

Comparing advanced L2 and heritage language learners' Spanish grammars

Some pedagogical considerations

Clara Burgo

Loyola University Chicago

It is very well known that we should take a sociolinguistic teaching approach for Spanish heritage language (HL) learners' instruction. Potowski (2005) proposed that instruction be centered on literacy development and grammatical knowledge. However, not much has been said regarding grammar instruction: What does Spanish HL learners' grammar look like? What are the main similarities and differences between advanced L2 learners and HL learners? What are the most effective grammar teaching techniques for Spanish HL learners? Can those techniques used for L2 grammar teaching be applied to HL learners? In this article, an answer to all of these questions is offered. Moreover, practical examples of activities are provided using several techniques such as processing instruction, interactional feedback, dictogloss, and input enhancement, followed by pedagogical implications derived from current research on grammar instruction for both advanced L2 and HL learners of Spanish.

Keywords: grammar instruction, processing instruction, interactional feedback, dictogloss, input enhancement

1. Introduction

There are many studies that show evidence of the efficiency of focus-on-form techniques for L2 grammar instruction (Arroyo Hernández, 2007; Benati, 2004; Bowles & Montrul, 2009; Collentine, 2010; D'Amico, 2013; Farley, 2004; Gallego, 2014; Kirk, 2013; Montrul & Bowles, 2008; Russell, 2012; VanPatten, 1996, 2002, 2004; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993, among others). But can all of these techniques be implemented in the heritage language (HL) learner classroom successfully? In order to answer this question, we need to first address the following two questions: What are the commonalities that these learners share? What do their grammars

look like? This article will discuss how advanced L2 and HL grammars differ from and resemble each other, followed by the pedagogical implications of L2 grammar instruction research on HL learners' grammar. Then, an overview of current grammar instruction techniques with a focus on form for advanced Spanish L2 learners will be presented. The article will then point out how they can be implemented for HL learners of Spanish via specific examples of the past subjunctive, which is typically considered problematic and incompletely acquired by Spanish HL learners, and consider the similarities between advanced Spanish L2 learners' grammar and that of HL learners.

Before comparing advanced L2 and HL learners' grammar, it is necessary to start with a brief description of the past subjunctive. The past subjunctive is used in the same contexts as the present subjunctive but with past events. An important use of the past subjunctive is in hypothetical, improbable, or opposite-of-reality situations. When the main verb is in the past, the past subjunctive in nominal clauses is used to indicate a wish, recommendation, suggestion, command, doubt, or denial. In adjectival clauses, it is used with an unknown referent, and in adverbial clauses after conjunctions of finality, when it refers to an anticipated event that has not taken place yet, and with *aunque* "although" when the clause expresses possibility (Samaniego, Rojas, Alarcón, & Rodríguez, 2013).

2. What do advanced L2 and HL learners' grammars look like?: Differences and similarities

Research has shown the benefits of using focus-on-form instruction with L2 learners and HL learners for grammar instruction (Anderson, 2008; Montrul & Bowles, 2008; Potowski, 2005). But which specific grammar points do we still need to teach HL learners and what do they already know? Although there is extensive variability in HL proficiency depending on HL learners' exposure to the HL, most of the research has been focused on the lower end of the spectrum (Montrul, 2013). The main difference between advanced L2 learners and HL learners is that the former can acquire native-like ability in morpho-syntax but not in phonology or pronunciation since they usually acquire their L2 after puberty. However, the latter population can acquire native-like ability in phonology or pronunciation but not in morpho-syntax (Au, Knightly, Jun, & Oh, 2002). This can be explained by the stage of acquisition. Considering these differences and despite the heterogeneity of ultimate attainment of some abilities by HL learners, Montrul (2013) concluded that HL learners were in fact native speakers since they were exposed to the HL since birth. Therefore, they were more likely to acquire native-like abilities in morpho-syntax and lexicon than L2 learners, especially in production and implicit

knowledge of the language, also known as linguistic competence (Montrul, 2011). Actually, these abilities are extremely hard for L2 learners even if they have been exposed to large amounts of input.

One of the main differences between L2 and HL learners is the age of acquisition. HL learners are typically exposed to Spanish earlier than L2 learners so we might think they would have an advantage over L2 learners at all linguistic levels. However, it has been found that even though they do have an advantage in the acquisition of phonology, they do not differ at the morpho-syntactic level (Au et al., 2002; Knightly, Jun, Oh, & Au, 2003). Therefore, grammar instruction techniques that are applied to L2 learners can be also implemented in the HL learner classroom since there are similar grammatical gaps between these two student populations (Kondo-Brown 2004; Montrul 2011; Montrul, Bhatt, & Bhatia, 2012; O'Grady, Kwak, Lee, & Lee, 2011; Song, O'Grady, Cho, & Lee, 1997).

Alarcón (2011) claimed that because of their early acquisition, HL learners were more advantageous than L2 learners in production and comprehension. Since phonology was acquired early in life, even if input was reduced later on in life, native-like abilities in acoustic perception, for example, were still possible (Montrul, 2013). At the morpho-syntactic level, however, results were mixed as it is explained below. There were some advantages depending on the task, proficiency, and type of structure (Mikulski, 2010; Montrul, 2010; Montrul, Foote, & Perpiñán, 2008a). The main findings had to do with the kind of task: Spanish L2 learners were more accurate in written production tasks whereas HL learners were more accurate in an oral description task.

Another aspect in which they differ is in their metalinguistic knowledge due to more exposure to classroom instruction for L2 learners (Bowles, 2011). There is research that does not encourage explicit metalinguistic grammar instruction since it may be negative for HL learners in terms of production and self-confidence (Anderson, 2008; Beaudrie, 2009). However, explicit grammar instruction could also bring many benefits for HL learners for they gain metalinguistic knowledge via language awareness, above all if they get to look at language as an object and not necessarily with a proficiency goal (Correa, 2014). All of this leads them to reflection, awareness, and empowerment (Correa, 2010; Potowski, 2005) by helping them to demystify prestigious forms and understand dialect and register variation (Llombart-Huesca, 2012). Montrul et al. (2008a) found that for advanced L2 learners the focus on metalinguistic knowledge had to be on oral accuracy rather than on written accuracy (more beneficial for HL learners).

In categorical features, there is asymmetry; it seems that tense marking is barely affected and that there are not many tense marking errors in HL grammars (Fenyvesi, 2000). Regarding forms acquired at an early stage in life, even though there are advantages for HL learners especially in oral production (Montrul et al.

2008a; Montrul, 2013), this does not mean that there are advantages for them in language classes, above all at the advanced level. Lower proficiency HL learners struggle with inflectional morphology and complex syntactic forms and advanced HL learners do with semantic and discourse-pragmatic computation (Carreira, 2013).

At the syntactic-discourse level, there are studies that show similarities with L2 learners like the use of overt/null subject pronouns (Keating, VanPatten, & Jegerski, 2011), subject/object inversion in *wh*-questions (Montrul, Foote, & Perpiñán, 2008b), or the interpretation of definite articles in inalienable possession constructions as a result of L2 transfer (Montrul & Ionin, 2012). There are also common errors in aspectual morphology (de Groot, 2005; Montrul, 2002, 2009; Polinsky 2006, 2008) and morphology associated with mood and polarity (Benmamoun, Montrul, & Polinsky, 2013).

On the other hand, there are grammar forms that are more effective when taught inductively like using input-output activities to acquire the future tense. Nevertheless, L2 grammar should not be taught inductively through input passages with textual enhancement since this technique appears to be ineffective for complex or simple grammatical forms in L2 learners (Russell, 2014). Textual enhancement and processing instruction (Russell, 2014) or even processing instruction alone are enough to make form-meaning connections so that acquisition can occur (Benati, 2004; Fernández, 2008; VanPatten, 1993, 1996, 2002, 2004; VanPatten & Oikkenon, 1996; Wong, 2004). As it is widely known, form-meaning connections have to be established during grammar instruction so that acquisition can take place. Based on this study, we can infer that it will be easier for HL learners to establish form-meaning connections, since they will be able to focus their attention more easily on form due to their more advanced abilities of comprehension. Because of the advantage of HL learners in terms of attention and oral proficiency, dictogloss (or text reconstruction) might be very appropriate for them since they can easily engage in metatalk to achieve grammar acquisition.

Regarding the similarities they share, according to Montrul (2011) both HL and L2 learners show variability and instability in gender agreement, tense, aspect, and mood morphology. These are major areas of differences between native and HL learners and a common ground with advanced L2 learners since both L2 and HL learners have linguistic deficits because of their exposure to reduced input compared to monolingual children (Montrul, 2013). However, there is still a main difference: L2 learners are more competent in metalinguistic knowledge and explicit tasks whereas HL learners do better at implicit tasks that minimize metalinguistic knowledge, due to their naturalistic acquisition (Correa, 2011; Montrul, Davidson, De La Fuente, & Foote, 2014) or to the age of onset of bilingualism (Guillelmon & Grosjean, 2001). Since HL learners acquired the HL in childhood,

they select the relevant features for gender, aspect, or mood; in contrast to L2 learners, who acquired the L2 after puberty. The fact that HL learners still make errors in these categories can be explained by a representational deficit not directly caused by age or lack of access to Universal Grammar (UG) (Montrul, 2011).

Alarcón (2011) replicated the study by Montrul et al. (2008a) to examine gender acquisition by advanced L2 learners and HL learners and showed similar results but with no advantages for L2 learners in the written comprehension task. She interpreted these results as supporting the prediction that Spanish gender agreement was acquired independently from the age of acquisition and the status of the gender features in the L1; they displayed the same level of implicit grammatical gender knowledge. In the same line, she agreed with these researchers on the advantages of HL learners in the oral production task.

Most HL learners' programs incorporate the use of standard grammatical forms and metalinguistic knowledge that facilitates the use of focus-on-form techniques to develop competence as we do for L2 learners following Lightbown (1991). Foreign language programs benefit from implicational hierarchies of grammar forms; that is, which forms are acquired first (Potowski & Carreira, 2004). However, there are no implicational hierarchies proposed for HL grammars so instructors have to decide on their own what to teach first (Beaudrie, Ducar, & Potowski, 2014). These authors proposed finding out what HL learners already know first due to their heterogeneity in order to decide what to teach next.

Thus, we should consider what grammar explanations to provide. As we know, L2 learners have more metalinguistic knowledge so explanations are usually done based on their previous classroom instruction. However, many HL learners have no previous classroom instruction experience so we should rely on their native intuitions to explain grammar points. In fact, one of the differences between L2 Spanish programs and HL learners' programs is that the latter usually start their Spanish instruction at an intermediate/advanced level rather than at a basic level (consequently, textbooks are written at those levels too). At those levels, familiarity with grammatical terms is a given (Carreira, 2007; Potowski, Jegerski, & Morgan-Short, 2009) and very valued (Beaudrie, 2012), so many students are not given the opportunity to obtain that metalinguistic knowledge (Correa, 2014). As Correa argued, the issue was not that they get more confused with grammar than L2 learners but that they started their Spanish instruction from a more disadvantageous position, which is very difficult to overcome for both students and instructors.

Ellis (2006) proposed teaching only the grammatical forms that are problematic for L2 learners. However, there is nothing comparable for HL learners due to the heterogeneity of these students as mentioned above. Therefore, it is recommended that instructors be more flexible with this type of learners (Beaudrie et al., 2014). Beaudrie et al. also suggested using a top-down approach for grammar instruction

for HL learners that uses previous knowledge as a base to process information in contrast to L2 learners who would benefit more from a bottom-up approach that focuses on basic building blocks to eventually develop a big picture. Specifically, Carreira and Kagan (n.d.) recommended using top-down activities for advanced HL learners and bottom-up activities for lower proficiency HL learners.

Montrul (2010) argued that advanced L2 learners and HL learners share similar learning challenges as well: acquisition, developmental and transfer errors, incomplete proficiency, and fossilization. In order to understand what HL learners' grammar looks like, we must consider how the language was acquired in comparison to monolingual children. HL learners acquire implicit knowledge of aspects of phonology and morphology early in childhood; aspects that are not dependent on a lot of input such as word order, clitic pronouns, wh-movement in Spanish (Montrul et al., 2008b), distinction between unaccusative or ergative verbs (Montrul, 2006). However, there are other forms such as inflectional morphology that are not fully developed since they are context-dependent. Reduced exposure to the language during the age of linguistic development, as well as the lack of formal schooling in the HL are some of the reasons for incomplete acquisition or attrition. Fossilization is also common in both L2 learners and HL learners since they need a strong motivation to maintain the HL where issues of identity play a key role. Therefore, one of the common patterns is that HL learners have a tendency to overgeneralize and simplify due to English transferances (Montrul, 2010). Thus, Llombart-Huesca (2012) provided a checklist with the most challenging grammatical elements for HL learners that should be included when designing a syllabus for them: omission of datives, personal *a* and pronouns, overuse of the gerund, overt subjects and relative pronoun *quien*, aspectual confusions, erosion of the subjunctive, misuse of the conditional, gender marking, and regularization of irregular verbs.

Spanish for HL learners' textbooks assume that students have a prior knowledge of grammar with a solid command of morpho-syntactic structures and verb conjugations (Lynch, 2008). Therefore, Lynch proposed a hybrid model combining elements of L2 and HL courses for lower proficiency HL learners. The grammatical forms that should be borrowed from L2 courses are the verb forms, the distinction between *tú* and *usted*, copula usage, agreement, pronouns, and prepositions. For advanced HL learners, a language arts approach would be recommended instead, following Potowski (2005).

Even though there are many studies proving similarities between L2 and HL grammars, there are exceptions like their use of topicalizations and clitic climbing (Montrul, 2012) or gender agreement (Montrul et al., 2008a; Montrul, 2013). Montrul (2013) claimed that the results differed because of their high occurrence in oral expression, where HL learners were more advantageous than L2 learners.

Thus, it is expected that HL learners will outperform L2 learners with grammatical forms that are frequent in oral production. Bowles and Montrul (2009) found positive results on the use of explicit instruction and feedback for dative marking in L2 learners. Montrul and Bowles (2010) replicated the study with HL learners with similar results.

If advanced L2 learners and HL learners struggle with many of the same grammatical forms, and focus-on-form techniques have been proven to be effective, what are the best techniques for both learners?

3. Subjunctive acquisition in L2 Spanish learners

As described by Collentine (2010), recent research on the late acquisition of the subjunctive by L2 learners has been approached from UG and psycholinguistic perspectives. According to UG perspectives, L2 learners only have partial access to UG after puberty, which leads them to grammatical errors (Montrul, 2000, 2008; Sorace, 2000). Since the syntactic-discourse interfaces are the most vulnerable, the subjunctive is a grammatical form that is very hard to acquire. Therefore, this form is also subject to attrition in HL learners if they have gone through incomplete acquisition processes (Montrul, 2008). Pearson (2006) suggested improving this vulnerability through explicit instruction about the pragmatics of the subjunctive. On the other hand, psycholinguistic perspectives have focused on strategies to increase the noticeability and communicative value of the subjunctive in the input.

Before addressing instructional approaches for the subjunctive, it is important to note that research showed some differences between the recognition of subjunctive by intermediate and advanced Spanish learners. Gudmestad (2006) compared intermediate Spanish learners' selection of the subjunctive with that of advanced learners. She found that in the intermediate learners, this selection was related to the presence of irregular verbs whereas in the case of advanced Spanish learners, it was related to the presence of not only irregular verbs but also expressions of futurity or desire, among others. In addition, while irregular verbs helped to predict the selection of the subjunctive mood for advanced learners, no linguistic factor worked with the irregular forms to predict the subjunctive selection for intermediate learners so it seems there was a disconnection between these two proficiency levels.

Regarding teaching approaches, many researchers have advocated for using processing instruction to teach the subjunctive to advanced L2 students (Collentine, 2010; Farley, 2004; Fernández, 2008; Kirk, 2013). Processing instruction seems to be a promising technique to teach infinitival and conjunctive phases requiring the subjunctive (Kirk, 2013). Collentine also claimed that this technique was very

efficient in fostering awareness of this form in input, understanding its meaning, and how to produce it. Therefore, he considered processing instruction the only input-oriented approach to target the subjunctive in the classroom because of its low communicative value. In the same line, there are other studies that advocate for the efficiency of explicit instruction as well as processing instruction to teach this complex grammatical form. For example, Henshaw (2012) found that explicit instruction followed by structured input activities (referential and/or affective) was sufficient for appropriate recognition and interpretation of the target form (subjunctive in adverbial clauses). Russell (2012) also argued that both processing and traditional instruction were equally effective for the acquisition of the subjunctive in adjectival clauses in interpretation and production tasks. However, she suggested using processing instruction with a visual input enhancement technique in order to teach complex grammar online.

Regarding meaning-oriented output strategies, research has shown short and long term gains in mood selection (Farley, 2000, 2004). In the same vein, Collentine (1998) claimed that these output-oriented approaches should be geared towards increasing the communicative value of the subjunctive. As it is well known, task-based approaches are also very common in L2 Spanish instruction. Advanced L2 learners will be able to use the subjunctive when they have to produce coherent messages such as hypotheses about an event (Robinson, 2001).

On the other hand, Potowski et al. (2009) used other focus-on-form techniques such as input processing and traditional output instruction to teach the imperfect subjunctive, also with positive results for both L2 and HL learners. Results showed that HL learners benefited from these techniques and that processing instruction was more effective than the traditional one. L2 learners were more reactive to explicit instruction than HL learners. According to Montrul (2012), the type of focus-on-form technique does not make a difference (traditional or processing instruction); what really matters is the type of structure and task.

On another note, the role of metalinguistic knowledge is still debatable. Correa (2011) found that L2 learners that are more aware of grammar produce the subjunctive more accurately. Nevertheless, in the case of HL learners, their knowledge of grammar is not related to their accuracy due to their naturalistic acquisition. She concluded that they acquired the subjunctive implicitly and they do not need to learn the rules in order to produce it accurately.

4. What focus-on-form techniques are effective for advanced L2 Spanish grammar acquisition?

Research on focus-on-form techniques has shown which techniques are most effective for L2 acquisition. However, there is no empirical evidence in support of one specific technique, but there is evidence that shows that noticing is necessary for acquisition, that comprehensive input is not enough, and that producing output is also required for acquisition (Gallego, 2014). There are several focus-on-form techniques that can be implemented in the classroom such as input enhancement, input flood, output enhancement, and interactional feedback (implicit), or input processing, dictogloss, garden path, or conscious-raising tasks (explicit). Many researchers have advocated for using processing instruction to teach direct object pronouns (VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993; VanPatten & Fernández, 2004; VanPatten, Inclezan, Salazar, & Farley, 2009; VanPatten & Oikkenon, 1996; VanPatten & Sanz, 1995) and the subjunctive to advanced L2 students (Collentine, 2010; Farley, 2004; Fernández, 2008; Collentine, 2010; Kirk, 2013). VanPatten et al. (2009) compared the use of dictogloss and processing instruction techniques in Spanish object pronouns and word order instruction at a basic-intermediate level and found that processing instruction was overall more effective. Moreover, D'Amico (2013) used a combination of focus-on-form and focus-on-meaning techniques to teach object pronouns in Spanish at a basic level and she found that focus-on-form techniques were more effective in facilitating their production of the target forms, and specifically, implicit feedback had a positive impact on students allowing them to concentrate on the pronouns and their use. Even though these studies focus on basic and intermediate learners, they might point towards a similar pattern to be found in advanced learners as well.

On the other hand, dictogloss has been shown to work better with advanced L2 learners since they can engage in metatalk, given that these students are cognitively ready to concentrate more on form (Fortune, 2005). Leeser (2004) carried out a dictogloss task on a Spanish content class and found that the students produced more LRE (Language Related Episodes) when discussing tense/aspect and subject/verb agreement issues that were in most cases successfully solved during reconstruction. Additionally, students were asked their opinion about this technique. Advanced students found it very effective in contrast to intermediate students, who were not of the same opinion, perhaps because it is a very collaborative task (that involves interaction and output production) and has a listening component that might require too much attention from students at lower levels (Gallego, 2014).

5. Which focus-on-form techniques are effective for Spanish heritage grammar acquisition?

Regarding pedagogical techniques used in the L2 classroom that could be implemented in the HL classroom, we should start focusing on how to improve HL learners' grammatical accuracy. Montrul (2011) proposed that HL learners engage in written tasks. We have to help them make connections between how language is used in oral and written production. They can rely on their implicit knowledge by expanding it and therefore facilitating the learning of the HL. Another solution could be relying on explicit knowledge like L2 learners. In this case, it would be crucial to explore which focus-on-form techniques are effective for Spanish heritage grammar acquisition.

There are not many experimental classroom studies regarding focus-on-form techniques for grammar instruction for Spanish HL learners so more research is needed in this area. As mentioned earlier, Potowski et al. (2009) compared traditional instruction with processing instruction in the instruction of the past subjunctive in written tasks and found that processing instruction was more effective. On the other hand, Montrul and Bowles (2009) used an explicit feedback technique with negative evidence in the use of the indirect object marker with *gustar* verbs. Results showed positive results in acquisition with positive and negative evidence in written tasks. Potowski, Parada, and Morgan-Short (2012) used contrastive analysis (presentation of two forms side by side with the differences between them) for the distinction between *haiga* and *haya*. This approach seemed to be highly effective, above all for second dialect acquisition. These are the only three classroom studies on focus-on-form techniques for Spanish HL learners. More research is therefore needed on using other techniques such as dictogloss or interactional feedback; however, these results seem very promising regarding the implementation of L2 focus-on-form techniques in the HL classroom.

In short, as Montrul (2010) concluded, HL learners have the ability to reach native-like attainment in grammar depending on optimal input and output conditions and the necessary motivation to achieve it.

6. Examples of focus-on-form input techniques for the Spanish heritage classroom

Research on grammar instruction in the classroom for Spanish HL learners is scarce; however, the few studies that do exist have shown positive findings for processing instruction (Potowski et al., 2009) and interactional feedback (Montrul & Bowles, 2009). Some examples of activities that can be used in the HL classroom

are presented here (Burgo, 2015). The first two activities in (1) and (2) focus on processing instruction and interactional feedback. Two additional techniques that are very popular in L2 grammar instruction are also proposed (dictogloss and input enhancement). The rationale behind the selection of this target form (past subjunctive) lies in a typical common error of using the past indicative instead of the past subjunctive by HL learners that has been addressed in classroom research (Potowski et al., 2009). Montrul (2007) interpreted this typical error as a result of having lost the mood category so she suggested teaching the subjunctive from zero in the classroom. Thus, L2 techniques seem to be appropriate to teach this grammatical form.

6.1 Processing instruction

In order for students to acquire the past subjunctive, instructors could use a processing instruction technique consisting of two steps: referential and affective activities. In Spanish, mood selection is key to distinguishing between wishes and facts. Nonetheless, HL learners tend to use the indicative instead of the subjunctive as a consequence of language attrition or incomplete acquisition as mentioned earlier (Montrul, 2008, 2009, among others). By offering a selection of the past indicative and subjunctive, the activity below intends to check for processing of the subjunctive in the past.

Winning the lottery: Have you ever thought about what you would do if you won the lottery?

Step 1. Referential Activity:

- (1) Decide whether Alex is expressing a wish (W) or remembering what he used to do when he was a child (a fact) (F).
 - a. Si ganara la lotería, me compraría un carro nuevo. W/F
 if win.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG the lottery me buy.COND.1SG a car
 new
 “If I won the lottery, I would buy a new car.”
 - b. Si tenía dinero, lo guardaba en una hucha. W/F
 if have.IMPF.1SG money it save.IMPF.1SG in a piggy bank
 “If I had money, I saved it in a piggy bank.”
 - c. Si comprara un carro nuevo, dormiría un poco más. W/F
 if buy.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG a car new sleep.COND.1SG a little
 more
 “If I bought a new car, I would sleep a little bit more.”

- d. Si mi papá me llevaba a la escuela, dormía un poco
 if my dad me take.IMPF.1SG to the school sleep.IMPF.1SG a little
 más.
 more
 "If my dad took me to school, I slept a little bit more." W/F

Step 2. Affective Activity ((T) rue/(F)alse):

- (2) What would you do if you were in these situations?
- a. Si ganara la lotería, me compraría un carro
 if win.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG the lottery me buy.COND.1SG a car
 nuevo.
 new
 "If I won the lottery, I would buy a new car." T/F
- b. Si tuviera más dinero, me iría al Caribe de
 if have.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG more money me go.COND.1SG to the Caribbean of
 vacaciones.
 vacations
 "If I had more money, I would go to the Caribbean for vacation." T/F
- c. Si sacara buenas notas, lo celebraría con mis
 if receive.IMP.SUBJ.1SG good grades it celebrate.COND.1SG with my
 amigos.
 friends
 "If I received good grades, I would celebrate it with my friends." T/F
- d. Si hiciera buen tiempo, iría a la playa.
 if do.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG good weather go.COND.1SG to the beach
 "If the weather were nice, I would go to the beach." T/F

6.2 Interactional feedback

During a class conversation, the feedback the instructor would give to the student for error correction regarding the wrong use of the past subjunctive using the interactional feedback technique would work like the examples in (3).

NEGATIVE FEEDBACK (recast)

- (3) Student: Si manejaba a la universidad, podría dormir un
 if drive.IMPF.1SG to the university be able to.COND.1SG sleep a
 poco más.
 little more
 "If I drove to the university, I could sleep a little bit more."
 Instructor: ¿Manejabas o manejaras?
 drive.IMPF.1SG or drive.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG
 "Did you drive or did you drive?"

POSITIVE FEEDBACK (prompt)

Student: Si manejaba a la universidad, podría dormir un
 if drive.IMPF.1SG to the university be able to.COND.1SG sleep a
 poco más.
 more

“If I drove to the university, I could sleep a little bit more.”

Instructor: ¡Qué bien! Seguro que si manejaras a la universidad...
 how good sure that if drive.IMPF.SUBJ.2SG to the university...
 “How great! I am sure that if you drove to the university...”

6.3 Dictogloss or text reconstruction

The instructor showed on the board or read the text below a couple of times and gave students the following instructions: You have two minutes to read the text on the board or you will listen to a text twice and then try to reconstruct the story as closely as you can with a partner:

- (4) Winning the lottery: Have you ever thought about what you would do if you won the lottery? After listening to the excerpt the instructor will read it aloud twice, reconstruct the story with your partner:

Alex conversaba con sus amigos tomando un café sobre uno de sus
 Alex talk.IMPF.1SG with his friends have.PROG a coffee about one of his
 sueños: ganar la lotería. Les dijo: “Si ganara la
 dreams win.INF the lottery them tell.PRET.3SG if win.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG the
 lotería, me compraría un carro nuevo. Si manejara a la
 lottery me buy.COND.1SG a car new if drive.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG to the
 universidad podría dormir un poco más. Estoy tan
 university be able to.COND.1SG sleep a bit more be.PRES.1SG so
 cansado este semestre...”

tired this semester

“Alex was chatting with his friends while having a coffee about one of his dreams: winning the lottery. He told them: “If I won the lottery, I would buy a new car. If I drove to the university, I could sleep a little bit more. I am so tired this semester...”

6.4 Input enhancement

When using the input enhancement technique, the input is enhanced (e.g., in bold) so that target form becomes salient and noticeable for the HL learners, as illustrated in (5).

- (5) Si **ganara** la lotería, me compraría un carro nuevo. Si
 if win.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG the lottery me buy.COND.1SG a car new if
manejara a la universidad dormiría un poco más.
 drive.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG to the university sleep.COND.1SG a little more
 ¡Ojalá **pudiera** ganar la lotería!
 wish.PRES.1SG be able to.IMPF.SUBJ.1SG win.INF the lottery
 "If I won the lottery, I would buy a new car. If I drove to the university, I
 would sleep a little bit more. I wish I could win the lottery!" Decide whether
 the statements about Alex are true or false (T/F):
- (6) Alex quiere tener más dinero para comprar un carro
 Alex want.PRES.1SG have.INF more money to buy.INF a car
 nuevo. T/F
 new
 "Alex wants to have more money in order to buy a new car."
- (7) A Alex le encanta ir a la universidad en tren. T/F
 to alex him like.PRES.1SG go.INF to the university by train
 "Alex loves going to the university by train."

7. Pedagogical implications of research on L2 and HL Spanish grammar acquisition

Research has shown that focus-on-form techniques promote acquisition. What techniques can we implement in the HL learner classroom apart from the examples above? Some possible techniques could include: input flood (text containing many target forms), structure-based tasks, focused communicative tasks (to produce target forms in order to perform a task), or error correction activities. There are also other techniques that focus on production rather than on noticing such as collaborative dialogues or the language experience approach (e.g., learners tell the instructor what they want to learn how to say and they compare the right form with what they produced) as described by Beaudrie et al. (2014).

Producing output forces learners to process language tending to form and meaning simultaneously (Swain, 1985, 1993, 1995, 1998). This technique seems appropriate for advanced learners of a language, especially for HL learners, who do not need to pay attention to meaning and instead can focus on form. Izumi (2002) has compared the production of output (internal attention-drawing device) with textual input enhancement (external attention-drawing device) in order to determine whether either technique or both have an effect on noticing and learning a grammar structure (relatives) in advanced English learners. He found that the output groups demonstrated greater learning but less noticing than the input

enhancement ones. The combination between both groups did not have more learning gains than the output task alone so pushed output alone seems to be an effective focus-on-form technique for Spanish HL learners as well as advanced L2 learners.¹ We can find a replication of this study in the acquisition of the Spanish future tense by true beginners under these inductive approaches to grammar instruction (Russell, 2014). Russell's findings supported those of Izumi since output groups outperformed non-output ones in terms of learning gains: textual enhancement alone does not facilitate learning. However, to my knowledge there are no studies on HL learners of Spanish in this direction.

Since there is no current debate on the effectiveness of focus-on-form instruction for L2 and HL learners, the question is how and when to implement it in the classroom. Llombart-Huesca (2012) proposed an isolated focus-on-form instruction for HL learners with a modular approach following Ellis (2002) since integrative approaches (content and form) lacked explicit grammar instruction. In fact, Ellis claimed that grammar could only be integrated into the communicative component through feedback when performing unfocused tasks. However, with the isolated focus-on-form technique, students were obligated to work on the target forms instead of using avoidance strategies (like advanced L2 learners) with communicative techniques.

Teaching grammar for HL learners is a complicated issue in that on one hand, we should take a sociolinguistic approach that respects our learners' sociolinguistic realities and, at the same time, teach them universal forms that they can add to their repertoire instead of replacing the forms they actually use (Roca & Gutiérrez, 2000).

Although there is still debate about establishing different tracks for HL and L2 learners so that each population can be best served by different curricula versus the typical mixed classes, HL learners greatly benefit from grammar instruction and are able to advance faster to higher levels of proficiency (Carreira, 2013). Perhaps this is one of the reasons there are not as many language courses for HL learners as there are for L2 learners (taking into account the student population).

8. Conclusion

This article has provided a description of Spanish HL learners' grammar. An analysis is given of the main similarities and differences with regard to the grammar of L2 learners in order to make a decision about what grammar techniques, that are

1. Pushed output refers to a technique used to push learners to deliver a message in tasks that they are not completely familiar with (Nation, 2011).

efficient in the L2 classroom, can be transferred into the HL classroom. Examples are provided of activities for Spanish HL learners of four popular focus-on-form input techniques: processing instruction, interactional feedback, dictogloss, and input enhancement. Finally, an overview is presented of the pedagogical implications of applying grammar instruction techniques with a focus on form, highlighting those that have been effective for advanced Spanish L2 learners and HL learners. Then, the advantages of implementing these techniques with HL learners of Spanish are discussed while considering the similarities between them. It seems that all of the research on the effectiveness of HL learners' grammar instruction has focused on processing instruction or explicit feedback. However, more research is needed on applying other input techniques such as dictogloss or input enhancement.

References

- Alarcón, I. (2011). Spanish gender agreement under complete and incomplete acquisition: Early and late bilinguals' linguistic behavior within the noun phrase. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 14(3), 332–350. doi: 10.1017/S1366728910000222
- Anderson, J. (2008). Towards an integrated second-language pedagogy for foreign and community/heritage languages in multilingual Britain. *Language Learning Journal*, 36(1), 79–89. doi: 10.1080/09571730801988553
- Arroyo Hernández, I. (2007). *Didáctica y adquisición de las construcciones existenciales y locativas con haber y estar: Instrucción basada en el procesamiento* (Master's Thesis). Antonio de Nebrija University, Madrid.
- Au, T. K., Knightly, L. M., Jun, S. A., & Oh, J. S. (2002). Overhearing a language during childhood. *Psychological Science*, 13(3), 238–243. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00444
- Beaudrie, S. (2009). Receptive bilinguals' language development in the classroom: The differential effects of heritage versus foreign language curriculum. In M. Lacorte & J. Leeman (Eds.), *Español en Estados Unidos y otros contextos de contacto: Sociolingüística, ideología y pedagogía* (pp. 325–346). Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert Verlag.
- Beaudrie, S. (2012). Introduction: Developments in Spanish heritage language placement. *Heritage Language Journal*, 9(1), i–xi.
- Beaudrie, S., Ducar, C., & Potowski, K. (2014). *Heritage language teaching: Research and Practice*. New York: McGraw Hill Education.
- Benati, A. (2004). The effects of processing instruction and its components on the acquisition of gender agreement in Italian. *Language Awareness*, 13(2), 67–80. doi: 10.1080/09658410408667087
- Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 39(3–4), 129–181.
- Bowles, M. (2011). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge: What can heritage language learners contribute? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 33(2), 247–271. doi: 10.1017/S0272263110000756

- Bowles, M. & Montrul, S. (2009). Instructed L2 acquisition of differential object marking in Spanish. In R. P. Leow, H. Campos, & D. Lardiere (Eds.), *Little words: Their history, phonology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics and acquisition* (pp. 199–210). Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Burgo, C. (2015). Grammar instruction techniques in the Spanish heritage classroom. Paper presented in the Spanish in the US conference, NYC.
- Carreira, M. (2007). Teaching Spanish in the US: Beyond the one-size-fits-all paradigm. In K. Potowski & R. Cameron (Eds.), *Spanish in contact: Policy, social and linguistic inquiries* (pp. 61–80). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/impact.22.07car
- Carreira, M. (2013). Advanced proficiency: A practitioner's perspective on this special Issue. *The Heritage Language Journal*, 10(2), 1–14.
- Carreira, M., & Kagan, O. (n.d.). *Teaching heritage languages: An online workshop*. Retrieved from http://startalk.nhllrc.ucla.edu/default_startalk.aspx.
- Collentine, J. (1998). Processing instruction and the subjunctive. *Hispania*, 81, 576–87. doi: 10.2307/345673
- Collentine, J. (2010). The acquisition and teaching of the Spanish subjunctive: An update on current findings. *Hispania*, 93(1), 39–51.
- Correa, M. (2010). Heritage language learner programs and life after the classroom: A not so critical approach. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 1(2), 221–240.
- Correa, M. (2011). Heritage language learners of Spanish: What role does metalinguistic knowledge play in their acquisition of the subjunctive? In L. Ortiz (Ed.), *Selected proceedings of the 13th Hispanic linguistics symposium* (pp. 128–138). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Correa, M. (2014). Heritage language learners in linguistics courses: At a major (but fixable) disadvantage. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 27(2), 107–120. doi: 10.1080/07908318.2014.897713
- D'Amico, M. L. (2013). Approaching the direct object pronouns: How much grammatical form is necessary in instruction?. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 3(4), 319–329. doi: 10.4236/ojml.2013.34041
- De Groot, C. (2005). The grammars of Hungarian outside Hungary from a linguistic typological perspective. In A. Fenyvesi (Ed.), *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary* (pp. 351–370). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/impact.20.18gro
- Ellis, R. (2002). The place of grammar instruction in the second/foreign language curriculum. In S. Fotos & E. Hinkel (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 17–34). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *Tesol Quarterly*, 40(1), 83–107. doi: 10.2307/40264512
- Farley, A. (2000). *The relative effects of processing instruction and meaning-based output instruction on L2 acquisition of the Spanish subjunctive*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Farley, A. (2004). Processing instruction and the Spanish subjunctive: Is explicit information needed? In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*, (pp. 227–239). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fenyvesi, A. (2000). The affectedness of the verbal complex in American Hungarian. In A. Fenyvesi & K. Sándor (Eds.), *Language contact and the verbal complex of Dutch and Hungarian: Working papers from the 1st Bilingual Language Use Theme Meeting of the Study*

- Centre on Language Contact November 11–13, 1999, Szeged, Hungary (pp. 94–107), Szeged: JGyTF Press.
- Fernández, C. (2008). Reexamining the role of explicit information in processing instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 30(3), 277–305. doi:10.1017/S0272263108080467
- Fortune, A. (2005). Learners' use of metalanguage in collaborative form-focused L2 output tasks. *Language Awareness*, 14(1), 21–38. doi:10.1080/09658410508668818
- Gallego, M. (2014). Second language learners' reflections on the effectiveness of dictogloss: A multi-sectional, multi level analysis. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(1), 33–50. doi:10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.1.3
- Guillelmon, D., & Grosjean, F. (2001). The gender marking effect in spoken word recognition: The case of bilinguals. *Memory & Cognition*, 29(3), 503–511. doi:10.3758/BF03196401
- Gudmestad, A. (2006). L2 variation and the Spanish subjunctive: Linguistic features predicting mood selection. In C. A. Klee & T. L. Face (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 7th Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as First and Second Languages* (pp. 170–184). Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Henshaw, F. (2012). How effective are affective activities?: Relative benefits of two types of structured input activities as part of a computer-delivered lesson on the Spanish subjunctive. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), 393–414. doi:10.1177/1362168812436919
- Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(4), 541–577. doi:10.1017/S0272263102004023
- Keating, G. D., VanPatten, B., & Jegerski, J. (2011). Who was walking on the beach?: Anaphora resolution in Spanish heritage speakers and adult second language learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 33(2), 193–221. doi:10.1017/S0272263110000732
- Kirk, R. W. (2013). The effects of processing instruction with and without output: Acquisition of the Spanish subjunctive in three conjunctive phrases. *Hispania*, 96(1), 153–169. doi:10.1353/hpn.2013.0009
- Knightly, L. M., Jun, S., Oh, J. S., & Au, T. K. (2003). Production benefits of childhood overheard. *Journal of the Acoustic Society of America*, 114(1), 465–474. doi:10.1121/1.1577560
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2004). Do background variables predict students' scores on a Japanese placement test?: Implications for placing heritage language learners. *Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*, 1, 1–19.
- Leeser, M. J. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 55–81. doi:10.1191/1362168804lr1340a
- Lightbown, P. M. (1991). What have we here?: Some observations on the effect of instruction on L2 learning. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 197–212). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Llombart-Huesca, A. (2012). A modular approach to Spanish for heritage language learners courses. *Hispania*, 95(3), 509–522.
- Lynch, A. (2008). The linguistic similarities of Spanish heritage and second language learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(2), 252–381. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03292.x
- Mikulski, A. M. (2010). Receptive volitional subjunctive abilities in heritage and traditional foreign language learners of Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 217–233. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01018.x
- Montrul, S. (2000). Transitivity alternations in L2 acquisition: toward a modular view of transfer. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(2), 229–273. doi:10.1017/S0272263100002047

- Montrul, S. (2002). Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense/aspect distinctions in adult bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 5(1), 39–68. doi: 10.1017/S1366728902000135
- Montrul, S. (2006). On the bilingual competence of Spanish heritage speakers: Syntax, lexical semantics and processing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 10(1), 37–69. doi: 10.1177/13670069060100010301
- Montrul, S. (2008). Incomplete acquisition in Spanish heritage speakers: Chronological age or interfaces vulnerability? In H. Chan, H. Jacob, & E. Kapia (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* (pp. 299–310). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Montrul, S. (2009). Incomplete acquisition of tense-aspect and mood in Spanish heritage speakers. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13(2), 239–269. doi: 10.1177/1367006909339816
- Montrul, S. (2010). Current issues in heritage language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 3–23. doi: 10.1017/S0267190510000103
- Montrul, S. (2011). Morphological errors in Spanish second language learners and heritage speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 33(2), 155–161. doi: 10.1017/S0272263110000719
- Montrul, S. (2012). Is the heritage language like a second language? *EuroSLA Yearbook*, 12(1), 1–29. doi: 10.1075/eurosla.12.03mon
- Montrul, S. (2013). How “native” are heritage speakers. *The Heritage Language Journal*, 10(2), 15–39.
- Montrul, S., Bhatt, R., & Bhatia, A. (2012). Erosion of case and agreement in Hindi heritage speakers. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 2(2), 141–176. doi: 10.1075/lab.2.2.02mon
- Montrul, S., & Bowles, M. (2008). Negative evidence in instructed heritage language acquisition: A preliminary study of differential object marking. In M. Bowles, R. Foote, S. Perpiñán, & R. Bhatt (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 2007 Second Language Research Forum* (pp. 252–262). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Montrul, S., & Bowles, M. (2010). Is grammar instruction beneficial for heritage language learners?: Dative case marking in Spanish. *The Heritage Language Journal*, 7(1), 47–73.
- Montrul, S., Davidson, J., De La Fuente, I., & Foote, R. (2014). Early language experience facilitates the processing of gender agreement in Spanish heritage speakers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 17(1), 118–138. doi: 10.1017/S1366728913000114
- Montrul, S., Foote, R., & Perpiñán, S. (2008a). Gender agreement in adult second language learners and Spanish heritage speakers: The effects of age and context of acquisition. *Language Learning* 58(3), 503–553. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00449.x
- Montrul, S., Foote, R., & Perpiñán, S. (2008b). Knowledge of wh-movement in Spanish L2 learners and heritage speakers. In M. Almazán, J. Bruhn de Garavito, & E. Valenzuela (Eds.), *Selected papers from the 8th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 93–106). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Montrul, S., & Ionin, T. (2012). Dominant language transfer in Spanish heritage speakers and second language learners in the interpretation of definite articles. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96(1), 70–94. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01278.x
- Nation, I. (2011). Second language speaking. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*: Vol. 2, (pp. 444–454). New York: Routledge.

- O'Grady, W., Kwak, H., Lee, O. M., & Lee, M. (2011). An emergentist perspective on partial language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 33(2), 223–245.
doi: 10.1017/S0272263110000744
- Pearson, L. (2006). Patterns of development in Spanish L2 pragmatics acquisition: An analysis of novice learners' production of directives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 473–495.
doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00427.x
- Polinsky, M. (2006). Incomplete acquisition: American Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 14, 192–265.
- Polinsky, M. (2008). Without aspect. In G. Corbett & M. Noonan (Eds.), *Case and grammatical relations*, (pp. 263–282). Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1075/tsl.81.13pol
- Potowski, K. (2005). *Fundamentos de la enseñanza del español a los hablantes nativos en los Estados Unidos*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Potowski, K., & Carreira, M. (2004). Teacher development and national standards for Spanish as a heritage language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(3), 427–437.
doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02700.x
- Potowski, K., Jegerski, J., & Morgan-Short, K. (2009). The effects of instruction on linguistic development in Spanish heritage language speakers. *Language Learning*, 59(3), 537–579.
doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00517.x
- Potowski, K., Parada, M. & Morgan-Short, K. (2012). Developing an online placement exam for Spanish heritage speakers and L2 students. *Heritage Language Journal*, 9(1), 51–76.
- Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 27–57.
doi: 10.1093/applin/22.1.27
- Roca, A., & Gutiérrez, J. (2000). Sociolinguistic considerations. In American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (Ed.), *Professional development series handbook for teachers K-16: Spanish for native speakers: Vol. 1*, (pp. 21–28). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College.
- Russell, V. (2012). Learning complex grammar in the virtual classroom: A comparison of processing instruction, structured input, computerized visual input enhancement, and traditional instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(1), 42–71.
- Russell, V. (2014). A closer look at the output hypothesis: The effect of pushed output on noticing and inductive learning of the Spanish future tense. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(1), 25–47. doi: 10.1111/flan.12077
- Samaniego, F. A., Rojas, N., Alarcón, M. E., & Rodríguez, F. (2013). *El mundo 21 hispano*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Song, M., O'Grady, W., Cho, S., & Lee, M. (1997). The learning and teaching of Korean in community schools. In Y. -H. Kim (Ed.), *Korean Language in America 2: Vol. 2* (pp. 111–127). Manoa, HI: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Sorace, A. (2000). Differential effects of attrition in the L1 syntax of near-native L2 speakers. In S. C. Howell, S. A. Fish, & T. Keith-Lucas (Eds.), *BUCLD 24: Proceedings of the 24th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* (pp. 719–725). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50(1), 158–164.

- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64–81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VanPatten, B. (1993). Grammar teaching for the acquisition-rich classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26(4), 435–450. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.1993.tb01179.x
- VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction: Theory and research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, 52(4), 755–803. doi: 10.1111/1467-9922.00203
- VanPatten, B. (2004). Input processing in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (pp. 5–31). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(2), 225–243. doi: 10.1017/S0272263100011979
- VanPatten, B. & Fernández, C. (2004). The long-term effects of processing instruction. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*, (pp. 273–289). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- VanPatten, B., Inclezan, D., Salazar, H., & Farley, A. P. (2009). Processing instruction and dictogloss: A study on object pronouns and word order in Spanish. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(3), 557–575. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01033.x
- VanPatten, B., & Oikkenon, S. (1996). Explanation versus structured input in processing instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(4), 495–510. doi: 10.1017/S0272263100015394
- VanPatten, B., & Sanz, C. (1995). From input to output: Processing instruction and communicative tasks. In F. Eckman, D. Highland, P. Lee, J. Mileham, & R. Weber (Eds.), *Second language theory and pedagogy* (pp. 169–186). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wong, W. (2004). The nature of processing instruction. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (pp. 33–63). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Resumen

Es bien sabido que deberíamos tomar un enfoque pedagógico sociolingüístico para la instrucción del español para aprendientes de lengua de herencia (LH). Potowski (2005) propuso que esta instrucción se debería centrar en el desarrollo de la alfabetización y del conocimiento gramatical. Sin embargo, no se ha dicho mucho sobre la instrucción de gramática: ¿Cómo es la gramática de los aprendientes de español como LH?, ¿cuáles son las principales similitudes y diferencias entre los aprendientes avanzados de L2 y los de LH?, ¿cuáles son las técnicas de instrucción de gramática más eficientes para los aprendientes de español como LH?, ¿pueden aplicarse a los aprendientes de LH las empleadas en la enseñanza de la gramática para los de L2? En este artículo se ofrece una respuesta a todas estas preguntas. Además, se facilitan ejemplos prácticos de actividades usando varias técnicas como la instrucción de procesamiento, la re-orientación interaccional, la dictoglosia y el realce del input seguidas por las implicaciones

pedagógicas derivadas de la investigación actual en la instrucción de gramática para tanto los aprendientes de español avanzado de L2 como los de LH.

Palabras clave: instrucción de gramática, instrucción de procesamiento, retroalimentación interaccional, dictoglosia, realce del input

Author's address

Clara Burgo
Loyola University Chicago
Department of Modern Languages and Literatures
Crown Center 217B
1032 W. Sheridan Rd.
Chicago, IL 60660
USA
cburgo@luc.edu

Biographical notes

Clara Burgo is an Assistant Professor of Spanish at Loyola University Chicago. Her current research interests are Spanish for heritage language learners' instruction, technology-enhanced language teaching, and mixed classrooms.