

The 'transformative' potential of translanguaging and other heteroglossic educational practices

M. Rafael Salaberry

Abstract

Over the last few decades, there has been an increased awareness about imprecise, inaccurate and, thus, unfair conceptualisations of language based on monoglossic views of language that delegitimise the linguistic repertoire of multilingual minorities as is the case of heritage speakers of Spanish in the US or speakers of Lingua Franca English worldwide. At the same time, there are theoretical and educational proposals that offer new conceptualisations of multilingualism focused on the concept of heteroglossia, which, in contrast with monoglossic views, focuses our attention on the fluid and full use of all linguistic resources available to language learners/users as they engage in the process of interacting with their interlocutors. In the present paper, I describe an important challenge that compromises the valuable agenda of heteroglossic approaches to develop multilingualism: the effect of listeners' biases and reverse linguistic stereotyping. That is, educational programmes designed to counteract the negative effect of monoglossic approaches to second language learning in general cannot adopt a segregationist approach (neither in their theoretical design nor in their practical implementation). To place this challenge in context, I describe in detail the specific example of Spanish heritage second language learners at the tertiary level of education in the US setting and I also provide a broad outline of potential improvements in the curricular design of such programmes.

KEYWORDS: SPANISH; TRANSLANGUAGING; HETEROGLOSSIA; HERITAGE LANGUAGE.

Affiliations

Rice University, USA
email: rafaels@rice.edu

1 Introduction

As Blommaert, Leppänen and Spotti (2012:1) describe it, ‘multilingualism is a positive thing in societies. ... It represents the richness of cultural diversity in language and so enriches society, and it is beneficial for individuals too.’ How we define and circumscribe multilingualism is, however, not a simple matter. For one thing, some languages may be promoted over other languages for the development of multilingualism, depending on a number of geopolitical and sociocultural factors. For instance, whereas the region of Europe tends to be described as a multilingual area because there is an institutional policy that favours a *plurilingual* approach, not all languages are regarded as relevant for such a multilingual view (e.g., García and Otheguy, 2019; McNamara, 2011). As pointed out by McNamara (2011:434), for instance, in Europe ‘policy tends to prioritize the learning of the national languages of other members of the European Union rather than to focus on the existing multilingualism in the classroom.’ Along the same lines, in the USA, the use of Spanish as a second language may represent a valuable resource among white students (i.e., elite bilingualism), but a liability among heritage language users (i.e., minoritised bilingualism) (e.g., Flores and Rosa, 2015; García, 2009; Otheguy, 2013; Rosa and Flores, 2017).

In large part to address this unbalanced and socially unfair conceptualisation of multilingualism, there has been an explicit effort to develop new theoretical perspectives and new educational programmes that attempt to address and remedy this situation. Over the last few decades, there has been an increased awareness about imprecise, inaccurate and, thus, unfair conceptualisations of language based on monoglossic views of language (e.g., Heller, 2010; Lippi-Green, 1997) that delegitimise the linguistic repertoire of multilingual minorities as is the case of heritage speakers of Spanish in the US (García, 2009) or speakers of Lingua Franca English worldwide (Canagarajah, 2011). There are also multiple theoretical and educational proposals that offer new conceptualisations of multilingualism (e.g., Blommaert and Rampton, 2011; Canagarajah, 2011; García and Li Wei, 2014; García, Flores and Woodley, 2015; Jørgensen and Møller, 2014; Leung and Valdés, 2019; Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012; Li, 2011; Otsuji and Pennycook, 2010; Pennycook, 2016). The majority of these new conceptualisations (e.g., metrolingualism, polylingualism, translinguaging, translanguaging etc.) are based on the two overlapping constructs of languaging and heteroglossia.

Both languaging and heteroglossia make reference to the dynamic and fluid nature of language, in which the latter is conceptualised as both a process and a product (cf. being and doing), as opposed to a finished product only (i.e., a discrete language). García and Leiva (2014) trace the original reference of the

term languaging to the work of biologists Maturana and Varela who defined it as the 'simultaneous being and doing of language ... at the same time that it continuously constitutes us differently as we interact with others' (p. 202). García and Li Wei (2014:9) further note that languaging emphasises 'the agency of speakers in an ongoing process of interactive meaning-making.' Møller (2019:32) extends the description of languaging even further while underlining its goal-oriented nature: it is 'designed in one way or another to influence the interlocutor.' The concept of heteroglossia, in turn, has been attributed to Bakhtin's work on literary theory and the stylistics of the novel, wherein language is viewed 'not as a system of abstract grammatical categories, but rather ... conceived as ideologically saturated, language as a world view' (Bakhtin, 1981:271). Blackledge and Creese (2014) highlight how Bakhtin's notion of 'the social and historical voices populating language' (p. 300) leads to shift our perspective on language from the viewpoint of the social construct of a named/national language (e.g., Bourdieu, 1991; Heller, 2007, 2010; Otheguy, García and Reid, 2015; Turner and Lin, 2020) to the social construct of speakers who make use of language to interact with others. Overall, both concepts (i.e., languaging and heteroglossia) focus our attention on the fluid and full use of all linguistic resources available to language learners/users as they engage in the process of interacting with their interlocutors (e.g., Blommaert and Rampton, 2011; Canagarajah, 2011; García and Li Wei, 2014; García, Flores and Woodley, 2015; Jørgensen and Møller, 2014; Otsuji and Pennycook, 2010).

The theoretical foundation advanced by heteroglossic approaches to the description of language has had enormous influence on educational practices. The concept of translanguaging, for instance, has been associated, from its very beginning, with pedagogical approaches applied to the contexts of bilingual and multilingual education (e.g., Canagarajah, 2011; García and Kleyn, 2016; García and Li Wei, 2014; García, Flores and Woodley, 2015).¹ Furthermore, given the heightened focus on the language user, almost by definition, 'translanguaging pedagogical practices are deeply critical and political, as they make visible the meaning-making potential of all students' (García and Otheguy, 2019: 11). Some authors, however, have challenged the avowed benefits of heteroglossic approaches for the design of educational programmes given the apparent paradoxical situation brought about by the need to help learners develop their own nonstandard repertoires, at the same time that they are being asked to develop the standard variety of languages that is the goal of a monoglossic approach (e.g., Jaspers, 2018, 2019; Jaspers and Madsen, 2019). Jaspers and Madsen (2019:21), for instance, attribute the limitation of the agenda of heteroglossic approaches to their 'tendency to view opposition to fluid language practices as conservative,' at the same time that they decry 'the trend to imbue these practices [i.e., fluid language use] with liberation or

transformation.’ And Jaspers (2018:4), warns that ‘if the predicted effects fail to occur or prove to be overstated, there is a risk that this agenda gets discredited as unrealistic, naïve, or mistaken.’

In the present paper, I argue that this critique is unfounded given that heteroglossic approaches, by definition, constitute an integrated view of language practices oriented toward the development of both fixed and fluid components of the construct of language use. I describe, however, an important challenge that does compromise the valuable agenda of heteroglossic approaches to develop multilingualism: the effect of listeners’ biases (Lippi-Green, 1997) and reverse linguistic stereotyping (Kang and Rubin, 2009). That is, educational programmes designed to counteract the negative effect of monoglossic approaches to second language learning in general cannot adopt a segregationist approach (neither in their theoretical design nor in their practical implementation). To place this challenge in context, I describe in detail the specific example of Spanish heritage second language learners at the tertiary level of education in the US setting and I also provide a broad outline of potential improvements in the curricular design of such programmes. Using this particular example as a point of departure, I then consider whether a broader range of political and socioeconomic options, rather than solely curricular options, is better suited to address the agenda of social justice proposed by translanguaging (cf. Jaspers’ proposal) and/or whether the efforts from diverse constituents – including educators – could be integrated into a coherent approach.

2 From structuralist to poststructuralist perspectives on language

The theoretical division between monoglossic and heteroglossic perspectives is part of a broad theoretical refocusing of ideas in the transition from structuralism to poststructuralism that started decades ago (e.g., Canagarajah, 2018; Heller, 2010; Kubota, 2016; McNamara, 2011; Ricento, 2009). Canagarajah (2018:31), for instance, notes that ‘structuralism encouraged scholars to consider language, like other social constructs, as organized as a self-defining and closed structure, set apart from spatiotemporal “context.”’ Within this perspective, language is to be defined as a sociopolitical theoretical construct that is correlated to a national or named language with specific groups of people that are geographically, historically and culturally related to each other. This construct of language, neatly circumscribed as part of national boundaries, provides neither an accurate nor a complete depiction of language and language use.

First, this static conception of language does not properly reflect real-life use given the multiplicity of contextual factors that give rise to so much variety in

language use even within the confines of one 'single language.' For instance, the overreliance on norms associated with the written standard (e.g., Linnell, 1998; Lippi-Green, 1997) has equated the conceptualisation of language with the standard variety, thus biasing our perspective toward an overly simplistic description of language practices. Second, the construct of language cannot be properly circumscribed as a bounded system on solely linguistic criteria given the multitude of linguistic and nonlinguistic resources that we use to communicate (embodied means) such as, for instance, gaze, facial expressions and gestures (e.g., Burch and Kasper, 2016; Heller, 2007; Jørgensen et al., 2015; Plough, Banerjee and Iwashita, 2018). García and Otheguy (2019:8), for instance, claim that translanguaging '... incorporates an understanding of how different modes, including our bodies, our gestures, our lives etc., add to the semiotic meaning-making repertoire that is involved in the act of communication.' Finally, and most relevant for the field of multilingualism, the traditional monoglossic definition of language that is founded on the static separation of languages – famously described by Grosjean (1982, 1989) as 'two monolinguals in one' – cannot provide a true description of the fluid use of communicative resources used by multilinguals (e.g., Blackledge and Creese, 2014) and among all language users in general given the functional diversification of language uses. As Otsuji and Pennycook (2010:243) describe it, one of the inherent problems of traditional models of multilingualism is that 'in celebrating multiplicity, models of diversity tend to pluralise languages and cultures rather than complexify them.'

Given the limitations of this static conceptualisation of language, Canagarajah (2018:31), for instance, argues 'for a shift from ... structuralist assumptions to consider more mobile, expansive, situated, and holistic practices.' In contrast with the limited scope of a monoglossic perspective on language, three crucial tenets of languaging/heteroglossia have been incorporated into the foundation of new conceptualisations of language that are compatible with a broad view of multilingualism: (i) the unitary nature of multilanguage competence (e.g., García and Li Wei, 2014; García and Lin, 2017), (ii) the aggregation of linguistic (and nonlinguistic) resources (e.g., Burch and Kasper, 2016; Canagarajah, 2012) and (iii) the negotiated nature of identity through linguistic interactions (e.g., McKinney and Norton, 2008; Otsuji and Pennycook, 2010). First, García and Li Wei (2014:2, stress added) underline the integrated nature of linguistic competence within a translanguaging perspective: '... *one linguistic* repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages.' For his part, Canagarajah (2012:6) emphasises the variety of linguistic, paralinguistic and nonlinguistic resources available to language users in the praxis of translanguaging: communication involves the use of 'diverse semiotic resources and ecological affordances.' Finally, Otsuji

and Pennycook (2010:240, stress added) define metrolingualism as the ‘product of modern and often urban interaction, describing the ways in which people of different and mixed backgrounds use, play with and *negotiate identities through language*,’ thus underlining the dynamic and interactive nature of multilingualism.

3 Theoretical challenges and educational applications

3.1 External VERSUS internal perspectives on language

From a methodological point of view, monoglossic and heteroglossic approaches use distinct units of analysis: whereas monoglossic approaches take named or national languages (and their corresponding linguistic features) as their reference point (e.g., Otheguy, García and Reid, 2015; Turner & Lin, 2020), heteroglossic approaches focus on the language user/speaker. As a consequence, the critical distinction between monoglossic and heteroglossic approaches to multilingualism is predicated on an external and an internal view of language respectively. Accordingly, some recent theoretical approaches to multilingualism such as translanguaging, metrolingualism and translanguism – all framed within a heteroglossic view – take a decisively internal perspective on the definition of what constitutes multilingualism. For instance, whereas the goal of plurilingualism is to achieve partial competence in multiple languages, rather than full competence in two or three or more languages, the goal of heteroglossic approaches (as reflected on the goals of translanguaging) is to ‘give voice’ to minority bilingual speakers and help them develop their own multilingual identity. García (2019:637, stress added) underlines that this new perspective leads us to ‘building multilingual subjectivities that are legitimate and authorized, *without reference to the social construction of native speakers, or that of sanctioned named languages*.’ In essence, the core principle that underlies the concept of translanguaging is that language belongs to the speaker rather than to the nation state.

The concept of an internal-external perspective on language to distinguish heteroglossic from monoglossic approaches is not the only conceptual dimension that can be used to assess this continuum: the concepts of authenticity and anonymity are also useful for that purpose (O’Rourke, 2015; O’Rourke and Ramallo, 2013; Woolard, 2008). Woolard describes the authentic end of this spectrum as the one that ‘is viewed as the genuine expression of such a community, or of an essential Self.’ In other words, it signals ‘who you are more than what you say’ (2008:304). The reference to the speaker’s perspective associated with authentic forms of language – over the generic and anonymous standardised registers of the language – defines authenticity as the criterion that is most clearly associated with identity (but see Rosa and Burdick, 2017

for some limitations of the concept of authenticity when based on essentialised definitions).

More importantly, the dichotomous (theoretical) categories described above (i.e., internal versus external and authentic versus anonymous) are also reflected on popular beliefs about the classification of language varieties (e.g., Preston, 2013). These folk beliefs reflect the natural tendency of all language users to engage in the evaluation of language (e.g., Cameron, 1995/2012; Ruuska, 2019). In his analysis of folk beliefs about language, Preston (1989), for instance, concluded that there are two main dimensions that are prevalent in the description of language varieties among nonspecialists: social status ('standard') and group solidarity ('friendly'). Preston further notes that whereas speakers of majority varieties have a tendency to spend the symbolic capital of their own variety on a 'standard' dimension, speakers of minority varieties usually spend their symbolic capital on the 'friendly' dimension. Whereas Preston gathered his conclusions based on data from English-majority-language speakers, Pennnycook and Otsuji (2019) note that multilinguals describe the use of their linguistic resources in similar ways. In essence, the data across both monolingual and multilingual speakers demonstrate that folk theories of language reflect the intersection of language practices and ideologies of language.

3.2 Challenges to the heteroglossic perspective on multilingualism

Despite the obvious benefits of incorporating the foundational tenets of a heteroglossic approach to accurately describe the concept of language, the pedagogical application of its theoretical premises has prompted some researchers to voice concerns about sudden or sweeping changes that may backfire on the idealistic goals of its proponents. In particular, some authors have challenged the avowed educational benefits of heteroglossic approaches given the apparent paradoxical situation brought about by the need to help learners develop their own nonstandard repertoires, at the same time that they are being asked to develop the standard variety of languages that is the goal of a monoglossic approach (e.g., Jaspers, 2018, 2019; Jaspers and Madsen, 2019).

The apparent paradox is, however, an illusion. The fundamental insight of a heteroglossic approach is that as much as we can we have an external perspective on language (leading to the perception of languages as structural entities on their own), we can *also* have an internal perspective from the point of view of the speakers of the language. As our focus of attention moves from the language to the speaker, we heighten our awareness of the plural and varied linguistic practices of speakers as they move across different contexts. But, this shift in viewpoint may move back and forth, from external to an internal perspective, and from internal to external viewpoint. Bakhtin (1981: 272)

describes this social tension inherent to the use of language as the opposing pull of centripetal and centrifugal forces: the former pulling towards the standardising core of the ‘unitary language,’ and the latter towards the ‘stratifying forces’ of decentralisation. Furthermore, given that speakers need to develop both their own nonstandard repertoires (heteroglossic pole of the continuum) and the standardised varieties of language (monoglossic pole), the distinction between multilingual and monolingual language learners is blurred. In effect, the processes employed by language users to interact and communicate with their interlocutors are not specific to multilingual language users, but they are part of normal interaction among all speakers – whether monolingual or multilingual. More importantly, the notion of a continuum from speaker-based to language-based conceptualisations and vice versa is empirically substantiated with data from a variety of sources. For instance, Møller’s (2019:37) analysis of data from two longitudinal projects shows that language users adapt to the specific nature of any given interaction, whether the interaction is predominantly marked by a named language (standard), or through the use of ‘linguistic resources associated with different languages’ when needed.

Jaspers (2018:9) is right nevertheless when he claims that ‘at the end of the road, pupils will be evaluated for their skills in a monolingual, academic type of language. This dilemma will not soon disappear ...’ Faced with this dire description of the status quo in schools, Jaspers, in search for a pragmatic solution, pivots towards what can be done by noneducational agents and adduces that ‘One goal for social action could be to concentrate on changing the conditions that make us argue so much about language at school.’ More specifically, Jaspers claims that ‘governmental institutions should accommodate to linguistic diversity [and thus] could take off the pressure from teachers.’ As valuable as Jaspers’ suggestion to expand the scope of view about potential solutions is (and thus to relieve the potentially unfair burden placed on teachers), he seems to be framing the issue with an either/or position with regard to solutions. It is difficult to see how the educational establishment could not be called upon to be part of a broad approach that would also require the participation of other noneducational institutions and participants. The integration of a speaker-based and a language-based approach – as reflected on standard and nonstandard repertoires – provides an almost unavoidable path for the educational institutions and the teachers to contribute to finding a solution to the dire dilemma described by Jaspers at the beginning of this paragraph. In practical terms, acknowledging that the status quo of most educational environments leads to structurally favouring monoglossic perspectives on language (e.g., teaching goals, assessment procedures etc.), does not entail that this insufficient context for learning could not be ‘supplemented’ with additional educational opportunities focused on the learner and not the language. In fact,

one could argue that the very subject of language learning entails developing metalinguistic awareness about the functional uses of language (cf. Ruuska, 2019). Almost by definition, the focus on 'giving voice to the learner' proposed by translanguaging and other heteroglossic approaches entails raising speakers' awareness about the nature of language and, in particular, bringing into focus the contrast between fluidity and fixity.

3.3 Educational application: External AND internal perspectives on language

Given that the notion of fluid language use (i.e., dynamic, authentic, interactive etc.) is predicated on the concomitant notion of fixed language use (i.e., standardised, anonymous, conventional etc.), the academic structure of the educational programme requires a strategic focus on both poles of this continuum. In effect, García and Li Wei (2014:71–72) state that 'students need practice and engagement in translanguaging, as much as they need practice of standard features used for academic purposes.' In even more explicit terms, García and Kleyn (2016:17) emphasise that the approach to translanguaging is not antithetical to (and should 'not abandon') '... the traditional understanding of language that is external to the child, for they know that in order to succeed academically the bilingual child will have to exclusively use language features of one or the other named language at different times.' The previous references show that even though heteroglossic approaches (in this case translanguaging) privilege the fluidity of language use as a constitutive aspect of the concept of multilingualism (i.e., speaker-based), they do not reject the relevance of language-based conceptualisations of language.

Despite some isolated calls to limit the implementation of educational approaches guided by heteroglossic perspectives due to a potential overemphasis on an internal perspective on language, a detailed analysis of the previous literature reveals a broad consensus on the integrated view of language described above. Otheguy (2016:XII), for one, recognises that monolinguals engage in translanguaging as much as multilinguals and sees no qualitative distinction between languaging and translanguaging.² Similarly, Otsuji and Pennycook (2010) explicitly claim that individuals enact and negotiate both fixed and fluid identities, and more specifically that fixity and fluidity 'co-exist and co-constitute each other' (p. 252). Finally, Jaspers and Madsen (2019:16) acknowledge that 'linguistic fluidity and fixity presuppose each other.' In essence, as much as these contrasts seem to be in orthogonal relationship to each other (i.e., fluidity *versus* fixity; monoglossic *versus* heteroglossic), they are integrated in actual language use (i.e., fluidity *and* fixity; monoglossic *and* heteroglossic).

Despite the benefits of incorporating the perspective from heteroglossic definitions of language to multilingual educational settings, there have been some understandable concerns about the future of some minority languages (e.g., Basque and Catalan in Spain, Quechua in Perú and Bolivia, etc.) should the process of translanguaging not be managed properly (e.g., Cenoz and Gorter, 2017, 2019). The problem is that whereas a language can be described as a minority language in one specific sociopolitical context (e.g., Spanish in the US), that same language may portrayed as the majority one in a different sociopolitical environment (e.g., Spanish in Spain). To wit, not only is Spanish among the top five languages spoken in the world (both when we count native speakers and when we tally both native and nonnative speakers together), but it is also supported by a strong international institutional apparatus that both regulates its use across a wide range of repertoires and supports its expansion worldwide (e.g., Mar-Molinero and Paffey, 2011). For the purpose of our discussion, we should note that the apparent discrepancy in the description of Spanish when placed in two distinct linguistic contexts (e.g., the US and Spain) is given by the fact that we are not using the same definition of language in each situation: In one case we are focusing on the varied linguistic resources used by minorities in the US (speakers' languages/voices), whereas in the other one, we are making reference to the 'named language' (e.g., García and Otheguy, 2019) that is ideologically supported by a strong institutional apparatus.³ Not only is this theoretical distinction (i.e., individual language versus named language) crucial to properly conceptualise the notion of translanguaging (and, by extension, other heteroglossic perspectives), but it is also necessary to understand and identify possible ways to support minority languages in one context at the same time that we can support the speakers' (multilingual) voices in another case. For instance, the proposed solutions advanced by Cenoz and Gorter (2019) to support the growth of Basque as a minority language (in contra-position with not just Spanish but English as well) are appropriate for that specific sociopolitical context. Their analysis, however, does not preclude the value of heteroglossic perspectives even when incorporated to their particular sociopolitical setting. In fact, it appears that Cenoz and Gorter are aware of this fact given that their support for the role of metalinguistic awareness – with an inherent focus on developing speakers' voices – is central to two of their five guiding principles.⁴ On the other hand, one could argue that the proposal advanced by Cenoz and Gorter is not comprehensive enough, insofar as it does not address the need for Spanish-only majority language speakers to be part of the process as well. I will come back to the analysis of this point once I address the equivalent situation in the US setting in the following sections.

In sum, the previous analysis leads us to the identification of two distinct objectives to be pursued by educational programmes dedicated to addressing

the needs of *both* monolingual and multilingual learners: (i) develop the standard repertoires (anonymity, fixity, centripetal forces), and (ii) develop the learner's own voice through the use of nonstandard language practices (authenticity, fluidity, centrifugal forces). The biggest hurdle to manage these twin educational goals is the deep entrenchment of unfounded beliefs about standard languages (Lippi-Green, 1997) and the concomitant reluctance to promote fluid language practices in most classrooms. As a corollary, the first challenge for the design of a comprehensive language education programme is to *counterbalance* the weight traditionally assigned to monoglossic perspectives with a proactive and explicit focus on fluid language practices (e.g., Hesson, Seltzer and Woodley, 2014; Solorza et al., 2019). And this is precisely the objective of educational approaches like translanguaging. In sum, contrary to some objections discussed above (i.e., the support and promotion of fluid language practices is counterproductive and not viable), the objective of *re-balancing* the focus on fluid language practices is not incompatible with the concurrent development of the standardised version of language use.

3.4 Listeners' biases and reverse linguistic stereotyping

On the other hand, one (sometimes overlooked) significant challenge to integrate both internal and external perspectives is the relative isolation and ghettoisation of multilingual practices. This separation occurs as a matter of educational design when multilingual and monolingual learners are placed on separate curricular tracks on the basis of (supposedly) educational needs of each specific population of students (e.g., long-term English learners, heritage language learners). Effectively, learners in segregated groups are prevented from productively engaging with speakers from another group, thus contributing to the development of the strategic allocation and selection of the entire continuum of language resources, from fixity to fluidity. More importantly, the lack of interaction between monolingual and minoritised multilingual learners may promote already established biases in perception and representation about the ability of each group in the eyes of the opposite group. This lack of interaction is particularly negative for the minoritised multilingual speakers whose competence in the standardised varieties (predominantly monolingual) is perceived as deficient, regardless of their actual ability to perform according to the standard norms. The unfortunate – and overlooked – feature of the separate track programmes is that it magnifies the (monoglossic) view that minoritised multilinguals are not competent enough in the standardised varieties of language.

In her description of the deleterious effects of the standard language ideology, Lippi-Green (1997: 71) notes the insidious effect of listeners' biases in the

interpretation of interlocutors' abilities to co-construct the interaction: '[i]n many cases ... breakdown of communication is due not so much to accent as it is to negative social evaluation of the accent in question, and a rejection of the communicative burden.' That is, there is a potential listeners' bias on the assessment of the linguistic performance of the interlocutor (the speaker), no matter how appropriate the speaker may be. The potential listeners' biases on the assessment of the linguistic performance of the interlocutor are deeply rooted and can lead to linguistic stereotyping and discrimination. Purnell, Idsardi and Baugh (1999), for instance, show that landlords discriminate against African American and Hispanic prospective tenants based on the sound of their voice.

Most cases of linguistic stereotyping have been attested through numerous studies based on, mostly, auditory information. Kang and Rubin, however, describe the case when visual information prompts interlocutors to rely on stereotypes. They define *Reverse Linguistic Stereotyping* (RLS) as cases when the 'attributions of a speaker's group membership trigger distorted evaluations of that person's speech' (2009:441). Among the most well-known studies that have assessed the effects of RLS, Rubin (e.g., Kang & Rubin, 2009; Rubin, 1992) documented that when participants were asked to judge the linguistic ability of teaching assistants in English, they were biased against the ones that 'looked foreign.' That is, visual information (ethnicity) affects auditory information (accented speech). In one of the better-known studies (Rubin, 1992), undergraduate students were asked to rate various recordings of lectures on diverse topics (humanities and science) from the same female native speaker of Standard American English. Each speech sample lasted about four minutes and for each one the students were shown a picture representing the teaching assistant in the recording. The pictures used, however, showed not one but two different female instructors randomly distributed. The pictures represented two different ethnicities: one was Caucasian and the other one was Asian (Chinese). Even though in every speech sample the participants were rating the same speaker, their ratings of the recordings presented in association with the picture of an Asian instructor were more likely to be regarded as accented, nonstandard English. In another study, undergraduate listeners' perceptions of the teaching assistant's accent were one of the strongest predictors of ratings of teacher effectiveness, whether the perception was accurate or not.

Rubin also noticed that measures of listening comprehension were mildly correlated to the undergraduates' previous experience with those teaching assistants. He concluded that participants who had more familiarity or had been exposed to interactions with nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants were less affected by RLS. To evaluate this possibility, Rubin provided some undergraduates with the opportunity to give teaching assistants feedback on their pronunciation (a supportive role) under the assumption that

such cooperative activity would counteract, or make less salient, their negative interpretation of the teaching assistants' ability to communicate in English. The result of the short training intervention revealed that there was no significant change in attitude, a result that Rubin attributed to the short-term nature of the intervention. In a more recent study, Zheng and Samuel (2017) expanded on the research design of Rubin's studies in order to methodologically separate perception from interpretation (i.e., a distinction between actual online perception and postperceptual judgements). That is, they assessed data on what participants in a study hear at a perceptual level (i.e., perception) and what they think they hear (i.e., interpretation). Ultimately, they concluded that the effect discovered by Rubin was not due to perception, but rather to interpretation. This is promising given that, in principle, interpretation is subject to change via training and education. In this respect, the potentially positive effects of educational interventions that are longer than the short training interval implemented by Rubin provide a cogent reason to assess the purported benefits of closer interactions between learners with diverse language backgrounds.

3.5 Educational applications: Integrating the listener's perspective into the curriculum

In line with Rubin's proposal about the potential benefit of bringing together groups of learners with distinct language backgrounds, it is relevant to identify potential gaps in the structuring of educational curricula that may create or magnify sources of linguistic prejudice. A specific case of an institutional structure that separates language learners is the established practice of offering two distinct curricular tracks for so-called traditional second language students and heritage learners (henceforth HLs) respectively at both the secondary and tertiary levels of education in the US.⁵ Indeed, Flores and Rosa (2015) report on the effect of what they describe as 'white gaze,' whereby language use among minorities is judged by speakers in situations of sociopolitical privilege (the speech of the upper-middle class in Lippi-Green's analysis). Flores and Rosa argue that 'long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners can be understood to inhabit a shared racial positioning that frames their linguistic practices as deficient regardless of how closely they follow supposed rules of appropriateness' (p. 149). That is, the judgement on appropriate language use is not based on the use of objective linguistic-interactional criteria, but it is rather based on the perception of appropriateness as judged by the dominant white speakers. Similarly, echoing the concerns about listeners' biases described above, Leeman (2015: 108) points out that one of the challenges faced by HLs is that 'identity claims and performances are also constrained by the identities ascribed by others.'

3.5.1 Heritage Language Curriculum. The option of a separate track for Spanish HLs (henceforth SHLs) has been instituted so that teachers and material creators can develop and provide more accurate instruction specific to the educational needs of heritage speakers (e.g., Beaudrie and Fairclough, 2012; Leeman & Martínez, 2007; Martínez, 2003; Ricento, 2009; Valdés, 1995; Villa, 2009).⁶ The recent history of the development of Spanish heritage language courses in the US shows a consistent demand for college-level courses designed for HLs (e.g., Beaudrie and Fairclough, 2012; Carreira, 2000; Del Valle, 2014; Valdés et al., 2003; Villa, 1996, 2002). Beaudrie and Fairclough, for instance, report on a fourfold increase in enrolments in courses tailored for HLs at the post-secondary level. According to the traditional criterion of language proficiency, traditional Spanish second language learners are the ones who have not had any significant exposure to the target language culture, whereas SHLs have had varying degrees of exposure to and/or use of Spanish. Beaudrie and Fairclough (2012) define the term heritage language learner along two (nonexclusive) dimensions: a familial or personal connection with Spanish (cf. Fishman, 2001) and a language proficiency criterion (Valdés, 1997).⁷

Both criteria are the consequence of learners' previous exposure (early in life) to the target language (i.e., Spanish) as part of their linguistic and cultural heritage (cf. Valdés, 1995, 1997). Notwithstanding the obvious relevance of language background, Beaudrie and Ducar (2005), Carreira (2004) and others propose that the identity needs of the heritage learner should be regarded as the primary factor that should define the category of HLs. The criterion of cultural and personal connection to the language leads to specific goals that are relevant for HLs to study Spanish as part of their identity needs, such as, for instance, establishing a connection with one's history and heritage, developing the ability to communicate with family members who function mostly in Spanish and becoming a member of the community of heritage speakers (cf., Carreira, 2004). On the other hand, as argued above, SHLs need to have access to curricular options focused on the development of their language competence as part of a named language. Leeman (2005: 39), for instance, argues that NOT providing HLs with access to information and education about the standard language '... would constitute an imposition of specific linguistic conventions – in this case, conventions associated with non-prestige varieties' (see also Leeman, 2018; Fairclough, 1992; and Villa, 2004, *inter alia*).

It may be the case, however, that prevailing biases in the educational structure of most second language programmes (i.e., the privileged status of the standardised named language and the effect of RLS) circumvent possible benefits of such curricular strategy. First, it is not clear that the implementation of a pedagogical approach designed for SHLs is actually put into practice. Valdés et al. (2003), for instance, cautioned that the design of heritage language

courses continues to be constrained by traditions in the language-teaching field and by expectations about the outcomes of classroom language instruction in general (i.e., instrumental versus critical approaches). Similarly, Martínez (2003:7) lamented the apparent 'bleeding' of pedagogical traditions common among courses for traditional second language learners, and thus he pointed out that '[t]he question that looms over us, as SHL educators ... is how to begin to address [sociolinguistic, functional] issues in a curriculum that is focused on verb conjugations, the alphabet, and the proper placement of written accent marks.'

Moreover, the expectations about the learning of Spanish among SHLs focuses on the attainment of proficiency in the standard language and a specific variety of language at that. Valdés (1995:79) notes that the primary objective of the standard language is reflected in the institutional organisation of language departments in most universities: '[t]he primary aim of the language division of many Spanish departments in this country is to produce students who come very close to monolingual speakers of Spanish.' Leeman (2012:45) argued that the analysis of Spanish teaching in the United States shows 'a historical tendency to view the literary and cultural production and the linguistic varieties associated with Spain as superior or more "legitimate" than those of the Americas.' As a consequence of this academic tendency to favour some varieties of Spanish over others Carreira (2000:430) notes that 'heritage speakers may ... reject Spanish because they have internalised messages about its inferiority or undesirability. These issues are not normally present in heterogeneous groups of non-Spanish speakers ...'

More importantly, a second inherently structural problem in the separation of heritage from traditional learners is that even in the improbable case that minority populations were to be empowered with the knowledge and practices to develop their full linguistic repertoire (unlikely given the problems identified above), we would still fall short of the goal given that (nonminority) listeners have as much – if not more – power to determine which linguistic practices will be viable in society (e.g., Flores and Rosa, 2015; Rosa and Flores, 2017; Rubin, 1992; Zheng and Samuel, 2017). In essence, despite the fact that the separation of curricular tracks is intended to address distinct pedagogical needs of two different populations of learners (i.e., heritage and traditional), it is possible that this type of 'curriculum segregation' does not solve the identified problem of distinct pedagogical needs, and at the same time it introduces an even bigger problem.

3.5.2 Raising learners' critical consciousness about language use. A potential solution to the two challenges discussed in previous sections (i.e., the privileged status of the standardised named language and the effect of RLS) is to

purposefully integrate the curricular tracks. The immediate positive outcome of this change is that the interface of these two distinct groups of learners may lead to (productive) ‘tensions between standardization and variability in the space between language-as-skill and language-as-identity’ (Heller, 2010:103). These two inherently intersecting goals, each associated with one group or the other one (and sometimes shifting from one to the other group), provide an opportunity to explicitly address the objective of leading learners to understand and make productive use of the dynamic and fluid nature of language both as a process and as a product. The group of heritage learners is the one that, by definition, has developed experience with the use of authentic language to the detriment of the anonymous end of the continuum of language use. Conversely, traditional students, having experienced language learning primarily in a classroom setting, have gained experience in the use of the standard language to the detriment of a broad range of (authentic) language use.

The notion that both heritage and traditional language students may be able to shuttle back and forth between authenticity and anonymity (fluidity and fixity) in their language use can only be enacted if they are given the opportunity to fully engage with various forms of language *performed* by a variety of speakers (both minority and majority language speakers). For instance, García and Kley (2019:15) state that translanguaging ‘start[s] from a place that leverages all the features of the children’s repertoire, while also showing them when, with whom, where, and why to use some features of their repertoire and not others, enabling them to also perform according to the social norms of named languages as used in schools.’ For learners to ‘perform, index and negotiate identities’ (Leeman, 2015:110), they need to be provided with a broader range of contextualisation settings for their use of language, including interlocutors who are representative of the majority language perspective they are expected to interact with outside of the academic environment. For this to happen, fluid language practices need to be developed through an explicit process whereby guided practice and reflection on the way we use our resources are purposefully incorporated to the curriculum.

Several proposals of how to accomplish the goal of reflection in action (Schön, 1983) have already been advanced for various levels of education. For instance, the various descriptions from Canagarajah about transitioning from a proficiency goal to one of translingual competence present a possible framework for the type of curricular integration needed for the specific setting of the tertiary level of education. Canagarajah proposes the development of three basic sets of skills to achieve the objectives of translingual competence: Language awareness, Rhetorical sensitivity and Negotiation strategies. Furthermore, the focus on a functionally-oriented, dynamic view of grammar (procedural knowledge in contrast with propositional knowledge) leads

to reconceptualising language competence from the perspective of praxis: 'As people continue to use their mix of resources for specific purposes, their resources get patterned into grammatical and discourse conventions' (Canagarajah, 2016:449).

From a broader perspective, the goal of integration of efforts across a diverse group of learners (distinct needs in terms of their language experience) can be regarded as part of the type of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP), which focuses on helping students achieve academic success, maintain their cultural competence and develop 'a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the social order' (Ladson-Billings, 1995:160). As argued by Ladson-Billings, at its core, CRP is a pedagogy for 'the subaltern, or underclass' that 'explicitly engages questions of equity and justice' (2014: 83). More importantly, notwithstanding her strong position in favour of developing teaching practices 'to ensure that those who have been previously disadvantaged by schooling receive quality education,' Ladson-Billings explicitly adds that 'we also want those in the mainstream to develop the kinds of skills that will allow them to critique the very basis of their privilege and advantage' (p. 83). The present proposal in favour of the integration of curricular tracks (across majority language and heritage learners) mirrors Ladson-Billings' argument in favour of the integration of efforts across groups of learners providing both groups with needed access to gain awareness about the nature of language as represented in both internal and external perspectives.

4 Conclusion

There is no question that heteroglossic approaches – and translanguaging in particular – could be regarded as 'radical' educational practices given their explicit goal to 'disrupt hierarchical structures of power' (Kleyn and García, 2019:73). Viewed from that angle, the objective of translanguaging is primarily to change the way language learners *define* languages, and secondarily, *how* they learn languages. This should not be surprising. Such a hierarchical ordering of the goals pursued by translanguaging is apparent in the following description offered by García and Otheguy (2019:11, stress added):

... there can be no question that an important aspect of translanguaging pedagogical practices is to get students to gain access to the ways of using named languages that dominant groups and schools uphold, *while raising students' critical consciousness about the ways in which language dominance has been established.*

The first clause in the quote above dispels any fear about the purported lack of intent of heteroglossic approaches to develop learners' abilities in the standard/

named language – as I argued in the previous sections. On the other hand, the concern raised by Jaspers, *inter alia*, about the approach to ‘impose’ a heteroglossic educational perspective appears to be ‘valid’ on its face given the intent to raise students’ critical consciousness (cf. second clause). Ironically, the point of convergence between these two apparently incommensurable positions may be found precisely on the intersection of minoritised and privileged learners. That is, as argued above, the effort to raise minoritised learners’ awareness about the fluid nature of language should be expanded to include as wide a range of learners with diverse experiences of language learning as possible (including privileged learners). A word of caution is nevertheless relevant here. Notwithstanding the benefits of expanding the range of participants in multilingual interactions prompted by this structural change, it is important not to lose sight of the dangers of the complex implementation and unforeseen consequences of expansive educational approaches premised on the integration of majority and minority groups of learners. The analysis of the haphazard implementation of two-way dual language programmes (e.g., Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Salaberry, 2009; Sánchez, García and Solorza, 2018) – also based on the integration of learners with distinct family language backgrounds – is inherently relevant to place the benefits and shortcomings of the present proposal in proper context.

With the previous caveat in mind, however, the principles guiding the need to incorporate counterweights to a lopsided view on language use that favours monoglossic views of language education (the ‘disruptive’ influence of translanguaging) may require a more expansive implementation of the principles of heteroglossic approaches to language education, that is, one that integrates both majority and minority language users (a second ‘disruptive’ effort). Such curricular integration could provide multilingual learners with a viable educational route toward the development of a range of languaging options – from authenticity to anonymity – in an integrated fashion that is ‘ecologically’ valid given that functioning within society at large requires such integrated approach. Equally significant would be the opportunity afforded to monolingual learners who would also be provided access to fluid language practices among multilingual learners, thereby increasing the chances that such contact and awareness of strategic use of language resources would lead to revised perceptions and interpretations and, in the end, social transformation for all.

About the author

M. Rafael Salaberry (PhD, Cornell University 1997) holds an appointment as Mary Gibbs Jones Professor of Humanities at Rice University. His main areas of

research are Spanish Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition/Teaching, and Multilingualism/Bilingual Education.

Notes

1 First coined in Welsh, as *trawsieithu*, translanguaging made reference to a pedagogy that 'encouraged the use of two languages (Welsh and English) [concurrently], ... mainly to promote the acquisition of Welsh' (Williams, 1994 as quoted in Jaspers, 2018:2).

2 In general, languaging is defined as 'the use of language by human beings, directed with an intention to other human beings' (Jørgensen and Møller, 2014:67). Languaging thus becomes a broad synonym for the various definitions of heteroglossic approaches (Jaspers and Madsen, 2019:8).

3 Note that the type of Spanish used by minority groups in the US has been described (and decried) in contraposition with the standard variety of Spanish vetted by various associated institutions such as the RAE, Instituto Cervantes etc. (e.g., Del Valle, 2014). This is concrete evidence that we are not dealing with the same theoretical construct, but rather two different ones.

4 The five guiding principles are: (i) Design functional breathing spaces for using the minority language, (ii) Develop the need to use the minority languages through translanguaging, (iii) Use emergent multilinguals' resources to reinforce all languages by developing metalinguistic awareness, (iv) Enhance language awareness and (v) Link spontaneous translanguaging to pedagogical activities. (Cenoz and Gorter, 2019:909).

5 This two-track system tends to be implemented at the third-year level of instruction, depending on the personnel resources of each department.

6 Valdés (1995) proposed four instructional goals for HLs to improve the teaching of heritage learners: (i) the acquisition of a standard dialect (but see Villa, 2002), (ii) the expansion of the bilingual range, (iii) the transfer of reading and writing abilities across languages and (iv) the maintenance of immigrant languages.

7 Carreira (2004) includes a third dimension defined by membership of heritage learners in an ethnic community.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas.
- Beaudrie, S. and Ducar, C. (2005) Beginning-level university heritage programs: Creating a space for all heritage language learners. *Heritage Language Journal* 3.1: 1–26.
- Beaudrie, S. and Fairclough, M. (2012) Introduction: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States. In S. Beaudrie and M. Fairclough (eds), *Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States: The State of the Field* 1–17. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Blackledge, A. and Creese, A. (2014) Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. In A. Blackledge and Creese (eds) *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy* 1–20. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_1
- Blommaert, J., Leppänen, S. and Spotti, M. (2012) Endangering multilingualism. In *Dangerous Multilingualism* 1–21. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137283566_1
- Blommaert, J. and Rampton, B. (2011) Language and superdiversity. *Diversities* 13.2: 1–22.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Burch, A. R. and Kasper, G. (2016) Like Godzilla. In M. Prior and G. Kasper (eds) *Emotion in Multilingual Interaction* Vol. 266, 57–85. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.266.03bur>
- Cameron, D. (1995/2012) *Verbal Hygiene*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203123898>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011) Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal* 95.3: 401–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>
- Canagarajah, S. (2012) *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073889>
- Canagarajah, S. (2016) Crossing borders, addressing diversity. *Language Teaching* 49.3: 438–54. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000069>
- Canagarajah, S. (2018) Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics* 39.1: 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041>
- Carreira, M. (2000) Validating and promoting Spanish in the United States: Lessons from linguistic science. *Bilingual Research Journal* 24.4: 423–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2000.10162776>
- Carreira, M. (2004) Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term heritage language learner. *Heritage Language Journal* 2: 1–25.
- Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. (2017) Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38.10: 901–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855>
- Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. (2019) Multilingualism, translanguaging, and minority languages in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal* 103(S1): 130–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12529>
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014) A critical look at dual language immersion in the new Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal* 37.1: 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893267>
- Del Valle, J. (2014) The politics of normativity and globalization: Which Spanish in the classroom? *The Modern Language Journal* 98.1: 358–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12066.x>
- Fairclough, N. (1992) The appropriacy of ‘appropriateness’. In N. Fairclough (ed.) *Critical Language Awareness* 33–56. London: Longman.
- Fishman, J. (2001) 300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States. In J. Peyton, D. Ranard and S. McGinnis (eds.) *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource*. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Flores, N. and Rosa, J. (2015) Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review* 85.2: 149–71. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- García, O. (2009) *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- García, O. (2019) Reflections on Turnbull’s reframing of foreign language education: Bilingual epistemologies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22.5: 628–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1277512>
- García, O., Flores, N. and Woodley, H. H. (2015) Constructing in-between spaces to ‘do’ bilingualism: S tale of two high schools in one city. In J. Cenozo and D. Gorter (eds) *Multilingual Education between Language Learning and Translanguaging* 199–224. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- García, O. and Kleyn, T. (eds) (2016) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315695242>
- García, O. and Leiva, C. (2014) Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds) *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy* 199–216. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_11
- García, O. and Li Wei (2014) *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- García, O. and Lin, A. M. (2017) Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García, A. Lin and S. May (eds.) *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* 117–30. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1>
- García, O. and Otheguy, R. (2019) Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932>
- Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1989) Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language* 36.1: 3–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(89\)90048-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(89)90048-5)
- Heller, M. (2007) Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* 1–22. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230596047_1
- Heller, M. (2010) The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39: 101–14. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.012809.104951>
- Hesson, S., Seltzer, K. and Woodley, H. H. (2014) *Translanguaging in Curriculum and Instruction: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. New York: CUNY-NYSIEB.
- Jaspers, J. (2018) The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication* 58: 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001>
- Jaspers, J. (2019) Authority and morality in advocating heteroglossia. *Language, Culture and Society* 1.1: 83–105. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lcs.00005.jas>
- Jaspers, J. and Madsen, L. M. (2019) The deliberative teacher: Wavering between linguistic uniformity and diversity. In J. Jaspers and L. Madsen (eds) *Critical Perspectives on Linguistic Fixity and Fluidity: Linguagised Lives* 217–40. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429469312-10>
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M. and Møller, J. S. (2015) Polylinguaging in superdiversity. In K. Arnaut, J. Blommaert, B. Rampton and M. Spotti (eds) *Language and Superdiversity* 147–64. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315730240-14>
- Jørgensen, J. N. and Møller, J. S. (2014) Polylingualism and languaging. In *The Routledge Companion to English Studies* 97–113. London: Routledge.
- Kang, O. and Rubin, D. L. (2009) Reverse linguistic stereotyping: Measuring the effect of listener expectations on speech evaluation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 28.4: 441–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X09341950>
- Kleyn, T. and García, O. (2019) Translanguaging as an act of transformation: Restructuring teaching and learning for emergent bilingual students. *The Handbook of TESOL in K-12* 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119421702.ch6>
- Kubota, R. (2016) The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 37.4: 474–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu045>

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995) Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal* 32.3: 465–91. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014) Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: aka the remix. *Harvard Educational Review* 84.1: 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751>
- Leeman, J. (2005) Engaging critical pedagogy: Spanish for native speakers. *Foreign Language Annals* 38.1: 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02451.x>
- Leeman, J. (2012) Investigating language ideologies in Spanish as a heritage language. In S. Beaudrie and M. Fairclough (eds) *Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States: The State of the Field* 43–59. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Leeman, J. (2015) Heritage language education and identity in the United States. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 35: 100–19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000245>
- Leeman, J. (2018) Critical language awareness and Spanish as a heritage language: Challenging the linguistic subordination of US Latinxs. In K. Potowski and J. Muñoz-Basols (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Spanish as a Heritage Language* 345–58. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315735139-22>
- Leeman, J. and Martínez, G. (2007) From identity to commodity: Ideologies of Spanish in heritage language textbooks. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 4.1: 35–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427580701340741>
- Leung, C. and Valdes, G. (2019) Translanguaging and the transdisciplinary framework for language teaching and learning in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal* 103.2: 348–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12568>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B. and Baker, C. (2012) Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation* 18.7: 655–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Li, W. (2011) Multilinguality, multimodality, and multicompetence: Code- and modeswitching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools. *The Modern Language Journal* 95.3: 370–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01209.x>
- Linell, P. (1998) *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Perspectives*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.3>
- Lippi-Green, R. (2011) *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203348802>
- Mar-Moliner, C. and Paffey, D. (2011) Linguistic imperialism: Who owns global Spanish? In Diaz-Campos, M. (ed.) *Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics* 747–64. New York: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444393446.ch35>
- Martínez, G. (2003) Classroom based dialect awareness in heritage language instruction: A critical applied linguistic approach. *Heritage Language Journal*, 1.1: 43–57.
- McKinney, C. and Norton, B. (2008) Identity in language and literacy education. In B. Spolsky and M. Hult (eds) *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics* 192–205. Malden, MA: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470694138.ch14>
- McNamara, T. (2011) Multilingualism in education: A poststructuralist critique. *The Modern Language Journal* 95.3: 430–41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01205.x>
- Møller, J. S. (2019) Recognizing languages, practicing languaging. In J. Jaspers and L. Madsen, (eds) *Critical Perspectives on Linguistic Fixity and Fluidity: Languagised Lives* 29–52. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429469312-2>

- O'Rourke, B. (2015) Language revitalisation models in minority language contexts: Tensions between ideologies of authenticity and anonymity. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 24.1: 63–82. <https://doi.org/10.3167/ajec.2015.240105>
- O'Rourke, B. and Ramallo, F. (2013) Competing ideologies of linguistic authority amongst new speakers in contemporary Galicia. *Language in Society* 42.3: 287–305. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404513000249>
- Otheguy, R. (2013) The linguistic competence of second-generation bilinguals: A critique of 'incomplete acquisition.' *Romance Linguistics* 301–20. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.9.160th>
- Otheguy, R. (2016) Foreword. In O. García and T. Kleyn (eds) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments* ix–xiii. New York: Routledge.
- Otheguy, R., García, O. and Reid, W. (2015) Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6.3: 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Otsuji, E. and Pennycook, A. (2010) Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7.3: 240–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710903414331>
- Pennycook, A. (2016) Mobile times, mobile terms: The trans-super-poly-metro movement. *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates* 201–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107449787.010>
- Pennycook, A. and Otsuji, E. (2019) Mundane metrolingualism. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 16.2: 175–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1575836>
- Plough, I., Banerjee, J. and Iwashita, N. (2018) Interactional competence: Genie out of the bottle. *Language Testing Special Issue* 35.3: 427–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218772325>
- Preston, D. (1989) *Perceptual Dialectology*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris.
- Preston, D. (2013) Language with an attitude. In J. K. Chambers and N. Schilling (eds), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change* 157–82. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118335598.ch7>
- Purnell, T., Idsardi, W. and Baugh, J. (1999) Perceptual and phonetic experiments on American English dialect identification. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18.1: 10–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X99018001002>
- Ricento, T. (2009) Problems with the 'language-as-resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. In M. R. Salaberry (ed.) *Language Allegiances and Bilingualism in the US* 110–31. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691798-007>
- Rosa, J. and Burdick, C. (2017) Language ideologies. In O. García, N. Flores and M. Spotti (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society* 103–23. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190212896.013.15>
- Rosa, J. and Flores, N. (2017) Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society* 46.5: 621–647. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562>
- Rubin, D. L. (1992) Nonlanguage factors affecting undergraduates' judgments of nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *Research in Higher Education* 33.4: 511–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00973770>
- Ruska, K. (2019) Languagised repertoires : How fictional languages have real effects. In J. Jaspers and M. Madsen (eds) *Critical Perspectives on Linguistic Fixity and Fluidity: Languagised Lives* 53–75. New York: Routledge.

- Salaberry, M. R. (2009) Bilingual education: Assimilation, segregation and integration. In M. R. Salaberry (ed.) *Language Allegiances and Bilingualism in the US* 172–195. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Sánchez, M. T., García, O. and Solorza, C. (2018) Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal* 41.1: 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1405098>
- Schön, D. A. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Solorza, C., Aponte, G., Levernz, T., Becker, T. and Frías, B. (2019) *Translanguaging in Dual Language Education: A Blueprint for Planning Units of Study*. New York: CUNY-NYSIEB.
- Turner, M. and Lin, A. M. (2020) Translanguaging and named languages: Productive tension and desire. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23.4: 423–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1360243>
- Valdés, G. (1995) The teaching of minority languages as academic subjects: Pedagogical and theoretical challenges. *The Modern Language Journal* 79: 299–328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb01106.x>
- Valdés, G. (1997) The teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speaking students: Outstanding issues and unanswered questions. In M. C. Colombi and F. Alarcón (eds) *La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes: Praxis y teoría* 8–44. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Valdés, G., González, S. V., García, D. L. and Márquez, P. (2003) Language ideology: The case of Spanish in departments of foreign languages. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 34.1: 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2003.34.1.3>
- Villa, D. (2009) General versus Standard Spanish: Establishing empirical norms for the study of U.S. Spanish. In M. Lacorte and J. Leeman (eds) *Español en Estados Unidos y otros contextos de contacto: Sociolingüística, ideología y pedagogía* 175–90. Madrid and Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert. <https://doi.org/10.31819/9783865279033-010>
- Villa, D. (2004) Heritage language speakers and upper-division language instruction: Findings from a Spanish linguistics program. In H. Byrnes and H. Maxim (eds) *Advanced Foreign Language Learning: A Challenge to College Programs* 88–98. Boston, MA: Heinle.
- Villa, D. (2002) The sanitizing of U.S. Spanish in Academia. *Foreign Language Annals* 35: 222–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2002.tb03156.x>
- Villa, D. (1996) Choosing a ‘standard’ variety of Spanish for the instruction of native Spanish speakers in the U.S. *Foreign Language Annals* 29: 191–200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb02326.x>
- Williams, C. (1994) *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgyng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.
- Woolard, K. (2008) Language and identity choice in Catalonia: The interplay of contrasting ideologies of linguistic authority. In K. Süselbeck, U. Mühlshlegel and P. Masson (eds) *Lengua, nación e identidad: la regulación del plurilingüismo en España y América Latina* 303–23. Frankfurt: Vervuert and Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- Zheng, Y. and Samuel, A. G. (2017) Does seeing an Asian face make speech sound more accented? *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* 79.6: 1841–59. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-017-1329-2>