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ABSTRACT

Though the field of Spanish heritage language (SHL) studies has seen a boom in research, such research has not yet addressed the materials available for SHL classes. This dissertation fills a gap in previous research by addressing the representation of US Latinos and US varieties of Spanish in the SHL context. The current study involves a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the presentation of both culture and language in intermediate level university SHL textbooks, in order to show how such texts present US Spanish-speaking people’s culture and their language varieties.

Previous research on both history and Spanish as a foreign language textbooks show that US Latino populations in such texts are frequently reduced to numbers, faceless statistics or stereotypes (Arizpe & Aguirre, 1987; Cruz, 1994; Elissondo, 2001; Ramírez and Hall, 1990; Rodríguez and Ruiz, 2005; and van Dijk, 2004a; 2004b). Additionally, previous analyses of the presentation of Spanish in Spanish foreign language (SFL) textbooks show SFL texts provide “…varying or misleading intuitions about dialects of Spanish” (Wieczorek 1992, p.34; see also Fonseca-Greber & Waugh, 2003). This dissertation corroborates these findings in the SHL context and presents suggestions for improving the quality of materials used in the SHL context. The results of the current study clearly parallel those found by van Dijk (2004b); though the texts present “factual” information, it is the selective presentation of this information that culminates in an overall negative representation of immigrant and minority cultures, which is rooted in a metonymical understanding of what it means to be immigrant. Additionally, all the texts continue to promote a pseudo-Castilian variety of Spanish,
while delegating student varieties of the language to *appropriate* home contexts. This bidialectal treatment of US varieties of Spanish excludes critical based dialect awareness altogether.

This dissertation addresses the need to both improve and develop “…pedagogically sound textbooks and new technology materials designed to meet the Hispanic bilingual student’s linguistic needs” (Roca, 1997, pp.37-43). It is only through critical discourse analysis that we can assure that textbooks are indeed presenting a positive image of US Latinos and their language to students enrolled in university SHL classes.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION & REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The prominence of the growing Hispanic population in the United States is evident almost everywhere, but nowhere is its presence in more urgent need of attention than within the realm of education (Carreira, 2003; Colombi & Roca, 2003; Peyton, et al. 2000; Valdés, 1995; 2000). According to US census information, from 1990 – 2000 there was a 53% increase in the Hispanic population. This same population growth is simultaneously reflected in college and university demographics as well. According to the 2000 Census, 14% of all students enrolled in colleges and universities were Hispanic (http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-26.pdf). This pointed and continued increase in the Latino population has resulted in a growing awareness and need for the creation and continued improvement of Spanish Heritage Language (SHL) programs, a need which is especially pertinent at the college and university levels (Aparicio, 1993).

Before delving further into the necessity for the present study, it is imperative that we first define the set of learners which are the focus of this dissertation. In order to encompass as broad a range of SHL learners as possible, SHL learners throughout this dissertation will be understood as

“individuals that have experienced a relatively extended period of exposure to the language, typically during childhood, through contact with family members or other individuals, resulting in the development of either receptive and/or productive abilities in the language” (Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005, on-line).

Though SHL learners are present at all levels and learning institutions here in the United States, policy restrictions at the state and federal levels have historically impeded or at
least deterred the full implementation of programs specifically directed at maintaining the minority language within the K-12 context. As Aparicio points out, SHL programs will, therefore, remain crucial to colleges and universities “until federal policies toward bilingual education change, until maintenance oriented programs replace transitional bilingual programs…” (1993, p.194). The crucial nature of university level SHL programs creates an equally critical need for an analysis of the materials most commonly employed at this same level. As one heritage language website states, “Accommodating the needs of heritage speakers, which are clearly different from those of foreign language (FL) students, will require changes in secondary and post-secondary language programs.” (University of California, 2001). These changes need to occur on many levels: teacher training, textbook improvements, assessment methods, placement tools, and more. A first step in addressing this need requires a thorough assessment of those textbooks employed in SHL classes. Such an analysis is particularly pertinent at the university level, where the majority of heritage speakers encounter their first interaction with academic Spanish and outside (i.e. non-U.S.) varieties of the language.

Many of the major college-level textbook publishers have begun to address the specific needs of the Spanish heritage population in a dual-fashion. First, a new class of textbooks targeting the needs of the SHL population has been developed. On a second level, however, both the newly burgeoning field of SHL textbooks as well as the well-established field of Spanish as second language textbooks have begun to incorporate sections devoted to both the language varieties and cultures of US Spanish-speaking populations (Elissondo, 2001; Pinnix, 1990; Ramirez & Hall, 1990; Winke & Stafford,
However, a discourse-style analysis of the textbooks designed specifically for SHL speakers has not yet been undertaken. The current study performs just such an analysis of these texts, focusing on the textual presentation of both culture and language in textbooks used at the intermediate university level, in order to assess just how such texts present US Spanish-speaking people’s culture and their language varieties to their target population of SHL students. In a newly burgeoning field such as that of heritage languages, it is essential that both teachers and researchers take a critical look at the materials they are using in class to ensure that such materials are indeed best fit to serve the population of students for whom they are intended.

This critical discourse analysis (hereafter, CDA) of texts in the SHL context can be used to provide SHL program directors, instructors and both textbook authors and publishers with insights into the underlying ideologies present in the texts used in SHL classes. The analysis and its findings are not intended to suggest that either the authors or publishers intentionally chose to devalue US Latinos or US Spanish, rather such an analysis is intended to highlight the fact that despite the best intentions, some underlying, unintended discursive stereotyping often still exists in many texts used in the SHL context, in terms of the treatment of both culture and language. This initial glimpse into textbooks commonly used in university level SHL classes helps highlight the need to look at other materials used in SHL classrooms, and classrooms in general, in a more critical light.

The current study addresses Roca’s 1997 call for the need to both improve and develop “…pedagogically sound textbooks and new technology materials designed to
meet the Hispanic bilingual student’s linguistic needs” (Roca, 1997). Though Roca proposes the continued use of a bidialectal approach in textbooks, it is hoped that the critical analysis of the wording of textbooks used in the SHL classroom provided here will shed light on the need for improvements within the bidialectal or biloquial framework, as well as the possibility for other frameworks (such as critical based dialect awareness, as proposed by Martínez, 2003)) that may better suit the goals of SHL students. Only through a continued, thorough analysis of the discourse currently employed in texts used in the SHL context can we come to understand the underlying orientations and ideologies represented in such texts, in order to be able to improve them for future use.

As SHL educators and researchers, we must recognize that language shapes both personal and cultural identity (Dicker, 1996; 2003). Crucially, “As educators, we cannot afford to have any student feel embarrassed or humiliated about his/her culture or ethnicity because of the print material used in class” (Cruz, 1994, p.62). Though textbooks may seem appropriate within their respective contexts of use and may even seem to present a fair and accurate perspective of both culture and language to the untrained readers eye, it is only through critical discourse analysis that we can assure that textbooks are indeed presenting a positive image of US Latinos and their language to students enrolled in university SHL classes.

The CDA of the treatment of language and culture in textbooks used in SHL courses is clearly vital to the progress of the SHL field. This study contributes to the already growing field of research in heritage languages and will serve to further
strengthen that field by addressing a critical gap in the current literature; my findings show that a critical discourse analysis of the culture and language component of textbooks used in the SHL context is necessary in order to improve the quality of materials used in the SHL context, and can even be used as a pedagogical tool in SHL classrooms, providing a basis for class discussion of dialects, cultural differences, hegemonic ideologies and racism. It is critical that both teachers and researchers take a critical look at the materials used in classes to ensure that such materials do not convey any underlying racist ideologies but rather comply with their intended goals of reactivating an interest in and increasing the use of both the heritage language and culture.
LITERATURE REVIEW
AN OVERVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The research presented here borrows from the ideas and methods of numerous fields. It is most relevant, of course, to the field of Spanish as a Heritage language, though its implications reach beyond this field into the heritage language field as well as the field of second language acquisition. Thus, my literature review begins with a brief discussion of the SHL field as a whole, providing both a historical basis for my research, while simultaneously highlighting those areas within the SHL field that are most relevant to the current study. I begin with a discussion of what precisely it means to be a heritage language learner. I then provide a historical framework for the issues and ideologies most pertinent to the discussion of language within the SHL context. This discussion leads naturally into a discussion of the ideologized notions of nativeness and standard language. I then touch briefly on the inextricable connection that exists between language and identity, and its particular import in the SHL context. Next, I briefly discuss the lack of teacher training and preparation within the SHL context and the resulting reliance on textual materials in SHL classes. Lastly, I conclude the section on the field of heritage languages with a brief discussion of the materials used in intermediate university SHL classes.

From there, I go on to discuss the field of textbook studies. As my own research deals with the presentation of U.S. Latino populations and the varieties of Spanish which are spoken by such populations, my review in this area begins by discussing how this population is portrayed in history textbooks. From there, I move on to studies which
have focused on the presentation of the various Spanish-speaking cultures in general in Spanish Second Language (SSL) textbooks. I then move on to discuss the presentation of language within both Spanish and French as a second language textbooks, noting the lack of similar research in the SHL field in both areas.

Lastly, I provide an exhaustive discussion of the field of critical discourse analysis, as this field represents more than the methodology of the current research project. In fact, I see CDA as a tool which connects academic research to the real world, providing not only a means of analysis, but also a grounding in the knowledge that our research is for naught if we do not see it through beyond the stages of academic research to its fruition in the form of pedagogical ramifications and changes. In this section, I first detail the disciplines and people that serve as cornerstones in CDA. I then specify my own understanding of CDA research after a discussion of the three leading researchers in the field and how each has influenced the present dissertation. Lastly, I briefly discuss the critiques that have been levied against CDA, as well as my attempts to contest these critiques in my own research. I conclude with a discussion of the importance of CDA in the educational context and the need to reconnect such research with the students’ whom it is intended to serve.

THE SPANISH HERITAGE LANGUAGE FIELD

SHL students in the US come from a wide panorama of backgrounds and have differing degrees of exposure to the Spanish language. Not only is there a disparity of levels of bilingualism present in the group, but there is also the question of group homogeneity on other levels. As Fishman points out, the label *Hispanics* is a misnomer
implying both a cultural and linguistic uniformity among an extremely diverse group of people (1991). It is imperative to recognize the truly differing degree of skills, language varieties and cultures that these learners bring to the classroom. Indeed, here at the University of Arizona, the heritage language program’s structure reflects the diversity of skills represented in the SHL population. Arizona’s SHL program spans numerous class levels, including SPA 103 (oral skills for heritage learners), SPA 203 (writing and oral skills for heritage learners, SPA 253 (elementary composition), SPA 323 (intermediate composition I), SPA 333 (intermediate composition II), SPA 343 (phonetics for native speakers). What follows is a diagram of the bilingual continuum (adapted from Martínez 2003, class notes).

**Figure 1: Bilingual Continuum**

As can be seen in the above graphic, the emphasis on having acquired a standard variety of either Spanish or English is implicit in the hierarchical presentation which puts those with more education into the top quadrants and those with less education into the
bottom quadrants. The diagram highlights the notion that the so-called ideal bilingual does not exist. One’s educational context is shown to play a major role in the development of language; thus, though the term SHL learner is intended to encompass the entire population of interest in this dissertation, it is vital to recognize that the SHL population itself is not a homogeneous one.

Initial programs in the SHL field began as early as the 1960’s at several southwestern colleges and universities. These programs clearly had different concerns in mind upon beginning what were then termed “Spanish for Native Speakers” programs. The crucial need for the present study can be gleaned from a brief review of one of the more popular texts used for the group in the past. The text, *Español para el bilingüe* (Barker, 1972) encompassed the pedagogical goal of correcting local varieties. The text itself was composed of various lists entitled “Se dice” and “no se dice”, where no se dice was defined as “palabras o expresiones no dignas del habla de la gente decente” (Barker, 1972, p.47). The implication, of course, was that the community varieties that students brought to the classroom were somehow substandard. Such texts and the ensuing Spanish for Native Speaker (SNS) programs were implemented under a language-as-problem orientation (see Ruiz, 1984). More recent SHL programs have embraced a language-as-resource orientation; unfortunately, however, not all of the teachers or all of the textbooks in such programs share the same philosophy. Though there clearly has been progress in the specialization and development of textbooks geared toward SHL learners, SHL learning often continues to be approached from a language-as-problem

---

1 Words or expressions not dignified of the speech of decent people (my translation)
orientation, even today, though both the words and the ideologies framing such orientations have clearly shifted. Many SHL teachers and textbooks still see their main task as eliminating any remnants of stigmatized varieties of Spanish, while simultaneously equipping students with a more sufficient or worthy foreign standard. Yet there clearly has been progress in the field. Since the publication of Valdés’ 1981 seminal text discussing the presentation of dialects in the classroom, the eradication based philosophies of the past have decreased, resulting in a marked increase in biloquial (also known as bidialectal or appropriateness based approaches) and language awareness approaches toward language. Though the latter are still scarce, their numbers are growing. Both eradication and biloquial philosophies toward language continue to represent the dominant underlying orientation toward minority language in the US. Such languages continue to be treated as problems while foreign (or second\(^2\)) languages are treated as resources (Ruiz 1984, 1990).

The irony of the situation is that in the case of Spanish, the same language is viewed through two completely different lenses, resulting in a beneficial outcome for students of non-Latino decent and a debilitating outcome for Latino students. The paradox of the presence of the Spanish language in the United States is exemplified by the perceived blurring between a colonial Latino presence and the newer Latino immigrant presence via the use of grouping terminology such as: *Hispanics, Latinos, Mexican-Americans*, etc. (Valdés, 2000). To this day, colonial heritage languages like

\(^2\) Note the tendency of language learning in high schools continues to be referred to as foreign language instruction. I prefer the term second language instruction, especially in the case of Spanish, which is not in fact a foreign language in this country.
Spanish lack in both mainstream support and justification in part because of a detachment from their colonial heritage and their perceived connection with continuous immigration (Fishman, 2001). Spanish colonial and immigrant languages in the US have been negatively recast as “… harmful to those who bring them to America” (Dicker, 1996, p.28). Such mythical linguistic insecurities prey on the notion that U.S. Spanish is inherently bad; “Rather than being viewed as the literary and standardized language that it has been for centuries, Spanish is widely viewed as the dialectally splintered and socially stigmatized language of lower-class illiterates. As a result, it is severely undervalued as a language resource” (Fishman 2001: 92). In fact, some might argue that U.S. Spanish is not even considered part of the Spanish language, but rather is considered a separate, distinct entity and is understood as somehow lesser than other varieties of Spanish. It is essential that both researchers and educators critically examine the underlying orientations present in textbooks commonly used in today’s university SHL classrooms, in order to avoid sending detrimental messages to our students, like those found in Español para el bilingue.

The interaction of two powerful myths combine to augment the misunderstanding of US Spanish; the ideologized nativeness of the standard, combined with the myth of the native speaker (NS) simultaneously interact to impede the recognition of US Spanish as a valid variety in its own right. Speakers of standardized languages are thought to live in standardized cultures, and unfortunately for US speakers of Spanish, US varieties of the language and their speakers are not yet recognized as one of these mythological standardized cultures. As Train (2003) discusses, standard language is understood to be
synonymous with the idea of native language. Both of these concepts are tied to what Train (borrowing from Anderson, 1991) calls, “imagined communities” such communities are typically represented by the entrenched hegemonic communities of the educated elite. As Davies points out, native speaker proficiency measures are guided by a monolingual norm, a norm that does not exist for the majority of SHL learners within the United States, nor in fact for numerous other Spanish-speaking bilinguals around the world (2003).

We must acknowledge that SHL learners are bilinguals who are complex individuals that are fundamentally different from monolinguals (Valdés, 1995). The current situation within the U.S. educational framework, upholds Train’s (2003) findings that “Successful language learners are those who have mastered the standard language” whether or not this was their intended goal (p.8). The teaching of Spanish as a heritage language finds itself in a paradoxical situation. The classes that bear the name Spanish for Heritage Learners, are, in theory, simultaneously promoting the “heritage variety” while concurrently teaching the standard. Yet if the students (and indeed educators) recognize that only the standard language is valued, then often, the original dual-focused goal becomes reduced to that of the acquisition of the standard language. This asymmetrical focus on the acquisition of both standard language and standard culture will be clearly evidenced in this dissertation.

The ideologized nativeness of the standard is tied to myths of the monolingual native-speaker, these two powerful myths work together, breeding hegemonic attitudes

---

3 For a discussion of the notion of imagined communities and its relevance to the SHL field, please see the section entitled: (Re)Presenting US Latinos: SHL learners as members of an imagined community
which often impede educational equality (Ortega, 1999b). Most importantly, the monolingual norm itself is unrealistic, as is the resulting dominant emphasis on becoming a native-speaker. In fact, the entire notion of native-speakerhood needs to be problematized under the SHL framework. What is it that separates heritage learners from native speakers? I would argue that it is nothing more than their bilingual background. This bilingual background somehow imparts an inferior status on these students, barricading their way from becoming a native speaker of either English or Spanish under our current understanding of the concept. Despite the fact that Spanish is a major world language, in the US context it continues to be associated with negative concepts such as, “marginality, poverty, illiteracy, economic immigration” (Roca, 1997). As educators, we must learn to question such underlying negative associations. As SHL professors, we must critically examine the texts we use and the truths we uphold in the classroom. What message are these texts sending our students? How are minority US Latino populations treated in such texts? What prominence do SHL texts\(^4\) give to US varieties of the Spanish language? This study intends to address these issues, among others.

SHL students represent a combination of linguistic and social characteristics attributed to both second language acquisition and situations of languages in contact (Lynch, 2003). Thus, the vastly heterogeneous group of learners represented by SHL students brings many differing attitudes toward the Spanish language to the classroom as well. Such students often hold a negative opinion of the Spanish they possess due to

---

\(^4\) Please note that although a majority of the texts analyzed were designed specifically for the SHL context, the *Avanzando* text was not. Despite this discrepancy, all textbooks analyzed will hereafter be referred to as SHL textbooks, as they are indeed all employed in the SHL context.
what Aparicio terms strong public “disapproval” of Spanish (1993). Villa upholds this idea, stating that such a negative opinion may in fact represent a double-edged sword: not only do SHL learners have a feeling of inadequacy toward their own personal linguistic skills, but they also feel that the particular variety of Spanish which they or their family members speak is somehow inferior to other varieties of Spanish (2002). It is the intrinsic connection to one’s identity that is alluded to in the statements made by both Aparicio and Villa that needs to be considered carefully in an SHL context, especially in terms of the textbooks that are used within such a context. The presentation of both language varieties and cultures that are so closely tied to one’s identity need to be carefully scrutinized to ensure an empowering, identity promoting perspective as opposed to the negative, eradicating stance previously observed in earlier texts used in the SHL context.

Sadly, this inextricable connection between language and identity has often been all but absent in previous generations of textbooks designed for the SHL learner. As recent as 1997, Benjamin was struck by the omission of information on identity and community connections in both SHL texts and the SHL field at large. She states that often the standard variety of textbook results in an artificial variety of Spanish that stifles “the potentiality for creativity and real language growth” (Benjamin, 1997, p.47). The imposition of an outside standard by both texts and teachers, which pervades the current structuring of SHL classes prevents many students from reaching their true goals, namely that of establishing a closer connection to their culture, identity and ultimately to themselves (Benjamin, 1997). Students’ goals in the SHL context are often immediate;
many students want to be able to reconnect before it’s too late to grandparents, parents, relatives and friends who they don’t feel they fully understand. Often, the textbooks assume a goal of long-term academic success in the Spanish language, resulting in underlying biloquial or eradication based philosophies (Valdés, 1981), as opposed to presenting a critical language awareness perspective on dialect variation (Fairclough, 2002; Martínez, 2003). Textbooks and SHL classes in general need to keep the goals of the students in mind when imparting language and cultural information to students.

An additional point of concern for university level SHL programs is the lack of specialized teacher training in the field. Potowski (2002), along with Colombi and Roca (2003) and Potowski and Carreira (2004), indicate that though many universities require a FL methods course for those in teacher training programs, an equivalent HL methods course is rarely even offered, let alone required. Roca poignantly signals the urgent need for improved teacher training in the SHL field when she states: “…most K-12 Spanish teachers and college professors have traditionally received little or no graduate training in teaching Spanish as a second or foreign language. Even fewer have received training in teaching Spanish to United States Hispanic bilingual students…” (1997). Clearly, “The teaching of minority languages is not yet recognized as a legitimate and separate area of applied linguistics” (Valdés, 1995, p.303). From a professional standpoint, it remains to be recognized that FL and HL education are not one in the same; “…the theoretical assumptions underlying each type of instruction are also fundamentally different” (Valdes, 1995, p.320). It is imperative, therefore, that this study undertake a particularly careful investigation of those textbooks that are considered cross-overs, FL texts that
have been modified in order to meet the perceived needs of the SHL population. One such text, *Mundo 21 hispano* remains one of the most popular choices in intermediate level university classes. It is particularly important to see how this text parallels or differs from other texts which have been designed originally and specifically for the SHL population. Again, the current study undertakes such an analysis.

Though the field of SHL studies has seen a boom in research (Brecht & Ingold, 2002; Colombia & Roca, 2003; Leeman, 2005; Leeman & Martínez, in press; Lynch, 2003; Martínez, 2003; Ortega, 1999a; 1999b; Peyton, et.al., 2001; Potowski, 2002; Potowski & Carreira, 2004; Valdés, 1995; 2000; Webb & Miller, 2000, to name a few); such research has not yet addressed the materials available for such classes. There is an urgent need for a thorough analysis of the textbooks employed specifically in the SHL classroom. Do such texts both meet and address the goals and needs of their intended population? Do they present positive representations of both SHL students’ cultures and language varieties? Do they serve their intended purpose; namely that of revitalizing the language of SHL students or do they participate in an unwritten promotion of the standard at the expense of the home variety? None of these questions have yet been discussed, let alone addressed by the field. These questions and others will be addressed by this dissertation with the hopes of meeting some of the goals set forth for heritage language learning while simultaneously providing practical pedagogical information as well. Before outlining the specific details of the dissertation, however, I would also like to discuss my choice of the textbook as the focal point of the study.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION: TEXTBOOK STUDIES

An integral part of all classrooms, be they second language, foreign language heritage language or even non-language classes, is the textbook. Despite a shift in focus toward communicative competence, college and university level language classes still rely heavily on the textbook as both a source of language and cultural enrichment. As Cruz states, “Although contemporary teaching methods courses at the university level have begun to de-emphasize the role of the textbook, by all accounts the textbook still enjoys a primary role in the delivery of content information and, in many cases, in the development of curriculum and instructional strategy” (1994, p.54). According to Cruz (1994), the textbook is the most often used resource in today’s classrooms, thereby dominating what students learn. As Byrnes (1988) states, “for better or for worse, the textbook or the sequence of textbooks being used often drive the individual course syllabus as well as the overall curriculum” (29, as cited in Ashby, 2003, p.15). Textbooks in any learning context must be taken as an integral source of information in the learning process. Language textbooks, specifically those targeting the SHL learner often represent the first contact these learners have with academic varieties of Spanish. Additionally, such texts may also represent these same students’ first contact with outside (i.e. non-U.S.) Latino cultures and varieties of Spanish as well. Ashby (2003) points out that “The first exposure that a person has to new input serves as the primary template for the process of constructing conceptualizations which humans use to make sense of their experiences” (p.215). As stated previously, most SHL learners’ first contact with academic Spanish occurs via the module of the textbook; therefore, if said textbook aims
at reinforcing the standard at the expense of the local variety, the student may internalize
that stigma and the attached level of inferiority associated with his/her native variety of
the language and by extrapolation, may attach these same negative stigma to his/her
identity as well. Again, it is imperative that we thoroughly assess the textbooks used in
the SHL classroom to see just how they present US Latinos and US varieties of Spanish.

Teachers often regard the textbook as “authoritative, accurate and definitive”
(Cruz, 1994, p.53), especially those teaching assistants (hereafter TAs) typically found in
lower and intermediate level college courses, who have undergone little preparation in
the field of teacher training (Potwoski, 2002). As many previous researchers in the field
have noted, post-secondary instructors are often ill prepared for undergraduate language
teaching (Ashby, 2003; Ortega, 1999a; 1999b; Pomerantz, 2002; Potowski, 2002). This
is particularly important in the SHL field, where teacher varieties of formal/standard
Spanish and exposure to a so-called standard academic variety of written Spanish via the
text are often students’ first encounter with a formal variety of Spanish. The student is apt
to believe what he/she reads in a textbook unless the teacher or some other authority
figure questions its validity and truth-value. It is therefore extremely dangerous to note
that the people teaching SHL classes often have not been trained in SHL pedagogy
(Potowski, 2002). As Ashby points out, often the TA is a person who has grappled with
language issues him/herself and has taken up the “standard is essential” view (2003).

Couple these language issues with the fact that textbooks often present a
peripheral view of immigrant and minority populations by showing few positive images
of the groups, and one has a recipe for disaster. Norton (2002) states that there remains a
desperate need for texts which do not victimize the immigrant and other minority populations, but rather describe the complexity and multiplicity of such populations, as opposed to current texts which reduce these same populations to a one-dimensional portrait of immigrant/minority groups as victims (Norton, 2002). The issue of group categorization also becomes relevant to this discussion. The mass media, political groups, educational structures and government institutions have decided that being a speaker of Spanish is enough of a commonality to connect groups from 23 different countries into one homogeneous whole. The notion of US Hispanics, though now taken up by US Spanish-speaking populations, was initially a creation of the government, deriving at least in its print format out of the Bureau of the Census. This grouping has allowed for the creation of a culture of fear. Spanish is perceived as a threat to national unity. Couple this notion with the fact that Hispanics have become the stereotype of immigration in the US today, and the growing Hispanic population is converted into a threat to dominant Anglo authority (see also Dicker, 1999; 2003).

The critical analysis of SHL textbooks undertaken here tackles both of the aforementioned issues by first addressing the presentation of minority and immigrant populations within the text and secondly by analyzing the attitude toward language varieties spoken by these groups in these same texts. As Norton suggests, we must address the need to create textbooks that describe the intricacy represented by the diversity of students, language and cultures (2000). This need is especially pertinent in the SHL context. As the textbook may still function as the primary source for
information on language and culture for SHL students, it is surprising that a critical examination of SHL textbooks has not yet been performed.

As Cruz states,

“it is imperative that measures be considered and taken to improve educational print materials; in school textbooks, there is now overwhelming evidence of significant bias and academic misinformation. These inaccuracies damage students of all ethnicities by promoting stereotypes, furthering ethnic bias, and promulgating inaccurate information” (1994, p.62).

No study has been realized to date that analyzes the use of stereotypes along with the presentation of cultural and language information in SHL textbooks. As van Dijk points out,

“…forms of educational discourse such as lessons and textbooks, play a prominent role in the reproduction of society. Besides their overt contents aiming at the acquisition of standard knowledge in society and culture, textbooks and their hidden curricula also play an important role in the reproduction of dominant ideologies, such as those of race, gender and class” (2004b, on-line).

It is imperative that we critically analyze the texts employed in the SHL context, to see what role, if any, these texts play in the reproduction of societal ideologies, and how their representations of US Latinos and their language may potentially impact the students of SHL classes.

PREVIOUS STUDIES OF CULTURE AS REPRESENTED IN TEXTBOOKS

Cruz (1994) reviewed 6 history textbooks for grades 7-12, specifically focusing on their representations of Latin America and Latin Americans. All six texts were found to reinforce cultural stereotypes. The same textbooks highlighted negative stereotypes of Latin Americans as lazy, passive, irresponsible, lustful, animalistic and violent via the use of specific and repeated adjectives, adverbs and parenthetical comments (Cruz, 1994). In
fact, the animal metaphors found in Cruz’ study clearly parallel Santa Ana’s findings for the treatment of Latino immigrants in the LA Times (1999; 2002). Just a couple of the examples highlighted in the Cruz study are included here:

**Table 1: Metaphors for Immigration found in Cruz (1994)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATIN AMERICANS AS ANIMALS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…the Americans were badly mauled”</td>
<td>In reference to the Mexicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…he herded the Cubans into the camps”</td>
<td>In reference to the Spanish-American War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these six history textbooks, the primary role of Latin Americans is that of initiator of conflict. Cruz points out that the inclusion of necessary parentheticals which highlight negative information about Latinos add to an overall derogatory stereotyping of the group across the textbooks she analyzed.

Most relevant to the present study, Cruz mentions that these same images appear in Spanish textbooks as well, according to Cruz’s colleagues. She cites a specific example from the *Spanish for Mastery I* textbook showing some adolescent Puerto Ricans at a party, one of whom has a switchblade in his pocket. According to Cruz’s colleagues, it is the image of the Puerto Rican with the switchblade that inevitably catches students’ attention. Such representations, accompanied by textual inaccuracies and stereotyping would be particularly damaging in an SHL context, where the intended audience of the book is in fact one and the same as the group that is potentially being negatively stereotyped! Again, the need for a similar study in the SHL context is blatantly evident.
Even recent studies of history textbooks, such as the one performed by Rodríguez and Ruiz (2005) shows that in today’s textbooks, Latinos are frequently reduced to numbers or faceless statistics. According to Rodríguez and Ruiz, current history texts tend to lump all Latino groups together, thereby obliterating both individual and group differences (much like the government treatment of the groups in the Census). In most texts analyzed, Mexican Americans as a group were used to stand for all Latinos. The same history textbooks’ coverage of the Latino economic situation focuses on the wage laborer and agricultural experiences of Latinos, leading to the implication that all Latinos are working-class Mexican Americans. The recent nature of this study emphasizes the need to verify that the same rampant negative stereotyping is not occurring in even the most current versions of SHL textbooks, for though the results of the Cruz study could be seen as an artifact of the past, the fact that Rodríguez and Ruiz’s more recent study confirms their findings even today, is cause enough for further investigation.

A related study on the realization of racism in textbooks presenting immigrant and minority groups in Spain was recently completed by van Dijk (2004b). Van Dijk’s analysis of previous research in the field yields the following prototypical realizations of racism in textbooks: exclusion, emphasis on difference, exoticism, stereotyping, positive presentation of self (us), negative representation of other(s) (them), outright denial of the existence of racism, and lack of voice for minority populations. In Van Dijk’s 2004 analysis of Spain’s social science textbooks targeted at the 12-16 years of age group, he observes a polarization between developed and underdeveloped countries. Migration from so-called underdeveloped countries to developed countries is framed as a necessary
relocation that occurs in order to escape poor conditions or natural, economic or social disasters present in the immigrants’ former nations. Though, as van Dijk points out, the picture painted by such discourse may appear “correct” to many a reader, in reality, “the selection of negative aspects of immigration and immigrants creates a social representation that is predominantly negative” and, therefore, inherently slanted (van Dijk, 2004b). Through the repetition of discursive arguments, texts establish a stereotypical connection between poverty, illegality and criminal behavior.

Van Dijk’s textbook analysis shows numerous underlying racist ideologies rampant in Spain’s most common social science textbooks: immigration itself is caused by the needs of immigrants (not by those of the receiving society), immigrants are again often reduced to statistics and stereotypes, and immigration itself, despite its numerous forms both legal and illegal, is almost always stereotyped as being solely an illegal activity. The vital interdependence of immigration and the immigrant-receiving society is not stressed in any of the texts Van Dijk analyzed. Unfortunately, as will be shown, these same tendencies predominate across the SHL texts studied as well.

More pertinent to the proposed study is the research of Arizpe & Aguirre (1987) addressing similar issues of cultural stereotyping in their study of first year college level introductory Spanish FL textbooks. The two researchers looked at all introductory texts published between 1975 and 1985 in order to investigate the textbooks’ treatment of Mexican, Cuban and Puerto Rican ethnic groups. Arizpe and Aguirre found four major areas of inconsistencies relating to the portrayal of these groups: (1) factual inaccuracies, (2) stereotypes, (3) oversimplifications and (4) omissions. According to Arizpe and
Aguirre, introductory Spanish texts “…perpetuate the only partially correct notion that Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans reside in specific identifiable geographical areas in the United States” (1987, p.126). The three groups are portrayed as facing the common problems of being overly lazy, romantic, emotional and impractical. The depiction of Mexican American and Puerto Rican stereotypes as agricultural workers was perpetuated both within and across the textbooks studied, while the majority of Cuban Americans were stereotyped as upper or middle class refugees. The language of all three groups was purported to be laden with calques in many of the textbooks, thus conveying the image of a semi-literate class of people (Arizpe and Aguirre, 1987). The two main aspects of Mexican American life focused on were bilingual education and illegal immigration. The earlier findings of Arizpe and Aguirre support van Dijk’s later hypothesis that immigration is depicted negatively and associated with illegality. This study particularly exemplifies the need for similar in-depth studies of SHL textbooks, as the presentation of these same cultures and their languages in a similar fashion in SHL textbooks could have a highly detrimental effect on the students of such classes.

Ramírez and Hall (1990) also analyzed both language and culture in secondary level Spanish textbooks from sociocultural, sociolinguistic and curriculum design perspectives. In the textbooks studied, people from all cultural backgrounds were shown as “generally, well-dressed, appearing to come from the middle to upper middle class backgrounds” (Ramírez & Hall, 1990, p.51). Cultural places highlighted by the texts seem to target a middle class tourist-oriented population: museums, modern shops, sports resorts and universities, representing those cultural activities attended by only a small
percent of the population of each country, and more likely to be visited by foreign travelers. An examination of 60% of the chapters found in 5 prominent secondary level Spanish textbooks revealed that a majority of the cultural information presented focused on Spain and Mexico (37%) while an additional 34% was devoted to all of the Spanish speaking countries of South America. The same study revealed that the 5 most prominent textbooks used in secondary-level Spanish classrooms only devoted 8% of the cultural information supplied to US populations of Spanish speakers. As Ramírez and Hall point out, in fact, “…no text contains significant representation of the Spanish-speaking groups living in the United States” (1990, p.63). The texts do not focus on Spanish within the US, but rather continue to reinforce the exotic, touristic appeal of the language and cultures outside of the US. Since the same publishing companies and authors publish both the SFL and the SHL texts, and many of these companies and authors choose to modify SFL texts to fit the SHL context, or merely remarket an SFL text as an SHL text, this same tourist-perspective and minimal attention paid to US Spanish and its speakers may be embedded in SHL texts as well. Only a thorough analysis of the most commonly used texts such as that which is presented here will provide us with detailed insight into the structure and underlying philosophies of SHL texts, thereby making a comparison between the two types of texts possible as well.

A 1993 study by Young and Oxford addressed how “Students’ feelings and attitudes about language materials can affect their attitudes toward language class, language study in general and even the culture of the target language” (p.593). The researchers looked at student reactions to two intermediate level college textbooks:
Young and Oxford analyzed learner reactions to both
textbooks, looking specifically at students’ satisfaction with each text and the
implications of student reactions. Of the two texts, *Dos Mundos* was far preferred, and
the researchers found that “Student perceptions and attitudes regarding their language
learning materials…can impact the process of language learning” (p.599). It was found
that *Entradas* evoked a much higher level of language anxiety and therefore conversely
affected the students’ perceived ability to learn. Concerns regarding language anxiety
and linguistic insecurity are often augmented in the SHL classroom (Aparicio, 1993;
Villa, 1999; 2002), creating a need for teachers to critically consider both student
reactions to their textbooks and the images present in those same textbooks. If one SHL
text presents a negative image of US Latinos and their language and another a more
positive image, the more positive presentation should ultimately be preferred in order to
reduce student anxiety levels.

More recently, Elissondo (2001) performed an in-depth analysis of introductory
level Spanish FL textbooks. According to Elissondo, students see language instruction as
the acquisition of skills, not a space for social engagement. She adeptly notes “almost all
of the texts available for college teaching implicitly…confirm the ideas that students
bring to their courses by offering simplistic visuals and narratives that rarely encourage
students to think critically” (2001, p.72). Elissondo addressed three specific questions in
her analysis of three introductory college level Spanish textbooks, *Qué tal, Mosaicos* and
*Entrevistas*: (1) What kind of visuals are employed, (2) How are different groups of
people represented in narratives? and (3) How do ethnicity, class, gender, age and sexual
inclinations interplay with power relations in the same textbooks? Her findings, once again, are alarming. The reader takes on the role of tourist in these texts, in his pursuit to gather cultural information. Of the 136 pictures of people represented in Qué tal and Mosaicos, all but 9 photos represent light skinned, middle class Latinos of European ancestry. The three texts present peaceful coexistence and middle-class views as the norm, with the majority of historical and social struggles being obfuscated in the texts.

Elissondo further analyzed the treatment of US and Canadian Latinos within Qué tal and Mosaicos as well. She found that these cultures were represented via the highlighting of individuals and their respective individual achievements; these same individuals were not represented as members of their ethnic communities. Rather, the individual presentations of the people ignored why these people came to the US, and what their ensuing struggles, disappointments and accomplishments were. The focus on such individual representations rests on the myth that anybody can achieve material success and prestigious employment in America. Elissondo states that ethnic minorities are presented as decorative pieces to the larger cultural picture. The message of the texts is clear: material success and individual achievement are the preferred societal goals.

Elissondo prefers Entrevisitas presentation of culture topics pertaining to US and Canadian Latinos, stating that this text includes three controversial chapters which focus on illegal immigration, discrimination and deportation as well as on American interpretations of Latino culture, though in light of van Dijk’s discussion of immigration, the presentation of such topics clearly requires a more detailed analysis than that which Elissondo provides us with. She concurs with van Dijk, however, stating that the texts
she analyzed also do not promote critical discourse analysis (CDA), but rather “…tend to present versions of reality that embody certain interests, reify certain interpretations and value judgments, and give prominence to specific pieces of information while rendering others invisible or --- grossly – distorted” (Elissondo, 2001, pp.95-96). As educators and researchers, we often take for granted that textbooks designed for a specific population will be sensitive to the needs of that population, yet empirical research-upholding that assumption is still lacking. This study tackles this issue in the SHL context.

PREVIOUS STUDIES OF LANGUAGE AS REPRESENTED IN TEXTBOOKS

As Train (2002) points out, “The standard language is ideologically constructed by means of an ongoing sociocultural and sociolinguistic process of standardization involving the codification and institutionalization of the dominant linguistic and cultural norms of the “educated native speaker” (on-line). Though there have been few previous studies looking at presentation of a so-called standard language in SFL textbooks, those that have been conducted provide intriguing insight into the questionable nature of the version of Spanish that is presented in typical SFL textbooks. As Wieczorek states, several studies have indicated that there is a notable degree of discrepancy evidenced between the Spanish that is presented in a typical textbook and that which is used in real-life (1992; 1991 see also O’Connor, 1989). In Wieczorek’s analysis of 13 beginning to advanced level SFL textbooks, he finds that texts provide “…varying or misleading intuitions about dialects of Spanish” (1992, p.34), while further pointing out that certain morpho-lexical elements of various dialects of Spanish are completely ignored by textbook accounts of the language. Wieczorek’s findings support the claim that the
majority of today’s SFL textbooks continue to promote a Castilian-based dialectology of Spanish (1992); and by so doing, both obliterate and invalidate the many other dialects of the Spanish language. Wieczorek further stresses the odd yet continued inclusion of vosotros in language textbooks, despite the fact that only 8% of the Spanish speaking population uses the pronoun and its corresponding grammatical forms. It is this continued focus on Spain and the Castilian dialect that continues to inadvertently devalue other varieties of Spanish, leaving newcomers to the Spanish language, like US varieties of Spanish, ignored again.

An analysis of the presentation of culture without addressing the presentation of language in SHL textbooks would ignore the most prominent goal of the SHL classroom, namely that of second dialect acquisition or awareness. To date, no one has questioned the presentation of language in SHL texts. No one has questioned the value of learning the standard; it remains a universal legitimate (Train, 2002). No critical studies of the treatment of US dialects alongside the presentation of a standard dialect within SHL textbooks have been conducted either. The absence of research in this area is alarming, considering that respect for student dialects and acquisition of a standard dialect are two of the most highly regarded and cited goals of the field. This study also intends to address this critical need with an initial look into the treatment of US varieties of Spanish language in SHL textbooks.

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

CDA lies within the framework of Critical Applied Linguistics. The roots of CDA lie in post-structuralist theories, critical linguistics, as well as critical theory. Yet
the major influences within CDA come primarily from Poststructuralism and the work of Foucault, Bourdieu’s work in sociology, as well as the neo-Marxist tradition. CDA researchers borrow from Poststructuralism the idea that discourse constructively forms and shapes human identities and actions. Following the Foucauldian tradition, discourses are seen as institutionalized instantiations of power. Furthermore, the production of truth is seen as controlled by power regimes and both meaning and social identities are believed to be derived from discursive interactions. In this tradition, people are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising power. Bourdieu’s work in sociology has also been influential in CDA, where researchers have followed Bourdieu’s idea that practices and interactions with texts function as forms of cultural capital. Lastly, CDA researchers also borrow from the neo-Marxist tradition the idea that discourses are produced and used to articulate larger ideological interests (see Hall, 1996).

Despite its varied backgrounds and traditions, the unifying focus of CDA research is its concern with overarching issues of power and change as manifested in day to day discursive practices. The intent of CDA is to demonstrate how discourses construe aspects of the world in inherently selective and reductive ways, ‘translating’ and ‘condensing’ complex realities (Harvey, 1996). The job of the CDA research is not only to demonstrate what is occurring within the text, but also to note what is absent from the text; why this particular selection or reduction, why here, why now? The overarching goal of CDA is to make visible the way in which institutions and their discourse shape us. This is particularly relevant in the educational framework. Educational systems function,
in part, to meld students into knowledgeable citizens. Yet what knowledge qualifies as suitable for study is brought to light in the present research. How are certain aspects highlighted or obfuscated by texts? CDA uses linguistically based discourse analysis and takes this analysis one step further. In addition to illuminating what is occurring in the text, CDA is explicitly critical of textual practices and presentations. In the case of the present study, the hope is that a raised awareness of the slanted presentations of both language and culture in SHL texts can result in an improved presentation of both not only in future texts, but also in the classroom as well.

The goal of CDA is to show how “linguistic-discursive practices” are linked to “socio-political structures of power and domination” (Kress, 1990, p.85) by emphasizing “the role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 249). Fairclough (1995) explains that critical discourse analysis explores the sometimes “opaque” relationships that exist between “(a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power” (p.132). CDA sees language as a form of social action which constructs social reality. In CDA, discourse is considered both socially constitutive as well as socially shaped, implying a dialectal relationship. This dialectal relationship is best exemplified in the following diagram.
As exemplified in the diagram, the job of the CDA researcher is to delve into an in-depth micro-level analysis of discourse, language and text in order to elucidate their relationship to macro-level societal structures. The role of ideology, as defined by previous CDA researchers, however, has been poorly specified. Though many CDA researchers seem to feel that ideology indeed plays a role in the societal production of asymmetries of power (especially Fairclough), the task of revealing the relationship(s) that exist between ideology and micro and macro structures has proved problematic for researchers thus far. CDA researchers all share the common goal of using micro-level discourse analysis to expound the dialectal effect that exists between micro and macro-level societal structures, which, if left in place and unquestioned, are argued to have the potential to result in a reproduction of the current hegemonic societal order. The CDA
researcher, via a close, linguistic analysis of the micro, makes explicit the implicit and seemingly natural power arguments laden in texts, discourse and language in the hopes of bringing about some kind of a change in the societal order, typically resulting in increased voice for oppressed or subordinate populations.

There has been a prolific amount of research in CDA, particularly since 1990. Though the list of CDA researchers today is quite numerous, three researchers stand at the forefront of the CDA movement: Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak and Teun van Dijk. Fairclough is known for his triadic analysis of discourse, which looks at language texts, discourse practices and discursive events as instances of sociocultural practices. The overriding focus of his research is the analysis of the dialectical relations that exist between discourse and non-discursive elements of the social world, as tools used to unveil the underlying power relationships that exist in society at large. His own research agenda focuses on language and globalization, contemporary social change, as well as language, education and power. Fairclough’s approach has been heavily criticized on two accounts. First, and perhaps most frequently, for its claim to be scientific in nature; as Widdowson (1995) points out, “The privileging of particular interpretations actually undermines the validity of CDA as analysis” (my emphasis). Additionally, Fairclough’s claim for the “one-to-one relationship between ideological formations and discursive formations” has also been extensively criticized (Fairclough, 1995, p. 40). In fact, meaning is clearly not fixed and static, as alluded to here, and ideology is not a pre-given. My research pursues Fairclough’s interest in the relationship that exists between language, education and power, but does not concur with his claims regarding ideology.
Though my analyses are well-grounded in linguistic research, I by no means claim that my analyses are the only analyses possible. In fact, the culminating aspect of my research, and my own answer to many of the critiques that have been levied against CDA, rests in providing SHL students, the actual consumers of the texts I am analyzing, a chance to provide their own interpretations. It is by combining my own analyses with theirs that my research brings CDA back to its roots and sparks the beginning for change in the SHL context.

Ruth Wodak’s sociolinguistic ethnographical CDA approach is frequently referred to as the discourse-historical approach. Wodak’s research emphasizes not only the necessarily contextualized nature of discourse within its present state of occurrence, but also explicates the development of this discourse through a historical continuum. Her focus has centered on issues of anti-Semitism, and is particularly relevant to the research at hand. My in-depth discussions of the history of SHL programs in the U.S., as well as the evolution of SHL textbooks and the historical-political situation of U.S. Latinos all answer Wodak’s call for a historical foundation to CDA research. Particularly relevant to my own research, also, is the evolution of grouping terminologies targeting U.S. Latinos, as well as the development of arguments surrounding standard language in the U.S. All of these discussions will help the reader to see the historically contextualized evolution of SHL texts, while simultaneously grounding my own research within the confines of the socio-historical reality out of which it has arisen.

Lastly, Teun van Dijk’s prolific contribution to the field of CDA cannot be ignored. In fact, it is his research that has most inspired the current dissertation. Van
Dijk’s socio-cognitive approach to CDA describes the structures and strategies of text and talk, and relates these to the social and political contexts in which they occur. Van Dijk himself points out that CDA can take many shapes, including: semantic analysis, syntactic analysis, discourse structure analysis, as well as the analysis of metaphors and speech acts. All of these analyses systematically relate the structures under investigation to elements of the social context. (van Dijk, 2000). Van Dijk’s own research has primarily focused on the role of the news media in the promulgation of societal order. More recently, however, van Dijk’s research has also turned to the role of academic textbooks in the maintenance of societal myths and hegemonic structures. Van Dijk situates his research findings within a cognitive framework, with references to both episodic and long term memories. The cognitive connection that is so evident in van Dijk’s research is particularly pertinent to my discussion of cognitive metonymies present in the SHL texts analyzed. It will be argued that the metonymies serve to form a conceptual basis that allows for our understanding of groups of people as identifiable categories, each with its own prototypical instantiation. Clearly, this is a powerful claim, with serious repercussions not only for the SHL field, but in general.

Though all of the aforementioned researchers and numerous others have had a major impact on the field of CDA, van Dijk and Wodak have served as the inspiration for the current study. CDA, as exemplified within this dissertation, will be defined following van Dijk (1988) as the linguistically based study and analysis of written texts and spoken words in order to reveal the underlying discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, and bias evidenced in both. Though Fairclough’s approach to CDA has been
widely criticized, van Dijk’s approach is more widely accepted, due to its cognitive underpinnings. I will combine van Dijk’s cognitive method with Wodak’s socio-historical method of discourse analysis in order to provide both a cognitive and historical basis for my work. Particularly relevant to the current study are the cognitive underpinnings of categorization, metaphor and metonymy and their collaborative effect in the texts studied that serve to reduce the U.S. Latino population to a monolithic, uni-dimensional entity. The explanatory capacity of CDA will be expanded by this discussion, and my subsequent analysis of the texts can be used as a starting point to improve these same texts, and SFL texts for future generations. Additionally, the historical basis for the arguments in favor of standard language ideologies will also be highlights, following Wodak’s approach, in order to contextualize the rampant nature of the appropriateness based arguments present in SHL texts, while offering alternatives for future SHL and SFL texts. Despite the many complaints that have been rallied against CDA, the discipline has in fact achieved its stated goals. CDA has indeed drawn attention to the existence of stereotyped categorizations in daily talk, elite talk and texts. It has also successfully shown how language users categorize behavior, actions and attributes using language itself.

According to Luke, “there must be a critical approach to second language acquisition” (Luke, 2004, p. 28); I would argue that the SHL field is also in dire need of more a critical approach (see also Leeman, 2005; Martinez, 2003). As Luke points, all education “…remains about, within, and for the nation, tacitly about the protection and production of its Culture (and, by implication, its preferred ethnicities and races,
languages, and codes)...” (Luke, 2004, p. 24). SHL and SFL education are no exception to this; both occur within a politically framed educational context, and both suffer the consequences of that context. Many have critiqued CDA, specifically within the educational context, for ignoring the population which it purports to help. The CDA researcher, it is claimed, operates within his or her academic bubble, analyzing educational texts, without taking the next step and checking his or her analysis of the text against students’ own analyses. Pennycook (2001) cites the need to combine textual analysis with production and consumption practices; noting that what is produced without this last step is reduced to nothing more than a particular reading of a particular text. My research attempts to address this concern within the field of CDA by incorporating a survey, in which SHL students are asked to provide their own analysis of two excerpts from the texts under investigation in this dissertation. Not only does this aid in validating my own analyses of these texts, but also, crucially, this represents the first step in bringing CDA back to the classroom. As Kress (1996) states, there is an urgent need to operationalize CDA insights for pedagogical purposes. This dissertation intends to do just that. As van Dijk (2000) has mentioned, institutional racism is implemented in schools and universities, in lessons and textbooks, in assignments and research projects. It is only by articulating such racism and contesting it, while simultaneously equipping our students with the tools to do the same that change will occur. As Huckin has stated, “CDA deliberately seeks out texts that matter, the kind that students are confronted with in their daily lives”(1997); by encouraging students to think critically, and providing
them with tools of linguistic analyses to support their claims, we are in fact better
equipping them to construct their own futures and participate in power structures. In fact,

“If students are to learn how to read the world critically, they must be given
access to discourses that can allow them to analyse that world, discourses that can
enable them to explore the ways in which their own reading acts, as well as the
texts of their culture, are embedded in complex social and historical relations”

CDA is one such discourse. It is the intent of this dissertation and dissertator, not only to
complete a CDA of SHL texts, but to bring CDA back to the students who inspired my
research in this area, providing them with an arena to articulate their own thoughts and
readings of SHL texts, and perhaps allowing them a voice in a discourse that may serve
to reshape those texts.
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

AN OVERVIEW OF THE PRESENT STUDY

As this review of the literature has shown, though there have been numerous studies on the representation of US Latinos in both history and Spanish textbooks, there have been no similar studies conducted to analyze the treatment of US Latinos in SHL textbooks. A discourse analysis of the presentation of both culture and language in intermediate level university SHL textbooks, similar to those conducted in SFL contexts, is performed here, in order to address the absence of a similar study in the previous literature, while simultaneously amplifying the scope of previous studies via the addition of a language component. By addressing both of these gaps in the previous research, the current study draws a parallel between the presentation of both language and culture as a representation of the underlying ideologies present in SHL textbooks, with the hopes that similar studies can be conducted in both the contexts of heritage languages other than Spanish as well as in the FL context. Additionally, the current study has important implications for teacher training in both the SHL and SFL fields. As Train 2003 points out, instructors need to be taught to “…critically reflect on pedagogical materials by learning to question the standardized linguistic and cultural knowledge represented in textbooks” (22). The findings of the study represent vital pedagogical information for directors and teachers of SHL programs and classes, as well as providing new insight to publishing companies as to how to better address the needs of this growing population of students. Furthermore, as has been noted repeatedly in current research, the reality of
today’s Spanish classes is a mixed one; therefore, the information contained in this study is relevant not only to SHL teachers at all levels, but also to SSL teachers as well. The information contained herein will be pertinent to the training of both groups of individuals.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How are US Latinos grouped in SHL textbooks? What countries/ cultures/ sub-cultures/ ethnicities/ races/ etc. are highlighted or obfuscated by the texts? With what degree of frequency are each of the groups treated? What visual aids, stereotypes, categorizations, omissions, signs, metaphors, metonyms, myths and other discursive tropes function together to construct US Latino identity?

My analysis first takes on a broad focus, looking at the general organization of chapters dealing with US Latinos and US varieties of Spanish in the textbooks. Within the scope of this broad analysis, I look at such things as frequency of pages devoted to the group, as well as how US Latinos are categorized. Are US Latinos seen as a homogenized whole, or are there sub-groups which are highlighted or obfuscated by both the text as well as the visual aids present within the text. Lastly, within the framework of critical discourse analysis, I look to see which metaphors, metonyms and myths are unveiled upon close analysis of the text. This involves a detailed analysis of the use of pronouns, the use of active versus passive sentences and the overall presentation of historical events via linguistic devices. Are such events presented in a neutral fashion, or in such a way as to either portray a positive or negative image of the culture in question? Van Dijk’s findings on discursive racism are central to what I see as the need for this study. For that
reason, more in-depth analysis follows for those texts which deal with the immigrant, in order to see if the much studied representation of immigrants in the media is also played out in SHL textbooks (see Crawford, 2004; Mehan, 1997; O’Brien, 2003; Santa Ana, 1999; 2002 and van Dijk, 2004a; 2004b).

2. How is language variation treated in SHL textbooks? More specifically, are US varieties of Spanish addressed by the text and if so, how?

The initial analysis in this section will again be broad in scope, simply looking at the treatment of US varieties of Spanish. Are US varieties of Spanish addressed in the textbook? Are US varieties of Spanish covered in the language section of the textbook or are they covered in the culture section of the textbook? How are US varieties of Spanish treated? Do the textbooks tend to follow 1 of the 3 paths proposed by Valdés 1981’s seminal article on dialects in the SHL classroom (dialect eradication, biloquialism and dialect awareness) or do the texts take on a more critical and student-centered perspective toward US varieties of Spanish, such as that proposed in Martínez 2003? Issues of native-speakership will also be addressed here. Who do these textbooks present as native speakers of Spanish? Several researchers have raised concerns over issues of native-speakership within bilingual communities (Davies, 2003 and Train 2002; 2003) Does the presentation of US varieties of Spanish within these texts uphold or reject these ideas? What type of Spanish is presented as standard Spanish in these textbooks? Which varieties of Spanish are promoted or demoted by the texts? What justification or reasoning is given to SHL learners for acquiring the proposed standard variety?
3. Does the researcher observe any connections between the treatment of US Latino culture and the treatment of US varieties of Spanish in the textbooks that show either evidence or absence of discursive racism?

This question intends to address the issue of whether or not there is a connection between the treatment of both US Latinos and US varieties of Spanish in the textbook. It has been suggested in other contexts that US textbooks tend to promote assimilatory so-called “American” values at the risk of criminalizing (MacGregor-Mendoza 1998) or marginalizing US varieties of Spanish and its speakers. Are such accusations upheld or rejected by the texts under investigation? Do the texts show an underlying philosophy toward internal US Latino cultures? Is the treatment of cultures and language varieties consistent or is the treatment of these two areas distinct within texts? Is there a standard culture that is presented alongside the standard language as presented in the texts?

4. How do students perceive the presentation of U.S. Latinos and U.S. varieties of Spanish as presented in typical SHL textbooks?

This question addresses several concurrent questions. What are students’ goals? Do students feel that these goals are met in the textbooks currently in use? Do students perceive the readings in the same way as the researcher? Do students undertake their own form of CDA when reading passages relevant to U.S. populations of Latinos? Do students like the textbooks in use? Why or why not?
TEXT SELECTION

The trend toward the incorporation of SHL programs at the college and university level has led to a reciprocated trend in the textbook arena. Today, more than ever before, teachers of SHL classes have a wide variety of texts from which to choose when teaching SHL classes (Winke & Stafford, 2002). Both the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) have generated lists of relevant pedagogical materials for the SHL classroom. It is from these lists that the initial selection of texts to be analyzed began. Initially, all textbooks listed in the Draft of LangNet Annotated Bibliography List of Materials was consulted in order to assess a preliminary list of those materials most frequently used in intermediate university level classes. The intermediate university level is often considered the entry-level course for SHL learners in colleges offering a sequence of courses. Additionally, as many colleges and universities have not yet incorporated a full-fledged SHL program, such colleges and universities often opt to offer only an intermediate level SHL course. Thus, the intermediate university level was selected, based on its prevalence across college and university level SHL programs in the US.

From the LangNet Annotated Bibliography, all 7 intermediate university level SHL textbooks mentioned on the site were selected for inclusion in the present study. However, I wanted to verify that these 7 texts were indeed those that were most frequently used in colleges and universities across the US. Thus, a random survey was conducted of colleges and universities in areas of the country most likely to include SHL programs. The survey was issued, via e-mail, requesting the titles and publishers of the
textbooks used at the intermediate level in SHL programs. Some universities were contacted directly, while others were surveyed via a posting to the heritage language listserv and the ACTFL listservs. Additionally, colleges and universities listed on the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities website, which also offer SHL programs, were also contacted directly via e-mail, in order to include those Spanish departments most likely to include an SHL component. 34 institutions responded to the survey, yielding the following results:
Table 2: Materials used by responding institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of responding institution (in order of response)</th>
<th>Textbook Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Nuevos mundos (NM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grand Valley State University (Michigan)</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos (LLQH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Nuevos mundos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Avanzando (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Mundo 21 hispano (M21H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>Nuevos mundos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City University of New York at Manhattan</td>
<td>Instructor’s resources (compiled) (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>Manual de gramática (MDG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>New Mexico State University</td>
<td>Nuestra herencia (NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>Mundo 21 hispano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>Nuevos mundos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Avanzando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of California at Santa Barbara</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of California Irvine</td>
<td>Avanzando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of California Los Angeles</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>University of California San Diego</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>St. Edwards University</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gainesville College, GA</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Nuevos mundos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>City College of San Francisco</td>
<td>Nuevos mundos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cochise College</td>
<td>Español escrito (EE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Miami Dade Community College</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>Nuevos mundos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Glendale Community College</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pima Community College</td>
<td>Mundo 21 hispano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>California State University Fresno</td>
<td>Avanzando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>New Jersey City University</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>St. Peter’s College, New Jersey</td>
<td>Instructor’s resources (compilation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wilbur Wright College, Chicago</td>
<td>La lengua que heredamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Colombia Basin College</td>
<td>Español escrito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Brownsville</td>
<td>Nuevos mundos/ Mundo 21 hispano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>California State University, Chico</td>
<td>Mundo 21 hispano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following texts emerged as the most commonly used texts in the SHL context.

Table 3: Tabulation of materials used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LLQH</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>M21H</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>MDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviation Key:
LLQH = La lengua que heredamos
NM = Nuevos mundos
M21H = Mundo 21 hispano
A = Avanzando
EE = Español escrito
CR = Compiled Resources
NH = Nuestra herencia
MDG = Manual de gramática

As the results show, *La lengua que heredamos* is the most widely used textbook at this level, with 11 responding institutions employing this text. *Nuevos mundos* is also extensively used, with 8 responding institutions using the text. *Mundo 21 hispano* is also employed at six institutions, and interestingly, 4 institutions also use the *Avanzando* text. *Español escrito* is also used at two institutions, and has been included in this study, despite the rather low institutional response rate associated with this particular text, upon the suggestion of Glenn Martínez, a well-respected SHL scholar. Texts that are only employed at one institution are not included in the present study, nor are the compiled resources used by several of the responding institutions, as these materials varied across institution. Therefore based on the results of the aforementioned survey, the scope of this

---

5 Please note that one institution listed two textbooks in their response. Both were included for the purposes of the study. Thus, although only 34 institutions responded, 35 distinct responses were received.
dissertation is limited to providing an in-depth critical discourse based analysis of the following five SHL texts: *La lengua que heredamos, Nuevos mundos, Mundo 21 hispano, Avanzando* and *Español escrito*.

**CDA AND SHL TEXTBOOKS**

As can be seen from the research questions, both the treatment of US Latino culture and US varieties of Spanish present in each text will be analyzed. The first aspect of my research employs CDA in order to analyze both the textual and pictorial representation of US Latinos in the selected textbooks (Ashby, 2003; Fairclough, 1992; 2001; Pennycook, 2001; Van Dijk, 1985; 2004a; 2004b). As I am primarily interested in how the texts represent US Latino populations, I have limited my analysis to those chapters or sections of the textbooks pertaining specifically to US Latinos. In the five textbooks under investigation, this amounts to approximately 100-140 pages per textbook. The structure of my analysis is, of course, guided by previous research, while simultaneously amplifying that research by connecting to previously unresearched areas, namely that of the combination of the treatments of both culture and language in SHL textbooks.

In my initial, general analysis, I have followed Ramírez and Hall (1990), in looking at the sheer percentage of pages devoted to the US Latino population in the texts. Next, as virtually all of the aforementioned studies have done, I have looked at which cultural topics are selected for inclusion and which topics occur with greatest frequency both within and across the texts. Additionally, I have included an analysis of the
pictorial representations supplied in each text to see if these too offer any insights into the semiotic representation of US Latinos in the text, from a non-discourse perspective.

After this preliminary, more general analysis was completed, I performed a more in-depth CDA of the actual texts devoted to culture in the selected chapters. Many researchers have pointed out that the methodological specifics of discourse analysis and CDA are ambiguous and hard to define, as the two methods draw on multiple disciplines to form their research base. CDA, for the purposes of the present study, will be defined following van Dijk (1988) as the linguistically based study and analysis of written texts and spoken words in order to reveal the underlying discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, and bias evidenced in both text and the spoken word. Huckin (1997) provides an outline for aspects of analysis under the CDA framework. Huckin suggests initially looking at the big picture represented by first focusing on an analysis of the pictorial elements and headlines or other highlighted text present. On a second level, Huckin recommends looking at both the frequency and types of realizations of such areas as topicalization, agency, nominalization, insinuations, connotations, and modality in order to make explicit the underlying ideology of a text. The specific realization of the in-depth analysis proposed here represents a product of the previously mentioned topics of analysis, as well as additional topics that were elucidated as pertinent through the course of my investigations. The texts themselves guided my analysis; based on previous research, I analyzed the following components: choice of pronouns (i.e.: we vs. they), verb choice (from a lexical-semantic perspective), active versus passive sentences, lexical tendencies, stereotyping, categorizations, metaphors, metonymies, myths, and the
presentation of specific topics from one perspective (i.e. immigration), to the exclusion of other topics or perspectives.

In the next phase of my analysis, I addressed the issue of how US varieties of Spanish are treated within these same texts. Based on the argument that both culture and language are a reflection of identity, I felt it was important to address both of these issues in the current analysis. I first focused on the issue of whether or not US varieties of Spanish are addressed by the individual texts, and what variety of Spanish is promoted in the texts. This investigation led naturally into a discussion of standard language, as either implicitly or explicitly defined by the texts. I then looked to see if the texts that deal with US varieties of Spanish follow one of the three paths proposed by Valdés 1981’s seminal article on dialects in the SHL classroom, namely: dialect eradication, biloquialism or dialect awareness. However, I also incorporated a fourth category into my analysis, namely that of the critical based dialect awareness as proposed in Martínez 2003. Determination of the underlying philosophy of the text was guided by a CDA of the texts’ metalanguage regarding US varieties of Spanish, as well as the metalanguage used to justify the variety of Spanish promoted in the textbook. Additionally, I looked to see if the texts discuss previously studied, known characteristics of Mexican-American Spanish. I have selected to look solely at Mexican-American Spanish, as Mexican-Americans represent the largest sub-population within the global category of US Latinos, and the linguistic intricacies of Mexican-American Spanish have typically been more studied than those of other varieties of US Spanish. Specifically, I looked to see how the texts deal with lexical borrowings that have become incorporated into the dialect (lonche,
troque, etc.), as well as manifestations of so-called over-generalizations as studied by Silva-Corvalán (2001) (namely, the use of subject pronouns, the loss of the subjunctive mode, the –s ending on preterit tense second person singular verbs, etc.). Lastly, I also address the use of direct and indirect object pronoun variation, as the treatment of this topic within the texts is quite distinct from their treatment of all other forms of language variation that are discussed therein; thus adding an important component to the overall frame of the analysis.

The combined analysis of the metalanguage and the texts’ actual treatment of these specific manifestations of one variety of US Spanish have indeed shed light on the text’s philosophy toward the language that students bring to the SHL classroom context. Appropriateness based arguments are still rampant in the texts. Such arguments continue to subordinate U.S. varieties of Spanish to outside, peninsular varieties of the language. Lastly, after an in-depth analysis of both the presentation of US Latinos culture and language in the SHL intermediate university level textbooks selected for inclusion in the study, I also analyzed any connections observed in the underlying philosophies or orientations treating the two areas with the intent of showing whether or not texts serve to present an overall positive, negative or contradictory presentation of the two aspects under analysis.

BACK TO REALITY: CDA FROM THE STUDENTS’ PERSPECTIVE

The last phase of my analysis focused in part on responding to many of the critiques made against CDA, while simultaneously connecting my research back to the population of students which inspired it. In this last phase, I conducted a survey of those
students enrolled at the intermediate level here at the University of Arizona (see Appendix A for a copy of the survey). The student participants (N=42) completed a brief survey which investigated three distinct areas: (1) student opinion of the textbook employed in these classes, in this case, Mundo 21 hispano, (2) a brief reading and reaction section, and (3) a brief survey of student goals and motivation as related to SHL classes and Spanish language revival.

In part 1, students responded to 12 questions regarding their perceptions of and satisfaction with their textbooks. All 12 questions employed a 4-point Likert scale, where answers ranged from strongly agree, agree, disagree to strongly disagree. This section of the survey also included one open ended question which asked students to express, in their own words, whether they liked or disliked their textbook, and why. In the second part of the survey, students were asked to read 2 text selections taken from their textbook, one discussing U.S. Latino culture and the other discussing a U.S. variety of Spanish. In this section, students were provided with the selected text in both Spanish (as it appeared in the textbook) and English (my translation), to allow for faster reading and increased comfort with the study, thereby increasing student participation. After completing each of the readings, students were asked to respond to one closed and two open-ended questions, in which they expressed their opinions about the readings, thus providing their own, mini-CDA. Lastly, students responded to two closed-choice questions, one which addressed their own reasons for taking the Spanish heritage course in which they were enrolled, and one which addressed students’ own goals regarding the type of Spanish they hope to acquire in that class.
The results of the survey were analyzed on both a qualitative and quantitative level. Likert-scale and closed-choice questions were analyzed using descriptive statistics. In the case of open-ended responses, a qualitative analysis was performed, which looked for recurring themes in the student responses.

CHAPTER OVERVIEWS

In Chapter 3, I analyze the presentation of US Latino groups across the 5 SHL texts studied. My analysis first presents a broad overview of the pictorial representations of US Latinos, highlighting the disparate treatment of light and dark-skinned Latinos while also revealing the textbooks’ dominant focus on famous US Latino icons. The icons are presented as pillars of the American dream; having achieved success, they are divested of their origins, and presented as a mere list of accomplishments.

I then continue of my analysis of US Latinos, by performing a CDA of the treatment of immigration within and across texts. Here it is argued that the stereotypical presentation of US Latinos as immigrants is rooted in cognitive metonymic underpinnings. It is shown that Hispanics are understood to be the prototypical illegal immigrant. The repercussions of this stereotyping are then discussed.

Lastly, I show that both the findings of Rodriguez and Ruiz (2005) and those of van Dijk (2004b) are upheld by my analysis of SHL texts. Indeed, Mexican-Americans are generally used to represent all Latinos, while immigration is presented as a uni-beneficial process. Immigrants as presented in the texts come to the United States from poor, politically and economically unstable countries, in search of a better life. No mention is made of the benefits of immigration from a US perspective. Rather, the
rampant stereotyping of Latinos as illegals results in cognitive association with criminal behavior and poverty.

In Chapter 4, I present my analysis of the presentation of language across the textbooks. I begin my analysis by looking at the ideological frameworks employed in the texts. In this first section, I analyze the introductions and prefaces of the textbooks to see how the texts’ align themselves in the treatment of both student varieties of Spanish and standard varieties of the language. The three main themes found across texts are (1) to be acquainted with standard Spanish and its appropriate contexts of use, (2) to write using a correct form of Spanish and (3) to help the student to overcome the inherent problem of being bilingual. Despite explicit claims to value the students’ varieties of Spanish, the underlying orientation present across texts reveals an appropriateness-based framework, which dictates when students should and should not use their varieties of language. This leads naturally into a discussion regarding the standard language presented as the students’ goal in the textbooks.

I next look at the treatment of variation across texts, specifically focusing on how processes said to be common to bilingual varieties of Spanish are treated or ignored by the texts. Though numerous topics are treated across the textbooks, none is dealt with more extensively than lexical borrowings. Such borrowings continue to be mislabeled as false cognates across the texts, disacknowledging their well-documented presence which has been widely establish in the field of sociolinguistics. Textbooks continue to aim to rid students of these “embarrassing” words and equip them with a more standard language.
Other processes including: pronoun variation, morphological variation, and syntactic variation are also dealt with, though each to a much lesser degree. Each process is detailed as per the texts’ treatment of the topic, specifically highlighting whether the texts approves or disapproves of the use of such forms, and whether or not textual explanations are based on sociolinguistic research. Overall suggests that the texts present an uninformed, geographically based presentation of language variation, rarely citing the sociolinguistic realities of the processes discussed.

In Chapter 5, responses to student surveys are presented. First, general student reactions to closed questions regarding the presentation of language and culture in their textbook are presented. Surprisingly, students feel their texts include positive representations of their cultures and language. Student reactions to an excerpt on immigration are presented next. Overall, students have acquired the dominant discourse on immigration; their responses indicate that they too present immigration as a uni-directional and uni-beneficial process. Generally, students see the text as a presentation of factual information, and do not question the facts presented, as they see the text as a source for true information.

Next, students’ reactions to an excerpt dealing with language variation are presented. Though my findings present this passage as a clearly derogatory, negative representation of Cuban Spanish, the students do not agree. They again see the texts’ presentation of this variety of Spanish as a mere factual reality.

Students were also asked to react to their textbooks and state which variety of Spanish they would prefer to learn. Generally, students are satisfied with their textbooks.
Additionally, most students state that they would like to learn a Mexican-American variety of Spanish in their classes. Lastly, I discuss the pedagogical implications of the students’ opinions and what our next step as SHL educators needs to be.

In Chapter 6, I discuss the pedagogical implications for SHL educators, administrators and publishers alike. I argue for the necessity of corpus-based, sociolinguistically informed textbooks that promote a critical, emic-based understanding of language and power intricacies for students. To that end, I suggest a wish-list of topics that should be included in future SHL texts, as well as some sample activities that exemplify the pedagogy I am arguing for. I also discuss the implications of this research for future research, suggesting several possible avenues for future research. In light of the othering of US Latinos present in the textbooks and the negative treatment of language which is perpetuated even today, it is imperative that SHL specific teacher-training begin. A framework for such training is detailed as a starting point for institutions wishing to implement such a program. It is crucial that we recognize the highly political nature of language instruction in the United States today, and make a point to improve the situation for heritage languages and their learners by acknowledging both as a legitimate and distinct field in their own right.
CHAPTER 3: (RE)PRESENTING U.S. LATINOS IN SHL TEXTBOOKS

As mentioned previously in the literature review section of the paper, the presentation of US Latino populations in textbooks of all kinds has been problematic for years. Research into group categorizations, stereotypes and prominent metaphors continues to show evidence of racial stereotyping and tendencies toward exoticizing the cultures of these so-called others (Arizpe & Aguirre, 1987; Ashby, 2003; Cruz, 1994; Elisondo, 2001; Norton, 2000; Ramírez & Hall, 1990; Rodríguez & Ruiz, 2005; Schultz, 1987; Van Dijk, 2004a; 2004b). As Cruz poignantly states, “…what is truly galling is how the loaded verbiage, negative stereotyping, and gross inaccuracies continue” even today (1994, p. 60).

In a current study of film’s portrayal of Latinos, recent films were found to “…repetitiously present(ing) Latinos as "the other" to contrast what are "American" values, culture and national character;” with what it meant to be non-American. It is this constant contrasting, coupled with the metonymic underpinnings of stereotyping or prototyping in general that has been successfully used to other US Latino populations into a marginalized status of difference (Saad, 2005, p. 51). As Cruz points out, these types of blatant inaccuracies and stereotypings continue in today’s textbooks. Unfortunately, this is equally true in the SHL context.

In the following section, I will share my findings regarding the presentation of Latinos in SHL textbooks, and ask that you, the reader, bear in mind the intended audience of these texts as you read through my analysis. Keep in mind that these texts, in large part, are targeting US Latinos in college and university settings. It is imperative
that we recognize that the very cultures that are being inaccurately portrayed and negatively stereotyped are often the cultures of those same students who are reading these textbooks. How such students reconcile these inaccuracies and stereotypes with their own self-image requires another study altogether, and indeed represents an avenue for future research\textsuperscript{6}. The scope of the present study, however, is limited to describing how US Latino cultures are presented in today’s most popular SHL textbooks.

I will begin with the big picture, looking at what is both highlighted and obfuscated by the texts. Next, I will move to an explanation of the cognitive metonymies that come into play in the presentation of US Latinos in SHL textbooks. Though much work has been done looking at the metaphors surrounding the US Latino population (see Mehan, 1997; O’Brien, 2003; Santa-Ana, 1999; 2002), little work has been done to date looking at the metonymical underpinnings that invoke contiguous relationships and thus also contribute to the negative stereotyping of US Latino populations. It will be argued, in fact, that the metonymical underpinnings are what have led to the possibility of stereotyping in the first place, and that any efforts to contest stereotyping must first address the metonymical roots from which the stereotypes have derived.

As all the texts continue to associate being Latino with immigration, this topic will be treated in greater depth. In fact, the \textit{othering} of US Latino population occurs in large part during textual discussion of immigration related issues. As will be seen, the texts create an \textit{Us v. Them} dichotomy, much akin to what van Dijk found in his own textbook analyses (see 2004a; 2004b). What is interesting in the SHL context, however,\footnote{Though the current study does begin to look at that in the compiled survey data found in Chapter 5.}
is that students are being forced to consider where it is that they fall in this dichotomy, as they read about their own cultures as different from the Us of US society as a whole. The treatment of immigration most clearly illustrates this dichotomy and will serve as the major springboard for the discussion presented here. This chapter concludes with an analysis of the overall presentation of US Latinos, showing how the same metaphors, metonymies and myths observed in the sections dealing with immigration are perpetuated and active in other forms of stereotyping of US Latinos in general, not just in SHL textbooks, but in the larger media, political and educational discourses of the present day.

A PICTURE IS WORTH A THOUSAND WORDS: DEPICTIONS OF US LATINOS IN SHL TEXTBOOKS

There are 128 pictures or drawings in the pages devoted to US Latinos across the five textbooks. The data present in the SHL textbooks confirm van Dijk’s 2004 findings, which state that pictorial representations in texts tend to focus on “…the exotic, negative or problematic dimensions of Others or other countries. Thus, we will typically see a picture of ‘huts’ in Africa or igloos in Canada, rather than of a traffic jam among skyscrapers of many cities in Africa, Asia or Latin America” (2004b, on-line). In fact, the majority of the non-people portraying pictures in the textbooks depict places, with plazas being the most popularly depicted place, though this is due in large part to the Avanzando text, which has an overwhelming focus on Culture as opposed to culture\(^7\), and therefore includes numerous pictures of plazas (9 of the 50 pictures in the text are of plazas). This conforms with van Dijk’s notion of exoticizing the culture of the other. By focusing on

\(^7\) Reference and definition here
places that are dissimilar to places found within so-called popular US culture, the
textbooks serve to make Latino populations, even those present here in the US, seem
exotic. As Elissondo points out, stereotypical cultural icons continue to be the focus of
today’s textbooks, and this is no less true in the SHL context (2004).

The overall focus across all texts, however, centers around the presentation of
people, more specifically, that of famous people. The majority of the pictures highlight
the faces of famous Latinos as focal points; pictures of this style make up 54 of the total
128 pictures presented. The people most popularly represented are writers, actors and
actresses, musicians, artists and politicians (listed in order of frequency). In addition to
the pictorial representations of famous people, the second most popular pictorial
presentation is that of ordinary people (N=29). These pictures include shots of people
working, studying and immigrating. It is interesting to note the quantity of pictures
devoted to each of these categories:

**Table 4: Pictures of ordinary people in SHL textbooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working</th>
<th>Immigrating</th>
<th>Studying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be further noted that of the pictures devoted to people working, 50% depict
individuals working in manual labor, while the other 50% depict people working in
“professional” fields. It is also of note that despite the fact that the target population of

---
8 This category includes singers, dancers and musicians
the textbook is students, there are relatively few pictures of them across the five textbooks studied.

In taking a closer look at the pictures of people present in the texts, we notice a further discrepancy: namely, there are few, if any dark skinned Latinos present in any of the textbooks. In fact, across all the pictorial representations of people, of the 136 pictures of people presented\(^9\), only 15 of the pictures were of dark skinned Latinos, the remaining 121 all depicted light skinned individuals. In only two cases were light and dark skinned Latinos shown in the same photograph. In one instance, a light skinned doctor was helping a dark skinned patient and in the other instance, 2 light skinned police officers were carrying off a dark skinned individual they had arrested. Clearly, this discrepancy needs to be dealt with. My findings are not isolated; in fact, in Eilssondo’s 2001 study of 3 university level Spanish textbooks, she found that of the 136 pictures of people represented, all but 9 photos represented light skinned, middle class Latinos of European ancestry. The same holds true for the SHL textbooks. Elissondo further points out that this representation presents a peaceful coexistence of races, and a predominantly middle-class valued-people as the norm, with the majority of historical and social struggles being obfuscated in the texts. The big picture presented in the text tells its readers that Latinos are basically “the other” whites. This notion is confirmed by US Census categorization headings, where *Hispanic or Latino* is in juxtaposition with the

\(^9\) Note, the numbers do not coincide here, as some picture contained more than one individual, and in this part of the analysis, each individual was counted separately, as the overall picture was not the focus, but rather the presentation of individuals was highlighted. It should also be noted the pictures with more than 3 people were not included in this analysis, as the people in such pictures were generally too small to analyze. Additionally, only actual photos were counted, as drawings were less clear in their depictions of individuals; therefore, no pictures from the *Español escrito* text were included, as the text is composed solely of drawings.
category of *White alone*. This now popular distinction between Hispanic and non-Hispanic white serves to reinforce the division between the *us v. them* categories, while the textbooks emphasis on the lighter skinned Hispanic population serves to isolate darker skinned Hispanics even more. This detailed separation of whites from Hispanic whites creates a seemingly *natural* division among people, providing the readers of the texts with a prototype for dividing groups of people. False social grouping, and in turn, hierarchies, are thus created, subtly hiding the dehumanizing and hegemonic nature of the terminology employed in discursive practices of SHL texts.

This bigger picture helps us to understand who the textbooks conceive of as US Latinos. In pictorial terms, this population appears to be rather uniform, as Elissondo (2001) found, representing Latinos as a light-skinned population that seems to straddle the social classes of middle and lower class America. To further illustrate this last point, we need only look to the types of jobs exemplified in the pictures found across the textbooks. I have classified all the pictures of people working into the two categories of either skilled labor or professional, based on the texts’ own categorizations. The following table illustrates the jobs that are associated with the non-famous US Latinos presented in the texts.
Table 5: US Latinos and their jobs, according to SHL textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skilled workers</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avanzando</strong></td>
<td>Taxi driver, gaucho</td>
<td>Soccer player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Español escrito</strong></td>
<td>Manual laborer, maid</td>
<td>School teacher, professional man, 2 professional women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mundo 21 hispano</strong></td>
<td>2 secretaries, farm worker, soldier</td>
<td>Doctor, businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nuevos mundos</strong></td>
<td>Tobacco shop workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>La lengua que heredamos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street Musicians, Folk dancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This division between the middle class and the lower class comes across at first glance rather balanced looking, but if we take into account the numerous photos of famous people also included in the text, we see a drastically different representation of who US Latinos are. In fact, pictorially, not only are US Latinos light-skinned, but they are also predominantly professionally employed. If we calculate the total of professionally employed individuals to include the famous people, the table shifts dramatically to include 61 professionally employed to 9 skilled laborers. It is interesting to note this pictorial emphasis on the professional, which is not at all emphasized by the words of the texts. Again, in looking to Elissondo’s research, we see that the findings in SHL textbooks truly mirror her findings of SFL texts, namely there is an overwhelming emphasis on the individual, and their achievements. Elissondo’s research underscores the fact that individuals and their respective individual achievements are highlighted by the texts; these same individuals are not represented as members of their ethnic communities. Rather, the individual presentations of the people tend to ignore the historical trajectory
of why these people came to the US, and what their ensuing struggles and
disappointments were. The focus on such individual representations rests on the myth
that anybody can achieve material success and prestigious employment in America.
Elissondo states that ethnic minorities are presented as decorative pieces to the larger
cultural picture. The message of the texts is clear: material success and individual
achievement are the preferred societal goals. Elissondo’s conclusions, coupled with the
evidence found in the SHL textbooks serve to emphasize how the importance of the myth
of the American dream even on a merely pictorial basis has infiltrated the text. The
obliteration of any purely “Latino” values is achieved subtly via a pictorial emphasis on
work and immigration. By identifying the Latino culture predominantly with these two
concepts, the need for assimilation and adoption of standard US values is adopted by the
populations depicted in the text, thus eliminating the individuality of the many cultures
already mixed together under the misnomer of Hispanics.

In fact, the overall presentation of US Latinos emphasizes the exotic and famous
aspects of each individual. The information presented details the successes of each
person, many of which the students already know. Take for example the presentation of
Jennifer López in Mundo 21 hispano:

Jennifer López es una popular actriz y cantante descendiente de padres
puertorriqueños. Nacida el 24 de julio de 1970 en el Bronx en la ciudad de Nueva
Cork, Jennifer López empezó su carrera como bailarina en el show de televisión
In Living Color (1990). Su primer papel fílmico de importancia fue el papel
estelar de Mi familia, dirigido por Gregory Naava en 1995. Este mismo director
la dirigió en Selena (1997), que constituyó su ticket de entrada al mundo de las
grandes estrellas. Gracias a su talento y a su belleza de rasgos claramente latinos,
es dirigida frecuentemente por grandes cineastas como Francis Coppola (Jack,
1990), Bob Raffelson (Blood and Wine, 1996), Oliver Stone (U Turn, 1997) y
Steven Soderbergh (Out of Sight, 1998). En años recientes sus éxitos continuan

Though this paragraph indeed contains factual information, it merely lists one film alter another, requiring little actual language and information processing on the part of the student. Most of the facts presented are familiar to the students, while more obscure facts emphasizing her connection to the Latino community are ignored. In fact, the only mention of her *Latinidad* comes in reference to her physical traits. Thus, famous Latinos are presented in the textbooks as exotic cultural icons, successful in their intent to secure the American dream. Let us look now at the big picture presented across texts.

**GENERAL TENDENCIES ACROSS TEXTS: WHO’S IN AND WHO’S OUT**

The pictorial analysis leads naturally into a discussion of who it is that is being presented in these pictures, and how it is that the texts themselves have chosen to group US Latinos. *La lengua que heredamos, Mundo 21 hispano and Nuevos mundos* are all divided into chapters that highlight either cultural groups or regions. These chapter headings were used as the basis for classification in the table that follows. Notice that *Español escrito* is not included in the table, as this text does not divide its chapters by countries or groups. However, *Español escrito* does emphasize the Mexican-American and Dominican experience in the US, as all of the first person narratives that occur throughout the text are from the perspective of one of these two groups. The *Avanzando* text is not divided into chapters which focus on specific countries either, as the text’s main focus is grammar; however, readings in each chapter tend to focus on one
geographic area. I have based the information in the table that follows on the titles used in those readings, rather than using a chapter heading as was done in the case of the three other texts.

**Table 6: Textual Grouping as Evidenced in Chapter and Reading Headings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los hispanos en los Estados Unidos</th>
<th>Los mexicano-americanos (los chicanos)</th>
<th>Los puertorriqueños</th>
<th>Los cubano-americanos</th>
<th>Los dominicanos</th>
<th>Los centro-americanos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avanzando</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La lengua que heredemos</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundos 21 hispano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevos mundos</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be gleaned from the table, the majority of the texts tend to emphasize the presence of *hispanos* in the U.S. while there is a strong secondary emphasis on Mexican-Americans, perhaps due to the size of this group in relation to the size of the other groups present in the US. Yet it is important to note that the majority of the texts continue to treat the Spanish-speaking cultures present in the US under one heading. This tendency has a homogenizing effect, and in fact again reinforces the categorizations employed by the US Census and the discourse surrounding these diverse populations in the US in
general. In effect, such grouping terminology serves to meld the many diverse Spanish-speaking cultures into one group.

Similar types of categorizations are prominent in media discourse, politics and even within the realm of education. Such categorizations have contributed to a common understanding of the different groups of people that coexist within the United States’ borders. Categorization is, after all, a primary means of understanding reality (Kim, 1996). Grouping people together is thought to be a natural process, yet how such groupings are detailed and what benefits each group receives are by no means natural. Despite the fact that Spanish is spoken by many disparate groups within the US, each with his or her own distinct variety of the language, “the dominant Anglo-American culture has decided that use of Spanish language equals Hispanic in culture…there again exists a de facto categorization that all Hispanics are one and thus speak the same Spanish” (Stephens, 1994, p.4). Indeed, this grouping is even employed for the purposes of analysis in the current paper, though the researcher admits that this is both ironic and unacceptable, I am left with little choice, for to talk about what is occurring in the textbooks, I am obliged to use the categories I observe to detail my analysis. I, however, concur with Fishman: “The label Hispanics is a misnomer”, implying both a cultural and linguistic uniformity among an extremely diverse group of people (1991, p.190). Yet this misnomer is used throughout the textbooks, and indeed, even in this very analysis.

A closer inspection of the readings in each textbook dealing with the notion of Hispanics in the United States reveals that some groups are acknowledged as subparts that fall under the umbrella term; whereas others never gain an identity as an individual
culture in the readings. As the first reading in the Marques’ text illustrates, “…los hispanos se han convertido en la minoría más grande en los Estados Unidos…” (2005, p. 20). Becoming the largest minority would not be possible if it were not for the grouping of people from 23 different countries into one solitary category. In fact, this grouping of all those who speak Spanish under one global category permits the creation of a culture of fear. Hispanics are perceived as a large population of people who endanger the majority culture. Couple that with the fact that Hispanics have become the symbol of immigration in America (Dicker, 2003), and the question of American identity is placed at stake, purely because American identity as a monolithic entity does not exist. It is this fractured reality that causes and stirs fear within people, resulting in uninformed, reactory prejudices that manifest themselves in the form of anti-immigrant/minority and anti-Spanish legislation. How ironic that this very same discourse should be present in today’s SHL textbooks. It is imperative to be acquainted with the truly differing degree of skills, language varieties and cultures that labels like Hispanic and Latino hide. Though both terms are used throughout this dissertation, it is crucial to recognize that the Hispanic population itself is not a homogeneous one.

The individual groups that are mentioned within the reading in the Marques text include: Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Central Americans, Cubans, Nicaraguans, Salvadorans, Columbians, and South Americans. It is interesting to note that even in this one reading, there is some overlap amongst the categories employed. South Americans should include Colombians, yet Columbians stand out as somehow different, due to their strong presence in Jackson Heights. The same holds for the Nicaraguans and the
Salvadorans who are set apart from other Central American groups, the Nicaraguans due to their growing presence in the Miami area, and the Salvadorans due to the political strife that has plagued their country. Yet these countries are afforded a voice, or a presence that is in fact denied of the other Spanish-speaking nations. It is interesting, in fact, that Dominicans are not mentioned as a separate group in the text, for if the explicit treatment of groups was based on numbers alone, the Dominicans should receive separate treatment, due to their growing presence in New York City, yet this does not occur. Despite the fact that Spanish is spoken by many disparate groups within the US, each with his or her own distinct variety of the language, “the dominant Anglo-American culture has decided that use of Spanish language equals Hispanic in culture…there again exists a de facto categorization that all Hispanics are one and thus speak the same Spanish” (Stephens, 1994, p.4). In the case of the Samaniego text, the divisions are similar: Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cuban Americans, Dominicans, and Central Americans. Within the section on Central Americans, it is important that only certain countries are highlighted in the text: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. Both Costa Rica and Panama are not included in the reading. This allows for a rather negative portrayal of all of Central America, as a region ridden with political and economic strife. In fact, the reading itself serves to reinforce these ideas, as will be seen in my later analysis of the reading itself.

The text by de la Vega and Salazar again highlight many of the same groups, focusing again on Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cuban Americans, and Central Americans, while again highlighting Nicaraguans in particular due to their growing
presence in Miami. The Roca text also focuses on: Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Central Americans and South Americans and “other” hispanos. Again, within the grouping of Central Americans, the same four groups highlighted in the Samaniego text are again highlighted here: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua.

In essence, what is observed is a double othering of Latino immigrant groups across all of the texts. By emphasizing specific groups and completely ignoring other groups, the texts continue in the marginalization process of US Latinos. By further stressing the migratory processes of Spanish-speaking peoples and ignoring their historical presence in this country, US Latinos are identified as new immigrants. Essentially, the division between a colonial Latino presence and the newer Latino immigrant presence has been blurred by the use of grouping terminology: Hispanics, Latinos, Mexican-Americans, etc. (Valdés, 2000) and by the overbearing emphasis across texts on immigration itself.

This continuous repetition of immigration related topics and US Latino groups has resulted in a powerful, metonymical relationship that results in a cognitive understanding of the group as a whole as immigrants, rather than citizens. To be Latino, according to the textbooks, is to speak Spanish. To speak Spanish, is to have immigrated. Thus, the reality of the diverse Latino population is ignored by the texts. Their focus on Latinos as a group and the textual emphasis on immigration serve to reinforce the discourse of assimilation that is prevalent across political, media and educational discourses today.
If we take a look at the quantity of pages devoted to each group across texts, the following tendencies become clear. (Please note pp = pages, para = paragraphs and sent = sentences)

Table 7: Quantity of Text Devoted to US Spanish-speaking populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los hispanos</th>
<th>Los mexicano-americanos</th>
<th>Los puertorriqueños</th>
<th>Los cubano-americanos</th>
<th>Los centro-americanos</th>
<th>Los dominicanos</th>
<th>Los colombianos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avanzando</td>
<td>6 pp.</td>
<td>3 (para.)</td>
<td>2 (para.)</td>
<td>4 (para.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (para.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La lengua que heredemos</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 (para.)</td>
<td>1 (para.)</td>
<td>2 (para.)</td>
<td>1 (sent)</td>
<td>1 (para.)</td>
<td>1 (para.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundo 21 hispano</td>
<td>34 pp.</td>
<td>7 pp.</td>
<td>9 pp.</td>
<td>7 pp.</td>
<td>7 pp.</td>
<td>4 pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39 pp. (para)</td>
<td>38 pp. (para)</td>
<td>20 pp. (para)</td>
<td>7 pp. (sent)</td>
<td>4 pp. (para)</td>
<td>2 (para)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this quantifiable analysis of pages and paragraphs, we can glean that by the term Hispanics, these texts predominantly are referring to Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans. The next most likely to be considered Hispanic are the Cuban Americans, followed by the Central Americans. The sheer use of the term Central American, a purely geographical divide, is problematic as well, as there exist deep political divisions among several of the countries in Central America, as well as prejudice across those same geographic boundaries. It would be unlikely for instance, for a Costa Rican to consider himself the same as a Nicaraguan, yet this grouping terminology suggests some sort of
sameness between the two groups of people. Of course, there is also the additional consideration that numerous groups are not included at all. In part, this is due to space, yet these inclusions and exclusions help to define who the textbooks consider Hispanic. As can be seen by this brief, very superficial analysis, it is evident that though the term Hispanic is used to refer to many diverse cultures under one name, it also serves to exclude at the same time. In one sense, certain groups are given priority in the texts, while others are completely obfuscated by this grouping terminology; however, if we look at the all encompassing use of the word Hispanic, which continues to be used even in the sections devoted to specific subcultures, we see how this grouping terminology can successfully serve to assimilate Mexican-Americans, Puerto Rican, Central Americans and Cuban Americans, and all other Hispanics into one homogenous whole. Indeed, all of the texts introduce these populations by using what Fishman terms the *misnomer* of Hispanics. The term Hispanic has resulted in a dual assimilation process. US Latinos must not only assimilate to the dominant English-speaking anglo culture, but they must also begin to conceptualize themselves as the same as all other Spanish-speaking individuals. Thus, a dual process of assimilation is invoked: one to the dominant culture, and one to the dominant culture’s newly defined group of Hispanics.

Though assimilation to the dominant US culture is well-documented, researchers are just now beginning to study the effects of this second assimilatory wave. Recent research by Zentella and Otheguey highlights the linguistic effects of assimilating Hispanics into one group (2005). Their findings show convergence in pronoun usage across the many diverse groups from Spanish-speaking countries that co-exist in the New
York City area. Their research serves to show that the increased dialogue across cultural groups is resulting in actual linguistic change. This same change, once attributed to the influence of English, is shown in their research to be a product of increased interaction with people outside their language group (i.e.: Mexican Americans speaking with Cuban Americans, etc.). Thus we can see that boundaries that once existed amongst groups have been blurred. I am not saying that this is a good or bad occurrence, rather, that it is important to note the repercussions of the discourse surrounding US Latinos in real life activities.

Though I concur with Fishman’s (2001) and Valdés’ (2000) conclusions that grouping terminology associated with US Latinos has resulted in a perceived connection with continuous immigration; I will go a step further and state that the terms Hispanic and Latino have metonymically come to be synonymous with immigration. I am arguing that operating alongside of this grouping terminology are cognitively based linguistic and visual metaphors and metonymies that work in conjunction with one another, simultaneously articulating and reproducing relationships of societal dominance (Santa-Ana, 2002). The overwhelming majority of metaphorical speech surrounding Hispanic immigrants is appallingly negative, resulting in rampant negative stereotyping of the group (Dicker, 1996); “The metaphors to conceptualize Latinos, as found in contemporary public discourse, weave a congruent web of marginalization and aspersion” (Santa-Ana, 2002, p.284).

As Lakoff has pointed out time and again, “it is vital, literally vital, to understand just what role metaphorical thought plays” in our understanding of current diplomatic
policies (1991, p.1). Though Lakoff was speaking here specifically in reference to the war in Iraq, metaphorical manifestations play an equally important role in shaping our understanding of immigrants as well. Santa-Ana echoes Lakoff in his support of the importance of metaphor. The metaphors surrounding immigrant and minority populations are seen as “…a crucial measure of the way that public discourse articulates and reproduces societal dominance relations,” for “insofar as discourse is power, contemporary U.S. public discourse on minority communities is oppressive” (Santa-Ana, 2002, p. 21 and p.11).

Critical Discourse Analysis allows one venue for a closer linguistically-based understanding of the readings, and in turn of the definition of Hispanic espoused therein. What follows is a critical discourse analysis of the first reading present in each of the texts, accompanied by a summary discussion which intends to tie the images found across texts together into one big picture of what it means to be Hispanic.

BEING HISPANIC IN MUNDO 21 HISPANO

In Mundo 21 Hispano, the very first reading presented in the text deals with immigration related issues. In fact, the title of the reading itself is interesting: Crisol de sueños: los hispanos en los EE.UU. Immediately, the title invokes the hegemonic mythology of the melting pot (Dicker, 1996). It is this reference to the crisol that conjures assimilatory notions while simultaneously introducing the idea of the American dream that penetrates the introductory reading and all four additional readings in the chapter. The dichotomy which has been superimposed by the melting pot mythology is again that of old versus new immigrants, native-born versus foreign-born. O’Brien, in his
research on immigrant metaphors, found that new immigrants are classified as “physically, mentally and morally inferior to the older immigrant class” (2003, p.34). The discourse surrounding the two groups persists in its claim that old immigrants are somehow different, in fact superior, to new immigrants. According to Warner, “The American social system is not, strictly speaking, a ‘melting pot’ which fuses its diverse ethnic elements into a new amalgam, as was once popularly believed, but is rather a system which performs the transmutation of diverse ethnic elements into elements almost homogeneous with its own” (Singer, 1986, p.103). Yet the melting pot mythology persists, masking not only the realities discussed thus far, but also deeper more hideous divisions that remain to be uncovered.

Moving on from the title to the actual text itself, it is interesting to note both the lexical implication of the verbs related to specific countries functioning as agents in the sentences of the text as well as the use of active versus passive verbs contained therein. The only active verb associated with Mexico in this introductory reading is the verb perdió: “El conflicto terminó con el Tratado de Guadalupe Hidalgo en 1848, en el cual México perdió la mitad de su territorio, o sea lo que hoy es California, Nevada, Utah, la mayor parte de Arizona, y partes de Nuevo México, Colorado y Wyoming” (Samaniego, et.al, 2005, p.2); the United States, however, is the subject of various active sentences, all of which involve non-negative verbs such as dio, declaró and adquirió. Though the reading states that Mexico was guaranteed many rights under both the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Gadsden Purchase, the fact that these rights were not upheld in the US in many cases is phrased in the passive: “estas garantías no fueron respetadas”
(2). The agent who performs the action of disrespecting said rights, the United States, is rendered invisible by the passivity of the sentence. Additionally, the fact that many of the Mexican-American people living in the US were here long before their Anglo counterparts is also de-emphasized by the text, reinforcing the stereotypical idea of Mexican-American immigration, while ignoring the many Mexican-Americans who have been born and raised in the U.S. for numerous generations.

This same introductory reading goes on to address the historical aspects of the acquisition of Puerto Rico. Here, we find the next realization of a passive sentence. The text states, “…como resultado de la Guerra entre los EEUU y España, Puerto Rico pasó a ser territorio estadounidense” (Samaniego, et.al., 2005, p.2). In this case, Puerto Rico itself is converted into a commodity that was literally fought after by the US and Spain. The paragraph addressing the Puerto Rican presence in the United States again emphasizes the search for a better life: “…más de dos millones de puertorriqueños han emigrado de la isla a EEUU en busca de una vida mejor” (Samaniego, et.al., 2005, p.2). The text chooses to emphasize the fact that there are more Puerto Ricans living in New York than in San Juan, stating that this is a result of the fact that all Puerto Ricans receive US citizenship: “En 1917 los puertorriqueños recibieron la ciudadanía estadounidense” (Samaniego, et.al., 2005, p.2). The choice of the verb “recibieron” here is also interesting, for the right to citizenship is then framed as a gift to the Puerto Rican people, as opposed to a right that they merit.

Lastly, in the brief paragraphs dealing with Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Central America, again the quest for a better life is emphasized:
La inestabilidad política y económica en varios países centroamericanos entre 1950 y 1970, dio comienzo a una masiva inmigración. En El Salvador, el desempleo y la escasez de tierras agrícolas entre 1950 y 1960 dio comienzo a la inmigración salvadoreña a EE.UU. En Nicaragua, los conflictos entre sandinistas y contras en la década de los 60, iniciaron otra ola de inmigración. En Guatemala, el largo periodo de inestabilidad y violencia que empezó en 1957 inició la inmigración guatemalteca. En Honduras, la inestabilidad política y económica de los países vecinos motivó el comienzo de la inmigración hondureña. Pero las grandes inmigraciones de centroamericanas fue afectado por los movimientos revolucionarios en Guatemala y El Salvador, y los conflictos entre los sandinistas y los contras en Nicaragua. (Samaniego, et.al., 2005, p. 3)

The word inestabilidad is used 3 times in reference to Central American nations. The reasons mentioned for immigration include: inestabilidad política y económica, desempleo, escasez, conflictos, violencia, and movimientos revolucionarios. The aforementioned countries are categorized as unstable both politically and economically, and the need to escape these conditions for a better and more secure future is proposed as the only logical option for people from these nations. In fact, in the section devoted to Central Americans in the US, only negative aspects of each of the nations mentioned are highlighted. The only other nouns mentioned in the paragraph are the proper names of the countries and the words for revolutions and immigration. The Central America presented is one of rampant political and economic instability.

Additionally, the treatment of immigration itself is interesting. The two adjectives used to describe immigration are masiva and grandes, both of which imply a large quantity of immigration from Central American nations to the US. The reference to the popular metaphor of immigration as water movement is also employed: otra ola de inmigración. According to Santa Ana, seemingly ordinary metaphors, like this one when “...expressed in public discourse, can be studied as the principal unit of hegemonic
expression” (Santa Ana, 2002, p.9). The metaphor of IMMIGRATION AS NATURAL DISASTER has well documented by numerous researchers (Mehan, 1997; O’Brien, 2003; Santa-Ana, 1999; 2002); however, its frequent use often makes it seem a natural metaphor for immigration, despite its underlying negative connotations. Lastly, despite the sub-title the reading carries: Los centroamericanos, there is in fact no mention of any Central Americans, or people of any kind in this reading. The process of immigration is completely dehumanized via the nominalization/ topicalization of the phrase immigration. Neither the verb to immigrate or the agent of the action, namely the immigrants themselves are mentioned in the reading. The choice to use the term immigration instead of immigrants or immigrate shows how subtle lexical choices hide the racist nature of the terminology employed in SHL texts.

Interesting also is the complete exclusion of Panama and Costa Rica in this section of the text; oddly, they are the only Spanish-speaking Central American nations ignored by the text. Perhaps Panama’s and Costa Rica’s democratic governments and more stable economies do not make them a good fit for the purposes of the current reading. Of course, it is interesting to note as well that all South American nations are completely ignored as contributors to the culturally diverse group of US Latinos. This reading represents a clear example of what van Dijk has termed subtle discursive racism. Though historically accurate details are presented, it is the selective presentation of certain details, to the exclusion of others, which renders this reading unacceptable, especially in light of the text’s target audience.
The results obtained from a CDA of just this one reading clearly parallel those found by van Dijk (2004) in his study of Spain’s social science textbooks. In Mundo 21 Hispano we again see a focus on migration from so-called underdeveloped countries to developed countries; this relocation is framed as an unavoidable result of the need to escape the impoverishing conditions of social and economic disasters present in Central American nations. Again, “the selection of negative aspects of immigration and immigrants creates a social representation that is predominantly negative” and, therefore, inherently slanted (van Dijk, 2004b, on-line). This slanted representation is particularly dangerous in SHL texts, where the readers of the text are students whose family and cultural heritage comes from the countries discussed in the readings. The presentation of such a negative image of these countries is potentially detrimental to the students’ concept of identity, culture and language, even more so than it would be in an SFL context, where issues of language learning and identity are not as inextricably entwined.

**BEING HISPANIC IN AVANZANDO**

The Avanzando text continues with an emphasis on immigration, as evidenced in the title of the reading “Inmigraciones hispanas en los Estados Unidos” (de la Vega & Salazar, 2005, p. 251). However, despite its title, the text spends ample time explaining the historical presence of Latinos in the United States, and goes so far as to state: “…gran parte del territorio ocupado hoy por los Estados Unidos podría haber sido parte del mundo hipanoamericano” (de la Vega & Salazar, 2005, p. 251). In fact, the text devotes the entire first paragraph to a historically based explanation of the presence of Latinos in
the United States. Yet the second paragraph’s treatment of immigration remains reminiscent of the findings observed in *Mundo 21 Hispano*.

En el siglo XX ese pasado hispano se fortaleció, debido a las inmigraciones hispanas que actualmente representan un aspecto importante de la vida y la cultura de los Estados Unidos. Según el último censo, se calcula que la población hispana pasa de los veinte y dos millones, cifra que no incluye a los millones de indocumentados que viven en el país. Se calcula que para el año 2010 los hispanos serán la minoría más grande de los Estados Unidos. Las mayores inmigraciones que forman esta población hispana han venido de México, Puerto rico, Cuba y Centroamérica (de la Vega & Salazar, 2005, p. 251).

Again, we see a nominalization of the immigration process. When referencing the topic of immigration, the words immigrant and to immigrate are not used, rather, the noun form immigration appears three times, again serving to dehumanize the process of immigration. Also interesting is the choice of the *pasiva refleja*, or the use of *se* to form a passive construction. Though such a usage is common to textbook discourse, it is interesting to note the overall tendency of texts to reduce agency via such a common discursive practice. In both cases cited above, rather than referencing the government directly, the verb *se calcula* is used to show discuss the number of Hispanics in the United States, though again it is interesting that rather than referencing people in both instances, another nominalization is used, *población*, rather than referring to actual people again. In this text, we see an explicit reference to the US Census grouping terminology, and at least a forthright acknowledgement of the origin of the term.

It is interesting to contrast these nominalizations with the actual references to people that do appear in the text. There are two such instances: *indocumentados* and *hispanos*. Again it is interesting to observe the repeated reference to large quantities: “no
incluye a los millones de indocumentados que viven en el país” (de la Vega & Salazar, 2005, p. 251). In fact, our first reference to people in conjunction with immigration draws our attention to the illegal nature of immigration. As Santa Ana points out, repeated references tying illegality to immigration results in a cognitive tendency to see immigrants first and foremost as “lawbreakers who should be punished” (1999, p. 214). I would argue that across the textbooks, as well as in the media and political discourse that has surrounded immigration, the word immigration has taken on the metonymical meaning of illegal immigration. That is, whereas in the past there was a distinction between immigration and illegal immigration, this same distinction no longer holds today. In fact, immigration is now understood to be illegal, with legal immigration representing the exception to the rule.

In the paragraph which follows, the discussion of immigration continues, and in this case, the words most commonly associated with the topic are más, gran and grandes. This continued emphasis on size in matters concerning immigration serves to feed into the culture of fear which was mentioned earlier. In this case, immigrants (understood to be Hispanics who are illegally entering the country) are perceived as a large population of people who endanger the majority culture. As Dicker states, Hispanics have become the symbol of immigration in America (2003), yet I feel that the term symbolism does not go far enough to describe the process which is occurring here. What is evidenced in the texts, and what is obvious in listening to the discourse surrounding immigration in general, is that the “prototype” for immigration has become the Hispanic individual, illegally crossing the border. I concur with Santa Ana, “…it is a fatal error to become
oblivious to the contingency and naturalizing effect of metaphor” (2002, p. 317) and would add that metonymy too falls into this category, and perhaps is even more powerful than metaphor due to its subtle and naturalizing nature.

The majority of the rest of the reading goes on to highlight the accomplishments of various Hispanic individuals, each of whom is presented as an exemplary member of their cultural group: Tomás Rivera, Rolando Hinojosa, Sandra Cisneros, Rosario Ferré, Julia de Burgos and Roberto Sierra for Puerto Rico, Guillermo Cabrera Infante, Reinaldo Arenas, Cundo Bermúdez, Ramón Alejandro, Julián Orbón, Aurelio de la Vega and Tania León. Each of these individuals is noted for their contributions to American society. Yet the contribution of the cultures represented by these individuals as a whole is not highlighted by the text. In fact, the focus across the readings related to US Latinos continues to underscore focus on Culture, as opposed to culture. This overall emphasis on famous Latinos and the detachment of these individuals from their cultures reinforces the findings of Elissondo’s study. US Latinos are portrayed in one of two ways, either as immigrants fleeing a bad life in search of the American dream, or as successful individuals detached from their ethnic communities. These famous people are presented, in Elissondo’s perception, as decorative pieces to the larger cultural picture (2001). She argues, and I would concur that overall textual representations are strongly rooted in “racial and ethnic stereotypes, individual achievement, and erasures of social processes” (2001, p.97)

---

Lastly, the issue of assimilation is also mentioned in the text when talking about the Puerto Rican population in New York: “Muchos de ellos han asimilado la cultura norteamericana y han tenido éxito, otros mantienen una dualidad cultural y otros aun están agrupados solamente entre ellos mismo” (de la Vega, 2005, p. 252). Again, the use of the passive voice is noted. For though the sentence implies that these people were assimilated, presumably by someone or something, the sentence structure obliterates the assimilating force. Also interesting is the clear association between assimilation and success. There is no reason the reference to success couldn’t have come at the end of the sentence, and yet it appears in closest proximity to the word assimilation. I would argue that we are again seeing evidence of yet another contiguous relationship; namely, that which exists between assimilation and success. This would fall under what Kovecses terms EFFECT-FOR-CAUSE, where success in life is attributed to one’s ability to assimilate into American culture (2002). A similar reference to assimilation is made in reference to Cuban Americans: “Los cubanos se han incorporado a la vida estadounidense, ocupando puestos importantes en las universidades y escuelas…” (de la Vega, 2005, p. 254). The implied association is that by incorporating themselves in the US life, Cuban Americans have been able to become successful. Again, I would argue that success, when used with what are considered to be immigrant populations, assumes assimilation as a necessary prerequisite to the process. Looking back to the title of the Mundo 21 hispano reading, “Crisol de sueños” we see the powerful notion of the melting pot, and its association with the American dream. Presumably, it is not possible to achieve the latter without having passed through the former. The reality of the melting
pot mythology is that such melting is **unidirectional** (see Dicker 1996, 2003). That is, minorities should melt into the majority culture, and **NOT** vice-versa. The theory, as such, precludes the co-existence of immigrant elements within the larger U.S. society; success for immigrants is contingent upon assimilation.

The metonymic underpinnings alluded to in this discussion will be further elaborated at the end of this chapter, but first, let us continue with our analysis of the texts’ presentation of US Latinos.

**BEING HISPANIC IN **LA LENGUA QUE HEREDAMOS**

Again in *La lengua que heredamos*, there are repeated references to the large number of Hispanic immigrants in the US. The continued use of adjectives such as *grande* (3), *más numeroso* (2), *gran número* (2), *aumentar* (1), and *muchos* (1) contribute to the popular understanding of the group as a large and growing population. Granted, the population is indeed growing, yet we need to be aware of what associations are being made with Latinos in general. As van Dijk points out, though much of the information included in the readings is indeed factual, it is the selection to emphasize and include certain elements while excluding others that is highlighted by CDA that reveals the hidden discourse often present in texts (2004a).

First and foremost, as has been noted in all of the previous readings, despite the long historical trajectory of such groups in the United States, all of the readings focus on the immigrant population, emphasizing the newness of a group that historically has been present longer than their Anglo-Saxon counter-parts in this country. Of the 17 paragraphs which appear in the Marqués reading, 13 of those paragraphs deal with
immigration in some way. This overwhelming focus on immigration leads to a metonymic understanding of Hispanics (as they are referred to in the text) as immigrants. Being Hispanic is understood contiguously as being an immigrant.

As Gibbs states, metonymy invokes the use of a salient characteristic of a group as used to represent the entire group (1994). Thus, despite the fact that all Hispanics are not immigrants, the frequent association of the two words has led to an understanding of Hispanic as immigrant. The saliency of the immigration debate in the US and its overbearing focus on immigrants from Spanish-speaking nations, literally results in a metonymic constraint of our understanding. According to Gibbs, “…our ability to think metonymically constrains what speakers/authors explicitly state and what they leave unstated. In a similar way, metonymy constrains how listeners/readers understand the communicative intentions underlying messages or texts.” (1994, p.358). He goes on to state that the stereotypical attitudes that people have about other groups of people are rooted in metonymic thought, and are cognitively hard-wired (so to speak) in our brains. Gibbs argues that colloquial tautologies, which connote stereotypical inferences tend to “convey negative, sober attitudes” (1994, p.350). Thus it can be argued that stereotypes themselves derive from metonymic conceptual underpinnings and actually constrain our understandings of certain groups. The devotion of 13 paragraphs of text to the topic of immigration in the Marqués texts serves to illustrate how powerful the metonymy that exists between Hispanicity and immigration is. Across all texts studied, we see the same repeated references to Hispanics as immigrants. This contiguous repetition in SHL texts and in discourse surrounding both Hispanics and immigration in general has resulted in a
cognitively based metonymic understanding of Hispanic as immigrant, replete with all
the negative connotations implied by immigration itself as well.

Knowing how powerful contiguous associations can be in our metonymical
understanding of so-called others, it is important to look closely at what these texts are
associating Hispanic populations with. Take the following paragraph from the Marqués
text:

Pero no todo es color de rosa. Dentro de las comunidades hispanas existen una
serie de problemas que demandan inmediata atención: el desempleo o los bajos
sueldos, la deserción escolar entre los jóvenes, las pandillas callejeras, el abuso
de drogas, la vivienda inadecuada, la falta de buenas escuelas y la falta de seguro
de salud, entre otros. Sin embargo, la población hispana sigue creciendo,
laboriosa y empeñada en probar que la mayoría viene a este país a trabajar, a crear
el fruto de su esfuerzo y a obtener una mejor vida para sus hijos (2005, p.23).

The activities mentioned here are not of course particular to Latinos in general, though
that idea is conveyed by the phrase “Dentro de las comunidades hispanas.” This
adverbial phrase limits those who are affected by the words that follow to Hispanic
communities, despite the fact such activities are clearly not confined to the Hispanic
population. Also interesting is the use of the passive in the construction “una serie de
problemas que demandan inmediata atención;” as readers, we are left to wonder whose
attention these problems require. Are they the responsibility of the Hispanic population
only, as that is the only group mentioned in the paragraph, and indeed in the reading as a
whole, or are they the responsibilities of the larger society as well? The ambiguity of this
construction leaves us wondering who is to blame for the situation. It’s also interesting to
note the use of the phrase sin embargo, which notes that in spite of all of these negative
things, the Hispanic population continues to grow. Yet perhaps most interesting is the
statement that the Hispanic population is attempting to “probar que la mayoría viene a este país a trabajar, a crear el fruto de su esfuerzo y a obtener una mejor vida para sus hijos.”  Again, the notion of the American dream is invoked, as is the idea that the U.S. provides a better life to those who come here. In fact, there is a direct reference to the American dream in the sentence prior to the paragraph analyzed: “Todo lo cual demuestra que sí es posible para muchos realizar <<el sueño Americano>>, basado en la educación y el esfuerzo personal” (Marqués, 2005, p. 23). These repeated references to the American dream explicitly state the path to success for immigrants: assimilate. Again, success is contingent on assimilation. I again would argue that these repeated associations between success and assimilation have resulted in a metonymic understanding of assimilation as a precursor to success.

In the paragraph analyzed, without any explicit reference to immigration, the reader understands that the Hispanics that are being referred to are indeed immigrants. The explicit statement of needing to prove that they have come to this country to work allows no other interpretation. One might wonder why the verb probar is even necessary, and yet in the larger context of discourse surrounding immigration it is quite clear that proving one’s self is a prerequisite to acceptance in this country. The repeated associations of Hispanics with immigration and of both immigrant groups and Hispanics with negative, often illegal activities, has resulted in several entwined stereotypical understandings of Hispanic: Hispanic as immigrant, Hispanic as Other and Hispanic as criminal. As Santa Ana has repeatedly pointed out, “The vast number of metaphors and metonyms of immigrants used in public discourse are anti-immigrant” (1999, p.207).
though it is often easy to pick out the metaphors present in discourse, cognitive
metonyms are harder to identify because of their frequent contiguous occurrence. We
take for granted that immigration is illegal, and that immigrants are Hispanic, rather than
questioning that reality and understanding that those two interpretations are but two of
many that exists surrounding those two topics. It is imperative that researchers begin to
detail the many metonymous relationships that constrain our understanding of the
immigration process. Though much work has been done in the area of cognitive
metaphors and immigration, much more needs to be done in the realm of immigration
and metonymy.

Turning now to those metaphors that have been frequently cited in the previous
research on immigration, we see that in the paragraph on Puerto Rican immigration, there
are two references to the metaphor IMMIGRANTS AS WATER: “Fueron los primeros
en llegar en grandes oleadas” and “Al convertirse en el rompeolas de los inmigrantes
hispanos…” (Marqués, 2005, p.21). The metaphor of IMMIGRATION AS NATURAL
DISASTER has been well documented by numerous researchers (Mehan, 1997; O’Brien,
2003; Santa-Ana, 1999,; 2002); however, its frequent use often makes it seem a natural
metaphor for immigration, despite its underlying negative connotations. Metaphors like
these that reference immigration as a natural disaster rest on other metaphors that are
equally important in maintaining immigrants as a marginalized group. One such
prominent metaphor is that of NATION AS HOUSE (lots of folks say we have to shut the
door on immigration)\textsuperscript{11}. The linguistically-constructed dangers posed by immigrants

\textsuperscript{11} Sample taken from Santa Ana 2002.
become clear when these two groups of metaphors are combined. Immigrants are not merely represented as natural disasters; they are flood waters that are causing the U.S. household to *burst* at its seams.

It should be noted that the readings in the texts do not themselves take up a racist viewpoint; rather, they present seemingly factual and objective pieces on the immigrant issues. Yet despite their intended objectivity, derogatory conceptual metaphors and metonymies clearly continue to construct the immigrant reality in SHL texts (see also Santa Ana, 1999; 2002). I would argue that such texts are merely reiterating the surrounding discourse on immigration. The resulting intertextuality inadvertently reinforces the dominant discourse, as will be in seen in student reactions to the issue.

**BEING HISPANIC IN *ESPAÑOL ESCRITO***

The Valdés and Teschner text does not incorporate readings similar to those found in the other texts. Rather, the book contains two running narratives which begin in the first two chapters and continue throughout the course of the book. The narratives are written as if from the first person perspective of either Fernando, a Mexican-American, or Marisela, a Dominican. As the overall structure of the text is entirely distinct from that of the other 4 texts analyzed, *Español escrito* will be analyzed distinctly. Though I will perform the same CDA of the first reading, for consistency’s sake, I will also look at the overall themes presented throughout the first person narratives, in order to give a clearer picture of who Hispanics are in this text.

Fernando’s first narrative is basically an introduction to who he is. He first explains his name, and then moves on to explain his family to the reader, as well as his
own interests and activities. Fernando comes from a family of 7, including his parents. His father is a plumber and his mother a store clerk in El Paso, Texas. He, like his readers, is a university student. He describes himself as tall and slightly fat, and not having very much money. One day he would like to become an engineer and be rich (see excerpt in Appendix B). In this short reading, we see a promulgation of what has come to be seen as the stereotypical Hispanic. Hispanics are Mexican-Americans who come from large, middle or lower economic class families, who are living in the US in the hopes of realizing the American dream of becoming successful and rich. As Gibbs states, “Part of the common ground that forms the context for comprehension is the set of stereotypical attitudes people have about other individuals (and types of individuals) and various human activities” (1994, p.350-351). Again, we see the same emphasis on the American dream, and a somewhat stereotypical painting of what it means to be a Hispanic adolescent. These stereotypical attitudes are promulgated throughout the Valdés and Teschner texts.

As mentioned earlier, Español escrito will be treated differently from the other texts, due to its unique organizational style. The titles of all the narratives included in the text are detailed in the table that follows.
There are several themes that repeat throughout the text, the most prominent of which is that of realizing the American dream. In fact, the “voices” of the narrators throughout the texts are two adolescents who have begun to walk towards their own realizations of that dream, by attending college. In many cases, references are made and in fact short stories within the narratives are included that highlight the ability to achieve individual success. Yet an underlying negative theme also predominates throughout the text, namely that of crime, tragedy and day to day difficulties. Both Fernando and María are presented as two youths who work incredibly hard. They both attend school, and have at least one full time job, in addition to family chores. Both work in order to support their families, which couldn’t survive without their financial support. In fact, even in the chapters emphasizing the importance of schools, a heavy emphasis is placed on the gangs and
crime rampant in the schools in which they were enrolled. A bleak portrait of Latino life is painted in this text, one which requires the acquisition of English and a college education as two paths on the road of assimilation to success.

A third theme transcending the text is the need for women to marry. This topic recurs in 8 of the 20 chapters! Marisela, in recounting the feelings of her grandmother on the issue states: “La mujer nace para una sola cosa: ser madre y esposa” (Valdés and Teschner, 2003, p. 225). The text goes on to explain that everyone in Marisela’s family agrees with this philosophy: “…casi todos los de mi familia, y en particular las mujeres, dicen que están de acuerdo con ella” (Valdés & Teschner, 2003, p. 224). The grandmother’s narrative explicitly talks against the education of women (for an entire paragraph) and states that it is the woman’s job to provide her family with as many children as possible. This is one of the longest readings in the text, and one of the only ones in which the opinions presented are said to be shared amongst everyone in the family. This reading coupled with the other references to the topic of marriage in the text place an extreme importance on the role of marriage in the life of Spanish-speaking women, and results, essentially in the promulgation of yet another stereotype, namely, that of a submissive Hispanic woman who stays at home and has babies. Though this association is not seen across texts, it merits mention nevertheless for its prominence in Español escrito.

Chapter 9 details one of the most intricate stories of immigration present in the text, that of Marisela’s Aunt Elvira. Elvira’s story begins at the age of 6 when she started school in Oviedo, a city in the Dominican Republic. At the age of 12, she recounts, she
was forced to quit school and move to the capital in order to earn money for the family. She was hired as a maid, essentially, for a rich family. She spent 3 years working there until the son of the family raped her and she was thrown out of the house and left without work. She decided to leave the Dominican Republic and head to Puerto Rico; “Sin embargo, no pensé quedarme en Puerto Rico, donde hay desempleo; mi destino era Nueva York” (Valdés and Teschner, 2003, p. 105). She faked a Puerto Rican identity to get into the United Status, married a gay American to get citizenship, and after earning enough money to put herself through college, divorced the gay man and set out to find a real husband: “porque yo sí quiero tener hijos” (Valdés and Teschner, 2003, p. 107). Again, we see an emphasis on illegal immigration, despite the fact that it is never explicitly referenced. Again, in the Valdés and Teschner text it is clear that to be Hispanic is to be an immigrant, and to be an immigrant in the US is to be poor. The frequent references to immigrant neighborhoods, and the gangs and violence therein, coupled with the repeated narratives of immigration again serve to paint a bleak picture of life for Hispanics in the United States today.

BEING HISPANIC IN NUEVOS MUNDOS

It is interesting to note, before entering into an analysis, that the Roca text is the only which chooses to use the word Latino instead of the word Hispanic. The undertones of the choice of each are controversial and problematic, as stated earlier. Yet Roca’s choice reflects my own inclination to use the term Latino over the term Hispano in part in order to reject the classifications used in the Census system. Yet it should be
acknowledged that both terms are indeed controversial, for many of the reasons that have been outlined in the present dissertation.

The Roca text is also the only text which goes into an elaborate explanation of the historical presence of Spanish and its speakers in the United States. The text devotes two paragraphs to explaining the presence of Spanish in the United States, and emphasizes that said presence predates the presence of English by many years. Roca also makes reference to the numerous names in the nation that have Spanish origins.

Of further interest is the choice to use the term *hispanohablantes* rather than the terms *hispanos* or *latinos* in the reading. Roca notes that “Los hispanohablantes en los Estados Unidos forman en el presente la minoría lingüística ‘as grande del país…” (2005, p.4). In fact, the Roca text is the only to make explicit mention of the possibility of legal as well as illegal immigration: “El aumento de la población hispana se le ha atribuido a la inmigración (legal e illegal)…,” but the sentence continues: “pero también se debe el gran aumento al número de nacimientos de familias hispanas en la nación” (2005, p.5). It is interesting to see that even in the Roca text, where I would argue extra care has been taken to avoid stereotyping and present a more balanced picture of reality, we find more references to the illegal nature of immigration and frequent references to the large number of Latinos entering or being born in this country:

“Muchos hispanos, por ejemplo, que carecen de documentos legales de inmigración, no llenan los formularios del Censo por temer ser señalados y hallados por el gobierno federal, lo que significaría para ellos tener que regresar a su país y, posiblemente, ir a la cárcel…debe haber más de 40 millones de hispanos en la nación, incluyendo a los ilegales…” (Roca, 2005, pp.4-5)
It is also important to note that the Roca text does not participate in the dehumanization of the immigration process. In fact, there are frequent references to people in the text, and we do not see the same tendency toward nominalization that was present in the other texts. This emphasis on the human nature of immigration is present throughout the Roca text, not only in the introductory reading, but also in the thought-provoking questions which follow the readings in the text. The questions require students to reflect on their own lives and experiences, and touch upon the very human aspect of immigration. These questions will be discussed in depth later.

Despite these noted improvements on the presentation provided in the other texts, some of the same tendencies continue to exist. Namely, the presentation of immigration as unidirectional and uni-beneficial continues. In talking about the Nicaraguans, the Roca text states, “empezaron a llegar miles de nicaragüenses a Estados Unidos debido a la instable situación política en su país. In talking about the Nicaraguans and the Argentines alone, the text uses numerous adjectives that serve to emphasize the size of the groups: miles (2), cientos (2), más (1). Note the following paragraph that appears in the text:

En el caso de los nicaragüenses, desde fines de los años sesenta y durante las décadas de los setenta y ochenta, empezaron a llegar miles de nicaragüenses a Estados Unidos debido a la instable situación política en su país, primero bajo la dictadura de Anastasio Somoza y después con el gobierno sandinista. Se calcula que en Miami posiblemente haya más de 130,000 nicaragüenses, pero miles de nicas – como ellos mismos se llaman orgullosamente—también se han establecido en otras regiones del país. En los últimos años también hemos visto llegar a Estado Unidos a cientos y cientos de argentinos que salen de su patria debido a los difíciles y serios problemas económicos que enfrenta Argentina (Roca, 2005, p.7).
The hedging that occurs in reference to the actual number of Nicaraguans in Miami is interesting. First, via use of the se refleja pasiva, we are unsure as to who is giving the count, as all agency has been removed from the verbal form, resulting in a passive, agentless sentence. Next, the use of the adverb *posiblemente* is noted as a means to convey insecurity in the data which follows. Next, the verbal form *haya*, in the subjunctive mode, indicates again to the reader a sense of uncertainty in regards to the claim being made. The Nicaraguan immigration to the US is interestingly coupled with the Argentine immigration, despite the fact that the two regions are not even remotely geographically connected and do not have any other connection that I am aware of. Yet what binds the groups together in the reading is the need of those immigrating to the US to leave the two nations to escape the unstable political and economic conditions. Again, we see a repetition of van Dijk’s finding. As van Dijk states,

> It is clear that migration flows are rather generated by the adverse conditions in the countries of origin and not so much by the attraction factors in the places of destination. Thus it is the desperation of the inhabitans of many countries in the South which presently give rise to the migration flows toward the countries of the North (2004b, on-line).

As both van Dijk’s research and the present study have shown, no mention is made of the needs of the receiving nation, in this case, the United States. In no reading thus analyzed is there reference to the need for cheap, immigrant labor in order to maintain the economy. Rather, there is repeated reference to the poor political and economic conditions of what are portrayed as the “undeveloped” nations, in juxtaposition to the wealth and benefits provided in the “developed” nations. As van Dijk states, “If only a handful of things are being said about immigrants, and these are the same kind of things
the children hear from parents or friends or see on TV, then this can only confirm
established stereotypes.” (2004b, on-line). Clearly, our SHL textbooks are not only
guilty of confirming established stereotypes, but also of highlighting those same negative
aspects of immigration that are highlighted in the news, while continuing to emphasize
the exoticism of individual success.

The paragraph which follows this one continuous to present the idea of the
growing number of Hispanics present in the United States. The paragraph is included
below:

En Nueva York, aparte de la presencia significativa de puertorriqueños y/o
nuyoricans, continúa creciendo el número de dominicanos, colombianos y otros
latinoamericanos. En California, Texas, y Washington, D.C., en particular, se
cuentan miles de centroamericanos, sobre todo muchísimos salvadoreños y
guatemaltecos. Se cree, por ejemplo, que hay más de 300,000 hispanohablantes
en Washington, D.C. y en los suburbios de Virginia y Maryland que rodean la
capital. En algunas partes del país, como California, los latinos forman más de un
tercio del total de la población y las escuelas públicas están llenas de estudiantes
hispanos que, a la vez que necesitan aprender o mejorar el inglés, tratan de
mantener su idioma heredado, el español. (Roca, 2005, p.7)

Again, the numerous references to the large group are noted. I would like to point out
that I am not suggesting that these references intend to paint immigration in a negative
light. Rather, I would like to highlight the fact that these same references to immigration
from Hispanic countries that occur in both the media and the political discourse
frequently in today’s world are indeed correlated with negative repercussions for US
society. I would argue that said repercussions, though not explicitly invoked here, are
connoted, simply due to the similarity of the discourse. In fact, the last sentence of the
text alludes to the situation present in public schools in California. The idea that
California’s schools are full of students who need to learn or improve their English, conjures ideas of the English-only debate in that state (see Santa Ana, 2002).

Despite these commonalities, and the failure of all the texts to present the dual-nature of immigration, the Roca text does go far beyond all of the other texts in stimulating thought and providing students with a forum for participation and expression of their own experiences. In the question which follow this reading (and indeed, throughout the textbook), students are asked to identify with the readings, to explain their own experiences, to talk about their own observations and opinions, and to interview other students to find out what they believe. It is the only text that steps away from a focus on comprehension and asks students to do more than comprehend; it empowers students to form their own opinions, based on their own experiences. Note the questions which follow the reading just analyzed:

1. ¿Cómo se identifica usted? ¿Se describe como norteamericano, sudamericano, latinoamericano caribeño, U.S. Latino, hispano o usa otra denominación que refleja sus raíces de una manera más específica? ¿Usa el mismo término en español como en inglés?

2. ¿De dónde son sus amigos hispanos? ¿vienen sus familias de diferentes partes del mundo? ¿De qué lugares son o eran originalmente?

3. ¿Cuáles son dos o tres ventajas o beneficios de su herencia hispana? ¿Por qué cree que son ventajas o beneficios?

4. ¿Qué grupos hispanos hay en el lugar en donde vive? Si hay varios grupos, ¿Cree usted que tienen una experiencia y cultura comunes o que existen muchas diferencias? Explique.

5. Se calcula que va a aumentar considerablemente el número de hispanos en los Estados Unidos para mediados del siglo XXI. ¿Qué efectos cree que puede tener este aumento? (Roca, 2005, pp.7-8).

As can be seen by the questions detailed here, these questions imply comprehension of the reading, but require students to go beyond simple comprehending the reading and
come to their own understandings of the details presented in the reading by jeans of their own experiences. I would argue that the Roca text is the only text which goes this extra step and therefore fits into a more critical pedagogical framework. Leeman has called for such a politically aware critical framework in her research, stating: “…educators must make the relationship between language and sociopolitical issues explicit, provide opportunities for students to examine and interrogate dominant linguistic practices and hierarchies, and encourage students to explore the ways language can be used to perform a wide range of social functions and identity work” (2005, p.36). Such activities are imperative to the future of Spanish in the United States. Despite the predominance of bilingualism throughout the world, the path to social access in the U.S. is laid with monolingual English bricks, yet resistance to U.S. linguistic hegemony must occur through bilingualism in the minority language and English, not English monolingualism alone (Suarez, 2002). Without some kind of change to the educational framework and hegemonic ideas imparted to our SHL students, not only via their texts but throughout popular media, political and educational discourses, our HL resources will “erode, disintegrate and ultimately disappear. That is a terrible loss, economically, socially, and not in the least, personally” (Peale, 1991, p. 450).

CONCLUSION: THE COGNITIVE METONYMIC AND METPAHORIC UNDERPINNINGS OF LATINOS AND IMMIGRATION

In this section of the dissertation, it has been argued that the metonymical underpinning of Latinidad and immigration are tied to one another, resulting in rampant negative stereotyping of Hispanics as illegal immigrants throughout the SHL texts
studied and indeed throughout the larger discourse surrounding immigration in general. This negative stereotyping exists alongside an exoticisation of the achievements of certain individuals with Latino roots. Both of these ideas will be discussed at length, in an attempt to conclude the findings of this chapter.

As Elissondo points out, stereotypical cultural icons continue to be the focus of today’s textbooks, and this is no less true in the SHL context (2004). The images presented here truly mirror her findings of SFL texts, namely there is an overwhelming emphasis on the individual, and their achievements. Individuals and their respective achievements are highlighted by the text, yet these same individuals are not represented as members of their ethnic communities. It was argued that this segregation of those who have achieved success from the immigrant populations discussed in depth throughout the textbooks serves to reinforce the myth that anyone can achieve the American dream, as long as he or she dissociates himself or herself from their roots and becomes fully assimilated into American mainstream culture. The message of the texts is clear: material success and individual achievement are only possible via a complete assimilation. Elissondo’s conclusions, coupled with the evidence found in the SHL textbooks serve to emphasize how the importance of the myth of the American dream has permeated the text. The obliteration of any purely “Latino” values is achieved subtly via a pictorial emphasis on work and immigration. By identifying the Latino culture predominantly with these two concepts, the need for assimilation and adoption of standard US values and language is adopted by the populations depicted in the text, thus eliminating the individuality of the many cultures already mixed together under the misnomer of
Hispanics. Here, we see the first of the metonymical relationship present in the texts, namely the continuous association of success and implicit assimilation. Though assimilation is not explicitly discussed in the texts, the lack of reference to the origins and roots of the famous people presented in the texts, in effect serves to show that assimilation has occurred for these people. They are dissociated from the cultures of origin and aligned instead with the elite and successful pop-America culture.

As Gibbs has argued, metonymies are an integral part of our conceptual system (1994). His research contends that cognitive metonymy is the source of many so-called prototype effects. In the case of illegal immigration, we have an example where a salient subcategory has the status of standing for the whole category. The frequent references to the illegal nature of immigration in the news media, and in the discourse surrounding immigration in general has led to the prototype of immigration as illegal. Following the research of Kovecses and Lakoff, this idea can also be seen to fall under the realm of category and member idealized cognitive model (ICM) (see Kovecses, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). In this case, the sub-category illegal immigration is used to stand for the whole of immigration. The same connotations and metonyms carry over across word domains, implying that reference to the word immigrant invokes contiguous notions of illegality, while reference to the action of immigrating and immigration do the same.

Additionally, I would argue that not only are notions of illegality now metonymically linked to immigration, but so too are notions of Hispanicity. Though this connection is perhaps a direct result of the focus of the textbooks studied, I would argue that a close inspection of political and media discourses surrounding immigration would
yield the finding that immigration is frequently contiguously associated with both Hispanicity and illegality. These associations, in the opinion of the researcher, have become so frequent, that they no longer need to be stated explicitly, but rather are understood metonymically via their frequent contiguous associations in discourses surrounding immigration. Thus, the notion of the illegal Hispanic immigration is part of an underlying conceptually based metonymy.

Terminology itself feeds into and simultaneously derives out of the cognitive underpinnings and metonymical understanding of immigration, by using terms such as: *illegal aliens, alien invasion, and immigration inundation* (Hinojosa & Schey, 1995). All of these terms invoke ideas of foreignness, some even implying a potentially extraterrestrial character to immigrant people (Mehan, 1997). In conservative discourses especially, the use of the word *illegals* is quite prevalent, making immigrants first and foremost lawbreakers in need of punishment (Lakoff, 1996). The seemingly natural nature of these terms, and our capacity to readily understand their underlying negative connotations of illegality and foreignness are in fact what make the discussions surrounding immigration so dangerous. It is argued here that the continued references to immigration present in SHL texts cannot but fall into these same traps, as our minds are hard-wired to readily understand immigration as illegal.

The overall metonymic representation of US Latinos in SHL textbooks conveys the idea that “…people in poor countries are unhappy and that immigrants in rich countries are happy, thus contributing to unfounded generalizations and stereotypes, and to ignorance about the actual living and working conditions of immigrants in rich
countries. “ (van Dijk, 2004b, on-line). As Santa Ana pointed out in his research of the Los Angeles Times, individual immigrants are used to represent immigration in general (1999). In the case of the texts studied here, the notion of individuality and immigration are not present, rather, immigration is understood as a large-scale process, involving Hispanics from all over the Spanish-speaking world. The large-scale and wide-spread notion of immigration is achieved via continuous contiguous reference to adjectives which function as modifiers and serve to highlight immigration as a growing and numerous process. The illegal aspects of immigration are repeatedly highlighted in the texts. In fact, the default definition of immigration throughout the texts studied requires an understanding of the process as illegal. Immigrants if referred to at all, are referred to as *indocumentados o ilegales*, thus making them firstly “lawbreakers who should be punished” (Santa Ana, 1999, p. 214). The cognitive foundations of these metonyms remain unexplored in the discourse on immigration. Though Santa Ana’s research begins to look at these issues, his focus on metaphor obscures the powerful nature of the metonymies that often accompany the metaphors surrounding the immigration issue.

The information about immigration present in the texts is often limited to simple statistics about how many there are, where they come from, and where they settle. Though little detailed information is given about any given group of immigrants, one of the standard items highlighted across all texts is that many of them are illegal, yet no information is provided about “illegal” employers who give work to such immigrants (see also van Dijk, 2004b). In fact, issues facing the Hispanic population in general are not treated in the texts. Racism, prejudice and discrimination are infrequently mentioned. As
van Dijk states, “No details are given about the kinds of daily discrimination.” (2004b, on-line). What is presented is an idealized United States, which offers nothing but opportunity and possibility to those who enter it. Couple that with the emphasis on illegal immigration and the need to problematize the entire conceptualization present in the textbooks becomes self-evident.

The metaphors and metonymies used to “…conceptualize Latinos, as found in contemporary public discourse, weave a congruent web of marginalization and aspersion” (Santa Ana, 2002, p.284). Latino immigrants and indeed the process of immigration itself continue to be dehumanized (see also Santa Ana, 2002). The use of predominantly negative and derogatory images leads to a metonymic association of Hispanic with illegal behaviors that are in turn tied to immigrant populations. This cognitive metonymy is dangerously present not only in the discourse surrounding immigration in SHL textbooks, but also in the political, media and larger educational discourse context. It is only by explicitly drawing attention to such cognitive metonyms that we can begin to reverse the insidious stereotyping that they mask.

(RE)PRESENTING U.S. LATINOS: SHL LEARNERS AS MEMBERS OF AN IMAGINED COMMUNITY

It would be inappropriate to conclude this chapter without mentioning the fact that the students themselves are rarely present in their textbooks’ readings. It would be curious to see where students align themselves with the two divergent conceptions of Latinidad that dominate in their textbooks. Do they see themselves as assimilators, on the road to the American dream? Or do they see themselves as immigrants, struggling to
escape the notions of illegal behavior and negative stereotyping associated with being a 
*Hispano* in the United States.

It is my hunch that students have difficulty relating to either group. They are neither famous singers and writers nor recently arrived illegal immigrants. Rather, the reality that is their daily life is not present in their textbooks, resulting in the creation, perhaps of an imagined community (see Norton, 2000). After all, the term Spanish heritage learner is itself an imagined community, both imagined and instantiated by the educational institution. Do the students across Spanish heritage language classes conceptualize themselves as a homogeneous group? Or has this term again been imposed on them, forcing them to participate in yet another group where they do not feel a member.

SHL students are confronted with the notion of imagined communities on a daily basis. Their English is rejected as being somehow different than the English of their peers (see Lippi-Green, 1997); their Spanish is characterized as inferior or different by their textbooks and at times their families (see Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005). Their linguistic resources are not valued by the communities in which they participate. According to Pavlenko (2000), access to linguistic resources is essential to one’s involvement as a *legitimate* speaker in a community of practice. These students are being marginalized from two sides: from the English monolingual US culture and from the Spanish-dominant bilingual culture, neither of whom recognizes the linguistic resources of the students as sufficient. As Norton points out, “… inequitable relations of power limit the
opportunities L2 learners have to practice the target language outside the classroom”. (2001, p.166). I would argue that heritage learners may face these same limitations.

Where then do these students fit? And why are these issue ignored by the texts? I would argue that such students have ample linguistic resources available at their disposal. Bilingual community practices of code-switching and borrowing, coupled with their abilities to function as monolinguals of either of the languages they command do indeed confer on them the right to be recognized as their own speech community. Perhaps these students have created their own imagined community, yet such a conclusion has yet to be substantiated by research in the field. There needs to be an emic-based investigation of these students understanding of identity. Perhaps, based on such research, textbooks can move away from the metonymic stereotypes that they continue to perpetuate to a new discourse that reaffirms students’ identity in a multicultural society. Imagined or not, the presence of bilingual youths is a reality in the US today, but in order to preserve that reality, much needs to be done to create an unimagined space for them in the educational system as it currently exists.
CHAPTER 4: TEXTBOOK SPANISH: THE UNFOLDING OF A MYTH

THE ROLE OF TEXTBOOK SPANISH

An analysis of the presentation of culture without addressing the presentation of language in SHL textbooks would ignore the most prominent goal of the SHL classroom, namely that of second dialect acquisition or awareness (see Valdés, 1981). To date, no one has questioned the presentation of language in SHL texts. No one has questioned the value of learning the standard; it remains a universal legitimate (Train, 2002). Indeed, few have questioned the idea of a single standard, despite the numerous Academias that exist, each purporting to promote a distinct standard. The teaching of the standard remains a central tenet of SHL education;

“Many students who participate in SNS courses speak what may be interpreted as rural or stigmatized varieties of Spanish. Instruction aimed at teaching students the prestige or standard variety involves developing metalinguistic awareness about the differences between the standard and other varieties, teaching traditional grammar, and teaching when it is appropriate to use more or less formal Spanish.” (Peyton, et.al., 2001, p.4).

Statements similar to the one cited here are frequent in SHL pedagogy literature (Hidalgo, 1999; Valdés, 1981; Villa, 1999; 2002). Though there is a significant amount of research concerning the teaching of the standard in the English as a Second Language (ESL) and English Language Arts (ELA) classroom, no critical, parallel studies of the treatment of US dialects of Spanish alongside the presentation of a standard dialect within SHL textbooks have been conducted. The absence of research in this area is alarming, considering that respect of student dialects and acquisition of a standard dialect are two of the most highly regarded and cited goals of the field. Though there clearly has
been progress in the specialization and development of textbooks geared to SHL learners, SHL learning often continues to be approached from a language-as-problem orientation, even today. Many SHL teachers and textbooks still see their main task as eliminating any remnants of stigmatized varieties of Spanish, while simultaneously equipping students with a more sufficient or worthy foreign standard. The fact that Spanish language education in the United States today continues to be considered part of foreign language education is quite ironic, in light of the fact that the United States is the 5th largest Spanish speaking nation in the world. It is this lack of recognition of the Spanish that is right in our own backyard, so to speak, that results in a marginalization of SHL programs throughout the US educational system.

The orientation toward minority language in the US continues to treat such languages as problems, while foreign languages are treated as resources (Ruiz, 1984; 1990). Textbooks serve to reinforce the notion that the language SHL students bring to the classroom is somehow insufficient in and of itself. Notions of appropriateness and uni-directional translation activities serve to reinforce the subordinate and often problematized position of SHL students’ dialects. Yet, as Fairclough states,

People cannot be effective citizens in a democratic society if their education cuts them off from critical consciousness of key elements within their physical or social environment. If we are committed to education establishing resources for citizenship, critical awareness or the language practices of one’s speech community is an entitlement (1992c, p. 6 in Pennycook, 2001, p. 95).

Educational practices should not deny any student, including those in the SHL context the right to understand the socio-historical context of their language variety and the language practices of the Spanish-speaking world in general, yet texts continue to promote
appropriateness based arguments toward the acquisition of the standard language without providing any type of contextualized explanations for students. To understand the language practices of U.S. Latino communities requires an in-depth understanding not only of U.S. Spanish language practices, but also U.S. English language practices. To isolate the variety of Spanish spoken by SHL students, while concurrently promoting an outside, idealized standard of the language is, in fact, to deny our students the right alluded to by Pennycook and Fairclough.

The subordination of students’ language varieties is further reinforced by the fact that the textbook itself often serves as the local standard within the classroom. Thus, “…it would be useful to explicitly examine how the textbook norm is socially and linguistically situated with respect to language practices existing outside that norm” (Train, 2002, p. 21). Instructors need to be taught to “…critically reflect on pedagogical materials by learning to question the standardized linguistic and cultural knowledge represented in textbooks” (Train, 2002, p. 22). Though there have been few previous studies looking at presentation of a so-called standard language in SFL textbooks, those that have been conducted provide intriguing insight into the questionable nature of the version of Spanish that is presented in typical SFL textbooks. Any Spanish teacher needs to no more than think of a typical introductory Spanish as a foreign12 textbooks. In such texts, the greetings introduced on the introductory pages always include the questions ¿Cómo estás? and its appropriate answers: bien, mal, así-asi. I for one have yet to hear a

---

12 I am using the term here only because the textbooks themselves are so-named. Please note that I would prefer the field, and the textbooks used therein to be referred to as Spanish as a second language, which is a more apt description of the learning situation for our non heritage students.
native speaker use the form *así-así*. This is but one concrete, tangible example of how textbook Spanish diverges from so-called real-life Spanish. In fact, one of the main researchers in this area, Wieczorek, states that several studies have indicated that there is a notable degree of discrepancy evidenced between the Spanish that is presented in a typical textbook and that which is used in real-life (1992; 1991 see also O’Connor, 1989).

In Wieczorek’s analysis of 13 beginning to advanced level SFL textbooks, he finds that these texts provide “…varying or misleading intuitions about dialects of Spanish” (1992, p. 34), while further pointing out that certain morpho-lexical elements of various dialects of Spanish are completely ignored by textbook accounts of the language. Wieczorek’s findings support the claim that the majority of today’s SFL textbooks continue to promote a Castilian-based dialectology of Spanish (1992); and by so doing, both obliterate and invalidate the many other dialects of the Spanish language. Wieczorek further stresses the odd yet continued inclusion of *vosotros* in language textbooks, despite the fact that only 13% of the Spanish speaking population uses the pronoun and its corresponding grammatical forms (Hispanic Market Weekly, 2000). It is this persistent focus on Spain and the Castilian dialect that continues to inadvertently devalue other varieties of Spanish, leaving newer varieties of the Spanish language, like US varieties of Spanish, ignored again. If we further consider the stigma attached to the bilingual nature of speakers of US Spanish, this double devaluation puts US Spanish in an extremely marginalized position, as will be seen as we look at its treatment across the textbooks under investigation.
Other research on the authenticity of textbook language has been carried out in the field of French language acquisition. In research by Fonseca-Greber and Waugh (2002; 2003), corpus-based data on spoken French are contrasted with the French that is found in textbooks. Their research focuses on the discrepancy that exists between the treatment of subject pronouns in French textbooks, and the actual use of these same pronouns as evidenced in a corpora comprised of 194,000 words. After analyzing the data, the authors conclude that “…the spoken French taught in American classrooms is a fiction, based on ideas about how people should speak, not on how they do speak” (Fonseca-Greber & Waugh, 2002). The researchers contend that textbook French is a “pseudo-language” representing a mix between a particular version of standard written French and an idealized, non-spoken variety of everyday spoken French. The two argue that textbook language should not be based on an idealized, or prescriptive reference grammar, but rather should find its origins in the results of “rigorous corpus analysis” (Fonseca-Greber & Waugh, 2002, p. 118). The discrepancy in the treatment of pronouns found in textbooks is particularly relevant to the present study, which will unveil a similar inconsistency in textbook Spanish. As the researchers argue, corpus based textbooks are necessary if we want our students to develop as full participants in the sociolinguistic reality that surrounds them.

Lastly, in research on textbook treatment of the Spanish subject pronominal system, Mason & Nicely (1995) found a similar misrepresentation of the Spanish language. Much like the findings of Wieczorek, Mason & Nicely discovered that though treatment of vosotros was extensive across texts, the vos pronouns was all but absent
form the 37 first year Spanish textbooks they analyzed. In fact, only 16% if the texts studied even mention the pronoun *vos*, let alone provide an extensive treatment of the form. As the researchers point out,

> “Given that the population of Spain is approximately 39.1 million and the combined populations of the eight countries where *vos* is dominant is over 69.1 million, students are at least as likely if not more likely to have contact with a native speaker who uses *vos* than one who uses *vosotros*” (Mason & Nicely, 1995, p.361).

Due to the increasing amount of *voseo* users present in the United States, and particularly in SHL classrooms, it is imperative we address this same issue in SHL texts. Not surprisingly, the same biases will be revealed to exist.

**LANGUAGE AS IDENTITY MARKER**

Before beginning our discussion on the role of standard Spanish in SHL textbooks, we must first address what role languages themselves play in acting as expressive agents of people’s identities. As Lippi-Green points out, language “is the most salient way we have of establishing and advertising our social identities” (1997, p.5). Identity construction is “complex, multi-faceted and dialogic,” yet in its most primordial human form, it requires the use of language (Schecter & Bayley, 1997, p.512). The indexical nature of language derives from the fact that varieties of language are both used by the individual and by society at large to construct identities.

Identity and language share a special, dual natured relationship. Language simultaneously allows for identification from an outside perspective, while also functioning as a means of self-identification (Tabouret-Keller, 1997). Language shapes
both personal and cultural identity (Dicker, 1996). Yet, as Sebba and Wooton point out, “the linguistic medium by which social identities are constructed may itself be a part of the identity, but we cannot assume a fixed relationship between a social identity and the language of the utterance that evokes (or invokes) it…” (1998, p. 284, also see Argenter, 2000). This essentialist tendency obscures the complex nature of identity and results in incomplete predictions about the identities of a given person or culture (Mendoza-Denton, 2002). Such essentialism rests on two dangerous assumptions: (1) groups can be clearly delimited and (2) group members are more or less alike. As researchers, we must keep in mind that “…social identities created through linguistic practices are both flexible and fragmentary and always have been” (Bucholtz, 2003, p. 411). Yet, intuitively, identity issues are connected to language issues, for simply by hearing someone speak, we make conclusions about that person; “The difficulty of separating who we are from how we sound is evident” (Dicker, 1996, p. 8, also emphasized in Tabouret-Keller, 1997). As Davies puts it, there is this gut feeling that people possess that asserts the “…common human experience of feeling and asserting identity through language” (2003, p. vii).

This gut feeling becomes part of a very real reality in the SHL classroom. I can cite numerous examples from my students where they question their own identity, and wonder where it is that they fit based on their language skills. As both students’ Spanish and English function as salient markers of their identity, and are simultaneously employed as characteristics that distinguish them from others, it is important to keep in mind the intrinsic language-identity connection. Ian, a student in one of the first SHL
classes I taught, always talked about his trips to Mexico, and the fact that no one took him seriously because of his *pocho* Spanish. The bilingual variety of Spanish which he spoke marked him as different from his own family members, creating a painful divide. In another case, María, also an SHL student of mine, brought her textbook up to me on the first day, to let me know that it was wrong. The verb conjugations in the text did not coincide with how she spoke. When I explained that both her idea and that of the textbook were “right,” she immediately interpreted her own Spanish as wrong. Though I had just explained to her that both forms were acceptable, the fact that the form she was used to did not show up in the textbook, told her that her variety was wrong. She informed me she would have a talk with her mother that night (which I then talked her out of). The point is that though the students use both Spanish and English in their daily lives, SHL students often face linguistic insecurities different from those of their SSL counterparts. Though both groups of learners are often concerned with notions of right and wrong, SHL learners may see correction as an affront not only against their variety of Spanish, but also against their community or family, or themselves. This personal connection to the language needs to be explored more. Issues of language and identity in the SHL field merit extensive future research. Though these issues will be touched upon in the present dissertation, much research still needs to be done.

**THE ROLE OF THE STANDARD**

In addressing the notion of the standard, it is critical that we look not only to the research that has been done in the SFL and SHL realms, but also to that which has been done in ESL and ELA contexts, in order to provide a foundation for the current
discussion. The perceived connection between language and identity is at the heart of standard language ideologies (SLI) that are promoted in both ESL and SHL contexts. According to Lippi-Green, SLI is defined as “…a bias toward the abstract, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class” (1997, p. 64). Thus, success in the language classroom, be it an ESL or an SHL classroom, is associated with the acquisition of the dialect spoken by those in power in the dominant, monolingual society. Thus, a double-edged sword is accosting today’s SHL students: first and foremost, they must acquire a standard dialect of English, and secondly, they must acquire a standard dialect of Spanish. In essence, education, acts as the voice of society, and tells such students that in fact none of the languages they posses are fully adequate to achieve success, unless they speak those dialects as their L1, like elite children do.

Accordingly, a critical awareness of the ideologized nativeness of standard languages is essential prior to undertaking our discussion of the standard. The use of the word standard, much like the word dialect, remains an inherently problematic issue for many SHL and SFL texts alike. Before entering into discussion about the realizations of various standard Spanishes within SHL textbooks and the metalanguage surrounding this concept, it is important to acknowledge the ambiguous nature of the term standard itself. As Villa (1996) points out, there are two different yet inter-related meanings associated with the word standard. First, standard implies a certain degree of uniformity, requiring complete linguistic specifications in terms of phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon
and pragmatics. Clearly, such a detailed definition is lacking for virtually all of the world’s languages! Yet, it is this first aspect of the definition of standard that our students are so often looking for within their texts. Additionally, it is imperative to note that this idealized notion of uniformity also ignores the fact that there is no single agreed upon standard of Spanish, as evidenced by the 23 Academias that exist throughout the Spanish-speaking world. The second, and related meaning of standard implies something better; something towards which one should aspire. The term standard thus carries with it potent connotations, rendering it pedagogically unsound (Villa 1996).

Though many texts avoid outright metaconversation of the term standard, the idea of norms and proper academic Spanish are indeed invoked regularly. From a sociolinguistically informed perspective, clearly, there is no single standard Spanish. The notion of standard Spanish represents yet another misinterpreted myth of language learning. As Train (2002) and Milroy (2001) point out, speakers of powerful world languages, like Spanish, believe the language which they speak exists in some standardized form. Such a standard language ideology ignores the linguistic reality which shows us that numerous varieties of Spanish co-exist along a status-based continuum. Sadly, “By employing and blindly accepting these categories, we perpetuate divisions based on power structures, class conflicts and linguistic myths” (Aparicio, 1993, p.187). As Train (2002) points out, “The standard language is ideologically constructed by means of an ongoing sociocultural and sociolinguistic process of standardization involving the codification and institutionalization of the dominant linguistic and cultural norms of the “educated native speaker” (p. 1). So-called standard
Spanish is an ideologically constructed language which involves not only the codification and institutionalization of dominant linguistic norms, but also that of dominant cultural norms as well (Train, 2002). This connection between standard language norms and standard cultural norms was made explicit in the analysis of the treatment of immigration in SHL textbooks. SHL texts are clearly not only equipping students with the vocabulary necessary to discuss immigration, but they are also imparting opinions and the normed cultural view toward immigration via these same words. It is imperative that we as both educators and researchers not only become aware of these hidden linguistic and cultural ideologies, but also begin to take action to change the presentation of both language and cultural norms in textbooks, allowing for texts that provide students with an opportunity to question dominant ideologies and form their own informed opinions.

According to Train, there are three central components to the standard language mythology: (1) nativeness, (2) monolinguality and (3) the quality of language. All three components function to marginalize the SHL learner and their language, due to the inherently bilingual nature of their upbringing and the perceived non-standard quality of the variety of Spanish which they speak. Unfortunately, the dominant assumption in SFL and SHL textbooks and in education in general remains that the standard language is the teachable language (Train, 2002; 2003). The teaching and promotion of standard languages construct a worldview in which variation becomes problematic and bilingual varieties are deemed invalid. By promoting so-called standard Spanish, textbooks are not just promoting the acquisition of a linguistic commodity; they are also promoting an identity shift, one which calls for SHL learners to shed their identity, accept the
hegemonic societal norms and acquire both the linguistic and cultural norms of the
dominant groups. Said valuation of an idealized, standard Spanish language will be
clearly revealed in the analysis that follows.

STANDARD LANGUAGE IN SHL CLASSROOMS: A HISTORICAL REFLECTION

How then has the issue of dialect valuation or eradication been treated in SHL
textbooks? Valdés’ 1981 seminal publication on the pedagogical implications of
teaching Spanish to the Spanish-speaker discussed three common approaches toward the
treatment of language in the SHL context: (1) eradication, (2) biloquialism and (3)
appreciation of dialect differences. Initially, schools and textbooks alike typically
attempted to eradicate stigmatized varieties of US Spanish (Valdés, 1981; Hidalgo, 1990;
Villa, 2002a, 2002b). Under this view, Spanish acquired within the US borders had been
and continues to be seen as contaminated in some way by its contact with English.

Before continuing the discussion of the treatment of language in the SHL
classroom, let us take a brief look at some of the research that has been done on language
attitudes toward US Spanish, as it will be relevant in informing the reader as to the origin
and persistence of both the eradication and biloquial approaches. Studies in perceptual
dialectology have looked at the perception others have of different groups who speak
Spanish (as well as numerous other language). Such studies have been carried out using
methods that range on a continuum from direct (i.e. What do you think of the Spanish
spoken in the United States?) to indirect (i.e. matched guise techniques). In fact, “the
relationship between attitudes and action is neither straightforward nor simple” (Baker,
1992, p.13). Yet in spite of the indirect relationship that exists between language
attitudes and actions, such studies have overwhelmingly shown that attitude not only affects language acquisition, but may also result in linguistic prejudices and social discrimination. Though delving into the complexities of research on language attitudes is not within the scope of this paper, it is important to recognize that researchers, like Barker, who have attempted to synthesize the results of such studies emphasizes that “Of all the institutions that may be linked with attitude change, school is often regarded as the most influential” (1992, p.110). In fact, Baker goes on to state that “Through the formal or hidden curriculum and through extra curricula activities, a school may produce more or less favorable attitudes and may change attitudes” (1992, p.43). This dissertation will in part elucidate the connection between both the formal and hidden curriculum present in textbooks, and its effects on students’ language attitudes, as will be discussed later in the results of the survey section.

Returning now to the discussion of the approaches available toward treatment of language varieties, it should be obvious that eradication philosophies are rooted in negative language attitudes. According to eradication philosophies, the only available solution is that of the complete elimination of the stigmatized forms in the students’ vernacular variety (Faltis, 1990). Those who take up this view often see the imposition of an outside standard variety of Spanish as the key to students’ future economic success (Villa, 1996). Dialect eradication followed by both linguistic and cultural assimilation to the prestige dialect/culture is thought to pave the path toward academic achievement (Aparicio, 1993). Thus, the eradication process is framed as a problem-correction that is necessary in order to achieve success; it is portrayed as necessary for the students’ own
well-being (see Ruiz’ discussion of language-as-problem, 1984). Such an ideology has long since been proven to be a myth (Villa, 1996, see also Santa Ana’s discussion of language in his 2002 work). In actuality, denial of the non-standard dialect actually impedes acquisition of the standard (García-Moya, 1981). By requiring students to model a prestige variety and correcting so-called stigmatized forms, we are telling them both implicitly and explicitly that their variety of Spanish is inferior, and that they too are inferior (Martínez, 2003). The imposition of such an out-group standard clearly has the potential for severe negative repercussions (Villa, 1996, 2002; Martínez, 2003). Under the framework of dialect eradication, “the mother tongue of minorities is invisibilized” (Kontra, et.al. 1999, p.2). Students need to be able to exercise their linguistic human rights in order for their language to become (or be viewed) as a positive and empowering resource (Kontra, et.al., 1999). Though none of the textbooks under analysis adopt such an extreme philosophy, all do show tendencies toward appropriateness.

The other two means of treating the issue of the standard within the SHL classroom, biloquialism and appreciation of dialect differences, both use the student dialect within the classroom, contrary to the dialect eradication technique (Valdés, 1981). Under these pedagogies, student varieties serve as a natural starting point, building from that which the students already possess, in the hopes of both maintaining and reaffirming ethnic identity and self-dignity (Aparicio, 1993; Gutiérrez, 1997). Such an additive policy of multiple dialect acquisition would seem to respect both student and standard dialects, thus further empowering the student (Hidalgo, 1990). Though Aparicio (1993) asserts that such a push to acquire other dialects would also result in a devaluation of the
student dialect, I respectfully disagree. It is common knowledge in sociolinguistics that most monolingual and bilingual speakers adeptly possess multiple dialects or registers and are able to move smoothly in and out of these. In fact, the acquisition of various varieties of a language is a completely normal facet of everyday language acquisition. As I see it, the real questions that remain are which dialect should students be exposed to in the classroom, and why and how should we go about implementing such exposure?

The goal of biloquialism is to teach students the appropriate contexts of use for each of the various dialects/varieties, and therein lies its problem (Martínez class notes, 2003). Biloquialism is, of course, a better option than dialect eradication, in that it attempts to preserve the students’ vernacular (Martínez class notes, 2003). However, it maintains some of the same goals as eradication in its continued promotion of the prestige variety in the necessary contexts. Biloquialism only addresses the question of which dialect should be taught, ignoring the issues of why and how the dialect should be introduced, resulting in a group of students who are told to conform to pre-existing societal constructs which dictate which variety is acceptable within which contexts. It is this philosophy which is most commonly promoted across the five textbooks under analysis.

In more recent research, the term biloquialism has been renamed appropriateness-based approaches to language learning. As Leeman points out, models of appropriateness both reinforce the dominant linguistic and social hierarchies while simultaneously denying student agency (2005). I concur with Martínez (2003), biloquialism is not enough, yet I would take Martínez’ Critical Based Dialect Awareness
proposition and push it further. As Suarez (2002) astutely notes, overcoming the pre-existing language and social hierarchies requires bilingualism for those with SHL backgrounds. Yet I would argue that such a process would also entail bidialectalism in both the dominant and the heritage language. If we consider the larger framework of Suarez’ statement, and recognize that she is arguing for the need for students to become fluent in the dominant language in order to have a voice that can fight for the maintenance of their heritage language and culture, we must also recognize that SHL students, to some degree need to be fluent in a prestige variety of Spanish in order to obtain that same voice and clout in Spanish, as that which Suarez is arguing for English.

I propose yet another, alternate approach to the teaching of languages in the classroom, one which stems from Martínez (2003), Suárez (2002) and Leeman (2005). Such an approach would entail a student-centered philosophy that allows the students to become ethnographic observers of the linguistic and cultural realities around them. Students need to have a chance to openly observe the processes of language maintenance, language dominance and language shift. They need to have the chance to arrive at their own opinions and make their own decisions as to what types of languages and language varieties they need to have available at their disposal in order to achieve their goals in life. I would argue for the implementation of a teaching based approach entitled Critical Student Awareness; such an approach would entail the creation of a sociolinguistically aware classroom which allows students opportunities to experience language in its everyday context and come to their own conclusions regarding the power or lack their of different language varieties. Of course, curricular design and standardization does not
allow for such flexibility at all levels, but the incorporation of ethnographic elements such as those suggested in Martínez (2003), coupled with a socially-aware element, would, I argue, result in a more active learning environment, one which produces students who arrive at their own opinions and conclusions while having the opportunity to use their language(s) in real world contexts.

THE RISE OF METHODS AND THE PROMOTION OF STANDARD LANGUAGE

Part of the issue surrounding which dialect, standard or variety to use in the classroom and in textbooks lies in the pedagogical pushes that are promoted in many foreign language teacher preparation courses. In recent years, there have been two overpowering influences in that field: the proficiency movement and the methods-based movement (Ortega, 1999a). The proficiency movement holds broad implications for both FL and SHL teaching. First, the myth that the most efficient path to acquisition as an adult is achieved through immersion persists alongside the proficiency movement under the guise of the study abroad experience (Ortega, 1999a). Rather than condoning involvement in local Spanish speaking communities, the system continues to value an outside standard over an inside one. The proficiency movement also encompasses a simultaneous push to exclude the use of the native language in the classroom, emphasizing the sole use of Spanish as the target language. The use of Spanish, to the exclusion of English, disallows connections between the L1 and the L2, something found by research to be a useful and necessary part of language learning (Ortega, 1999a), not to mention a normal aspect of bilingual functioning.
The other major current pedagogical push is methods-based. Methods-based teacher training essentially decontextualizes language learning, a dangerous fallacy particularly in the SHL field. Such a decontextualization does not question the asymmetries surrounding language use, nor does it bring these asymmetries to the attention of either teachers or students, resulting in an “unconscious reproduction of unequal societal power relationships in the classroom” (Ortega, 1999a, p.29). It ignores conflated issues of language and power that should be inherent in any teacher training program. Language itself functions as the main means of producing and reproducing structured and seemingly immovable hierarchies of dominance, power and status (Van Dijk, 1985; Woolard, 1989). It is imperative that teachers be made aware of the non-neutrality of SHL textbooks and other materials used in class, particularly where issues of dialect and standard promotion within the classroom are at stake. My dissertation is a first attempt at addressing this issue.

The English only push is but one side of the double-edged sword that accosts Spanish in the US today. The flip side of the sword rests on the inherent linguicism that results when an outside standard variety of Spanish is pushed onto students as if it were the only correct means of speaking and writing in Spanish. Strict instruction in an outside dialect of Spanish simultaneously devalues the already negatively stigmatized varieties of US Spanish while also adding to the linguistic insecurities of SHL learners and other speakers of US Spanish. US varieties of Spanish need to be promoted as resources in their own right. Such an orientation does not put either side at risk yet addresses the need to change perspective. As linguists, sociolinguists and instructors in the SHL classroom,
we must address the inherently political nature of dialect/standard selection (Villa 1996). Currently, a majority of SHL texts and other in class materials ignore internal US cultures and linguistic varieties, focusing solely on outside contexts of Spanish use as my analysis will reveal. Imposition of an outside standard in the classroom context concurrently devalues the Spanish spoken by students and divides families. For example, choosing to say *fuiste* instead of *fuistes* may be noticed by family or community members, just as using a text-given *standard* lexical item such as *solicitar* instead of the more common bilingual Spanish lexical term *aplicar* are actual linguistic practices that get noticed by community and family members. The interpretations of a shift from the home variety to a standard variety also have yet to be detailed by researchers. Yet one possibility is that such a shift could result in a divide between family members.

Clearly, a problematization of the notions of standard, native-speaker and what constitutes language itself needs to occur; “…heritage language students that have been defined with respect to the linguistic and cultural practices of idealized standardized “native” speakers in terms of (in)correctness, (in)accuracy, (in)appropriateness “error” and “interlanguage”.” (Train, 2002, p. 15). Such a negative treatment of U.S. varieties of Spanish is indicative of a silent yet insidious linguicism that is present in many SHL texts. As Peale points out, if language variation within the U.S. continues to be treated in this way, not only is language loss inevitable, but so too is the loss of identity and community and family connections as well (Peale, 1991).
Leeman and Martínez (2005) state that “Critical pedagogy has long recognized the status of textbooks as cultural artifacts that embody and reify particular ideologies of knowledge.” Due to the increasing expansion of SHL programs and the lack of preparation for teachers to teach SHL courses, a reliance on the textbook has become more and more apparent (see Potowski, 2002 and Potowski & Carreira, 2004). Leeman and Martínez both address and simultaneously demand the need for further research on SHL textbooks. Their recent study, which investigates the language ideologies projected in SHL textbooks’ titles and prefaces across the span of the last 30 years, finds that the ideological focus in such textbooks has shifted from the local and issues of identity to the global marketability of Spanish. Their findings support Ortega’s idea that the notion of Latinidad and the idea of Spanish itself in today’s textbooks comes from without not within (1999a). Whereas older textbooks recognized local knowledge and exemplified its importance as central to SHL pedagogy, newer textbooks tout Spanish as an inherited commodity.

According to Leeman and Martínez, in early SHL textbooks, 3 central themes emerge: (1) local knowledge (2) inheritance and (3) language ownership. The three most prominent themes in more recent SHL textbooks, however, emphasize: (1) a global focus (2) a privileging of business concerns and (3) a process of language commodification. The objective of SHL textbooks, and in fact that of many SHL classrooms has shifted significantly in the last 3 decades; “The pedagogical goal of these textbooks is not to promote integration of students into their communities, but rather to facilitate
participation within a global society” (Leeman & Martínez, 2005). Yet despite this shift in focus, Leeman and Martínez found that the one constant in SHL textbooks, across the three decades of their existence, is the imposition of a standard language ideology. Clearly, the need to articulate what such an ideology entails and how it is exemplified in the most popular, current texts is the next necessary step in SHL research.

**APPROPRIATENESS ARGUMENTS AND THE PROBLEM WITH BEING BILINGUAL**

If we first analyze merely the titles of the textbooks involved in the current study, we see clear evidence of the global marketization of Spanish in today’s SHL textbooks: *Avanzando, La lengua que heredamos, Mundo 21 hispano, and Nuevos mundos*. With the exception of the title of *Español escrito*, these textbooks, combined, present Spanish as an inherited commodity that will advance us into the 21st century and lead us into new worlds. Yet, closer inspection of the metalanguage surrounding the variety of Spanish promoted in these texts shows that though the words which are used to discuss the SLI within textbooks has changed, the underlying SLI itself remains very much the same. There are 3 recurring themes found within all five SHL textbooks under investigation: (1) to be acquainted with standard Spanish and its appropriate contexts of use (2) to write using a correct form of Spanish and (3) to help the student to overcome the inherent problem of being bilingual. Each of these themes will be addressed at length.

The notion of appropriateness is a particularly important one in SHL textbooks and in the SHL classroom, and is without a doubt the most frequent of the three themes cited above. The acquisition of the so-called *standard* and the implication that it is to be used
in the *appropriate* contexts, carries with it serious pedagogical repercussions. As Train indicates, a move from a *non-standard* variety to a *standard* variety of a language is “ideally to be accompanied by the corresponding shift in identity as the student assumes the *appropriate* cultural norms, generally based on a highly stereotyped view of the native (i.e. foreign) target culture of the idealized native speaker” (Train, 2003, p. 9, my emphasis). As mentioned earlier, such models can be used to deny student agency and tend to impose more of a banking philosophy toward language learning (Leeman, 2005, p. 35).

If we consult the language present in the textbooks under analysis, we see the following references to the notion of appropriateness: “...nuestras lecciones habrán de ofrecerle la oportunidad de agregar las formas prescriptivas a su repertorio y de emplearlas *en momentos apropiados*” (Valdés y Teschner, 2003, p. xvii, my emphasis).

The basic tenet of such appropriateness-based approaches is that some language varieties are more appropriate than others in specific contexts (Leeman 2005). This tenet may seem like a given truth on the surface, yet the text does not go on to explicate why such uses are appropriate and what a breach of appropriateness means for the students. Furthermore, what is problematic with the textbooks presentation of the notion of appropriateness is the uni-directional nature of the appropriateness based arguments presented therein. Only one of the texts under investigation actually addresses the issue of when and why it is both *appropriate* and useful to use local varieties of Spanish. All of the texts, however, address issues of appropriateness in regards to the use of the abstract notion of standard. The idea that it would not be appropriate, perhaps, to go
home and talk to one’s family using book Spanish, that such an act might be interpreted as an act of distancing or rejection of one’s origins, is not discussed. Rather, the texts continue to focus on the need to use normative, academic, standard Spanish in specific contexts. Roca is very cautious in her treatment of the topic in *Nuevos mundos*:

"Cuando las lenguas están en contacto entre sí es normal y natural que se produzca un cambio de códigos, una mezcla de idiomas. A veces se usa una palabra o una frase entera en inglés, se adaptan términos y se inventan vocablos. Esto sucede *incluso* en los círculos más educados y refinados. Sin embargo, aprender las formas que se consideran estándar o normativas no sólo ayuda a expandir el vocabulario y el poder de comunicación, sino que facilita el vínculo lingüístico con las personas que no dominan el inglés, y abre las puertas a un mayor entendimiento y comprensión.” (2005b, p. 33, my emphasis).

Yet even this treatment of the use of standard or normative language emphasizes the importance of this variety in order to communicate with monolingual Spanish speakers. Despite the fact that the linguistic varieties present here in the U.S. share many linguistic aspects with varieties of Spanish present in numerous Spanish speaking nations (as will be discussed later), the possibilities of communication between bilingual and monolingual Spanish-speaking communities appears to require knowledge and use of a standard form of the language, or at the very least requires the use of a variety of Spanish that is free of English interference. The textbooks seem to be ignoring the fact that successful inter-dialectal communication occurs daily. Argentineans haven’t stop using the *vos* and continue to call *fresas frutillas*, yet they are able to successfully achieve their communicative goal without major issues daily. As will be seen throughout this analysis, the burden of understanding and being understood will continuously be placed on the SHL learner, not on his or her interlocutors.
In fact, the texts as a whole, imply that without the standard form, students will be unable to communicate with Spanish speakers who reside in monolingual Spanish-speaking communities. The *Mundo 21 hispano* textbook tells the instructors who use the text, we must “Remind students that just as it is important that they maintain their home language for use in their own community, it is equally important that they learn a more widely used Spanish to use when communicating with Spanish speakers that do not use and may not understand their variant” (Samaniego et.al 2005, p.IAE-16, my emphasis). The potential for misunderstanding is cited here as an impetus toward the need to acquire the standard. As Valdés and Teschner remind their readers, “Las formas normativas son las formas correctas, las que la Real Academia de la Lengua dice que debemos usar.” (2003, p. 170). The authoritative tone and the utmost importance of the standard found here are reiterated in all of the textbooks to some degree. Thus, standard Spanish, according to these textbooks, can be seen as the default or unmarked language. It is the language to be used in the widest context, and is deemed that which is most readily understood. Though never explicitly stated, it is clear that the standard is considered both more valuable and more useful than the local variety.

The continued stigmatization of U.S. Spanish is most clearly exemplified in *Mundo 21 hispano*, where after introducing each grammar topic, there is a section entitled “Nota para hispanohablantes,” which appears in a bright purple box, set off from the rest of the white page, perhaps to capture students’ attention. All of these *notas* end with the same phrase: “Es importante evitar *este* uso fuera de *esas* comunidades y en particular *al escribir*.” There are a total of 70 blurbs of this nature in *El Mundo 21*
**hispano** alone! Of course, what is obviously lacking here is *why*! These texts are clearly endorsing the use of the standard over the local variety. The use of the demonstrative those (esas) communities essentially functions to separate speakers of U.S. varieties of Spanish from other speakers of Spanish. It implies that the authors of the text do not share in this language usage and that only US Spanish speakers would employ such a use.

If I were reading this as a student and perhaps even as a well-educated non-sociolinguist, I believe I would come to the same conclusion many of my students have: *The Spanish I speak is clearly wrong, if it can only be used here. Maybe no one else will understand me if I speak like this!* What is missing in these little blurbs is some sort of explanation as to how languages come to be stigmatized, as well as *why* the book is recommending these uses only within the prescribed contexts. The book is operating under a biloquialist framework; the text’s message is clear, don’t use this Spanish outside of your home community, yet what missing is *why*. In fact, in the introductory explanation to the text, the *notas para hispanohablantes* are said to be “…aimed at making heritage Spanish speakers aware of your own community language and when to use a more widely spoken Spanish” (Samaniego et.al., 2005, p. xxi). Though this is an explicit goal of the text, the text itself fails to address *why* it deems some varieties of Spanish more appropriate than others in certain contexts.

Clearly, SHL texts are still lacking in a critical awareness of the ideologized nativeness of standard (Train, 2002). *Mundo 21 Hispano* reflects the same dominant assumption that Train (2003) discovered for FL education: the teachable language, according to the text, is the standard language! As Train points out, the imposition of
standard languages constructs a worldview in which variation itself becomes problematic, by placing the standard as the evaluative norm from which all variation should be judged. In effect, FL and SHL textbooks are importing this same ideology on to their students. The previously mentioned tag line present on all of the Notas para hispanohablantes present in Mundo 21 hispano further implies that one should never write using a U.S. variety of Spanish. Though there would be clear connotations and consequences to using what is often considered a purely spoken variety of Spanish in written contexts, such uses are not uncommon. Imagine writing a grocery list in standard Spanish, or English for that matter, using complete sentences and proper punctuation and avoiding all so-called non-standard forms of language. Such a usage is not only highly unlikely, but it is also most definitely inappropriate, if we understand appropriateness in the sense in which it is being discussed in these texts. The notion of appropriateness and its implications need to be further articulated and discussed, for as it stands, “… the delineation of appropriate domains for different language varieties may serve to bolster the hegemony of prestige varieties by socializing students to accept and reproduce dominant ideologies and practices without critical analysis” (Leeman, 2005, p. 38). The presentation of standard Spanish and its appropriate contexts of use is laden with repercussions for SHL students. Notions of appropriateness, rather than serving to further students’ success, may in fact serve to devalue their home language and increase their linguistic insecurities; something educators and textbook writers need to keep in mind.

This leads us directly into our discussion of the second theme, namely, that of writing in a correct form. Español escrito again explicitly addresses this issue: “We hope
that by the end of this course none of you will be writing *bad Spanish* and that all of you will possess an improved command of a variety of formal spoken Spanish” (Valdés and Teschner, 2003, p. xxiii). The implication of this statement, of course, is that if the Spanish the students are writing with is considered *bad Spanish* then why wouldn’t the same stigma be attached to the Spanish with which they speak? An additional issue raised again by this particular quote is that of formal Spanish. Though the text purports to teach *a variety of formal Spanish*, there is no explicit reference as to which particular variety of Spanish that might be. A close analysis of the treatment of language found in *Español escrito* and the other textbooks, however, reveals that the Spanish found in SHL textbooks cannot be pinned down as one specific variety, rather it represents a pseudo-variety of Spanish, one which exists in the texts alone.

This quote also touches upon the privileging of written over spoken discourse, as a higher level of expression which has existed for quite some time. In the past, this criterion was used to differentiate civilized societies from so-called uncivilized societies. Yet the stylistic distinction between modes of writing is losing its clarity in today’s technologically entrenched world. It can no longer be said that written and spoken language are entirely separate from one another. In reality, the two exist (and indeed have always existed) on a continuum with one another. Text messaging, a popular form of the written language is clearly much closer to spoken language than say a literary masterpiece, yet both remain part of the written language. The once clear distinction between the written and the spoken forms of language is being continuously blurred by technological advancements. To ignore this facet of reality is to ignore a very important
part of our students’ world. Though written language was once claimed to be “free” of variation (even as recently as 2005, see Lippi-Green), such a claim can no longer be made in today’s world.

In fact, an emphasis on the written language is stressed in heritage language programs in general. As Brecht, et.al. state, “Systematic heritage language programs that include formal instruction in the written language, standard or prestige usage, and technical or professional domains are necessary to maintain heritage languages at professionally useful levels of knowledge and skill.” (1998, p. 3). This necessary focus on the written language serves to reinforce the privileging of outside varieties of Spanish over internal varieties of the language. The emphasis on the need to use the standard form of Spanish naturally spills over into the realm of reading as well. As exemplified in the introduction to the readings in the Marqués’ text, “All are written in clear, standard Spanish” (2005, p. vi). This text, along with the others, is drawing a parallel between being understood in written contexts and the use of a standard form of Spanish. The statement itself is incredibly simplistic, implying that there is a single standard form of Spanish. Continuing its discussion of the readings in La lengua que heredamos, the text again emphasizes that

“the vocabulary is based on the standard lexicon used in all Spanish-speaking countries. However the text does not dismiss nonstandard varieties as useless or undesirable. It aims to add the standard forms known to monolinguals of other Spanish-speaking countries to the linguistic repertoire the bilingual students already have…” (Marqués, 2005, p. v, my emphasis)

Again, the simplification of language variation in the Spanish-speaking world is evident in the continued discussion of a singular, standard Spanish. Though the text purports to
not dismiss nonstandard varieties of Spanish, the only adjective found in conjunction with the term nonstandard (which is problematic in and of itself) are the adjectives useless and undesirable. Again, though the text is making an attempt to acknowledge student varieties, its wording falls short of upholding its goals. In fact, even the naming of such varieties as non-standard invokes the notions alluded to by Villa (1996): namely, if the standard is something toward which we should aspire, a nonstandard form then is clearly something that should be avoided.

Additionally, the lexicon referred to in the previous quote is not one which allows for the variation which exists in reality, but one which limits an understanding of Spanish to a mythical abstraction of a unified standard form. Additionally, this standard form is relegated to the monolingual speakers of the Spanish language, leaving the bilingual Heritage student outside of the realm of understanding. This statement presupposes that HL students do not possess this mythical standard language, perhaps not at all, which is clearly not the case. It also presupposes that all monolingual Spanish speakers are exposed to some variety of standard Spanish, which may not always be the case either. Additionally, the continued emphasis on monolingual varieties of Spanish ignores the reality that bilingualism and situations of languages in contact exist in many Spanish-speaking countries, and are not isolated to their realizations here in the United States. Spain, Mexico, Paraguay, Perú and Guatemala are all representative of societies in which multiple languages co-exist and the Spanish of all of these nations shows similar processes common to situations of languages in contact (see Silva-Corvalán 2001, p.278).
This divesting of language inheritance has been addressed in depth by Lourdes Ortega. As Ortega herself has pointed out, “There is ample evidence that foreign language education is structured in ways so as to reproduce the pervasive societal belief that second languages are a resource available for mainstream monolingual speakers only” (1999b, p. 246). Train has added to this discussion in his work on ESL, FL and HL contexts. According to Train, FL textbooks focus on the mainstream culture of the target FL, while ignoring internal cultures. Therefore, non-standard forms of language, or language variation present in communities who use the FL within the US are often stigmatized or deemed under-developed (Train, 2003). These features, prevalent in bilingual varieties of U.S. Spanish, are seen as “non-native like” thereby further reinforcing the hierarchy of monolingual speaker of Spanish over the bilingual speaker, Spanish-English speakers (Ortega, 1999a, p. 31). Essentially, pervasive societal myths “…portray these minority students as inadequate language learners and defective speakers of the target language” (Ortega, 1999b, p. 260). Such myths, though not explicitly evident in SHL texts, are present in today’s textbooks under the guise of appropriateness.

These same myths contribute to the notion that SHL students are not seen as native-speakers of Spanish, despite the fact that many learned Spanish as their L1. This discrepancy is evidenced not only in educational contexts, where teachers often differentiate heritage from native speakers, but also in research contexts, where heritage language participants are often contrasted to a native-speaker control group. As mentioned previously, the term heritage speaker itself in fact has resulted in the creation
of an imagined community of learners (see Norton, 2000; 2001). Perhaps we need to question the use of this term as well, and ask ourselves what boundaries we have created for these students by invoking this new terminology, and whether we too are not aiding in the process of telling them that they are not native speakers of Spanish. The term itself picks up on the reality that there are differences between monolingual and bilingual native speakers, but I wonder why it is that we still cannot conceive of a bilingual native speaker of a language. As Davies points out, “the native speaker boundary is…as much created by non-native speakers as by native speakers themselves” (2003, p.9). It is the pervasive and silent nature of the discourse surrounding the native speaker that allows it to create a boundary that seems natural to those on both sides of it. Perhaps a more empowering term for such students would be bilingual native speakers, yet I admit that this term also has its problems.

Language ownership is inextricably embedded in foreign and heritage language education. Yet the educational system, and in particular, SHL textbooks, continue to produce FL students who feel like they are the rightful owners of the Spanish they acquired as a foreign language, alongside of HL students who leave the classroom feeling embarrassed, and often eventually, disown their own language (Potowski, 2002); essentially, SHL students continue to be inadvertently framed as defective speakers of their own language (Hidalgo, 1997; Ortega, 1999a; b). Effectively, both FL and HL education persist in their promotion of the current hegemonic linguistic situation: the

---

13 Many students in SHL classes do not consider themselves to be native speakers, and therefore, shy away from classes that employ the term, feeling those same linguistic insecurities discussed throughout this dissertation.
dominant group, unfortunately, is often successful at convincing the Latino subordinate group that their language norms are not as adequate as outside norms. Potwoski emphasizes the need for sociolinguistic training and awareness within teacher training programs to combat such issues (2002), and I would argue that this same issue needs to be brought to the forefront in textbook preparation and publication as well. As Ortega eloquently states, “The myth of the ‘monolingual speaker’ is prevalent in the FL profession at an individual and institutional level and it breeds hegemonic attitudes towards educational equity and multilingualism” (1999b, p. 251). I would argue that this myth is equally present within SHL contexts, and is particularly pervasive in textbooks, as will be seen in our continued discussion. Critical based dialect awareness is altogether missing in all of the texts, for rather than building on what students already possess and specifying the social implications of different dialects, the texts merely assert the standard variety as the best variety.

Though *Nuevos mundos* includes statements that are similar to those in the texts cited above, the text goes a step beyond by also emphasizing the appropriateness and importance of both the maintenance and acquisition of local varieties of Spanish as well. We find, in Roca’s text, the explanations that are blatantly missing in the other texts: “Como ya se dijo en el Capítulo 2, el conocimiento de la forma estándar de la lengua es beneficioso, especialmente cuando es necesario comunicarse por escrito con hispanohablantes de otras partes del mundo” (Roca, 2005, p. 53). Here, *Nuevos mundos* also discusses the utility of the standard language in writing, and yet it emphasizes that this utility is of course limited to contexts where the correspondent or intended reader of
the writing is from a monolingual context. Though an initial glance at this excerpt may appear to place an unnecessarily larger burden on the bilingual speaker of Spanish; in fact, Roca’s text goes a step further, placing the burden on both the bilingual and the monolingual. Roca is the first to recognize both the utility of U.S. varieties of Spanish, as well as pointing out their strong connection to one’s identity:

“Tanto los hispanohablantes como los estudiantes de español como segunda lengua, deben familiarizarse con las variantes del español que se escuchan en los Estados Unidos. Es, en realidad, una destreza muy práctica en comunidades bilingües que facilita la comunicación oral entre diversos grupos. Para la persona que usa estas variantes, puede formar parte de su herencia cultural y de su identidad” (Roca, 2005, p. 53)

This is the only textbook among those analyzed here which refers to internal, U.S. varieties of Spanish as skills equally worthy of being acquired by SHL and SFL students alike, as well as by outside communities of Spanish speakers. In fact, Roca’s text addresses Train’s call to problematize notions of appropriateness and accuracy as viewed solely from the perspective of the legitimized standard norm (2003). Train highlights the need to situate appropriateness within its sociological and historical reality and within the ideologies within which it operates (Train, 2003, see also Fairclough 1992, and Leeman, 2005). Roca in fact does this throughout her text by emphasizing the context of language use as well as the normalcy of language variation. The other texts analyzed fall far short of this mark.

Though many SHL instructors may be in agreement with goals (1) and (2) as discussed thus far, goal (3) tends to come as a surprise to all. If we again return to the wording in the textbooks at hand, we see a continued problematizing of the Spanish used by SHL learners and a strict emphasis on the need to improve the variety of Spanish
which they speak. As shocking as this last element may be, most textbooks problematize the notion of being bilingual by addressing issues inherent in bilingual speech with words such as problem, correct, improve, and difficulties. Ana Roca is a well-known researcher in the SHL field and goes to great lengths within her textbook, Nuevos mundos, to acknowledge and validate the language that SHL students bring to the classroom, yet even in this text, the problematic notion of bilingualism is discussed: “Este cuaderno…es útil para repasar y practicar aquellos puntos de ortografía, gramática y vocabulario que tradicionalmente les causan dificultades a los estudiantes bilingües” (Roca, 2005b, p. v my emphasis). In La lengua que heredamos, though the author explicitly states that the text is not geared toward one particular group of Spanish speakers, the perceived difficulties of some groups are targeted (Marqués, 2005). Two other extremely well-known researchers in the SHL field, Valdés and Teschner, address the issue in the following way: “None of you will be expected to change dialects. However, a problem does arise for many of you with regard to style” (Valdés y Teschner, 2003, p. xxii, my emphasis). In this case, the idea that the Spanish of the students presents a problem to their potential to acquire various styles within Spanish is made explicit. The text goes on to state that “one final problem for bilingual speakers of Spanish is that they are bilingual.” (Valdés and Teschner, 2003, p. xxii). How ironic that such a statement should make its way into an SHL textbook where instructors strive daily to impress upon their students the importance of bilingualism in today’s increasingly global world community. To explicitly term bilingualism as problematic is not only outrageous, it is a potential
attack on both the students’ identities and their self-esteem. Clearly, we have to be more careful and more aware of our choices in addressing our learners’ needs.

This problematization of bilingualism is rampant in a U.S. society that values monolingualism as a symbol of national unity. Despite its hands off federal language policy, the United States continues its obsession with the notion of ‘one nation, one language’ at both the state and local levels of government, as well as within the realm of educational policy and planning (Zentella, 1997). Over the last 20 years, the US government has decidedly shifted away from policies that are supportive of linguistic diversity in the classroom, in part as a result of the standards movement, which attempts to obliterate language differences (García in Suarez, 2002). The asymmetrical relationship that exists between individual and group bilingualism, promoting the former as an elitist and highly respectable achievement and the latter as an insidious expression of a lack of patriotism is not the only asymmetry at play in this battle.

Additionally, the division between a colonial Latino presence and the newer Latino immigrant presence has been blurred by the use of grouping terminology: Hispanics, Latinos, Mexican-Americans, etc. (Valdés, 2000). Colonial heritage languages like Spanish lack in both mainstream support and justification in part because of a detachment from their colonial heritage and their perceived connection with continuous immigration (Fishman, 2001). Furthermore,

the imposition of bilingual education (but not bilingualism) has not only fostered socio-linguistic homogenization among otherwise disparate Spanish-speaking groups, but it has also aided in the focalization and fusion of both Hispanic culture and the Spanish language and has encouraged the subsequent assimilation of Hispanics into mainstream Anglo American culture’ (Abalos as cited in Stephens, 1994).
Spanish colonial and immigrant languages in the US have been negatively recast as
“…not only harmful to those who bring them to America, but also pose a threat to
English as the dominant language and to the nation as a whole” (Dicker, 1996, p.28).
Such mythical linguistic insecurities prey on the notion that Spanish is inherently bad;
“Rather than being viewed as the literary and standardized language that it has been for
centuries, Spanish is widely viewed as the dialectally splintered and socially stigmatized
language of lower-class illiterates. As a result, it is severely undervalued as a language
resource” (Fishman, 2001, p.92). Ethnic languages like Spanish are identified with
inferiority and poverty through subtle ideological practices embedded in the discourses of
media and politics and, as we’ve just seen, in education, making language shift an all but
inevitable reality (MacGregor-Mendoza, 1999; Ortega, 1999a; 1999b; Pomerantz, 2002;
Santa Ana, 2002; 1999; Torres, 2000; Zentella, 1997).

Improving the position of heritage languages in the United States requires
changing people’s attitudes toward language and readjusting the current dominant
ideologies that shape those same attitudes and understandings. At present, U.S. Spanish
has not been validated through the traditional status and corpus planning methods
(Hidalgo, 1997). Yet before Spanish HL programs can gain their legitimate status as
equals to their FL counterparts, U.S. Spanish itself must be legitimized not only in the
minds of those who do not speak it, but in the minds of its own speakers as well. As it
stands, Spanish as a HL continues to be seen as a problem, linked to both poverty and
social stagnancy, forming an insurmountable roadblock to economic success (Santa-Ana,
The role of academic ideologies in perpetuating the subordinate position of U.S. Spanish is not an innocent one, as evidenced in the texts at hand (see also Pomerantz, 2002).

Noticeably missing in the previous discussion are citations and remarks from the Avanzando text. In fact, Avanzando treats language variation as if it does not exist; it is not mentioned explicitly in either the preface or the grammatical sections of the text. Unlike the other textbooks studied here, the Avanzando text is perhaps the most discriminatory of all against U.S. varieties of Spanish, as it does not even acknowledge the existence of U.S. varieties of Spanish, let alone suggest that its readers come to the text with some degree of knowledge of Spanish already. This is due in part to the texts ambiguous target audience, as the text purports to be equally suitable to both a heritage or foreign language context. Avanzando is lacking in the sociolinguistic discussion so clearly present in all of the other SHL textbooks.

CONCLUSION THE STANDARD LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY OF SHL TEXTBOOKS

As was evidenced in this section, the three most prominent themes across the 5 textbooks under investigation are (1) to be acquainted with standard Spanish and its appropriate contexts of use, (2) to write using a correct form of Spanish, and (3) to help the student to overcome the inherent problem of being bilingual. Though all of the texts claim to value the students’ varieties of Spanish, the majority (with the exception of Nuevos mundos) fall short in actually realizing this claim. Across all texts, the underlying philosophy remains one of biloquialism. The particular type of biloquialism evidenced in the texts rests on notions of appropriateness, stressing the need to use
standard Spanish in appropriate contexts, while ignoring the equally important need to use the students’ varieties of Spanish in appropriate contexts as well. The texts do nothing to problematize notions of appropriateness, resulting in a reinforcement of the dominant linguistic hierarchies already present, which continue to value monolingual native speakers of Spanish over bilingual speakers of the language.

The ideologies present throughout the textbooks act as a precursor to how these same texts treat language variation. It is not surprising, in light of the standard ideologies just uncovered that such texts approach variation from two perspectives: (1) as divergent from some unspecified norm, and (2) as an error in need of correction. Though all of the textbooks avoid an eradication based philosophy in their explicit ideologies, all do present an underlying orientation toward varieties of Spanish in the United States as problematic. Nowhere is this more evident than in the texts’ treatment of variation processes typical of US varieties of Spanish.

THE MISSING LINKS: LOCAL VARIETIES OF U.S. SPANISH

Clearly, part of what is missing in many of these texts is an explicit discussion of the types of sociolinguistic variation commonly present in bilingual communities in the U.S. Though false cognates and lexical borrowings are discussed at length in a majority of the SHL texts studied, the complex nature of the numerous varieties of Spanish in the U.S. is reduced, often, to a one-page discussion, if it is discussed at all. Many textbooks continue their promotion of biloquial philosophies in their treatment of linguistic variation.
Early textbooks in the SHL field often included lists of words that were part of the “local” variety of Spanish next to parallel lists which then translated the local word into standard Spanish. These lists, at times subsumed under the headings of *se dice* and *no se dice*, emulate the eradication based ideology that was so prominent in early textbooks. Textbooks have evolved, and though similar lists are often included in the textbooks, none use the headings found in earlier texts. Rather, most texts present lists of *préstamos* and *lengua estándar*. However, as mentioned in the Leeman and Martínez study, ideologies have shifted and Spanish since the 90’s and the commodification of Spanish has resulted in a surge of appropriateness-based language norms. These norms are not drastically different from those found in the earliest SHL texts. Recent books seem to suggest that what SHL students possess isn’t quite Spanish. This idea, that the Spanish of the students is not quite the same Spanish that is necessary to survive in the real world, is most clearly seen upon close inspection of the treatment of language variation across texts.

A first look at the treatment of variation in SHL texts reveals that the majority of the texts, 4 out of the 5 studied, do address the issue of linguistic variation, though each does so to different degrees via different approaches to language. The one exception to the rule, again, is the *Avanzando* text, which again ignores the reality of linguistic variation altogether. According to *Avanzando’s* exercises and lexical and grammatical explanations, there is but one correct way to speak/write Spanish. A general glance at the variationist picture presented in the four other SHL textbooks, however, shows that each one in its own way acknowledges language variation, and in fact, many address the same
topics, showing which aspects of language variation textbooks authors feel are most salient, or in some cases, most problematic.

Before delving into the topics covered in the 4 textbooks which treat variation, I would like to discuss the Spanish presented in the *Avanzando* text. As this text presents a stagnant, unchanging and unvaried variety of Spanish, it is interesting to view the language presented in order to decipher just which variety of Spanish is being promoted. As mentioned earlier, both the *vosotros* pronoun and its corresponding grammatical forms are present in all aspects of the text, thus biasing the presentation to a Castilian variety of the language. Further inspection shows that the variety of Spanish excludes many lexical items typical of U.S. Spanish. On p. 184 of the text, there is a list of verbs entitled *Verbos que se prestan a la confusión* (de la Vega & Salazar, 2005). The list consists of lexical items that are often referred to as ‘false cognates.’ Some examples include *mover/mudarse, dares cuenta de/realizar*. A similar list is located on p. 400 of the textbook, entitled *vocabulario útil – cognados falsos*, the 2 lists, combined contain a total of 127 words, many of which are used in U.S. Spanish with the meaning that the book claims does not exist!

Though I believe it is important for students to be made aware of the differences between monolingual and bilingual varieties of Spanish, I think it is equally important that students’ own language varieties be validated and used as a point of departure not only in textbooks, but in SHL classes in general. Ignoring the student variety is not merely to ignore linguistic variation, it is to deny the existence of a vibrant, changing, and very much alive language, one which is inextricably tied to the students’ identity.
Other aspects of language variation are simply ignored altogether by the *Avanzando* text. Unlike the other texts, there is no discussion of variation in the subjunctive, in verbal forms, in direct and indirect object pronouns usage, subject pronoun usage, etc. Even the well-documented variation present in Castilian Spanish of 3rd person singular direct and indirect object pronoun usage, the *leísmo*\(^{14}\), is unmentioned in the text. What is represented is a completely stale, invariant Spanish, which strictly conforms to the rules of the *Academia Real*. Even in cases where the *Academia* admits variation (such as the case of the *leísmo*), the text ignores it, thus invisibilizing the many voices behind the Spanish language.

On rare occasion, *Avanzando* does address some facets of language variation. There is small reference to the possibility of orthographical variation on p. 11, where the text mirrors eradication ideologies of old in its use of the phrases *se escribe* and *no se escribe* in reference to the use of capital letters in Spanish. As mentioned previously, all subject pronouns used in Spanish are used, with the exception of the *vos* form, which goes unnoticed in the text. The only other potential reference to language variation comes on p.96 of the text, in its discussion of the verb *haber*; “Se usa la forma de la tercera persona del singular del verbo haber, en todos los tiempos que sean necesarios, para expresar el concepto de hay. No se usan las formas plurales” (de la Vega & Salazar, 2005). Again, though the insinuation implied by the above statement is that some speakers of Spanish do use the plural form, the text obliterates the existence of such

\(^{14}\) Leísmo refers to the use of the indirect object pronoun *le* in place of the direct object pronoun *lo*; this process is common in Peninsular Spanish as well as other varieties of Spanish, and tends to occur more frequently when the direct object is animate and male.
speakers by nullifying the possibility of language variation yet again. Clearly, this is a dangerous position for any text to take. In order to best equip our students to learn a language, the obvious reality of language variation must be incorporated into both SHL texts and classrooms and in SFL contexts as well.

The most frequently discussed topics dealing with variation tendencies present in the textbooks’ treatment of U.S. Spanish are tallied in the table below:

**Table 9: A Quantitative Look at the Treatment of Variation in U.S. Varieties of Spanish across Textbooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Español escrito</th>
<th>La lengua que heredamos</th>
<th>Mundo 21 hispano</th>
<th>Nuevos mundos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical variation (extensive)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject pronoun variation ($vos$ and $vosotros$)</td>
<td>X (1 paragraph)</td>
<td>X (one paragraph)</td>
<td>X (1 page)</td>
<td>X (3 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularization of the 2nd person singular form in the preterit tense</td>
<td>X (one footnote)</td>
<td>X (one footnote)</td>
<td>X (one footnote)</td>
<td>(not discussed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect subjunctive ~ Conditional indicative variation</td>
<td>X (one footnote)</td>
<td>(not discussed)</td>
<td>X (one footnote)</td>
<td>(not discussed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct and indirect object pronoun variation</td>
<td>(discussed, no variation mentioned)</td>
<td>X (one footnote)</td>
<td>X (one note)</td>
<td>(not discussed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the topics illustrated above will be discussed in their order of prominence. I will focus on the individual textbook’s presentation of each and the overall framework toward language that can be derived by close examination. In all cases, I have focused my research on the actual textbook discussion of the topics at hand. As all five of the textbooks employ the same style of exercises when dealing with variation, I have left the
discussion of exercises until the end of this section. It functions as a summary of the respective textbooks’ underlying attitudes toward language variation and provides some questions for consideration for authors, publishers and students when discussing language variation, whether in the textbook or in the SHL classroom itself. It is argued that a more in-depth discussion of language variation, with a specific focus on regularized grammatical practices present in U.S. Spanish-speaking communities combined with open discussions of the political and social underpinnings of language prejudice is still lacking in today’s SHL textbooks. It is suggested that ethnographic approaches and bi-directional translation activities can be implemented in the classroom in order to address some of these concerns and provide a stepping stone for increased sociolinguistic discussions in the SHL classroom.

SE DICE V. NO SE DICE: LEXICAL VARIATION IN TODAY’S SHL TEXTS

Clearly, the most prominent topics related to variation continue to focus on lexical aspects of variation. Perhaps this extra attention is due in part to the saliency of lexical variation. The majority of discussions across the texts focus on the existence of borrowings from English in U.S. varieties of Spanish, and the need to be wary of these words when speaking with monolingual Spanish speakers not familiar with U.S. English, a population that is growing increasingly smaller in our increasingly small global community. While Español escrito treats lexical variation within its narrated stories, the rest of the textbooks, including Avanzando, all treat cases of false cognates extensively, spending multiple pages listing words to be wary of. As the Samaniego text points out, “el aprender el verdadero significado de estos cognados los va a ayudar muchísimo a
evitar situaciones vergonzosas…” (2005, p. 198, my emphasis). The idea of appropriate and correct usage of such words in bilingual community contexts is ignored. These students have been using these words their whole lives without being embarrassed, yet there is no discussion of appropriate contests where such words might be used. Equating students’ use of Spanish with embarrassing situations does not begin to explain the reality behind lexical variation. Why is it that a bilingual students’ presumed misuse of a word is deemed embarrassing when very often the same ‘creative’ use by a monolingual speaker of the language is deemed innovative? The language double standard which holds monolinguals to be superior to bilinguals has again reared its ugly head.

The treatment of lexical variation within the Marqués text is the only to address the numerous forms that lexical variation can take. In what looks to be a partial summary of Silva-Corvalán’s work on lexical variation in U.S Spanish, the Marqués text addresses 3 types of lexical variation:\(^{15}\): (1) English words that have been ‘spanish-ized’ (hold-up \(\rightarrow\) jolopo), (2) semantic extension of pre-existing Spanish words (cavidad takes on the meaning of cavity), (3) and literal translation (to run for office \(\rightarrow\) correr para representante or to call back \(\rightarrow\) llamar para atrás). Again, the possibility of being misunderstood is brought up as the main reason for learning the so-called standard meanings of the phrases discussed: “Aquí nos ocuparemos de los préstamos que ocurrren en el español que se habla en los Estados Unidos y que los otros hispanohablantes no familiarizados con ellos tendrán dificultades en comprender” (Marqués, 2005, p. 50). I wonder if such claims are made in, for example, Puerto Rican Spanish textbooks, as they

\(^{15}\) I have collapsed Marqués’ 3\(^{rd}\) and 4\(^{th}\) points into one, as Silva-Corvalán does in her studies.
discuss the term for bus, yet another term with significant lexical variation across Spanish speaking communities. Why is it that these texts place the burden of being understood and explaining one’s self on the heritage learner alone? Is not conversation a bi-directional activity, with give and take required on the part of both the speaker and the listener? With the exception of Nuevos mundos, the burden of making one’s self understood consistently rests on the shoulders of the SHL student. It is his variety of Spanish which is assumed to be confusing and is therefore in need of repair.

Lippi-Green addresses this issue in her research on speaking English with an accent (1997; 2005). According to Lippi-Green, when two people enter into conversation with one another, each must decide whether or not to accept the communicative burden of conversing, that is of making one’s self understood while simultaneously attempting to understand. As she points out,

“What can be demonstrated again and again is this: members of the dominant language groups feel perfectly empowered to reject their portion of the burden and to demand that a person with an accent (that is, an accent which differs from their own accent) carry a disproportionate amount of the responsibility in the communicative act” (2005, p.298)

In the case of SHL learners, this burden is dually borne. These students often carry the burden of making themselves understood both in Spanish and English conversations. Such a reality only leads to increased linguistic insecurities, due to the implication that the language spoken by the SHL learner is somehow incomprehensible and in need of repair.

Mundo 21 hispano, in addition to addressing the topic of false cognates, also addresses the topic of so-called arcaísmos. Yet even the title of the section in which the discussion unfolds is telling: Variantes coloquiales: lengua campesina. Such arcaísmos,
though quite prominent in the Spanish of many U.S. cities, are thus equated with the language of farmers, or rural people and are considered both antiquated and uneducated, as “hoy se han dejado de usar en las grandes metrópolis” (Samaniego et.al., 2005, p. 128). Yet simply because of the evolutionary patterns of U.S. Spanish do not mirror those of Castilian Spanish does not mean that one is more archaic or modern than the other. In fact, one could argue that the vast amount of borrowing from English in the technology domain of U.S. Spanish makes the language more modern than its counterpart in Spain. Lexical variation, as portrayed in these textbooks is seen as both problematic and archaic, despite the fact that lexical variation is widespread across all Spanish-speaking communities, and typically, does not result in mass-miscommunication.

As all linguists know, lexical variation is the least systematic of all variation, yet at the same time, lexical variants pose little difficulty in actual communicative circumstances. A mere instance of periphrasis or re-wording usually clears up any lexical confusions that might result in a cross-variety conversation. In fact, as Carreira points out,

“With their nearly exclusive focus on… the lexicon, existing linguistic activities are limited in their ability to demonstrate three important linguistic principles. These are: (a) the nonlinguistic basis of language prejudice, (b) the linguistic validity of all dialects of a language, and (c) the relatively small number of linguistic differences that separate the variants of Spanish” (2000, 4).

These three linguistic principles are at the heart of both SHL teaching and learning, and can be gleaned from some of the conversations surrounding the other types of variation present in the texts. Yet by focusing on the lexical differences that exist across varieties,
SHL textbooks continue to highlight the seemingly haphazard differences across languages, rather than drawing attention to the innumerable similarities that exist.

Rather than basing the discussions within the texts on the extensive and growing body of sociolinguistic research which focuses on borrowings, calques and even code-switching, the texts align themselves with the preferred terminology of SFL instruction. In fact, the texts fail to acknowledge this extensive body of research altogether. Additionally, textbooks fail to acknowledge the well-established distinction between established borrowings and nonce borrowings. All the lists present in all of the texts focus on what sociolinguistic researchers’ term *established borrowings*; such words are considered a legitimate part of the typical US Spanish-English bilingual lexicon. Yet the well-established nature of these words is masked by the terminology used to discuss them in the textbooks. In fact, as already mentioned, the texts’ overbearing focus on the lexicon obfuscates the commonalities that hold across all varieties of Spanish (Carreira, 2000). In fact, there are a relatively small number of linguistic differences that separate varieties of Spanish. Yet across texts, this is the variation topic which is most discussed.

**VOSOTROS V. VOSEO: VYING FOR A VOICE**

The question arises, then, what variety of Spanish is presented in SHL textbooks? What is the tangible component of this abstract standard which the texts are so anxious to appropriate to SHL students? Before continuing with this discussion, let us first look briefly at the subject pronominal system that exists in Spanish.

---

16 For those interested in this field, here is a list of some of the many researchers in the area: Poplack, Sankoff & Miller, 1988; Silva-Corvalan, 2001; Smead, 1998; Weinrich, 1953.
Table 10: The Spanish subject pronominal system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish Singular</th>
<th>Spanish Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/we</td>
<td>Yo</td>
<td>Nosotros(as)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You (you all)</td>
<td>Tú (familiar)</td>
<td>Vosotros(as) (familiar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vos (familiar)</td>
<td>Ustedes (familiar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usted (formal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/She/They</td>
<td>Él/Ella</td>
<td>Ellos/Ellas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rarely, if ever do textbooks (and by textbooks here I am referring both to SHL and SFL texts) present the Spanish pronominal system in this way. In fact, most textbooks, and indeed most Spanish classrooms tend to ignore the use of vos altogether (see also Mason & Nicely, 1995). Yet as will be demonstrated, this second person singular pronoun is widely used, and some even argue that it is more prevalent that its counterpart, tú.

However, nearly all texts include the second person plural pronoun vosotros, whose context of use is restricted primarily to the Iberian Peninsula. In fact the pronominal situation found in Spanish textbooks parallels the findings of Fonseca-Greber & Waugh (2002; 2003) in French textbooks; namely, the pronominal system given does little to reflect the sociolinguistic reality of the Spanish-speaking world.

My research into the pronominal system also shows that Wiezoreck’s (1992) and Mason & Nicely’s (1995) findings are very much mirrored by SHL textbooks. The language promoted in SHL textbooks emulates that of a Castilian-based variety of Spanish. As we have seen already with Valdés and Teschner’s reference to La real academia española, Castilian Spanish maintains its position of authority in the world of
SHL textbooks. One of the most telling ways to identify Castilian Spanish is via the use of the vosotros pronoun and its corresponding verbal forms. All of the textbooks analyzed include some form of vosotros at least once in the text. Of the five textbooks analyzed, 3 include the vosotros form explicitly in all references to verbs: Avanzando, La lengua que heredamos, and Mundo 21 hispano. Two of the three textbooks require student production of the form in formal exercises, while the other text merely requires recognition or comprehension of the form. The other two textbooks, Español escrito and Nuevos mundos, both include a discussion of the vosotros form, though they do not implement the verb form when reviewing tenses and conjugations.

As has been discussed earlier, the imposition of the vosotros form in an SHL environment is a questionable one. The use of vosotros is restricted to Castilian-based dialects of Spanish. As is now well-documented, vosotros is used by only 13% of the Spanish-speaking population, namely, by those who reside on the Iberian Peninsula. According to Mason & Nicely, vos is dominant in at least 8 Spanish-speaking countries, and used by a minimum of 69.1 million people (1995). As these authors suggest, “...students are at least as likely if not more likely to have contact with a native speaker who uses vos than one who uses vosotros” (1995, p. 361). This is even more so true in the SHL context, where students have increased interactions with the Spanish-speaking community of the United States, a community much more likely to use vos than vosotros. Clearly, this is an issue which needs to be addressed not only by SHL textbooks, but also by SHL programs and teachers.
A discussion of the treatment of Spanish subject pronouns would not be complete without addressing the issue of the *voseo*. *Vos*, like *vosotros*, is addressed in the majority of the SHL textbooks studied. Its presence is noticeably absent in the *Avanzando* text, which, as mentioned earlier, does not discuss issues of language variation and tends to promote a strictly Castilian based Spanish, not only requiring students to recognize the *vosotros* form, but also requiring student production of the form as well. The other 4 texts all discuss the use of *vos* to some degree. Yet unlike the treatment of *vosotros*, the corresponding grammatical forms for the *vos* pronoun are not discussed in the majority of the SHL textbooks. In general, the textbooks acknowledge the existence of *vos* without going into too much depth to explain its use.

One example of the treatment of *vos*, can be found in workbook that accompanies the *Nuevos mundos* text. The following excerpt shows how the *voseo* is presented to the students:

**El voseo:** El *vos* se usa en lugar de *tú* o *ti* en ciertas regiones de América Latina, sobre todo en Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, en partes de México, y también en Centroamérica (Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Guatemala). Observe cómo cambia el uso de los verbos en el segundo ejemplo.
- El regalo es para vos. (El regalo es para ti.)
- Vos tenés muchísima suerte, ¿lo sabés? (Tú tienes muchísima suerte, ¿lo sabes?)
- Quisiera ir al cine con vos esta noche. (Quisiera ir al cine contigo…) (Roca, 2005b, p. 9)

Though the notion that the *vos* is used in numerous countries is conveyed, its complex sociolinguistic realities are entirely masked by the brief treatment found in the text. In light of the fact that there are a growing number of voseo users present in the US, a more in-depth treatment of the complexity of this pronominal form and its
morphological repercussions is glaringly absent, not only in the *Nuevos mundos* text, but across all texts studied.

The treatment of subject pronoun variation in *Avanzando*, is again, all but non-existent. The text includes the vosotros form in all of its grammatical explanations and conjugations, yet there is no discussion of when to use the pronoun and its corresponding grammatical forms. Perhaps, as this is an intermediate text, it is assumed that the readers already know and understand this distinction. Yet it is doubtful that the readers have come across the vos distinction in previous academic encounters with Spanish, yet this pronoun and its corresponding grammatical forms are entirely invisibilized by the text. There is no mention of vos at all. Equally counter-productive is the lack of discussion of pronoun variation is general. Again, *Avanzando* falls short of its counterparts in appearing to assume a Spanish devoid of variation. The text further imposes the importance of a Castilian variety of Spanish by not only requiring students to recognize the vosotros forms as employed in the text, but also requiring students to produce these forms in the grammatical exercises which follow-up the discussion of the various morpho-syntactic aspect of the Spanish verbal system. The utility of a Castilian variety of Spanish for a SHL learner is dubious at best. These students state that their primary goals are those of reconnecting to friends and family via the Spanish language. Unless the students’ family comes from Spain (which a very small portion of the U.S. Spanish-speaking population does), the utility of the vosotros form is naught.

The treatment of the voseo in *Mundo 21 hispano* is the most in-depth treatment, grammatically speaking, yet it is one of the weakest from a sociolinguistic perspective.
The text initially presents the pronoun ‘vos’ as part of the lexical variation present in Central America. It then goes on to state that actual verbal forms are affected by the use of the pronoun and in fact gives students the most common endings in the present tense indicative (ás, és, ís) and subjunctive endings (comprés, vendás, vivás), as well as the imperative forms (comprá, queré, vení). In a footnote, the text even acknowledges that there is variation in the possible verbal endings that agree with the use of vos. Yet despite this extensive grammatical treatment, there is no explanation as to how to use the vos form; it is merely mentioned as a possible choice instead of the tú form. Of course, this is a gross simplification of a complex sociolinguistic decision. In fact, as Mason & Nicely state, despite the fact that “A far greater number of native speakers of Spanish regularly use vos” (1995, p. 366), only 17% of SFL textbooks even address the form (Mason & Nicely, 1995)! As Lipski points out,“In at least some part of every Latin American nation except for Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic, the pronoun vos is used instead of or in competition with tú for familiar usage; at least six different sets of verbal endings accompany voseo usage” (2000, on-line). The complexity of this linguistic situation cannot be watered down to a simple one sentence explanation. Worse yet, it should not be relegated to a mere two page mention. The prominence of the voseo is growing, as are the number of immigrants from Central America, a prominent voseo region, to the U.S. Textbooks need to address and validate this form of the language, and acknowledge its far-reaching prominence in the Spanish-speaking world. The absence of the voseo in all other parts of the textbook and its virtual absence across textbooks,
Despite the continued prominence of the vosotros form shows a continued bias toward outside varieties of Spanish, particularly those of a peninsular character.

The limited usage of the vosotros form is acknowledged in *La lengua que heredamos*: “Vosotros, vosotras se usa en ciertas regiones de España como plural de tú, pero es de poco uso en Hispanoamérica, donde se prefiere la forma *ustedes*” (Marqués, 2005, p. 360). However, despite this acknowledgement, the textbook includes the vosotros form for all verbal conjugations. Though students are not asked to produce the form in any of the follow-up exercises, its omnipresence in the text is indicative of its perceived elevated status. The relative absence of the pronoun vos and its corresponding grammatical forms is again conspicuously evident. The only mention of the form comes in a reading on the history of the evolution of the Spanish language:

“Otras peculiaridades propias del español que se habla en América son el voseo y el yeísmo. El uso del vos en sustitución del tú y ustedes está muy difundido en algunas regiones de Centro y Sudamérica. En la Argentina el voseo tiene una modalidad especial *(vos sos)*. Si usted ha visto alguna película argentina o conoce algún argentino, probablemente haya notado este uso” (Marqués, 2005, p. 7, my emphasis).

Again, the complex nature of the vos/tú distinction is obliterated by the simplified definition provided by the text. The importance of this linguistic variant is obfuscated by its invisibility in the rest of the text. According to this text, and many of the others, the voseo is unworthy of study.

*Español escrito* provides their readers with a schema of subject pronouns on p. 152 of the text. The schema does not include either the vosotros or the vos forms that have been discussed to this point. The text does acknowledge both forms in the following way, however:
“Hay dos pronombres personales de sujeto que aquí no se presentaron: vosotros/vosotras y vos. Vosotros y vosotras — pronombre personal de segunda persona familiar plural — se emplean profusamente entre españoles; los hispanoamericanos, en cambio, no los usan. Vos — pronombre personal de segunda persona familiar singular — se usa en lugar de tú en la Argentina, el Uruguay, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras y El Salvador y se usa conjuntamente con tú en Guatemala, Chile y Ecuador” (Valdés & Teschner, 2003, p. 152).

The only other mention of vos occurs in a footnote in a narrated story, much later in the text. The footnote again reiterates that vos is quite common in Argentina, Uruguay and all of Central America. Español escrito chooses to address the issue of subject pronoun variation briefly, emphasizing what the authors perceive to be the most widely used forms in the language. Yet their choice, again, to include tú forms and exclude both vosotros and the voseo, does send a message to the readers. In fact, the issue of whether or not the tú form is more widely used than vos is a hotly contested issue. Some researchers even contend that the tú/vos distinction has serious political implications. Clearly, our students deserve to be informed of this usage, for those who do not already use the vos. At the same time, inclusion of the pronoun and its accompanying morphological changes would add validity to those varieties of Spanish spoken by those who already use the vos as part of their daily repertoire.

The privileging of tú over vos is one of the more salient and observable aspects present not only in SHL texts, but in SFL texts as well. Additionally, the lack of discussion of the variation inherent in the Spanish subject pronominal system highlights the importance of equipping newer textbooks with relevant sociolinguistic research and information. In order for students and teachers alike to make the most educated and informed decisions about which sort of Spanish they wish to use, something as salient as
The discussion of pronominal usage in Spanish and its manifestations across SHL textbooks serve to show us just how these structures of power can affect our own understandings of what is correct and appropriate Spanish. The continued promotion of Castilian Spanish is brought into question here not because it is not a valid form and deserving of discussion in its own right. Indeed it is! However, its utility as the main variety of Spanish in the SHL context is questioned, and it is suggested that a more in-depth sociolinguistic discussion of the realities of pronominal variation in the Spanish-speaking world in today’s SHL textbooks be used as a point of departure for furthering both students’ and teachers’ understandings of the complex and powerful nature of sociolinguistic variation. A small restructuring of the presentation of varieties of Spanish in SHL textbooks could result not only in a textual form of validation for U.S. varieties of
Spanish, but also for increased awareness of the potent role of sociolinguistic variation in society at large.

¿ADÓNDE FUISTES?: REGULARIZATION PROCESSES IN U.S. SPANISH

Though the process of regularization and rule-generalization is again well-documented in the socio-linguistic literature, the SHL textbooks which choose to treat this topic again do so briefly, with no reference to the research which has been done in the field. As Silva-Corvalán has documented extensively, “…en situaciones de contacto de lenguas, los bilingües desarrollan diversas estrategias con el propósito de hacer más liviana la carga cognitiva que implica recordar y usar dos o más sistemas lingüísticos diferentes” (2001, p. 272). One of the strategies which Silva-Corvalán discusses in depth is that of over-generalization of linguistic forms which tend to follow a regularization pattern. This is the case of the 2nd person singular verb endings in the preterit tense in many varieties of Spanish, including U.S. varieties of Spanish. As Silva-Corvalán points out, the addition of an –s to the 2nd person singular preterit form (fuistes), or the elision of an –s in this same form (fuite, or fuites) is not characteristic of U.S. Spanish alone, but rather is characteristic of popular varieties of Spanish in general (2001, p. 320). In fact, what the textbooks make out to be an idiosyncrasy of U.S. Spanish is in fact a widely attested phenomenon in much of the Spanish-speaking world.

The three SHL textbooks which treat the topic of 2nd person preterit regularization all do so in brief notes directed toward their readers. In La lengua que heredamos, the issue is treated in a footnote: “Debe ponerse cuidado en no agregar s a la segunda persona del singular. Debe decirse dijiste y no dijistes.” (Marqués, 2005, p. 248). Again, this
decontextualized reprimand does not begin to explain the wide-spread sociolinguistic reality of this phenomenon. Nor does it explain to the students why such a usage is stigmatized in certain realms. In fact, it does not even allow students to continue to use this form within the home context. According to the text, *dijistes* should not be used, period.

In *Mundo 21 hispano*, the treatment of the regularization of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular preterit form again occurs in one of the notes directed at *hispanohablantes*:


This treatment, again, does not being to acknowledge the wide-spread realities of this phenomenon, and in fact, treats it as it does all other language-related variation; the text confines the use of the variable to *those* communities in which such a variety of the language is used, and prohibits this use outside of that context and especially when writing. In fact, the follow-up exercise on p. 254 requires students to choose between the two variants: *pasaste* v. *pasates*; naturally, the text accepts only one correct answer, again reaffirming the notion that the students’ Spanish is somehow wrong or inferior. Rather than using this variant, which is not only common to U.S. varieties of Spanish, but also to popular Spanish in general, as a point of departure from which a discussion of language variation can ensue, the appropriateness argument of the text is again reiterated, and the corrective method is again employed. Unlike lexical variation, syntactic
regularization processes are quite systematic and even predictable across language varieties. Yet rather than using the regularization process as a teachable moment to explain the natural process of language variation, while discussing the naturalism of such a process, the text again chooses to “correct” the variant and dismiss it as a peculiar behavior of certain Spanish-speaking communities, ones to which the authors, again do not belong.

The treatment of the same phenomenon in *Español escrito* is much less corrective in nature, and in fact, acknowledges the widespread use of the form, again, in a footnote:

“Formas normativas de la Segunda persona singular informal del pretérito no tienen s final. Pero las dos formas populares – por ejemplo, *hablastes, hablastes* – sí la tienen. El uso de la primera de estas formas populares – *hablastes, dijistes, comprastes, fuistes, vinistes, ordenastes*, etc.—está muy extendido en la sociedad actual. Hasta puede decirse que es la forma preferida del habla coloquial. Sin embargo, el español escrito (que se basa siempre en el uso normativo) no lo admite a menos que el escritor procura imitar el lenguaje coloquial en citas directas” (Valdés & Techsner 2003, p. 191)

Though this explanation is the only that goes to any length to describe the widespread use of the phenomenon in question, it remains buried in the text as a footnote, likely to be ignored by the reader.

The other texts do not treat this particular process of regularization, and that too is important to acknowledge. By not even acknowledging the existence of such a common form in the language, the texts are, in some sense, both denying the forms’ existence and again ignoring an important process of language variation present in the language varieties of many SHL students. Students, however, are often keenly aware of their own language use, due perhaps to their pronounced linguistic insecurities. One of my heritage students, who chose to take an upper level advanced grammar course for non-native
speakers, approached me and said: Is the book wrong, or am I wrong? I always say fuistes and there aren’t any s-es on any of the forms in this book. Have I been talking wrong my whole life? Clearly, it is precisely situations like this which we as SHL educators want to avoid. I think this student, and many others that I have seen through the years, would have benefited greatly from a sociolinguistically based discussion of language variation, one which acknowledges the inherently normal nature of language variation and the politically loaded reality within which such variation exists. The fact that common practices of language variation, such as the regularization of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular preterit form, are either ignored by texts, or addressed in a footnote does little to promote an increased appreciation of the variety of Spanish which the students bring to the classroom with them. Though such process could easily be used as a point of departure for a critically-based discussions of language variation and sociolinguistic processes, none of the texts take advantage of the opportunity at hand. Indeed, the mention of the widespread nature and the regularity of processes like these could also help to aid the SHL teacher, who also might not be privy to this type of sociolinguistic knowledge. By adding a component like this, textbooks could address two issues prevalent in today’s SHL classrooms: (1) they could help combat students’ linguistic insecurities by validating student varieties using sociolinguistic data and (2) they could raise teachers’ sociolinguistic awareness with the same information. The pedagogical benefits of such a change could be far-reaching. I concur with Fonseca-Greber and Waugh (2002), corpus-based textbooks are essentially not only to providing our students
with a more accurate language knowledge base, but also to validate students varieties while simultaneously increasing their and their teachers’ sociolinguistic awareness.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE V. THE CONDITIONAL: THE WAR OF THE VERBS

As mentioned earlier, Silva-Corvalán has done extensive research on language variation as it exists in U.S. contexts. The case of the use of the conditional indicative, in situations where prescriptive Spanish prefers the imperfect subjunctive, is cited as yet another instantiation of the bilinguals’ attempt to reduce their cognitive load via a process of regularization. However, again in this case, she is quick to point out that: “Un examen de las etapas de simplificación y pérdida nos permite afirmar que no hay influencia directa del inglés” (Silva-Corvalán, 2001, p. 319). Though the regularization process may represent the bilingual’s attempt to reduce his or her cognitive load, it does not represent a change in the language that was brought about due to its contact with English. In fact, it is again representative of a process of regularization that frequently occurs in monolingual contexts as well.

In fact, variation within the subjunctive itself is prevalent across all varieties of Spanish. This particular instantiation, however, is addressed (minimally) in only 3 of the textbooks studied. The first, Mundo 21 hispano, addresses the topic in the manner which has by this point become characteristic of this particular text:

“Hay una tendencia dentro de algunas comunidades de hispanohablantes a usar el condicional o el imperfecto de indicativo en cláusulas adverbiales que expresan posibilidad o conjetura. Por ejemplo, en vez de usar el imperfecto de subjuntivo y decir, “Aunque tuviera tiempo, no visitaría…”, dicen: Aunque tendría/tenia tiempo, no visitaría...Es importante evitar este uso fuera de esas comunidades y en particular al escribir. (Samaniego, et.al., 2005, p. 500).
Again, the prescriptivist, nearly eradicative nature of this particular textbook is evidenced by the fact that it continues to relegate the use of this particular type of language variation to *those communities* and non-written, presumably informal contexts. This appropriateness based argument is reaffirmed by the 7 other notes that aim at “correcting” similar tendencies in the students’ language. Take for example the final note directed at *hispanohablantes* in the text:

Hay una tendencia dentro de algunas comunidades de hispanohablantes a mezclar estos tiempos de distintas maneras. Por ejemplo, en vez de decir “si hubiera ido, habría visto los cuadros”, dicen: *si hubiera ido, hubiera visto los cuadros; si habría ido, habría visto los cuadros; o si habría ido, hubiera visto los cuadros.* Es importante evitar este uso fuera de esas comunidades y en particular al escribir.” (Samaniego, et.al., 2005, p. 514).

Here, not only is the importance of avoiding such behavior again highlighted, but again we see that systematic language variation is treated as a haphazard process. In the above example, not only do *those communities* not use the imperfect subjunctive in the appropriate contexts, but they are also accused of mixing verb modes and tenses altogether. Again, the picture of language variation the student is presented with is one full of haphazard processes and misuses.

In discussing the same aspect of language variation, *Español escrito* again acknowledges the pervasive use of the indicative in place of the subjunctive in yet another footnote:

“En el español coloquial se expresa con frecuencia lo hipotético mediante el uso del tiempo imperfecto de subjuntivo en las dos cláusulas, tanto en la matriz como en la subordinada: “Si tuviera $40,000, me comprara un Cadillac de lujo.” El español popular da un paso más empleando en ambas cláusulas el imperfecto de indicativo: “Si tenía $40,000, me compraba un Cadillac de lujo.” En el presente
libro de texto con preferencia se empleará la construcción prescriptiva que en estas páginas se acaba de presentar” (Valdés & Teshchner, 2003, p. 231).

In fact, there are many properties of U.S. Spanish that have been detailed by Silva-Corvalán and others that are not addressed by any of the texts studied. Perhaps we can assume that the processes which are ignored by the text represent less-stigmatized examples of language variation, ones which the others chose not to discuss due to time and space constraints. Yet it is important to at least acknowledge some of the more prevalent examples here: (1) lexical variation, (2) code-switching, (3) the extension of estar, (4) the loss of the subjunctive (in general – in both the present and the past tenses), (5) the loss of distinction between the preterit and imperfect tenses, (6) the loss of the relative pronoun, que. These processes, and indeed others should be incorporated into the SHL and even present day SFL textbooks. By raising both students’ and teachers’ awareness of these processes, and their existence in non-bilingual contexts as well, texts will do more than just say they value student varieties, they will be able to show this validation by examples and research. Activities could be included which ask the students to go out and observer language in action, and see if indeed such processes are present. By increasing SHL students contact with Spanish, SHL textbooks can help reverse the process of language shift (see Silva-Corvalán, 2001).

**LEÍSMO, ACCEPTING LANGUAGE VARIATION: A QUESTION OF HISTORY AND POWER**

As has been the case in the previous discussions of language variation present in SHL textbooks, the *Avanzando* text continues to ignore language variation altogether, even in the case of the very widespread use of the *leismo*, a use that has come to be
widely accepted not only by Spanish speakers, but also by the *Real Academia Española*. Yet again, a stagnant variety of the language is presented, one which is not flexible enough to include variation of any sort, even the accepted kind. Interestingly, this particular aspect of variation is also not treated in *Español escrito* or *Nuevos mundos*. The *Nuevos mundos* text does not address the topic of direct and indirect object pronouns at all, while the *Español escrito* text only shows the prescribed use of both sets of pronouns. However, both *La lengua que heredamos* and *Mundo 21 hispano* do address indirect and direct object pronominal variation. What is interesting to note here is the distinct tone of such treatment, as opposed to the treatment of other aspects of variation previously discussed.

In *La lengua que heredamos*, the explanation given for the variation between the use of *lo* and *le* is explained in the following way:

“Muchas personas sobre todo en España, distinguen entre *le*, que se usa para personas y *lo*, que se usa para cosas. Así dicen: *Veo el libro; lo veo; Veo a Pablo, le veo*. Las personas que hacen esto se llaman <<leístas>>. La Academia acepta este uso, pero no lo recomienda. En Hispanoamérica, la mayor parte de la gente usa lo tanto para personas como para cosas. Los que hacen esto se llaman <<loístas>>. El uso de *les* como complemento directo en el plural – *veo a los niños, les veo* – no es considerado correcto por la Academia. Evítelo.” (Marqués, 2005, p. 361).

Although many of my own SHL students in fact are *leístas* as well, the treatment of variation here confines such variation to the geographic space of Spain. Again, the prescriptivism of the text is self-evident in the closing statement: *Evítelo*. This command is clearly authoritative in manner. The inherent implication is that such a use would be perceived negatively, though again, there is no explanation as to why it is accepted that the people in Spain portray such stylistic variation in their speech. Furthermore, the issue
of why this particular instantiation of variation is addressed, while other instances of variation in U.S. Spanish are treated as in need of correction is also not addressed. The message to the students is clear. Spanish from Spain is superior to Spanish in the U.S., even in terms of linguistic variation practices.

Perhaps the most disturbing treatment of this particular type of variation comes from the Mundo 21 hispano text. Though we see the typical Nota para hispanohablantes, this particular nota is strikingly different from all the others present in the text:

“Es importante notar que en algunas regiones, en España en particular, le y les se usan como pronombres de objetos directo en lugar de lo y los cuando se refieren a personas: Los soldados del ejército de Benito Juárez capturaron a Maximiliano y le asesinaron.” (Samaniego, et.al., 2005, p.171)

Notice that this is the only nota that doesn’t open with the line “Hay una tendencia” and doesn’t close with the now infamous sentence “Es importante evitar este uso fuera de esas comunidades y en particular al escribir.” The glaring asymmetry which exists between US varieties of Spanish and Peninsular Spanish is highlighted in this one, tiny difference. Though the text is referencing a form of linguistic variation here, it is the only form which is accepted outside of its “typical” context of use. It is the only form which students do not have to avoid outside of the communities which use it. This double-standard is blatantly clear, and again, sends a strong message to the SL students using this text.

It is important to note the prescriptive tolerance, according to the Real Academia Española, of the use of le in the capacity of direct object pronoun (where normally one would use lo or la). In fact, the Academy’s take on this has had sociolinguistic
implications in and of itself. The Academy accepts the use of *le*, particularly in cases referring to men, and is not as tolerant of its use in reference to women. Furthermore, despite the Academy’s acceptance of the use of *le*, its corresponding plural form, *les*, has never achieved the same level of acceptance in the world of prescriptive language; “dada esta tolerancia del “leismo” para referentes masculinos vivos, habrá que preguntarse también por qué no se extiende esta tolerancia al “leismo” plural, que la Academia no ha aceptado nunca” (Klein-Andreu, 1999, 208). In fact, Klein-Andreu’s research goes on to show that this differential treatment of the two forms has in fact resulted in different patterns of linguistic evolution, in part due to the prescriptivist norms maintained by the Academy. What is important to note here is that variation in terms of the use of *le* or *les* (the indirect object pronouns in Spanish) as direct object pronouns is not a unified process, even in Spain. The instantiations of variation differ not only across regions, but also according to pragmatic and syntactic constraints (see again Klein-Andreu, 1999). Despite the ambiguity of its use in actuality and the growing tendency to use both *le* and *les* as direct object pronouns in contexts outside of Spain, SHL textbook treatment of the variation remains decidedly simplistic.

ONE-WAY TRANSLATION: OURS IS BETTER THAN YOURS

With the exception of the *Avanzando* text, language variation is discussed to some degree in all four of the other SHL texts under investigation. Three of the texts also share the common thread of incorporating activities to raise students’ awareness of the differences that exist between monolingual and bilingual varieties of the language. These activities are identical across the three texts. After a brief explanation of the type of
variation present in a given variety of Spanish, the textbooks then present their readers
with an exercise written in that type of Spanish (though all are quick to mention that
writing in such a variety is rare, and used predominantly for stylistic purposes in
literature). In each case, the written exercise requires the students to ‘translate’ from the
local variety into ‘more formal’ Spanish (see Appendix C). Such unidirectional
translation practices go directly against the premises of critical language awareness. As
Leeman states, “Crucially, instructors need to avoid the one-way ‘translation’ of non-
prestige forms into more normative linguistic features” (2005, p. 41). One-way
translation exercises of this nature effectively serve to silence language variation yet
again. Leeman points out that this ‘silencing is “enacted in part through a unitary focus
pedagogical utility of linguistic science in teaching both students and teachers of
language about the arbitrary nature of linguistic prejudice and the inevitability of dialectal
variation” are fundamental to the SHL context (p. 2). I would argue that such linguistic
prejudices are not in fact arbitrary, but rather are based on powerful social and cultural
forces that value one way of speaking (and being) while devaluing another. Linguistic
prejudice, after all, is just a mask covering up even deeper forms of prejudice typically
against a people, culture, ethnicity or race (see Lippi-Green, 2005).

Carreira goes on to state:

“Activities that focus on issues such as dialectal variation and linguistic prejudice
against U.S. Spanish have been argued to be powerful and much-needed tools in
promoting effective communication among the dialectically diverse communities

\[17\] Thanks to Lin Waugh for pointing this out ☺
of Spanish speakers in the United States, and in enhancing the linguistic self-esteem of students” (2000, p. 3).

Rather than emphasizing the differences that exist between so-called standard varieties and U.S. varieties of Spanish, textbooks and SHL programs in general should be focusing on the similarities between the two. The major differences that exist between language varieties are typically not linguistic in nature, but rather social and political, yet these topics remain ignored in many of the SHL textbooks.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Historically, the in-classroom focus both in foreign and heritage language classes has been one of grammatical correctness; this in turn led to an obsession with and eventually the imposition of outside\textsuperscript{18} prestige varieties (Peyton, et.al., 2001). This focus on grammatical correctness presupposes one standard; leading to the fallacy of converting what is essentially an abstract notion into a seemingly realistic truth; “By focusing on prescriptive grammar in an effort to correct their bilingual students’ speech, they are not teaching Spanish as a native language. Rather, they are teaching standard Spanish as a second dialect” (Valdés, 1981, p. 11). As has been shown, the resulting intolerance toward non-conforming, stigmatized speech forms is then magnified in the SHL textbooks, where the imposition of a prestige variety onto a non-prestige-variety is prevalent.

The ‘silencing’ of U.S. varieties of Spanish is “enacted in part through a unitary focus on the norms of the standard language” (Leeman, 2005, p.41). This singular focus

\textsuperscript{18} Outside here refers to Spanish from outside of the US (ie: Spain, Central & South America, Mexico, etc)
on the standard is both overtly and covertly addressed in the texts under study. All of the
texts mention the need to study and learn the standard and use it in appropriate contexts.
Yet this unitary focus on the standard is further reinforced by activities which require
students to translate or decipher U.S. varieties of Spanish into so-called standard
Spanish. As Leeman (2005) indicates, uni-directional translation from local varieties
into the standard can serve to reinforce dominant societal hegemonic ideologies. In fact,
“…the construct of appropriateness, which on the surface appears to value linguistic
diversity, is premised on a misrepresentation of linguistic variation and acts to legitimize
the dominant position of prestige varieties” (Leeman, 2005, p. 38). A close CDA based
inspection of SHL textbooks reveals a favored prejudice toward a pseudo-Castilian
Spanish. The promotion of this dialect serves to silence student dialects by relegating
their use to the home environment and effectively silencing such varieties in larger
contexts of use.

Dialect eradication, biloquialism, appreciation of dialect differences and critical
based dialect awareness (CBDA) all share a similar goal. Each, in its own way attempts
to inform the student about the existence of a (or several) standard dialect(s). CBDA,
alone, however, affords the student the empowering information of how it is that varieties
of a language come to be stigmatized/elevated, and allows the student to make his/her
own decision as to which variety of the language to employ when. In fact, the goal of
CBDA is not mere dialect awareness, but rather dialect flexibility, with the intention of
better controlling the projection of one’s own self-image should one choose to do so.
A PROPOSAL FOR THE FUTURE

Martínez’s conception of Critical Based Dialect Awareness (hereafter CBDA), not only addresses the need to appreciate dialect differences, but also addresses the need to critically evaluate their sociolinguistic underpinnings and political motivations. This critical aspect of dialect awareness is glaringly missing in most textbooks to date, as well as in a majority of classrooms. Under the CBDA framework, students are made aware that the linguistic equality among languages and dialects is mismatched by the underlying social inequalities which language both marks and masks. Students and teachers need to be made aware of how language practices are intrinsically linked to power relations and unconscious ideological processes\textsuperscript{19} (Fairclough, 1992). Martínez states that such ideas are not new to the SHL field, but rather, are matters that are consistently treated in the later years of SHL programs. By informing students from both a linguistic and a critical-sociolinguistic perspective students themselves will be more able to make their own informed decisions about which variety they would like to use within any given context. Under such a framework, students would be shown how languages are valued or devalued, based on the power society affords to their users (Fairclough, 1992). The hope is that a critical framework of this nature will empower students to be able to “…contest the rampant racist ideologies that use language as a pretext for social subordination” (Martínez, 2003, p.9). We need to empower the learners themselves by giving them their own analytical framework within which they can judge their own current, past, and future language experiences and make their own educated decisions (Pennycook, 1991).

\textsuperscript{19} Ideology is understood here in the sense in which it is used in Tollefson (1995), where ideological power is the ability to project one’s own beliefs as universal and commonsense.
Additionally, I feel that in light of the intrinsic connection between language and culture, an essential co-component of CBDA must include some treatment of cultural awareness as well. Biculturalism is necessarily implied in bilingualism (Agar, 1991). SHL instructors are not simply teaching dialects and languages, we are teaching ways of being and understanding the world as well. Especially within the SHL field, there is a critical need to link language to culture (O’Neil, 2000). Clearly, “the goals for Spanish revitalization cannot be separated from those for cultural pluralism” (Villa, 1996, p.96). This wider definition of communicative competence necessitates an understanding of dialect, language and cultural awareness as understood in the sociolinguistic tradition.

It is imperative we tap not only the linguistic resources that students bring with them to the classroom, but their cultural resources as well (Ortega, 1999a). Students need to be made aware of the intrinsic connection that exists between language, identity and culture. SHL classes should not only work to promote CBDA but also critical based cultural awareness (CBCA). As evidenced by my analysis of the cultural components of texts used in SHL classes, not only should instructors and students be empowered through language knowledge, but also through cultural knowledge as well. Liberation from hegemonic ideologies requires active participation by students, where they are allowed to arrive at their own understandings of social asymmetries, and not merely come away with knowledge of the instructor’s perceived differences (Freire, 1998).
CHAPTER 5: BACK TO REALITY: CDA FROM THE STUDENTS’ PERSPECTIVE

The last phase of my analysis connects my research back to the population of students which inspired it. In this last phase, I conducted a survey of all students age 18 and older, enrolled in any of the classes where the textbooks under investigation were being used here at the University of Arizona (see Appendix A for a copy of the survey). There were 4 total class sections using the *Mundo 21 hispano* at the time of the survey, which was administered in the Fall of 2005. The student participants (N=42) completed a brief survey which investigated three distinct areas: (1) student opinion of the textbook, (2) a brief reading and reaction section, and (3) a brief survey of student goals and motivation as related to SHL classes and Spanish language revival. The results of the survey were analyzed on both a qualitative and quantitative level. Likert-scale and closed-choice questions were analyzed using descriptive statistics. In the case of open-ended responses, a qualitative analysis was performed, which looked for recurring themes in the student responses.

PART I: STUDENT REACTIONS TO TEXTBOOK PRESENTATIONS OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

In part 1, students responded to 12 questions regarding their perceptions of and satisfaction with their textbooks. As previous research has found that it is best to use a scale with an even number of options, also stating the students often have an easier time with fewer options as opposed to more options, a 4-point Likert scale was constructed (ask Sara for reference). Answers to all 12 questions ranged from strongly agree, agree,
disagree to strongly disagree. Student responses to questions 1 – 13 were coded according to the following scale: 4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. The following table reflects the mean and the standard deviation obtained for each of the questions, across the entire group:

**TABLE 11: Means and Standard Deviations of Student Responses to Pt. I of the Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language used in the textbook is the same as the language my friends/family use.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>There are examples from my culture in the textbook.</strong></td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The textbook positively portrays the type of Spanish I’m used to hearing &amp;/or using.</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>According to the textbook, the type of Spanish spoken in the US is good Spanish.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The textbook says that some Spanish is correct and some Spanish isn’t.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Spanish used in the textbook is Mexican Spanish.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The textbook says that there is only one correct way to write Spanish.</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>The textbook talks about my culture in a positive way.</strong></td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I can relate to the language used in the textbook.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can relate to the topics covered in my textbook.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The textbook talks about many different varieties of Spanish.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Spanish used in my textbook is the Spanish spoken in Spain.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the data in this form are not very clear. With the exceptions of questions 2 and 8, student responses result in mean scores that are somewhere in between agree and disagree, which leaves us with no concrete inclination as to their feelings in one direction or the other. It is important to note, however, that the standard deviations generally hover around the .5 range, indicating that there is a low deviation among student answers.
Thus, in analyzing the data in this format, the only clear conclusions that can be observed are that students do indeed agree that there are examples from their cultures in the textbook and also agree that the textbook talks about those cultures in a positive way.

These results in and of themselves are quite important, for although the analysis presented in the previous chapters clearly details a negative representation of US Latino cultures and US varieties of Spanish, it appears that students do not perceive these same tendencies.

If we turn now to look at the same data in percentage form, student intuitions toward their textbook become much clearer.

TABLE 12: Percent Student Responses per Category for Pt. I of the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language used in the textbook is the same as the language my friends/family use.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are examples from my culture in the textbook.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The textbook positively portrays the type of Spanish I’m used to hearing &amp;/or using.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>According to the textbook, the type of Spanish spoken in the US is good Spanish.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The textbook says that some Spanish is correct and some Spanish isn’t.</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Spanish used in the textbook is Mexican Spanish.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The textbook says that there is only one correct way to write Spanish.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The textbook talks about my culture in a positive way.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I can relate to the language used in the textbook.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can relate to the topics covered in my textbook.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The textbook talks about many different varieties of Spanish.</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Spanish used in my textbook is the Spanish spoken in Spain.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, though there is a divide among students, it is clear that a vast majority seem to agree with the statements made regarding their textbook. The exceptions to this generalization are highlighted in the table. In the case of question 6, the group is divided nearly 50/50 in their responses, reflecting that some do feel the text employs Mexican Spanish, while other do not. This same near equal split is observed in question 12, which may imply that some of the students feel the text presents a Peninsular variety of Spanish, while others see the language of the textbook as Mexican Spanish. Clearly we will need to look to the students’ open responses to have a more clear understanding of their interpretations. In the case of question 7, students clearly disagree with the idea that the textbook presents only one correct way of speaking Spanish, again, a very interesting finding in light of the previous analysis of the presentation of language in Mundo 21 hispano.

Notice that if we group the data into simply agree/strongly agree and disagree/strongly disagree, the results obtained become even clearer:

Table 13: Percent of students agreeing and disagreeing with statements regarding culture in Pt. I of the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly agree</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are examples from my culture in the textbook.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The textbook talks about my culture in a positive way.</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can relate to the topics covered in my textbook.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presented in this light, the tendencies of the data become more salient. In looking at the questions related to culture first (#2, 8, 10), it becomes clear that an overwhelming majority of students, 98% feel that their culture is presented in a positive way in the textbook (see question 8). It is not surprising then, to find that a majority of students (88%) also feel that the textbook presents examples from their culture as well (see question 2). Somewhat intriguing is the more pronounced discrepancy between students’ opinions regarding whether or not they can relate to the topics presented in their textbook, where 64% agree and 37% disagree. This discrepancy could be due in part to the textbook’s heavy emphasis on history and students’ feelings toward that subject, a topic which was highlighted frequently when students were allowed to openly respond to the texts presented, or of course it could just be an issue of personal differences among students. What is important is that students indeed feel that their cultures are present in the textbook. Moreover, they feel that the text’s presentation of their cultures is positive, a finding that is in stark contrast with the results obtained from the CDA performed in the previous chapters. A discussion of this discrepancy, and a potential explanation for the difference of opinion presented by the researcher’s analysis and the student’s reactions will be provided following the discussion of students’ responses to the open-ended questions of the survey, where the basis for their opinions is made explicit.

If we turn now back to the questions related to language presented in this section of the survey, we see that students are less clearly aligned with one another in their feelings towards the textbook’s presentation of language.
Table 14: Percent of students agreeing and disagreeing with statements regarding language in Pt. I of the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly agree</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language used in the textbook is the same as the language my friends/family use.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The textbook positively portrays the type of Spanish I’m used to hearing &amp;/or using.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>According to the textbook, the type of Spanish spoken in the US is good Spanish.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The textbook says that some Spanish is correct and some Spanish isn’t.</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Spanish used in the textbook is Mexican Spanish.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The textbook says that there is only one correct way to write Spanish.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I can relate to the language used in the textbook.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The textbook talks about many different varieties of Spanish.</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Spanish used in my textbook is the Spanish spoken in Spain.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, it is interesting to note that a vast majority of the students (78%) agree with the statement that they can relate to the language used in the textbook. This is especially interesting in light of students’ responses to the reading on language presented in the second part of the survey, where numerous students stated that they cannot relate to the words used in the reading, and in their textbook in general. In fact, the number one student complaint regarding the textbook reflects students’ dissatisfaction with the vocabulary presented in the textbook. This will be discussed in more depth later.

Returning to student responses, we see that many students agree with the idea that the textbook talks about many different varieties of Spanish (75.5%). In fact, the CDA performed earlier upholds students’ intuitions. *Mundo 21 hispano* actually goes to great lengths to include as many varieties of Spanish as possible, more than was found in any
other textbook under investigation in fact. In regards to question 1 & 3, students largely feel that the language presented in the textbook is the same as that which their friends and families use (72%) and agree that the textbook portrays this language positively (68%). A slight majority (64%) feel that the textbook presents US Spanish as “good” Spanish. This is extremely interesting in light of Mundo 21 hispano’s Notas para hispanohablantes which repeatedly reiterate the need to be aware of US Spanish and only use it within those communities where it is found.

Students are rather divided in their opinions regarding questions 6 and 12, both of which deal with the type of Spanish used in the textbook. Question 6 states that the textbook uses Mexican Spanish, while question 12 states that the text employs a Castilian variety of Spanish. In question 6, 51% agree that the text uses Mexican Spanish while 48% disagree. It is not surprising in light of student responses questions 6 that question 12 shows a similar divide. 56% of the students in this case perceive the Spanish of the textbook as a peninsular variety of Spanish, while 44% disagree with this perception. Again, such a divide does not provide us with any detailed insight into how students arrived at such conclusions, yet as will be revealed momentarily, students’ free responses do elaborate on these gut intuitions.

Question 5 again presents a divided opinion. In this case, 58.5% of the students feel that the textbook upholds some varieties of Spanish as correct and others as incorrect while 41.5% of the students disagree with this statement. This could be due in part to the students’ perceptions regarding which language is being used by the textbook. It could also be due to the fact that many students expressed that they do not understand all of the
statements and readings in their textbook, and therefore may not be picking up on the subtleties toward language that are present in the textbook. If, for example, a student does not understand the difference between demonstrative adjectives, and the essentially distancing effect of the word _esas_, then students may not be aware that the _notas para hispanohablantes_ are somewhat derogatory in nature. Students repeatedly make reference to their inability to fully understand the language in the text in their free responses, which could in part account for the divided opinion presented here.

**PART II: IMMIGRATION FROM THE STUDENTS’ PERSPECTIVE**

In the second part of the survey, students were asked to read 2 text selections taken from their textbook, one discussing U.S. Latino culture and the other discussing a U.S. variety of Spanish (again, see Appendix A for full text). Students were provided with the selected text in both Spanish (as it appeared in the textbook) and English (my translation), to allow for faster reading and increased comfort with the study, thereby increasing student participation. After completing each of the readings, students were asked to respond to several closed and open-ended questions, in which they expressed their opinions about the readings, thus providing their own, mini-CDA.

In the first reading students were presented with discussed immigration to the United States from Central America. After completing the reading in either English or Spanish, students were then asked to react to the text. They were presented with three options: positive, neutral or negative, and asked to select only one. 6 students (14% of those surveyed) stated their reaction was positive, while 6 stated it was negative. The overwhelming majority of the students, 71%, said that they were neutral towards the
reading (N=30). After stating their initial reaction, students were asked to explain why they chose the answer which they chose. Their responses are enlightening, and truly will help to explain not only their reaction to this text, but the responses discussed earlier as well.

Students’ responses tended to group around 2 dominant themes. The first and most prominent theme found in their responses is the frequent reference to the text’s presentation of facts. In fact, it seems that many students do not feel they could have a positive or negative reaction to the text because it is, as they stated, simply presenting factual information. 17 of the students responding mentioned that the reading was simply stating facts. As one student commented: “It really just states the fact and isn’t really blaming anyone” (John, pseudonym). A compilation of student comments follows below:

**TABLE 15: Student reactions to Immigration reading – just the facts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203.5a</td>
<td>It is positive because in this entire paragraph the reader can tell a lot about the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.6a</td>
<td>There are a lot of facts that talk about immigration but I don’t understand what it is all referring to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.6b</td>
<td>It’s good in terms of facts and such but it’s rather dull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.2b</td>
<td>Because it is merely explaining why the various central American countries began massive immigration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.3b</td>
<td>Because the truth of history is said that immigration was a real problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.4b</td>
<td>Because it just summarized the how of immigration in Central and North America. It talked about what was behind the cause of immigration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.10b</td>
<td>The reading is something negative that happened but its something historic that happened and there’s nothing we can do about it now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.3c</td>
<td>I didn’t really know what had caused certain immigration movements. It does not seem like a paper written by opinion but more about facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.4c</td>
<td>The text is neutral because it does not side with whether or not the waves of immigration was a good or bad thing. Although it talks about instability in Central America, it does not give an opinion, it just states a fact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.7c</td>
<td>It was very informative and unbiased in the way it was written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.8c</td>
<td>I think people should know the true reality of what is really going on in Central America, and why they are forced to come to this country to live a better life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that these students see their textbooks as a source of truth. They state, at times explicitly, at times implicitly, that they are unable to form a positive or negative reaction to the text because they believe that the text is simply presenting reality. It should be noted that these students do not seem to perceive the fact their textbooks are actively creating, transmitting and selectively reproducing “culture” through the information presented therein (see also Ashby 2003). The students are picking up on the fact that textbook narratives are considered to superficially serve the function of information-giving; however, as has been shown by the CDA performed in this dissertation, closer examination reveals the negative nature of the discourse produced in these same texts (again, see Ashby, 2003). In fact, some researchers argue that even teachers often regard the textbook as “authoritative, accurate and definitive” (Cruz, 1994, p.53), especially those TA’s typically found in lower and intermediate level college courses, who have undergone little preparation in the field of teacher training (Potwoski, 2002). Perhaps these students are merely reacting to the presentation of the text. As one student adeptly stated: “All textbooks seem the same to me. It’s what the teachers do with them that makes them different.” (María). María’s intuition is right on; the student is apt to believe what he/she reads in a textbook unless the teacher or some other authority figure questions its validity and truth-value. It is disheartening to note that the people teaching Spanish HL classes often have not been trained in SHL pedagogy, and therefore are not aware of the sensitive connection between language and identity that is so often relevant in the SHL context (Potowski, 2002). As Ashby states, these students are being exposed to similar information not only in the Spanish textbooks, but also in
other textbooks, the news media and in daily life. Thus, they are “…very likely (to) eventually end up contributing to racist propositions that then become racial macropropositions on a larger scale…” (Ashby, 2003, p.222). It is precisely this subtle dissemination of hegemonic ideologies that this dissertation intends to highlight. Student responses indicate that students perceive the information in the textbook to be truthful, and therefore do not question the presentation of reality that the texts offer them. In part, this contributes to the propagation of anti-immigrant ideologies, so rampant in the United States today.

Such anti-immigrant ideologies have been studied profusely by van Dijk. As van Dijk states, discourse itself is “the principal means for the reproduction of racist prejudices and ideologies” (2004, on-line). In fact van Dijk holds that textbooks, as the predominant form of educational discourse, plays an explicit role in the reproduction of societal order. Textbooks’ so-called “hidden curricula” are integral in the reproduction of dominant ideologies (see also Apple, 1979, 1982, 1993; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991).

In his research on Spain’s social science textbooks, van Dijk found that “the main explanation of migration is the negative motivation of people in poor countries, rather than the needs of rich countries” (2004, on-line). Immigration is factually presented as caused only by the needs of immigrants. The potentially beneficial effects of such immigration for the “richer” countries is completely ignored by most textbooks, according to van Dijk. Though van Dijk’s research centers solely on what textbooks are presenting to their readers, the current dissertation aims to explore, in part, van Dijk’s claim that such a presentation of information results in the dissemination of anti
immigrant feelings, and an overall understanding of immigration that parallels the findings just presented.

In looking at student reactions to the text on immigration from Central America, we in fact see that van Dijk’s claim is indeed upheld by the responses of the students. In fact, the second most common theme in the data is that of the “need” to immigrate to the US due to the impoverished conditions in the countries of origin. This interpretation of the reading is not surprising, in light of the readings repeated references to political and economic strife in the countries mentioned. What is interesting, is that students do not perceive this presentation of immigration as either negative or derogatory; to them, it is simply factual information. Yet when they set out to explain their understanding of the factual information, they invoke the dominant ideologies latent in the discourse. 13 students referenced some sort of a need for the Central Americans to escape their lives and find a better life in the United States. As some of the responses overlap with those that were previously presented, a compilation of only the new responses reflecting this theme follows.

**TABLE 16: Student reactions to Immigration reading – immigrants have to immigrate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>203.1a</th>
<th>The situation in the countries was tough, so in order to provide for their families people migrated to the US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203.2a</td>
<td>There has always been immigration to the United States and there always will be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.12a</td>
<td>Many immigrants immigrated to the United States because of economic or political instability in their home country. Portrays the countries as less than the US. Portrays the countries in a negative way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.3b</td>
<td>Because the truth of history is said that immigration was a real problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.7b</td>
<td>I felt that this passage was negative because it labels the Central Americans as a troubled people that come to the US to escape their lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
What is interesting is the correlation that students have made, in several of their responses, between the presentation of fact and the perceived need for Central Americans to leave their countries and flee to the United States. One student even uses one of the often cited metaphors for immigration, IMMIGRATION AS WATER, in her response to justify the presentation of fact. The student responses are an excellent indication of the power of the cognitive underpinnings of metaphor and metonymy and their role in constructing anti-immigrant notions. By metonymous association, the Central American nations, as a whole, are understood as politically divided and economically weak. The perceived need to immigrate to the US for a better life therefore becomes “obvious;” thereby allowing the interpretation of the reading as the presentation of purely factual information.

One of the most fascinating responses to this reading came from a student whose family is from Central America. This student wrote: “I chose this answer (neutral) because I have little to say about the topic. My family immigrated here from Central America, so I really can’t say much about it.” It’s fascinating to note that despite the student’s personal experience with the issue, he does not feel credible enough to hold an
opinion against or in favor of the text presented in the textbook. This lack of credibility and empowerment on the part of the student is reminiscent of Pomerantz’s finding in her study of Shadyside School. In her study, students studying Spanish as a foreign language were able to construct themselves as more legitimate users of the language than native speakers of Spanish! She found that personal experience with the language was not valued as much as academic success in the language. In the case of the student from Central America, we see that despite having personal experience with the topic, she does not see herself as credible enough to formulate an opinion on the reading. The power of the textbook to present facts that are more credible than personal experience is amazing! Clearly, the inequalities evident in these ideologies need to be acknowledged in order to be effectively counteracted. The language classroom, and language textbooks represent an inherently political arena, and must be treated as such if the current educational asymmetries are ever to be rectified.

The final most common reaction to this particular reading is that of indifference. Numerous students stated that they had no reaction to the reading because the reading itself does not affect them. Some stated that they did not know any Central Americans. Others stated that they are Mexican-American, and therefore the topic of the reading is uninteresting to them. Still others stated that they dislike history in general and therefore were bored by the reading. In all cases, however, it is imperative to note that only two of the students who explicitly stated their families were from Central America, aligned themselves with the people in the readings. The rest of the students, a majority of whom were Mexican-American, and a few of whom were from a Caribbean background did not
“relate” to the topic of the text. This, of course, causes a problem when we consider the use of the term Hispanic or *Hispano* or *Latino* in the textbook. If students do not relate to these people, and are disinterested in their history; how can we legitimately use the term *Hispano* to include these diverse groups under one umbrella? The students have picked up on the differences that exist between groups, rather than the similarities that exist. The labeling of *Hispanos* stems from a dominant, Anglo perception, that all those who speak Spanish are the same in some sense. Clearly, the students surveyed here do not agree.

**PART II CONTINUED: LANGUAGE FROM THE STUDENTS’ PERSPECTIVE**

In this section of the survey, students were again presented with a short excerpt from the text, this time one which focused on the discussion of language. In order to avoid sensitive issues of identity and language connection, a passage on Cuban Spanish was chosen, as there were no participants in the study from Cuba. Students were asked to read the selection and then react to it. Their reactions entailed 4 closed-item responses and one open-ended question in which they again justified their reaction to the text in their own words.

Students were posed the following questions, and given the following options for their responses.
TABLE 17: Questions from Part II’s reading on Caribbean Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is this reading positive, negative or neutral in its portrayal of...</td>
<td>-positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>According to this reading, how would you describe Caribbean Spanish?</td>
<td>-very good Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-good Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-OK Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-bad Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is this dialect of Spanish____________, based on the description...</td>
<td>-easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-harder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does this reading make you want to study Caribbean Spanish?</td>
<td>-yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students again had an overall positive reaction to this reading, again, in spite of the researcher’s analysis of the text. 23 students, or 58%, indicated that the reading was positive. 14 students, or 35% indicated that it was again neutral for them, and only 3 (7%) responded that the reading was negative. Again, we will see students reference the presentation of fact and truth in their justification for these responses.

In students’ free responses to the question of why they perceived the reading as either positive, neutral or negative, several themes emerged, the most prominent of which, again, was a reference to the presentation of factual information. Other topics which emerged include: students’ personal experiences, the pedagogical nature of the text, and simple positive or negative statements. Again, if we look first to students’ references to fact, we see that students invoke this idea again 15 times. The following types of statements are found in the data:
TABLE 18: Students’ appeals to fact for justifying their responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>203.1a</th>
<th>The text only says what is happening it doesn’t really give an opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203.2a</td>
<td>this reading is just showing how some cultures language is different and I think that is important to know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.4a</td>
<td>It shows different kinds of Spanish language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.6a</td>
<td>It’s just showing the differences in their language but they don’t say that its bad at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.9a</td>
<td>Again, I see this as a neutral piece because it is relating information to the reader. No opinions are involved; therefore, it has no specific effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.10a</td>
<td>It is an accurate description of what happens to the people on the Caribbean coast, but it makes it seem like it is incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.12a</td>
<td>It is merely describing a certain type of Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.8b</td>
<td>It’s just explaining who uses the dialects and how it works. It also explains that this dialect is only spoken, not written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.11b</td>
<td>It was about different areas speaking different Spanish. Its normal cause they are in different areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.3c</td>
<td>The author is again stating what is known (facts) and it could be taken in a negative way – but it is not insulting nor demeaning; just a fact of how people speak in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.4c</td>
<td>The text is just describing a fact about Caribbean culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.5c</td>
<td>I think it’s positive because it’s true, when talking you could use words that have been uttered with, but when you write you must use the true word for the reader to know exactly what you are saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>It is just talking about different Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>It simply states a fact without prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>It simply states the difference of dialect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In looking at student responses to question 2, we see a somewhat divided reaction to the reading’s portrayal of Caribbean Spanish. Only one student thought the reading portrayed the variety as “very good Spanish,” while 7 students, or 18% thought Caribbean Spanish was bad, based on the reading. The vast majority classified the Caribbean variety as either good (N=16, 40%) or ok (N=16, 40%). It seems students interpret Caribbean Spanish in a generally positive light, though it is clear that it is not considered a prestige dialect in their estimations. This perception is corroborated in students’ response to question 4, where 23 students, or 58%, stated that they would not be interested in learning Caribbean Spanish, based on the knowledge they gained from the
17 students (42%), however, stated that they would be interested in studying Caribbean Spanish. Again, students are quite divided on the issue, and unfortunately, few students chose to elaborate on this area, thereby leaving us with very limited data.

Lastly, it is interesting to look at students’ perceptions of the difficulty level of Caribbean Spanish. Only 5 of the students, or 13%, perceive of the variety as easier based on the reading, whereas many more perceive of it as either of equal difficulty (N=16, 43%) or harder (N=16, 43%). As one student stated, “it’s ridiculous how those different words get changed. They can speak it right so why not say it the way it’s supposed to be.” Another simply stated “I don’t want to talk like they do.” This perception of right versus wrong, coupled with the text’s presentation of the haphazard nature of changes that occur in the Caribbean language may have contributed to the relatively large percent of student who perceive Caribbean Spanish as difficult.

If we look now to students’ open-ended responses to this part of the survey, again we find enlightening information. Students were asked to explain why they would or would not choose to study Caribbean Spanish, based on the reading. The reasoning behind their responses varied across 4 prominent themes: curiosity and interest (12 responses), negative perception (i.e.: improper Spanish) (11 responses), relevance to their lives (10 responses), and personal experience (3 responses). Obviously, the limited number of responses in the category of personal experience is due to the fact that the majority of the population being studied is Mexican-American, and therefore have not had as much experience with Caribbean Spanish. There were, however, three speakers of
a Caribbean variety of Spanish, all of whom mentioned their own personal experience with this variety of Spanish.

The table that follows shows the responses of those students who expressed curiosity or interest in learning Caribbean Spanish.

**TABLE 19: Student responses to why they want to study Caribbean Spanish: Curiosity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>203.8</th>
<th>Curiosity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>It would be interesting to know another dialect of Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>Because I would like to learn other ways of speaking Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>It's interesting to see how Spanish is used differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.7c</td>
<td>It makes me want to learn a different type of Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.6c</td>
<td>I find the varieties of Spanish in different parts of the world interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.2c</td>
<td>Well it would be interesting to learn how they speak, what has happened over time and linguistics that causes them to change. Take for example Spanish in Spain, they have a lisp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.1c</td>
<td>It would be interesting and fun learning varied dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.10b</td>
<td>I think it’s interesting how the same language can be said and pronounced differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.5b</td>
<td>Just to know what different words are spoken different to better understand the dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.7a</td>
<td>I find it interesting to study different dialects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems in this case, the students have an intrinsic motivation to learn different varieties of Spanish. None of their responses reference the reading itself; rather, students own curiosity seems to motivate their desire to learn more about the Caribbean variety of Spanish.

In the case of the students who cited relevance (or lack thereof) for studying Caribbean Spanish, we again see responses that do not invoke any particular aspect of the reading. Rather, students cite their own personal reasons for wanting to study or not study Caribbean Spanish.
TABLE 20: Student responses to why they want to study Caribbean Spanish: Relevance

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>I don’t want to learn because I don’t think it’ll be relevant to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>No because most likely I will not use this speech in everyday life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>Not really because I am already used to my Spanish speaking habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.11b</td>
<td>I want to learn Spanish from Mexico first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.9b</td>
<td>I’m not interested in learning Caribbean Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.1b</td>
<td>Maybe if I traveled there and wanted to fit in, but otherwise no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.12a</td>
<td>Spanish is Spanish. Though there are many types Caribbean Spanish would not be useful to me unless I was going to use my Spanish speaking skills in Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.9a</td>
<td>It is just information presented. Linguistics is not something I’m interested in so no, I wouldn’t consider researching it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.6a</td>
<td>I wouldn’t want to study Caribbean Spanish because I would want to really get to know the Spanish that is spoken around me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.1a</td>
<td>I don’t live near the Caribbean coast. I want to study Mexican Spanish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, across all responses, we notice that the reading (in at least an explicit sense) played little role in these students decisions. Students’ reasons behind their motivation to study Caribbean Spanish reflect their perceived importance of the language to their personal world. In most cases, students stated that they were not interested in studying this variety of Spanish, because it is not relevant to their own lives. For the same reasons that the students who mentioned personal experience desire to study the variety, those who have little personal experience with the variety do not perceive its potential usefulness in their lives.

Lastly, and perhaps most interestingly, there was a significant number of students who stated that they would not study Caribbean Spanish because of their own negative perception of the language or because they did not perceive it as “proper” Spanish (their words). The students who answered in this way at times do make reference to the
reading, thereby showing that they do perceive a negative undercurrent to the reading, whether at a conscious or unconscious level.

**Table 21: Student responses to why they want to study Caribbean Spanish: Negative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.10</td>
<td>I don’t like to talk like they do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.8c</td>
<td>Because it is not proper Spanish and this might cause some confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.5c</td>
<td>I am more interested in proper Spanish (correct way) because learning proper Spanish, you have a more general sense of the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.4c</td>
<td>Right now I am trying to learn “proper” Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.3c</td>
<td>Yes so I could see the differences in Caribbean Spanish and “proper” Spanish. No, because it wouldn’t really matter since you are learning an appropriate almost universal form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.8b</td>
<td>It sounds too much like if the speaker has a speech problem plus when writing you want to be able to speak what you write correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.7b</td>
<td>Because it frames it in such a way that it is not really Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.6b</td>
<td>I am from Argentina and that would just mess up my language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.2b</td>
<td>No because it sounds strange and who uses Caribbean Spanish anyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.10a</td>
<td>It makes it seem like this type of Spanish is wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In four of the responses, students make reference to the reading’s presentation of Caribbean Spanish. Notice the use of the word “it” in responses 203.8b, 203.7b, 203.2b, and 203.10a. In each case, the pronoun “it” is used to reference the reading. Thus, students’ negative understanding of Caribbean language is derived in part from the reading’s presentation of the language. It is interesting that those students who make reference to incorrect or improper Spanish are the only ones to reference the reading itself.

One final response that merits comment, in fact the only response that I could not isolate into one of the aforementioned themes is also very pertinent and interesting for the present study: “I have enough problems with the Spanish I’m learning right now as it is” (Roberto, pseudonym). This student has touched upon one of the most important issues
Part III: Students’ Motivation for Studying Spanish

The following section of the questionnaire looked at students’ motivation for studying Spanish, coupled with which type of Spanish they would like to learn, if given the chance to choose the variety taught for themselves. Students were given the option to select multiple motivations, thus resulting in a larger number of total responses (N=106). Of the 106 responses given, the overwhelming majority of students, indeed nearly all of those participating, indicated that the desire to improve their Spanish was one of their principal motivations in studying the language. 36 of the 42 students participating indicated this response.
It would have been interesting to see what students’ themselves define as improvement, and what language it is that they aspire to, but that does not fall within the scope of the current study. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the need for improvement again upholds Ruiz’ idea that oftentimes, heritage language students approach the language learning situation from a language-as-problem perspective. That is, they perceive their own language as inadequate in some way and in need of improvement. This builds off of the idea that languages like Spanish, which have been framed as foreign languages in the US context, despite their long historical trajectories in that same context, become decontextualized from their contexts of use here in the United States. The restriction of so-called natural bilingualism\(^{20}\) alongside the promotion of learned bilingualism\(^{21}\) has been a recurrent theme throughout US history (Dicker, 2003). Languages and cultures need to be foreign in order to be accepted; when they are found in our own backyard, they are almost always rejected.

Such orientations toward language result in two interacting asymmetries of language learning within the U.S: the study of English is valued above the study of all other languages, and foreign language studies are valued over heritage (or minority) language studies. The educational industry is dealing with a double edged sword: (1) how to validate the study of languages other than English\(^{22}\) and (2) how to undo the elitist asymmetry that favors foreign language learning by the majority group over heritage language learning (often of the same language) of the minority group. These competing

\(^{20}\) also referred to as folk bilingualism or group bilingualism

\(^{21}\) also referred to as elitist bilingualism, academic bilingualism or individual bilingualism

\(^{22}\) Currently, English, math and science are much more highly esteemed than FL education, which is seen as more akin to the study of music or art, academically admirable, but not necessarily useful.
hierarchies result in social asymmetries, privileges and deprivations that begin in the educational system and are perpetuated throughout life. Students’ motivation to improve their Spanish is evidence of the language-is-problem orientation that they have internalized. By and large in the United States today, the attitude toward so-called folk bilingualism remains negative, even feared, while the “Bilingualism that is valued is the elite variety – full competency in two languages among a small percentage of people for the purpose of scholarly work, diplomacy, foreign trade, or travel.” (Dicker, 1996, p. 63). Clearly, the students in the current study have internalized these feelings. As Fishman states, it is the job of educators to bring HLs into the mainstream of both public and higher education in order to combat these feelings (2001).

A further paradox surrounds the issue of language education in the United States; namely, that Spanish itself continues to be deemed a foreign language, despite the fact that it is also a native language to many in the United States (Valdés, 1995). In fact, the Spanish were the first to colonize major parts of what is known today as the United States (Dicker 1996). The Spanish-Mexican presence in the US Southwest predates that of all other European settlers (Valdés, 2000)! Much like English, Spanish is spoken both within the U.S. borders and outside of them, on a broad and far-reaching scale. I contend that very few Americans know these facts, due in part to the limited discussion of this aspect of US history in public school discourse. Thus, Spanish continues to be understood as a “dialectally splintered” immigrant language (Dicker, 1996, p. 28), despite its long-standing existence as a literary, standardized language both within the US context and beyond.
Language ideologies play an imperative role in supporting these asymmetries. Family legends, conventional wisdom, political principles, ethnic paranoia, melting pot mythologies and underlying conceptual metaphors and contribute to the oppressive discursive practices that frame our understanding of language (see Davies, 2003; Dicker, 1996; 2003; Santa Ana, 1999; 2002). Within the United States, English is the majority language, and thus, the unmarked language as well. Spanish in the U.S. is seen as a minority language, and thus is a member of the class of marked languages, only one of many that co-exists along with English. According to Ruiz, unmarked languages undergo planning from a language as resource orientation (Ruiz, class notes, 2004). ESL classes, as well as the English-Only movement frame the acquisition of English as equal to that of acquiring a tool, or an empowering resource that will help all individuals to better their social and economic well being. Spanish and other minority languages, on the other hand, are treated from a language-as-problem orientation. Not only are U.S. Spanish speakers taught that the Spanish language is not as necessary to their future as English is, but they are also taught that the variety of Spanish which they speak represents bad Spanish, and should be eradicated. Worse yet, code-switching practices within the bilingual Spanish-speaking community are viewed by outsiders as a lack of linguistic ability in either one or both of the languages. Often, bilingual community members themselves view code-switching in a derogatory manner, and are often apologetic of their code-switches or even embarrassed by them (Baker & Prys Jones, 1998). Again, the negative stigma attached to bilingual community language practices, as well as the
language-as-problem orientation attached to varieties of U.S. Spanish add to the inequities present in the current educational framework.

These same orientations frame our understandings of foreign language and heritage language study in the U.S. as well. Again, the study of Spanish as a FL is encouraged as a resource that will be useful to the majority population. HL learning, however, is often approached from a language-as-problem orientation; in this case, it is the task of the teacher to eliminate any remnants of a stigmatized variety of Spanish, and equip the student with a more sufficient or worthy foreign standard. Again, ethnic languages are treated as problems while foreign languages are treated as resources (Ruiz, 1990). The irony of the situation is that in the case of Spanish, the same language is viewed through two completely different lenses resulting in the deprivation of resources in the case of minority students, while their majority counterparts enjoy the addition of the same valuable resource that the former group was robbed of! When one considers the value that US society places on second-language learning, “…it is essentially illogical to insist that non-English speakers give up their own languages” (Dicker, 1996, p.26). As Roca states, “…foreign language study and language minority education must be seen as complimentary paths towards the same goal” (1999, p.308). Currently, the two are on very divergent paths.

Returning now to our discussion of student motivation, students’ reasons for studying Spanish do not focus solely on the need to improve their language, rather we see a varied array of other responses as well which are involved in their motivation. Students’ motivations for studying Spanish are tabulated in the chart below.
It is interesting to note that the second most prevalent reason given for studying Spanish is to allow students to communicate with friends and family (N=24). Again, it is important to observe that more than half of the students surveyed indicated that this was one of the principal motivations behind their study of Spanish. The issue of communicating with friends and family in Spanish is one that is rarely taken up by the textbooks. There is such an overbearing focus on academic Spanish in the textbooks that I have often wondered if rather than serving to improve communication between family members it doesn’t serve to further divide families in some senses. If one of students’ main motivations to study the language is to communicate with friends and families, it seems to me that the textbooks themselves should incorporate more opportunities for the students to do just that. Glenn Martínez, in his article entitled Classroom Based Dialect
Awareness in Heritage Language Instruction: A Critical Applied Linguistic Approach offers some tacit suggestions for how to incorporate ethnography based activities across all levels of SHL instruction. Such activities require students to go out into the Spanish-speaking community and observe language related activities relevant to the surrounding communities. In my own classes, I have incorporated family interviews as part of the class requirements. Such activities respond to students’ desire to communicate with friends and family in Spanish, while simultaneously giving them the metalanguage to talk about the linguistic practices common to their own speech communities.

Many students also reference the idea of Spanish as a resource in citing a job as one of their principal motivations to learn the language (N=18). This particular aspect is highlighted in numerous textbooks. In fact, Martínez & Leeman have argued that today’s SHL textbooks have been transformed into tools for the marketization of Spanish. They argue that textbooks published in the 90’s as opposed to those published in the 70’s and 80’s “…emphasize economic competitiveness, globalization, and the commodification of linguistic and cultural diversity” (2005, p.1). According to their analysis of several popular SHL textbooks, Spanish is represented as an invaluable tool for professional success (Leeman & Martínez, 2005). The most important aspect of their findings is the shift in ideologies present in the textbooks. As the authors state,

“In textbooks designed specifically for heritage speakers there is a radical departure from the earlier constructions of students’ language ownership, a representation that afforded them linguistic legitimacy and authority. In SHL textbooks from the 1990’s, Spanish does not ‘belong’ to heritage students, but nor is it portrayed as an obstacle to Latino success” (Leeman & Martínez, 2005, p. 24).
This shift in focus is particularly relevant to the present discussion, for it is reflected not only in students’ view of the utility of Spanish as a tool toward career advancement, but also in their desire to “improve” their Spanish. These two ideas combined together reflect that same shift in ideology that Leeman and Martínez found across textbooks. Students no longer view themselves as legitimate speakers of their language, but as students, acquiring a new Spanish, one that will afford them more opportunities not only with their friends and family, but also in terms of career development.

Of course, many students also cite the requirement to study a foreign language as one of their motivations for taking Spanish at the university level (N=14). Several students mentioned the desire to better understand Spanish (N=13), which combines with the idea of improving their Spanish, this time from a receptive standpoint. Very few students mentioned the desire to pursue interests in literature (N=3); however, it is important to note that this is one of the most prominent themes across all textbooks. Not only is academic writing emphasized in the textbooks (and as a topic of SHL research as well) but also literary excerpts and writers themselves are two prominent topics in all of the texts studied. In fact, if we return to the idea of who is presented most frequently in pictures of people found in the textbooks, we see that authors are the most prominent of all groups! This overbearing focus on literature is reflective of the state of Spanish departments in the US in general today. Literature is still much favored over linguistics; this can be seen in the sheer number of faculty devoted to each area in departments. In many cases, departments have one “token” linguist. Applied linguistics as a subfield
within linguistics is also marginalized. Couple that with the fact that “The teaching of minority languages is not yet recognized as a legitimate and separate area of applied linguistics” (Valdés, 1995, p. 303), and the ignored state of heritage language education in this country becomes blatantly apparent. Clearly, “In order for the teaching of minority language to be more than a well-intentioned but meaningless response to population changes, much needs to be done” (Valdés, 1995, p. 321).

PART IV: WHAT SPANISH DO STUDENTS WANT TO LEARN?

In one of the final questions of the survey, students were simply asked to state which type of Spanish they would prefer to learn, if given a choice. In this case again, students were allowed to select more than one option, resulting in a total of 81 responses. The results of their responses are tabulated in the chart that follows.

**Figure 4: Students’ Preferred Variety of Spanish**

As can be seen in the chart, students overwhelmingly show a preference for Mexican Spanish (N=26, 62%), which isn’t surprising given the demographics of the population.
and given their stated motivation to utilize their Spanish to communicate with friends and family. The second most popular language preference is Mexican-American Spanish (N=20, 48%); again, this preference is not surprising in light of students’ family backgrounds and their stated goal to speak with friends and family.

12 students, or 29% of those responding, cited the desire to learn academic Spanish. Again, this shows that the majority of students are not studying Spanish for academic purposes. Though there are a significant number of students who express the desire to learn academic Spanish, all of those students also mentioned at least one other variety of Spanish as well as part of the language they would like to be exposed to in the SHL classroom. Again, we should keep in mind that so-called academic Spanish continues to be the focus across textbooks. As Leeman and Martínez state, today’s textbooks tend to emphasize the communicative value of acquiring a universal or global form of Spanish as a linguistics commodity that will help students achieve economic advances (2005). By promoting such ideas, textbooks continue to devalue US varieties of Spanish. Though the terminology has shifted, the message remains the same: US Spanish is still not considered a resource, from an economic standpoint, despite the growing number of people who speak the language. I am not arguing that it is wrong to teach students such a variety of Spanish, but rather that it is imperative that if we indeed to choose to teach such a variety, a discussion of language ideologies become an imperative part of what is taught not only in the SHL context, but in the Spanish as a second language context as well.
Another 11 students, or 26%, stated that they would like to learn US Spanish. Again, it would be interesting to see what students identified as US Spanish. For indeed, the term itself buys into the ideology latent behind the use of the terms *Hispanics* and *Latinos* so prevalent in political, media and educational discourses today. Sociolinguistic research continues to center around specific populations of Spanish speakers within the US, rather than discussing tendencies in US Spanish as a whole. Though there are clearly some common tendencies among the varieties of Spanish in contact with English found within the United States today, there are also some clear differences (see Lynch, 2003 for a discussion of the situation in Miami, which he holds is distinct from all other US Spanish-speaking communities).

Lastly it is important to recognize that only 6 students, or 14% of those surveyed, stated that they would like to learn Castilian Spanish. Though my earlier analysis revealed a continued preference for Castilian Spanish across the textbooks, students do not share this preference. If we are indeed going to succeed in the attempt to better meet the needs of our SHL students, we need to begin to listen to their concerns and preferences and take their insights into account when planning future SHL textbooks and indeed future SHL classes.

Before moving on, I would like to highlight the students’ overall preference to study a variety of Spanish rooted in the US context. If we group students’ answers to this question together, it becomes even more clear that despite a perception to the contrary, students are indeed interested in acquiring one of the varieties of US Spanish. If we group the categories of US Spanish, Mexican-American Spanish and Tucson Spanish
together, we see a total number of responses of \( N = 34 \). Unfortunately, as students were allowed to give multiple responses to this question, I cannot make the claim that 81% of the students are interested in learning a US variety of Spanish; however, I do think it is important to note that at a minimum, an overwhelming number of students chose to highlight these varieties; a finding that contradicts the presupposition of many SHL teachers and textbooks.

**PART V: STUDENTS REACTIONS TO THE TEXTBOOK**

The last question on the survey allowed students an opportunity to react to their textbook in their own words. Again, student responses were instructive in showing what their main areas of concern were. Students responses in this section centered around the following themes: vocabulary issues (\( N=8 \)), grammar issues (\( N=4 \)), English (\( N=7 \)) and facts (\( N=3 \)). It should also be noted that not all students responded to this question; in fact, only 30 of the 42 students or 71% chose to state an opinion about the textbook. Across these themes, student responses reflected either a positive or negative undertone in a majority of cases. 18 students had negative reactions to the text, while 12 students had positive reactions to the text. Some of the students’ responses included both an explicitly positive and an explicitly negative statement, while other responses were either neutral or indifferent (i.e.: “I don’t know. I never read it.” Alison; “The textbook is just a regular book to me” Jorge; \( N=12 \)). Students’ apparent apathy toward their textbook is also interesting. One could speculate many reasons for this apathy, some of which were expressed by the students: expense, text isn’t used, it’s just a book. Yet no one trend
accounted for the neutral responses, and therefore, no real conclusion can be drawn from that aspect of the data.

Students did express strong opinions in terms of the treatment of both grammar and vocabulary in the textbook. The responses regarding grammar are tabulated in the table below.

**TABLE 22: Students’ reaction to the textbook: Grammar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203.6c</td>
<td>I find the parts of the book covering tenses and grammar a little hard to comprehend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.2b</td>
<td>It’s ok. Although I do feel that the Grammar part could use some improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.1b</td>
<td>The textbook is ok. I feel that the integrated grammar lessons are done pretty well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.10a</td>
<td>I dislike it because I don’t think it does a very good job giving grammar examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.9a</td>
<td>The textbook is ok. I don’t know if it’s the teacher or the textbook, but some grammatical things are hard to follow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those students that chose to discuss grammar generally share the opinion that the presentation of grammar in the textbook is not as clear as they would like; though as one student states, she is not sure whether this fact is attributable to the textbook or the teacher. Only one student expressed satisfaction with the grammar section. Granted, there are few responses here from which to draw. Yet the mere decision to discuss grammar is itself interesting. When choosing to evaluate the textbooks, students focus on what might be deemed “typical” aspect of language learning, namely grammar and vocabulary.

Students’ responses regarding the presentation of vocabulary in the text were both more prevalent and more varied. Their responses are again presented in the table that follows:
TABLE 23: Students’ reaction to the textbook: Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>I wish it had more vocab in the back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>I think it’s ok, but they use big words that I’ve never heard before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.9b</td>
<td>The textbook provides a variety of new information on countries around the world, although I believe it’s hard for me to understand most of it because the vocabulary is very difficult. I honestly do not like the textbook for that reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.8b</td>
<td>I think it is a good textbook BUT since it is entirely in Spanish, it is at the same time difficult to understand. Some words or phrases are unfamiliar to me and my family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.7b</td>
<td>I do not like this textbook, it spends too much time on cultural background that can be learned in a history class. Also it uses terms only found in Spain Spanish instead of Mexican Spanish. As a heritage learner, this is what I want to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.3b</td>
<td>I like the text and at the same time dislike it because if I need translations, not all definitions are in the glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.6a</td>
<td>I feel the textbook uses some difficult context and vocabulary that’s hard to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.5a</td>
<td>It teaches a lot of new words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ responses indicate that the presentation of vocabulary in the text is problematic in their opinions. Students cite the difficulty level of the vocabulary or the use of “new words.” One student even explicitly makes reference to the fact that the Spanish used in the textbook is “Spain Spanish” and not “Mexican Spanish” which is what she wants to study. Student 203.8b’s response is particularly interesting as she states that not only is the Spanish found in the textbook unfamiliar to her, but it is unfamiliar to her family as well. The potentially divisive and detrimental effects derived from the imposition of such an outside standard represent a daily challenge in many SHL classrooms. In fact, recently I talked to a heritage learner of Spanish. She had just been informed by her Spanish tutor that the use of –s on the tú form in the preterit tense in Spanish is equivalent to the use of ain’t in English, and was not part of the real Spanish language. She immediately went home and complained to her mother, asking her why she had taught
her bad Spanish. Her mother was mortified to think that the way she had been speaking her entire life was incorrect and spent the rest of the night on the phone calling her friends in other Spanish-speaking countries to see if in fact she was using the wrong form! The issue became much more than a question of student varieties, but resulted in a questioning of the family’s linguistic practices as well. In essence, when the student’s tutor questioned her use of the –s on the tú form in the preterit tense, she also simultaneously questioned not only the student’s right to use Spanish, but her cultural identity as well. As has been revealed in the CDA of language present in SHL textbooks, this is not an isolated case, but rather a prevalent one present in many SHL textbooks. I spend many weeks every semester trying to convince my students that the Spanish they speak is a valid and legitimate form of the language. Students both need and deserve to be made aware that linguistic processes evidenced in various varieties of US Spanish are also found in non-contact varieties of Spanish, and are representative of normal processes of regularization within the language (Hidalgo, 1990). Students need to be explicitly told that negative stigmas attached to such varieties do not come from some kind of bad linguistic practices, but rather represent socially imposed judgments, not about language itself, but about a language’s speakers. The bulk of my analysis has detailed how this very aspect is blatantly missing in nearly all the textbooks studied. Though texts state an explicit intent to value student varieties of Spanish, they fall short of this goal in the end. Students perceive the discrepancy between the Spanish presented in the text and that which they use, and these same perceptions feed into their desires to improve their Spanish, feeding into aspirations which drive them to acquire a more “global” variety of
the language. In essence, rather than teacher heritage Spanish to SHL students, we continue within the field in which SHL classes were born: foreign language education. What is taught in today’s SHL classrooms continues to be a foreign standard. Students’ perception of this foreignness have been evidenced throughout their responses to this survey. It is imperative that we take their concerns into consideration in publishing and researching in the SHL field.

Lastly, students’ comments about their textbook often mentioned the need for more English. Their responses are detailed in the table that follows:

Table 24: Students’ reactions to the textbook: English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203.3c</td>
<td>I like it because it is informative as are most textbooks. But I also dislike it because some English would help while you are reading, since you are learning!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.11b</td>
<td>I like the fact that it’s all in Spanish, because it makes you learn it, but it’s hard when you don’t understand at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.4b</td>
<td>I feel it’s a very general book and could include more guides and maybe translate parts into English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.3b</td>
<td>I like the text and at the same time dislike it because if I need translations, not all definitions are in the glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.9a</td>
<td>The book should include a little bit of English when explaining things (both languages would allow students to grasp the info better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.6a</td>
<td>There should be some type of translation of what the textbook is trying to portray.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.4a</td>
<td>I think there should be some English instead of all Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.3a</td>
<td>It is a great resource but should contain more English to help readers that are not fluent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ bilingual reality is reflected in their responses. Their desire for English, as a “crutch” to help them understand Spanish is in fact not unique to this group. Previous studies of code-switching have found that English dominant bilinguals often code-switch to English when momentary retrieval of a word in Spanish is less salient for them (see Ducar, 2004; Zentella, 1993). Such students often use English to enhance their
understanding and their abilities in Spanish. This technique has been termed “crutching” by Zentella, as it provides the students with a “crutch” that allows them to take the next step forward in their language processing. In fact, the use of English in Spanish second language classrooms is a contested issue. Some argue that the target language alone should be employed in the classroom while others argue that a combination of both Spanish and English allow students to make more connections between their L1 and their L2\textsuperscript{23}. Though this argument is still open to debate, it is clear that the students’ bilingual reality results in a desire that their textbooks also reflect this bilingual reality.

STUDENT SURVEY: CONCLUSIONS

The student opinions and reactions discussed in this section of the dissertation impart imperative knowledge to those of us who teach, administrate and work with SHL students and SHL programs. In fact, student feedback and assessment of student needs is integral to the continued improvement and development of SHL programs in the US (see Colombia & Roca, 2003). Student responses indicate that they perceive their textbooks as fountains of unquestionable factual knowledge. In large part, they unquestioningly believe the information presented in their text, and in fact have begun to reproduce some of the discursive structures and ideas latent therein.

In the closed-question section of the survey, students overwhelmingly feel that their cultures are presented in the textbooks in a positive way, and a majority of students

\textsuperscript{23} The debate surrounding this issue is intense, and numerous authors could be cited to support both sides of the argument. However, as the intent of this dissertation does not encompass this debate, I refer the reader to a succinct summary of the ideas and arguments present on both sides, offered in Turnbull & Arnett (2002).
also see their language represented in a positive fashion in the textbooks. These findings are of course in stark contrast with the analysis I have performed. Yet students’ responses to the open-ended questions regarding language and their opinions of their textbooks reveal a different opinion. In fact, several students mentioned the discrepancy between the vocabulary presented in the text and the vocabulary that they are used to using.

Student reactions to the readings revealed that students have acquired the frame of immigration that is represented in their textbook. This frame is best defined using van Dijk’s research on immigration as presented in Spain’s social science textbooks: immigration is seen as motivated by a need to escape negative conditions in poor countries and move toward a “better life” in a richer country (2004). As van Dijk notes, the beneficial aspects of immigration for the receiving country is masked by this discourse. Additionally, our understanding of immigrant within this framework is confined to poor individuals, escaping hardships. Clearly, this member categorization device is employed frequently in media, political and educational contexts. I am not arguing that students’ frequent references to this scenario are a specific result of the text they are reading; rather, I am highlighting the propensity of SHL texts to reiterate the popular discourse surrounding immigration and thus feed into the discursive hegemony that surrounds the issue today. Students’ tendency to reproduce this discourse results from their understanding of their texts as a source of truth. In the words of one student, “The text is neutral because it does not side with whether or not the waves of immigration was a good or bad thing. Although it talks about instability in Central America, it does
not give an opinion, it just states a fact;” from this statement, we see how students see history as a stagnant reality, rather than a subjective entity. Such an understanding underscores the need for a critical framework within SHL classes, programs, textbooks, and within academia as a whole. As has been shown, textbooks impart prejudices already inherent in their designers, teachers also impart these same ideas, as they were often trained using similar, or more typically, more stereotypical resources. All of these ideas merge with the preconceived notions of the learner (those of linguistic insecurity in the case of the HL) and lead to the perpetual creation of similar attitudes in society at large due to their entrenched and reinforcing nature which is pervasively present in the current educational system (see also Ashby, 2004).

Student reaction to the reading on Caribbean language again underscores their perception of the texts’ ability to present factual information, despite the fact that one would be hard pressed to find a linguist to agree that the information present in the text that they read could be considered *factual* (though of course the students don’t know this). It is interesting that based on the reading, many students perceive Caribbean Spanish to be more difficult to learn. Nearly all of those with negative reactions to the language referenced the reading in their responses, whereas those who expressed an interest in studying this variety of Spanish did not reference the reading at all, and rather discussed intrinsic or personal motivations for studying it. In fact, students’ perception that the Caribbean variety of Spanish is irrelevant to their lives underscores their understanding of themselves as distinct from the Caribbean culture, an understanding which is not afforded by the incessant referencing to *Hispanos or Latinos* found
throughout their texts, and indeed prevalent in political, media and other educational contexts.

Student motivation to learn Spanish stems in large part from their desire to improve their production and comprehension of the language; however, many students also desire to learn Spanish to communicate with friends and family. As mentioned earlier, though the textbooks do address student desire to improve their Spanish, and in fact focus on this aspect of language learning, no texts incorporate activities which would require students to communicate with friends and family in Spanish, outside of the classroom. Such activities are vital to the maintenance of Spanish in heritage communities throughout the United States, and should be addressed in future SHL textbooks.

Overall, students expressed general agreement with the statements regarding their textbook, and hold the text to be a source of factual information. Students reiterate many of the ideas found throughout the text regarding immigration and linguistic insecurities, many of which are also echoed throughout the political, media and educational discourses surrounding US Latino populations. In essence, “the hegemonic construction of linguistic inferiority is implicated in the social and political marginalization of specific groups of people, both within and outside academia” (Leeman, 2005, p.41). We need to critically evaluate not only the language present in today’s SHL textbooks, and indeed in their Spanish as a second or foreign language counterparts, but we also need to take a critical look at the presentation of standardized cultures and the latent stereotypes present in these same textbooks. In fact, according to Leeman, one of the key goals for a critical
SHL pedagogy would include an “…awareness of formal features and sociolinguistic principles…an understanding of the linguistic subordination of groups, and the recognition of students’ own choices to either conform with or contest sociolinguistic conventions both in their own interactions and in society at large” (2005, p.41). It is crucial that today’s SHL instructors not only have a command of the Spanish language and the characteristics of it as manifest in the United States contexts, as well as of the pedagogical practices most useful in an SHL context, but also

“… are also informed about the realities of the minority populations in the geographic/political realms where their target languages are spoken, able to articulate that reality independently of the textbooks they are given to choose from, and most importantly, willing to equip L2 learners with a critical eye for the information received and engage them in critical dialog about it” (Ashby, 2003, p.232)

Though Ashby is speaking in reference to an L2 German language acquisition context, I would argue that the need to be informed on such topics is even more crucial in the SHL context, and needs to become a key component in SHL teacher training and education. Student responses as reported in this dissertation underscore that a critically informed pedagogy is essential to the continued success and development of SHL programs nationwide.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

This dissertation has presented an in-depth CDA of 5 of the most commonly used SHL textbooks today. The findings presented here detail how today’s SHL texts continue to subordinate both US Latino culture and language to the dominant Anglo norm. Though all of the texts analyzed explicitly state that the preservation of students’ language and culture is one of their main goals; the texts fall far short of accomplishing this goal as evidenced not only in this analysis, but more importantly, in the results of the student survey. My analysis has revealed an overall marginalized presentation of US Latinos and their language, consistent with the findings of previous research. Though it is maintained that textbooks today have indeed evolved in many ways from those of the past, there is still much room for growth. I would again like to clarify my position that though the analysis has highlighted the negative aspects of the presentations of US Latinos language and cultures, yet that is not to say that there are not many positive images of famous Latinos in the texts; indeed, the presentation of famous Latinos is what dominates across texts. However, these individuals are indexically presented as icons of success, rather than as integral members of a Spanish-speaking community.

This presentation is starkly contrasted with the presentation of non-famous Latinos in the text. In fact, texts’ place a strong emphasis on immigration issues when presenting non-famous US Latinos. By further stressing the migratory processes of Spanish-speaking peoples and ignoring their historical presence in this country, US Latinos are identified as new immigrants; that is the unmarked status of these individuals.
In other words, the default understanding of the text, which is also reflected in students’ responses to the texts, is that Latinos are understood as an immigrant population, regardless of how long they have lived in the United States. Essentially, the often observed division between a colonial Latino presence and the newer Latino immigrant presence is blurred by the use of grouping terminology: *Hispanics, Latinos, Mexican-Americans*, in textbooks in much the same way as Valdés has discussed this same blurring in mainstream media and politics (2000) due to the overbearing emphasis across texts on immigration itself.

In large part, the textual emphasis on and discussion of immigration related issues results in an *othering* of US Latino populations. Texts create, or more likely, inadvertently follow society’s already regularized presentation of an *Us v. Them* dichotomy, much akin to what van Dijk found in his own textbook analyses (see 2004a; 2004b). The presentation of *us* and *them* is achieved via the discussion of immigrating societies as *unstable, unlivable environments*. This lop-sided, overgeneralized presentation results in an understanding of immigration as a necessary process for Latinos, a process that allows for the escape from *bad* conditions, while providing for the possibility of the achievement of the *American dream*. The subtle presentation of assimilation as a necessary first step toward this process again highlights the need to eliminate the *us v. them* dichotomy in order to fully integrate into our society. What is interesting in the SHL context, is that students are being forced to consider where it is that they fall in this dichotomy, as they read about their own cultures as different from the *Us* of U.S. society as a whole.
The degradation of immigrants carries over into the realm of education and language, where language and group categorization coupled with appropriateness policies serve to marginalize student (heritage) varieties of Spanish. It is imperative to see the connection between the degradation of immigrants and minorities and the simultaneous belittling of the Spanish language. These are not two disconnected discursive strategies; they are tied to each other by having one and the same goal: maintain the social hierarchy by ideologically privileging Anglo-American English speakers over Spanish-speaking immigrant and minority populations. Even today in SHL texts, “Discussion of the Spanish language here conjures up images of illegal aliens, and the restriction of Spanish is metonymically a means of controlling those aliens” (Woolard, 1989, p.274). Though Woolard is not speaking specifically of SHL texts, her comment is quite pertinent to this dissertation. The argument presented in this dissertation maintains that the presentation of US Latinos across texts depends on pre-existing, socio-cognitively based metonymical and metaphorical schemas regarding language, immigration and even our understanding of what it means to be Latino. The rampant, negative discourse surrounding the topic of immigration and indeed language across media, political, education and other discourses are actively invoked in present day America, resulting in a ready uptake of such ideas. It is hard in fact for our students and indeed for any of us to think outside of these concepts and understand immigration as something other than a migratory process where one leaves one area in the hopes of finding something better in another. It is hard to even recognize that this is a culturally understood definition of immigration. It is harder still to
recognize that the categories we have been using to classify people are not pre-existing, given realities, but again, rest on culturally agreed upon notions and ideals.

As this dissertation has shown, SHL texts present immigration as a US Latino issue; thus, reinforcing the dominant understanding of immigration already present in today’s discourse on the issue. As van Dijk points out, textbooks have a propensity toward stereotyping (2004b), in part due to the limited space they have to convey the information they feel they need to convey. The reductionist nature of textbooks, therefore, often results, as has been shown here, in an overall negative presentation of immigration issues and immigrants and serves to reinforce the dominant societal understanding of the topic. As van Dijk states,

“If only a handful of things are being said about immigrants, and these are the same kind of things the children hear from parents or friends or see on TV, then this can only confirm established stereotypes. It would in that case be much more important to take advantage of the textbooks to emphasize those aspects of immigration than are less known, or that tend to be denied or forgotten.” (2004b, on-line).

The overwhelming presentation of immigration as a Latino issue, coupled with the overpowering understanding of Latino as immigrant results in a cognitively based metonymic understanding of all Latinos as immigrants (i.e. a part for whole understanding). Furthermore, by frequent association to illegality and poor political and economic conditions, immigrants are understood to be a poor people who cause problems in our society when they do not assimilate to our goals. Such a framework is clearly dangerous, and yet, is not salient to the average reader. The problem with the presentation of immigration in SHL textbooks is not that the information presented is
somehow factually inaccurate, but rather that the selection of the already often discussed negative aspects of immigration and immigrants perpetuate a social representation of Latinos and immigration as intrinsically connected and predominantly negative. This could be understood from a Bakhtinian perspective, where the intertextuality evidenced in SHL textbooks is drawing on the already existing discourse on immigrants and reproducing the negative connotations associated therewith.

If we turn our discussion to the treatment of language in these same texts, we again see that the texts are not presenting false information; rather, the overwhelming tendency of the texts to emphasize an appropriate-based usage of language results in a perpetuation of the metonymically-based stereotypes surrounding US varieties of Spanish. Additionally, the selection of which elements to include in texts, as examples of standard Spanish tend to include Peninsular varieties and exclude bilingual varieties of the language. This is perhaps most clearly evidenced in the treatment of subject pronouns across texts, where vosotros still receives significant textual treatment, while the more common vos continues to be virtually ignored by texts. Overall, linguistic variation is generally not addressed in SHL textbooks. Such texts are not yet based on either corpus data or sociolinguistic research, and therefore perpetuate an understanding of standard language that rests on idealized notions rather than concrete research. These same notions continue to belittle bilingual varieties of the language by delegating their use to appropriate contexts and misleading the reader into believing that the processes found in such varieties are peculiar to bilingual varieties, when oftentimes the same process are evidenced across varieties of Spanish.
The three main themes evidenced in the textbooks’ treatment of language: (1) to be acquainted with standard Spanish and its *appropriate* contexts of use, (2) to write using a *correct* form of Spanish, and (3) to help the student to overcome the inherent *problem* of being bilingual, disseminate an underlying ideology towards student varieties of Spanish as ineffective tools for communication. The overwhelming emphasis on the standard serves to subordinate student varieties without concurrently highlighting the utility and importance of bilingual varieties of Spanish. Additionally, the textbooks’ focus on grammatical correctness presupposes one standard, leading to the fallacy of converting what is essentially an abstract notion into a seemingly realistic truth. In fact, appropriateness itself is “…premised on a misrepresentation of linguistic variation and acts to legitimize the dominant position of prestige varieties” (Leeman, 2005, p. 38). The CDA undertaken in this dissertation has revealed a favored prejudice toward a pseudo-Castilian Spanish. The promotion of this idealized variety serves to silence student varieties by relegating their use to the home environment and effectively silencing such varieties in larger contexts of use.

The status of US varieties of Spanish in SHL textbooks needs to be changed. Hidalgo has suggested changing the status of Spanish from a *vernacular* to a semi-official language, stressing that such a move would not only serve to institutionalize Spanish, but also would create new domains of use which would assure its preservation (1990). However, such an overly simplified view of minority language planning in the US paints a rather unrealistic picture. Currently, even English doesn’t enjoy the status of being an *official* language. The chance that Spanish and English would concurrently rise
to share this title is highly unlikely given the current state of rampant fear of others prevalent in the nation today. Additionally, mere institutionalization of the language will not necessarily result in increased domains of use. Language planning is a long and involved process and would need both bottom-up and top-down support in the realms of status and corpus planning in order to have a chance at success (Ruiz, 2004). Yet Hidalgo’s suggestion that US Spanish be codified in order to help legitimate it and simultaneously counteract linguistic insecurities is an admirable one. Such codification has begun and must continue to occur. Clearly, a next step requires our SHL textbooks to implement the Spanish our students use in their texts, not as the sole language to which students should be exposed, but as one of those highlighted in the texts, in order to help legitimate and elevate the status of US varieties of Spanish.

Stereotyping of immigrant and minority groups and languages is present in SHL textbooks in both a subtle and simultaneously dehumanizing form. The most crucial thing to recognize is that the various discussions of immigration and language present in the texts, along with the rhetoric that supports them are not framed as attacks on Spanish-speaking groups in any way, but rather are presented as precursors to greater social mobility and economic success of this group (Woolard, 1989). This framing fits into the already existing schema just discussed. If dominant ideologies of this nature are not recognized and contested, “…the conventional worldview will remain undisturbed” (Santa-Ana, 2002, p.296). Immigrants will continue to be conceived of as less than human and their language will continue to be viewed as an inferior and unnecessary means of communication. Today’s mythologies have “gradually taken on sociological
and pedagogical functions, supporting and validating a certain social order and instructing individuals of that order how to conduct their lives” (Danesi & Perron, 1999, p.259). The discursive framing of immigrant and minority Latino populations and their language use via subtly entrenched myths and metaphors creates a discourse reminiscent of the dominant discourse surrounding these issues, thus serving to maintain the status quo of Anglo-American dominance within the United States. Such practices continue to strengthen dominant hegemonic ideals while simultaneously reinforcing social asymmetries.

Perhaps the most interesting aspects of this dissertation are derived from the students’ comments. The clearest finding is that students believe in their textbooks. They trust the presentation of information to be factual, and therefore do not question what the texts state. I believe this in part is a reflection of the students’ educational training. They have been raised in a test-dominated (and text-dominated) environment, where the “right” answer is most important, and critical thinking is a waste of time. They are products of the banking or consumerist model of education. They consume information as it is given to them in order to reproduce the correct answer. The hesitancy of students to formulate their own opinion, coupled with their frequent reference to “facts” shows their ready consumption of the information presented in their texts. Their responses to the survey indicate that they have acquired the discourse of the text. Student responses show that they perceive their textbooks as fountains of unquestionable factual knowledge. In large part, they unquestioningly believe the information presented in their text, and have begun to reproduce some of the discursive structures and ideas latent
therein. Thus the Bakhtinian process of intertextuality continues as these students begin to reproduce the same discourses that have been critically discussed in this dissertation.

The propensity of SHL texts to reiterate the popular discourse surrounding immigration and US Spanish feeds into the discursive hegemony that surrounds these issues today. Students’ tendency to reproduce this discourse results from their understanding of their texts as a source of truth, as well as from their extensive exposure to such discourses in everyday life. Such an understanding underscores the need for a critical framework within SHL classes, programs and textbooks. As has been shown, textbooks impart prejudices; teachers may also impart these same ideas, as they are often trained using similar, or more typically, more stereotypical resources. All of these ideas merge with the preconceived notions of the learner (particularly those of linguistic insecurity in the case of the HL) and lead to the perpetual creation of similar attitudes in society at large due to their entrenched and reinforcing nature which is pervasively present in the current educational system (see also Ashby, 2004).

Student motivation to learn Spanish stems in large part from their desire to improve their production and comprehension of the language; however, many students also desire to learn Spanish to communicate with friends and family. As mentioned earlier, the textbooks do address student desire to improve their Spanish, and in fact focus almost exclusively on this aspect of language learning, emphasizing the appropriate acquisition of the standard. Though students cited a desire to improve communication with friends and family, no texts incorporate activities which would require students to communicate with friends and family in Spanish, outside of the classroom. Such
activities are vital to the maintenance of Spanish in heritage communities throughout the United States, and should be addressed in future SHL textbooks.

Overall, students expressed general agreement with the statements regarding their textbook, and hold the text to be a source of factual information. Students reiterate many of the ideas found throughout the text regarding immigration and linguistic insecurities, many of which are also echoed throughout the political, media and educational discourses surrounding US Latino populations. In essence, “the hegemonic construction of linguistics inferiority is implicated in the social and political marginalization of specific groups of people, both within and outside academia” (Leeman, 2005, p.41). Student responses as reported in this dissertation underscore that a critically informed pedagogy is essential to the continued success and development of SHL programs nationwide.

As has been shown, “…pejorative metaphors often serve to frame public debates that relate to marginalized community groups” (O’Brien, 2003, p.45). Such metaphors and metonyms, along with the myths and ideologies they support are used to maintain repressive policies against marginalized groups. In fact, these metaphors and metonyms frame our cognitive understanding of immigrant groups and bilingual varieties of Spanish. It is imperative that we better “…understand the discourse strategies of divisiveness so that we can speak out effectively against them” (Mehan, 1997, p.268). The devaluation of Spanish-speaking people, along with their language is reminiscent of what is found in the dominant discourse; to continue to ignore the linguistic devices supporting this discourse is, in fact, to support it. As can be seen in the survey results, students have begun to internalize this discourse and reproduce it themselves, thus
perpetuating the vicious cycle of immigrant and linguistic prejudice. We must continue to analyze the language that surrounds the discourse on immigrant and minority groups, as well as that which surrounds the rhetoric on US varieties of Spanish in order to reveal and eventually counteract the linguistic hegemony present in both.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

This dissertation is not intended to belittle the texts that we currently have available to us in the SHL context. Rather, it is intended to help those texts grow and evolve in order to more adequately meet the needs of the population they are intended to serve. I am by no means suggesting that the authors of these texts intentionally frame the treatment of US Spanish-speaking groups and their language in a negative manner. I am, however, suggesting that the discourse surrounding US Latino populations and US varieties of Spanish has become a dominant topic in political, media and educational realms. This discourse utilizes certain repetitious aspects that have become “naturalized” and which in fact aid in the rapid and unquestioning consumption of the “facts” and ideas presented therein.

The student opinions and reactions discussed in the survey section of the dissertation impart imperative knowledge to those of us who teach, administrate and work with SHL students and SHL programs. In fact, student feedback and assessment of student needs is integral to the continued improvement and development of SHL programs in the US (see Colombia & Roca, 2003). We must keep in mind that student attitudes and opinions can have a tremendous impact on their acquisition. Barker, a leading researcher in the field of attitude and language learning research, states “Attitudes
are socially constructed through language. Discourse is an important process in the way attitudes are learnt, modified and expressed” (Baker, 1992, p.46). The survey results presented here uphold this finding. Students are acquiring the discourse present in their textbooks, which is of course only a small fraction of the discourse that they are being exposed to in general. Yet the textbooks’ discourse closely mirrors that of the dominant discourses surrounding the issues of immigration and bilingual varieties of US Spanish. If we see the textbooks as a small window of opportunity allowing a forum in which to combat such dominant discourses, perhaps we can begin to shift the rhetoric surrounding these issues and begin to counter the entrenched metonyms and metaphors that guide current understanding of immigration related issues.

In light of my research, I have several suggestions for publishers of future textbooks, as well as for teachers of SHL classes in general. This list is by no means exhaustive, and it is acknowledged that not all classes or texts would be able to incorporate all of the following ideas into a semester class or a single textbook. Yet, if even one of these ideas were to be used in an SHL class or textbook, we would be taking our first step toward continuing the progress of the SHL field. It is in this hope that I propose the following areas as a wish list of pedagogical modifications for future SHL textbooks and teachers. After a brief discussion of each, I also include several activities that may prove useful in an attempt to make these wishes a reality. Of course, the possibilities for such activities are endless; therefore, what follows is only a partial list of suggestions for future SHL classes and texts and should not be seen as exhaustive.
MODIFICATIONS IN THE TREATMENT OF IMMIGRATION

1) Texts and teachers should highlight the long-standing presence of US Latino populations, rather than focusing exclusively on immigration issues.

This can be achieved by incorporating readings which focus on the Latino population that existed in the US before the United States itself even existed, rather than focusing on the already often discussed issue of immigration. By shifting the focus away from immigration and toward the historical presence and importance of Latinos in the US, textbooks can serve to balance the picture of US Latinos that is presented, and perhaps begin to diverge away from the *us v. them* dichotomy.

2) Texts and teachers should strive to discuss novel aspects of immigration, rather than those that are already extensively treated in the political and media discourses.

Rather than focusing solely on a uni-directional understanding of immigration, such as that found in both the current study and van Dijk’s (2004b) study, textbooks could instead highlight the lesser talked about immigration topics. These could include: the economic dependency of the receiving nation, a discussion of legal immigration, a discussion of the businesses most dependent on immigration, individual stories of legal immigration as well as stories of earlier immigrants who are part of vibrant US communities. The overall textual presentation serves to dehumanize the immigration process; this same type of dehumanization is also rampant in dominant political and media discourses. By presenting some first person narratives to students, rather than
simply bombarding them with statistics and geographical information, textbooks could take a step forward in humanizing the topic of immigration. All of these suggestions would serve to address van Dijk’s call to improve textbook treatment of immigration by highlighting those aspects of immigration most ignored by popular dominant discourses on the topic.

3) Texts and teachers should expand away from the banking/consumerist method of education and incorporate a critical aspect, asking students to form their own opinions on the issues at hand, rather than regurgitating topics already frequently discussed in other arenas.

This suggestion of course dovetails off of the previous suggestion. Reading about immigration alone is not enough. Talking about the historical presence of Latinos in the US in terms of numbers and dates is also not enough. Students are fully capable of performing their own research and arriving at their own conclusions and opinions. Students could be asked to research particular aspects of immigration, or to interview recent immigrants, and present a synopsis of their discoveries to the class. Thus, not only will they be exposed to a fresh perspective on immigration, but they will also be required to use their Spanish!

Students could also be asked to investigate and then discuss the categorizations used for Census purposes. A discussion could then be held as to the usefulness and appropriateness of the terms provided. Students could be asked to self-define, using the categories given in the Census or by creating their own, thereby helping students to think for themselves and arrive at their own understandings. Such discussions can be
supplemented by articles in the media or news clips that employ the same terminology. Students could be asked whether or not they agree with the given classifications.

Another easily implemented technique is the survey. Many researchers have suggested surveying SHL students at the beginning of the course in order to assess student backgrounds and needs (Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005; Carreira, 2003; Colombi & Roca, 2003; Mercado, 2001). As this has been a suggestion of many researchers and teachers in the field, including a survey in textbooks that could be used to talk about students’ backgrounds and their families’ history in the US seems like a natural first step in addressing some of the issues raised in this dissertation. If time permits, students could also be asked to interview family members and compile a student’s family autobiography, or could be asked to use the same type of survey with a set number of family and community members to see just how many people immigrated to the US and how many were born here.

Additionally, there are many supplemental materials available to teachers who would prefer to step away from the traditional textbook or merely supplement the text they use with additional resources and materials. The *Quinto sol* publication by Octavio Romano has a compilation of US Latino literature excerpts. Teachers could also look to the numerous Chicano English and Chicano Spanish dictionaries that are available. There are many US Latino voices present in US newspapers, radio and television, and these too could form a part of a more holistic SHL materials base. The Internet itself is a wonderful source for teachers. Blogs, and chat rooms make US Spanish easily accessible

---

24 My thanks to Dr. Ruiz for mentioning this idea!
to today’s generation of computer-savvy students. Not only are informal writings found on the Internet appealing to students, in terms of the topics discussed and the mode of communication, but they also provide a real context for the use of US varieties of Spanish. Such a realization is a much more pertinent source of validation than any teachers’ comments could ever be!

LANGUAGE MODIFICATIONS

In terms of the treatment of language, again, much could be done to improve the current situation. In part, a simple heightening of awareness of the complexity of linguistic issues would serve to create a more balanced presentation of language across SHL texts. Such a balance could be more easily achieved via the incorporation of some or all of the following elements.

1) Inclusion of sociolinguistic research and corpus based information and data in the preparation of textbooks and their treatment of language variation and standard language

First and foremost, textbooks authors need to base their presentation of language on actual research, rather than intuitions. There is a plethora of corpus-based research available which could be used to better inform the presentation of language in textbooks. Not only could such research be used to present a more accurate understanding of the standard, but it could also be used to show the widespread regularity of linguistic variation. Perhaps most importantly, such research could be used as a catalyst for the discussion of the socially based nature of linguistic prejudices. In part, by using
sociolinguistic research, textbooks would become more credible sources of information for students while concurrently highlighting the socially-contingent nature of language use. Such information is also imperative to teacher training. Sociolinguistic awareness should form the cornerstone for SHL teacher training and textbook creation.

In addition to creating more sociolinguistically informed textbooks, such texts could also include activities which promote sociolinguistic awareness. One example of such an activity would include ethnolinguistic observations, much like those discussed in Martínez (2003). These observations would require students to look at a specific variable (perhaps the 2nd person singular preterit) and simply note their own observations regarding the use of this form by a given community of speakers. This provides students with the opportunity for language input while also allowing them to decide how the differing forms are used, rather than reading about the contexts of use in a footnote in their texts.

Students could also be asked to narrate or write their own linguistic autobiographies. By asking students to reflect on their own language practices, or those of their family members, students will become aware of the ever-changing nature of language use. A critical reflection might involve looking back across their lives, and noting which language was dominant or was used in a particular context. Or, students could be asked to keep a linguistic journal, documenting their current language use. Again, such activities can be adapted to suit the needs of each particular class.

Lastly, students could also be asked to survey local community members to achieve a wider understanding of the role of language in society. Participants could be
asked about their own language practices or about their opinions about specific practices. In all cases, the students will be given an opportunity to critically look at language practices in the communities near them, and reflect on their own practices. The end result may be that the textbooks were right, and a particular kind of Spanish tends to dominate in certain contexts, or it may be different. The key difference between the two approaches is the active involvement of the student in the latter suggestions, versus their passive consumption of information, as per the activities detailed in the current texts.

2) Presentation and discussion of several sociolinguistic variables (vos, 2nd person singular preterit forms, etc.)

By using a sociolinguistically (or corpora) informed textbook, students would have a clearer picture of the reality of the language variation that is currently only treated in brief, as a geographic side-note in the texts. The inclusion of the vos pronoun, for example, would be a first step in responding to Hidalgo’s (1990) call to institutionalize US varieties of Spanish. By acknowledging the prevalence of vos, and including as an element worthy of being learned in SHL textbooks, we are simultaneously legitimizing varieties of Spanish which employ the pronoun. Not only will our students be better informed, but some of the stigma attached to such elements will be diminished by their inclusion in a textbook which the students deem factual.

3) Activities which focus on the issue of language based discrimination

Activities which encourage students to talk about language based discrimination could include student observations of local bilingual programs. Students could also be asked to observe transactions in a local supermarket. Naturally, students could be asked
to reflect on their past, and speak to their own dealings with the issue. There are a plethora of articles available discussing Proposition 227 in California and Proposition 203 in Arizona, these too could be used as the basis for a discussion of linguistic discrimination. Additionally, students could be asked to research English-Only groups, or survey local community members in regards to their opinion of code-switching or other stigmatized language practices. In the course of their investigations, students would inevitably come to their own understandings of the issues at hand. It is my belief that this would heighten students’ awareness, and perhaps serve to combat some of the linguistic insecurities so commonly found in the SHL population.

4) 2-way translations

Though current texts present translation activities for students, such activities continue to require that students translate from a local variety into a standard variety. The same activities could easily be reversed, showing the utility of all language varieties, rather than privileging one over all others.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SHL TEACHER TRAINING

To end this dissertation without addressing the need of teacher training specifically designed for Spanish heritage language teachers would be to ignore one of the most pressing issues in the field. It is my hope that this dissertation has shed light on the crucial need for such training, and has begun to elucidate some of the points that I feel are most relevant for those looking to begin a heritage teacher training program or class. What follows is a brief summary of some of the components I feel are most essential, in order to further empower our teachers. Oftentimes, a non-native speaking teacher in a
classroom full of heritage students can feel threatened by the language skills of the students with whom he is faced. Perhaps their Spanish sounds more native than his. Yet if both teacher and student are empowered through a process of learning from one another, I feel the outcomes can be nothing but beneficial. As today’s Spanish classrooms become more and more mixed, the need to address the heritage language component in teacher training programs grows more and more imperative. It is my hope that this dissertation will begin a dialogue about the component necessary for heritage teacher training that will then be taken up at all levels of teacher training.

Ideally, a course targeting the Spanish the training of heritage language teachers should first and foremost serve as an introduction to the theories and concerns most relevant to the burgeoning SHL field. Seminal texts in the field should be (re)visited, and connections made between the fields of second language acquisition and language arts, while simultaneously critiquing the shortcomings of both in their abilities to fully address the needs of SHL students. Such a course should begin by first defining the field itself and SHL learners, while then progressing through the goals of SHL instruction, the resources available for its teaching, the sociolinguistics processes common in SHL students’ Spanish and the sociopolitical position of Spanish in the US. In addition to these theoretical perspective, an ideal SHL teacher training course should incorporate a practical component of classroom observation and focus-group student interviews to provide future teachers with a more complete understanding of the practical concerns of SHL learning and instruction from an inside perspective.
First, community varieties should be emphasized in heritage language teacher training programs (Villa, 1996). Teachers should be cautioned against the prolonged and potentially damaging effects of teacher-centered corrective feedback on US varieties of Spanish (Potowski, 2002). Though instructors often have no ill-intentions when making such corrections, their mere lack of awareness may result in serious negative implications for their students. For these reasons and others, “It is imperative that Spanish language teachers in the U.S. put aside any prejudicial notions that they may have about what constitutes “good” or “pure” Spanish and what they consider “Spanglish” or “español malhablado” (Lynch, 2003, p.43). Teacher preparation programs should require a course on sociolinguistic dialect awareness which focuses on the local varieties of language most commonly found in the classroom, so that teachers can become more familiar with the language spoken by their students (García-Moya, 1981). Teachers need to respect and inform their students, empowering the latter group to leave the classroom with a deeper understanding of language use which they can use to justify their own language choices, and perhaps, improve the current situation of US Spanish as well.

Various components are lacking in current teacher training programs at both the secondary and post-secondary levels. First and foremost, the continued overwhelming focus on literature and literary criticism in universities in general creates a Euro-centric, lecture-based, book-centered pedagogy and pedagogue (Ortega, 1999a). According to Roca (1990), 93% of teachers are trained in literature, and thereby lack the necessary level of sociolinguistic awareness which is required to be successful in an SHL classroom. The overwhelming focus on literature rests on the banking theory of
education, where the teacher is seen as the holder of knowledge, and the students as empty vessels in need of that knowledge (Freire, 1998). Often, the only requirement of new teaching assistants (TAs) is a one-semester foreign language (hereafter FL) teaching methods course, which is often taken concurrently with the first course the TAs teach (Potowski, 2002)! Not only are such teachers unprepared to teach in the SHL classroom, but they are unprepared to teach in general!

Certain myths surrounding the language teacher also need to be dispelled in order to validate the SHL field. The most rampant myth is that near-native or native proficiency in the language is sufficient to qualify one as a teacher of language. Just as mere ability to solve algebraic math problems does not qualify one as a teacher of algebra, so too knowledge of a language is but one among many qualities necessary to be a language teacher. We need to counteract societal attitudes toward language, as well as address issues of language ownership (Ortega, 1999a). This requires a legitimization of the field of SHL study and research, as a valid and valued sub-field of applied linguistics (Valdés, 1995);

In spite of the fact that the Spanish heritage language population has increased enormously during the last ten years, schools of education, almost without exception, do not require their majors to take courses in the field of heritage language learning and teaching as part of graduation requirements. Indeed, students are lucky to even find elective courses in this area as part of the curriculum (Colombi & Roca, 2003, p.6).

Part of the issue surrounding which dialect, standard or variety to use in the classroom lies in the pedagogical pushes that are promoted in many foreign language teacher preparation courses. In recent years, there have been two overpowering influences in that field: the proficiency movement and the methods-based movement
The proficiency movement holds broad implications for both FL and SHL teaching. First, the myth that the most efficient path to acquisition as an adult is achieved through immersion persists alongside the proficiency movement under the guise of the study abroad experience. Rather than condoning involvement in local Spanish speaking communities, the system again values an outside standard over an inside one. The proficiency movement also encompasses a simultaneous push to exclude the use of the native language in the classroom, emphasizing sole use of Spanish as the target language. The use of Spanish, to the exclusion of English, disallows connections between the L1 and the L2, something found by research to be a useful and necessary part of language learning (Ortega, 1999a).

The other major current pedagogical push is methods-based. Methods-based teacher training essentially decontextualizes language learning, an extremely dangerous fallacy particularly in the SHL field. Such a decontextualization does not question the asymmetries surrounding language use, nor does it bring these asymmetries to the attention of either teachers or students, resulting in an “unconscious reproduction of unequal societal power relationships in the classroom” (Ortega, 1999a, p.29). It ignores conflated issues of language and power that should be inherent in any teacher training program. Language itself functions as the main means of producing and reproducing structured and seemingly immovable hierarchies of dominance, power and status (Van Dijk, 1985; Woolard, 1989). It is imperative that teachers be made aware of the non-neutrality of the language-teaching profession, particularly where issues of dialect and standard promotion within the classroom are at stake. “The underlying social and
political motivations of linguistic differentiation and subordination both in the classroom and in society at large” should be brought to the attention of both teachers and students (Martínez, 2003, p.2, also emphasized by Potwoski, 2002). The educational system often mutes critical awareness and responsiveness; its main intent being the maintenance of an acquiescent culture of silence (Freire, 1998). The best way to empower students to make informed decisions about their language use is to provide them with teachers who not only are speakers of the language, but also understand the sociolinguistic underpinnings and societal asymmetries inherent in language use.

Yet, language awareness alone is not enough. Though language awareness should form an integral part of any language education program, the majority of language awareness programs and texts to date have been insufficiently critical (Fairclough, 1992). This returns us to the need to implement an approach similar to that which is set forth in Martínez (2003). CBDA would not only increase student awareness, but also help teachers to look at language and the world more critically, empowering both teachers and students to make their own choices as informed and critical decision-makers.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Clearly, the suggestions presented here are not extensive enough to include all possibilities, yet the list provides a tangible beginning point as well as some concrete activities that can be used to implement some of the changes suggested both in future SHL textbooks as well as in SHL classrooms in general. Again, I would argue for the implementation of a teaching based approach entitled Critical Student Awareness; such an approach would entail the creation of a sociolinguistically aware classroom which
allows students opportunities to experience language in its everyday context and come to their own conclusions regarding the power or lack their of different language varieties. Furthermore, I concur with Leeman; the key goals for a successful critical SHL pedagogy must include

“in addition to awareness of formal features and sociolinguistic principles, are an understanding of the linguistic subordination of groups, and the recognition of students’ own choices to either conform with or contest sociolinguistic conventions both in their own interactions and in society at large” (2005, p.41)

In addition to a critical approach toward the presentation of language in SHL texts and classes, there must also be an informed and critical approach toward the presentation of US Latino culture. By providing students with the tools necessary to question the texts and discourses they are presented with, we are empowering students to make their own, informed decisions. A more critical presentation of language and cultural issues would allow students to come to their own understanding of how societal institutions such as the media, the government and education interact to empower and disempower languages and groups of people. As Suarez has pointed out,

“Given the rising numbers of heritage language speakers in the United States, social and political hegemonic forces notwithstanding, it is crucial that a framework of resistance to linguistic hegemony be established which takes into account the paradox of linguistic hegemony as an explanatory dynamic between heritage language maintenance and successful resistance to linguistic hegemony” (Suarez, 2002, p. 528).

By creating more sociolinguistically informed textbooks and teachers, and by raising awareness toward the rampant metonyms used to stereotype US Latinos into otherness, textbooks, teachers and students can begin to contest the well-entrenched hegemonic forces present in US society; “Crucially, educators and students must explicitly address
the use of language as a tool of subordination…” (Leeman, 2005, p. 42). Textbooks and programs which promote a critical perspective dependant on student agency will in the end also create more informed students who are better prepared to function with their knowledge of the intricate interaction of language and society.
APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: STUDENT SURVEY
Spanish Textbook Questionnaire

I would like your help answering some questions concerning your Spanish textbook. There are no right or wrong answers. Please respond honestly, as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation!

😊 THANK YOU 😊

A- Please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- The language used in the textbook is the same as the language my friends/family use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- There are examples from my culture in the textbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- The textbook positively portrays the type of Spanish that I’m used to hearing and/or using.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- According to the textbook, the type of Spanish spoken in the US is good Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- The textbook says that some Spanish is correct and some isn’t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- The Spanish used in the textbook is Mexican Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- The textbook says that there is only one correct way to write Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- The textbook talks about my culture in a positive way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- I can relate to the language used in the textbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- I can relate to the topics covered in my textbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- The textbook talks about many different varieties of Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- The Spanish used in my textbook is the Spanish spoken in Spain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B – Please read the following passages (in whichever language you prefer to read them in), and respond to the questions that follow each, based on your reading and your own opinion of the reading.

Reading 1: El crisol de sueños: Centroamericanos

**Spanish Version**
La inestabilidad política y económica en varios países centroamericanos entre 1950 y 1970, dio comienzo a una masiva inmigración. En El Salvador, el desempleo y la escasez de tierras agrícolas entre 1950 y 1960 dio comienzo a la inmigración salvadoreña a EE.UU. En Nicaragua, los conflictos entre sandinistas y contras en la década de los 60, iniciaron otra ola de inmigración. En Guatemala, el largo periodo de inestabilidad y violencia que empezó en 1957 inicio la inmigración guatemalteca. En Honduras, la inestabilidad política y económica de los países vecinos motivó el comienzo de la inmigración hondureña. Pero las grandes inmigraciones de centroamericanas fueron afectadas por los movimientos revolucionarios en Guatemala y El Salvador, y los conflictos entre los sandinistas y los contras en Nicaragua. (Samaniego et.al. 2005, 3)

**English Version** (The melting pot: Central Americans)
The unstable political and economic situation in various Central American countries between 1950 and 1970, led to the beginning of a massive immigration. In El Salvador, unemployment and a shortage of agricultural lands between 1950 and 1960 brought about the beginning of Salvadoran immigration to the United States. In Nicaragua, the conflicts between the Sandinistas and the Contras during the 60’s, initiated another wave of immigration. In Guatemala, a long period of instability and violence that began in 1957 resulted in the Guatemalan immigration. In Honduras, the unstable political and economic situation of the neighboring countries caused the beginning of the Honduran immigration. But, the large wave of Central American immigration was affected by revolutionary movements in Guatemala and El Salvador, as well as by the conflicts between the Sandinistas and the Contras in Nicaragua. (translation by Ducar from Samaniego et.al. 2005, 3)

1. What is your gut reaction to this text?
   - [ ] Positive
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Negative

Please explain why you chose this answer below

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Are there any other topics that you would have included in this reading if you were the author of this text?

_____________________________________________________________________
Reading 2: El habla caribeña: los puertorriqueños

**Spanish version:**
Muchos caribeños, ya sean cubanos, puertorriqueños o dominicanos, y hasta algunos mexicanos, centroamericanos, colombianos y venezolanos que viven en la costa del Caribe, muestran una riqueza de variantes coloquiales en su habla. Estas variantes, llamadas o señaladas el “habla caribeña”, incluyen consonantes aspiradas (esta → ehta), sílabas o letras desaparecidas (todo → to) y unas consonantes sustituidas por otras (muerto → muelto). Es importante reconocer que estas variantes sólo ocurren al hablar y no al escribir, a menos que un autor trate de imitar el diálogo caribeño…” (Samaniego et.al. 2005, p.28)

**English version (Carribbean speech: Puerto Ricans)**
Many Carribean people, whether they’re Cubans, Puerto Ricans or Dominicans, and even some Mexicans, Central Americans, Colombians and Venezuelans that live on the Carribean coast, use a rich local variety of Spanish in their everyday language. These varieties, called or referred to as “Carribean speech”, include aspirated consonants (esta → ehta), syllables or letters that disappear (todo → to) and some consonants that are substituted for others (muerto → muelto). It is important to recognize that these varieties only occur when speaking and not when writing, unless the author tries to imitate the Carribbean dialect. (translation by Ducar from Samaniego et.al. 2005, p.28)

1. Is this reading positive, negative or neutral in its portrayal of Caribbean Spanish in your opinion?
   - Positive
   - Neutral
   - Negative

2. Please explain why you chose this answer below

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. According to this reading, how would you describe Carribbean Spanish?
   - Very good Spanish
   - Good Spanish
   - OK Spanish
   - Bad Spanish

Is this dialect of Spanish ________________, based on the description in the above reading?
   - Easier
   - The same
   - Harder
   (No different than any other dialect)

Does this reading make you want to study Carribean Spanish? Explain.
   - Yes
   - No

Explain: ____________________________________________________________
C-Please select the phrase which best represents your answer to the following questions. You may select more than one answer, if you like.

1. I am taking Spanish because…
   - It is a requirement.
   - I want to communicate more with friends and family.
   - I want to understand the language.
   - I want to improve my Spanish.
   - It will help me get a job.
   - I want to study literature in Spanish.
   - Other___________________________________________________

2. Which type of Spanish do you want to learn in class? (you may select more than one option if you like)
   - Mexican Spanish
   - Mexican-American Spanish
   - Puerto Rican Spanish
   - US Spanish
   - Castillian Spanish (Spanish from Spain)
   - Tucson Spanish
   - Cuban Spanish
   - Academic Spanish
   - Other ____________________________

D – If you would like, please let me know how you feel about your textbook – whether you like it, dislike it and why.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________  

If you would be interested and willing to participate in a follow-up interview (15 minutes) in the coming year, please let me know by including your e-mail address here, so that I may contact you at a later date. If you are not interested, just leave this line blank 😊

Yes, I would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview.
Here’s my e-mail address: ________________________________

😊 GRACIAS! 😊
El tema: ¿Quién soy yo?

Lee con atención los párrafos siguientes.

¿Quién soy yo? ¿Cómo me llamo? ¿Cómo es mi nombre completo en español? Sé que en muchos países de habla hispana la gente usa dos apellidos. Primero va el apellido paterno (el del padre); luego va el apellido materno (el de la madre). Mis padres me pusieron como nombre de pila Fernando Manuel. Mi padre se llama Luis Gabriel González Ruiz y mi madre, María Elena Robles de González. Él es plomero y ella trabaja de dependiente en una tienda y también trabaja mucho en casa. Si yo viviera en México u otro país latinoamericano, mi nombre completo sería Fernando Manuel González Robles. Pero como vivo aquí, el nombre que más uso es Fernando González, y mis amigos me llaman “Fernando” o “Fernie”.

Soy de El Paso, Tejas. Tengo veinte años y soy mexicoamericano. Soy estudiante de tercer año de universidad. Quiero llegar a ser ingeniero y hacerme rico. Tengo cinco hermanos; yo soy el mayor de los varones. Mis padres siempre dicen que tengo que dar ejemplo a los demás. Soy bastante alto y también un poco gordo: mido seis pies de altura y peso doscientas diez libras. Uso bigote. Me gusta levantar pesas y comer mucho después. Como soy estudiante, soy tremendamente inteligente. (Claro, no soy nada presumido.) Me gusta la ropa elegante, aunque no tengo mucho dinero. Soy muy simpático, excepto cuando me enojo. Tengo muchos amigos, y todas las mujeres quieren que sea su novio. (Valdés & Teschner, 2003, p. 2)
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE TRANSLATION EXERCISE

Taken from *Nuevos mundos* (Roca, 2005, p. 56-57).

En grupos de dos o tres estudiantes, lean la siguiente carta y fíjense en los neologismos, falsos cognados y otros giros que suelen utilizarse algunas comunidades bilingües de los Estados Unidos. Luego, vuelvan a escribirla dirigiéndose a una persona que no comprenda inglés. Comparen su versión con las de otros grupos de la clase.

“Querido Johncito:

Tengo un chance bueno para ti, pues hay aquí un caurto fornido con quicineta, muy cerca de la marqueta y con uindo para la yarda, aunque está algo escrachao. Lo malo es que no dan muchas blanquetas pero como no hace frío no importa. El estimjí también es malo. Abajo hay un lonchrun en donde puedes lonchar. No he visto más a Charli y oí que la otra noche lo jolopearon, pero afortunadamente estaba broque y no tenía más que una cuora. El consiguió un yob en una grocería de un relativo de él que antes era colector. Yo estoy trabajando de guachimán de noche y mi bos es muy bueno, pero tengo que manejar un guinche y chequearle el agua a un tanque y esto es un trabajo bien tofe. Mi mujer siempre toqueando todo el tiempo y cuando mi familia fastidia mucho la mando para el cho, pero por lo demás oqué. Yo estoy supuesto a trabajar los domingos pero si vienes nos vamos a la barra un rato. Bueno, viejo, solón.”
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