Portland State University

PDXScholar

University Honors Theses

University Honors College

2014

Research Thesis Essay of Findings from Campus Language Capacity Survey 2012-2014 Done in Collaboration with the Heritage Language Initiative

Laura Van Doren
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/honorstheses>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Van Doren, Laura, "Research Thesis Essay of Findings from Campus Language Capacity Survey 2012-2014 Done in Collaboration with the Heritage Language Initiative" (2014). *University Honors Theses*. Paper 38.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.86>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Research Thesis Essay of findings from Campus Language Capacity Survey 2012-2014 done in
collaboration with the Heritage Language Initiative.

by

Laura Van Doren

An undergraduate honors thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Arts

in

University Honors

and

Applied Linguistics and Psychology

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Tucker Childs

Portland State University

2014

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	4
Introduction.....	5
Literature Review.....	7
Working Definition.....	12
Heritage Language Initiative.....	13
Methodology.....	15
Participants.....	15
Measures.....	16
Procedures.....	18
Results.....	19
Discussion.....	27
Implications.....	33
Limitations.....	34
Conclusion.....	36
Annotated Bibliography.....	37
Appendix I: Proposal.....	41
Appendix II: Email Paragraph.....	42
Appendix III: Survey Paragraph.....	43
Appendix IV: Survey Questions.....	44
Appendix V: Sweepstakes Information.....	47
Appendix VI: Graphs from Survey Results.....	48
Appendix VII: Participant Response.....	56

Appendix VIII: CLCS 2005; Participant Information.....	57
Appendix VII: CLCS 2005; Survey Questions.....	58
Appendix VIII: CLCS; Results.....	59

Abstract

This paper presents the findings of the “Campus Language Capacity Survey 2013” a study conducted as an online survey to investigate heritage language usage at Portland State University. Heritage language was defined as “an indigenous or immigrant language other than English”. The survey was sent to 15,000 randomly selected participants from the PSU student, staff, and faculty body and over 1,000 responses were collected. There was a 10% response rate and 119 participants self-identified as heritage language speakers and/or learners. These participants are individuals in the PSU community who have ties to their heritage community. The top five heritage languages named were Spanish, French, German, Russian, and Japanese. From the 119 identified heritage language learners and/or speakers, 64% indicated that they would be interested in having their heritage language available as an online course through PSU and 72% indicated that they would be interested in having their heritage language fulfill the 2-year foreign language credit requirement. The data from this study will inform the creation of new programs tailored to the needs of those enrolling, teaching, or funding heritage language courses.

Introduction

This essay presents the findings from the Campus Language Capacity Survey 2013. It does this by providing working definitions of a heritage language (HL), a heritage language learner (HLL) and heritage language speaker (HLS), and explaining the purpose of the Heritage Language Initiative (HLI). The literature review section details the background information and previous research which informed and guided this survey. The working definition of HL for this survey is outlined in the following section. The methodology section details the steps taken or completion of this project and then the results are listed. The discussion section provides a further breakdown of the survey components and implications of the results. This survey is important to anyone who studies languages at Portland State University's (PSU) and to anyone interested in HL. The 2013 survey complements and expands a 2005 survey [Appendix VIII] in identifying HLs and asking about HLL interest in online courses, especially as they would qualify for the foreign language credit requirement.

The field of HL research is a small and fairly diverse community. Research ranged from performing ethnographies to assessing archival census data. Moreover, it has been conducted by researchers from a variety of backgrounds, ranging from anthropology to business studies. Despite these wide ranges, the actual research conducted has been fairly limited. Much of it touches only briefly on HL communities and their interactions with formal educational systems. HLs are influenced by identity perceptions and social frameworks involved in the heritage culture and community, as well as the dominating culture and community; the tension between these two makes the specific needs of each HLL situationally based. Formal educational systems, such as at PSU, add another layer of complexity through educational standards and academic

requirements. At the same time such institutions provide resources for programs adapted to the needs of HLLs.

In the literature review, the history of the term HL, and the formation of HLL and HLS identities will be explained. This project is another contribution to the literature on heritage language and uses the combined perspectives of applied linguistics and psychology.

Literature Review

Before the 1990s and the emergence of the term “heritage speaker”, people in the U.S. with a language other than English were referred to as “imperfect or semi-speakers” (Dorian, 1981), “incomplete acquirers” (Polinsky, 2006), “unbalanced or pseudo-bilinguals” (Montrul, 2008) or many other alike terms that negatively reflected on the speakers inability to assimilate into U.S. culture due to home language interference. The variety in these terms stems from the lack of clarity among the linguistic field on how HL is acquired and what proficiency qualifies a HLS. Due to the multidisciplinary nature of HL research, most HLLs in the United States have only had academic access to their HL through foreign language classrooms. In 1977 the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages issued a statement:

if the United States is to remain a world leader, it must develop for its citizens the opportunities to learn to communicate adequately in many tongues and in the context of many cultures. It must provide for orderly development of native or ancestral languages as well as a choice of other languages for all its people. It is understood, however, that development of the official language of the nation English is important to all citizens (NCSSFL, 1977).

However, it would still be a couple decades before the U.S saw the creation of its first heritage specific program or classroom. Canada was the first to start using the term “heritage” in association speakers with a different home language and created the *First Peoples’ Cultural Council* which was one of the first government sanctioned organization to provide services and programs to support heritage, culture, and language. The *First Peoples’ Cultural Council* also established the First Peoples’ Heritage, Language, and Culture Act designed to promote language

revitalization through formal language learning. With the umbrella term of “heritage” to distinguish HLL and HLS from foreign language learners and speakers (FLL and FLS), the field of HL research and the establishment of formal education services in HL began, although the amount of available services is still underwhelming.

In the U.S., only recently has the perspective of HL started to shift from foreign language towards a more HL view with specific programs featuring classes in HLs. PSU is one of the few American universities that has incorporated HL courses into its curriculum. This has supported local HLLs in:

- enhancing their HL reading and writing knowledge
- creating written materials
- expanding HL syntax and lexicon acquisition and knowledge towards an academic register
- working towards a 4-year university degree
- accessing media and academic resources in their HL or from their heritage countries
- collaborating with other HL communities in other university settings
- developing a sense of ownership and positive bilingual identity associated with their HL
- networking with bilingual professionals
- becoming community advocates

PSU has focused on the above criteria for its HL classrooms because a HLL brings many special traits to the classroom experiences that a FLL does not. Usually the HLL will have some pre-existing knowledge about their heritage language and culture, as demonstrated by native

speaker pronunciation, conversational fluency, broad vocabulary, and instinctive understanding of cultural norms and practices (Sanchez-Muñoz, 2013). These traits can also be demonstrated by strong oral proficiency with fluidity and automaticity, as well as creative and spontaneous use of the target language. This differs from the typical FLL who usually learns with attention focused on the grammatical structures and rules. More than the HLL, the FLL tends to have a more limited vocabulary and more planned patterns of usage.

HL is typically introduced early in the speaker's life while the brain is still developing. Research related to the brain, neuroscience, and language has shown that learning two languages before adolescent can influence learning, behavior, and the structure of the brain itself. Language is constructed through constant negotiation of tense, syntax, morphemes, metaphors, allusions, and synonyms that all use up some degree of cognitive functioning to understand and manipulate language during comprehension and production. For people using learning two languages at once (bilinguals) the mental effort, exposure to input, and creation of output is twice as much. This phenomenon can be called "the dog-chien dilemma" where bilinguals are "encountering an object, action or concept and instantaneously toggling between two different words to describe it" (Kluger, 11). This daily encounter allows bilinguals to outperform their counterpart monolinguals on the Stroop Test¹, which in and of itself is not a marketable skill but it does reveal some key details about brain patterns. Bilinguals have a higher processing time for focused details which is associated with executive functioning² and a higher interpretation of symbolic representation³ which is also seen in people with extended experience in math and

¹ Developed by John Ridley Stroop to measure reaction time; participants are given a series of color names with the text in a different color from the name and must name the color, not read the word. For example: red yellow blue

² Communication between the two hemispheres of the brain, particularly in the frontal lobes, through the corpus callosum.

³ Associated with right hemisphere processing (whereas language processing is associated with the left hemisphere).

music (Kluger, 11). Understanding more of the physiological and psychological process behind HL learning helps to inform methods of instruction in HL classrooms.

These differences between the HLL and the FLL have resulted in strained dynamics for the foreign language classroom. Language instructors might not be able to accommodate the specific needs of a HLL in a class of twenty or more students, especially when the curriculum is highly structured with specific goals of vocabulary acquisition and grammatical knowledge. Separate HL classrooms provide a HL-centered curriculum that can attend to the distinct needs of the HLL within an academically structured context. Since HL classrooms are still relatively new, it is important for universities to evaluate HLL needs and classroom.

One of the key differences between a HLL and a FLL is the HL's cultural and language identity. Unlike FLs who come into a language classroom with little to no authentic language interaction or identity tied to the target language and culture; HLs have a personal link to the language's culture and community. Sometimes this link is remote such as a grandparent who is a fluent speaker but they do not speak the language and sometimes this link is encompassing through daily interactions and active community involvement (Oh and Fuligni, 2009).

Many ethnographic studies have been conducted to try and distinguish between the various layers of cultural identity with HLL and HLS. In addition to the self-constructed cultural identity from the HLL's or HLS's lived experiences, there are also the other-perceived identities of all people who come into contact with the HLL or HLS (You, 2010). Identity is often perceived as linear, a person looks or speaks a certain way and is placed into a conventional ethnic or racial community. U.S. culture finds it difficult to define people of mixed cultures and mixed heritages because the assumption is that individuals can only belong to one community at a time (Shin, 2010). Even within HL communities and classrooms, the mixed-heritage aspect can

be overlooked because the heritage culture is being emphasized and the U.S. integrated identity minimalized.

However, HL identity is not linear. Ethnic and racial diversity interplays with the dominant culture and language identity. This mixed-heritage background is unique to each HLL and HLS and is brought into the classroom with the learner. This survey was designed to discover more about the backgrounds of the PSU student body in relationship to their HL and cultural identity. By collecting HL information as well as information about family HLSs, birth places outside of the U.S., and age of immigration a better picture of the constructed identity can be created for the HLLs of PSU.

Working Definition

As seen in the literature there are various ways of defining people with connections to HL. My definition of ‘heritage language’ relies on two features of HL identified in Valdés 2001:

- 1) Individuals having historical or personal connections to a language such as an endangered indigenous language or immigrant language that is not normally taught in school
- 2) Individuals who appear in a foreign language classroom, who are raised in homes where a non-English language is spoken, speak or merely understand the HL [heritage language], and are some degree bilingual in English and the HL (Valdés, 2001)

and of two features of HLSs identified in the National Heritage Language Resource Center:

- 1) Simultaneous bilinguals who speak a family language and a societal majority language equally or almost equally (NHLRC, 2012)
- 2) Native Speakers of the majority language whose parents or grandparents speak a heritage language, who have *strong emotional connections... strong cultural ties... little or no overt connection...* to the heritage language/culture (NHLRC, 2012).

These two definitions provide an adequate view of what survey participants might have encountered as definitions and Valdés definitions have been widely used for HL classes and programs across the United States. With a combination of these definitions and the HLI motto, I defined a heritage language as: “an indigenous or immigrant language other than English”. This shortened definition should allow survey participants to understand and apply the term during the survey.

Heritage Language Initiative

The formation of the Heritage Language Initiative (HLI) by Dr. Linda Godson and Dr. Patricia Wetzel in 2004 has served as the center for HL classes, programs, and courses at PSU. It is a student-based organization in the World Languages and Literatures Department with the mission:

- 1) To meet the needs of speakers of languages other than English in our communities
- 2) To build on the strengths that come out of bilingualism

The HLI conducted its first Campus Language Capacity Survey (CLCS) in 2005. The first time PSU's general campus population was surveyed with regard to HL. This survey identified 87 different heritage languages in use by students at PSU. Based on this survey, two HL courses have been regularly offered by PSU in Spanish and Vietnamese. There have been other courses offered on demand, e.g. Kurdish and Urdu, but they have not been successfully maintained due to diminishing demand and instructor availability.

After the creation of the Spanish and Vietnamese HL classes, the HLI began administering a Heritage Language Student Survey in every class. Each term the students in each HL classroom are asked in-depth questions about their HL background and usage, and their needs and expectations for the course. The HLI continues to supply this feedback opportunity to current HL students and provide research mentorship related HL for students working towards bachelor and master degrees.

The Campus Language Capacity Survey 2013 described here, slightly modifies the CLCS 2005. It canvases the current heritage languages represented by PSU students, staff, and faculty, as well as identifies further formal education opportunities for HLL at PSU. CLCS 2013 has

been adapted to reach a larger number of participants by using the host server software compatible with the university email system. It has also been modified to ask non-HL identifying participants about their familiarity with terms related to HL and FL acquisition and usage. In addition to these modifications, the CLCS also includes two new questions for identified HL participants. One asks about HLL interest in online courses and the other asks about interest in their HLs qualifying for the 2-year foreign language credit requirement for a Bachelor of Arts at PSU. These changes from CLCS 2005 reflect the progressive steps the HLI would like to take in expanding HL course offerings through online formats and for generating HL interest and familiarity with non-HL community members.

Methodology

This section elaborates on the criteria of the participants, measures, and procedures used to conduct this survey. The participants are all part of the PSU community and the participants section describes the selection process for those receiving a survey. The measures section describes the selection process for the components of the survey and includes a brief description of the host server software. The procedure section describes the implementation and completion of the survey.

Participants:

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning randomly selected 15,000 participants from the pdx.edu email mailing lists. This represents roughly half of the students at PSU and doubles the number of participants in CLCS 2005 survey. The survey was emailed through host server software and was open to randomly selected participants with an active pdx.edu email account. Advertising for this project was done through email invitations. All 15,000 participants received an email inviting them to participate and offering the option of winning a gift card. Advertising was also done through in-class announcements on the PSU campus. I contacted several professors and asked permission to give a 3-minute talk about the survey at the beginning or end of their class time.

As part of the survey participants were asked to indicate their status as an undergraduate, graduate, Post Bac, faculty, or staff. There was also the option of “Other” with an open response box⁴ for those wishing to comment. Students were asked to also indicate their area of study and expected degree. This is the only information asked from participants other than their language

⁴ Text box where respondents are free to devise their own unique answers to the posed question (Ruane, 2007).

experiences, the subject of the survey. Because none of this information is used to identify participants their anonymity was ensured.

Participation in this survey was completely voluntary, but to encourage participation a small incentive was offered. All participants were notified in their email and on the first page of the survey that there was an opportunity to win a local gift card. To enter the gift card sweepstakes, participants were required to complete the survey and click on an external link on the last page of the survey. The sweepstakes information form that asked for the participant's name and email address was not linked to their survey data. When the external link was clicked the original survey was ended and could not be re-accessed. Participants were notified through email during winter break and again at the beginning of winter term if they had received one of the gift cards which could be picked-up at the World Languages and Literatures Department (Neuberger 491).

Measures:

This project used a questionnaire format with open and closed response methods with both qualitative and quantitative responses. Its twelve questions ranged in level of sensitivity and focused questioning on HL and PSU HL questions. The survey had fewer questions taking cognizance of the potentially culturally sensitive topic of HL and to prevent oversharing of identifying participant information. The limited number of questions also shortened the survey time and limited the focus to the main intentions of the survey.

The primary intention of this survey was to better gauge the HL use of PSU's diverse community as well as to provide guidance for designing HL curricula. Six of the twelve

questions were required yes/no responses and six of the twelve questions were restricted open ended qualitative questions. They required a specific country, number, or language as a response which had to be manually entered. Some of these were available only if a previous “yes” response had been given (Appendix IV). Such questions do not count as part of the overall total of twelve questions since they are dependent on a specific previous response. Two questions were nominal categories, one for places where participants had encountered the specific terms related to HL and the other for identifying PSU. One question asked about the participant’s comfort level in different uses of the HL. Two questions asked the participant to indicate their degree of interest in the question’s topic by means of sliding scale with zero representing no interest and one hundred representing high interest. At the end of the survey there was a message thanking the participant and listing my contact information for further questions or comments. Underneath this question there was an open response box where the participant could leave any further comments or questions they wished to have included in the survey. The results section lists each question and collected answers.

To ensure compatibility with different computers and with the pdx.edu emailing system, the server software Qualtrics was selected to host the survey. Qualtrics is a research tool provided through PSU’s Office of Information Technology. Qualtrics is specifically designed for online data collection and analysis. Each question was uploaded and formatted into a survey template on Qualtrics and then the list of participants was uploaded into the emailing template which required a start and ending time to be set. As the surveys were completed by the participants, Qualtrics automatically collected and quantified the results as well as made lists of all the qualitative data. The Qualtrics server coded every available response space numerically and for this survey there are 25 available response spaces so that each possible response had a

separate code. Qualtrics also assigned each survey a “Response ID” and a “Respondent number” random identifiers used to see all related responses from a single participant. All information remained on the Qualtrics host server and was only extrapolated off the host site for publication purposes of the research findings. The findings and related published research of this project will remain in possession of the original researcher (myself) and the HLI for future research projects.

Procedures:

The survey emails (consisting of 13,000 randomly selected student participants and 2,000 staff/faculty participants with active pdx.edu email accounts) were sent through the Qualtrics on 18th of November 2013. This launch time was selected because it was not a midterm or finals week. The survey remained open for four weeks with an email reminder during the beginning of weeks 2 and 4 sent only to those with incomplete surveys. The survey was closed at midnight on the 13th of December 2013, the last day of Fall Term at the end of week 4.

Results

In this section is an overview of each survey question with its accompanying results. The results and implications of each question are further discussed in the next section. The total number of selected participants was 15,000 but due to some bounced emails, failed emails, or faulty addresses not recognized, and from “Out of Office” automated responses, the number of participants available to receive an email was 14,866. This yields a 9.6% response rate with a total number of 1,426 completed responses. The survey averaged 6.8 minutes to complete.

Question 1: “Have you heard of the terms heritage language, heritage language learner, or heritage language speaker before?”

Yes = 41%

No = 59%

School	Community	Work	Family/Friends	Home	Other	Advertising
73%	36%	32%	21%	13%	5%	3%

The “Other” category was as open response box. The 5% response rate represents 25 responses that fall under the umbrella of “Media” such as news, newspapers, internet, specific websites, books, and social media such as Facebook.

Question 2: “In what country where you born?”

A total of 86 participants indicated that they were born outside of the United States of America.

The top 5 birth places in descending order were: Mexico, India, Philippines, Ukraine, and Canada.

Question 2a: “If not born in the U.S., how old were you when you arrived here?”

The responses were given in a numerical value and ranged from age 0 to 44 years old.

Question 3: Does/Did your family use one or more languages other than English at home?”

Yes = 30% No = 70%

A “Yes” response unlocked an open response box where participants could type which languages. Of the 30% who responded Yes, 16.7% of them reported more than one language. The most reported language was Spanish, followed by German. See Appendix VI for a full graph.

Question 3a: “Does/Did anyone in your family speak one or more languages other than English?”

Yes = 57%

No = 43%

A “Yes” response unlocked an open response box where participants could type which languages. See Appendix VII for a full graph.

Question 4: "Do you identify as a heritage language learner or speaker?"

Yes = 23%

No = 77%

The 23% represents a total of 119 self-identified heritage learners and speakers. These participants were asked a series of questions about their level of comfort with their strongest heritage language while those who did not identify as heritage language learners or speakers were forwarded to Question 9 about languages other than English. Question 5 was specifically to identified HLL and HLS and the table below represents the possible responses with the number of responses collected with the totals for each row.

Question 5: “What is your comfort level in your strongest heritage language? (Please check one for each row)”

	Not at all Comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Comfortable	Very Comfortable	My language does not have a formal written system	Total Responses
Speaking	12	21	26	57	0	116
Listening	6	19	20	70	0	115
Reading	14	21	29	50	1	115
Writing	25	22	24	41	2	114
Total Responses	57	83	99	218	3	(460)

Question 6: “How interested are you in improving your ability in your heritage language by taking courses at PSU?”

The participants were asked to indicate their interest on a sliding scale of 0 to 100 with 100 being “very interested” in two separate areas:

Reading/Writing: the average was 63.46 with a standard deviation of 35.16.

Speaking/Listening: the average was 59.90 with a standard deviation of 35.47

Question 6a: “How important is it to you that such a course grant credit?”

The participants were asked to indicate their interest on a sliding scale of 0 to 100 with 100 being “very important”. The average response was 64.70 with a standard deviation of 37.77. All 199 participants responded to this question.

Question 7: “Would you be interested in having your Heritage Language be eligible for the 2-year language credit requirement?”

Yes = 79% No = 21%

Question 8: Would you be interested in having your heritage language available as an online course through PSU?”

Yes = 64% No = 36%

Questions 9 and 10 were open for all participants and asked about their languages-other-than-English proficiencies.

Question 9: “Would you be interested in taking online language courses through PSU?”

Yes = 55% No = 45%

There was a 100% response rate for these questions and many participants chose to comment on this topic in the open response question at the end of the survey. The below responses have been included because of their relevancy and eloquence to Question 9:

Would love to see more language options, especially online. Am very interested in more African language options. (47607)

Courses online would be a great option for parents that look to improve ourselves on our heritage language. (11722)

The idea of online language learning is intriguing however, I believe that there must be some contact between instructors and students when learning a language. The face-to-face component of language learning is essential in making valuable progress. (15771)

I would love the opportunity to take a language course online, however I think it would be best if there was some oral component as well. Perhaps a regular meet up where groups are given topics to discuss in the language? Online learning is helpful when meeting flexible schedules but to learn a language I would need practice speaking it. (26186)

Since language acquisition is also deeply grounded in cultural nuance, I'm not sure solely learning another language on-line can be as successful as a classroom experience. I say this as a teacher of many on-line classes and as someone who has learned two languages. (08667)

I don't think online language classes are anywhere near as impactful as "in-person" classes with an instructor and classroom. I would discourage PSU from heading in the direction of distance learning for language classes. Indonesia is a country of growing interest to the US and world (4th largest population, largest Muslim population). I would encourage PSU to consider developing a language program for Indonesian. Plus, President Wim Wiewel's wife is part Indonesian! (21484)

Question 10: "Have you learned a language other than English?"

Yes = 86% No = 14%

For Question 10 participants who answered "Yes" were asked to complete an open response table indicating which language(s), their age they began learning, and how comfortable they are using this language (uncomfortable, comfortable, very comfortable). An example table is shown:

Language	Age	Very Comfortable	Comfortable	Less Comfortable

Spanish, French, Japanese, American Sign Language and German were the top five languages in descending order. The ages for when they began learning these languages ranged from 0 to 60 years old. 351 participants indicated that they felt "very comfortable" using their language other

than English. 1,100 participants indicated that they felt “uncomfortable” using their language other than English. The most languages recorded for a single participant was eight and there were three participants who indicated they had learned up to eight languages.

Question 11: “Please indicate your status at PSU”

Undergraduate = 51%

Graduate = 18%

PostBac = 8%

Faculty = 13%

Staff = 14%

Other = 2%

“Other” had an open response box which collected 26 responses. These 26 responses fell into the categories of: High School Student, Auditor, Non Degree Student, International/Exchange Student, Advanced Placement Student, and Alumni. Since this was an online survey without a targeted PSU demographic, it is useful to know which demographics were reached so that future research can use the same online email approach to reach their targeted focus groups.

Question 12: “Do you have any questions or comments?”

This was an open response box and received 179 responses; some are presented in this paper to more accurately express participants’ views.

Discussion

In this section is a discussion of the results relating to the literature review and future implications. The survey results will be informative to the heritage community at PSU but it is not exhaustive. Limitations to this survey regarding the format and launch dates will also be discussed to inform future heritage research.

The first concern for all future launches of this survey (or similar surveys by the HLI) will be to boost participation rates. In this survey the first question was designed as a participant consent form [see Appendix III]. There was a 97% rate for “Yes, I would like to participate” and the other 3% is mainly divided between “No, I would prefer not to participate because I don’t have the time” (2%) and the free response “No, I would prefer not to participate because...” (1%). These responses suggest that the welcoming environment that was being aimed for through careful language selection was achieved. One “No” selection was a free response box and participant responses were mainly centered on the participant identifying as a non-heritage speaker or learner with responses such as: *English is my native language, therefore I'm unsure if my responses will benefit your research. Thank you, I don't speak, read or write a "heritage language"* and *I am not a heritage speaker*. The HLI can work on creating a clearer and more accessible survey for future launches based on this feedback. Two survey links might be a possible solution, so that one is specifically designed for those who readily identify as a heritage learner or speaker and the other is designed for those who do not identify as heritage learners or speakers. Data on foreign language development and student interest is also valuable to the HLI because it can be the foundation for generating more programs and courses where HLL numbers are low. By separating foreign language and heritage language issues of focus with two distinct surveys the related needs of each language learner can more easily be addressed.

Questions 3 and Questions 3a are very similar. The formatting of a similar question is used in the survey to help evoke responses from participants who might not identify as heritage language learners or speakers, but could perhaps be included under the definition. This second question format also extends the definition of family beyond those who live in the home which might have a different cultural weight for some people. Also, it was important to see which languages are represented through the participants' families, as family members might also be interested in pursuing classes at PSU if their language was offered. These questions are based off of the National Heritage Language Resource Center's definitions for HLL:

Simultaneous bilinguals who speak a family language and a societal majority language equally or almost equally

and

Native Speakers of the majority language whose parents or grandparents speak a heritage language, who have *strong emotional connections... strong cultural ties... little or no overt connection...* to the heritage language/culture (NHLRC, 2012).

These two definitions provide an adequate view of what survey participants might have encountered as definitions of HL. If a survey participant has only encountered the first narrow definition than they might not identify as a HL member because of these constraining parameters. In contrast, a survey participant might identify as a HL member under the second board definition but have trouble finding community connections and support due to not having “overt connections” or being able to speak the HL. Finding an appropriate working definition for the survey provides participants with tangible and relatable parameters for HL, while using current definitions to influence survey questions provides participants with ample opportunities

to apply the working definition. These two definitions influenced a two-part series question in the survey to help trigger HL association. The narrower definition influenced the wording in Question 3 for participants who learned a language in the home and used it regularly. The boarder definition influenced the wording in Question 3a to encompass participants who heard, spoke, or have a familial tie to a language other than English. If participants answered “No” to both of these questions then the online formatting automatically skipped to Question 9 asking about foreign language acquisition.

Question 3: Does/Did your family use one or more languages other than English at home?”

Question 3a: “Does/Did anyone in your family speak one or more languages other than English?”

The sliding scales used in questions 6 and 6a resulted in high standard deviations. This may indicate a need for an open question box attached so participants can further explain their response and that the sliding scale with increments of “1” was inadequate for these questions. The high standard deviations may also indicate the topic of these two questions as controversial since taking courses at PSU to improve these skills may not be a goal for the participants.

The topic of online language learning in question 9 had mixed results among the participants. The split results accurately reflect the inclusion of this topic in the participants’ feedback from question 12, indicates that there is more to say on the subject. A further study on this topic could delve further into the various aspects around this issue and also allow participants more opportunities to voice their opinions.

For question 11, undergraduates made up half of the participant demographic which may be an indicator that this demographic is most interested or informed in issues relating to HL.

Future research projects could be tailored to target this specific demographic and programs in the HLI can consider developing specific criteria based on identified needs of undergraduate students.

The last question of the survey was for further comments or questions and this open response box received a 14.4% response rate. Since many positive and related questions and comments were brought up in this open response box, it proved to be a useful addition to the survey. By allowing participants to give their personal opinions upon completion, the HLI now has data on the specific interests, motivations, and hesitations for those seeking HL services at PSU. Since this open response box was not a requirement for finishing, none of the participants were under any pressure to respond. There was no character limit so one participant (95309) wrote a nicely eloquent response about their experience as a HLL:

I was never properly taught Thai but since my dad spoke it with his family, I was around it and learned by being submerged in the language, the same goes for Spanish... when I took Spanish 3, it focused on writing more than speaking and I became less confident in speaking and could not conjugate or think of words as quickly while trying to do oral presentations... However, if you go to a Spanish speaking country and you're trying to communicate, you don't have time to think, you just speak and that's where I feel emphasis on writing hinders one's speaking ability. I would like to see more speaking emphasis in the language courses and less writing, more oral presentations and conversation workshops within the class. (Appendix VII)

This participant has experienced what many other HLL have experienced by trying to learn their language in a foreign language classroom or through other conventional methods of language learning. From this participants feedback the HLI can look into furthering the available heritage course offerings to include Thai and Arabic.

Other course offering could include Native American languages from the surrounding regions and Gaelic or Welsh, as these were repeated requests from several participants. Here are some quotes from their free responses to better express their viewpoints:

Would like to see Native American language classes offered. Perhaps languages pertinent to local indigenous tribes in the NW region. (47629)

I would just like to comment on the fact that my tribe is from Oregon, yet my language is not offered here. There are other tribes like the Navajo who can learn their language, yet Oregon continues to deny me my culture. Also I find it very ironic that I have to learn a "foreign language" to graduate, which I have --ENGLISH, but somehow that does not count. (55632)

If you are aiming to try new languages at PSU, all current languages are foreign, it would be nice to be able to learn a language that may be in danger of being lost from local or surrounding areas, such as Sahaptin (which is spoken on the

Plateau of Oregon, Washington, Idaho) or even a coastal language, or Chinookan language (other than chinook jargon as it's only a trade language and only has 500 words or so), A university in Oregon has done a Sahaptin class for three years and was very successful, would be nice to see it here in Portland. (72201)

I would love to learn Gaelic more fully, Scots or Irish. If Portland State could help me find teachers for something like this, I would appreciate it. Some other students might likely be in this same boat. (24135)

I think it would be interesting if Portland State offered a class or way to learn less common national languages. For instance I am interested in learning Irish Gaelic but there are very few resources that offer learning it, probably because it is less used. But I think it would be cool to see more languages offered whether that is through a normal class or by some other means. Thank you. (18078)

It would be great if PSU offered a wider variety of languages from various language families; there are multiple romance languages but no Brythonic languages like Welsh. (51229)

Due to the flexible definition of a heritage speaker, learner, and language Native American languages, Gaelic, and Welsh fall under the umbrella of heritage language. Not all heritage languages have to be learnt in childhood or informally introduced to the learner during their lifespan. A heritage language can come from the learner's heritage and ancestry. The HLI can work towards offering a course for these languages through future canvassing to find what the student demand is for of each language and the availability of instructors, classrooms, materials, etc.

Implications:

Due to the variation in HL definitions and author perspectives in the Literature Review, it is evident that language teaching needs to be student-centered for HL contexts because of the unique previous language experiences and cultural identities of the learners. The traditional methods for foreign and academic language instruction will not meet the needs of a HLL. By reevaluating the defining parameters of HL, it is also necessary to reevaluated how language is taught. These perspectives are significant influences for the HLI's construction of their HL surveys and to the creation and necessity of this survey to better fit the needs of HLL. The traditional course offerings of language being taught as a 'foreign language' do not meet the complicated social and cultural needs of heritage language learners and are insensitive to the oral proficiencies of most heritage language speakers. Traditional introductory foreign language classes are not prepared for heritage students who have high oral and conversation skills but are perhaps lacking the ability to read, write, or use an academic HL register. This can cause the heritage student to feel bored or as if they don't belong. These feelings can distance them from their goal of learning about their heritage language.

The working definition and general formatting of this survey took into consideration the cultural sensitivity and ambiguousness of HL. Questions needed to be proposed in a non-intrusive way while also extracting maximum information about HLs represented on the PSU campus and potential HL interest for language learning benchmarks and course credits. This documented interest will serve as the foundation for the HLI and PSU to work in collaboration to offer language credit (a Bachelor of Arts degree requirement) for students taking HL courses. This will help students continue on their path to graduation without unnecessary electives, time, or money spent on additional courses and it will provide an opportunity for heritage students to continue in their heritage language studies rather than completing an additional set of foreign language courses.

Limitations:

A limitation of this survey is that it is not possible to reach all students, staff, faculty, and PSU affiliates. It is limited to those with active pdx.edu accounts and dependent on participant interest in the survey and tendency to regularly check their pdx.edu accounts. It is also limited in size to only 15,000 participants. Even though this survey has been created with an emphasis on heritage social and cultural sensitivity, there is still the possibility that completion may be avoided due to the personal questions about identity and HL proficiency.

Another limitation was the timing of the survey launch. The ideal week for launching would have been the second week of classes, which is a time of relatively low stress and high extracurricular engagement compared to other weeks such as the 4th week (midterms) and the 10th and 11th weeks (last week of classes and finals). Different timing could have received higher response rates and allowed the survey to remain open for longer with less curricular interruption.

With the online formatting and accessibility of the survey's creation process, I hope that further research will include another completion of the survey. If the survey were able to be revised and collect new data on a biannual basis then this would yield data useful for long-term assessment of HL trends. This would also allow more accurate feedback on the implemented programs.

This survey catered to the academic needs of the HLI for creating future programs at PSU. HL research is typically done in the ethnographic style to capture the participants' unique voice and extend discussion on cultural identity. Despite the inclusion of open response boxes on the survey; an online survey is simply not the correct format to collect an extensive amount of personal information. The coding of qualitative data in a high-participant research project is time consuming and impractical. Based on the literature review, it is apparent that HL and heritage community are deeply intertwined. It would be valuable to also put the survey results in context with the "sense of community" built at PSU and see the correlation between heritage language speakers and speakers of languages other than English and their sense of community. To extend the research focus beyond the classroom because most of the cultural and language interaction is currently happening within the HL communities. It would also be valuable to place this survey in context with the greater Portland demographics for languages spoken beyond the campus of PSU, other surrounding sources of academic language instruction (such as Portland State Community College and Lewis and Clark University) and also in the context for the whole state of Oregon.

Conclusion

This survey has shown that there is a significant HL community at PSU. Of the HL community represented through these survey responses, the majority have shown interest in pursuing courses, online and in the classroom at PSU, related to their HL. This survey has also provided a list of HLs used by the current PSU population, and indicated a desire for students to receive credit in HLs to fulfill degree requirements. With this new information the HLI in collaboration with PSU will be able to create programs tailored to the needs of those enrolling, teaching, or funding courses.

While this survey canvassed a relatively small and constricted participant group, it has adequately represented the participants' views and needs related to HL academic learning. It has also shown that it is possible to survey university campuses using an online email format and that some of the related criteria specific to university campuses, such as greater undergraduate responses and division among opinions of online language classes. Heritage language research is a growing field that can benefit from all kinds of research. This survey will help not only the PSU community but also the greater community by providing a model for future surveys. Modern technology has in many ways transformed our expanding world into a communicative global village. It has played a significant role in language preservation and revitalization and brought to light the vulnerability of language. HLS and HLL face the constant risk of losing their heritage, culture, and language as more dominant languages are needed for wider communication. By raising awareness of endangered languages, as a community we can reach out to support them before they disappear.

Annotated Bibliography

Bauckus, Susan; Brinton, Donna M; and Kagan, Olga (ed.s). (2008). *Heritage Language education: A new field emerging*. New York: Routledge.

A collection of case studies focusing on heritage language. Each case study is present in a similar format and the results and implications are tied into further heritage research and knowledge for the emerging field. Many of the studies focus on indigenous languages in Canada and immigrant languages in the US.

Bianco, J. and Peyton, J. (2013). *Vitality of Heritage Languages in the United States: The Role of Capacity, Opportunity, and Desire*. Heritage Language Journal, 10 (3) I – VIII.

A research paper based on the three conditions necessary for language vitality and revitalization. These conditions are: capacity development, opportunity creation and desire. By looking at the dynamics of heritage language cultures and communities the researchers have defined this criteria based on natural observation of languages withstanding endangerment.

Dana, G. (2011) *Infancy: Development from Birth to Age 3, Second Edition*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

University level textbook about human development from conception to age 3. The information is laid out in chronological order. There is comprehensive historical background to this period in life and how that has developed over time and come into the modern views of today. It also addresses how current public policies have been shaped due to recent infant development research.

Godson, Linda; and Wetzel, Patricia. *Campus Language Capacity Survey*. Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures: Heritage Language Initiative. Portland State University, 12 May 2005.

A previous survey launched at Portland State University to investigate the heritage language use of the student body. It was conducted in 2005 and the results informed the creation of this current survey. The research is attached in the appendix.

Godson, Linda. *Campus Language Capacity Survey Proposal*. Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures: Heritage Language Initiative. Portland State University, 12 May 2005.

A previous survey launched at Portland State University to investigate the heritage language use of the student body. It was conducted in 2005 and the results informed the creation of this current survey. The research is attached in the appendix. This is the proposal section.

Hall, C., Smith, P. and Wicaksono, R. (2011). *Mapping applied linguistics: a guide for students and practitioners*. New York: Routledge.

University level textbook of introductory material for the field of Applied Linguistics. This text includes a socio-cultural and cognitive perspective for the growing range of theories, methods, and issues under this field. A section of this text is dedicated to language teaching and education, literacy and language disorders and how these theories are applied in real world settings.

Heath, S. (1982). *What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school*. *Language in Society* 11 (1) 49-76.

Peer reviewed article of a comparative study on patterns of language use in three literate communities in the south-eastern United States. The research is set up as an ethnography with an empirical study of the written sources across three communities (one high socio-economic status, one middle socio-economic status, and one low socio-economic status) and marks the interactions of 'literacy events' which the author defines as "occasions in which written language is integral to the nature of the participants' interactions and their interpretive processes and strategies". The two key focuses of this study are the ways each community uses and interpret knowledge from the printed word and its relationship to children's social interactions with caregivers and the validity of "the literate tradition" or "the oral tradition". This article presents evidence for the power of printed word (specifically in the form of books) and literacy events in a young child's developing mind as a positive impact. It also shows the disparity between the parent's level of education and relationship to printed word and the amount of literacy events integrated into everyday life.

Heritage Language Initiative (2012). *What is the Heritage Language Initiative? FAQs*. World Languages and Literatures, Portland State University.

Retrieved from: <http://pdx.edu/wll/heritage-languages>

The online website of the Heritage Language Initiative. Information relating to the student organization and the motto can be found here. Contact information is available and the website is part of the World Languages and Literatures Department at Portland State University.

Johnson, D.C. (2010). The Relationship between Applied Linguistic Research and Language Policy for Bilingual Education, *Applied Linguistics*, 31(1), 72-93.

The article looks at the school systems of Philadelphia and the political obstacles facing many of its bilingual supporting programs. The research was conducted as a three year long ethnographic study of bilingual education language policy. The article argues that several of the reformations to Philadelphia's bilingual education system have turned the programs from bilingual friendly places to English-integration focused. This excludes all native English speakers and citizens born in the USA with English as a first language from participating in their programs. These policies place several strict parameters on these programs if they wish to continue state and government funding. The conclusion of this article focused on the need to maintain native language and create a better committee system involving local community members as well as political appointees.

Kluger, J (2013). *Understanding How the Brain Speaks Two Languages*. Time Magazine, 10-13. An article about the current psychological understanding of language. This article outlines the main points between heritage and bilingual speakers contrasted to monolingual speakers. It deciphers some of the intricate neurological workings of the brain and how language is perceived, functioning, and produced.

Oh, J. and Fuligni, A. (2008). *The Role of Heritage Language Development in the Ethnic Identity and Family Relationships of Adolescents from Immigrant Backgrounds*. Social Development, 19 (1) 202-220.

A research article about the influence of immigrant-background adolescents; heritage language proficiency and the use of the language on parent-child relationships. This research involved 414 adolescents from Latin American and Asian backgrounds. Heritage language proficiency was positively associated with quality of this relationship but not the heritage language use.

Owens, R. (2012). *Language Development: an Introduction, Eighth Edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

University level textbook information in a chronological and practical layout with a developmental perspective on language and with an emphasis on abnormal language development. This text includes discussions on language variations among children, new advances in linguistics and neurology, the importance of literacy, language development theories, bilingual and dialectal issues, and constructionist perspectives.

National Heritage Language Resource Center (2012). *How do you define Heritage Speakers?* UCLA International Institute: Center for World Languages. The Regents of the University of California. Retrieved from: <http://www.nhlrc.ucla.edu/>

An online internet resource for the current heritage language research conducted by the National Heritage Language Resource Center from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Sanchez-Munoz, A. (2013). *Who Soy Yo?: The Creative Use of "Spanglish" to Express a Hybrid Identity in Chicana/o Heritage Language Learners of Spanish*. Hispania, 96 (3) 440-441.

A research article that looks into the creation and use of "Spanglish" a code-switching and code-mixing phenomenon between English and Spanish bilingual speakers. This research looks at the identities formed in the communities and in the classrooms for Chicana/o college students.

Shin, S. (2010). "What about me? I'm not like Chinese but I'm not like American": *Heritage-Language Learning and Identity of Mixed-Heritage Adults*. Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 9 (3) 203-219.

A research essay on a study that examined heritage language experiences and identities through a series of in-depth background and autobiographical interviews. There were 12 adult participants of mixed-heritage backgrounds, each with an American parent and a parent from the heritage culture. The concepts of self and other perceived identities is discussed at length as well as the cultural view of U.S. identity and the interaction it plays with culture and community.

Sims, C. (2005). *Tribal Languages and the Challenges of Revitalization*.

Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 36 (1) 104-106.

A research article on how heritage language research is establishing a pattern to help inform and connect heritage language communities in their efforts of revitalization. It assesses the main-stream influence of English on heritage languages and their communities. It also analyzes language learning events that extend beyond the instructional times in classrooms for further understanding of heritage language acquisition.

Traxler, M. (2012). *Introduction to psycholinguistics: Understanding language science*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

University level textbook information covering the full spectrum of language representations and processes. Recently published, this follows the most current thinking of today with a scientific, psychological, and linguistic perspective. This text contains in-depth explanations of language processing models, bilingual language processing, sign language, reading, and the neurological basis of language production and comprehension.

Valdés, Guadalupe (2001). *Heritage Language Students: Profiles and Possibilities*. Stanford

University. Retrieved from: <http://www.nflc.org/REACH/documents/valdes.pdf>

An online resource for definitions related to heritage language and communities. This resource explores the many aspects of heritage language and heritage culture and those who identify with them.

Werker, J. (2012). Perceptual foundations of bilingual acquisition in infancy. *Annals of The New York Academy of Sciences*, 1251(1) 50-61.

Bilingual infants in this study were found to be able to discriminate between their native language and non-native languages by looking at silent talking faces at 8 months old but their monolingual counterparts were unable to do the same. When tested previously at 4-6 months old both cohorts were able to discriminate equally. Bilingual infants were found to use rhythm and visual information to discriminate their own language from others and comprehend word order. Infants are born equipped to handle information from multiple languages and are efficient and differentiating between languages.

You, B. (2010). *Children Negotiating Korean American Ethnic Identity Through Their*

Heritage Language. The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 29(3) 711-721.

A preliminary study about the interpretive readings of focus groups and interviews from Korean American children. The aim of this research is to examine how Korean American children negotiate their ethnic identity and heritage identities. Maintaining heritage language is important to Korean American children in terms of helping them have a positive ethnic identity.

Appendix I

Campus Language Capacity Survey

7 October 2013

Laura Van Doren (contact: vandoren@pdx.edu)

Proposal:

This survey is intended as a follow-up to the Campus Language Capacity Survey conducted in March of 2005 by the Heritage Language Initiative [HLI], in the Department of World Languages and Literatures at Portland State University [PSU], under Linda Godson, Juliette Stoering, Cheryl Ramette, Andy Wang, and Patricia Wetzel. I will be defining a heritage language as an indigenous or immigrant language other than English. The primary intention of this survey is to better gauge the language use of the PSU students, faculty, and staff as well as to provide guidance for offering correct and adequate instruction for those who wish to increase their speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills in their heritage language.

The 2005 survey measured the number of PSU students, staff, and faculty who had lived, or currently lived, in homes where a heritage language, a language other than English, was primarily spoken. The main purposes were to guide new language course offerings, to assist in planning outreach to local ethnic communities, and to contribute to research in heritage language studies. The survey was conducted via email to a randomly selected sample of 5,852 students and 2,155 faculty/staff, of which approximately 20% responded, representing 7% of the total number of individuals at PSU. In their responses, 87 different languages were represented from the 397 people who identified themselves as heritage language speakers and 245 of the heritage language speakers indicated that they were interested in improving their heritage language skills.

This follow-up survey will allow the HLI the opportunity to reach a larger sample of PSU students, faculty, and staff, with a target goal of approximately 15,000 participants via email. This survey will allow the chance to compare survey responses between the 2005 survey and the new survey, to continue to appropriately improve and develop HLI and PSU programs by addressing the needs of heritage speakers at PSU and in the community, and to contribute to further research on heritage languages. There will be some changes from the 2005 survey. I will use more participant friendly terminology to provoke comfortable participation as well as more specific and in-depth questions so I, in collaboration with the HLI, can better determine areas for improvement. I have also added a question for those wishing not to participate so future surveyors can accumulate a larger respondent group and create surveys that better accommodate our participants.

Appendix II

Email Paragraph:

Hello,

My name is Laura Van Doren and I would like to invite you on behalf of PSU's Heritage Language Initiative, to participate in the Campus Language Capacity Survey 2013. This is a brief survey focusing on improving and developing our language programs here at Portland State University and should take about 10 minutes to complete. Participation in this survey is completely voluntary and you are not required to participate. By completing this survey you may enter in our Heritage Language Initiative Sweepstakes and win a local gift card. The survey responses are anonymous and will not be linked to the identify information used to award the gift card.

By clicking on this link you are consenting to participate in the survey:

[Link to Survey]

Thank you!

Laura Van Doren

For further comments or questions about this survey please email me at vandoren@pdx.edu

Appendix III

Survey Paragraph:

Please read the following paragraph before beginning the survey:

This survey is completely voluntary and you are not required to complete it. The survey is part of a research project intended as a follow-up to the Campus Language Capacity Survey conducted in March of 2005 by the Heritage Language Initiative in the Department of World Languages and Literatures. The primary intention of this survey is to better gauge the language use of PSU's diverse community as well as to provide guidance for offering correct and adequate instruction for those who wish to increase their speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills in their heritage language. **In this survey heritage language is defined as an indigenous or immigrant language other than English.** This survey is composed of twelve questions and should take between 5 to 10 minutes. By participating in this survey you will be contributing to valuable research needed to appropriately improve and develop our programs by addressing the needs of heritage speakers at PSU and in the community, and to further research on heritage languages. By completing the survey you will also be eligible to win a local gift card. The survey responses are anonymous and will not be linked to the identify information used to award the gift card.

Survey responses are anonymous and will not be connected to any personal information.

- ☐ Yes, I would like to participate.
- ☐ No, I would prefer not to participate because I don't have the time.
- ☐ No, I would prefer not to participate because I don't see the relevance.
- ☐ No, I would prefer not to participate because I'm unsure of what is expected.
- ☐ No, I would prefer not to participate because the directions are unclear.
- ☐ No, I would prefer not to participate because this survey is too personal.
- ☐ No, I would prefer not to participate because _____(open response)_____.

Appendix IV

Survey Questions 2013

1. Have you heard of the terms heritage language, heritage language learner, or heritage language speaker before? Yes ____ No ____

1a. If yes, please indicate where you have heard these terms:

__ Home

__ Work

__ Community

__ Family/Friends

__ School

__ Advertising Business or Company

Other: _____(open response)_____

2. In what country were you born? _____(open response)_____

2a. If not born in the U.S., how old were you when you arrived here? _____(numerical)_____

3. Does/Did your family use one or more languages other than English at home?

Yes ____ No ____

3a. Does/Did anyone in your family speak one or more languages other than English?

Yes ____ No ____

4. If yes, which language(s) _____(open response)_____

5. Do you identify as a heritage language learner or speaker? Yes ____ No ____

6. What is your comfort level in your strongest heritage language?

(please check one for each row)

	None	Some	Most	Fluent	My language has no formal written system
Speaking					
Listening					
Reading					
Writing					

7. How interested are you in improving your ability in your heritage language by taking courses at PSU?

7a. For Speaking/Listening (please circle one)
Not interested [0-----100] Very interested

7b. For Reading/Writing (please circle one)
Not interested [0-----100] Very interested

8. How important is it to you that such a course grant credit? (please circle one)
Not important [0-----100] Very important

8a. Would you be interested in having your Heritage Language be eligible for the 2-year language credit requirement? Yes ____ No ____

9. Have you acquired another language other than English? If yes, please tell us which language(s), at what age you began learning and how comfortable you are speaking it:

Language (One Language Per Line)	Age (Numerals)	Uncomfortable	Moderately Comfortable	Very Comfortable

10. Would you be interested in taking online language courses through PSU?
Yes ____ No ____

11. Please indicate your status at PSU

__ Undergraduate __ Graduate __ PostBac
__ Faculty __ Staff __ PSU Alumn

11a. Students, please indicate your area of studies and what degree you expect to earn

_____ (open response) _____

12. Do you have any questions or comments?

Please do not reveal any identifying information you do not wish to have published in regards to this survey's results. If you have further questions or comments in regards to this survey but do not wish to record them in the survey, please contact Laura Van Doren at vandoren@pdx.edu

_____ (open response) _____

Thank you for participating in the Campus Language Capacity 2013 survey!

Please use the link below if you would like to be entered in our sweepstakes to win a local gift card. Survey responses are anonymous and will not be connected to any personal information. By clicking on the link below you will leave this survey.

[LINK]

end of survey

Appendix V

Separate Link for Sweepstakes:

This information is not in any way connected to previous survey answers and is strictly confidential.

If you would like to be entered in our sweepstakes to win a local gift card please fill out the following information:

Name: _____
Phone: _____
Email: _____

I am a heritage language speaker (this will not affect your eligibility): Yes ____ No ____

I am willing to be contacted for further follow-up (this will not affect your eligibility):
Yes ____ No ____

If you have additional comments or questions, you may email Laura Van Doren at vandoren@pdx.edu.

For more information, take a look at the PSU Heritage Language website at <http://www.fl.pdx.edu/html/Languages/heritage/index.htm>

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix VI
Graphs of Survey Questions

6 Responses:

Farsi, Yiddish

5 Responses:

Danish, Hebrew, Polish, Portuguese

4 Responses:

Dutch, Gaelic, Laotian, Urdu

3 Responses:

Hmong, Hungarian, Ilocano, Mixteco, Norwegian, Punjabi, Sinhalese, Swahili, Taiwanese, Telugu, Thai, Turkish, Visayan,

2 Responses:

American Sign Language, Armenian, Czech, Greek, Kannada, Marathi, Navajo, Palauan, Romanian, Scots, Swedish, Swiss German,

1 Response:

Amharic, Arpitan, Azeri, Bahasa Indonesia, Basa Surabaya (Surabaya Dialect), Belau, Bengali, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cebuano, Chinuk WaWa, Creole, Croatian, Finnish, Flemish, Fortran, Hakka, Icelandic, Ilonggo, Indonesian, Irish, Kalengin, Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Klamath, Kurdish, Lithuanian, Luhya, Maay Maay, Macedonian, Malay, Mandarin (Hun), Modoc, Native American Pima, Nepali, Nigerian, North Sumatran's Batak, Persian, Pingelapese (Micronesian Dialect), Romansh, Sahaptin, Sanskrit, Serbian, Serbian (Serbo-Croatian), Serbo-Croatian, Somali, Tajik, Tamil, Tarazcan, Tigrigna, Tongan, Turkish-Arabic, Uzbek.

15 Responses:

Hindi, Portuguese

13 Responses:

Dutch, Swedish

12 Responses:

Korean, Norwegian

9 Responses:

American Sign Languages, Cantonese, Greek, Turkish, Yiddish

8 Responses:

Polish

7 Responses:

Danish, Farsi, Ukrainian

6 Responses:

Hungarian, Thai

5 Responses:

Czech, Latin

4 Responses:

Croatian, Telugu

3 Responses:

Armenian, Finnish, Ilocano, Kannada, Laotian, Persian, Punjabi, Sinhalese, Swahili, Taiwanese, Tamil, Urdu

2 Responses:

Cebuano, Cherokee, Gaelic, Indonesian, Lithuanian, Nepali, Palauan, Romanian, Sanskrit, Sign Language, Uzbek

1 Response:

American Indian Karuk Tribe, Amharic, Arpitan, Austrian, Azeri, Bahasa Indonesia, Basa Surabaya (Surabaya Dialect), Basque, Belarusian, Belizean Creole, Bengali, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cajun French, Castellano, Chinook Wawa, Creole, Fortran, Friez, Haitian Creole, Hakka, Hawaiian, Hmong, Icelandic, Irish, Kalenjin, Kapampangan, Kikuyu, Kinyarwanda, Kirundi, Klamath, Kurdish, Luhya, Maay Maay, Malay, Malayalam, Marathi, Mixteco, Modoc, Native Language of Mexico, Navajo, Pascal, Pidgin, Pima, Quechua, Quileute, Sahaptin, Samoan, Scots, Scots Gaelic, Serbian, Serbian (Serbo-Croatian), Sheng, Slavic, Slovak, Somali, Swiss, Swiss-German, Tahitian, Taishanese, Tajik, Teochew, Tigrigna, Tongan, Turkish-Arabic, Urdu, Visayan, Yugoslav

Have you acquired another language other than English?

Total Responses = 1,175

10 Responses:

Hebrew, Norwegian , Portuguese

9 Responses:

Turkish

7 Responses:

Greek, Sign Language, Swedish

6 Responses:

Ancient Greek, Dutch, Tagalog

5 Responses:

Mandarin, Polish, Swahili, Tamil, Thai

4 Responses:

Cantonese, Czech, Danish, Haitian Creole, Kannada, Sinhalese, Telugu

3 Responses:

Farsi, Finnish, Hungarian, Indonesian, Nepali, Uzbek, Yiddish

2 Responses:

Armenian, Bengali, Croatian, Icelandic, Irish Gaelic, Kurdish, Lithuanian, Malay, Marathi, Persian, Romanian, Sanskrit, Scots Gaelic, Taiwanese, Tongan, Urdu, Wolof

1 Response:

Anishinaabemowin, Azeri, Basa Surabaya, Basque, Bulgarian, Cambodian/Khmer, Classic Greek, Gaelic, Greek (Homeric), Guarani, Hakka, Hawaiian Creole, Ilocano, Kalenjin, Kikuyu, Kisi, Kiswahili, Klamath, Laotian, Modoc, Mongolia, Newari, Pima, Provencal, Punjabi, Sahptin, Samoan, Sanish, Scots, Setswana, Sign Language (SEE), Somali, Swiss, Tahitian, Tajik, Teochew, Welsh, Xhosa, Zulu

Appendix VII**Participant 95309 Response**

I REALLY want to learn Arabic and when I read the course description the course focuses a lot on reading and writing. While I understand that reading and writing are critical in learning a new language, it is very hard for me to learn this way. I was never properly taught Thai but since my dad spoke it with his family, I was around it and learned by being submerged in the language, the same goes for Spanish. I was required to learn Spanish in middle/high school and the first year was strictly speaking and less reading/writing; I excelled and was at the top of my class. But when I took Spanish 3, it focused on writing more than speaking and I became less confident in speaking and could not conjugate or think of words as quickly while trying to do oral presentations because when you do a writing assignment, you have time to think of the word you want to use, think about the conjugation and read it over to make sure you formed the sentence correctly. However, if you go to a Spanish speaking country and you're trying to communicate, you don't have time to think, you just speak and that's where I feel emphasis on writing hinders one's speaking ability. I would like to see more speaking emphasis in the language courses and less writing, more oral presentations and conversation workshops within the class.

Appendix VIII

Campus Language Capacity Survey 2005: Participant Information

The Foreign Languages and Literatures Department has begun work on a new language initiative. As a first step in this process, we would like to know how many people at PSU live or have lived in homes where a language other than English is spoken – that is, a heritage language. The data from this study will be useful in a number of ways. It will help us offer appropriate language courses, will contribute to developing programs to address the needs of heritage speakers at PSU and in the community, and will be used in much-needed research on heritage languages.

We would very much appreciate your taking a few minutes to fill out this brief survey. Your participation is voluntary and all information will be strictly confidential. Participation or non-participation in the study will not affect your status at Portland State University in any way. If you have concerns or questions about your participation in this study or your rights as a research subject, please contact the Human Subjects Research Review Committee, Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, 111 Cramer Hall, Portland State University, 503-725-4288. If you have questions about the study itself, contact Dr. Linda Godson at 360-546-0341 or godsonl@pdx.edu.

Appendix IX

Campus Language Capacity Survey 2005: Survey Questions

Filling out the following form will indicate that you have read the above information and agree to take part in the study.

1. If you are a currently admitted undergraduate student, what is your major or area of study?

2. If you are a currently admitted graduate student,
 - a. What is your area of study _____
 - b. What degree do you expect to earn? _____
3. In what country were you born? _____
4. If not born in the U.S., what year did you arrive here? _____
5. Does your family use a language other than English at home? Yes ____ No ____
If no, please go to question 10.
6. If yes, what language(s) _____ -
7. What is your ability level in your strongest heritage language?

<u>Speaking/listening</u>	
a. understand some, but can't speak	_____
b. speak a little	_____
c. get along in a conversation	_____
d. understand and speak fluently	_____
<u>Reading/writing</u>	
e. cannot read at all	_____
f. can read and/or write a little	_____
g. can read and/or write well	_____
8. How interested are you in improving your command of your heritage language by taking courses at PSU? (circle one) Not interested 1 2 3 4 Very interested
9. How important is it to you that such a course grant credit?
Not important 1 2 3 4 Very important
10. Do you have any questions or comments?

If you are a heritage language speaker and would be willing to be contacted for follow-up, please provide the following information:

Name _____
 Phone _____
 Email _____

If you prefer, you may email Dr. Linda Godson at godsonl@pdx.edu .

For more information, take a look at the PSU Heritage Language website at
<http://www.flpdx.edu/html/Languages/heritage/index.htm>

Thank you for your help

Appendix X

Campus Language Capacity Survey 2005: Results

Campus Language Capacity Survey

Heritage Language Initiative

Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

Portland State University

May 12, 2005

Contacts: Linda Godson, 360-931-0408 or 360-546-0341 or godsonl@pdx.edu

Patricia Wetzel, 503-725-5277 or wetzelp@pdx.edu

● Background

In March, 2005, a survey was conducted via email to find out how many people on the PSU campus live or have lived in homes where a language other than English is spoken—a heritage language. It consisted of 14 questions. Uses for the data are:

- a) to guide new language course offerings,
- b) to assist in planning outreach to local ethnic communities, and
- c) to contribute to research in heritage language studies.

The survey was created, tested, administered, and analyzed by:

Linda Godson, Coordinator of the Heritage Language Initiative

Juliette Stoering, Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP)

Cheryl Ramette, Center for Academic Excellence

Andy Wang, Center for Academic Excellence

☞ Subjects

The survey was sent to a randomly selected sample of 5,852 students and 2,155 faculty/staff. Approximately 20% responded, representing about 7% of the total number of individuals at PSU. Of the respondents, 25% or 397 people identified themselves as heritage language speakers. Two hundred forty five heritage language speakers indicated that they were interested in improving their heritage language skills.

☞ Results

Languages: 87 different languages were represented. The most common was Spanish with 75 speakers or 15.5% of the heritage language speakers. The next 10 most common (high to low) were Chinese, German, Hindi, French, Japanese, Vietnamese, Arabic, Russian, Korean, and Telugu. Some of the less familiar languages represented were Kannada (India), Amharic (Ethiopia), Twi (Niger-Congo), Newari (Tibet), and Chamorro (Guam). There were 3 Gaelic speakers and 1 Welsh speaker.

Many respondents reported they speak more than one heritage language. 55 speak 2 languages, 14 speak 3, 5 speak 4, and 1 speaks 5 languages.

Languages from all parts of the world were given with these breakdowns in percentages of the total number of heritage speakers::

European (other than Spanish)	29.39 %	
East Asian	17.18	
Spanish	15.53	
South Asian	13.46	
Southeast Asian	9.11	
Middle Eastern	5.80	
African		3.93
South American	1.45	
North American (ASL)	1.04	
Native American	0.84	
Caribbean	0.84	
Polynesian	0.63	
Central Asian	0.42	
Micronesian	0.42	

☞ Abilities in a heritage language

Of the 397 heritage language speakers who responded, 70% evaluated themselves as fluent. Only 63% said they could read and/or write well.

☞ Interest in further study

The breakdown for interest in further heritage language study was:

Not interested	140
Slightly interested	57
Somewhat interested	80
Very interested	108

Thus, 245 of 397 or 60 % of heritage speakers are candidates for courses. About 70% of heritage speakers thought that it was important that such courses be offered for credit.

Respondent comments

Many respondents had comments about heritage language use and courses. Examples are,

“I wish I could speak one of my ‘heritage’ languages (Swedish or Norwegian).”

“I think the program is a wonderful idea. Here at Upward Bound we work with a large population of high school students who learned English as a second language. There are really no opportunities for many of them to study their ‘heritage’ language.”

“I am a native Japanese but my husband is an American. He took Japanese courses at PSU and PCC. Since he liked the method at PSU, he may take it again in the future without credit.”
(Note: a person with a cultural tie to a language is also a ‘heritage speaker.’)

“I am totally psyched about having Heritage Languages here at PSU! I teach Spanish, and there are so many people who have Spanish language background that are losing their language because it is not supported by a culture that stresses fluency in English.”

“I grew up in a home where Polish language was spoken. I would be interested in a class to re-learn it. I get letters from my relatives in Poland written in Polish and have to seek out native interpreters.”

“I think Cantonese should be offered as a heritage course.” (Note: It will be offered in Fall 2005)

“I think that Heritage Language courses are vital in an effort to preserve linguistic diversity as more and more languages become extinct due to the growing hegemony of English motivated by globalization and the ever widening world trade circles.”

☞ Next steps

The data are now being analyzed further with breakdowns of most questions by students vs. faculty/staff and by language.

The comments will be summarized and reported.

Demographics of the public schools in the area and from the U.S. Census will be compared to the survey results.

The survey will be conducted each Spring quarter to follow trends in languages represented on campus.