved in her Spanish because she could use the subjunctive without pausing.

4.1.2 SPANISH IMPROVEMENT

The Chicanas, their professors and peers mentioned the students' Spanish skill improvement over the study abroad period. Also, students' sentiments on improvement were interpreted from any gain in the pre- and post- skill ratings, and were explicit in comments made in the students' final journal entries. The improvements in the four language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) and Spanish vocabulary will be related (see also Table 4 for the Chicana Spanish skills rating).

Reading was the skill least mentioned in the Chicanas' journal entries and interviews. On their rating scales, Leila and Gracie indicated that they had not improved over the ten-week period of study, Brooke gave herself a half-point improvement, and Leila gave herself one point improvement. Leila commented the most on her own reading. She felt that it had improved because she read a 400-page novel in Spanish. Interestingly, most of the Chicanas mentioned their belief that their Spanish, especially vocabulary acquisition, improved according to how much they read.

Writing, a skill in which Chicano students characteristically lack experience and instruction (Marrone, 1981; Teschner, 1981; Valdés, 1995) seemed to improve during the semester. The learners in the Hernández Pérez (1997) study reported writing as their weakest skill. All the Chicanas reported a lack of Spanish academic writing skills and vocabulary, typical of Spanish heritage language learners (Hernández Pérez, 1997; Marrone, 1981; Teschner, 1981; Valdés 1995) (see section 4.1.2 for a description of perceived literacy improvement for the

Table 4. Ratings of Chicanas' Spanish Skills

(5 = native speaker skill level)

	Gracie				Leila				Mikaela				Brooke				
Raters	Professor	Peer	Chicana Beginning	Chicana End	Professor	Peer	Chicana Beginning	Chicana End	Professor	Peer	Chicana Beginning	Chicana End	Professor	Peer	Chicana Beginning	Chicana End	**Average**
Speaking	5	3.5	3	3	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2.5	3	**3.8**
Listening	5	4.5	4	4	3	4	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	**4.1**
Reading	4	3.5	3	3	3	4	3	4	2	4	3	3	4	5	3.5	4	**3.5**
Writing	4	3.5	3	3	3	5	3	4			2	3	3		2.5	3	**3.2**

students). This appeared to be the case from the perspectives of the Chicanas, their professors, and the suitemates as the average Chicanas' writing skill rating was lower than their other skill ratings. This was likely because only one out of four of the Chicana students, Brooke, had previously received academic Spanish writing instruction at the university level. Gracie reported having never written in Spanish before; for this reason she took the Writing Communication class. Mikaela had not experienced writing Spanish since high school. Leila had had no Spanish writing instruction since elementary school. Although rated the lowest, writing seemed to be the skill that had most improved for the Chicana students. All students except Gracie rated themselves higher in writing than at the beginning of the study abroad. Further, according to the self-rating scores, the students improved the most in writing. The Chicanas felt their writing improved because they sensed being able to write faster, have fewer error marks on a composition, and feeling comfortable with writing.

Listening, on average, was the highest ranked skill. At the end of the data collection Brooke was the only one to rate herself higher than her original rating, which parallels her mention that "I think my listening skills have really improved and this puts me at much greater ease when I'm speaking to a fellow Spanish speaker." Leila also felt her listening improved the most, even though she rated herself with native Spanish listening at the beginning and at the end of the study abroad period. Leila explained that "I feel like I can understand everything anybody says, where at first . . . the native Mexicans who spoke amongst each other really, really fast…I just couldn't follow them." Both Brooke and Leila measured their listening abilities by how well they understood native speakers.

Speaking was the Spanish skill for which most comments were made. Although only one of the Chicanas rated her speaking higher on the self-rating scale at the end as compared to the

beginning of their study abroad program, all expressed belief that their speaking abilities had improved. Brooke felt that her Spanish was "more grammatically correct," Gracie thought her Spanish had improved when she recognized the absence of the Chicano features, and Mikaela felt that her most improved Spanish skill was speaking. Leila mentioned that "with speaking, I just feel really comfortable . . . I guess that's [where] I've put the most effort."

The students expressed that they sensed improvement in speaking from interactions with native Spanish speakers. For example, Brooke's Guadalajara host family mentioned that she "speaks a '*chorro*' ['ton'] of Spanish now . . . [and she] had more of a Mexican accent" as compared to the previous summer in Mexico. Brooke related that "it's things like strangers acknowledging my Spanish skills that make me recognize them as well." Gracie added, "the best thing was that I could communicate with the natives."

Along with Spanish skill improvement, the Chicanas sensed growth in their Spanish vocabulary. This concurs with Freed (1998a), who mentioned that a varied vocabulary develops during study abroad. Brooke perceived improvement in her vocabulary in writing when she noticed fewer correction marks on her composition at the end of the semester as compared to the beginning of the study. Mikaela also sensed her vocabulary growth. Leila expressed that reading helped expand her vocabulary. Other participants mentioned the Chicanas' acquisition of academic vocabulary. Mikaela's roommate comments, "*yo siento que al estar acá, se le ha obligado a conocer muchas palabras, porque al hablar de economía como que usas un lenguaje muy propio, muy edecuado*" ("I feel that being here, she has been obligated to know many words, because speaking about economics, like you use very proper and educated language"). Leila commented about the "outrageous" vocabulary that she learned from her literature class. Brooke expressed that, at first, she had a hard time understanding the terminology in her

economics and art classes due to a lack of background knowledge. Gracie's professor commented that her academic vocabulary was getting better. Vocabulary increase is a characteristic of language acquisition in the study abroad context according to Freed (1998).

Mikaela demonstrated awareness of the difference between formal and informal Spanish vocabulary from the beginning of the study. She observed in journal 1:

> I'm definitely learning new vocabulary words but if there's been any change at all, I would have to say that it's been in the formality of my Spanish. The Spanish that I speak at home with family or friends is usually very common language.

Mikaela's comments demonstrate that before her study abroad, she used Spanish words from the home register. This corresponds with research finding that Chicano Spanish speakers do not have a formal Spanish lexicon because their vocabulary is limited to the home context (Barker, 1975; Galindo, 1995; Solé, 1981; Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998). Thus, Mikaela's formal Spanish developed over the 10 weeks. At the end of the semester she wrote: "I noticed that I speak differently with my friends and suitemates here than with say, my [professors] or other [administrators] . . . I'm able to change my style appropriately."

Along with academic vocabulary, the students also increased their colloquial usage. Again, almost from day one, they reportedly "picked up on slang." The Chicanas learned from and used colloquial expressions with their suitemates. Brooke was the only one who did not mention using colloquial terms, and this could be because she had little contact with her roommates until the end of her study abroad time. Colloquial language and other native-like features (speech speed, quantity of words, fluency, and fewer mistakes) are what appear to create the impression of native-like speech in language learners during study abroad (Freed, 1998; Yager, 1988).

4.2 ATTITUDES TOWARD CHICANAS' SPANISH

This section examines attitudes toward the Chicana students' Spanish over time as related by the Chicana students, their professors, and their peers.

4.2.1 CHICANAS' ATTITUDES OVER TIME

The Chicana students' attitudes towards their own use of Spanish were analyzed before, two weeks, four weeks, six weeks, eight weeks, and ten weeks into their study abroad in Mexico, as summarized in Table 5. Before their arrival in Mexico, the Chicana students looked forward to knowing Mexico, had hopes to improve their Spanish skills, and were nervous about their current Spanish skills. Mikaela expressed the most comfort with her Spanish. But, after the first two weeks in Mexico, even Mikaela's confidence "was shot." In journal 1, the four Chicanas described being self-conscious and disappointed in their Spanish. Gracie felt "guilty that I should know Spanish, I should be able to communicate."

Four weeks into the study abroad, as documented in journal 2, the Chicana students expressed improvement, but not without some dissatisfaction. Brooke explained that

> honestly, I am frustrated with my Spanish right now. Sometimes it just flows and I don't really have trouble saying what I want to say; but even just today, I was trying to say something a couple of times and I just couldn't get it out en "*español*." Sometimes I wonder why I, or anyone else for that matter, ever considered myself/me bilingual.

In the journal 3 entries, the students recorded more positive feelings than in the previous journals, although evidence of negativity remained. Gracie expressed that "I am still disappointed that my Spanish doesn't seem to be improving that much." Leila, Mikaela, and Brooke added their observations regarding their slow progress and some positive moments in language learning. The students' journal 4 entries, written eight weeks into the study abroad, reported improvements and positive attitudes toward their Spanish. Gracie was the only one to

Table 5. Chicanas' Attitudes Toward Their Spanish Skills Over Time

	Gracie	Leila	Mikaela	Brooke	*Generalization*
Before Study Abroad	People disappointed that she was traveling to Mexico which is not popular nor safe; they thought her Spanish was poor	Admires the language, knows that some things are better expressed in Spanish; previously made fun of by teammates	Felt comfortable and confident with her Spanish; Stanford professor warned her about potentially critical students and professors	Nervous, worried about academic environment; knows she needs to feel comfortable to speak Spanish	Most brought sentiments that made them weary about their Spanish in Mexico
Journal 1, 2 weeks	"Guilty that I should know Spanish," "frustrated…when I want to say something…"	"I found myself struggling quite badly...I was concentrating too hard, fearful of making a mistake."	Confidence "shot," Not as fluent as expected, feels "other people are being critical…"	Feels "okay" but "disappointed," "frustrating," "uncomfortable," "self-conscious"	Frustrated, not communicating as well as they'd like
Journal 2, 4 weeks	"I can recall that my Spanish has improved, not significantly…"	"My Spanish is… improving, just not as fast as I would like… I have been more frustrated than anything."	Does not feel improvement in speaking but has more confidence in writing	"frustrated with my Spanish… sometimes it just flows…;" knows "acting self-conscious" is unhelpful; questions her bilingualism	Most felt slight improvements, Brooke & Leila still frustrated
Journal 3, 6 weeeks	"I am still disappointed that my Spanish doesn't seem to be improving that much."	"As for speaking, I would say progress is stationary. I am not quite as frustrated as before."	"I feel like my Spanish is getting a little bit worse;" felt good translating for others on vacation	"I was feeling a bit better… I sill felt really lacking since I generally always feel this way."	Increase in positive feelings toward their Spanish (except Gracie)
Journal 4, 8 weeks	Suitemates often correct her; doubted that she could still articulate herself in English until she talked to a friend	"I don't speak as quickly but I feel the quality of my Spanish has improved and I am much less frustrated."	"Well, I think I can finally say that my Spanish has improved a little bit."	"I'd have to say that my sentiments about my Spanish were improving;" "I was… less intimidated… self-conscious."	General improvements (except Gracie)
Journal 5, 10 weeks	"... my Spanish has improved; that my confidence had grown from being in Mexico…It blows my mind, however, that I have survived so far."	"So, while I may not leave Mexico as fluent as I would like, it is at least comforting to know that I can get around this country just fine on my own...and with patience and a little more work, the fluency will come."	"I think that I feel very comfortable with my Spanish now. I feel like I can pretty much get through any conversation. I've accepted that fact that there is always going to be some word that I don't know how to say and have to ask."	"Right now I feel comfortable with my Spanish. It's still not as advanced as I'd like it to be and it still doesn't come as easy as I'd like but I feel like its now on a very workable level, a level from which I can definitely reach my Spanish goals."	Comfort, functionality in speaking Spanish, acceptance of their language

continue to express frustrations without positive comments. Mikaela recognized her improvement: "I think I can finally say that my Spanish has improved a little bit." Leila admitted that "I don't speak as quickly but I feel the quality of my Spanish has improved and I am much less frustrated."

Finally, in journal 5 and during the ninth and tenth weeks of the study, the Chicana students showed comfort in speaking, recognized the functionality of their Spanish, and showed acceptance of their language even though they did not feel as much improvement as they desired. Gracie explained in journal 5:

> today I was touring three girlfriends throughout Cholula and found that my Spanish had improved; that my confidence had grown from being in Mexico . . . . It blows my mind, however, that I have survived so far.

The students expressed a gradual change in attitudes over their 10 weeks of study. Their feelings went from insecurity and self-consciousness as seen in the journal 1 entries to feelings of improvement and acceptance of their Spanish skills in the journal 5 entries. Although the Chicanas' attitudes toward their Spanish fluctuated throughout the study, their confidence grew as they interacted with peers and in their classes, experienced success and compliments, and most of all, accepted their own Spanish skills at their developing state, even when they did not arrive at a native levels. Most students commented on their satisfaction with the functionality of their Spanish, thus evoking contentment and positive attitudes. Fishman (1999) discussed the same phenomenon: feeling that one's language is functional creates positive attitudes toward the language. Additionally, the Chicana students' less than native level of Spanish at the end of the study abroad period suggests that not even heritage language learners acheive native language levels after studying abroad, as Regan (1998) found for non-heritage language learners.

4.2.2 PROFESSORS' ATTITUDES

The professors' attitudes were gleaned from what the Chicanas and professors expressed to the researcher. Three of the four students perceived their professors to be supportive. (This is a difference from past years' reports of professors being critical of the Chicanos' Spanish skills.) The professors commented on their previous experience with Chicanos and attitudes toward the Spanish of the Chicana students in this study (see Table 6).

In general, the Chicana students felt that professors' attitudes toward their Spanish were positive, and the Chicanas were satisfied with their classes. Gracie sensed that her professors were "open," and Leila appeared to be content as well. Mikaela commented "I got here thinking that all of the professors were going to be very critical and judgmental, and none of them were at all. All of them have been very nice, very helpful." Brooke commented, "if anything, all the professors I have had here have been very understanding of . . . my Spanish abilities."

Each of the five professors interviewed had previous experience, albeit varied, in instructing Chicano students. However, their philosophies in teaching Chicano students were manifested in distinct manners, from not treating or instructing the student differently than other students, to having a special program designed for them. Brooke and Gracie's Art professor, who had 10 years of experience teaching Chicano university students studying abroad, was very egalitarian in her treatment of every student: "*es mi alumno y ya*" ("she is my student, and that is it"). At the other end of the spectrum is Brooke and Mikaela's Stanford writing workshop professor, who worked with the Stanford Chicano students during the 4 years prior to this study and developed a knowledge of what Chicano students characteristically need to develop their

Table 6. Professors'Background and Attitudes Toward Chicana Spanish

* (S= speaking, L=Listening, R= Reading, W= Writing)

Professor	Previous Experience with Chicano Students	Philosophy in Working with Chicano Students	Chicana Student	Ratings out of 5*	Comments on Chicana Student	Chicana Students' Comments on Professor
Popular Art Professor	10 years giving literature and culture classes to Chicanos and other international students	Chicanos not treated differently	**Brooke**	S = 3 L = 4 R = 4 W = 3	Professor focuses on the content of what Brooke says and feels that Brooke is a good student	Feels her Art professor is supportive of her, like the rest of the professors
Spanish Business Professor	Gave classes to Chicano students (in Mexico) from Texas for 3 years	Important to measure their understanding and level of Spanish at the beginning of class	**Leila**	S = 3 L = 3 R = 3 W = 3	Has not evaluated her much, but sees her as completely American in speech and the way she constructs her grammar	Did not think class was challenging, and that she was the one with the best accent in the class
Spanish Composition Professor	Various years of experience teaching international students, including Chicano students	Chicano students might need extra support in reading and writing; prof. must be sensitive when discussing certain issues	**Gracie**	S = 5 L = 5 R = 4 W = 4	Gracie is an open person and has very good Spanish verbal skills and grammar	Gracie perceived her professor as open and gives her special treatment
Economy of Mexico Professor	Has given various courses to Chicano students over many years	Some have minimal Spanish background which gives them problems in their academic courses; some Chicanos have concerned themselves to learn Spanish and speak it well	**Mikaela**	S = 4 L = 3 R = 2	"She speaks very well…economy is not her field of study, and because of this I cannot expect her to understand everything . . . "	He played the father figure role when Mikaela was homesick; "All of [my professors] have been very nice, very helpful."
Writing Workshop Professor	Has coordinated the writing workshop for Chicano students for the last 4 years; knows needs of the students	Supports their dialect, but teaches standard Spanish; is "there" for the students when they need her help	**Mikaela** **Brooke**	NA	"They need to clear up concepts of using vocabulary . . . that their syntax, discourse, nor academic level . . . was very strong nor solid."	" . . . she is really committed to helping us."

academic writing skills. She expressed awareness that students should develop their standard academic Spanish form in their writing, but adds that "*no quiere decir que ellas estén mal, que ellas no lo puedan decir [como lo aprendieron en su casa]"* (it does not mean that they are wrong and they cannot say it [they way they learned at home]). The professor expressed a consciousness of the heritage language instruction goal that students should learn standard academic language without it replacing their home variety (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Gonzalez-Berry, 1981; Hidalgo, 1993; Orrantia, 1981; Valdés, 1995). Along with understanding the Chicana students' language needs, the writing coordinator also expressed being approachable and willing to coach students as they brought their doubts and questions to the workshop session, as is recommended for effective heritage language instruction (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Gonzalez-Berry, 1981; Scalera, 2000; Webb & Miller, 2000). The writing workshop coordinator reflected:

> *El simple hecho que yo esté allí para ellos es algo, no? o mucho…tienen con quien desarrollarse, que tienen con quien comentar, que tienen con quien leer sin miedo, que tienen con quien exponer sus ideas sin temor.*
>
> (The simple fact that I am there for them is something, no? or much… they have someone with whom to develop, with whom to comment, with whom they can read without being scared, with whom they can express their ideas without fear.)

Mikaela recognized that the writing coordinator was "really committed to helping us."

In summary, all the participating professors appeared to be supportive and generally sensitive to the academic and emotional needs of their Chicana students. It is important to note that three of the five professors interviewed were language teachers and the other two taught content courses. The Art teacher was not a language teacher, and this may explain her focus on the content of Brooke's writing and speech rather than her attention to Brooke's language needs as a SHLL. The fact that the writing workshop coordinator was a language teacher and her special assignment was to coordinate the writing workshop particularly for Spanish heritage

language learners would necessitate that she learn and accommodate to the specific needs of SHLL. These differences in professors' content focus likely explain the difference in attention to the SHLL needs.

4.2.3 PEERS' ATTITUDES

The students' peers demonstrated a wider variety of attitudes toward the Chicanas' Spanish than did the professors. Also included in the peer data were comments from people outside the university setting. Attitudes appeared to form and adjust as the suitemates and Chicanas grew to know one another, and were apparent when the Chicanas were made fun of, complimented, and when people reacted to their identity (see Table 7).

The Chicanas and their suitemates generally took time to feel comfortable with each other. At first the Chicanas (except Gracie) reported feeling uncomfortable speaking in Spanish around their suitemates, and the suitemates expressed not knowing how to interact with their Chicana suitemates. Once they grew to know each other and expectations where voiced about what language learning support the Chicanas desired, a comfortable environment was established in which the Chicanas felt confident using their Spanish. Mikaela explained:

> When I first got here I felt like they [her suitemates] were staring at me crazy because of my Spanish . . . lately, not only have they changed the way they respond to me talking but they've also commented that my Spanish is very good. I think we just weren't very comfortable with each other initially.

What made the Chicanas and suitemates uncomfortable was not necessarily negative attitudes, but rather not knowing one another well at the beginning of the study abroad. As the Chicana students felt more comfortable with their roommates, they felt more comfortable speaking Spanish to them. Giangreco (2000) noticed the same phenomena when speaking Italian. The more comfortable he felt around the people with whom he interacted, the more confident and comfortable he felt using Italian.

Table 7. Peer Attitudes Toward Chicana Student Spanish Skills and Identity

	Gracie	Leila	Mikaela	Brooke	*Generalizations*
Perceived Identity	At first, most think Gracie is a Mexican national	Suitemate has some knowledge of Chicanos in the U.S.; soccer teammates perceives Leila as American	Suitemates: see her as an international student, Outside of UDLA: see her as a Mexican national	Roommate sees her as Chicana; suitemates see her as a Mexican national	Chicanas viewed in varying ways
Beginning of Study Abroad	Suitemates felt comfortable around her because she has Mexican background; 2 weeks passed before they felt comfortable correcting her Spanish	Suitemates recognize Leila is very open and friendly; they laugh when she speaks Spanish incorrectly; Leila did not feel comfortable speaking Spanish with the suitemates	Little interaction with suitemates at first, she perceived them to be critical; people outside the suite complimented her but she questioned their perspective	Brooke avoided speaking to her suitemates to avoid intimidation; suitemates asked her what language she would like to speak; Ana recognized her abilities	Some discomfort between Chicanas and suitemates
Middle of Study Abroad	Suitemates correct Gracie and think she is "cute;" they imitated her which made Gracie feel uncomfortable; others think Gracie is a Mexican national showing off her English	As Leila got to know her suitemates she felt comfortable speaking Spanish, asks them to correct her; roommate laughs and is "snooty" when Leila makes an error; Mexican classmates say her Spanish is good	Mikaela realized she just needed to be comfortable around her suitemates; many compliments on her Spanish but Mikaela still wonders why	Peers outside UDLAP give compliments; still feels self-conscious around suitemates; classmates snickered while she read aloud	Compliments; more comfortable with suitemates than before; some joking directed at Chicanas
End of Study Abroad	Suitemate doesn't think Gracie is aware of her errors because she hasn't corrected them, wonders where Gracie learned the words; think Gracie's speech is more fluid; still laugh at how Gracie pronounces some words	Non-Spanish speakers compliment her Spanish; suitemate says her Spanish is good, she has good knowledge of meaning; suitemates feel that it is their job to correct her	People continue to be impressed and tell her they think her Spanish is good	Roommate thinks her goal was too high; Brooke finally spends time with her suitemates who are friendly	Good relationship with suitemates, say Chicana Spanish is good
Overall Attitudes	Suitemates think Gracie's Spanish is fluent and "cute" by the say she says things; they notice and correct her non-Standard Spanish and wonder where it comes from	Leila felt more comfortable with her suitemates over time; they correct her, only one has a negative attitude toward her; those outside of her suite compliment her	Peers and others are impressed with and compliment her on her Spanish	Took a while to warm up to suitemates; peers outside UDLAP compliment; supportive roommate	Peers are generally supportive although they might poke fun at Chicana Spanish

However comfortable the Chicanas became with their peers, there existed some laughing and joking about the student' Spanish in all four cases. For example, Gracie related that her suitemates thought Gracie's Spanish was very "*mona"* ("cute") and they imitated it, which almost made Gracie "cry" out of embarrassment. Leila reported that "my roommate will sometimes correct me and kind of laugh… she'll make little snooty remarks sometimes or make a joke with her boyfriend." Leila reported that she did not let the jokes bother her; otherwise she would have difficulty gathering the courage to speak Spanish. There was one case where other young Mexican nationals also made fun of a Chicanas' Spanish. Brooke did not report joking from her suitemates, but the researcher observed several Mexican classmates giggle when Brooke started to read aloud in her Art class.

The data suggests that the Chicana students received more compliments than they did jeering. Compliments came from their suitemates and people outside of the UDLA environment. Gracie's suitemate commented, "*está más fluído su español, pero los mismos errores los sigue teniendo"* ("Her Spanish is more fluid, but she continues to have the same errors"). Leila received compliments from her suitemate, her Art classmates, a non-Spanish speaking friend, and her suitemate's boyfriend. Although she questioned the validity of some of their perspectives, she appreciated every compliment and explained that "it is the little triumphs like those that will feed me the confidence I need to keep on." People constantly complimented Mikaela on her Spanish: "I think they all think my Spanish is very good." Brooke's roommate noted her Spanish improvement, "*… yo no dudo que ha mejorado porque el ambiente que la rodea es en español…tal vez, no es tan, tan, tan fluído como ella desearía."* (I do not doubt that she has improved because everything around her is Spanish…but perhaps she is not so, so, so fluent as she would like…"). Brooke was encouraged by the compliments on her Spanish by her

Guadajara host family, and other Mexican friends and acquaintances. Brooke mentions not being able to see her own improvement and "that's why I rely on what other people say to me… if they are so bold as to comment."

The Chicana students received compliments throughout the semester that showed signs of encouragement to the students. Where suitemates' comments were not without criticism, other students, people on trips, and foreigners appeared to offer compliments free from criticism. This seems to have occurred because the suitemates knew more about the Chicanas' Spanish by living with them on a daily basis, and seemed to feel a responsibility to assess their suitemates' language. Nonetheless, the students felt encouraged by and appreciative to those who offered compliments.

Woven into the comments by suitemates and by others were perceptions of the Chicanas' identity. Initial perceptions were formed by appearance: if the Chicanas looked Mexican, peers generally expected them to speak native Mexican Spanish and consequently reacted when the Chicanas did not or when they spoke native-speaker English. However, if the Chicana's were perceived as international students and/or American, then Mexican nationals seemed to have different reactions to their Spanish. For example, people generally thought Gracie was a Mexican national because of her looks. Gracie's suitemate explained:

> *empezó hablar conmigo normal . . . . Como a los cinco minutos de estar hablando con ella fue cuando me dijo que era de Tejas . . . su español, no se oye mal, se oye bien, y no me di cuenta que era Tejana. Y más por mis amigos que la conocen, a principio piensan que es Mexicana y hasta [tiempo después de estar] hablando con ella, se dan cuenta."*
>
> (she started speaking naturally with me . . . . After about five minutes of talking she told me that she was from Texas . . . her Spanish doesn't sound bad, it sounds good, and I couldn't tell she was Texan. And more as my friends meet her, at first they think she is Mexican and after a while of talking with her, they realize [she is not].)

Leila, on the other hand, was not perceived by peers as a Mexican national. Before the study abroad experience, she told her soccer teammates that she was Mexican-American and they responded, "no, you're not, you're American." Leila's professor also perceived her as very "American."

Mikaela reported peoples' perception on her identity and the resulting surprise when she spoke. She felt that, because her suitemates thought she was an Anglo international student (and her roommate seemed to confirm this in the interview), they thought her Spanish was excellent. Her roommate expressed being surprised that Mikaela spoke Spanish so well, even though Mikaela explained that her great-grandparents came from Mexico. Outside of the UDLAP while Mikaela was vacationing, tourists and tour guides seemed to think she was Mexican, and were surprised when she started speaking in English. Mikaela wrote in journal 3 that people would say: "'wait, how do you know Spanish so well? How do you know English so well? Are you or aren't you Mexican? You're Mexican and live in the US?' A lot of them were quite confused." This gave Mikaela the opportunity to explain to people that "you can be Mexican AND from the United States" at the same time.

Finally, Brooke explained her experiences with people's perception on her identity. Her roommate, who lived in Texas for five years and was familiar with the Chicano culture, saw Brooke as a Chicana and showed an attitude of respect and admiration: "*El hecho que un Chicano está en México significa . . . la gloria"* ("the fact that a Chicano is in Mexico is . . . glorious").

In summary, peer reactions and attitudes toward the Chicanas' Spanish varied according to how people identified the Chicanas. If the suitemates and/or others perceived the Chicanas to be Mexican, then they were surprised at their Spanish or English proficiency. If they perceived

them as American (or Chicana), then they were surprised that and/or admired the fact that the Chicana spoke Spanish so well.

These results do not totally coincide with the Riegelhaupt and Carrasco (in press) "expectations paradigm," described in section 1.2.3.3. None of the Chicanas' professors demonstrated expectations that their Chicana students would speak standard Mexican Spanish, as the paradigm proposes. The professors' previous experience with Chicano students likely had an influence on their expectations that the Chicana students would not speak standard, academic Spanish. If the professors had no prior knowledge of or experience with Chicano students, such as a Mexican professor who encounters a Chicano student for the first time, then they might fit the paradigm. As far as the suitemates and other peers are concerned, expectations depended on how they perceived the Chicana and if they had previous experience with Chicanos. Only Gracie's peers showed expectations of her being a Mexican national at first, and did in fact expect her to speak standard Spanish and reacted with confused and/or negative attitudes once they heard her speak English or Chicano Spanish. The other Chicanas' suitemates either perceived the Chicanas as international or American students, or Chicanos, so there was little expectation that the Chicanas speak standard-like Spanish. It might be wise to add a "identity perception" component to the paradigm. If the Mexican host or professors perceives the Chicano as Mexican because there has been no prior contact with a Chicano, then the paradigm is accurate. However, if the Chicano's identity is perceived as anything other than Mexican, then the expectations change. Expectations of language proficiency depend on identity perception.

4.3 CHICANA STUDENTS' EFFORTS IN LEARNING

Over the course of the ten weeks, the Chicana students and other participants reported on the efforts the students made to learn more Spanish. Sánchez (1993) comments on the efforts that must be made to learn Spanish as a heritage language:

> It is, I think, politically important to be fully functional in both languages, and that is something that Latino and Chicano university students can attain, but it will undoubtedly take time and effort and most of all, the desire and willingness to do so. (p. 80)

One UDLAP professor mentioned that "*yo creo que es una tarea consciente la comunicación"* ("I think communication is a conscious effort"). Once in Mexico, the Chicanas themselves recognized the efforts they had to make to reach their goals to continue learning their heritage language. Gracie said, "I recognize that I need to practice consciously and think about what I am going to say." Brooke asserted that, "my level of bilingualism without me making the effort to learn . . . was . . . low." Leila concurred: "the more I put into learning Spanish, the more I will learn." The Chicanas' conscious efforts to learn more Spanish were evident in their initiative to study in Mexico, to have others correct their Spanish speaking and writing, to spend time with their roommates, and to use other strategies, all of which their suitemates and professors recognized.

The first effort is evident in the fact that they studied abroad in their heritage language country and developed goals to achieve more fluent Spanish. Leila did not feel her Spanish classes at Notre Dame were "teaching me enough." Thus, in coming to Mexico she had determined that, "I'm not going home until I pass for a native." Brooke set her course by stating that "I'm here on a mission. I'm here because I'm in search of better Spanish skills." Gracie wrote that she came to Mexico to learn about the geography and culture, and later mentions that "I just hope that I will learn more, become confident in what I have to say and am able to

articulate just what is on my mind." Mikaela wanted to improve her Spanish skills and realized "I want to have improved my skills while I was here, rather than returning to the US with the same speaking level that I came with."

The students insisted that others correct their Spanish, created and took advantage of opportunities to interact with native Spanish speakers, and utilized other resources to aid their Spanish language learning. The Chicanas showed interest and appreciation for corrections. Mikaela expressed: "I . . . want people to correct me. If not, I feel like I'm never going to know I'm saying the wrong thing." Brooke understood that when she was corrected, it was because she needed the correction. Gracie's professor did not perceive that Gracie was bothered by corrections. For Leila, she encouraged corrections from her suitemates, commenting, "I need to learn Spanish, correct me . . . I'm fine with it."

The students viewed the time with their suitemates as opportunities to improve their Spanish. Mikaela and her roommate spent time speaking in Spanish together, with a portion of that time usually dedicated to negotiating with hand signals what Mikaela tried to communicate in Spanish. Leila appreciated the fact that "my roommates are making me speak only Spanish to them." Late in the study, Brooke made the conscious decision to greet and speak to her roommates more frequently than before. She regretted not having spent more time with them because she realized her Spanish, and Mexican friendships, would have improved more than they did when she did not interact with her suitemates. Gracie frequently interacted with suitemates, who constantly attended to Gracie's use of Spanish.

Leila recorded other strategies for her increased language learning. She partnered with individuals outside of her suite, including a soccer teammate and another friend, to take turns speaking in Spanish and English. She appreciated "being forced" to speak Spanish on a trip,

with her soccer team, in class, and at work. Leila created a vocabulary list to keep track of words learned in class and with friends. She also constantly used the strategy of positive self-talk to encourage herself. She "must keep reminding myself 'one step at a time' . . . and with a little patience and a little work, the fluency will come." Leila demonstrated a socioaffective strategy to encourage herself, or to control her emotions during language learning (Mercado, 2000).

Leila mentioned using her dictionary as a strategy to decode unfamiliar Spanish words. The other Chicanas also reported their interaction with dictionaries. Mikaela learned to better use the dictionary and realized it improved her vocabulary. Gracie started out "too proud" to use the dictionary, but toward the end of the study conceded using it. Brooke insisted on using a Spanish-Spanish dictionary because she was trying to "wean" herself off direct translation.

The professors and peers noticed the efforts the Chicanas students made in their Spanish language learning. Mikaela's economics professor mentioned that "*ella me da la impresión que se ha preocupado por estudiar el español bien"* (she gives me the impression that she has concerned herself to learn Spanish well"). Mikaela's suitemate reinforces the professor's comment: "*siento que ha estado practicando, y ella ha aprendido"* ("I feel that she has been practicing and she has learned [Spanish]"). Brooke's roommate commented on her effort:

> *Porque en verdad, Brooke ha aprendido el español por decisión propia. Porque en su casa . . . predomina el inglés . . . y bueno dijo "necesito aprender el español" . . . es muy valiente esto.*
>
> (In reality, Brooke has learned Spanish by way of her own decision. English is the dominant language in her household . . . she said "okay, I need to learn Spanish." This is very admirable.)

Leila's suitemate observed that she *"es una persona que le pone mucho empeño y ganas al idioma español*" ("is a person who puts much effort and enthusiasm in [learning] the Spanish language"). Perhaps Leila's professor did not see this same level of effort since, as Leila

reported, she was not stimulated and admittedly did not make much effort to interact in the class. She seemed to place a high value on her informal Spanish experiences, which she credited as important in improving her Spanish.

Each Chicana made efforts to improve her Spanish skills, and Leila explicitly recorded her efforts and strategies more than the other students. These differences likely occurred because the students started the study abroad with various perceptions of language learning. Differences in goals and perceptions of language learning have been shown to influence language acquisition in study abroad (Brecht & Robinson, 1995; Pellegrino, 1998; Wilkinson, 1998).

4.4 CHICANA STUDENTS' AWARENESS

The Chicana students seemed to express various levels of awareness of their Spanish language skills, which can be connected with their previous experience with the Spanish language. Leila appeared to be aware of her Spanish because she had been playing with the Mexican national women's soccer team for three years prior to the time of this study. This awareness about her Spanish not being "native" probably had an affect on her determination and apparent intensity in learning Spanish during her study abroad. Brooke seemed to be aware of her Spanish skills and background, evident when she mentioned her "bilingualism" in many journal entries and her interviews. In the final interview she described her Spanish at home to be comprised of words for food and "from a children's book." Brooke's awareness seemed to come from her two Spanish classes for heritage language learners at Stanford and her Spanish classes for bilingual speakers in Guandalajara the summer previous to this study.

Mikaela also expressed knowledge about her family's Spanish lexicon starting in journal 1: "the Spanish that I speak at home with family or friends is usually very common language." She predicted that the words were "probably made up by my friends or grandmother." Mikaela

reported developing the sociolinguistic ability to use Spanish in informal and formal situations throughout the semester. Distinguishing between and appropriately using formal and informal registers is an important component in heritage language learning according to Draper & Hicks (2000), and may be a sociolinguistic feature acquired during study abroad.

Gracie was not sure where her Spanish features came from either (i.e., adding an extra "s" to the end of the second person preterite verb; using the English calque, and other English loan words). In journal 4 she wrote, "I wonder where that comes from?" Mikaela took Spanish courses consistently up through her junior year in high school, but Gracie did not. Neither of the Chicana students took a Spanish for heritage language learners class that may have increased their sociolinguistic awareness of certain Spanish features. Neither Mikaela nor Gracie had contact with Mexico when they might have compared their Spanish to standard Mexican Spanish. For this reason, both Mikaela and Gracie wondered about the origin of some of their words that seemed to cause the most reaction from suitemates and professors.

In the case of the four Chicana students, two seemed to be more aware of their Spanish language as compared to standard Mexican Spanish, and two were not. Brooke and Leila had either heritage language learner classes (with a goal of creating sociolinguistic awareness in the learner) and/or contact with Mexicans. Hidalgo (1993) would suggest that, having had more contact with monolingual Spanish speakers, Brooke and Mikaela previously had access to a gauge by which to compare their own Spanish skills, and were aware of their skill levels before studying abroad in Mexico. Whereas Leila and Gracie, having no university Spanish heritage language classes nor contact with Mexico, seemed to question the origin of particular Spanish forms in their spoken Spanish.

4.5 CHICANA STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR IDENTITY AND LANGUAGE

All four case study participants identified themselves as Chicana, decided to study in Mexico in part to better know their Mexican background (an integrative motivation according to Gardner & Lambert, 1972) and had certain perceptions of their own ethnic identity before they came to Mexico. During the semester, their identity seemed to be influenced by insights into their Spanish and English language expression (see Table 8 for changes in language and identity during the semester).

Gracie studied in Mexico to learn about the "culture and geography" and seemed to want to "survive" with her Spanish. At Brown, she used Spanish to connect with her Latino friends and "raise my [Mexican] flag" to show pride in her Mexican heritage. Once in the land of her heritage, she gained a different perspective on her language and identity. Gracie admitted, "I've never been proud to know English before. But here in Mexico . . . I . . . accepted that English was a part of me." She found she could express herself better in English. As in Pavelenko & Lantolf (2000), Gracie commented on the difficult to fully express her identity in another language. She also realized that "I come here and I'm completely not Mexican" as compared to the Mexican nationals. Gracie's study abroad experience taught her how American she was, and that English, the language into which she switched all semester to better express herself, was a source of pride. She maintained her pride in Spanish as well, stating that she felt "now more than ever . . . Spanish will be a part of . . . me."

Leila chose to study abroad in Mexico to improve her Spanish and be closer to her teammates. She felt the linguistic and cultural rift over the previous few years when her teammates laughed at her Spanish and told her "you're not Mexican, you're American." Even though Spanish "reminded her of home," she recognized that her family spoke a different

Table 8. Chicana Students' Identity and Language During Study Abroad in Mexico

	Language	Identity
Gracie	Before, used Spanish as cultural expression; now, feels proud of her English as she realizes she also needs English to properly express herself; continues her pride in Spanish.	Before, proud to be a Mexican in the United States; now, she realizes how American she is compared to Mexican nationals and appreciates and takes pride in being American.
	Gracie summary: New pride in English, new appreciation for her American side	
Leila	Before, wanted to be a native speaker of Spanish, especially to communicate with her teammates on the Mexican national soccer team; now, feels as though she has made a step toward her native-like Spanish abilities during her study abroad	Before, desired to be more Mexican, especially because she plays on the Mexican national soccer team; now, feels as though her "Mexicanness is meeting her Americanness"
	Leila summary: Spanish has improved, "Mexicanness" greater	
Mikaela	Before, fairly comfortable with her Spanish; grows slightly more comfortable with her Spanish, continues to use English and Spanish	Before, called herself Mexican; now, tries to explain to others that one can be Mexican and American at the same time
	Mikaela summary: Confident with her Spanish & English, confident one can be simultaneously Mexican and American	
Brooke	Before, her bilingualism always a point of struggle; now, realizes that Spanish is a part of her in a "Spanglish" way	Before, recognized her Chicano identity; now, she is more comfortable with her Chicano identity: being Mexican and American at the same time
	Brooke summary: More comfortable with her "Spanglish," more comfortable with her Chicano identity	

language, “Spanglish.” After a semester of study in Mexico, Leila felt that she had grown closer to her goal of native fluency in Spanish. She also felt that, as she had the chance to know the Mexican people and the Spanish language better, her “Mexicanness” came closer to matching her “Americanness.”

Mikaela studied in Mexico to improve her Spanish skills and understand “her [Mexican] culture.” From the beginning of the study abroad she expressed a confidence in her Spanish (although “shot” after initial contact with Mexico, it regained its initial level during the semester) along with her identity as a Mexican. Throughout the study abroad period she found herself explaining that one can be “Mexican AND live in the United States” to curious Mexicans and foreigners unable to identify her as Mexican or American because she spoke both languages. Her identity was both Mexican and American, just as she spoke both Spanish and English.

Brooke explained that “my Spanish is a huge part of my consciousness, it’s a huge part of who I am.” Although she reported a continuing struggle with her bilingualism that started from when she was young, she seemed to gain peace about it in Mexico. She stated “I would definitely say [my Spanish] is a big part of who I am more . . . in a Spanglish kind of way.” At the same time she realized she was comfortable with her “Spanglish,” Brooke explained “I feel very comfortable with my identity as a Chicano” as well. She was comfortable being both Mexican and American at the same time (Chicano) and speaking both Spanish and English. Gardner & Lambert (1972) found that HLL who were comfortable with both of their languages where also comfortable with both of their ethnic identities.

Being in Mexico and studying Spanish was a catalyst for further definition of the Chicanas’ identity, especially as connected to language. Interestingly, as Liebkind (1999) summarized, language and identity appear to be reciprocally related. This seems to be true in

this study because as the Chicanas' perception on language changed, so did their perception on their ethnic identity. The only exception is Mikaela, who did not seem to express such a shift. Fishman (1999) discusses how language and ethnic identity vary according to social context. The students experienced such a changes in their perception of both their ethnic identity and language during study in Mexico, a different social context than their American context.

4.6 FUTURE USE

The four Chicanas explained that, upon their return to the U.S., they will use their improved Spanish skills for purposes as documented in the literature review (Barker, 1975; Mejías & Anderson, 1988): for interpersonal communication within the Chicano community. In this case, leaning Spanish in Mexico seems to have been instrumentally motivated (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Brooke planned to use her Spanish skills more than she had used them before in the Stanford tutoring program. She stated, "it definitely helps the rapport between the . . . coordinators and the families whenever you can go in and speak to them in a language [with which] they are comfortable." She did not envision her interactions in the Stanford Chicano center changing because of her improved Spanish proficiency, whereas Mikaela does:

> When I get back, I think I'm just going to make an effort to use [Spanish] more. I think I'll go back feeling more confident with my Spanish speaking skills . . . a lot of my friends would talk to me in Spanish and I would answer in English because I was never confident enough.

Leila continued to discuss her determination to develop her Spanish fluency and use with her soccer team: "primarily, I plan to use it for playing with the Mexican team . . . and I probably won't stop until I'm fluent." Gracie is not sure she will continue to study Spanish, but mentions that after studying abroad in Mexico "I'll be more accepted by my mom's side of the family . . . that knows Spanish."

On a professional level, the four Chicana students articulated plans to use their Spanish. Brooke would like to use it "to serve the Chicano community" while Leila would like to use it to work for a U.S. consulting firm in Mexico. Mikaela and Gracie also have plans to use their Spanish in their respective medical fields. Most importantly for all of them, however, is their desire to teach Spanish to their own children and younger relatives. Mikaela expressed that "I definitely want . . . all of my family to speak Spanish . . . that's probably more important to me than what I'm going to do with it in my career."

4.7 CONCLUSIONS

4.7.1 *SUMMARY*

In summary, the Chicanas' attitudes toward their Spanish language changed from negative to positive over the 10-week study. Professors' attitudes were mostly supportive and positive, and their previous experiences with Chicano students resulted in non-specialized to specialized instruction for the students. Peers showed greater variance in their attitudes toward the Chicanas' Spanish than the professors, including linguistic support juxtaposed with criticism. Professors, with greater previous experience with Chicano students and awareness of Chicano Spanish language characteristics and learning needs, appeared to be less critical (at least openly) toward the Chicanas' Spanish. Perceptions of a Chicana student's identity seemed to influence expectations of Spanish proficiency.

Two of the four Chicanas exhibited Chicano Spanish features from the literature (i.e.: rural Mexican Spanish, influence of English on Spanish lexicon), all four showed evidence of code-switching, mostly due to a lexical gap in Spanish vocabulary, and all students reported having trouble with verb conjugations. Perceived Spanish improvement was marked by an increase in vocabulary, academic as well as colloquial, and a general improvement in Spanish

skills. Each Chicana noted improvement in different skills for varying reasons; nonetheless, all sensed improvement in the production skills of writing and speaking. Interactions with native Spanish speakers helped them to gauge their speaking and listening abilities.

The Chicanas also mentioned their efforts toward Spanish language improvement. The greatest effort was making time to study their heritage language in Mexico with goals to improve their Spanish, which they accomplished by applying various strategies. All welcomed Spanish corrections, recognized the benefits of interacting with suitemates and other native Spanish speakers, and used other strategies. The Chicanas' peers and professors recognized and complimented these efforts.

Finally, study abroad in Mexico provided a change in context that caused a change in the Chicanas' perception on their identity and bilingualism. Their perception change in language was parallel to their perception change in identity. Gracie became more accepting of her American side as she accepted that English was a part of her. Brooke felt more comfortable being American and Mexican and at the same time she realized that "Spanglish" described her bilingualism the best. Leila felt her "Mexicanness" meet her "Americanness" at the same time sensing she made steps acquiring native-like Spanish. Mikaela expressed comfort with her Mexican and American identity as she expressed herself fluently in both English and Spanish throughout the semester. The Chicanas projected that, having achieved an increase in confidence in Spanish during study in Mexico, they would use their Spanish in their families, other interpersonal situations, and in their profession.

4.7.2 *IMPLICATIONS*

This study of different perspectives on Chicana students' Spanish learning during 10 weeks of study abroad in Mexico has implications for the UDLAP study abroad program and

other language learning programs, especially regarding Spanish heritage language learners (SHLL). I would like to make the following recommendations for UDLAP professors, Spanish heritage language learners, and the suitemates and peers.

4.7.2.1 IMPLICATIONS FOR UDLAP PROFESSORS

In the results it is evident that the professors were sensitive and supportive of the Chicano students' needs to feel supported academically and socioaffectively. However, only one of the five professors, a language teacher, expressed extensive awareness of heritage language learner characteristics and teaching techniques similar to those in the research. I recommend that language and content professors alike increase their knowledge of the specific needs of SHLL. Webb & Miller (2000), written by teachers of heritage language learners, is an excellent resource to gain teaching ideas. Another theoretical base and idea source for heritage language instruction is the Stanford Spanish 300 course reader designed specifically for the teaching of SHLL (Valdés, 1999). UDLAP professors of SHLL should consider developing classroom materials to accommodate the SHLL needs. Professors and program coordinators should consider Valdés' (1995) four components of a heritage language program (see section 1.2.2). Professors are unlikely to have the luxury of designing a curriculum for a whole class of SHLL as there are few who study abroad at the UDLAP at one time; nonetheless, individualized instruction for SHLL students should be incorporated into course curriculum. For example, the literature recommends using learning packets and varied grouping so students may carry out independent work according to their skill level..

Results from this study and the pilot study demonstrated students' desire to be more encouraged in language learning and to have professors share perceptions on student progress. Therefore, it is recommended that professors pay more attention to student assessment. Mercado

(2000) suggested using a portfolio format, which includes a compilation of assignments and other documents, to assess student progress throughout the semester. In addition to a collection of course assignments, I suggest adding to the portfolio a list of student goals as well as journal reflections on student feelings and perceived language development.

For example, at the beginning of the study abroad period, students should be encouraged to write a list of three or four realistic, specific, measurable and time-based goals for their Spanish skill and socioaffective development (see Rubin (2000) for more ideas on language self-management and language strategy instruction). Journal reflections, with similar guidelines to those in this study, should be part of the portfolio. Written reflection is a helpful strategy to have students identify their own feelings, awareness, triumphs and strategy use during language learning. It can also be a tool for professors and students to discuss strategies to control emotions that may get in the way of language learning (Mercado, 2000).

The portfolio, complete with goals, assignments, and journal entries, should be reviewed once a month by professors and students so students may see their improvement and success. This portfolio could be compiled in the writing workshop, for example, so students do not have to create a portfolio for every class. Plus, an individualized weekly meeting structure between the writing coordinator and student is already in place in the writing workshop. Once every month time should be taken to analyze student goals, progress, and feelings regarding their language. A language counseling format should be considered, where the counselor guides the language learner in goal-setting, language strategy use, self-assessment, and evaluation of goals (Kelly, 1996). This review may especially encourage the students through times when confidence in their language is low.

Low confidence might be alleviated through increased awareness of the sociolinguistic aspects of their Spanish variety and implications of use when in Mexico, attitude fluctuation toward their Spanish throughout the semester, and strategies to keep positive and motivated through discouraging times. First, to increase sociolinguistic awareness, language professors should consider carrying out a general discussion about sociolinguistics and specifically address characteristics of heritage language learner (or Chicano) Spanish, as well as give students the metalanguage to discuss such sociolinguistic issues. Like Brooke and Mikaela, some Chicanos might have previous knowledge of their Spanish variety and/or about possible reactions to its use; however, many students will not be aware of such reactions until they experience them upon arrival to Mexico.

Second, students should be shown Table 5, an example of the pattern of Chicana student attitudes toward language over time. This would allow them awareness of the potential emotional roller coaster that Spanish heritage language learning may be in Mexico. They would also see that language improvement and confidence is attainable, which may encourage them to maintain their efforts in language learning. Also, students should be encouraged to have high, but attainable expectations. For example, students should not expect to reach native fluency, but rather, improve in native-like speech. Student discouragement in this study often came when their Spanish had not improved as much as they had hoped; once the Chicana students realized they would not be completely fluent, they became more comfortable with their Spanish language level and less anxious about their speech.

Third, students should know that they themselves can control their own emotions that affect their attitudes. Leila used positive self-talk to calm herself down when she realized her expectations to speak quickly were too high. Professors might introduce strategies to control

emotions (as suggested above in Mercado (2000)), and language learning strategies to encourage and make Spanish language learning more manageable (see Rubin & Thomspson (1994) for tips on language self-management). The previous three suggestions to create awareness about sociolinguistics, attitudes and the ability to control their emotions might take place in one presentation at the beginning of the study abroad semester, or, in a series of planned discussions over the first several weeks of the study abroad period. This talk or series of talks could possibly occur within the structure of the writing workshop, or in another setting as not all SHLL are enrolled in the writing workshop. A writing workshop could also be created for all Spanish heritage language learners at the UDLAP.

4.7.2.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR SHLL STUDYING ABROAD AT THE UDLAP

This study has implications for the Spanish heritage language learners who study abroad at the UDLAP. The SHLL should be encouraged to set concrete language learning goals with the help of the writing coordinator or language counselor. As mentioned above, the goals should be attainable and when reviewed every so often, students should feel successful by what they have accomplished. It is recommended that students share these language goals with their professors and suitemates, and discuss how they may be involved with the SHLL's learning process over the study abroad semester.

This study shows that the Chicana students and suitemates were slightly uncomfortable around each other, not because of negative attitudes toward the Chicana student, but because the the suitemates were still getting to know each other. To diminish initial discomfort, SHLL are encouraged to be open with their suitemates: sharing about themselves, their backgound, and their language learning goals. The suitemates will likely desire to help the SHLL accomplish these goals because the suitemates in this study where enthusiastic about supporting the Spanish

learning of the Chicana students. Students should let their suitemates know if, when, and how they would like their Spanish to be corrected. Also, SHLL are encouraged to practice the Spanish language, initiating discussions regarding the suitemates' backgrounds and interests. Suitemates should be viewed not only as a language resource, but as a source of friendship and support. However, SHLL should be warned of the potential disrespect or joking directed at their Spanish variety. If this occurs SHLL might take the opportunity to explain the sociolinguistic implications of their Spanish variety in the UDLAP context. The UDLAP program of language coordinators might chose to organize a special welcome party with the Chicano students and their suitemates. During the party some time should be taken to explain the history and origins of Chicano Spanish. Riegelhaupt & Carrasco (in press) found this type of meeting to be effective and as a result, the family's attitudes appeared to improve toward their Chicana homestay guest.

Aside from suggestions for SHLL goal setting and suitemate interactions, another recommendation is that students be encouraged to study abroad for a full semester or year. It is understandable that there are home university schedules and limitations, but the language and study abroad experience might bear more fruit if students extend their stay. For example, both Brooke and Mikaela's writing coordinator and economics professors mention that it is a pity the Stanford students must leave Mexico so soon. Brooke even encouraged "any Chicano to come to Mexico and spend some time here, and not a short period of time." Olga Cantú (personal communication, May 8, 2000), director of international education in the Department of International Affairs, recommended studying abroad for two semesters.

4.7.2.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR UDLAP PEERS

UDLAP suitemates and peers of Spanish heritage language learners are encouraged to support the study abroad experience of the students. Suitemates should make an extra effort to draw the new students in from the beginning of the study abroad period. SHHL might be a little shy about speaking Spanish, and even avoid interacting in Spanish as Brooke did in this study. Nonetheless, suitemates should continue to try to make contact with the SHHL and understand their background, interests, and language learning goals. Sensitivity will be needed when negotiating what the SHLL needs in way of corrections on their Spanish. Suitemates and peers should keep in mind that students may not be aware that their Spanish dialect is different than standard Mexican Spanish. SHLL will need encouragement and positive reinforcement, not joking or jeering, as they learn aspects of the formal variety of Spanish,.

4.7.2.4 IMPLICATIONS FOR OTHER STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS

These same recommendations can be made to other study abroad programs that send and/or receive university heritage language learners for periods of foreign language study. Programs would do well to inform themselves of the language needs of heritage language learners, understand the sociolinguistic environment at the host university, and consider organizing special programs such as the writing workshop offered by the UDLAP (see section 2.1.3). Also, heritage language learners themselves should be prepared for a range of attitudes, including negative, toward their language variety. Students should be equipped with strategies to deal with different attitudes. Workshops can be given at the home institution before study abroad, but more than likely, students may find the information more relevant if given in the host environment. Although Wilkinson (1998) mentions that it is difficult to generalize across study abroad programs, the recommendations for HLL teaching can be applied to other programs.

4.8 LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As there were several implications in the study, there were also limitations to the study and suggestions for further research. One important limitation to this study is the length of time for data collection. The data collection only lasted for 10 weeks (longer, however, than similar studies in Mexico by Rieglelhaupt & Carrasco (in press) and Yager (1998)). Had the study covered a longer period of time, perhaps other developmental trends in language attitudes and linguistic features would have surfaced, and/or the Chicanas' awareness of their language would have become more acute. Future studies should allow time for data collection over a semester, year, or multiple years. A future research question should be: what are the changes in SHLL identity, language acquisition, and attitude over a full semester or a full year?

A second limitation to this study is not following up on students' language experiences after the study abroad period at their home university. Future studies should conduct follow-up interviews with students, professors, and/or family and peers in order to understand how changes in the Chicanas' Spanish skills, sociolinguistic awareness, and/or identity affect the student and relationships upon return to the United States. Research questions should include: How are students' linguistic and confidence gains described by family, friends, colleagues, and/or professors? How do students' linguistic and confidence gains influence their communication in relationships and decisions regarding further Spanish study and/or future profession? How do the students accomplish the goals they set for themselves for their return home? What factors contribute to the maintenance of linguistic and emotional gain once students return to their home university?

A third limitation was the small number and variety of case study participants. The data in this study did not represent the full range of perspectives on the Chicanas' Spanish skills

because not all professors and suitemates were interviewed. Also, all students and their suitemates were female. Mejías & Anderson (1988) found women to have more sentimental attachement to Chicano Spanish than men, and in this study, there was no Chicano perspective with which to compare Chicana perspectives. The perspective toward the Chicanas' Spanish skills was limited to the university context. Also, as is a risk in most studies, data might have been influenced by variables such as the Hawthorne or halo effects, or subject expectancy caused by participants' attitudes toward the study (Brown, 1988). The following questions should be asked to generate additional insights: What are all of the professors' and suitemates' perspectives on the Chicanas' Spanish? What is the perspective of Mexicans outside of the university setting? What is the difference in perspectives on language toward a Chicano versus a Chicana? How do perspectives toward Chicano Spanish differ by the gender of the observer?

A fourth limitation was the information gleaned from the Spanish skill self-rating scores. The scores were principally used to observe any differences between student, peer, and professor ratings, and as a tool to discuss how the students perceived their skill level improvement. Being qualitative in nature, this study did not intend to use the self-ratings in a statistically significant manner. However, an interesting component for future studies would be an added quantitative measure of Spanish skill ratings. More participants would be required to complete ratings in order for them to be statistically significant. A quantitative measure would add to the external validity of the study.

A fifth limitation is the lack of concrete data representing Spanish proficiency and linguistic gain. In future studies, additional data collection should include pre- and post-test Spanish skills scores and any other assignments and measure that reflect changes in Spanish proficiency. At the time of this study there were no standardized Spanish proficiency exams like

the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), that could be used across studies. With concrete data one may ask, what is the change in Spanish skill level proficiency? Is there one skill that improves more than another?

Along with the recommendations resulting from the study limitations, other suggestions for further research can be made. The study results categories (attitudes toward heritage language over time, language features, language strategy use, awareness and language change with identity) were generated from the data itself. To further test these categories, they should be used in future studies. For example, the categories could be used in comparative studies. What are the differences and similarities within categories when comparing study abroad experiences of Spanish heritage language learners and non-heritage language learners in Mexico? What are the differences and similarities within categories when comparing study abroad experiences of heritage language learners who chose homestay with a Mexican family and those who chose to live in the dormitories? What are the differences and similarities within categories when comparing study abroad experiences of Spanish heritage language learners and heritage learners of other ethnic languages (i.e.: Chinese)? When a Chicano student studies in a Spanish speaking country other than Mexico, how are results different within categories as compared to those results in Mexico?

This study has served to fill part of the gap in the research on university Spanish heritage language learners in a study abroad setting. It has also served to create more questions to be investigated. Future research should be carried out with heritage language learners in study abroad settings to continue the understanding of the "admirable" efforts students make to study the language of their heritage, and in doing so, further define themselves as members of two cultural and linguistic groups.

Reference List

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters 83.

Barker, G. C. (1975). Social functions of language in a Mexican-American community. In Hernández-Chavez, E., A. Cohen, & A. Beltramo (Eds.), *El lenguaje de los Chicanos* (pp. 170-182). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Bourhis, R. Y. & Marshall, D. E. (2000). Ch.12, The United States and Canada In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of Language & Ethnic Identity* (pp. 244-263). New York: Oxford University Press..

Brecht, R. D. and J. L. Robinson. (1995). On the value of formal instruction in study abroad . In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 317-334). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Brown, J. D. (1988). Understanding research in second language learning: A teacher's guide to statistics and research design. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Draper, J. B. & J. H. Hicks. (2000). Where we've been; What we've learned. In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 15-35). New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Feliciano, W. (1981). Design for a two-semester course for Puerto Rican students. In G. Valdés, A. G. Lozano, & R. García-Moya (Eds.), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods* (pp. 196-210). New York: Teachers College Press.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word, 15*, 325-340.

Fishman, J. (1999). Ch. 11. Sociolinguistics. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of Language & Ethnic Identity* (pp. 152-163). New York: Oxford University Press.

Fluehr-Lobban, C. (1994). Informed consent in anthropological research: We are not exempt. *Human Organization, 53 (1),* 1-10.

Freed, B. (1995). Language learning and study abroad. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 3-33). Amsterdam; John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Freed, B. (Fall, 1998a). An overview of issues and research in language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad. Special issue: Language learning in a study abroad context,* 31-60.

Freed, B. (Fall, 1998b). Language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad. Special issue: Language learning in a study abroad context,* iv-viii.

Galindo, D. L. (1995). Language attitudes toward Spanish and English varieties: A Chicano perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17(1),* 77-99.

Galindo, D. L. (1996). Language, use, and language attitudes: A study of border women. *The bilingual review, 21(1),* 5-17.

Gardner, R. & Lambert, W. (1972). Attitudes and motivations in second-language learning. Rowley, Massachussetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (1997). Code-switching in community, regional and national repertoires: The myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages* (pp. 68-89). *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Giacone, M. C. (2000). Standards and the teaching of heritage languages. In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 99-110). New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Giangreco, C. (2000). Learning my heritage language: An odyssey of self-discovery. In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 59-66). New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Giles, H. (1973). Accent mobility: a model and some data. *Anthopological linguistics, 15,* 87-105.

Gonzalez-Berry, E. (1981). Basic Spanish for native speakers: A rationale and course outline. In G. Valdés, A. G. Lozano, & R. García-Moya (Eds.), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods* (pp. 178-187). New York: Teachers College Press.

Grosjean, F. (1998, February). Methodological and conceptual issues in bilingualism research. *Colloquium series on Language Processing in the Bilingual.* Department of Linguistics, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Hall, C. J. (1997). Palabras concretas, palabras abstractas y rasgos categoriales en léxico mental bilingüe. In R. Barriga Villanueva, R. & Martín Butragueño, P. (Eds.), *Varia lingüistica y literaria: 50 años del Cell, I. Lingüistica.* (pp. 363-381). Ciudad de México: El colegio de México.

Hernández-Chavez, E. (1993). Native language loss and its implications for revitalization of Spanish in Chicano communities. In B. J. Merino, H. T. Trueba, & F. A. Samaniego (Eds.), *Language and culture in learning: Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish* (pp. 58-74). London: Falmer Press.

Hernández Pérez, A. (1997). *A descriptive study of university students of Hispanic descent enrolled in Spanish as a foreign language (SFL) and Spanish for native speakers (SNS) classes in the United States.* Unpublished master's thesis, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, México.

Hidalgo, M. (1986). Language contact, language loyalty, and language prejudice on the Mexican border. *Language in Society, 15(2),* 193-220.

Hidalgo, M. (1987). Español mexicano y español chicano: Problemas y propuestas fundamentals. *Language problems and language planning, 11(2),* 166-193.

Hidalgo, M. (1993). The teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speakers: A 'problem' of inequality. In B. J. Merino, H. T. Trueba, & F. A. Samaniego (Eds.), *Language and culture in learning: Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish* (pp. 58-74). London: Falmer Press.

Hidalgo, M. (1997). Criterios normativos e ideología linguística: aceptaciones y rechazo del español de los Estados Unidos. In M.C. Colombi & F. X. Alarcón (Eds.), *La enseñanza del español a hispanoblantes: Praxis y teoría* (pp. 109-120). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Huebner, T. (Fall, 1998). Methodological considerations in data collection for language learning in study abroad. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad. Special issue: Language learning in a study abroad context,* 1-31.

Ibañez, B. (Fall, 2000). The love and passion of the latinos. *UDLA International,* 10. Cholula, México: International Affairs Office of the Universidad de las Américas-Puebla,

Kelly, R. (1996). Language counseling for learner autonomy: the skilled helper in self-access language learning. In R. Pembertson, E.S. Li Li, W. W. F. Or, & H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 93-112). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Lafford, B. A. (1995). Getting into, through, and out of a survival situation. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context (*pp. 97-121). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liebkind, K. (1999). Social Psychology. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of Language & Ethnic Identity* (pp. 140-151). New York: Oxford University Press.

Marrone, N. G. (1981). Español para el hispano: un enfoque sociolinguístico. In G. Valdés, A. G. Lozano, & R. García-Moya (Eds.), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods* (pp. 69-79). New York: Teachers College Press.

McCallister, C. (2000). The new essence of "teacher stuff": An orientation to language arts instruction. In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 111-127). New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

McGroarty, M. (1996). Language attitudes, motivation, and standards. In MacKay, S. L. & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 3-37). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mejías, H. A. & Anderson, P. A. (1988). Attitude toward use of Spanish in the south Texas border. *Hispania, 71(3),* 401-406.

Mercado, C. I. (2000). Monitoring the progress of heritage language learners: Assessment trends and emerging practices. In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 209-230). New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Merino, B. J., H. T. Trueba, & F. A. Samaniego. (1993). Towards a framework for the study of the maintenance of the home language in language minority students. In B. J. Merino, H. T. Trueba, & F. A. Samaniego (Eds.), *Language and culture in learning: Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish* (pp. 5-25). London: Falmer Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Quantitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

National Educational Association (1966). *The invisible minority: the NEA-Tucson survey on the teaching of Spanish to the Spanish-speaking.* National Education Association: Washington, D.C.

Nunan, D. (1992*). Research methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Orrantia, D. (1981). Spanish for native speakers: A proposed first-year syllabus. In G. Valdés, A. G. Lozano, & R. García-Moya (Eds.), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods* (pp. 169-177). New York: Teachers College Press.

Pavlenko, A. & J. P. Lantolf. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 155-177). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pellegrino, v. A. (1998). Student perspectives on language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad. Special issue: Language learning in a study abroad context*, 91-120.

Ramos-Pelicia, M.F. (2000, October). *A Puerto Rican Spanish retroflex approximate: Some socio- and ethnolinguistic explanations to the issues raised by its use.* Paper presented at Paper presented at the 29th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest, Puebla, Mexico.

Regan, V. (1998). Sociolinguistics and language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad. Special issue: Language learning in a study abroad context*, 61-90.

Riegelhaupt, F. & R. L. Carrasco. (in press). Mexico host family reactions to a bilingual American Chicana teacher in Mexico: A case study of language and culture clash. *Bilingual Research Journal*.

Richards, J. & D. Nunan (1990). *Second language teacher education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rippberger, S. (1993). Ideological shifts in bilingual education: Mexico and the United States. *Comparative Education Review*, 50-61.

Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rubin, J. (2001). Promoting effective language learning. [course reader for LA 524, Department of Languages, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla.]

Rubin, J. & I. Thompson. (1994). *How to be a more successful language learner. 2nd ed.* Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle.

Sánchez, G. I. (1997). History, culture, and education. In A. Darder, R.D. Torres, & H. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Latinos and education: A critical reader* (pp. 117-134). New York: Routledge.

Sánchez, R. (1981). Spanish for native speakers at the universities: Suggestions. In G. Valdés, A. G. Lozano, & R. García-Moya (Eds.), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods* (pp. 91-99). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sánchez, R. (1983). *Chicano discourse.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sánchez, S. (1993). Language variation in the Spanish of the Southwest. In B. J. Merino, H. T. Trueba, & F. A. Samaniego (Eds.), *Language and culture in learning: Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish* (pp. 75-81). London: Falmer Press.

Scalera, D. (2000). Teacher beliefs and the heritage language learner: What will you teach your students. In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners:*

Voices from the classroom (pp. 71-82). New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Simmen, E. (2000a). *Brief history of the UDLA-P.* Unpublished manuscript, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, México.

Simmen, E. (2000b). *Chronological history of the UDLA-P: 1940-1984.* Unpublished manuscript, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, México.

Smead, R. N. (1998). English loanwords in Chicano Spanish: Characterization and rationale. *The bilingual review/La revista bilingue, 23(2),* 113-123.

Smith, P. H. (2000). Community as resource for minority language learning: A case study of Spanish-English dual language schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Solé, Y. (1981). Consideraciones pedagógicas en la ensenañza del español a estudiantes bilingües. In G. Valdés, A. G. Lozano, & R. García-Moya (Eds.), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods* (pp. 21-29). New York: Teachers College Press.

Spolsky, B. (2000). Ch. 13, Second-Language Learning. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of Language & Ethnic Identity* (pp. 181-191). New York: Oxford University Press.

Stanford University (2000a). *Spanish for home-background speakers* [Brochure].

Stanford University (2000b). *Puebla program description, 2001-2002* [Brochure].

Stanford University (2000c). Stanford university: An introduction to the Chicano/Latino community [Brochure].

Stanford University (2000d). Stanford university time schedule, winter quarter 2000-2001 [Brochure].

Stovall, M. (1981). Spanish for the native speaker: A syllabus. In G. Valdés, A. G. Lozano, & R. García-Moya (Eds.), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods* (pp. 188-195). New York: Teachers College Press.

Teschner, R. V. (1981). Spanish for native speakers: Evaluating twenty-five Chicano compositions in a first-year course. In G. Valdés, A. G. Lozano, & R. García-Moya (Eds.), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods* (pp. 115-139). New York: Teachers College Press.

Valdés, G. (1988). The language situation of Mexican Americans. In S. McKay & S. L. Wong (Eds.), *Language diversity: Problem of resource* (pp. 111-139). New York: Newbury House.

Valdés, G. (1995). The teaching of minority languages as academic subjects: Pedagogical and theoretical challenges. *Modern Language Journal, 79(iii)*, 299-328.

Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Valdés, G. (1999). *Issues and methods in the teaching of Spanish as a heritage language.* [course reader for Spanish 300, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Stanford University].

Valdés, G. (2000). The SCTFL-Hunter College FIPSE Project and it's contributions to the profession. In J. B. Webb & b. L. Miller, eds. *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 235-252). New York: ACTFL.

Valdés, G. & M. Geoffrion-Vinci. (1998). Chicano Spanish: The problem of the "underdeveloped" code in bilingual repertoires. *Modern Language Journal, 82(4),* 472-501.

Van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 245-259). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Webb, J. B. & B. L. Miller (2000). A framework for learning about your students. In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 47-54). New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Wilkinson, S. (1998). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant perspectives. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad. Special issue: Language learning in a study abroad context*, 121-137.

Yager, K. (1998). Learning Spanish is Mexico: The effect of informal contact and student attitude on language gain. *Hispania, 81(5)*, 898-911.

Appendix A

Participant Consent Form

Researcher: Tracy R. McLaughlin
Masters Candidate
Department of Languages
Universidad de las Américas, Puebla
Santa Catarina Mártir, Cholula
Puebla, México

Title: Chicano, Peer, and Teacher Attitudes Toward Chicano Spanish in Mexico

The following is an explanation of and an invitation to participate in this study to measure attitudes toward Mexican-American Spanish in Mexico. Please read the whole content of the form. Your signature below will indicate that you agree to voluntarily participate in the study.

Purpose: This study is to document and understand language attitudes toward Mexican-Americans' Spanish when they study abroad in Mexico.

Procedure: With your permission, you will fill out a questionnaire, write 5 language journal entries, be asked to provide pre- and post-Spanish proficiency test scores (if any), allow the researcher to read select class assignments in Spanish, and be interviewed and audio-taped individually and in a group about the topic. (Your roommates and professors will also be asked to participate in filling out a questionnaire and in an interview.) The interviews will last approximately one hour. Your interview recording will be transcribed, and you may be asked to check the transcription for accuracy.

Final Products: Your questionnaire, journal entries, proficiency test scores, class writing assignments, and interviews will be used in the researcher's study for her Masters thesis for the Universidad de las Américas, Puebla, with the expected completion date being May 2001. After completion of the thesis paper, it will possibly be used in a journal, conference, book, or other publication.

Confidentiality: Your name and any names mentioned in your interview or writing entries will be protected by the use of pseudonyms, unless you request your real name be used.

Agreement by the Participant:

I have read and had explained to me the above information. My signature below indicates that I understand the above information, agree to participate in this research, and release my questionnaire, test scores, writings, and any audiotapes from my interview(s) to the researcher for use in this project.

_____ _____

Name (please print) Date

_____

Signature

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact the researcher by email: tracymclaugh@hotmail.com, or by phone: in the U.S. (559)436-1412 or in Mexico (2)230-5468.

Appendix B

Participant Consent Form

Researcher: Tracy R. McLaughlin
Masters Candidate
Department of Languages
Universidad de las Américas, Puebla
Santa Catarina Mártir, Cholula
Puebla, México

Title: Chicano, Peer, and Teacher Attitudes Toward Chicano Spanish in Mexico

The following is an explanation of and an invitation to participate in this study to measure attitudes toward Chicano Spanish in Mexico. Please read the whole content of the form. Your signature below will indicate that you agree to voluntarily participate in the study.

Purpose: This study is to document and understand language attitudes toward Chicano students' Spanish when they study abroad in Mexico.

Procedure: With your permission, you will fill out a questionnaire and be interviewed and audio-taped. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to fill out, and the interviews will last approximately 40 minutes. Your interview recording will be transcribed, and you may be asked to check the transcription for accuracy.

Final Products: Your questionnaire and interview will be used in the researcher's study for her Masters thesis for the Universidad de las Américas, Puebla, with the expected completion date being May 2001. After completion of the thesis paper, it will possibly be used in a journal, conference, book, or other publication.

Confidentiality: Your name and any names mentioned in your interview or writing entries will be protected by the use of pseudonyms, unless you request your real name be used.

Agreement by the Participant:

I have read and had explained to me the above information. My signature below indicates that I understand the above information, agree to participate in this research, and release my questionnaire and any audiotapes from my interview(s) to the researcher for use in this project.

_____ _____
Name (please print) Date

_____
Signature

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact the researcher by email: tracymclaugh@hotmail.com, or by phone: in the U.S. (559)436-1412 or in Mexico (2)230-5468.

Consentimiento del Participante

Investigadora: Tracy R. McLaughlin
Candidata a la Maestría
Departmento de Lenguas
Universidad de las Américas, Puebla
Santa Catarina Mártir, Cholula
Puebla, México

Título: Las actitudes del los estudiantes Chicanos, sus profesores y sus compañeros respeto a su español

El contenido de esta forma es una explicación de la investigación en la cual usted está invitado/a participar voluntariamente. Favor de leer todo el contenido de la forma. Su firma indica que usted ha sido informado/a sobre la naturaleza de este proyecto y que ha dado su consentimiento para participar según las condiciones establecidas abajo.

Propósito: El estudio tiene el propósito de documentar y entender las actitudes hacia el español de los estudiantes Chicanos que están estudiando en un programa de intercambio en México.

Procedimiento: Con su permiso, usted llenará un cuestionario y será entrevistado usando grabadora. El cuestionario durará aproximadamente 20 minutos en llenar y la entrevista durará aproximadamente 40 minutos. Posiblemente se le pedirá revisar una transcripción de dicha entrevista por razones de precisión.

Productos finales: Su cuestionario y su entrevista serán usados para la tesis de Maestría de la Universidad de las Américas, Puebla. Al terminar la tesis en mayo de 2001, es posible que el estudio sea usado en una revista, conferencia, libro u otra publicación.

Confidencialidad: Su nombre y algún otro nombre mencionado serán protegidos por medio de seudónimos, al menos que usted especifique que se utilice su nombre verdadero.

Consentimiento del entrevistado(a):

He leído y/o escuchado la información de arriba. Mi firma indica que entiendo dicha información y estoy dispuesto(a) a participar en este estudio. Autorizo a la investigadora que use las grabaciones de mi entrevista y datos de mi cuestionario para ser incluidos en este proyecto.

_____ _____

Nombre (letra) Fecha

_____

Firma

Si usted tiene preguntas de este proyecto, puede comunicarse con la investigadora vía correo electrónico: tracymclaugh@hotmail.com, ó por teléfono: en los E.U. (559)436-1412 ó en México (22)30-5468.

Appendix C

Student Language Questionnaire

This questionnaire will help the researcher understand more about your language background and evaluation of your own language and language in general. It should take about 20 minutes to fill out. Thank you for your participation!!

Name: _____ Date: _____

Contacts: *email*: _____ *phone*: _____ Age:_____ Sex: M F

Birthplace: _____ Country of permanent residence: _____

Name of home university: _____ Major/Minor: _____

A. LANGUAGE HISTORY

1.) What is the first language(s) you learned to speak?_____

Second (when)? _____ Others (when)? _____

2.) What language(s) do you speak to your mother? _____ father? _____

siblings? _____ maternal grandparents? _____

paternal grandparents? _____ other relatives? _____

3.) Where is your family from outside of the U.S.? (Please name and describe the town, city, and/or state as specifically as possible.) _____

_____

_____

4.) Who in your family first went to the United States to live? _____ When did they arrive? _____

5.) What is/was your father's occupation? _____ mother's?_____

maternal grandparents'? _____ paternal grandparents? _____

6.) Please describe the language(s) during your school years with approximate percentages. Be sure to state in which country your studies took place, and any other descriptions you think would be useful:

		IN CLASSROOM	OUTSIDE CLASS WITH PEERS	AT HOME
*** (example) PRIMARY**		70% English	90% English	50% English
Country:		30% Spanish	10% Spanish	50% Spanish
PRIMARY SCHOOL	**1-3 grades**			
Country:	**4-6 grades**			
MIDDLE SCHOOL				
Country:				
HIGH SCHOOL				
Country:				
COLLEGE				
Country:				

7.) From the time you were 12 years old until now, how often did you do the following in Spanish? (*Please put an x in the appropriate box.)*

	NEVER	ALMOST NEVER	SOME-TIMES	OFTEN	VERY OFTEN
Listen to music					
Attend religious events					
Attend cultural events					
Watch television					
Speak to your friends					
Speak to your immediate family					
Speak to your extended family					
Read					
Participate in clubs					
Practice sports					
Work					
Practice a hobby					
Go shopping					
Other: _____					

8.) When and why did you choose to formally study Spanish?

9.) Why did you choose to study in Mexico?

10.) Why did you choose to study at the UDLAP?

B. LANGUAGE SELF-EVALUATION AND DESCRIPTION

11.) Please rank your Spanish skills in order of importance (1 being most important).
___ SPEAKING ___ LISTENING ___ READING ___WRITING
Comments:

12.) Rate your ability to use *Spanish* in these four skill areas. A rating of 5 indicates native speaker proficiency.

SPEAKING	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
LISTENING	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
READING	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
WRITING	1……..2……..3……..4……..5

13.) Rate your ability to use *English* in these four skill areas. A rating of 5 indicates native speaker proficiency.

SPEAKING	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
LISTENING	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
READING	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
WRITING	1……..2……..3……..4……..5

14.) Rate your knowledge of Spanish and English vocabulary on this 9 point scale. Circle one number. A rating of 1 will indicate you only know English words. A rating of 9 indicates you know only Spanish words. A rating of 5 indicates you are equally proficient in English and Spanish vocabulary.

(English only) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (Spanish only)

15.) Rate your level of bilingualism using the same 9 point scale. Circle one number. A rating of 1 indicates complete English dominance (0 proficiency in Spanish). A rating of 9 indicates complete Spanish dominance (0 proficiency in English). A rating of 5 indicates you are equally proficient in English and Spanish.

(English only) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (Spanish only)

16.) When you speak Spanish or English, how often do you use both languages in the same sentence (i.e. "I am going to estacionar my troca"; "Quiero estudiar political science.") or discussion? *Circle one.*

NEVER ALMOST NEVER SOMETIMES OFTEN VERY OFTEN

17.) If you use both languages in the same sentence or discussion, please explain briefly when and with whom this happens, citing examples.

18.) If you use both languages in the same sentence or discussion, please explain how doing so benefits or harms you…

… *socially*.

… *academically*.

C. GENERAL LANGUAGE DESCRIPTION

There has been a lot of talk about "standard" and "non-standard" languages. Please give your thoughts about the topic by answering the following questions.

19.) What is your definition of a “standard” language?

20.) Give some examples of “standard” Spanish.

21.) What is your definition of a “non-standard” language?

22.) Give some examples of “non-standard” Spanish.

23.) Is there anything else the researcher should know about your language background and/or feelings toward your language *before* you came to Mexico?

Thank you for taking the time to fill this out!!

Cuestionario para los estudiantes

El cuestionario ayudará a que la investigadora entienda más de tus habilidades y actitudes hacia tu español. Tendrá una duración aproximada de 20 minutos. ¡Gracias por tu participación!

Nombre: _____ Fecha : _____

Contactos: *Email* _____ *Número de teléfono:* _____

Lugar de nacimiento: _____ Edad: _____ Sexo: M F

País de residencia permanente: _____

Nombre de la institución de donde vienes: _____

Carrrera/especialización:_____

A. DATOS PERSONALES

1.) ¿Cuál(es) es(son) su(s) idioma(s) materno(s)? _____

Segundo(s) idioma(s)? _____ Otro(s)? _____

2.) ¿Cuáles idiomas habla usted con su madre? _____ padre? _____

hermanos? _____ abuelos maternos? _____

abuelos paternos? _____ otros familiares? _____

3.) ¿De dónde es tu familia fuera de los Estados Unidos? (Favor de nombrar y describir

específicamente el pueblo, ciudad, y/o estado.) _____

_____

_____

_____

4.) ¿Quiénes de tus familiares llegaron primero a los Estados Unidos? _____

_____ ¿Cuándo llegaron? _____

5.) ¿En qué trabaja/trabajaba tu padre? _____ madre?_____

abuelos maternos?_____ abuelos paternos? _____

6.) Favor de describir el porcentaje del uso de tus idiomas en tus años escolares. Incluye en cuál país tomaba/toma lugar cada nivel educativo, y cualquiera otra información que se considere útil:

		EN EL SALÓN DE CLASES	**CON COMPAÑEROS FUERA DEL SALÓN**	**EN CASA**
*** (ejemplo) PRIMARIA**		70% inglés	90% inglés	50% inglés
PAÍS: E.U.		30% español	10% español	50% español
PRIMARIA	**Grados 1-3**			
PAÍS:	**Grados 4-6**			
SECUDARIA				
PAÍS:				
BACHILLERATO				
PAÍS:				
UNIVERSIDAD				
PAÍS:				

7.) Desde que tenías 12 años en adelante, cuánto tiempo pasabas haciendo lo siguiente en español? (Favor de marcar el nivel.)

	NUNCA	CASI NUNCA	DE VEZ EN CUANDO	CASI SIEMPRE	SIEMPRE
Escuchar música					
Asistir a eventos religiosos					
Asistir a eventos culturales					
Ver la televisión					
Placticar con amigos					
Placticar con la familia nuclear					
Placticar con la familia extendida					
Leer					
Participar en clubes					
Practicar un deporte					
Trabajar					
Tener un pasatiempo					
Ir de compras					
Otro: _____					

8.) ¿Por qué empezaste a estudiar español formalmente?

¿Cuándo?

9.) ¿Por qué decidiste estudiar en México?

10.) ¿Por qué escogiste la UDLAP?

B. DESCRIPCIÓN DE IDIOMA PERSONAL

11.) Enumera en orden de importancia de tus habilidades en español.
(1 indica la más importante)

____ HABLAR ____ ESCUCHAR ____ LEER ____ ESCRIBIR

Comentarios:

12.) Mide tus habilidades en español. Una medición de 5 significa un nivel nativo.

HABLAR	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
ESCUCHAR	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
LEER	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
ESCRIBIR	1……..2……..3……..4……..5

13.) Mide tus habilidades en inglés. Una medición de 5 significa un nivel nativo.

HABLAR	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
ESCUCHAR	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
LEER	1……..2……..3……..4……..5
ESCRIBIR	1……..2……..3……..4……..5

14.) Mide tu conocimiento de vocabulario en inglés y español en esta escala de 9 puntos. Marca un sólo número. Una medición de 1 indica que sólo tienes un conocimiento de palabras de inglés, y una medición de 9 indica que tienes un conocimiento de sólo palabras en español. Una medición de 5 indica que tienes un conocimiento igual en español y en inglés.

(sólo inglés)1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (sólo español)

15.) Mide tu nivel de bilingüismo en esta escala de 9 puntos. Marca un sólo número. Una medición de1 indica que eres dominante completamente en inglés (0 habilidad en español), y una medición de 9 indica que eres dominante completamente en español (0 habilidad en inglés). Una medición de 5 indica que tienes igual capacidad en inglés y español.

(sólo inglés)1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (sólo español)

16.) Cuando hablas en español o en inglés, cuánto hablas en los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso? (ej. I am going to estacionar my troca. Estoy estudiando political science)? *Marca uno.*

NUNCA CASI NUNCA DE VEZ EN CUANDO CASI SIEMPRE SIEMPRE

17.) Si usas los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso, favor de explicar cuándo y con quién suele ocurrir, dando ejemplos.

18.) Si usas los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso, favor de explicar como puede ser o no ser beneficioso…

… socialmente.

… académicamente.

C. DESCRIPCIÓN GENERAL DEL IDIOMA

Hay mucho debate sobre idiomas estándares y no estándares. Favor de explicar tus perspectivas sobre los dos en las siguientes preguntas.

19.) ¿Qué es un idioma estándar?

20.) Favor de dar ejemplos del español estándar.

21.) ¿Qué es un idioma no estándar?

22.) Favor de dar ejemplos del español no estándar.

23.) ¿Tienes otros comentarios u observaciones que te gustarían compartir sobre tus experiencias y opiniones de tus idiomas *antes* de venir a México?

¡Mil gracias por haber
llenado el cuestionario!

Appendix D

Professor Language Questionnaire

This questionnaire will help the researcher understand more about your students' Spanish language abilities. It should take you 15 minutes to fill out. Thank you for your participation!

Name: _____ Date: _____

Contacts: *Email* _____ *Phone:* _____ Age:_____ Sex: M F

Birthplace: _____ Country of permanent residence: _____

Name of institution where employed. _____

Years employed at institution:_____ Title: _____. **A**.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1.) What was your first learned language(s)? _____

Second? _____ Other? _____

2.) Please describe your previous experience working with Chicano students.

3.) Please rank the Spanish language skills you believe are the most important for your Chicano students to master. (1 being most important)

____ SPEAKING ____ LISTENING ____ READING ____ WRITING

Comments:

B. STUDENT LANGUAGE EVALUATION AND DESCRIPTION

Name of student: _____

Course(s) given to student: _____

4.) How many hours do you have contact with the student per week? _____

5.) In what language: do students do their homework? _____

is the class given? _____ are class readings? _____

6.) Rate your student's ability to use *Spanish* in these four skill areas. A rating of 5 indicates native speaker proficiency.

SPEAKING 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
LISTENING 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
READING 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
WRITING 1……..2……..3……..4……..5

7.) Rate your student's knowledge of Spanish and English vocabulary on this 9 point scale. Circle one number. A rating of 1 will indicate your student only knows English words. A rating of 9 indicates he/she only knows Spanish words. A rating of 5 indicates equal proficiency in English and Spanish vocabulary.

(English only) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (Spanish only)

8.) Rate your student's level of bilingualism using the same 9 point scale. Circle one number. A rating of 1 indicates complete English dominance (0 proficiency in Spanish). A rating of 9 indicates complete Spanish dominance (0 proficiency in English). A rating of 5 indicates your student is equally proficient in English and Spanish.

(English only) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (Spanish only)

9.) When your student speaks Spanish or English in class, how often do they mix both languages within a sentence or within discourse (i.e. I am going to estacionar my troca)? *Circle one.*

NEVER ALMOST NEVER SOMETIMES OFTEN VERY OFTEN

10.) If they use both languages in class or outside of class, please explain briefly how and with whom this happens.

11.) If they mix both languages, please explain how doing so benefits or harms them
… socially:

… academically:

…professionally:

These days there is a lot of talk about standard languages. Please explain your perspective on standard and non-standard languages in the following questions.

12.) What is a "standard" language?

13.) Give examples of "standard" Spanish.

14.) What is a "non-standard" language?

15.) Give examples of "non-standard" Spanish.

16.) Is there anything else the researcher should know about the student or the student's language abilities?

Thank you for taking the time to fill this out!!

Cuestionario de profesores

El cuestionario ayudará que la investigadora entienda más de las habilidades y actitudes de su alumna. Durará aproximadamente 15 minutos para llenar el cuestionario. ¡Gracias por su participación!

Nombre: _____ Fecha : _____

Contactos: *Email* _____ *Número de teléfono:* _____

Lugar de nacimiento: _____ Edad: _____

País de residencia permanente: _____ Sexo: M F

Nombre de institución en donde es empleado: _____

Número de años en la institución como empleado:_____ Título: _____

A. DATOS PERSONALES

1.) ¿Cuál(es) son su(s) idioma(s) maternal(es)? _____

Segundo(s) idioma(s)? _____ Otro(s)? _____

2.) Favor de describir sus experiencias previas con estudiantes Chicanos.

3.) Favor de numerar en orden de importancia las habilidades en español para los estudiantes Chicanos. (1 indica más importante)

____ HABLAR ____ ESCUCHAR ____ LEER ____ ESCRIBIR

Comentarios:

B. DESCRIPCIÓN DE LAS HABILIDADES DEL ESTUDIANTE

Nombre del estudiante: _____

Clase en cual está matriculado su estudiante: _____

4.) ¿Cuántas horas por semana tiene Ud. contacto con su estudiante?: _____

5.) ¿En su clase, en cuál idioma:

tienen que entregar la tarea los estudiantes? _____

está dado la clase? _____ están las lecturas? _____

6.) Mida Usted las habilidades en español de su estudiante. Una medición de 5 significa un nivel nativo.

HABLAR 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
ESCUCHAR 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
LEER 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
ESCRIBIR 1……..2……..3……..4……..5

7.) Mida Usted el conocimiento de vocabulario en inglés y español en esta escala de 9 puntos. Tache un sólo número. Una medición de 1 indica que su estudiante sólo tiene un conocimiento de palabras de inglés, y una medición de 9 indica que tiene un conocimiento de sólo palabras en español. Una medición de 5 indica que tiene un conocimiento igual en español y en inglés.

(inglés) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (español)

8.) Mida Usted el nivel de bilingüismo en esta escala de 9 puntos. Tache un sólo número. Una medición de1 indica que su estudiante es dominante completamente en inglés (0 habilidad en español), y una medición de 9 indica que su estudiante es dominante completamente en español (0 habilidad en inglés). Una medición de 5 indica que su estudiante tiene igual capacidad en inglés y español.

(inglés) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (español)

9.) Cuando su estudiante habla en español o en inglés en el salón de clases, cuánto habla en los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso? (ej. I am going to estacionar my troca. Estoy estudiando political science)? *Tache uno.*

NUNCA CASI NUNCA DE VEZ EN CUANDO SEGUIDO MUY SEGUIDO

10.) Si su estudiante usa los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso en clase o fuera del salón de clases, favor de explicar cuándo y con quién suele ocurrir.

11.) Si su estudiante usa los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso, favor de explicar como puede ser o no ser beneficioso:

… socialmente

… académicamente

…profesionalmente:

Hay mucho debate sobre idiomas estándares y no estándares. Favor de explicar sus perspectivas sobre los dos en las siguientes preguntas.

12.) ¿Qué es un idioma estándar?

13.) Favor de dar ejemplos del español estándar.

14.) ¿Qué es un idioma no estándar?

15.) Favor de dar ejemplos del español no estándar.

16.) ¿Hay otros comentarios u observaciones que le gustarían compartir del español de su estudiante?

¡Mil gracias por haber
llenado el cuestionario!

Appendix E

Peer Language Questionnaire

This questionnaire will help the researcher understand more about your peer's Spanish language abilities. It should take you approximately 20 minutes to fill out. Thank you for your participation!

Name: _____ Roommate's name: _____

Contacts: *email*: _____ *phone*: _____ Age:_____ Sex: M F

Birthplace: _____ Country of permanent residence: _____

Name of university: _____ Semester: _____

Major: _____ Date: _____

A. **PERSONAL BACKGROUND**

1.) What was your first learned language(s)? _____

Second? _____ Third? _____

2.) Please describe your previous experience (if any) interacting with Chicano students.

3.) Please describe your current contact with your Chicano peer.

How much time do you spend together?

Where do you spend time together?

What language(s) do you speak when you are together?

B. ROOMMATE LANGUAGE EVALUATION AND DESCRIPTION

4.) Rate your roommate's ability to use Spanish in these four skill areas. A rating of 5 indicates native speaker proficiency.

SPEAKING 1……..2……..3……..4……..5

LISTENING 1……..2……..3……..4……..5

READING 1……..2……..3……..4……..5

WRITING 1……..2……..3……..4……..5

5.) Rate your roommate's knowledge of Spanish and English vocabulary on this 9 point scale. Circle one number. A rating of 1 will indicate your roommate only knows Engish words. A rating of 9 indicates he/she only knows Spanish words. A rating of 5 indicates equal proficiency in English and Spanish vocabulary.

(English only) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (Spanish only)

6.) Rate your roommate's level of bilingualism using the same 9 point scale. Circle one number. A rating of 1 indicates complete English dominance (0 proficiency in Spanish). A rating of 9 indicates complete Spanish dominance (0 proficiency in English). A rating of 5 indicates your roommate is equally proficient in English and Spanish.

(English only) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (Spanish only)

7.) When your roommate speaks Spanish or English, how often do they mix both languages (i.e. I am going to estacionar my troca)? *Circle one.*

NEVER ALMOST NEVER SOMETIMES OFTEN VERY OFTEN

8.) If they use both languages in the same sentence, please explain when and with whom this happens.

9.) If they use both languages in the same sentence, please explain how doing so benefits or harms them *socially*.

10.) If they use both languages in the same sentence, please explain how doing so might benefit or harm them *professionally*.

11.) There has been a lot of talk about "standard" and "non-standard" languages. What is your definition of a “standard” language?

12.) Give some examples of “standard” Spanish.

13.) What is your definition of a “non-standard” language?

14.) Give some examples of “non-standard” Spanish.

15.) Is there anything else the researcher should know about your roommate's Spanish language?

Thank you for taking the time to fill this out!!

Cuestionario de compañeras

El cuestionario ayudará que la investigadora entienda más de las habilidades en español de tu compañera. Durará aproximadamente 20 minutos para llenar el cuestionario. ¡Gracias por tu participación!

Nombre: _____ Fecha : _____

Contactos: *Email* _____ *Número de teléfono:* _____

Lugar de nacimiento: _____ Edad: _____

País de residencia permanente: _____ Sexo: M F

Nombre de universidad: _____ Semestre: _____

Carrera: _____ Fecha: _____

A. DATOS PERSONALES

1.) ¿Cuál(es) son su(s) idioma(s) maternal(es)? _____

Segundo(s) idioma(s)? _____ Otro(s)? _____

2.) Favor de describir sus experiencias previas con estudiantes Chicanos.

3.) Favor de describir tu contacto con tu compañera:

¿Cuánto tiempo pasan juntos?

¿En dónde pasan tiempo juntos?

¿Cuál(es) idioma(s) hablan cuando están juntos?

B. DESCRIPCIÓN DE LAS HABILIDADES DE LA COMPAÑERA

4.) Mide las habilidades en español de tu compañera. Una medición de 5 significa un nivel nativo.

HABLAR 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
ESCUCHAR 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
LEER 1……..2……..3……..4……..5
ESCRIBIR 1……..2……..3……..4……..5

5.) Mide el conocimiento de vocabulario en inglés y español en esta escala de 9 puntos. Tacha un sólo número. Una medición de 1 indica que tu compañera sólo tiene un conocimiento de palabras de inglés, y una medición de 9 indica que tiene un conocimiento de sólo palabras en español. Una medición de 5 indica que tiene un conocimiento igual en español y en inglés.

(inglés) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (español)

6.) Mide el nivel de bilingüismo de tu compañera en esta escala de 9 puntos. Tacha un sólo número. Una medición de1 indica que tu compañera es dominante completamente en inglés (0 habilidad en español), y una medición de 9 indica que es dominante completamente en español (0 habilidad en inglés). Una medición de 5 indica que tiene igual capacidad en inglés y español.

(inglés) 1……..2……..3……..4……..5…..…6……..7……..8……..9 (español)

7.) Cuando tu compañera habla en español o en inglés, cuánto habla en los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso? (ej. I am going to estacionar my troca. Estoy estudiando political science)? *Tacha uno.*

NUNCA CASI NUNCA DE VEZ EN CUANDO SEGUIDO MUY SEGUIDO

8.) Si tu compañera usa los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso, favor de explicar cuándo y con quién suele ocurrir.

9.) Si tu compañera usa los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso, favor de explicar como puede ser o no ser beneficioso socialmente.

10.) Si tu compañera usa los dos idiomas en la misma oración o discurso, favor de explicar como puede ser o no ser beneficioso profesionalmente.

Hay mucho debate sobre idiomas estándares y no estándares. Favor de explicar sus perspectivas sobre los dos en las siguientes preguntas.

11.) ¿Qué es un idioma estándar?

12.) Favor de dar ejemplos del español estándar.

13.) ¿Qué es un idioma no estándar?

14.) Favor de dar ejemplos del español no estándar.

15.) ¿Hay otros comentarios u observaciones que te gustarían compartir del español de tu compañera?

¡Mil gracias por haber
llenado el cuestionario!

Appendix F

Journal Prompt

THESIS STUDY: Chicano, Peer, and Teacher Attitudes Toward Chicano Spanish in Mexico

Thank you again for helping me with my thesis study! Below are the approximate dates of meetings, interviews, and journal entries I am requesting from you. We will have one preliminary meeting together and a final group interview. I will be contacting you on an individual basis to set up interview times later in the semester.

A. JOURNAL ENTRIES

The journal entries will serve as a documentation of your interaction with your language during your study in Mexico. For each entry, please:

1. write one page (typed), and paste the entry onto an email page. Send the email to: **tracymclaugh@hotmail.com**.
1. Reflect and write about:
   a. how you are feeling about your Spanish and why,
   b. any change in your Spanish, with examples,
   c. others' attitudes toward your Spanish, with examples and your feelings about them,
   d. and anything else regarding your Spanish

B. SCHEDULE

January

12 Introduction meeting: review procedure, questionnaire, consent forms

15 Journal entry #1 due

February

1 Journal #2 due

15 Journal #3 due

28 Begin interviews with students, peers, and professors

March

1 Journal #4 due

8 Focus group interview

15 Journal #5 due

Appendix G

Class Observation Protocol

Chicana student: _____ Date: _____

Professor:_____ Class: _____

Observations to make:

1. Describe the class demographics.

2. Describe class proceedings.

3. Describe the Chicana student's participation.

4. Describe any Chicana-teacher interactions and/or Chicana-student interactions.

For the interviews:

5. Questions for Chicana:

6. Questions for professor:

Appendix H

Chicana Interview Protocol

SPANISH

1. Describe your academic Spanish learning before you came to Mexico.
2. Did you ever take a Spanish for Spanish speaker course?
3. How did you feel your Spanish was before you studied abroad?

STUDY ABROAD EXPERIENCE

4. Have you studied abroad anywhere else? Where and when? How is this experience different than the current one?
5. Generally, how has your study abroad experience been here in Mexico?
6. Tell me about the preparation your study abroad program gave you. Recommendations?

PEERS/ROOMMATES

7. Who do you have the most interaction with here in Mexico, and in what language. What kind of things do you talk about in Spanish?
8. How have they helped/hindered your Spanish, and in what ways (examples). Do they correct you? How do you feel about that? What forms do they correct the most? Did you know about the "incorrectness" of the forms before you came to Mexico?
9. What is your living situation?
10. How is your relationship with your roommates, and why?
11. In what ways has your Spanish changed because of your living situation? (specific examples) How else would you have liked to live?
12. How do you perceive your roommates' attitudes toward your Spanish? Give examples of why you think this way.

CLASSROOM/LANGUAGE POINTS

13. What were your expectations of their classroom experience? Of their out-of-class experience? Were they satisfied? How valuable was the formal instruction for you in learning more Spanish?
14. What course are you taking here at the UDLAP?
15. Describe your relationships with your professors? (examples)
16. How do you perceive your teachers' attitudes toward your Spanish? Why? (examples)
17. Describe your relationships with classmates? (examples)

18. How do you perceive your classmates' attitudes toward your language? Why? Examples.

AWARENESS

19. You mentioned that _____ is the most important Spanish skill. In what skill have you improved most. (examples) Why do you think this is?
20. Speaking of your improvements, how do you know about them and about your Spanish abilities in general?
21. Tell me about your improvement/awareness of specific grammar structures.
22. What are different conversational techniques you have learned, if any?
23. Has there been an improvement, comment, anything about your ACCENT?
24. What makes you aware? (Class, Mexican Peers, etc.)
25. Tell me about your Spanish before you came to Mexico. How would you describe your Spanish now as compared to before?
26. Describe your contact with Mexico.
27. How has your perspective changed regarding learning Spanish and about Spanish speakers in the U.S. or in Mexico?
28. How do you think people's perspectives have changed about you and your Spanish?

PERSONAL

29. How do you plan to use your Spanish in the future? Why? How?
30. Will you teach your children?
31. Are you a different person? Has this semester changed you in any way?
32. How connected is your language to your identity?
33. How do you think your identity has changed over the semester?
34. Other questions for interviewee.

Appendix I

Professor Interview Protocol

1. ¿Antes de este semestre has enseñado a Chicanos en tu salón de clases?
2. ¿Me podrías explicar su experiencia con los Chicanos?
3. Describe su filosofía en trabajar con estudiantes Chicanos si tenga.
4. ¿Cómo es tu relación con _____ ?
5. ¿Qué fue tu primera impresión de _____ y por qué?
6. ¿Qué fue tu primera impresión de su español y por qué?
7. ¿En qué idioma(s) hablan en el salón de clases?
8. ¿En qué idioma hablan fuera del salón de clases?
9. ¿Cómo ves su inglés?
10. ¿Cómo ves su español? (ejemplos)
11. ¿Qué características contiene su español?
12. ¿Corriges su español en el salón de clases?
13. ¿Qué sueles corregir más?
14. ¿Cómo reacciona tu estudiante?
15. ¿En qué tiene que mejorar?
16. ¿Cuál habilidad ha mejorado más durante el semestre? ¿Por qué?
17. ¿Cómo veías la conciencia hacía su español al comienzo del semestre?
18. ¿Cómo ves la conciencia hacía su español al comienzo del semestre?
19. ¿Has cambiado tu opinión hacía _____ tras el semestre?
20. ¿En cuales maneras ha cambiado _____ este semestre?
21. ¿Cuánto habla/participa en la clase?
22. ¿Cuál es la habilidad que más tiene que mejorar?

Appendix J

Peer Interview Protocol

1. ¿Antes de este semestre has tenido estudiantes Chicanos como compañeros de dormitorio?
2. ¿Antes de este semestre has tenido estudiantes Chicanos como amigos?
3. ¿Si alguna de tus respuestas anteriores son afirmativas, me podrías explicar tu relación con los extranjeros?
4. ¿Cómo es tu relación con _____ ?
5. ¿Qué fue tu primera impresión de _____ y por qué?
6. ¿Qué fue tu primera impresión de su español y por qué?
7. ¿En qué idioma hablan? ¿De qué cosas hablan?
8. ¿Cuánto tiempo hablan en español?
9. ¿Describe el español cuando llegó? (ejemplos)
10. Describe su español ahora. ¿En qué ha mejorado durante este semestre?
11. ¿Cómo está su acento? ¿Ha mejorado?
12. ¿Corriges el español de tu compañero?
13. ¿Qué sueles corregir más?
14. ¿Cómo reacciona tu compañero a las correcciones?
15. ¿En qué tiene que mejorar?
16. ¿Has cambiado tu opinión hacía su español tras el semestre?
17. ¿Has cambiado tu opinión hacía _____ tras el semestre?
18. ¿Cómo ha cambiado _____ este semestre?

Appendix K

Focus Group Interview Protocol

1. How have you become “Mexican for a semester” as the Dean of Asuntos Internacionales suggested at the beginning of the semester?
2. What are you taking back with you to the U.S.?
3. How much a part of you is the Spanish language? How has this semesters influenced this?
4. Tell me about the strategies you used to learn vocabulary?