



OPEN ACCESS

**Writing in Spanish as a Second and Heritage Language:  
Past, Present, and Future**

**Idoia Elola**  
*Texas Tech University*

**RESPONSE**

**El español como lengua de herencia**

**María Teresa García-Godoy**  
*Universidad de Granada*

*Hispania* 100.5 (2017): 119–26

*Hispania* Open Access files are licensed under a  
**Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.**



# Writing in Spanish as a Second and Heritage Language: Past, Present, and Future



**Idoia Elola**  
*Texas Tech University*

**Abstract:** In recent years, writing in Spanish as a foreign or heritage language has assumed more prominence in research and curricular policy in the United States. Increasing numbers of heritage language learners, the emergence of social media tools, renewed interest in writing genres, and changing instruction methods have all influenced how we understand writing and writers. This article provides a brief overview of the aspects of writing that are currently pertinent in pedagogical and research contexts, and suggests what writing practices might look like in the future.

**Keywords:** literacy/alfabetización, multimodality/multimodalidad, social tools/herramientas sociales, theoretical frameworks/marcos teóricos, writing in the heritage language/escritura en la lengua de herencia, writing in the second language/escritura en la segunda lengua

## Introduction

Inclined heads over phone, tablet, or laptop while fingers run across keyboards: this is a very typical image of today's world and today's classroom. People are actually writing more frequently, even though their messages might be fragmented or brief, and often unintelligible to people outside their immediate community. Not since communicative approaches to teaching foreign languages (FLs) dominated our pedagogical scene has writing in Spanish as a FL attracted our attention so keenly. Our understanding of the act of writing is being shaped in different and exciting ways by the acknowledgement of FL and Spanish heritage language (SHL) learners' different needs and the integration of social tools in the FL classroom that foster writing as the preferred form of communication. Yet, despite our renewed attention to writing practices, our specific knowledge of writing in Spanish as a FL or heritage language (HL) is still limited. Instructors still have an incomplete understanding of how students approach writing in languages that are not their L1 (or dominant language in the case of HL learners in the United States). Thus, this essay aims to identify issues in FL and HL writing contexts that are currently pertinent in language education pedagogy and to propose what writing practices might look like in the future. Because interest in Spanish language education is increasing, especially in the United States, this is a good time to explore how pedagogical inquiry and research can help develop writing literacy in Spanish in a way that meets the academic, professional, and personal needs of all learners (Elola 2007).

## The Status of Writing in the Spanish-language Classroom

Even though writing in Spanish as an FL or HL has been less explored in comparison to English as a second language (ESL) or as L1, writing as a skill has been incorporated into US curriculum frameworks, operated under the National Standards, and assessed by guidelines

created by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. From a pedagogical perspective, there is a tendency to regard writing primarily as a language exercise rather than as a complex act in which linguistic accuracy is intertwined with considerations of genre, organization, content, style, and multimodality (O'Donnell 2007). Traditionally, elementary-level FL textbooks have used writing activities to practice aspects of grammar and vocabulary use, whereas intermediate and advanced-level textbooks have focused on writing genres and provided grammar and vocabulary to support learners as they experiment with their use.

The view of writing as either a language exercise or a rhetorical endeavor has also shaped instructional approaches. Writing as a way to practice linguistic skills has been the usual approach (O'Donnell 2007); however, this traditional view has been expanding from process-based approaches, where the writing process is broken into interrelated stages such as planning, drafting, and revising, to the incorporation of task-based approaches, which offer holistic activities to further language learning by means of a process, a product, or both (Bygate and Samuda 2008). These approaches, in turn, have allowed instructors to start perceiving their role as writing instructor as much as language instructor.

In parallel with changing instructional approaches, writing research in Spanish has moved in new directions: it has explored aspects of language production, such as accuracy within FL populations (Elola and Oskoz 2010; Félix-Brasdefer and Greenslade 2006), SHL populations (Lado and Yanguas 2012), or both (Elola and Mikulski 2016; Potowski 2007); appropriateness of register (Colombi 2009); or the use of contrastive rhetoric within SHL or FL writers' practices (Elola and Mikulski 2016; Spicer-Escalante 2007). Within cognitive frameworks, several studies have looked at FL learners' interactions during writing tasks (Lee 2012) as well as FL and HL learners' interactions (Bowles 2011; Giglio-Henshaw 2013); the impact of feedback on FL learners' accuracy (Elola and Oskoz 2016; Félix-Brasdefer and Greenslade 2006) and on composition conventions (Elola and Oskoz 2010); and HL learners' writing processes through think-aloud protocols (Schwartz 2003) and time allocation (Elola and Mikulski 2016). Some recent sociocultural studies have focused on collaborative writing, comparing FL individual versus collaborative writing (Elola and Oskoz 2010) and observing FL and HL learners' interactions when writing collaboratively (Valentín-Rivera 2015); assessing FL language production improvement (Castañeda and Cho 2013; Valentín-Rivera, 2015); analyzing cooperation through the use of feedback (Lee 2012); evaluating tasks' effects on FL writers (Oskoz and Elola 2014); and documenting interrelationships between FL writers and social tools (Elola and Oskoz 2014). Finally, following semiotic perspectives, multimodal texts (including text, images, and sound) have been created through digital storytelling (Oskoz and Elola 2016). In the last decade, research into the status and nature of Spanish FL or HL writing, as well as tailoring instructional approaches to the challenges of writing in Spanish in the twenty-first century, has thrived mainly on the basis of the integration of technology in classroom practices and the notable increase of heritage language learners in US Spanish language courses, either in mixed or specific HL classes.

### **Heritage Language Learners' Writing**

From a historical research perspective, research on SHL writing has focused on the reasons for grammatical and orthographical deficiencies and how to address them. Although these issues have been observed through a variety of analyses, such as text analysis (Teschner 1981) and corpus analysis (Beaudrie, 2012), through interventions such as think-aloud protocols (Lado and Yanguas 2012; Schwartz 2003) or the use of screencast devices (Elola and Mikulski 2016), an unevenness can be observed in overall proficiency across a variety of registers in SHL learners' written Spanish. This appears to be linked to the fact that these learners develop their language skills in informal settings and have usually received their formal education in English (Colombi 41: 2009). Typical linguistic issues may be orthographical mistakes stemming from gender agreement (Bowles 2011) or where single phonemes have several graphemic representations (Beaudrie

2012)—issues which are understandable when learners write by ear (Callahan 2010). Asking SHL learners to make their writing resemble standard forms, however, raises questions about 1) the role of vernacular language in contemporary writing conventions; 2) judgments about correctness made on the basis of non-linguistic considerations, such as social prestige (Carreira and Potowski 146: 2011); and 3) variations in learners' language selection and production that are influenced by considerations of genre (Martinez 39: 2007).

Since most SHL learners are being taught in mixed classes, it is essential to consider the dynamics of these groups and to adopt approaches to writing that are anchored in research. Cognitive studies, for example, indicate that SHL learners depend on their FL partner to resolve language-related problems associated with orthography and accent placement, whereas FL learners rely on SHL learners to solve lexical problems (Bowles 2011); FL learners not only incorporate more linguistic information in matched FL-FL dyads than in FL-SHL ones, but SHL learners benefit less than their FL counterparts (Giglio-Henshaw 2013); or following activity theoretical perspectives, both FL and SHL learners benefit at the linguistic and writing convention levels when using specific tasks (Valentín-Rivera 2015). Yet, these results may be inconsistent due to some learners using controlled activities (cloze tests) rather than free writing tasks (open-ended prompts) or may be due to differences in learners' proficiency levels. Furthermore, the type of learner interaction, such as dominant-dominant, dominant-passive, or collaborative-collaborative (as explored in Valentín-Rivera's 2015 study) may trigger better linguistic and writing performance than traditional pairings based solely on linguistic proficiency. Thus, sharing metalinguistic knowledge appears to bring different degrees of mutual benefits to learners and has the potential to promote the writers' own learning.

The writing process is another area that has been explored within cognitive parameters. Schwartz's (2003) study using think-aloud protocols showed that SHL learners tend to rehearse and repeat the text in their attempt to express their ideas better, perform more surface than deep-level revisions, and plan and revise throughout the writing process. In screencast analyses of SHL writers' Spanish and English writing processes that compared time allocation, Elola and Mikulski (2011) noted that learners tend to allocate similar amounts of time to composing and revising in each language but spend more time planning between sentences when writing in Spanish, and they write more fluently and accurately in English. These results signal several pedagogical implications: 1) the need to use process-writing approaches in the SHL classroom to encourage learners to take advantage of their acquired knowledge from their home communities as well as to transfer writing processes acquired in L1 English composition courses; and 2) the application first of low-stakes writing assignments to familiarize SHL learners with writing in Spanish, allowing them to draw upon personal experiences before introducing more formal, academic assignments.

Besides writing approaches, few SHL studies have explored instruction methods. In Jill Jegerski, Kara Morgan-Short and Kim Potowski's (2009) study, for instance, SHL learners generally did not seem to benefit from traditional or input processing instruction regarding linguistic gains as much as their FL peers. However, Valentín-Rivera (2015) found that SHL learners benefited more than their FL counterparts from explicit or implicit instruction on aspectual distinction (preterit versus imperfect) as well as from the use of explicit or implicit feedback. Traditionally, efficacy of instruction has been assessed through the measurement of linguistic gains, but this view limits SHL learners' exploration of writing as a complex act that encompasses the many structural, contextual, and organizational features inherent in a text. Hence, more holistic approaches are needed to better promote and value SHL learners' writing.

### **Technology in the Spanish Language Classroom**

Acknowledging the ubiquity of technology in the language classroom, educators and researchers have been keen to investigate how technology can be best integrated into the FL

writing curriculum. Two areas have dominated current research: 1) web platforms and software that support the Spanish language curriculum (hybrid courses) and foster independent learning (flipping courses); and 2) the use of social tools, such as wikis, Facebook, and blogs that support individual and collaborative writing and the emergence of new genres. Online platforms, programs, assessment tools, and games are being used increasingly because of their potential to aid learners' linguistic development by allowing for out-of-classroom learning experiences. Spanish hybrid courses are able to support higher-level functions, such as more complex writing (Saury and Scida 2006); improve learners' writing more efficiently than face-to-face classrooms (Thoms 2012); and promote linguistic development through writing activities (Moreno 2007). These platforms allow learners to improve their writing through resources such as better-assisted linguistic references and automatic feedback (Elola and Oskoz 2014).

Similarly, introducing the use of social tools has been advantageous from a linguistic point of view (Elola and Oskoz 2010; Lee 2012); however, it has also brought two other areas of practice into sharp focus: the inclusion of collaborative work as a complement to individual writing and the emergence of new (digital) genres. Collaborative writing in FL classrooms has thrived due to the advent of social tools that allow learners to work synchronously or asynchronously with others inside or outside the classroom. Studies in this area have explored Spanish-American intercultural exchanges using blogs, Moodle, and podcasts (Lee 2009); collaborative versus individual writing tendencies (Elola and Oskoz 2010); the affordances of social tools in Spanish academic contexts—the use of discussion boards for idea generation and wikis and chats for developing content, structure, and accuracy (Elola and Oskoz 2010); the effect of tasks (argumentative versus expository essays) on linguistic and structural performance (Oskoz and Elola 2014); and the impact of different types of corrective feedback when delivered in online intercultural projects (Muñoz and Vinagre 2011), in blogs (Lee 2012), or in GoogleDocs (Valentín-Rivera 2015).

More recently, the notion of genre has received well-deserved attention due to new concepts of text that integrate several modalities (e.g., written words, images, sounds). Although traditional academic genres adapt well to the use of social tools, such as wikis and Google Docs (Elola and Oskoz 2010; Valentín-Rivera 2015), there is a growing interest in how to introduce the creation of texts that integrate non-verbal modalities. Certainly, learners are familiar with multimodal texts in their daily lives, and so bringing these modalities into the classroom will be increasingly relevant to learners' expectations. As a result, the burgeoning number of studies on digital stories (i.e., creation of written scripts integrating print, sounds, and images) reflects our changing understanding of literacy, assessment practice, and genre (Oskoz and Elola 2016). Without a doubt, technology and, particularly, new (social) tools are altering how our Spanish learners approach writing; thus, Spanish instructors need to explore how academic assignments can be combined with non-traditional genres, such as blogging, storytelling, and postings, and how they can be integrated into the curriculum to enrich linguistic development.

### **The Next Step**

The current focus on writing in Spanish language classrooms reflects recent exploration and innovation in the area of writing instruction and performance. The integration of new technologies and acknowledgement of the diversity of learner populations has initiated welcome dialogue and change. Although the pedagogic aim is still to write well and accurately in Spanish, we also need to acknowledge the authenticity of vernacular language in student writing; this acknowledges Spanish language varieties and also questions language standardization. In practice, this means shifting our notions about errors when SHL learners follow norms from their spoken communities that differ from traditional academic or class-based norms.

Future SHL and FL writing curricula and instructional changes should:

- 1) see the act of writing as a step-by-step process of planning and composing.
- 2) create tasks based on both academic and new or less-academic genres.
- 3) incorporate and value learners' opinions and reflections about writing in Spanish, which may well reflect their future professional or personal needs (Hedgcock and Lefkowitz 2011) or aspirations to attain language mastery or avoid language loss (Callahan 2010).
- 4) include collaborative work not only for metalinguistic purposes but also to expand learners' experience with new or unfamiliar genres.
- 5) tailor individual writing needs through the development of hybrid courses or flipping-classroom-like programs that meet the needs of both FL and SHL learners.
- 6) prepare learners for new technologies, such as gaming and virtual reality, insofar as these encourage linguistic growth and creativity.
- 7) help our learners to be multiliterate and effective writers.

To support these changes, it is imperative to increase research on instructional approaches, to connect research findings to the realities of the FL and SHL classroom, and to make highly technical research findings accessible to instructors with no background in theoretical linguistics or second-language acquisition (Carreira and Potowski 2011). At the same time, we need more research in the areas of genre and semiotics to understand how diverse modes may be intertwined and integrated to create new kinds of text; similarly, we need to see the development of effective assessment tools for texts created in a variety of registers. Only then can we guarantee that our learners will become effective communicators in tomorrow's collaborative and multi-literate learning environment.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Oskoz and Dr. Mikulski for our ongoing collaboration on writing issues.

## WORKS CITED

- Beaudrie, Sara. M. (2012). "A Corpus-based Study on the Misspellings of Spanish Heritage Speakers and Their Implications for Teaching." *Linguistics and Education* 23.1: 135–44. Print.
- Bowles, Melissa. (2011). "Exploring the Role of Modality: L2-Heritage Learner Interactions in the Spanish Language Classroom." *Heritage Language Journal* 8.1: 30–54. Print.
- Bygate, Martin, and Virginia Samuda. (2008). *Tasks in Second Language Learning*. New York: Palgrave. Print.
- Callahan, Laura. (2010). "US Latinos' Use of Written Spanish: Realities and Aspirations." *Heritage Language Journal* 7.1: 1–26. Print.
- Carreira, Maria, and Kim Potowski. (2011). "Commentary: Pedagogical Implications of Experimental SNS Research." *Heritage Language Journal* 8.1: 134–51. Print.
- Castañeda, Daniel A., and Moon-Heum Cho. (2013). "The Role of Wiki Writing in Learning Spanish Grammar." *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 26.4: 334–49. Print.
- Colombi, M. Cecilia. (2009). "A Systemic Functional Approach to Teaching Spanish for Heritage Speakers in the United States." *Linguistics and Education* 20.1: 39–49. Print.
- Elola, Idoia. (2007). "Portrait of a Teacher: Beliefs on Feedback and Revision in the Foreign Language Classroom." *From Thought to Action: Exploring Beliefs and Outcomes in the Foreign Language Program. AAUSC monograph*. Ed. Jay Siskin. Boston: Heinle. 48–66. Print.
- Elola, Idoia, and Ariana Mikulski. (2011). "Heritage Language Learners' Allocation of Time to Writing Processes in English and Spanish." *Hispania* 94.4: 715–33. Print.
- . (2016). "Similar and/or Different Writing Processes? A Study of Spanish Foreign Language and Heritage Language Learners." *Hispania* 99.1: 87–102. Print.

- Elola, Idoia, and Ana Oskoz. (2010). "Collaborative Writing: Fostering L2 Development and Mastery of Writing Conventions." *Language Learning and Technology* 14.3: 51–71. Print.
- . (2014). "Towards Online and Hybrid Courses." *The Routledge Handbook of Hispanic Applied Linguistics*. Ed. Manel Lacorte. London: The Routledge Publishing House. 221–37. Print.
- . (2016). "Supporting Second Language Writing using Multimodal Feedback." *Foreign Language Annals* 49.1: 58–74. Print.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. César, and Terri A. Greenslade. (2006). "Error Correction and Learner Perceptions in L2 Spanish Writing." *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as First and Second Languages*. Ed. Timothy. L. Face and Carol. A. Klee. Somerville: Cascadilla. 185–94. Print.
- Giglio-Henshaw, Florencia. (2013). "Learning Opportunities and Outcomes of L2-L2 and L2-HL Learner Interaction During a Collaborative Writing Task." Diss. U of Illinois. Print.
- Hedgcock, John, and Natalie Lefkowitz. (2011). "Exploring the Learning Potential of Writing Development in Heritage Language Education." *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language*. Ed. Rosa María Manchón. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 209–33. Print.
- Jegerski, Jill, Kara Morgan-Short, and Kim Potowski. (2009). "The Effects of Instruction on Subjunctive Development among Spanish Heritage Language Speakers." *Language Learning* 59.3: 537–79. Print.
- Lado, Beatriz, and Iñigo Yanguas. (2012). "Is Thinking Aloud Reactive When Writing in the Heritage Language?" *Foreign Language Annals* 45.3: 380–99. Print.
- Lee, Lina. (2009). "Promoting Intercultural Exchanges with Blogs and Podcasting: A Study of Spanish-American Telecollaboration." *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 22.5: 425–43. Print.
- . (2012). "Linguistic Feedback and Focus on Form through Expert Scaffolding in L2 Blog Writing." *Technology Across Writing Contexts and Tasks*. Ed. Idoia Elola, Greg Kessler, and Ana Oskoz. San Marcos: CALICO Monograph Series. 57–80. Print.
- Martinez, Glenn. (2007). "Writing Back and Forth: The Interplay of Form and Situation in Heritage Language Composition." *Language Teaching Research* 11.1: 31–41. Print.
- Moreno, Nina. (2007). "The Effects of Type of Task and Type of Feedback on L2 Development in CALL." Diss. George Washington U. Print.
- Muñoz, B., and M. Vinagre. (2011). "Computer-mediated Corrective Feedback and Language Accuracy in Telecollaborative Exchanges." *Language Learning and Technology* 15.1: 72–103. Print.
- O'Donnell, Mary. (2007). "Policies and Practices in Foreign Language Writing at the College Level: Survey Results and Implications." *Foreign Language Annals* 40.4: 650–71. Print.
- Oskoz, Ana, and Idoia Elola (2014). "Promoting Foreign Language Collaborative Writing through the Use of Web 2.0 Tools." *Technology and Tasks: Exploring Technology-mediated TBLT*. Ed. Marta González-Lloret and Lourdes Ortega. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 115–47. Print.
- . (2016). "Digital Stories: Bringing Multimodal Texts to the Spanish Writing Classroom." *CALICO Journal* 28.3: 326–42. Print.
- Potowski, Kim. (2007). "Characteristics of the Spanish Grammar and Sociolinguistic Proficiency of Dual Immersion Graduates." *Spanish in Context* 4.2: 187–216. Print.
- Saury, Rachel E., and Emily Scida. (2006). "Hybrid Courses and Their Impact on Student and Classroom Performance: A Case Study at the University of Virginia." *CALICO Journal* 23.3: 517–31. Print.
- Schwartz, Ana María. (2003). "¡No me suena! Heritage Spanish Speakers' Writing Strategies." *Mi Lengua: Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States, Research and Practice*. Ed. M. Cecilia Colombi and Ana Roca. Washington, DC: Georgetown UP. 235–56. Print.
- Spicer-Escalante, María L. (2007). "Análisis lingüístico de la escritura bilingüe (español-inglés) de los hablantes de español como lengua hereditaria en los Estados Unidos." *Estudios de lingüística aplicada* 45: 63–80. Print.
- Teschner, Richard V. (1981). "Spanish for Native Speakers: Evaluating Twenty-five Chicano Compositions in a First-year Course." *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic Bilingual: Issues, Aims, and Methods*. Ed. Rodolfo García-Moya, Anthony G. Lozano, and Guadalupe Valdés. New York: Teachers College. 115–39. Print.
- Thoms, Joshua. (2012). "Analyzing Linguistic Outcomes of Second Language Learners: Hybrid Versus Traditional Course Contexts." *Hybrid Language Teaching and Learning: Exploring Theoretical, Pedagogical, and Curricular Issues*. Ed. Fernando Rubio and Joshua Thoms. Boston: Heinle. 177–95. Print.
- Valentín-Rivera, Laura. (2015). "Collaborative Narratives Between Spanish Heritage and Foreign Language Learners: Understanding Aspect Selection Through Two Types of Corrective Feedback." Diss. Texas Tech U. Print.

Respuesta a “Writing in Spanish  
as a Second and Heritage Language:  
Past, Present, and Future”



## El español como lengua de herencia

**María Teresa García-Godoy**  
*Universidad de Granada*

**Palabras clave:** heritage language/lengua de herencia, sociolinguistics/sociolingüística, Spanish/español, United States/Estados Unidos

El español como lengua de herencia constituye hoy un foco investigador emergente para distintas disciplinas. Dicho foco eclosiona en el contexto educativo de las lenguas minoritarias en los Estados Unidos. Como es sabido, en este país, demográficamente, el español lidera el grupo de las lenguas no nativas. Pero, recientemente, se cuestiona que en el medio académico se otorgue al español dicho estatus de lengua no nativa y se reivindica la necesidad pedagógica de diseñar programas específicos para los alumnos de herencia hispánica. En efecto, en las aulas estadounidenses de español como lengua extranjera se revela este hecho diferencial: el alumnado hispano, genealógicamente, posee vínculos con el español y sus variedades, obviados, hasta ahora, en el diseño educativo.

Esta circunstancia está cobrando particular énfasis en el actual panorama investigador de la didáctica y de la pedagogía. Los primeros avances proceden de estas disciplinas y se cifran, principalmente, en diagnosticar dos sistemas de adquisición en las clases de español como lengua no nativa: el de los alumnos monolingües de inglés, por una parte, y el de los alumnos diglósicos de herencia hispánica, por otra. *Sensu estricto*, la didáctica de lenguas extranjeras es adecuada solo para el primer grupo, mientras que para el segundo resultaría más idóneo introducir algunos postulados didácticos de lengua materna. Este primer diagnóstico incluye también los principales rasgos de los estudiantes de herencia hispánica en el contexto estadounidense, a saber: 1) adquisición extraescolar de impronta oral, con débil base gramatical; 2) baja autoestima del español adquirido por herencia, al identificarlo con una variedad estigmatizada social y académicamente; y 3) idealización del español peninsular, identificado como único estándar prestigioso para la norma escrita.

Toda vez que ese perfil de alumnado revela el arraigo de creencias idiomáticas desmitificadas en la lingüística hispánica actual, esta disciplina incursiona, tímidamente, como complemento en los programas pioneros para estudiantes de herencia. Pese a estas incipientes experiencias didáctico-lingüísticas, el primer *status quaestionis* sobre este nuevo foco investigador señala como próximo reto un diálogo interdisciplinar, que, verdaderamente, conecte en un programa de actuación coherente los campos de la pedagogía, la psicolingüística, la sociolingüística y la lingüística hispánica (Díaz-Campos 2014).

A este respecto, seguidamente, se indica qué puede aportar la lingüística hispánica en ese nuevo reto de diálogo interdisciplinar. Según el diagnóstico ya presentado, el estudiante de herencia necesita objetivar su conexión con el contexto sociohistórico y cultural del español, en perspectiva intra- y extranacional. Se trata de que el alumnado desmitifique los falsos prejuicios sobre su vernáculo, a la luz de los conceptos técnicos de variación y cambio lingüísticos, presentados en el aula de forma muy divulgativa. Para ello, la lingüística hispánica ofrece herramientas

teóricas y descripciones idiomáticas adecuadas para que el alumno de herencia ponga en valor su propia adquisición del español en el contexto social inmediato. El acercamiento lingüístico a hechos básicos de variación diafásica, diastrática y diatópica favorece una incipiente reflexión técnica sobre el vernáculo, que suele ser deficitaria en el estudiante de herencia. Ilustrar esos parámetros variacionales con ejemplos prototípicos del geolecto estadounidense y sus variedades internas entraña también potenciar las conexiones culturales relevantes del entorno idiomático (Escobar y Potowski 2015: 265). Un caso práctico, en lo atinente a la escritura, podríamos encontrarlo en actividades que involucren el paisaje lingüístico estadounidense, atendiendo a las recientes descripciones lingüísticas. En definitiva, se trata de acercar estratégicamente al alumno de herencia al idearium plurinormativo internacional de la lengua española, partiendo de su realidad nacional.

Desde la perspectiva lingüística, el marco teórico subyacente a este planteamiento se sustenta en los conceptos de estandarización policéntrica y de política panhispánica. El primer concepto supone ampliar el número de focos estandarizadores del español en ambos márgenes del Atlántico. Consecuentemente, la visión eurocéntrica del español que establece la norma centropeninsular como único referente de prestigio carece de vigor en los planteamientos de la lingüística hispánica actual y desbarata los falsos mitos perpetuados, aun hoy, en los estudiantes de herencia. Por otra parte, el concepto de política panhispánica se vincula con la última codificación oficial del español, que implanta un nuevo enfoque plurinormativo. Las últimas obras gramaticales y lexicográficas de la Real Academia Española, oficialmente, censuran el respeto a la diversidad de modelos lingüísticos en la geografía de la lengua española.

## OBRAS CITADAS

- Díaz-Campos, Manuel. (2014). "El español como lengua de herencia". *Introducción a la sociolingüística hispánica*. Malden: Wiley. 241–65. Impreso.
- Elola, Idoia. (2017). "Writing in Spanish as a Second and Heritage Language: Past, Present, and Future". *Hispania* 100.5: 119–24. Print.
- Escobar, Ana María, y Kim Potowski (2015). "La identidad en la clase de español para hablantes de herencia". *El español de los Estados Unidos*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 247–68. Impreso.