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Introduction
A growing population of English Language Learners (ELLs) is U.S.-born, a phenomenon that raises new questions for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). This paper proposes the need for an improved understanding of how the research literature on heritage language speakers can inform ESL education.

Most US English Language Learners are Born in the USA
English Language Learners are defined as students with limited English proficiency who speak a language other than English at home (NCELA, 2006). During the 1989-1990 school year, a total of two million ELLs were reported in U.S. public schools (pre-K through grade 12). That number had more than doubled by the 2004–2005 academic year, when over five million ELLs, or approximately 10.5% of the total public school enrollment, were identified. In those fifteen years, ELL enrollment increased at nearly seven times the rate of total student enrollment (NCELA, 2006).

Moreover, the number of U.S. ELLs born in the United States has increased from approximately one third of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population in 1991-1992 (Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993) to 64 percent of all LEPs in 2006 (Batalova, 2006). Today, more than 75% of elementary school ELLs were U.S.-born (Capps, Fix, Murray, Ost, Passel, & Herwantoro, 2005), compared with 41% in 1992 (Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993).

Further disaggregation of the data reveals an unanticipated pattern of generational language use: twenty seven percent of ELLs in secondary school are second generation, and twenty nine percent are third generation or beyond. Among elementary-level ELLs, fifty nine percent are second generation and eighteen percent are third generation or beyond (see Figure 1) (Capps et al., 2005).
Capps et al. (2005) further point out that the numbers of third generation LEPs (18% from pre-K to 5th grade, 29% from 6th grade through high school) suggest that many U.S.-born pupils finish secondary school as LEPs.

**US-born ELLs Do Not Conform to the Three-Generation Expectation**

The traditional understanding of language use and shift in the United States is that the family’s native language is lost by the third generation (Fishman, 1966; Veltman, 1983). However, most studies of long-term heritage language maintenance conclude that the shift to English, and the accompanying loss of the heritage language, remains the norm (Castillo, 2004; Portes Schauffler, 1994; Rivera-Mills, 2001; Rumbaut, 1994; Veltman, 1983, 1988, 2000; Wong-Fillmore, 1991). At the same time, current demographics on U.S.-born ELLs do not conform to the expectation that a family’s native language is lost by the third generation and replaced with English as the dominant language. The large numbers of second-generation or higher ELLs born in the United States represent a population different from English monolinguals and fluent bilinguals and are worthy of acknowledgement and study.
While there is a good deal of research suggesting possible factors related to language maintenance, there has been much less research that has sought to understand factors behind second and third generation limited English proficiency. Some suggested factors include that limited English proficient children come from “linguistically isolated” households, where everyone over the age of 14 is limited English proficient (Capps et al., 2005). Other possibilities include ongoing ethnic and racial segregation. It has been noted that limited English proficient students are highly segregated by income in America's public schools (Urban Institute, 2004). De Cohen (2005) has documented that nearly 70 percent of the nation’s LEP students are enrolled in 10 percent of its schools, and that LEPs are known to be economically disadvantaged, “embedding the discussion of LEP students’ education within the context of what is already known about poor, minority, immigrant-serving urban schools” (p. 6).

Other suggestions are that second and third generation limited English proficiency results from use of the native language at home, which interferes with English development, and that newer immigrants and their children do not wish to learn English or become full participants in the American way of life (Krashen, 1998; Valdés, 2000b).

Second and third generation English language learners are a subpopulation of heritage language speakers. Although some studies have examined U.S.-born bilinguals (Linton, 2004; Suarez, 2002), the characteristics, differences and similarities of US born ELLs have not yet been widely studied. In their work outlining research agendas for LEP students, August and Hakuta (1997) emphasize that “priority should be given to addressing important gaps in population coverage, such as certain age or language groups, for whom the applicability of current findings from a more limited population can be tested” (p.6). Valdés (2005) has also encouraged researchers to identify differences and similarities among the spectrum of L1/L2 users. Research into heritage language speakers may contribute to the understanding of language use in the second and third generation.

This review of the research literature seeks to address the following questions:

1. What does the research say about second and third generation Heritage Language speakers?

2. Can what we have learned about U.S.-born heritage language speakers inform our understanding of U.S.-born English Language Learners?

**Literature Review – Methodology**

In this paper I use Valdés’ (2000) definition of a heritage language speaker as a student who “is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken” and who “speaks or at least understands the language and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English” (p. 38). This definition emphasizes that heritage language use starts in the
home, acknowledges a range of proficiencies in the home language and English, and is consistent with the definition of ELL and LEP given above.

This review focuses on the second generation or beyond, either alone or compared to other groups. Works selected for review shared the following characteristics:

- empirically-based studies, inclusive of diverse methodologies, qualitative and quantitative,
- studies based in the United States,
- studies dealing with U.S.-born heritage language learners,
- studies for which the unit of analysis included second generation or higher,
- literature on heritage language in public and private schools,
- sources from peer-reviewed journals.

The search and selection process yielded thirty-nine studies, which are summarized in the Appendix.

The selection of articles is limited by a dearth of studies that compare U.S.-born limited English proficient heritage language speakers with U.S.-born fluently bilingual heritage language speakers. The paper therefore reports on studies of second and third generation heritage language speakers who may or may not be limited English proficient.

**Findings**

The studies reviewed offer perspectives on three themes:

a. Designation of second and third generation heritage speakers

b. Language perceptions and linguistic adaptations of second and third generation HL speakers.

c. Relationships between heritage language maintenance and English language development.

**a. Designation of Second and Third Generation Heritage Language Speakers**

Several studies discuss the identification of heritage speakers and the designation of the terms *heritage language* and *second generation*. Research shows the need for a more considered use of both these terms, consistent with Wiley’s call (2005) for the reexamination of terminology.

For example, J.S. Lee (2005) suggests that the distinction made between heritage and non-heritage learners is one-dimensional. Her study participants, which included second generation, generation 1.5, and immigrant students, when asked to self-identify either as heritage or non-heritage language learners, make choices outside the parameters that HL
research applies to the term. Lee’s findings suggest that speakers’ perceptions of proficiency and their socio-psychological identification with the language are critical to their perceptions and use of their heritage language. Kondo-Brown’s (2005) inquiry into sub-groups of students of Japanese encourages further examination into the differences between heritage and foreign language learners, as well as into finer distinctions among heritage speakers. Both Kondo-Brown and Lee’s findings indicate the importance of self-identity to speakers. Taking this variable into account in the research design for studies of heritage speakers who are also LEPs may enrich understanding of this population.

The term second generation also would benefit from reexamination, as its inconsistent use influences research design. While most studies defined second generation consistently with the U.S. Census (see footnote 2), some researchers included members of generation 1.5 in this group, because linguistically these students have more in common with the second generation in development of the first language (e.g. Cho, 2005). However, Oropesa and Landale (1997), who examined criteria used to designate second generation speakers based on 1990 U.S. Census data, argue that researchers should distinguish foreign-born and native-born children, to allow for an examination of the differences in English proficiency among speakers based on place of birth.

Second generation LEPs also need to be distinguished from non-heritage speakers, fluent U.S.-born bilinguals, and recent immigrants. Portes (1994) argues that the failure to separate second generation speakers from other groups “obliterates their history” and results in “obscuring a major phenomenon in the recent evolution of American society” (p. 632).

b. Language Perceptions and Linguistic Adaptations of the Second Generation

It is important to study the “clash of languages confronted by second generation youth” (Portes & Shauffler, 1994, p. 644) in order to better understand the different possible outcomes of language contact, monolingualism in either language or bilingualism. This section focuses on studies of second generation language perceptions and linguistic adaptation. Language perceptions are represented by language attitude, preference, and choice, and linguistic adaptation is indicated by patterns of language use that correspond to those perceptions.

Across studies, although second generation heritage language speakers would like to maintain their heritage language and culture, they display an overwhelming preference for English. For example, an analysis of over 5,000 second generation students across language backgrounds found that over two-thirds expressed a preference for English over the heritage language (Portes & Hao, 1998). In their study of second generation 8th and 9th graders, Portes and Shauffler (1994) identified a “near-universal” preference for English in their subjects’ daily lives. They also found a strong shift toward English and a positive correlation between English proficiency and length of residence or birth in the
U.S. Again, the notion that native born ELLs are not interested in learning English is not supported in the research literature.

Even among second generation speakers who value bilingualism, English can be preferred to the parental language. In a seven-year study of Mexican-descent immigrant and U.S.-born parents and their U.S.-born children, participants continuously held “extremely positive” opinions about English because of its perceived higher value. The same participants were also highly positive about bilingualism and Spanish maintenance (Pease-Alvarez, 2002).

Since it is clear that English is preferred across the second and third generation, Portes and Schauffler (1994) suggest that the language attitude of youths toward their parental language is the deciding factor as to whether or not the child will retain some fluency in the parental language. Rivera-Mills’ (2001) study found that second and third generation speakers have a keen desire to maintain their heritage language. A study of U.S.-born Chinese Americans and Korean Americans also found a strong desire to keep their language and culture (S.K. Lee, 2002). A comparison of attitudes among Armenian immigrant and Armenian U.S.-born students led the researchers to conclude that “American-born bilingual children may have had a closer affinity with the Armenian American community than either monolingual or foreign-born bilingual children” (Imbens-Bailey, 1996). Other studies across language groups also suggested that U.S.-born speakers may have a stronger desire to keep the heritage language and culture than immigrants (S.J. Lee, 2005; Pease-Alvarez, 2002; Portes & Schauffler, 1994).

Heritage speakers’ views of their parental language can change over time. For example, Luo and Wiseman’s (2000) study of second generation Chinese American adolescents found that peers are the most important influence on language preference and HL maintenance. Both Chinese-speaking and non-Chinese speaking peers were influential in U.S.-born children’s use and retention of Chinese. Respondents also indicated that the relative importance of English and the HL varied at different times of life. Schecter and Bayley’s study (2004) found a similar pattern. Likewise, Pease-Alvarez (2002) found that a household can change its dominant language in either direction. One of her study subjects was a U.S.-born parent who initiated a greater use of Spanish in the home to repair communication between her children and their Spanish-dominant father. Other subjects included U.S.-born parents whose initially Spanish-dominant households became English-dominant. Nevertheless, these studies support the findings of previous research that the shift towards English is more common than maintenance of the heritage language.

To investigate departures from the typical pattern of language shift over three generations, Tse (2001) interviewed 18-24 year olds with high levels of heritage language literacy. She found that the most important factors for slowing the rate of shift included having HL print in the home, particularly “light reading”, which fosters interest in
reading. Guardado (2002) compared two groups, one bilingual and one English dominant, of U.S.-born children from Latino families. Parents of both groups said they believed that learning Spanish would give their children opportunities, and they all had a strong sense of cultural and ethnic identity. Guardado found that parents’ concern for their children’s Latino identity, moral development, and cognitive growth was the most significant factor in whether children remained bilingual or became English dominant. Facilitating factors for children’s ethnic identity and HL use were the concrete presence of Latino culture and Spanish language in the home, including reading children’s books in Spanish, playing or singing Spanish songs, and encouraging children with positive and enjoyable ways of using Spanish. Families who experienced language loss tended to use more “authoritarian discourses” (p. 354) and required, or demanded, that their children speak Spanish. Other factors associated with slowing down the rate of shift to English included the presence of grandparents in the household (Ishizawa, 2004; Kondo-Brown, 2005), gender (females are more likely to maintain the heritage language (e.g. Portes & Hao, 1998)), parental commitment to maintenance (Zhang, 2004), and higher parental education and socio-economic status (Portes & Shauffler, 1994). In general, positive relationships with parents and affirmative associations of heritage language use with home life positively influenced children’s maintenance of the heritage language over generations (Arriagada, 2005; Romero, Robinson, Haydel, Mendoza, & Killen, 2004).

As Hinton (1999) points out that while family dynamics play a role in establishing language use in the second generation, the community also plays an influential role. Tse (2001) found that language shift was slowed down for the second generation in communities where there was assistance of more literate heritage language users, community institutions that used and provided HL print, and opportunities to act as literacy mediators for parents and family.

Cho (2000) found that second generation speakers’ feelings of discomfort with native speakers, particularly during travel the home country, often motivated them to improve their knowledge of the heritage language. However, a shift to English can be hastened by a lack of appropriate education: J.S. Lee (2002) found that his participants wanted to develop their heritage language knowledge but had received inadequate instruction in school.

Hurtado and Vega’s study (2004) suggests that the “hybridity of bilingualism” allows for heritage languages to be retained. Hurtado and Vega (2004) examined the simultaneous phenomena of language shift from Spanish to English and Spanish maintenance, and found what they call “linguistic bands”, when two or more people speak a language together (p.147), which allows for speakers to continue to use Spanish after becoming dominant in English. They also suggest that Spanish can have periods of dormancy in the lives of speakers who are in communities where Spanish is spoken and still be available for use in response to appropriate triggers.
In sum, most second generation heritage language speakers prefer English but also wish to maintain their heritage language and culture. Language preference for this group is influenced by their peer groups, and subject to alternation over time. The rate of shift or maintenance over generations can be influenced by the presence of the heritage language in the home, a supportive community, and continued contact with heritage language speakers.

c. Relationships between heritage language maintenance and English development

Scholars have noted a relationship between second generation heritage language maintenance and English language development, academic achievement, and self-perception of competency.

For example, Shibata (2004) examined the relationship of Japanese proficiency, English proficiency, and academic achievement in a group of second generation Japanese American college students, most of whom had attended Japanese school and spoke Japanese at home. Shibata found that the subjects’ knowledge of Japanese did not compromise their knowledge of English. Moreover, a study of a nationally representative sample from NELS data found that heritage language maintenance and proficiency is associated with English proficiency and academic achievement (Yeung, Marsh and Suliman, 2000).

In studies by Buriel and Cardoza (1988), Glick and White (2003), Rumbaut (1995) and Suarez-Orozco and Marcelo (1995) the GPAs of non-U.S. born Mexican students were higher than those of U.S.-born students of Mexican descent. In a comparison of Mexican-born students with Mexican-descent students, Padilla and Gonzalez (2001) made the same findings, as well as a correlation of ESL/bilingual instruction with higher GPAs. They concluded that ESL and bilingual education provides students with increased academic achievement due to instruction in the “foundational skills” (p. 739) such as reading and mathematics, giving them an advantage over students without this foundation. Although Padilla and Gonzales did not distinguish between ESL and bilingual instruction, their research supports the positive effect of language education, including instruction in the heritage language.

Overall, a large body of research literature documents the positive effects of heritage language maintenance on academic achievement, cognitive development, social and psychological growth, and family relationships (e.g. Boals, 2001; Cummins, 1981; Dolson, 1985; Fernandez & Nielsen, 1986; Tseng & Fuligni, 2000; Peal & Lambert, 1962; Rumbaut, 1994). Portes and Hao (2002), in their study of second generation children, stress that “the positive effects of fluent bilingualism are not associated with mere attachment to these cultures but with simultaneous mastery of two languages and associated cultural repertoires” (p.907) (italics in original). The studies reviewed here, focusing on the second generation or higher, support Portes and Hao, and provide
additional evidence of the benefits of heritage language maintenance and fluent bilingualism.

Implications
ESL educators often claim that heritage language development is not related to them or their work (Lee & Oxelson, 2006; Pease-Alvarez & Winsler, 1994; Wong-Filmore, 2000). However, if education in the heritage language results in overall academic benefits, then maintaining heritage language knowledge is of interest to all instructors. ESL teachers can play a role in supporting heritage language maintenance by becoming strong advocates for biliteracy (Grant & Wong, 2003), and valuing and incorporating students’ heritage languages into classroom practices (Ernst, 1994). Even if ESL teachers and students are positively disposed towards bilingualism, rapid language shift can occur. For example, Pease-Alvarez & Winsler (1994) found that notwithstanding ESL instructors’ positive associations with Spanish, elementary school students used an increasing amount of English while decreasing their use of Spanish in the course of one academic year. Wong-Fillmore (2000) notes that the message conveyed to school children is “The home language is nothing; it has no value at all” (p. 208), and children respond by believing that “they must disavow the low status language spoken at home” (p. 208). ESL instructors can help students if they work collaboratively with parents, community members and heritage language speakers (Wong, 2000) to promote heritage language development simultaneously with the acquisition of English in and out of the classroom.

The studies reviewed here indicate that LEP heritage language speakers merit study as a group distinct from those who have become English dominant, rather than as failed heritage language or failed English language speakers (Cook, 2002) or as people who “know neither language” (McSwan, Rolstad, & Glass, 2002). Researchers’ findings make clear that the benefits of ESL instruction and TESOL education are not limited to imparting English proficiency and can contribute to supporting heritage language development. Moreover, the critical need for high-level heritage language speakers in the U.S. is well-documented (e.g. Malone, Rifkin, Christian, and Johnson (2004). The efforts of ESL and TESOL educators to support heritage language education can make a substantive contribution to this need and to the overall development of the child.

Notes
1. “English Language Learners” (ELLs) and “Limited English Proficient” (LEP) refer to those who speak a language other than English at home and who speak English less than “very well.” This definition of limited English proficiency is shared by the US Census and NCELA (2006). In this paper the term ELL is used unless discussing literature that uses the term LEP.

2. 1st generation: foreign-born children of foreign born immigrants.
2nd generation: U.S.-born children with at least one parent born outside of the U.S.


Note: Consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau’s definition of “native born,” children residing in the mainland with Puerto-Rican born parents are considered “native” i.e. U.S.-born. Children living in Puerto Rico are not considered part of the native-born population (Capps et al., 2005).

3. Capps et al. (2005) note that in 2000, 6 in 7 LEP students were “linguistically isolated” (p. 38).

4. Generation 1.5 refers to students who were born in a country other than the U.S. but emigrated as school-aged children or adolescents, and received most of their education in the U.S. (Harklau, Losey & Siegal, 1999).

5. This paper uses the term language shift as defined by Valdés (2005) as the “abandonment of the regular use of the non-English language” (p. 415).
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## Appendix
### Summary of Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample, Methods, Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Method:** NELS: 1988, student and parent surveys.  
**Main Finding:** Key aspects of the family context and home environment that encourage Spanish use and facilitate Spanish proficiency include: intact families, close parental relationships, Spanish as the L1 at home. |
**Method:** 1980 and 1990 Census Public Use Samples  
**Main Finding:** Lack of fluency in spoken English is uncommon among U.S.-born Americans. |
**Method:** Interviews and questionnaires  
**Main Finding:** Many participants claimed that their HL is an integral part of their Korean identity. Noted benefits of HL competence: professional advantages, and social advantages, including better relationships with heritage language speakers. Noted disadvantages of not having developed heritage language knowledge: difficulties interacting with the heritage community, feelings of isolation and exclusion from heritage community, difficulty interacting with HL speakers outside of the United States, and conflicts at home. |
**Method:** Surveys  
**Main Finding:** Parental use of the HL is important for heritage language maintenance. Notes that reading for pleasure and watching HL television are positive language practices under the voluntary control of the heritage language learner. |
| 5  | Guardado, M. (2002). Loss and maintenance of first language skills: | **Sample:** Range of generations, four Hispanic families  
**Method:** |
**Main Finding:**  
The L1 cultural identity is critical for heritage language maintenance. Study identifies six themes: 1) the role of the L1 culture, 2) encouragement to speak the L1, 3) consequences of L1 loss and maintenance, 4) optimism about L1 development, 5) importance of L1 literacy, and 6) L1 community. |
|---|---|
Asian-American college students, who grew up on the US, N=250  
**Method:**  
Language biographies  
**Main Finding:**  
Parental use of the HL is an important factor in children's use, but is not enough. Even in homes where the parents use the HL, children lose fluency. |
First, Second and Third generation Mexican Americans  
**Method:**  
1979 National Chicano Survey, California Identity Project (CIP), face to face interviews  
**Main Finding:**  
Finds shift from Spanish to English occurs, but the existence of "linguistic bands" results. |
US Born and Immigrant Latino Adolescents, N=129  
**Method:**  
Surveys  
**Main Finding:**  
Language acculturation is a significant factor in school experiences, achievement, motivation, and the perception of |
U.S.-born Armenian-American youth, ages 8-15 years, N=44  
**Method:**  
Questionnaires  
**Main Finding:**  
American-born bilingual Armenian-Americans may have closer ethnic, cultural and community connection with the heritage language than either foreign-born bilinguals or monolingual children. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Main Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ishizawa, H. (2004).</td>
<td>Minority language use among grandchildren in multigenerational homes. Sociological Perspectives, 47(4), 465-483.</td>
<td>First, second and third generation children, ages 5 to 17, living in multi-generational homes, N=5,962</td>
<td>U.S. Census, supplementary survey</td>
<td>The three-generational shift does not happen when the HL is used in the home where both parents and grandparents live. The grandmother is more effective than the grandfather at HL transmittal. The presence of any non-English speaking parents, grandparents or other adults in the household increases the likelihood of children's HL use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Main Finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lee, J.S. (2005)</td>
<td>Through the learners' eyes: Reconceptualizing the heritage and non-heritage language learners of the less commonly taught languages. <em>Foreign Language Annals</em>, 38(4), 554–567.</td>
<td>First and second generation, also self-identified Generation 1.5, university students of less commonly taught languages, N=530</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>The categories &quot;heritage&quot; and &quot;non-heritage&quot; learners may not be mutually exclusive; self-identity is multi-faceted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Linton, A. (2004)</td>
<td>A critical mass model of bilingualism among U.S.-born Hispanics. <em>Social Forces</em>, 83(1), 279-314.</td>
<td>U.S.-born and 1.5 generation Hispanic adults, metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), N = 38,395</td>
<td>1990 Census</td>
<td>Spanish HL maintenance is greater in areas where Hispanics have higher status and greater political power. Also noted is a &quot;critical mass effect,&quot; where the behavior of the larger group influences the language choices individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24(3), 307.</td>
<td>maintenance. Mothers seem more influential than fathers in shaping immigrant children's ethnolinguistic identity, may play a more important role than fathers in shaping children's language behavior. Mother-child cohesion is a significant factor in children's heritage language use, preservation and proficiency and positive attitudes toward the HL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropesa, R.S., &amp; Landale, N.S. (1997). In search of the new second generation: Alternative strategies for identifying second generation children and understanding their acquisition of English. Sociological Perspectives, 40(3), 429–455.</td>
<td><strong>Sample:</strong> Mixed generation, mixed heritage children, ages up to 17 years old <strong>Method:</strong> Child files from Public Use Microdata Sample of 1990 Census <strong>Main Finding:</strong> The classification of &quot;foreign born&quot; children is important for HL and intergenerational studies. Suggests that foreign born children should not be combined in samples with native born children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease-Alvarez, L. (2002). Moving beyond linear trajectories of language shift and bilingual language socialization. Conversations within Mexican-descent families: Diverse contexts for language socialization and learning. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24(2), 114-137.</td>
<td><strong>Sample:</strong> Multi generations, third graders and parents of Mexican-descent, N = 632 <strong>Method:</strong> Interviews and conversations, seven year time span <strong>Main Finding:</strong> Examines &quot;evolution of bilingualism&quot; of Mexican-descent families. States that language socialization is an interactive process with other social and personal factors, particularly within family contexts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Method:** Surveys  
**Main Finding:** Among the second generation, the knowledge of and preference for English is "nearly universal." Only a minority remain proficient in the heritage language. |
**Method:** Surveys and questionnaires  
**Main Finding:** Preference for English is high. |
**Method:** Children of Immigrants Longitudinal study (CILS) (survey data)  
**Main Finding:** 1) There is a "plurality of second generation linguistic adaptation types" (English Monolingual, Fluent Bilingual, Foreign Monolingual, Limited Bilingual). 2) When examining the effect of these linguistic adaptations on family variables, finds fluent bilinguals and foreign monolinguals are less likely to experience frequent conflict with parents. 3) After controlling for all other predictors of personality adjustment, fluent bilinguals display significantly higher levels of self-esteem and ambition than other groups, particularly limited bilinguals and foreign monolinguals. Concludes that early acquisition of fluent bilingual skills is linked to the subsequent maintenance, and that selective rather than full acculturation is preferable for immigrant children and their families. |
**Method:** Survey, interviews  
**Main Finding:** Higher familism is significantly associated with higher education (contrary to expectations) and that children who prefer to use both Spanish and English or English alone had higher familism than those who prefer Spanish. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Main Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>