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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the negotiation of language ideologies and identity construction amongst university intermediate level Spanish Heritage Language (SHL) learners in the U.S. Southwest. Combining sociolinguistic and ethnographic methods with discourse analysis, this study seeks to provide deeper insight into the linguistic practices and the negotiation of language ideologies that takes place amongst SHL learners. Data from participant observation of interaction in the SHL classroom throughout the semester, questionnaires, interviews with students and instructor, and student focus group discussions were used to analyze discourses about language and the multiple values placed on English and Spanish in general, and on standard and local varieties of Spanish in particular. More specifically, this study analyzes, through the application of Bourdieu’s (1991) notions of linguistic capital and symbolic power, how SHL learners negotiate these values and discourses as they study their heritage language. In addition, this study examines performances of identity observed during interactions within this group of SHL learners, recognizing the construction of multiple social identities, including bilingual, heritage learner and ethnic identities, as a dynamic and complex process that is recurrently shaped by interaction and the negotiation of competing language ideologies.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction to the Study

Specialized programs for Spanish as a Heritage Language (SHL) are increasingly being offered by Spanish language programs in academic institutions across the U.S. This is greatly in response to the rapidly growing Hispanic population in the U.S., and likewise the nation’s school systems, and to the growing body of research suggesting that this group of learners possesses unique language skills and needs that are better addressed outside of traditional foreign language (FL) programs. While research in this fairly new field of language study has aimed to better understand these learners to provide important pedagogical insights, research in the sociolinguistic realm in particular has been lacking. The present study seeks to fill this gap by examining the negotiation of language ideologies and the construction of identity amongst SHL learners.

This study examines language discourses and practices of SHL learners enrolled in an intermediate level university SHL course in the U.S. Southwest. Through analysis of data gathered from multiple sources, including ethnographic participant observation throughout the duration of the SHL course, questionnaires, interviews and student focus group discussions, as well as the SHL program website and textbook, this research attempts to answer the broad question of: How are language ideologies negotiated and
social identities constructed in this language contact situation in the U.S. Southwest by
learners who share the common goal of maintaining their heritage language? More
specifically, this research addresses the concepts of linguistic capital, agency and
symbolic power as it analyzes the multiple values placed on English, Spanish and
standard and local linguistic varieties and how SHL learners negotiate these values.

This qualitative study will investigate how SHL learners negotiate the competing
discourses of linguistic varieties presented at multiple levels: classroom instruction, the
SHL program website and the SHL textbook. It will also examine how SHL learners,
through linguistic and social interaction, are also active participants or agents of their
own social behavior, (re)affirming their bilingual and ethnic identities through linguistic
practices, especially code switching, the use of loanwords, calques and bilingual
discourse markers. A social constructionist approach is adopted for the analysis of
ideology and identity since our notion of self emerges within and through language as
“human beings are viewed as coming into contact with, and creating, their surroundings
as well as themselves through the actions in which they engage” (Wertsch, 1991: 8).
According to this view, the learner is understood as a complex social being, whose
self/identity is dynamic and constructed through everyday language use or interaction.
As members of the SHL course, these learners participate in the co-construction of
identities and the negotiation of language discourses about their heritage language.

It is thus with these social frameworks guiding this language study’s analysis that
I aim to provide further insights into the process of SHL learning. Investigation of SHL
learning is incomplete without the analysis of the negotiation of language ideologies and
the construction of identity, two critical components of these students’ learning experience. In both the broader context of the U.S. Southwest, where Spanish is the minority language in constant contact with English, the majority language, and in the more specific context of the intermediate SHL course, which aims to increase students’ awareness of differences between informal and formal registers and develop their competence in formal registers, students are exposed to multiple and competing language discourses that influence their relationship to Spanish and affect their learning objectives. SHL learners continually negotiate these ideologies as they construct their identities through their linguistic and social practices.

Rationale for the Study

Research involving Spanish as a Heritage Language (SHL) continues to be a growing focus of language research in the U.S., where important demographic changes have triggered a response from educators to better understand how to treat the increasingly diverse body of students occupying the nation’s Spanish language classrooms. According to U.S. Census records from 1990 to 2000, the Hispanic population increased by more than 50%, making Spanish the largest minority language spoken in the U.S. Currently, the Hispanic population in the U.S. totals approximately 14.4% of the total U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005) and this population is growing at a rapid rate. These demographics are equally reflected in student enrollments in colleges and universities across the U.S., making the need to create and improve SHL programs that address the changing student profile a critical issue (Aparicio, 1993).
In recent years, considerable efforts have been made to guide investigation in the field of heritage language education (HLE) and to promote HL maintenance and development. Initiatives such as the Heritage Language Research Priority Conference (2000), the National Heritage Languages in America Conference (1999, 2002), the UC Consortium Summer Institute on Heritage Languages (2002), the First International Conference on Heritage Languages (2010), the National Heritage Language Resource Center’s (NHLRC) annual Heritage Language Summer Research Institute (2007, 2008, 2009, 2010) and the creation of the Heritance Language Journal, for example, have all contributed to the establishment of a research agenda aimed at expanding HL resources in the U.S.

The areas most critically in need of further research within HLE have been identified as: HL demographic data, HL methodologies, HL curricula, materials and program development, HL pedagogy and effective teaching methodologies, HL assessment, HL loss and issues related to languages in contact, and sociolinguistic and linguistic descriptions of HL varieties (Wiley & Valdés, 2000, cited in Beaudrie 2006).

The current study aims to fill the gap in research in a number of these areas, especially: HL pedagogy and effective teaching practices, sociolinguistic issues relating to languages in contact and sociolinguistic and linguistic descriptions of HL varieties. The current study will also have some important implications for the development of HL curricula, materials and programs.

Research to date in this growing field has made some valuable contributions to the development and improvement of SHL programs, particularly in the areas of
curriculum development (Beaudrie, 2006), teacher and professional development (Potowski & Carreira, 2004), textbook analysis (Cruz, 1994; Ducar, 2006; Ramirez & Hall, 1997), program development and dual language immersion programs (Helmer, 2007; Potowski, 2002; Takahashi-Breines, 2006). While studies in these areas have increased both our awareness and understanding of the distinct pedagogical needs of this unique learner population, and addressed some of the critical issues in teacher and program development, much less research has been conducted from a sociolinguistic perspective with SHL learners, particularly at the university level. In fact, it seems that there has been no in-depth studies that examine the role of language ideology and identity amongst SHL learners. Such qualitative sociolinguistic research that examines how these learners’ language use is mediated through the negotiation of their own multiple identities and ideological discourses of language is essential in understanding the special linguistic, cultural, and affective needs of SHL learners.

Research Questions

The present study attempts to fill this gap in the research by addressing the following specific research questions:

1.) How do the SHL learners in the intermediate SHL course construct identity?

1.1 What are the linguistic practices (e.g. Spanish-English code switching, bilingual discourse markers, etc.) and/or other social practices through which SHL learners construct multiple social identities (bilingual,
heritage learner, ethnic, etc.) across different social contexts (classroom, interviews, focus group discussions)?

1.2 How do SHL learners themselves perceive the relationship between language and identity?

2.) What language discourses and ideologies do SHL learners experience in the intermediate university SHL classroom?

2.1 How are standard and non-standard varieties treated in the SHL program, classroom and textbook?

2.2 How do SHL learners perceive and negotiate these language ideologies and how are they implicated in their own attitudes toward Spanish?

The findings of the current study contribute to the field of language learning in general as well as to the needed development of theories for HLE and minority language preservation. By examining the identity practices of SHL learners and the language values, attitudes and ideologies these learners bring to the classroom and then negotiate with the institutional discourses they experience in the SHL classroom, this study addresses the need to better understand the sociolinguistic profile of SHL learners and, thus, has important implications for better meeting SHL learners’ needs. In doing so, this study sheds light on the close ties between language ideologies, language use and identity and the complex ways these elements are linked to language use and learning.
The Heritage Learner

The heritage learner population is by no means a homogenous one. In fact, researchers in the field have been calling for a clarification of the terms heritage language and heritage language speaker (Van Deusen-Scholl, 2003). Definitions of these terms vary widely. Fishman's (1999) definition of a heritage language focuses on family relations as he describes the term heritage language in the U.S. context as “a language of personal relevance other than English.” Guadalupe Valdés (2000), on the other hand, emphasizes the linguistic skills of the learner when she defines a heritage speaker as “a student of language who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language” (p. 1). Draper & Hicks (2000) propose a somewhat broader definition that does not limit contact with the heritage language to the home environment, identifying a heritage learner as “someone who has had exposure to a non-English language outside the formal education system. It most often refers to someone with a home background in the language, but may refer to anyone who has had in-depth exposure to another language” (p. 19). The fact that “heritage” is included in the term is also controversial because it implies that the language forms part of the speaker’s family cultural ancestry. Such is how Beaudrie and Ducar (2005) define heritage language learners: “all individuals that have experienced a relatively extended period of exposure to the language, typically during childhood, through contact with family members or other individuals, resulting in the development
of either receptive and/or productive abilities in the language, and varying degrees of bilingualism” (p. 8).

While definitions of these terms may diverge, what remains clear is that application of the term “heritage speaker” is highly dependent on the local context (Carreira, 2004). Proficiency levels differ greatly according to community, which can be attributed to a number of factors, including the number and generation of speakers of the minority language, presence of language revitalization programs and resources available for the maintenance and instruction of the heritage language. From my own personal experience as an instructor in the SHL Program at the university and having taught this particular course, intermediate level Spanish 253 learners, the focus of the current study, possess fairly strong oral skills in Spanish but encounter difficulties in the areas of spelling and writing. These characteristics, which are typical of HL learners, as well as a more complete description of this Spanish course level in the university’s SHL Program are provided in Chapter 2.

Regardless of individual differences amongst this population, heritage learners share a special relationship to the heritage language that differs from that of traditional foreign language learners, a fact that I argue implicates a distinct role of identity in learning. Research on the construction and negotiation of identity among this student population should address the following: 1) the learner’s social and linguistic practices, 2) the pedagogical, institutional and sociocultural discourses that shape and influence these practices, and 3) how these discourses and practices function together and govern the ways in which the learner positions himself and becomes positioned in various roles,
such as student, bilingual, HL learner, Latino, etc. The participants of this study form part of a collective group to learn their heritage language in an institutional setting: the university SHL classroom, where they are introduced to new linguistic forms and discourses that they must reconcile with both their existent knowledge of and relationship to Spanish as they actively participate in the construction of new social meanings.

Theoretical Framework

As a theoretical foundation for this study, I draw on various aspects of social theory and adopt a social constructionist perspective for my approach to the study of identity and ideology amongst SHL learners. Below I discuss the principal frameworks and concepts that guide this study.

Language as a Social Action

One of the most fundamental and critical observations about language, and from which point multiple theoretical frameworks have developed, is that language is a social action (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1975; Wittgenstein, 1958). The essential and constitutive role of social context and history in language cannot be ignored. By fundamental nature, language is tied to its use; in speaking a language, one constructs his/herself and the social world.

As argued by Austin, linguistic utterances are not mere products of autonomous reference, but rather acts constituted by convention, or social norms of behavior that
vary according to social context. In other words, what is important is to examine not only the “linguistic” meaning of the words in a given utterance, but also the meaning of all the social aspects that embody the utterance, such as the conventions, social roles, social context and conditions in which the utterance was made. Austin (1980) claims, “what we have to study is not the sentence but the issuing of an utterance in a speech situation” since what should be illuminated, in his view, is “the total speech act in the total speech situation” (p. 148).

**Language and Identity**

The term *identity* may be defined as “the active negotiation of an individual’s relationship with larger social constructs” (Mendoza-Denton, 2002: 475). While its typology includes, amongst others, national, ethnic, racial, class and rank, professional and gender identities, identity is linguistically constructed through the choice of a particular language or dialect (e.g. vernacular vs. standard), use of linguistic forms (e.g. phonological, lexical, etc.) and communicative practices (e.g. greetings) (Kroskity, 2000).

Developments in anthropology and social theory have contributed to our understanding of identity as an “individual and collective-level process of semiosis” (Mendoza-Denton, 2002: 475). Mendoza-Denton highlights essentialism as one of the downfalls of some sociolinguistic research. She and others (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Eckert, 2000; Schecter & Bailey, 2002) argue that identity construction be treated as a
complex, multivalent, dynamic, dialogic process rather than as a unified, fixed, static, one-dimensional phenomenon.

Likewise, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) also emphasize the fluidity of language in their explanation of language acts as *acts of identity* in which speakers “reveal both their personal identity and their search for social roles” (p. 14). They explicate how speakers move distances within a “multidimensional sociolinguistic space” in order to accommodate their speech to different situations, interlocutors and topics of conversation in an evolution of newly-focused forms according to their needs for different identities. Such a linguistic evolution amongst a community is not a linear one, but rather reflects members continually shifting their identities to the degrees needed to express their personal, political and cultural identities. As explained by Bucholtz and Hall (2005), “Identity is the social positioning of self and other” (p. 586). It emerges through interaction.

Taken from the language socialization perspective, Ochs (1993) explains, speakers “attempt to establish the social identities of others through verbally performing certain social *acts* and verbally displaying certain *stances*” (p. 288). Social acts refer to goal-oriented behavior acknowledged as meaningful by communities of practice, while stances refer to positions or orientations toward some attitudinal or ideological focus. Stances may be both “affective” and “epistemic”; Affective stances include “a person’s mood, attitude, feeling, or disposition as well as well as degrees of emotional intensity,” while epistemic stances refer to “a person’s knowledge or belief, including sources of knowledge and degrees of commitment to truth and certainty of propositions” (Ochs,
Members of the community learn the linguistic markers that index particular actions and stances and embody particular social identities and activities. Recognizing the creativity in the construction of identity is also critical for understanding the dynamic aspect of identity and how individuals continually construct and reconstruct themselves in relation to others. This is particularly observable in situations of languages in contact, as evidenced by Le Page and Tabouret-Keller’s (1985) study of Creole speakers in the West Indies, in which the freedom with which speakers play with language and switch codes produces a broad range of language use, extending from the highly innovative and idiosyncratic to the very highly conventional and ordinary (p. 12). It is such creativity in language use that I aim to examine amongst SHL learners, whose language contact situation with Spanish and English lends itself to innovative ways of speaking and shifting of identities.

Agency

It is through language acts that speakers can be interpreted as social agents of their behavior in the social world. As defined by Ahearn (2001: 112), “Agency refers to the socioculturally mediated capacity to act.” Agency can arise from the social, political and cultural dynamics of a specific place and time (Desjarlais, 1997, cited in Ahearn, 2001). In the case of this study’s SHL learners the social, political and cultural context has various meanings. For example, it may refer to the broad sociopolitical context of Spanish as a minority language in the U.S. and the unequal power differentials of Spanish and English in day-to-day interactions in the geographical
location of the U.S. Southwest. It may also refer to the context of the SHL classroom in which increasing proficiency in formal registers to appropriately participate in the academic context is a main goal of the course. Whether it involves language choice between Spanish and English or different varieties of language, such as standard and local varieties of Spanish, these speakers are agents in the construction of their identities.

Individuals’ agency is linked to the sociohistorical context in which language acts are performed and therefore different degrees of agency exist according to this context. In their discussion of identity, for example, Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) identify three types of identities, which reveal the varying degrees of agency of individual speakers: (1) imposed identities (which are non-negotiable in a particular time and place); (2) assumed identities (which are accepted and not negotiated); and (3) negotiable identities (which are contested by groups and individuals) (p. 21).

According to this concept, certain identities are constructed through dominant discourses (political, legal, etc.). Identities are attached to the social hierarchies and hegemonic forces in the socio-political context. For example, certain labels, such as ‘speakers of a minority language’, ‘Latino’, ‘non-speaker of English’ or ‘illegal immigrant’, may be imposed upon SHL learners regardless of how they self-identify or feel about these labels. Likewise, assumed identities are those that are not contested by individuals because they are so repeatedly expressed in dominant discourses that they are perceived as legitimized. Finally, negotiable identities are those in which individuals can exercise the highest degree of agency. Yet, the construction of identity is never
performed without the mediation of ideologies. This now leads to the discussion of language ideologies that follows, in which I discuss the inextricable relationship between the construction of identity and ideology and the concepts of symbolic power and linguistic capital.

**Language Ideology**

What is clear from the study of language from a social point of view is that speech is additionally constrained by a host of other influential factors, among them language ideologies and relations of power. Linguistic ideologies are representations that construct the intersection of language and humans in the social world, i.e. “a mediating link between social forms and forms of talk” (Woolard, 1998, p. 3). Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) insist that ideologies of language are critical for both social and linguistic analysis because they do not deal with language alone. In Woolard and Schieffelin’s view, language ideologies “envision and enact links of language to a group and personal identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology” (p. 56). They can thus be viewed as the mediating links between social structures and ways of speaking.

While ideologies are what mediate linguistic practices and performances of identity, this does not necessarily mean that practices reflect dominant ideologies. Bucholtz and Hall (2004) discuss this intimate yet complex relation between ideology and identity in describing precisely how ideologies inform language practices in the construction of identity:
Ideology is the level at which practice enters the field of representation. Indexicality mediates between ideology and practice, producing the former through the latter. Performance is the highlighting of ideology, through the foregrounding of practice. Yet it is also important to keep these processes conceptually distinct. What we find repeatedly in studies of language and identity is a clear difference between cultural ideologies and social practices: cultural beliefs about how people of various social backgrounds should, must, or do speak and act (generated through indexicality) are generally reductive and inflexible while the actual linguistic and social practices in which people engage in specific social contexts (including the display of practices of performance) are highly complex and strategic. (2004, pp. 381-382)

According to this view, practices are, thus, strategic in nature.

Ochs (1993) provides further insight into how ideologies support the relationship between linguistic forms and identities in a way that is not arbitrary but rather very much rooted in social and political relations:

… from a social constructivist perspective, it is not arbitrary that a speaker might use a linguistic structure, such as a tag question in English, to project the gender identity of “woman,” if tag questions are linguistic resources for constructing the act of requesting confirmation and the stance of uncertainty and if that act and that stance are conventionally linked to local sociopolitical realization for being a woman (pp. 296-7).

The relation between linguistic behavior and the social and political context is such that the social markers and status are continually recreated through the performance of linguistic acts. Such connections to social and political forces can also result in the form of covert discrimination in which the dominant group is favored and social inequalities are perpetually reconstructed. As explicated by Lippi-Green (1997), ideologies involve the “promotion of the needs and interests of a dominant group or class at the expense of marginalized groups, by means of disinformation and misrepresentation of those non-dominant groups” (p. 64).
Social institutions such as the nation-state and school influence the ways people perceive and use language because of the authority they maintain. These institutions form an integral part of the construction of language and identity in daily practices. This focus is of critical importance in the study of SHL learners, who, in the global context, are in a language contact situation where English is the dominant language and Spanish is the minority language, and where cultural conceptions about language, including attitudes, prestige, hegemony, standards and relations of power and authority are undeniably at play.

As mentioned, speaker agency is strongly tied to social influences as bilingual language practices are shaped by the U.S. social structure and social status. For example, while there are many different social and linguistic motivations for Spanish-English code switching, including topic of conversation, interlocutors, solidarity and identity, etc., switching codes clearly also has ideological connotations related to power and authority. In my approach to this study, I emphasize that linguistic practices must be examined in light of their relationship to larger social constructs. More specifically, my analysis involves Bourdieu’s notions of linguistic capital, symbolic power and domination.

Bourdieu’s social theory rests on the notion that social-historical aspects and relations of power are critical to language. In his seminal work *Language and Symbolic Power*, Bourdieu (1991) discusses the role of language and the construction of social reality, demonstrating how language is more than strict linguistic competence, but a medium of power through which socially characterized speakers’ actualization in
linguistic exchanges creates an “economy of symbolic exchanges” (p. 37). Language is explained as a social phenomenon that concerns power and authority and involves speakers knowing when they are entitled to speak and others recognizing this as an acceptable act that merits attention in the given circumstances.

From the perspective of ‘style,’ or “individual deviation from the linguistic norm,” Bourdieu (1991) explains that distinctive ways of saying exist only in relation to other agents who perceive and appreciate the distinctive discourse as systematically different (p. 38). The production of stylistically marked discourse is then both an individual and collective process. Practices and perceptions result from the relationship between the ‘habitus’ and social contexts, or in Bourdieu’s terms, ‘markets’ or ‘fields,’ in which individuals act. The habitus refers to a socially ordered set of dispositions that predisposes individuals to act and react in particular ways. These dispositions produce practices and perceptions that are fundamentally natural rather than consciously rule-governed. The interrelations of positions in the market or field are determined by the distribution of different kinds of ‘capital’ or resources, which include symbolic (e.g. accumulated prestige or honor), cultural (e.g. knowledge, skills and educational qualifications), economic (e.g. financial resources), etc. (p. 14). In terms of linguistic exchange, Bourdieu critically states:

Every speech act and, more generally, every action, is a conjunction, and encounter between independent causal series. On the one hand, there are the socially constructed dispositions of the linguistic habitus, which imply a certain propensity to speak and to say determinate things (the expressive interest) and a certain capacity to speak, which involves both the linguistic capacity to generate an infinite number of grammatically correct discourse, and the social capacity to use this competence adequately in a determinant situation. On the other hand,
there are the structures of the linguistic market, which impose themselves as a system of specific sanctions and censorships (p. 37).

Thus, central to Bourdieu’s conception of language, that is, the product of the relation between the linguistic habitus and the linguistic market, is that language is not ideologically neutral. For, the power of the speech act, Bourdieu argues, is derived from social institutions, or defined sets of social relations that endow agents with power, prestige, status and various types of resources or capital (p. 12).

One of the ways in which institutions impose their power is through the critical role they play in forging a standard, normalized language. In the case of speakers a contact variety of Spanish, schools often convey the message that U.S. Spanish is inferior and that these students need to be taught “good” Spanish. As discussed by Villa (2002) and Martínez (2003), the transmission of this purist ideology and attempts to “sanitize” the Spanish of U.S. speakers of Spanish are accomplished in schools via teachings and corrections by teachers, administrators, etc. that send the message that their Spanish is not “correct” or worthy of more than household talk. Such ideologies reinforce the lower status and stigmatization of contact variety forms, and could inhibit these speakers’ use of particular forms or in extreme cases, of speaking Spanish at all.

As Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) explain, language varieties are “revalorized” not only as markers of group identity, but as ciphers of political loyalty, social, intellectual or moral worth, and rightfully point out that, “…symbolic revalorization often makes discrimination on linguistic grounds publicly acceptable, whereas the corresponding ethnic or racial discrimination is not” (p. 62). Language, thus, is
successfully used as a means of maintaining social power and control and dominating groups precisely because it is not perceived as such, which directly corresponds to Bourdieu’s concepts of symbolic power and symbolic domination.

Symbolic domination is accomplished without consciousness or constraint (Bourdieu, 1991). Contrary to overtly oppressive forms of domination, Bourdieu explains, “All symbolic domination presupposes, on the part of those who submit to it, a form of complicity which is neither passive submission to external constraint nor a free adherence to values” (p. 51). It is through the habitus and the silent and insidious aspects of everyday practices that such influence is effectively transmitted, as individuals are socially predisposed to accept the demands of the market. Contributing to its success, symbolic power requires the shared belief in the legitimacy of power and of those in positions of authority. In this manner, individuals participate, to some extent, in their own subjection and in the reconstruction of the social structure or hierarchy and their place in it.

Bourdieu’s notions of power and symbolic and cultural capital provide a valuable theoretical framework to guide this study’s analysis of the construction of identity and the negotiation of discourses of language amongst SHL learners. These notions will inform the analysis of the values placed on Spanish, English and standard and local varieties of language. As already discussed, in the national context of SHL learners in the U.S., and Hispanics in the U.S. in general, English is recognized as the dominant, legitimate language, and Spanish as the subordinate language. English is the language of status, power, symbolic and cultural capital, and its domination is imposed
via a seemingly invisible and elusive yet effective force, as people believe and consent to its power and the subordination of Spanish. Likewise, unequal power relations exist between standard and local varieties of Spanish and in the context of the SHL classroom, this study analyzes how discourses about varieties of language and particular language forms are implicated in these learners’ attitudes toward language and, in turn, their conceptualization of their heritage, their culture, their families and themselves.

The Current Study’s Aims

Once again, this dissertation aims to elucidate the complex ways that identities and language ideologies are linked to SHL use and are implicated in SHL learning. By better understanding the language discourses, attitudes and ideologies that SHL learners both bring to and experience in the SHL classroom regarding their own and “standard” or academic language varieties, and how this is in turn implicated in SHL learners’ perceptions of language and learning objectives, we can shed light on improving pedagogical approaches and materials for the teaching additional language varieties to SHL learners with the goal of building learners’ confidence in their local varieties.

This study’s aims will be reached by examining more closely the SHL learner profile. Specifically, Chapter 3 will analyze how SHL learners perceive the relationship between language and identity, and the linguistic practices in which SHL learners perform multiple identities. Chapter 4 will analyze language discourses, particularly with regard to the treatment of standard and local language varieties at the various levels of contact with SHL students, including SHL classroom instruction, the SHL program
website and the SHL textbook. Chapter 2 will describe in detail the methods for this analysis.
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As mentioned in the introduction to this study, the current research involving Spanish Heritage Language (SHL) learners draws on multiple fields, all of which fall under the more general category of language study. The methods used in this research, thus, include methods used in these fields, particularly sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. In this chapter I will discuss in detail the methods of data collection and analysis. I will also describe the research setting, including the university SHL program in general, the SHL course of focus and the study’s participants. It is important to understand the objectives and goals of the SHL program and course as they provide the setting in which the participants of this research study Spanish. I will also discuss my role as researcher and the implications of my presence throughout the SHL course.

Data for the current study was collected during the fall and spring semesters of the 2007-2008 academic year and included a combination of student questionnaires, classroom observations over the course of one semester, followed by interviews with focal student participants and the instructor, and focus group discussions involving focal student participants. Such triangulation of data collection not only allowed for the collection of different types of data, including language use data as well as data relating to language background, habits, beliefs and ideologies, but also was sought to improve the quality and accuracy of my ethnographic findings (Fetterman, 1998) and to enhance the internal validity and reliability of this study (Merriam, 1998). Below I describe each
one of these methods of data collection in detail. I begin with the description of the setting for this research.

Research Setting

The U.S. Southwest

This research took place at a large public university located in a mid-sized southwestern U.S. city with a significant Hispanic population. The Southwestern region of the U.S. in general possesses the greatest percentage of Hispanics in the U.S., with nearly 60% of the Hispanic population of the U.S. residing in the five states typically considered part of the Southwest: Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Nevada and Utah, as shown in Tables 1 and 2 (data retrieved from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000; 1990). Figure 1 below shows a map of the U.S., detailing the Hispanic population as a percent of the total U.S. population.

Table 1: Hispanic Population (HP) in the Southwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HP 1990</th>
<th>% of U.S. population</th>
<th>HP 2000</th>
<th>% of U.S. population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S. population</td>
<td>22,354,059</td>
<td>35,305,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>688,338</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>1,295,617</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>7,557,550</td>
<td>33.80%</td>
<td>10,966,556</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>424,302</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>735,601</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>579,224</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>765,386</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>4,339,905</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
<td>6,669,666</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>86,160</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>179,304</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>124,419</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>393,970</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>84,597</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>201,559</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for the</td>
<td>13,589,319</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>20,432,826</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, the Southwest is home to nearly 55% of all the Spanish speakers in the United States. Table 2 shows the number of people five years of age or older who speak Spanish in each Southwestern state, according to Census records from 2000 and 1990.
Table 2: Spanish Speakers in the U.S. Southwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Census 2000</th>
<th>% of total # Spanish speakers</th>
<th>Census 1990</th>
<th>% of total # Spanish speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Spanish speakers</td>
<td>28,101,052</td>
<td>11,117,606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>927,395</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>478,234</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>8,105,505</td>
<td>28.84%</td>
<td>5,478,712</td>
<td>49.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>421,670</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>203,896</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>485,681</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>398,186</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>5,195,182</td>
<td>18.49%</td>
<td>3,443,106</td>
<td>30.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>207,687</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>299,947</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>141,060</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>64,562</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>150,244</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>51,945</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % for the SW</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spanish speakers in the state of Arizona comprise nearly 1 million people or 3.3% of the total Spanish speaking population of the U.S. The Census data clearly indicate a continued Spanish presence in the Southwestern region in general (54%). However it should be noted that this data can be misleading, as it may appear that Spanish is being maintained across generations of Hispanics, when in fact, research suggests that these numbers of Spanish speakers are largely due to the constant influx of new immigrants to the area (Silva-Corvalán, 2004).

At the state level, we find that the Latino or Hispanic population amounts to 25.3 percent of the total state population and in the city of Tucson, 35.7 percent is Hispanic or Latino (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000b). Amongst this Hispanic and Latino group, the
majority is of Mexican heritage (29.8%), followed by Puerto Rican (0.4%), Cuban (0.1%) and other Hispanic heritage (5.3%). With reference to language choice, approximately 25.9 percent of residents older than 5 years of age in the state of Arizona speak a language other than English at home, while within Tucson this population is even larger at approximately 32.6 percent.

Due to the city’s proximity to the U.S.-Mexico border (approximately 65 miles), in what is known as the Borderlands, and its historically large Hispanic or Latino population\(^1\), the setting for this research is best described as having strong ties to Mexico that are sustained by the continuous social and economic exchange (of people, products, and relationships) as well as linguistic exchange (between Spanish and English) that occur despite the political border separating the two countries. Particularly among the families that have resided in Tucson for generations and that were present when the territory that was once Mexico officially became part of the United States following the Gadsden Purchase in 1853, there is a strongly felt notion that they did not cross the border, rather the border crossed them (González, 2001).

Tucson today continues to be a place where Mexican food and music abound, favorite Mexican food items, pastries and candies are sold in the local markets and bakeries around town, and Mexican traditions and celebrations are practiced. Grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins who live on the other side of the border in the Northern regions of Mexico are just a short car ride away, enabling visits for

---

\(^1\) According to the 1900 census, Mexicans constituted the majority of Tucson’s inhabitants (54.7%), a decrease from the prior 1880 census due largely to the decline in immigration from Mexico (González, 2001).
quinceañeras, birthday parties and other family get-togethers, both formal and informal. Also, any favorite Mexican toys and goods not found on this side of the border are easily purchased via a short trip across the border to Nogales.

Despite the strong Hispanic presence in Tucson, however, a clear residential division along ethnic boundaries exists, with composition of the south side of the city equaling between 69.4 and 91.5 percent Hispanic versus the population of the northern portion of the city, which is approximately 85.4 to 99.6 % Anglo (Erickson, 1997, as cited in González, 2001). Whether this is due to socio-economic stratification or a mere desire to live in a neighborhood where one was raised and/or be surrounded by culturally familiar people and places, this division has historically existed.

The amount and degree of contact between Spanish and English in Tucson largely depends on the neighborhood. Within certain communities of Tucson the contact between the two languages can be described as constant and closely tied to day-to-day activities, while not at all the case in other communities around the city where predominantly English monolinguals reside. However, despite these residential divisions, language contact is inevitable in the city’s businesses, restaurants and on the streets. In Tucson it is not at all uncommon to hear Spanish at the grocery store, bank, park or other public places around the city. Spanish is widely spoken and heard.

The University SHL Program

The university that provided the setting for this study also shares a large Hispanic or Latino student body, totaling 14.45% (University of Arizona 2006-2007
Factbook) and due to this large Hispanic student population and the increasing number of heritage speakers enrolling in Spanish language classes, the Department of Spanish and Portuguese created the separate course track in Spanish for heritage learners. This specialized program, which is one of the oldest in the Southwest, was initiated more than 40 years ago. Since its inception it has grown considerably, making it currently one of the most comprehensive programs in the Southwest in terms of course levels offered, of which it currently offers six (Beaudrie, unpublished paper). Beaudrie (2006) provides an overview of university SHL programs in the U.S. Southwest. Based on this data, Table 3 below shows the number of SHL courses offered in programs across the U.S. Southwest (Beaudrie, 2006):

**Table 3: Number of SHL Courses Offered in U.S. Southwest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of SHL courses offered</th>
<th>Number of Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 course</td>
<td>99 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>24 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>28 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 courses</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 courses</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 courses</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 courses</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of universities: 166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beaudrie’s (2006) survey results reveal that 40% of four-year college institutions in the U.S. Southwest offer SHL courses. Table 4 below shows the data for universities within the state of Arizona (Beaudrie, 2006):

**Table 4: Number of SHL courses offered in Arizona**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of SHL courses offered</th>
<th>Number of universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 course</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 course</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 courses</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 courses</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 courses</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 courses</td>
<td>1 (25%) *University of the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of universities: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this data, the university that provided the research setting for the current study offers the most diverse course offerings of all universities surveyed in Arizona, and is one of just three universities (2%) in the U.S. Southwest to offer six course levels.

The SHL program at this institution has been showing consistent growth in recent years. Table 5 below presents the number of students enrolled in the institution’s SHL program over the past decade and demonstrates the growing number of students who opt to take these specially designed courses.
Table 5: Number of Students Enrolled in University SHL Program of Current Study, 2001-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of Hispanic enrollment and the number of majors, in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese as a whole, as of Fall 2008 there are 466 Spanish majors, of which 194 are Hispanic students, or 42%, and of the 1824 total minors in Spanish, 653, or 36%, are Hispanic.

The parallel course sequence for the department’s two tracks can be viewed side by side in Table 6 below. The courses are parallel for credit received although not necessarily in terms of course content and/or objectives.

Table 6: Spanish Courses in the FL and HL Track at the University of the Current Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FL Track Course</th>
<th>HL Track Course</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Semester Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Semester Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placement in the university’s Spanish language program, whether in the HL or FL track, is performed via a language placement test or credit equivalency. Students who do not have transfer credit from another college institution are required to take a language placement test prior to their first semester of enrollment. SHL learners are identified through an online survey that seeks to determine the degree of previous experience with the Spanish language (see Appendix A). Students who respond affirmatively to three or more statements on the survey will qualify to take the computerized HL placement exam, which determines the most appropriate course for placement: 103 (Oral Skills for Heritage Learners), 203 (Oral and Written Development for Heritage Learners), or 253 (Intermediate Spanish for Heritage Learners). It should also be noted that while recommended, SHL students are not required to take SHL courses; they may opt to take courses in the traditional FL track for scheduling or other reasons. Table 7 below provides an overview of the classes in the HL track and a brief description of the classes’ design and content:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 103</td>
<td>Oral Skills for Heritage Learners: In this course you will develop your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conversational skills in Spanish, expand your vocabulary, be introduced to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the written language, and strengthen your listening skills in a positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and supportive environment. A main focus of the course is to help students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>build confidence to use Spanish in a wide range of social contexts. In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>addition, students will be introduced to the main linguistic varieties and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cultural patterns of the Spanish-speaking world with a special emphasis on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Spanish varieties and cultures in the US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 203</td>
<td>Oral and Written Development for Heritage Learners: This course builds on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the linguistic competence students already have in order to expand their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proficiency for language use in a wide variety of situations. Although the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>main focus of the class is written and oral development, all skills,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including reading and listening, are practiced in a positive and supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>environment. Through course readings, videos, class debates, group-work,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written assignments, and oral presentations, students will achieve greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flexibility in their oral, written, listening, and reading abilities in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language. Grammar and spelling issues that are problematic to students are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 253</td>
<td>Intermediate Spanish for Heritage Learners: This course helps students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>build confidence in the Spanish abilities they already have. It also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focuses on raising the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Course descriptions retrieved from the University of Arizona’s Department of Spanish and Portuguese website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 323</td>
<td><em>Intermediate Spanish II for Heritage Learners:</em></td>
<td>This course is a continuation of Spanish 253 and the fourth in the Spanish for heritage learners program: Span 103, 203, 253, 323, 333, and 343. It focuses on expanding the learners' academic proficiency in oral and written discourse while it promotes their critical thinking skills. In addition, this course reviews advanced grammar and orthography topics for students to strengthen their written abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 333</td>
<td><em>Advanced Spanish for Heritage Learners:</em></td>
<td>This course is the fifth in the Spanish for heritage learners (SHL) program: SPAN 103, 203, 253, 323, 333 y 343. Learners can improve their oral and written discourse for use in academic and professional outlets. In a context where current events in Latin American and the US are discussed, students will learn advanced writing as a process, including practice with brainstorming, planning, outlining, drafting, revising, and editing. The following writing pieces will be covered: the essay, the argumentation, and the research paper. Students are highly encouraged to investigate topics relevant to their academic specialties. In addition, students will also practice Spanish for use in professional contexts by doing activities such as writing letters, memos, and giving professional presentations. Grammar and spelling will only be covered based on the specific needs of each course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 343</td>
<td><em>Spanish Phonetics for the Heritage Speaker:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

students' awareness of differences between formal and informal registers of Spanish while it expands both registers in the areas of writing, spelling, reading, grammar, vocabulary as well as oral production and listening comprehension.
Spanish 343 is the last course in the Spanish for heritage learners program: 103-203-253-323-333-343. It introduces learners to descriptive linguistics, specifically in the area of phonology and phonetics. Students learn about the differences between spoken and written language and use their new knowledge as the basis to improve their orthography. A main focus in this course is to expose students to the different dialects of the Spanish-speaking world. They particularly enjoy learning to identify similarities and differences between the speech of people from Spanish-speaking countries such as Cuba, Mexico, Spain, or Argentina, to name a few.

The SHL 253 Course: Intermediate Spanish for Heritage Learners

Table 8 below provides further details about the Spanish 253 course, which is the course level of focus in this study. The information, retrieved from the University of the Current Study’s Department of Spanish and Portuguese website, describes the course design and objectives:
### Table 8: Spanish 253 Course Description and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish 253</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who is this class for?</strong></td>
<td>The Spanish 253 course is designed for students who are heritage language learners. These students have had contact with Spanish from an early age but typically have grown up in the United States. As a consequence of this exposure, they may have not had enough contact with written and/or formal uses of Spanish. Spanish 253 is the third course in the SHL program: SPAN 103, 203, 253, 323, 333, and 343.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the focus of the course?</strong></td>
<td>This course helps students build confidence in the Spanish abilities they already have. It also focuses on raising the students' awareness of differences between formal and informal registers of Spanish while it expands both registers in the areas of writing, spelling, reading, grammar, vocabulary as well as oral production and listening comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will students learn about their cultural heritage in this class?</strong></td>
<td>All heritage language courses seek to deepen the students' knowledge of their cultural heritage by reflecting upon their own experiences and learn about Spanish-speaking countries' history, cultures, and literature. In this course, there is a special emphasis on learning about topics relevant to Hispanic communities in the U.S. such as identity, immigration, human rights, etc. At the same time, students develop an appreciation for the cultural and linguistic variation present within the different Hispanic communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the specific objectives of the course?</strong></td>
<td>By the end of the semester, students will: 1. Have an increased awareness of the differences among different registers of Spanish and the social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consequences of their use.
2. Be able to write a well-structured paragraph in Spanish
3. Develop their dialectal flexibility to be able to use formal and informal registers of Spanish depending on the context and their own judgment.
4. Develop Spanish oral production and presentation skills
5. Develop their reading and listening skills
6. Gain a good command of Spanish spelling
7. Expand their vocabulary
8. Recognize and understand grammatical concepts
9. Learn more about their cultural heritage and appreciate the diversity among Spanish-speaking cultures.

In sum, as detailed on the program website, this course is an intermediate level course for students who may not have had contact with formal registers of Spanish. The course aims to expand both registers while exposing students to content in the areas of literature, history and culture, and is part of a sequence of courses that aim to both build confidence in students’ linguistic abilities and develop dialectal flexibility.

Participants

The participants in the current study include 18 university HL learners enrolled in the Spanish 253 Intermediate Spanish for Heritage Speakers course in the SHL program, and the course instructor. First I will explain the general characteristics and
proficiency level of students at this course level, followed by background details about student participants and the instructor.

**Student Participants**

As discussed in Chapter 1, the term heritage learners in general refers to learners who have had extended contact with the heritage language outside the academic setting, usually in the home context, and thus come to the classroom already with some skills in the heritage language. Learners at the Spanish 253, or intermediate level, generally speaking, already possess some receptive and productive skills in Spanish upon entering the course, but usually have not had very much exposure to the more formal registers. The course, thus, focuses on developing these skills across the various registers with special attention paid to issues of spelling, accentuation, and structural organization for writing as well as vocabulary expansion and presentational skills.

In addition, these students share a unique and personal relationship with Spanish, a language that not only links them to their ancestral heritage but usually involves daily interaction with family members as well. Often times there is a particular sensitivity amongst this group of students to the variety of Spanish they speak and a lack of confidence in their language abilities due to the stigmatization of this language variety. This can result in issues relating to their learning, an inhibition to participate in class or speak at all with those speakers they perceive as “better” Spanish speakers. Furthermore, as a consequence of the close, dynamic relationship between language
skills and identity, this can result in issues beyond language competence and learning, to more general issues of linguistic insecurity, self-esteem and conflicts of identity.

All student participants in the study have at least one parent of Hispanic origin. While the majority of students are of Mexican-American heritage, there are also students of South American, Central American and other Hispanic heritage, as well as students of mixed heritage. The majority of students in this course were placed into the course via the university language placement exam. Table 9 provides specific details about the students’ language background and family information, collected from student questionnaires. The names seen below and that will be used throughout this research are pseudonyms. These pseudonyms were assigned by numbering student questionnaires and randomly selecting names from a list.

Table 9: Student Participants’ Language Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>First Language</th>
<th>Language(s) spoken at home as child</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Place where raised</th>
<th>Parents’ immigration to U.S.</th>
<th>Grandparents’ immigration to U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Guadalupe</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Phoenix/Sierra Vista</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maria</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Nogales/AZ</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Gracia</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Spanish/English/Other</td>
<td>Nogales/AZ</td>
<td>Nogales/AZ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Alberto</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Worked in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rebeca</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teo</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Nogales/ AZ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gilberto</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>Spanish/Italian/Portuguese</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Montevideo/Canelones</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Yes -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>English/English/Spanish</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jesica</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Nogales/ AZ and Hermosillo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Nogales/AZ</td>
<td>Nogales/AZ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lupita</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>Lake Havasu</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lorena</td>
<td>Spanish/</td>
<td>Nogales/</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Table 9 above, the majority of the student participants have been exposed to Spanish in the home as children. Only one participant, Raquel, was exposed only to English in the home. Also, many students were raised in bilingual households, where English and Spanish were both spoken.

In terms of birthplace, approximately 13 of 18 student participants were born in the U.S. while the remaining participants were born in Mexico, South America or Europe. Nearly 94% of the student participants’ parents emigrated to the U.S. and 44% of participants had grandparents that emigrated to the U.S. Table 10 describes the Spanish coursework (level and duration) that student participants had prior to their enrollment in the Spanish 253 course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Previous Coursework in Spanish</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Duration (Yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Guadalupe</td>
<td></td>
<td>High School and College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 María</td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Gracia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Andrés</td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>1 Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Raquel</td>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teo</td>
<td></td>
<td>High School and College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Gilberto</td>
<td></td>
<td>High School (AP)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nadia</td>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Marisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary (MX) and Middle School</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Juana</td>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cristina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 5, all student participants have completed some formal study in Spanish, however, as indicated, the extent of academic experience with the language varies considerably, with some students having completed just one semester of prior study and others having completed multiple years of study.

**Focal Participants**

While all of the 18 above described students participated in the class meetings throughout the semester, student presentations and questionnaires, ten focal students (participants 1 through 10) were selected to participate further in the study. This further participation involved the performance of one-on-one interviews with the researcher as well as focus group discussions with a small number of fellow student participants and the researcher. The ten focal students were selected based upon students’ willingness and availability to participate further in the study. Toward the end of the classroom participant observation period, a general announcement was made to all students.
interested in continuing in the research beyond the class meetings and these ten students graciously volunteered to participate further. To follow are brief descriptions of each of the focal participant’s language background information and Spanish language use and habits.

**Guadalupe**

Guadalupe was born in Phoenix, AZ and raised in both Phoenix and Sierra Vista, AZ. Both of her parents emigrated to the U.S. from Mexico, her father from Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico at the age of 16 and her mother from Agua Prieta, Sonora, Mexico in her 20s. Guadalupe’s first language was Spanish although both Spanish and English were spoken in the home while she was growing up. Guadalupe studied Spanish in high school for three years and in college for two years but reports feeling more comfortable speaking in English now. While Guadalupe does speak Spanish at home with her parents, siblings and grandparents, she reports not to speak Spanish with any friends at or outside of school. She reads some in Spanish, mainly newspaper and magazine articles and she also watches the news in Spanish also on the television program *Primer Impacto*.

**María**

María was born in Nogales, AZ and grew up in Tucson. Her mother emigrated to the U.S. at the age of 26. Spanish was her first language, however she feels more comfortable speaking English due to what she describes as “my fluency.” Both Spanish and English were spoken in the home as a child. María took an intermediate Spanish
course, Spanish 201, in the foreign language track at the university prior to her enrollment in the Spanish 253 heritage language course. She watches a lot of television in Spanish, including the news, novelas and Primer Impacto. She speaks Spanish with her parents, grandparents and friends both at school and outside school.

**Gracia**

Gracia was born in Nogales, Arizona and grew up with three languages spoken in the home: Spanish, English and Cantonese. Gracia’s mother is Mexican-American, born in the U.S., and her father emigrated to the U.S. at the age of 12 from Hong Kong. Gracia’s maternal grandparents emigrated to the U.S. from Nogales, Sonora, Mexico. Gracia’s native languages are Spanish and English and she studied Spanish in middle school for three years and again in high school for one year. Gracia reports feeling equally comfortable speaking English and Spanish. She reads and watches some TV in Spanish, mainly novelas. Gracia is also one of the most fluent Spanish speakers of the focal participants.

**Andrés**

Andrés was born in Tucson, Arizona and both of his parents emigrated to the U.S. from La Mesa and Terrenate, Sonora, Mexico at the age of 20. Andrés’ native language is Spanish and he feels more comfortable speaking Spanish. Both Spanish and English were spoken in the home while he was raised. Prior to the Spanish 253 course, Andrés studied Spanish in the university heritage language program for one semester in the Spanish 203 course. He watches many television programs in Spanish, including
Aquí y Ahora, Cristina, Primer Impacto and Ver para Creer. He also frequently reads the newspaper in Spanish and maintains friendships in Spanish in addition to his familial relationships.

Raquel

Raquel is a Tucson native and her parents are also native to the U.S. Her grandparents emigrated to the U.S. from Aguascalientes, Mexico in their teenage years. Raquel is the only one of the focal participants whose first language was English. Growing up at home only English was spoken, no Spanish. Therefore, she does not speak Spanish with her parents or siblings, nor does she speak with friends in Spanish. She does, however, speak some Spanish with her grandparents. She does not watch any television programs in Spanish or read in Spanish. Raquel feels more comfortable speaking English. She studied Spanish in high school for two years and of all the focal students Raquel has the lowest competence and fluency in Spanish.

Teo

Teo was born in Tucson to parents from Nogales, Mexico. He was raised in Nogales, AZ and his first language was Spanish. Both Spanish and English were spoken at home while he was growing up. He studied Spanish in high school for two years and reports feeling more comfortable speaking English. He speaks Spanish to some friends, both at and outside of school. He also speaks Spanish with his parents, brothers, sisters and grandparents. He watches television in Spanish, including Despierta America, although he reads the newspaper and magazines only in English.
Gilberto

Gilberto was born in Mexico but grew up in Anaheim, California. His mother emigrated to the U.S. from Zacatecas and Durango, Mexico. Spanish was his first language and he spoke both Spanish and English at home while growing up. In high school he studied AP Spanish for one year and feels no difference in speaking Spanish or English. Gilberto uses Spanish with friends as well as with his family. He has a rather large family with eight brothers and sisters with whom he uses Spanish. He watches television shows in Spanish, including Sábado Gigante, the news and even novelas, due to his large number of sisters. Gilberto is a very social and lively student who is very well liked by his peers. He is also very active in the Chicano student group at the university and frequently spends time studying and chatting with friends at the lounge they have on campus.

Nadia

Nadia is an outspoken young woman who was born in Montevideo, Uruguay and grew up in Montevideo and Canelones. She emigrated to the U.S. with her parents as an adolescent, at the age of 11. Her first language was Spanish although growing up, Italian and Portuguese were also spoken in the home by relatives since she is of European descent. She studied Spanish in high school in the U.S. for one year during her senior year and reports feeling more comfortable speaking English. She speaks Spanish with great fluency but only speaks with her family, not with friends from or outside of school. She also does not watch any television programs in Spanish or read magazines or newspaper articles in Spanish.
Marisa

Marisa was born in Tucson, Arizona to parents who emigrated to the U.S. from Agua Prieta, Sonora, Mexico. Marisa’s first language was Spanish yet both Spanish and English were spoken at home while she was a child. Marisa is fully bilingual and feels equally comfortable speaking Spanish and English. She speaks Spanish with Latino friends at school and outside of school and frequently watches soap operas, news and films in Spanish. Before the SHL 253 class, Marisa had never formally studied Spanish. Marisa does, however, enjoy learning languages and she is also an intermediate learner of French and beginner learner of Portuguese.

Ana

Ana was born in Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico and emigrated to the U.S. along with both of her parents. Spanish was her first language and the language spoken at home while she was growing up. She completed most of her schooling in Mexico and studied Spanish in elementary and middle school before moving to the U.S. Ana’s dominant language is Spanish and she is currently learning English. She maintains many friendships in Spanish as well as speaks Spanish to her siblings, parents and grandparents. She watches some television programs in Spanish, including Don Francisco, Cristina and Noticieros.

Instructor Participant

The participants also included one female language instructor from a monolingual country in Central America, 36 years of age at the time of the study. The
instructor is a native speaker of Spanish and a Ph.D. Candidate in studies related to second language acquisition and teaching. She held a M.Ed. Master of Education, a Licentiate Degree in Applied Linguistics in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) and a B.A. in TESOL. While she had been an instructor for over 10 years and had taught ESL, EFL and Spanish at various institutions in the U.S. as well as in her home country, she had been employed as an instructor of Spanish in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the university for five years at the time of the study. In this position, she taught several levels of Spanish foreign language courses, including beginning, intermediate and composition.

As a graduate student in the field of applied linguistics and graduate teaching associate in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, the Spanish 253 instructor was required to either take a course in Foreign Language Teaching Methodology, or transfer credit from an equivalent course during previous graduate study. The instructor had fulfilled this course requirement in her previous M.Ed. program for English as a Second Language. With regard to preparation in HL pedagogy, the instructor had never taken a HL pedagogy course for credit. Rather, the instructor audited a HL pedagogy course in 2007 and reports attending almost all classes. Since the instructor was not officially enrolled in the course, however, she did not complete any of the written or oral course assignments, such as presentations and the final project/paper. In this regard, the instructor’s preparation in HL pedagogy was limited.

It should also be noted that the Spanish 253 instructor was my colleague at the university, enrolled in the same graduate program and a fellow instructor in the
Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Thus, I felt comfortable and at ease as a participant researcher conducting ethnographic-style observations in her class. She welcomed me to participate in class activities and did not treat me like an outsider to the class.

Participant Selection Criteria

The selection criteria for student participants of the current study were: 1) to be heritage speakers of Spanish, and 2) to be enrolled in an intermediate university level Spanish heritage language course. The rationalization for these criteria stems from my strong interest in investigating the SHL learner population in the U.S. and examining language ideology and identity amongst university level SHL learners. As mentioned in the introduction, in recent years, considerable efforts have been made to guide investigation in the field of HLE and to promote HL maintenance and development. A research agenda has been established, aimed at expanding HL resources in the U.S.

Through investigation of language discourses and practices in the SHL classroom, the current study aims to contribute to HL pedagogy and effective teaching practices, sociolinguistic issues relating to languages in contact and sociolinguistic and linguistic descriptions of HL varieties. The current study will also have some important implications for the development of HL curricula, materials and programs.

Previous research that has contributed to these areas of HLE will be discussed in further detail in Chapters 3 and 4, however, it is important to note that the current investigation has been influenced by recent topics of study emerging within HLE,
including identity and language learning amongst Mexican-American SHL students (Helmer, 2007), register and style variation amongst HL learners (Muñoz, 2007) and identity and language ideologies and in SHL textbook discourse (Ducar, 2006; Leeman & Martínez, 2007), as well as sociolinguistic studies of Spanish in contact in the U.S. in general (see Lacorte & Leeman, 2009), such as code switching and discourse amongst Southwest Chicanos (García, M.E., 2009). This study addresses a lack of university level HL studies based on ethnographic classroom observations, like Helmer’s (2007) study of SHL high school students at City High School in Tucson, Arizona.

For the reasons described above, I have chosen to work with this particular population of university SHL students. Also, I have chosen to conduct my research with SHL learners who already possess good oral proficiency in Spanish and who are enrolled in an intermediate level university SHL language course. This population is particularly interesting for the study of language ideology and identity because for the many of these students this is the first time they are enrolling in a university level Spanish language course. These students, who are already speakers of the language as students at the intermediate level, come to the language classroom with personal, social and cultural connections to Spanish as well as attitudes and beliefs about language. For many students, the Spanish 253 class is the first time they are exposed to a more formal variety of Spanish. In the classroom, students are also exposed to new ideologies and discourses about language through discussions with peers, the instructor and contact with the textbook and SHL program. Beyond this level, they have been exposed to discourses in the community about the value and role of Spanish and English in the U.S.
Data Collection Methods

This study’s two main research questions are addressed through a combination of data collection instruments, including: ethnographic participant observation in the classroom, aided by the tools of field note taking, journaling and video and audio recording, sociolinguistic interviews with students, an interview with the instructor, and group discussions with focal student participants. Questionnaires were also administered to students to collect information about language background, habits and attitudes. Once again, the current study is interested in both the construction of identity and the negotiation of language ideologies amongst SHL learners, thus the research questions are two-fold:

1.) How do the SHL learners in the intermediate SHL course construct identity?

1.1) What are the linguistic practices (e.g. Spanish-English code switching, bilingual discourse markers, etc.) and/or other social practices through which SHL learners construct multiple social identities (bilingual, heritage learner, ethnic, etc.) across different social contexts (classroom, interviews, focus group discussions)?

1.2) How do SHL learners themselves perceive the relationship between language and identity?

2.) What language discourses and ideologies do SHL learners experience in the intermediate university SHL classroom?

2.1) How are standard and non-standard varieties treated in the SHL program, classroom and textbook?
2.2) How do SHL learners perceive and negotiate these language ideologies and how are they implicated in their own attitudes toward Spanish?

**Ethnographic Participant Observation**

Video and audio-recorded classroom participant observation served as one of the principal methods of data collection. Participant observation data obtained from visits three times per week (Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays) throughout the course of the semester addressed both Research Questions 1 and 2. Data retrieved from this method also provided valuable information about how standard and non-standard forms are treated by the instructor.

This method of data collection serves as a fundamental part of the ethnographic approach taken for the current study. I will now turn to a discussion of the term ‘ethnography’ and describe the origins and definitions of this method. Born in the field of anthropology, the ethnographic tradition has been influenced by a wide range of theoretical ideas across various disciplines over time, leading to the modern, variable conceptualization used across many disciplines and areas of social inquiry today. I will discuss how ‘ethnography’ has informed the current methodological approach to the study of ideology and identity among this group of SHL learners.

Ethnography has had a complex history, thus, the term has gone through a series of reinterpretations and recontextualizations since its original use, beginning with the known founders of ethnography, Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942) and Franz Boas.
The Polish anthropologist Malinowski conducted his fieldwork among the Trobriand Islanders in 1914, and was the first to clearly communicate his methodology, the relevance of participant observations and analysis of daily interactions by a trained fieldworker. He claimed that ethnography could not be performed without knowing the language of the people studied since the principal aim of ethnography in his view was “to grasp the native’s point of view, his relations to life, to realize his vision of his world” (Malinowski, 1922:25).

The German anthropologist Franz Boas also valued ethnography as a method of analyzing the relationship between language and culture. He documented that every group has its own culture and was the first to gather large amounts of ethnographic data from Native Americans (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2005). In Boas’ view, in order to study a culture, one must have direct access to the language of that culture. Boas was concerned with the ethnographic descriptions of Native Americans before they were destroyed or assimilated by European settlers and is responsible for the transformation of the classification of American Indian Languages into a “systematic study of their grammatical structures” (Duranti, 2001:9).

Thus, at one time ‘ethnography’ was typically synonymous with the term ‘ethnology’, referring to the analysis of non-Western societies and cultures, and required living amongst the group of people of study for an extended period of time, in order to document the social structure and system of values, beliefs and interpretation of behavior of a culture (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Yet during the twentieth century this approach broadened to include the analysis of communities within U.S. and Western
European cities and towns a result of sociological research primarily concerned with the effects of urbanization and industrialization. Later, in the 1960s, ethnography was influenced by the rise of cultural studies, followed by psychology and human geography amongst other disciplines, and has been continually remolded by a wide variety of theoretical concepts, such as Marxism, structuralism, feminism and constructionism, to name a few, as well as other methodological approaches, including conversation and discourse analysis, and psycho-social approaches.

Johnson (1992) explains that the purpose of ethnography is “to discover the insider’s view of reality—the emic view” (p. 142). This is accomplished primarily through participant observation. The ethnographer, as a participant-observer and listener, has the goal of reconstructing the social world of what is being observed, of explaining culture or the shared values and behaviors of the group. It entails thick description (Geertz, 1975), which takes into account the context of behavior, and is simultaneously “a process and a product” (Agar, 1996:53). Spradley (1979) defines culture as, “the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and generate social behavior” (p. 5). According to Spradley, during fieldwork ethnographers use three sources to make cultural inferences: what people say, how people act, and the artifacts they use (p. 8). Thus, the focus of ethnography is the group rather than the individual. In Duranti’s (1997) words, ethnography is, “…the experience of participating in the social life of a given group as a way of understanding how they constitute each other into a collectivity, what makes them at the same time unique and predicable” (p. 89).
All in all, ethnography has come to have a rather broad and varied meaning that can be applied to research in multiple disciplinary areas, yet, it still preserves certain distinctive characteristics. The principal features mostly included in ethnographic practice, as detailed by Hammersley and Atkinson (2007: 3), which have guided the present research methodology are:

1. Research takes place in the ‘field’, that is to say, human behavior is studied in everyday contexts, as opposed to conditions created by the researcher.

2. Data is collected from a variety of sources, while the principal sources are usually participant observation and/or relatively informal conversations.

3. Data collection is generally fairly ‘unstructured’ in two ways. First, it does not involve abiding by a fixed and detailed research design identified from the beginning. Second, the categories utilized for the interpretation of behavior are not created in the data collection process but rather in the data analysis.

4. The focus of the research is typically on a few cases, generally relatively small-scale, like a single setting or group of people. This is performed to facilitate in-depth study.

5. Data analysis involves interpretation of the “meanings, functions, and consequences of human actions and institutional practices” and how these are implicated in local and, perhaps, in addition, wider contexts.
Data analysis generates, for the most part, verbal descriptions, explanations and theories, while quantification and statistical analysis at most play a subordinate role.

Thus, the process of ethnography itself is a key component in the analysis and interpretation of data. The study aims to understand the “meanings, functions, and consequences”, as expressed by Hammersley and Atkinson (2007), of SHL classroom practices, allowing for analysis of the ideologies behind these practices. This is performed via data collection from a variety of sources through participation in the daily interactions of the participants under study, as Hammersley and Atkinson (2007: 3) further explain:

(E)thnography usually involves the researcher participating, overtly or covertly, in people’s daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, and/or asking questions through informal and formal interviews, collecting documents and artefacts – in fact, gathering whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the emerging focus of inquiry. Generally speaking, ethnographers draw on a range of sources of data, though they may sometimes rely primarily on one.

Thus, while participation observation served as the primary method of data collection for the current study, informal interactions with the instructor and students, interviews and group discussions, as well as the gathering of physical documents such as the syllabus, handouts, program and course descriptions from the university website, textbook and workbook, provided additional sources of information for analysis.

The ethnographic method is applied in order to describe the behavior of the group of SHL learners in the classroom throughout the duration of the course. An
important methodological limitation with regard to the duration of this study should be noted here. That is, the ethnographic observations for the current analysis were limited to the Spanish 253 course class meetings during the semester, interviews and focus group discussions during the following semester. I was not able to conduct observations with these participants outside of these contexts, or in the next level SHL course they might have taken after the 253 course, for example. However, while the study was limited in this aspect, I feel it provided an in-depth ethnographic account of the Spanish 253 course in its entirety. In agreement with the features of ethnographic practice as described by Hammersley and Atkinson (2007), the focus of my research was on this small group of participants and within this group, ten focal participants, allowing for a more in-depth analysis of SHL learners. My data analysis involves the interpretation of the meanings, purposes and effects of actions of the teacher and peers as well as institutional practices of the program, providing insight into the ideologies of the school (Bourdieu, 1991). The textbook, a form of authority like the teacher and the school, is analyzed as well.

Furthermore, as Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) describe, my focus of inquiry emerged through the participant observation process. While my area of interest had been identity from the start of the project, my research questions, throughout the course of the study, were reformulated and remolded in response to the emerging data. In this sense, the research was somewhat ‘unstructured’. The initial weeks of observation, for example, were an exploratory period in which I aimed to get to know the students, the instructor and the way things functioned in the SHL classroom. As I continued to
observe and participate in interaction in the classroom, and the pedagogical aims of the class and methods of instruction became clear, I could sense the recurring theme of standard versus non-standard language forms. This data then helped shape my interest in identity to include how the treatment of standard and non-standard forms and the discourses relating to language varieties in the classroom influenced how students identified themselves and perceived their relationship to language.

During each individual observation, interaction was observed and field notes taken in order to describe participants’ speech, actions, and the physical and social context. Observations were additionally video- and audio recorded in order to obtain accurate data and not to miss any relevant information revealed during the observed interactions. Having recorded observations served the purpose of having record of their behaviors that I could review repeatedly in order to capture the entire picture of each observation’s interactions. This allowed me to add additional information to the original notes in case not recorded, such as tone of speech, gestures and other important contextual elements. Recorded observations also allowed me to be able to go back to my data at any point during and/or after the data collection period.

It must be recognized that in conducting research by means of observation the observer’s paradox cannot be completely avoided. As noted by Labov (1972: 209), as researchers we want to capture how our participants behave in a naturalistic setting when they are not being systematically observed. As a participant observer, I was both observing and partaking in interaction with the participants of my study, however, I cannot deny the effect of my being a researcher and a stranger to them. I tried my
hardest to make my participants feel as comfortable as possible. In all observations I positioned myself in a location that provided a wide-angle view so that I could capture all participants’ linguistic and social interaction on video. In addition, I tried to position myself in an unobtrusive spot in the room so that I could describe their interactions in as detailed and accurate a way as possible. As participants became more comfortable and accustomed to my presence in the classroom, I engaged in interaction when invited to do so. While the first few observations my presence may have made them feel uncertain or uncomfortable, I noticed that after the first week or so, they grew accustomed to my presence. Even though I am a white female from the northeastern region of the U.S., I believe that because I am a bilingual in Spanish and English as well as a student, students felt comfortable with me. Also, students knew I was very interested in Latino culture and language and that I had personal experience with Latino culture through my relationships, both friendships and my relationship with my fiancé at the time of the study and his family. During conduction of the study and even after the study was conducted, students have shown interest in these connections by asking me questions about my wedding, my husband’s home country and culture, trips I have made to Latin America, etc. We have also had conversations about issues pertaining to language, bilingualism in the U.S. and heritage language maintenance on a more personal level in discussing plans for raising children.
Field Note Taking and Journaling

As mentioned, as a fundamental part of participant observation, I took detailed field notes during each observation, including descriptions, direct quotations and my comments as a researcher-observer. These field notes centered on the participants, their speech and interactions, and the physical surroundings. In addition to field notes, a journal was also kept, in which I wrote a descriptive account of all the details after each observation so as not to overlook any relevant observed behaviors. I also expanded on my ideas and reactions after each observation, forming my own interpretation based on the observed behaviors.

Questionnaires

A 15 minute questionnaire (see Appendix D) was administered to student participants to collect data provide language background information including students’ previous education in Spanish, details about family origin and immigration, if applicable, frequency, degree and contexts of Spanish language use, attitudes toward English and Spanish and motivations for taking the Spanish heritage language course. The questionnaire was administered by the researcher mid-way through the semester to all 18 student participants. Participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that neither their instructor nor anyone besides the researcher would see their questionnaires, and that the questionnaires would in no way positively or negatively affect their grade in the Spanish course and, therefore, they should respond to all questions as fully and honestly as possible.


**Student Interviews**

Sociolinguistic interviews (see Appendix C for sample questions) were conducted with the ten focal student participants after the participant observation period in the classroom. These interviews typically lasted approximately 60 minutes and were audio recorded. During the first part of each student interview a classic sociolinguistic interview format was followed to provide further data for analysis of linguistic features.

Sociolinguistic interviews have been employed by researchers in sociolinguistics as a method to capture spontaneous conversation. The reasoning is that as speakers become involved in the topics of the interview with open-ended questions, speakers enter a mode of narration, rather than simply responding to questions by the interviewer, allowing for less attention paid to speech. Thus, in the beginning of each interview some general background information was achieved, then moving to informal conversation about the weather or favorite pastimes in Tucson, followed by a discussion of childhood memories and gradually to narration of events that either caused great fear, surprise or trauma.

During the second part of the interview, information was obtained about students’ language attitudes and ideologies. Specific events that occurred in the classroom were brought up by the researcher to elicit students’ perceptions and reactions to the events. In other words, students were sometimes asked questions regarding language behaviors observed in the classroom and how they felt as a result of particular classroom discussions and/or instructor or fellow student behavior such as corrections of standard and nonstandard forms in the classroom. At this point in the interview students
generally felt very comfortable with me and felt at ease to open up and talk more freely. Finally, any pertinent background or family information that was not gathered by questionnaires or required further clarification was obtained in the interviews. Overall, the interviews provided critical data regarding students’ attitudes toward the classroom practices and how they viewed their relationship to Spanish in general. Topics discussed during the interviews provided an understanding of how students viewed the relationship between language and their heritage and culture, and who they are.

**Instructor Interview**

The course instructor was also interviewed for approximately 60 minutes after the observation period. This interview was semi-structured and included questions about the SHL program and course, the students, background information about the teacher’s teaching qualifications and experience, and teaching philosophy and approach. Questions also elicited the instructor’s language attitudes, including those relating to standard and nonstandard varieties of Spanish and particular linguistic forms observed in the classroom and the teaching of standard and nonstandard forms in general. The instructor was willing to express her ideas in an honest and frank fashion to me, likely due to my friendly relationship with the instructor prior to conducting the research study. As friends, the instructor and I typically talked about our jobs together, the classes we were teaching and the students we had during the semester, so the interview, although planned and under the context of the research project, was quite natural. The data retrieved from the instructor interview was compared and contrasted to the practices that
Focus Group Discussions

During the Spring semester, and after the classroom observation period had ended, two focus group discussions were conducted with some of the focal participants. These discussions were proposed as informal gatherings in which focal students could enjoy a pizza and snacks with some of their classmates from the SHL course and me, and ask a friend to join as well. Each discussion session, lasting up to three hours, was video and audio recorded and held in a room in the Chicano Studies lounge on campus. Two focal participants attended the first session and five attended the second session. The first part of the discussion consisted of informal conversation in which topics unrelated to the class were discussed. This was really a chance for students to see each other again, relax and talk while enjoying pizza, providing data that would allow for linguistic analysis in a more informal context.

Following this part of the focus group discussion, a conversation about language attitudes and ideologies was initiated. The format of this part of the discussion was somewhat unstructured, allowing students to initiate topics and elaborate on ideas brought up by their fellow classmates and me. Thus, in each discussion session, a wide variety of topics were touched upon, including, language habits and use with family and friends, motivations for studying Spanish, the different ways in which people talk,
family and cultural traditions, as well as broader issues such as the value of English and Spanish in the U.S. and standard and nonstandard forms.

Sometimes specific discussions about corrections of particular language forms in the classroom were brought up to gather students responses to the attitudes expressed in the classroom. For example, videos from classroom observation data that involved the treatment of standard and non-standard language forms were shown to students to extract student reactions and discussion. In addition, a Powerpoint presentation containing excerpts of people’s language attitudes from multiple sources was shown to students to initiate discussion of language attitudes. These multiple sources included, for example, letters to the news editor found online that discussed the topics of immigration, language maintenance and cultural assimilation, as well as written excerpts from focal participant interviews (of those not present in that particular focus group discussion) that revolved around issues of language and identity and attitudes toward linguistic varieties.

Data Analysis Methods

The previous section described the data collection process, detailing what types of data were collected, how and for what purpose. This section will now discuss the methods of data analysis, although further details will be provided in the analysis chapters themselves (Chapters 3 and 4).

The first step in analysis of the topics of identity and ideology amongst this group of SHL learners was analysis of the questionnaire data. This data was reviewed
for family language background information including where students were born and raised, language(s) spoken in the home when growing up, students’ and/or parents’ and/or grandparents’ immigration details, if applicable, educational experience with Spanish, as well as details pertaining to current Spanish and English language use, including self-reported language dominance, literacy and interaction habits.

Transcription of Data

The next critical step in the analysis was the transcription of data. Field notes and journal entries resulting from the semester-long classroom observation period were first reviewed for language use and discourses relating to identity practices and the use of standard and non-standard forms and relevant interactions were then reviewed on video and transcribed. More details will follow about this process in the section below on discourse analysis. For the ten focal student participants, sociolinguistic interviews with the researcher and the two focus group discussions with students were transcribed for analysis of identity practices and language ideologies. Finally, the interview with the instructor was also transcribed for analysis of language attitudes and ideologies.

Transcription conventions

It is important to discuss the method of transcription used in the current study, since, as described by Ochs (1979), transcription is theory. Furthermore, Bucholtz (2000) discusses the very political nature of transcription, and describes how the form of transcription can be embedded in a particular stance or ideology. Thus, for the purpose
of this study, I chose to use transcription symbols that did not correspond to written
conventions, since spoken discourse is its own independent form of communication and
should be treated distinctly. The transcription conventions I elected, thus, do not include
the use commas, periods, question marks, or capitalization typical of written
conventions. Instead I used other symbols to mark pauses and rising or falling intonation
(e.g., (.), ↑, ↓). Among the few signs I do preserve from written discourse, for no other
reason than a lack of possible signs to use, are the exclamation point, to indicate an
excited or animated tone, quotation marks, to indicate quotations made by the speaker or
around a word that the speaker has uttered along with gestured quotes, and three periods
to mark ellipsis. I also represent when students interrupt or overlap speech of another
interlocutor (with brackets), and at the place in the stretch of talk that it occurs rather
than returning to the beginning of that speaker’s turn. All other conventions are
modeled after research in conversation analysis (see for example, Sacks et al., 1974),
linguistic anthropology and interactional sociolinguistics. A convention key can be
found in Appendix B.

Discourse Analysis

As discussed in Chapter One, the analysis for the current research applies a
social practice perspective and Bourdieu’s concepts of power and linguistic and
symbolic capital. In applying these theories, Discourse Analysis (DA) served as a
principal method of analysis of the current study’s data, which allowed for analysis of
stretches of conversation in the transcripts from classroom, interview and focus group
DA is a research method used across various disciplines, thus, researchers employing this method pose many different questions and propose many different kinds of answers. DA has been traditionally defined as the analysis of language ‘beyond the sentence’ and as Johnstone (2002) describes, DA can provide insight into “how meaning can be signaled via the arrangement of chunks of information across a series of sentences or via the details of how a conversationalist takes up and responds to what has just been said” (p. 5). In this way, DA helps to examine speakers’ semantic intentions and the interpretation of what is said by those hearing it. In addition, DA serves as a valuable tool in helping to analyze social relations such as dominance, oppression, solidarity, personal identity and social identification (Tannen, 1994). In the current study, these dynamic social factors were analyzed combining DA with Bourdieu’s (1991) theoretical concepts of status and power relations.

As can be seen from the research questions, this study is interested in analyzing identities and ideologies through the students’ use of language and the treatment of standard and non-standard language varieties at the multiple levels of interaction with SHL students, including the classroom interaction with the SHL instructor, the official goals as put forth on the SHL program website and the SHL course textbook. It is also interested in how students negotiate these discourses, as revealed in student interviews and focus group discussions. While DA serves as the main framework of analysis for the current study’s combination of spoken and written discourse, scholars’ discussions on critical discourse analysis also provided some useful insights for the current study, particularly in terms of its intent to unveil the underlying sources of power, domination
and inequality (van Dijk, 1988). While not a textual analysis of media and news discourse, to which critical discourse analysis is often applied, the current analysis is also interested in how “linguistic-discursive practices are linked to socio-political structures of power and domination” (Kress, 1990, p. 85) by emphasizing the role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance (van Dijk, 1993, p. 249). The current study also seeks to explore, as Fairclough (1995) puts it, the sometimes “opaque” relationships that exist between “(a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power” (p. 132).

The current analysis views language as a form of social action that constructs social reality and aims to provide an analysis of discourse, language and text on a micro-level, in order to bring to light their relationship to macro social structures. Like Fairclough (1995), I view ideology as a critical component in the reproduction of societal power asymmetries. The goal of the current study in making the reproduction of hegemonic power structures in power-laden discourses explicit is ultimately to inspire social change. As noted by Johnstone (2002), “Discourse analysis is thus a methodology that is useful in answering many kinds of questions, both questions that linguists traditionally ask and questions asked by people in other humanistic and social-scientific disciplines. All uses of discourse analysis result in descriptions, but the end goal of discourse analysis is not always simply description of the status quo but social critique and, sometimes, intervention” (p. 27).
In Chapter 3, DA was employed to analyze how students perceive the relationship between language and identity in discourses during interviews and focus group discussions. In addition, code switching, calques, loanwords and bilingual discourse markers, terms which will be defined and discussed in detail in Chapter 3, are analyzed in data from classroom interactions, interviews and focus group discussions as linguistic practices through which SHL learners construct their ethnic and bilingual identities.

In Chapter 4, DA was employed to analyze the textual content on the SHL program webpage, the *Nuevos Mundos* textbook and workbook (Roca, 2005a; Roca, 2005b), student-instructor interactions from classroom observations, and the instructor interview. I was primarily interested in the representation of standard and non-standard varieties of language to determine the underlying language philosophies, and comparing and contrasting this data with actual classroom practices. I was also interested in analyzing discourses about the relationship between language and identity and the connections between the perceived value of particular varieties of language and student identity.

As discussed, the current study seeks to elucidate the relationship between micro-level practices and macro-level societal hierarchies in the hopes of instigating social change. It is the goal of this study, and my goal as a researcher studying SHL learners, to reveal some of the underlying, power-laden ideologies behind discourses in the SHL classroom that revolve around language varieties in an effort to provide SHL students with a greater voice in defending their variety of language, which is
inextricably tied to their identity. This study aims to contribute to needed changes in SHL pedagogical practices and the development of SHL curricula and materials that take more fully into account issues relating to language ideologies and identity.
CHAPTER 3: LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY AMONGST SHL LEARNERS

Introduction

This chapter discusses language and identity among SHL learners. Identity practices and discourses are analyzed across multiple registers, or social situations, including student presentations, focus group discussions, sociolinguistic interviews and classroom meetings. These interactions vary according to interlocutors, including peer-to-peer, student-instructor and student-researcher interactions, and degrees of formality (presentations being the most formal situation and group discussions being the most informal). Registers, as they are meant here, are thus situationally defined varieties (Biber, 1995; Finegan, 2004). My aim is to, first, explore how students perform acts of identity through linguistic behavior across these multiple contexts, as they attempt to align themselves with, reject or seek to modify an imposed identity. I will also seek to detect instances where multiple identities are performed, negotiated, and co-constructed through linguistic practices.

The framework adopted for the current analysis accommodates multiple dimensions of social analysis, particularly structure and agency, identity and ideology, thereby allowing for a more complete analysis of identity practices, particularly at the micro level. The main linguistic performances of identity in the current study were in evidence in the use of bilingual discourse markers, lexical choice and code-switching among the participants. Highlighted in particular are the various ways in which students construct their bilingual and ethnic identities through language, and how this process
yields not just passive by-standers, yet articulate agents of their own behavior. This study also demonstrates how students contribute to the shaping of their identity in a creative way that evokes their own style.

This chapter will review the theories of identity used as a framework for this study, as well as discuss some of the previous research on identity amongst language learners. The focus will then shift to an analysis of language and identity amongst the SHL learners of the current study, demonstrating practices through which students construct bilingual and ethnic identities. It will also begin to address an important issue of interest in this study: how discourses about language may be implicated in students’ perceptions of language, identity negotiation, and the acceptance and/or resistance of language ideologies.

A Practice-based View of the Social World

The view of the social world as defined by practices is not a novel one and rather dates back to a fundamental concept of Marxism: Praxis. More recently, the structurational perspective of sociologist and social theorist Giddens (1979, 1984) offers a view of the relationship between the reproduction of social structure and agency that rejects deterministic visions of social power. Alternatively, Giddens (1979) insists that, “Every social actor knows a great deal about the conditions of reproduction of the society of which he or she is a member” (p. 5). Furthermore, Giddens (1979) views language as intrinsically linked to practice: “The constitution of language as ‘meaningful’ is inseparable from the constitution of forms of social life as continuing
practices” (p. 4). Similarly, Goffman (1981) recognizes the role of coordinated activity or task in organizing the production of meaning through language: “A presumed common interest in effectively pursuing the activity at hand, in accordance with some sort of overall plan for doing so, is the contextual matrix which renders many utterances, especially brief ones, meaningful” (p. 143).

Both the relationship between language and other social practices and the view of language as central to social analysis have been expressed most clearly by the French sociologists Pierre Bourdieu (1975, 1991) and Michel de Certeau (1984). Each of these scholars upholds the view of language as a fundamentally social phenomenon, rather than simply an abstract formal system. In Bourdieu’s terms, practice originates from HABITUS, which he defines as “a permanent disposition towards language and interaction which is objectively adjusted to a given level of acceptability” (1975: 655). In other words, habitus is comprised of dispositions to act (e.g. speak, walk, read or eat) that are acquired through the individual’s inculcation into any social milieu. Bourdieu’s concept of habitus is strongly shaped by an individual’s personal history and experiences growing up, a time when not only language is acquired, but also a sense of the particular and potential value in the markets that the individual as well as those in his/her social environment (e.g. the individual’s family) inhabit. This experience-linked perspective closely resembles Schieffelin and Ochs’s (1986) notion of language socialization that is defined as socialization through and to the use of language as a result of the continual accumulation of experiences, in which individuals develop ways of thinking, feeling and acting through participation in social interactions. That is to say, sociocultural
information is essentially encoded in the organization of conversational discourse. The dispositions that make up habitus, which, once again, are acquired through one’s life experiences and history—more precisely, the ways in which we talk, comport ourselves, dress, and view the world—are transformed into structuring systems that, in part, determine how we behave in the social world. These dispositions are durable in that the individual unconsciously bears them throughout his or her lifetime and they can and do reproduce existing social structures. However, these dispositions also are generative and transposable since they have the potential of generating an unlimited spectrum of new behaviors and responses on the part of an agent (Bourdieu, 1991). This generative characteristic is particularly evident as individuals experience new social contexts such as school, social groupings, and institutions.

Habitus is also tied to the body via HEXIS, which is comprised of the individual’s habitual and socially meaningful embodied stances and gestures, amongst other non-linguistic ways of physical self-presentation. Language, from Bourdieu’s perspective, is, thus, merely one practice in which habitus is embedded. Bourdieu actually defines a subset of habitus, called linguistic habitus, which is a set of dispositions that are acquired as individuals learn to speak within particular social contexts. Bourdieu views language as, to use his economic metaphor, operating within a marketplace, exchanged by agents who, themselves, are characterized by their position within the hierarchical social structure. Thus, while any speaker might possess the ability or competence to utter a sentence, not every speaker has the authority to compel others to listen, and it is the authority or power that is imposed by those who define
legitimate language within the social milieu that ultimately determines what space people occupy, and the value people (society) place on their own utterances.

Bourdieu’s theory is, therefore, useful for the analysis of identity in that it provides a view of language as linked to other social dimensions, such as authority or position within the social structure. Language practices cannot be viewed as apart from the social environment or other social practices.

Like Bourdieu, De Certeau shares a view of language as embedded in social structure. De Certeau, as does Bourdieu, views all social practices, linguistic and non-linguistic practices, as having similar social roles. It can be argued, however, that whereas Bourdieu deems practice to be a reproduction of social structure, De Certeau, like other social scientists who followed Bourdieu, (Bruner, 1990; Fairclough, 1989; 1995; Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner & Cain, 1998; Scott, 1985; Wenger, 1998) perceives the individual as more agentive, thereby conceiving of the individual as having a greater capability of challenging the social status quo. This study will examine discourses and practices as they both contribute to the reinforcement of pre-existing social hierarchies as well as demonstrate resistance to these structures.

A social practice framework was chosen for the current study for various reasons, which I will now outline. First and foremost, I adopt the view that identities are not frozen, static, or predetermined; rather, they are fluid and emerge through practice. Through social interaction, and linguistic practices, speakers’ multiple identities are shifted and negotiated, influenced simultaneously by the opposing forces of social structure and speaker agency. The social practice perspective allows for the analysis of
identity in this fashion since at its foundation it recognizes practice as the motivating context for linguistic interaction, thus acknowledging the emergence of the self through practice.

Second, in valuing the individual’s actions and agency as a unit of analysis, as opposed to the predetermined group as a whole, such as that preferred by the speech community model, a social practice model allows for a more accurate analysis of individual variation, or style. In other words, the practice model does not demote the action of the individual to instantiating the acts of the group as a whole; rather, it perceives individual practices as worthy of analysis in their own right, whether or not such practices are aligned with the group. As argued by Johnstone (1996), style derives from individual’s agency and the linguistic choices individuals make to present the self. This is what I aim to capture in the current study.

Third, as Bucholtz (1999) points out, the ethnographic approach employed with a social practice perspective considers individual speakers’ perspectives of their own practices key to the analysis. In this way, Bucholtz (1999) describes ethnography as “participant-driven rather than analyst-driven” (p. 8). She states, “Where the speech community frame-work is skeptical of speakers’ perspectives on their own practices, ethnography makes local interpretations central to the analysis” (p. 8). In the current analysis of SHL learner identity and ideologies in the SHL classroom, the learners’ own views of their linguistic behavior as well as that of others is of critical value in interpreting what identities SHL learners construct. As will be shown, SHL learners engage in and resist particular linguistic practices in the construction of identity as they
identify themselves with or distinguish themselves from particular identities. Ideologies of language also interact with this dynamic process, as beliefs pertaining to linguistic practices influence how individuals identify themselves and others, resulting in the intersection of identity, ideology and agency. Overall, ethnography combined with a social practice perspective is most adequate for the study of the construction and negotiation of identities and ideologies because it allows for the analysis of how agency and structure interact. This study seeks to examine, as put forth by Bucholtz (1999), “both the actions of individuals and the structures that are thereby produced and reproduced, resisted and subverted” (p. 207).

Language and Identity

Language and identity are inextricably linked in a dynamic, dialectical relationship in which each continually contributes to the construction of the other. As Ochs (1990, 1993) explains, as an individual constructs his/her identity, his/her identity is at the same time co-constructed by others through the process of social interaction. This process, Ochs (1993) describes, takes place through the performance of particular social acts, or goal-oriented behaviors, and the display of certain stances, or ideological positions (p. 288). Below I discuss in detail the process of identity construction as explained from various scholars’ perspectives.

As discussed in Chapter 1, it is important to acknowledge that the construction of identity is connected to larger social constructs (Mendoza-Denton, 2002). Identity performances do not take place in one isolated context, rather they are defined and
contested by social and political organization in multiple different contexts. This is the “multidimensional sociolinguistic space”, as referred to by Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985), through which speakers move as they perform acts of identity and simultaneously search for social roles. In navigating through this “space”, speakers engage in linguistic practices, constructing multiple identities by accommodating their speech to different situations, interlocutors and topics of conversation according to their needs for different identities. Identity performance is, therefore, characterized by speakers’ continual shifting of identities to the degrees needed in the construction of their personal, political and cultural identities.

This shifting of identities can also be explained by Butler’s (1993, 1997) concept of performative acts of identity. In Butler’s model, an individual’s identity is constructed through his/her own actions yet is in a constant process of negotiation with the identities imposed by other interlocutors’ practices and perceptions of identity. In the same way, Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) explain the negotiation quality of identity in their explanation of identity construction as a discursive process that involves interaction with others but ultimately involves processes of negotiation that are internal to the speaker. In other words, through the internal process of self-definition, speakers are continually accepting, rejecting and negotiating imposed identities that they encounter through interaction. Identity construction is thereby a complex, bidirectional process that is in a continual state of negotiation and (re)negotiation, both internally and externally.

In addition, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller’s (1985) research in language contact situations has revealed the creative nature of speakers’ linguistic practices in the process
of identity construction. Le Page and Tabouret-Keller’s study of Creole speakers in the West Indies demonstrates how speakers can “play” with language, for example, switching codes, in the process of performing their multiple identities. In this way, speaker creativity can be viewed as a result of speakers’ agency, as speakers become active agents of their social and linguistic behavior. Again, it is one of the principal aims of this study to describe how SHL learners act as agents of their own linguistic practices as they construct their various social and ethnic identities. I am interested in discovering what creative practices these learners engage in as members of a community formally studying their heritage language in the university SHL program.

Once again, to recall Pavlenko and Blackledge’s (2004) discussion of identity, they identify three types of identities: (1) imposed identities (which are non-negotiable in a particular time and place); (2) assumed identities (which are accepted and not negotiated); and (3) negotiable identities (which are contested by groups and individuals) (p. 21).

Thus, Pavlenko and Blackledge’s (2004) model suggests that individual speakers possess varying degrees of agency in the construction of identity. This is because identities are constructed through dominant discourses (political, legal, etc.) and are informed by the social hierarchies and hegemonic forces in the socio-political context at that moment in time. This category would include certain labels, for example, imposed on speakers regardless of how they feel about them and whether or not they agree with them. For example, a Spanish heritage learner may be identified as any of the following labels, ‘foreigner’, ‘person that can’t speak English or Spanish’, ‘minority’, or ‘illegal
immigrant’. These labels are imposed by others, whether or not the speakers themselves self-identify as such, and all of which is facilitated by discursive forces such as the mass media coverage and political speeches.

On the other hand, assumed identities are those not contested by individuals because they are so repeatedly expressed in dominant discourses that they are perceived as legitimized, for example, that as speakers of a U.S. variety, they are somehow inferior to speakers of other varieties of language. Finally, negotiable identities are those in which individuals can exercise the highest degree of agency. Individuals may challenge and reject negotiable identities and choose to identify in another way, thereby, exercising agency. For example, Spanish heritage speakers may identify with a particular identity, such as being fully bilingual, and take steps to acquire this identity. The speaker may decide to formally study the heritage language to achieve this goal.

The Intersection of Identity and Ideology

Pavlenko and Blackledge’s (2004) model described above brings to light a critical aspect in the analysis of identity, which is how language ideologies inform linguistic practices in the construction of identity. As already discussed, dominant ideologies are communicated, disseminated and propagated in discourses that are often perceived as seemingly neutral and, thus, largely go unchallenged (Foucault, 1972). These discourses are embedded in unequal power structures and influence individuals’ attitudes as well as actions, including the negotiation and legitimization of particular
identities. For example, Bucholtz and Hall (2004) describe how ideology and linguistic practices of identity interconnect:

Ideology is the level at which practice enters the field of representation. Indexicality mediates between ideology and practice, producing the former through the latter. Performance is the highlighting of ideology, through the foregrounding of practice. Yet it is also important to keep these processes conceptually distinct. What we find repeatedly in studies of language and identity is a clear difference between cultural ideologies and social practices: cultural beliefs about how people of various social backgrounds should, must, or do speak and act (generated through indexicality) are generally reductive and inflexible while the actual linguistic and social practices in which people engage in specific social contexts (including the display of practices of performance) are highly complex and strategic. (pp. 381-382)

The SHL learners in the current study in the process of working toward the goal of learning more of the heritage language, interact with each other and the instructor in the classroom, while at the same time they assimilate and negotiate ideologies expressed by the textbook, the class instructor, the SHL program in general, as well as those they are exposed to outside the university context, such as in the broader border community of Tucson, Arizona, the United States, and the world. Through discourses, these learners are exposed to ideologies about how they “should, must and do speak and act”, as Bucholtz and Hall (2004) explain above. For example, SHL learners in the classroom, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4, are exposed to ideologies about the value of Spanish in the ever more globalized world, as well as ideologies about the value of standard vs. non-standard varieties of Spanish. These ideologies may influence the way they perceive and use language and the way they identify themselves. In examining the interactions of these intermediate SHL learners who, as members of the SHL course, share common goals related to the formal study of Spanish and the development of their
language skills in the language of their heritage and culture, we can examine how learners develop similar ways of speaking and viewing language, and how they negotiate discourses and their place in the Spanish-speaking world. As Desjarlais (1997) suggests, the social, political and cultural dynamics of a specific place and time are what contribute to the creation of agency (cited in Ahearn, 2001). Thus, the current study seeks also to examine how language ideologies may be implicated in SHL learners’ agency and identity formation. After all, amongst the multitude of influential factors that constrain language, language ideologies and relations of power serve as the mediating links between social structures and ways of speaking (Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994). Thus, they should not be ignored in investigating heritage language learning.

Previous Studies on Language and Identity amongst Bilinguals and Language Learners

As mentioned in the Introduction, much of the previous sociolinguistic research that has investigated language and identity has done so from an essentialist perspective (see Mendoza-Denton, 2002), relying on fixed categories such as gender and socio-economic class to explain identity. While these types of studies provide invaluable information about language patterns and language change across various social factors from a macro perspective, a practice-based approach to the study of identity can provide a micro view of how language practices and discourses interact in a dynamic process to shape multiple identities. The study of identity should also include issues of relations of power and social values, social contexts and social membership.
One of the most pertinent sociolinguistic studies among Spanish bilinguals in the U.S. that takes on this more comprehensive and dynamic approach to the study of identity is Zentella’s (1997) ethnographic study of girls in a Puerto Rican neighborhood of New York City, El Bloque. Her study focused on the children’s varying degrees of bilingualism and the linguistic behaviors that marked their multiple identities in various ways. Zentella demonstrates how the identity of the residents of el Bloque involved processes of acculturation and resistance. As agents in the formation and (re)construction of their identity, the children negotiated and resisted identities imposed by others.

One of the principal ways in which the children in her study participated in performative acts of identity was through code switching. As Zentella (1997) notes, “Every time they said something in one language when they might just as easily have said it in the other, they were re-connecting with people, occasions, settings, and power configurations from their history of past interactions, and imprinting their own “acts of identity” (p. 114). Zentella’s research demonstrates the various reasons for language code choices, which include a combination of the interlocutor’s language competence, ‘on the spot factors’ and the psychological setting. Code switching was also used as a discursive resource, or conversation strategy. Zentella identifies three major conversational strategies employed by the bilingual children in negotiating meaning: footing, clarification and/or emphasis, and crutch-like code mixing. While some of the switches children made were the result of either a temporary lapse in recalling a particular word, what she refers to as “crutching”, or a complete lack of knowledge of a
given word, code switching in *El Bloque* was characterized as the children’s natural way of interacting with each other. Code switching was commonly used by children of *El Bloque* to employ conversational strategies, construct their membership in *El Bloque* and to continually assert and reassert their dual cultural identity by touching on both languages in discourses. In the words of Zentella (1997), “Their code switching was a way of saying that they belonged to both worlds, and should not be forced to give up one for the other” (p. 114).

Like Zentella, Gonzales Velásquez (1995) analyzes the linguistic practices of a bilingual female community, but among Chicanas in New Mexico. Her study importantly elucidates the factors in language choice and identifies in-group and out-group membership as playing a vital role in the women’s choice of code. Specifically, she discusses how interlocutors influence the negotiation of identity and who is a member and who is not a member of a particular group. Her research emphasizes the dialectical nature of identity formation, and the close ties this process has with the perceptions of other participants in the social interaction.

Each of these studies shows how code choice is influenced by political and social forces; language choice depends on the setting and participants. Code switching is used as a conversational resource in the construction of multiple identities (social, political, ethnic/cultural, linguistic, etc.), to signal his/her perception of him/herself and his/her interpersonal relations with others. This agrees with multiple scholars’ social constructionist perspective of identity discussed in detail above as well as Myers-Scotton (2002), Auer (1998) and Dickers’ (1996) assertions that through code switching
individuals construct different identities and signal group membership or group identity by converging to or diverging from the addressers’ choice of code. These studies also clearly exemplify how individuals’ agency is linked to the sociohistorical context in which language acts are performed.

Miller’s (2004) ethnographic study of ESL students in Australia integrating into a local school demonstrated the importance of speakers’ language competence to the negotiation of an identity in English. Her study showed how migrant students often struggle to become authorized members of the mainstream and how the practice of speaking English was a step toward recognition in mainstream contexts for these learners so they could be heard as legitimate speakers of English. Miller refers to a few essential concepts that are important for students to be able to negotiate their identities through language in the school setting. The first is Giroux’s (1992) concept of voice. This notion is concerned with speakers’ agency and how speakers are rendered voiceless in certain contexts, silenced by intimidation. As Giroux explains, a racializing practice occurs within schools in which the voices of subordinate groups are silenced since their cultural capital is marginalized or degraded by the dominant culture of schooling. Miller relates this concept to the children of her study who do not speak the dominant variety of English, the so-called unmarked or unaccented form, and as a result, lack the symbolic resources that would lead them to the social and academic rewards. Gee (1996), in his analysis of ESL and social identity, also refers to this notion, calling it sounding right. It is through ways of speaking that identity is negotiated; thus, without the ability to sound and be heard as similar to the dominant majority, these students lack social currency in
the dominant marketplace. Miller (2004: 312) refers to this ability to sound and be heard as *audibility*, or the ability to speak “loudly enough, and in a variety of the discourse that can be readily understood and acknowledged by other speakers” and stresses that it is a critical part of being considered a legitimate member in the mainstream context, considering the discursive, contextualized nature of identity.

Miller’s analysis points to the important issues of language as a form of symbolic capital and social membership. In the context of the current study, SHL learners achieve *audibility* via the kinds of linguistic practices they engage in. Engaging in linguistic practices such as code switching in the social context amongst other SHL learners, SHL learners co-construct their identity with other members of the group. In this way, they construct themselves as ‘insiders’ (Gee, 1996). The linguistic practices shared by the learners of the SHL class (e.g. code switching) have high value or symbolic capital in this market. In other social contexts, other linguistic practices have value and provide *voice* or *audibility*. In the SHL classroom, for instance, other linguistic practices have symbolic capital, such as the use of “standard” Spanish. SHL learners thus partake in a dynamic interaction between language use, social context and social membership. This concept is represented by the below diagram (adapted from Miller, 2004):
Also examining social identity and discourses, McKay and Wong’s (1996) study deals with Chinese adolescents learning English as a second language and the ways in which students’ English language use was reinforced or hindered by social discourses, including Chinese nationalist, racialized immigrant, school and gender discourses. In this microanalysis, it was the case of one particular participant of the study from Mainland China who, as a result of anti-immigrant and colonialist discourses in the school environment, felt he could not compete with his more affluent and socially accepted Taiwanese peers. The authors describe the student’s poor proficiency in English with his inability to construct a socially valued identity and lack of investment in the language due to constant downward social positioning by his peers and teachers.
This study, thus, reveals the critical nature of the construction of a positive social identity and its influence on the learner’s relationship to language and the learner’s success in attaining the language.

Another important study on learner identity in second language acquisition is Pomerantz’s (2001) investigation of learners of Spanish as a foreign language. Pomerantz examined how different identities available to the foreign language learner are organized in relation to each other and how learners with a limited linguistic repertoire in the target language access and negotiate particular social identities. Her research revealed interesting findings relating to how students’ patterns of language use were dependent upon the students’ conceptions of themselves as “good” or “bad” language learners. When students possessed positive identities and viewed themselves as successful and competent users of Spanish in the classroom, they had access to a greater range of linguistic structuring resources. Pomerantz demonstrates that “what it means to be a successful, competent, or legitimate user of Spanish is steeped in social and power relations” and that “the range of potential identities available in a given situation and the value of these identities may delimit how people experience and use the target language” (pp. 280-1).

In a similar fashion, Peirce’s (1993) study of immigrant women in Toronto, Canada revealed the complex social practice implicated in the construction of identity through second language use of English. Based on Bourdieu’s conceptualization of competence as the right to command a listener and the power to impose reception, Peirce demonstrated that her participants’ language use was conditioned by inequitable
relations of power relating to gender, social class and ethnicity. Such inequalities in power relations made the use of English undesirable in certain contexts, as speakers felt restricted in their right to use English. This echoes Miller’s discussion of silencing due to her notion of *audibility* and Gee’s (1996) concept of *sounding right*. Peirce (1993) explains this relationship of power and authority in terms of investment:

The notion of investment… conceives of the language learner as having a complex social history and multiple desires. The notion presupposes that when language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers, but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world. Thus an “investment” in the target language is also an investment in a learner’s own social identity, an identity which is constantly changing across time and space. Thus learner’s investment in the target may be complex, contradictory, and in a constant state of flux (p. 17).

Peirce’s (1993) study and the concept of investment has important implications for the analysis of the negotiation of identity amongst Spanish heritage language learners in the current study because of the complex social structure and power relations surrounding the minority status of the Spanish language in the U.S. as well as the unequal status of the local variety of Spanish, as compared to the standard variety. Peirce’s study addresses the issue of learner’s access to linguistic resources, which will render it interesting to examine how this concept applies to heritage learners who, while typically have more access to linguistic resources when compared to traditional foreign language learners, also experience at a very different level the unequal power status attached to the variety of language that they are so personally connected to. In addition, Peirce’s discussion of the influence of the learner’s desire to learn the target language is also relevant to the current study, whose participants have various motivations to
“invest” in the Spanish language and the academic or standard variety of Spanish, all of which is influenced by the learner’s language competence, the relationship between the language and the learner’s family history and ethnic identity.

Finally, Potowski (2004, 2007) investigated language learning and identity among adolescents in a dual immersion program, a program that promotes the learning of English as a Second Language in addition to maintaining the students’ first language if it is a language other than English. Potowski’s (2007) ethnographic study examined these students’ Spanish and English language use in the classroom, as well as among four focal students, as they progressed from the fifth to the eighth grade. In terms of identity investments amongst Potowski’s (2007) eighth grade participants, she found that creating and performing social and linguistic identities is at the center of the development of language. Potowski found that when speakers feel that their language and culture are valued, they are more likely to identify themselves as members of the cultural group. On the other hand, when speakers feel their language is stigmatized and their cultural inheritance devalued, they are less willing to be identified with the language, whether they be L1 or L2 speakers. Overall, Potowski found that a combination of students’ resistance to use Spanish in the classroom, and evident opposition among peers, some school authorities and family members, led to an elimination of her eighth grade participants’ investment in the Spanish language. Such evidence demonstrates the importance of students building positive connections with the language and culture. The current study will examine SHL learners’ relationship to the heritage language and how identities and discourses of language are negotiated through
practices that members of this SHL class engage in. One of the important connections between language and culture is ethnicity, which will be discussed in the following section.

Language and Ethnicity

Regarding ethnicity, the ideological relationship between ethnic identity and language is a powerful one. In fact, ethnicity and language are often viewed as two sides of the same coin. As described by Anzaldúa (1990: 207), “Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity—I am my language.” While language proficiency has proven not to be a trustworthy indicator of an individual’s ethnicity, it is not uncommon for individuals to be considered outsiders of a particular ethnic group due to either a lack of language skills or the way in which they speak. Below I detail important studies that have been conducted on language and ethnic identity in particular.

Rampton’s (1991, 1995, 1998) research has focused on the construction and negotiation of identity amongst multilingual adolescent peers. His research shows that speakers with various degrees of expertise in the languages of his participants were able to draw from their linguistic repertoires to negotiate particular identities. This is evident particularly in Rampton’s (1995) study of crossing, which he defines as “code alternation by people who are not accepted members of the group associated with the second language they employ. It is concerned with switching into languages that are not generally thought to belong to you” (p. 280). His ethnographic study of teens in a multiethnic London neighborhood revealed how speakers “cross” into different language
varieties, specifically how: 1) White and Panjabi adolescents cross into Creole, 2) Black and White adolescents cross into Panjabi, and 3) White, Black and Panjabi adolescents cross into a stylized learner variety of English as a second language. Rampton (1998) argues that speakers cross into an additional language in order to test out their interlocutors’ identities or construct new ones (p. 300).

The fact that Rampton (1998) demonstrates that speakers with varying linguistic competence are capable of accessing their linguistic repertoires to assert and construct identities has important implications for the current study, whose participants possess diverse levels of Spanish linguistic and stylistic competence. Although these learners are at the intermediate course level in Spanish, and maintain differences in their linguistic knowledge and skills, they still provide a very interesting source of study for research centered on the construction of identity. Specifically, in studying Spanish in the academic context, they are exposed to discourses about the value of different varieties of language, promoted by the class instructor, textbook and SHL program, as they simultaneously strive to learn the variety of language being taught in the classroom. These intermediate learners are, thus, in a process of negotiating the linguistic knowledge they already possess from home and/or the community with new linguistic knowledge that is strongly tied to power relations. How they absorb and negotiate this knowledge and how it pertains to their own language and ethnicity is an important part of their acquisition of a new variety of language.

As Rampton has demonstrated the dynamic aspect of identity amongst adolescent youth in London, Foster’s (1995) examination of language use by African
American women in the classroom also reveals the fluidity of ethnic identity. In her study, Foster shows how the instructor manages different style shifts, from mainstream to African American Vernacular styles, in order to reach different communicative goals. In doing so, the instructor relays to students the importance of possessing competence in both non-Black and Black speech communities.

As part of a larger study, Foster (1990, 1991a, b) interviewed four African American teachers who, once comfortable with the researcher, code-switched from Standard English to African American Vernacular English during the interviews. Code-switching was performed to highlight statements as well as to report quotations made by others. Foster found that the frequency and use of code-switching varied according to the geographical region in which the participants grew up. Following Myers-Scotton’s description of marked vs. unmarked code-switching, Foster argues that teachers’ code-switching observed during the interviews were cases of marked code-switching, in which the speakers switched codes for the purpose of expressing affective meanings, solidarity and a shared identity with the listener. Foster explains how this code-switching behavior also reveals speakers’ expression of power and their attempt to resist the hegemony of public discourse.

Likewise, Bucholtz (1995), in her study of “passing” and ethnic identity amongst mixed-race women, demonstrates how language is used as a conscious portrayal of the self, and specifically addresses how linguistic practices can be used to resist particular identities. The women in her study, through language, express particular identities and reject others, often times resisting racist social structures. For example, one participant
in her study is able to obtain a job at Disneyland as the “ethnic” character Princess Jasmine, because her physical appearance allows her to pass for an Arab, while she is actually Mexican-American. In this job position, the participant sometimes speaks Spanish to children at the theme park, who are immediately surprised by her Latino ethnicity, having perceived her as an Arab. Bucholtz importantly argues that by asserting herself as the character Princess Jasmine, rather than opting for an invisible and subordinate position in the theme park, this participant resists ethnic as well as gender stereotypes. This challenging of ethnic expectations is accomplished in part by her use of the Spanish language, which calls attention to her Mexican-American identity. Finally, Bucholtz notes the financial and symbolic benefits the participant gains through her construction of identity as Mexican-American, and the resultant deconstruction of the character Jasmine, achieved through language.

Foster’s and Bucholtz’s research have shown the fluidity of social identity through speakers’ use of language for different communicative ends and to achieve multiple social meanings. It is this goal of this study to investigate how SHL learners assert and negotiate particular identities, especially bilingual and ethnic identities, and how ideologies that emerge through discourses may be implicated in this process.

Enacting Identity amongst SHL learners

In my search to examine how SHL learners conceptualize their identity, I ask how they perceive the relationship between language and identity, how they negotiate their multiple identities through practice, and through what linguistic and other social
practices their identities are constructed. Most importantly and with profound implications for SHL teaching, I ask how identity negotiation is implicated in the process of acquiring the heritage language.

As discussed in the review of theoretical concepts behind the study of identity and the findings of previous research studies on language and identity, the construction of identity is understood as a fluid, dynamic process that takes place through social interaction. Performances of identity are related to the socio-historical context and are embedded in ideological stances and relations of power. As outlined by Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004), however, speakers can and do exercise agency in the construction of certain negotiable identities. This study therefore seeks evidence of how this particular group of SHL learners, although a heterogeneous group of individuals, accepts, negotiates and sometimes even challenges particular identities imposed by hegemonic forces. Also of interest is individual style, how members of the SHL class demonstrate their own creativity in practice. In the sections that follow, data from student participants will be presented to highlight both performances of identity found through practice as well as students’ own perspectives of the relationship between language and their identity.

Language and Identity: SHL Learner Perspectives

Through my observations and interactions with the SHL learners throughout the course meetings, presentations, interviews and focus group discussions, it became evident that the majority of the SHL learners in my study feel a very strong connection
between the Spanish language and their identity. Spanish is not just the language they speak, it is an integral part of who they are and what from their perspective defines them as members of the Hispanic community.

In the below fragment of a focus group interaction, the topic of conversation is the connection between the Spanish language and identity, initiated by a commentary on the question of what role language plays in the assimilation to U.S. culture. From this dialogue, it is evident that the students view the Spanish language as having cultural and traditional connections that bring them closer to and unite them with their family and heritage. In considering the possibility of losing their family language, the students express what Spanish means to them. One of the participants, Gilberto, mentions, also, why he wants to pass the language onto his children in the future.

Example (1)

1 Gilberto: pero también es bueno uno también se quede en … digo el español pa’ mi es mi tradición (.1) es mi cultura es es este

significa

(.1) me verifica de donde vengo… me entiende↑ el español↓

2 Researcher: uh huh

3 Gilberto: pero en este mundo en () de ser freedom of speech yo creo que language (.1) la lengua está incluido en ese freedom of speech.

So (.1) usted entiende↑ so es lo que yo pienso

4 Angelica: a lo mejor también piensan las personas es que dicen que solo inglés, porque dicen que el idioma es la forma, si te quieren
quitar el idioma es porque quieren quitarte tu identidad o quieren quitarte tu cultura ↓ o sea a lo mejor ellos también se sienten ofendidos de que nosotros estemos hablando español ok y dónde va a quedar el inglés después ↓

5 Andrés: yeah (.1) eso es lo que yo pienso ↓ quizás para hacer ()

6 Ana: pero es lo mismo con nosotros (.1) o sea nosotros hablamos español como no nos vamos a dejar que se nos olvide el español (.1) por qué ↑ porque es somos nosotros no nos vamos a quedar nosotros sin el español ↓

7 Gilberto: pero también la las celebraciones de de de nuestra familia es por ejemplo yo soy primera generación (.1) first generation en los Estados Unidos (.1) este nací en México pero you know primera generación… generation pues que fui criado aquí en los Estados Unidos y cuando yo tenga hijos este voy a tratar de hablarles español también para que puedan entender eso es lo que tratamos de hacer en nuestra casa (.1) mi mamá y mi papá hablan puro español ↓ Mi mamá habla inglés pero no no no lo practica pues y mis hermanas (.1) la mitad de mis hermanas hablan español y la mitad hablan (.1) son bilingües y se nota la diferencia de uno uno de cómo uno fue criado a otro (.1) de cómo uno fue creciendo ↓ como mi sobrino más este grande él (.1) él habla (.1) él (.1) yo y el podemos tener una conversación
bien (.1) pero yo sé que cuando mis sobrinos chiquitos crezcan
va a ser difícil tratar de (.1)que ellos puedan hablar conmigo el
español pues (.1) sí me entiende†

8 Researcher:  sí (.1) uh huh

9 Ana:  es lo que a mí también me da como (.1) como mucho he conocido
personas de que se sienten mal de que (1.) dicen por qué mis
papás no me enseñaron español si yosoy hispano† o sea ellos
son de México o de cualquier parte y ellos hablan español (.1) y
yo no más hablo inglés si yo también vengo de ahí por qué no me
enseñaron (.1) también ellos (.1) o sea también es bueno que les
enseñen desde chiquititos el el los dos idiomas↓

In this excerpt, the themes of language (idioma, lengua, español, language,
bilingües) are frequently repeated alongside various references to origin or ethnicity
(México, hispano, primera generación, first generation en los Estados Unidos, de donde
vengo) and culture (tradición, cultura, familia), demonstrating the clear relationship
these students view between the language, culture and their identity. Ana insists in turn
4 that if people want to take away your language (idioma), it is that they want to take
away your identity (identidad) and your culture (cultura). And in turn 9, Ana
comments on how friends of hers whose parents never taught them Spanish feel bad;
they question why their parents did not teach them Spanish if they are Hispanic. Here
we can see how a lack of ability to speak the language throws into question one’s
identity. Ana brings up the point that some of her Hispanic friends who do not speak
Spanish compare themselves to those born in Mexico and do speak Spanish. They struggle with understanding how if they, too, are from Mexico, they were never taught the Spanish language. Seeing how this issue has affected some of her friends, Ana draws the conclusion in turn 9 that it is indeed a good idea that parents teach their children both languages from a young age. We can see how this experience, combined with her knowledge from her own upbringing, has influenced her attitudes about the Spanish language and its importance to the identity of Hispanics.

Also, during the second focus group discussion, the following conversation arose out of the question of whether someone can be considered Hispanic if he/she does not speak Spanish, demonstrating once again the strong connection students feel between language and identity:

Example (2)

1 Researcher: ¿Qué opinan de que hay mucha gente hispana que no puede hablar español↑

2 Guadalupe: No es su culpa↓

3 Researcher: No es su culpa↑

4 Guadalupe: Uhm no estoy diciendo que sea culpa de los padres también porque muchas veces tenían las mejores intenciones en mente para sus hijos (.1) por ejemplo yo tenía una maestra que era méxico-americana (.1) y ella siempre le culpó a sus padres que nunca le enseñaron bien el español porque sus padres tenían miedo que la gente la iba a juzgar si hablaba español así es que
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ellos vinieron a los Estados Unidos para empezar de nuevo y para que ellos pudieran uh criar a sus hijos como americanos para que tuvieran mejores oportunidades (.1) porque pensaban que si miraban a sus hijos como mexicanos no iban a tener las mismas oportunidades↓ Los estaban tratando de proteger pero al final le quitaron una herencia que era bien bien valiosa↓

5 Researcher: Uh huh

6 Gracia: a mí ( ) que dijiste (.1) pero porque yo tenía una maestra que eran mexicanos sus papás y hablan español pero ella lo negaba por completo (.1) decía que ella era americana, “no hablo español, cómo puedes pensar eso↑” Pues y se le notaba que era mexicana (.1) pero era muy ay no sé uhm se me hacía una cosa tan fea que negara que es mexicana (.1) especialmente a sus papás que sí hablan español (.1) se me hacía muy feo pero si no saben el español como dicen no es su culpa pero pues dependiendo de la persona es como lo tomé hay unos que “ay español (.1) cómo puede ser↑ no yo no lo hablo” y hay otros que nunca lo aprendieron↓

From this exchange, we can see that Guadalupe feels that it is not the fault of Hispanic children for not having learned Spanish if their parents did not teach them Spanish. As this student explains, most parents who make this choice to not teach their children Spanish do so with the best intentions. They want nothing less than success for their
children, or *mejores oportunidades*. Guadalupe understands the parents’ belief that if their children are viewed as Mexicans, they will not the same opportunities, and, thus, sees the connection to social inequality. Rather importantly, while she understands this perspective, she also recognizes that these parents have deprived their children of a very valuable heritage: the Spanish language.

Additionally, Gracia contrasts this situation when she describes a teacher she had in school whose parents were Mexican, but who denied her Mexican identity. This is a fact that Gracia clearly expresses as *ugly*. The teacher, she explains, identified herself as American, and when asked if she spoke Spanish, she questioned why she would be asked such a question, negating her Mexican heritage and language. This is unacceptable in Gracia’s view, since the Mexican heritage and language should be embraced, not denied.

And in another instance during the second focus group discussion, when discussing the idea of whether English should be established as the official language of the United States, Guadalupe responds that it would be a mistake:

Example (3)

1 Guadalupe: Pienso que es un (.1) sería un error porque hay muchos uhm hay muchas uhm muchas culturas aquí en los Estados Unidos y es como *robarle una parte de la identidad a alguien cómo se comunica uno forma gran parte de eso*

2 Researcher: uh huh

3 Guadalupe: y no es justo
She describes that taking someone’s language away is like stealing a part of someone’s identity, since how someone communicates is a big part of one’s identity. It would be unfair to do so. From this analysis of students’ opinions on this matter, it appears that they trace a clear connection between the Spanish language and their ethnic identity.

Enacting a Bilingual Identity through Code-switching and Loanwords

The linguistic repertoire of this group of SHL learners is both diverse and multi-faceted. Speakers utilize a variety of linguistic features that reflect the sociolinguistic and sociocultural reality of a language contact situation where strong distinctions between Spanish and English do not necessarily exist. Undoubtedly, the most manifest identity marker observed in my data is the use of code-switching between Spanish and English accompanied by the use of loanwords and calques. This is what the participants in my study themselves call Spanglish. Defining Spanglish has been a subject of disagreement and difficulty, with the term itself having become rather loaded and controversial, recently even inspiring academic debate amongst linguists themselves (see Otheguy, 2007). This was even the topic of discussion at the Spanish in the U.S. Conference held at Florida International University in February 2009, in which Otheguy and Zentella defended their differing opinions on the subject. Often conceived of as a form of Spanish with much interference from English, it is frequently a stigmatized form associated with the uneducated or those of the lower socio-economic class, which as Zentella (1997) points out has led to the view of Spanglish as a deformed or corrupt

\[ \text{I use the term “Spanglish” because that is the precise term that the student participants of my study use in referring to their own language use.} \]
form of Spanish. In their public debate, Zentella argued that the so-called “Spanglish” is in itself a separate language variety, whereas Otheguy insisted it was only the use of two separate codes. Other linguists present at the conference argued both for and against use of the term, provided its positive and negative connotations. For many, as Zentella argued, Spanglish is a source of pride, while for others, the term would only bring negativity and prejudice. While recognizably spoken by millions of Hispanics in the U.S., there is still little consensus today about what Spanglish exactly is, linguistically speaking, and what the future holds for it. For the purposes of this study, I will refer to the language variety of the student participants of my study as a variety of U.S. Spanish. As mentioned, however, “Spanglish” is the term that the participants themselves use when they describe how they speak.

Once again, the language spoken by my student participants is characterized by code-switching and code-mixing between varieties of English and Spanish as well the exhibition of linguistic phenomena such as borrowings, loanwords, calques, and semantic extensions. Before further describing these terms, it is important to note that while even amongst the population of Hispanic speakers in the U.S. there is phonetic, lexical, syntactic variation (for example, the language spoken by Hispanic speakers in Miami differs from that spoken in New York, Chicago or Texas), the more general characteristics described above pertain to contact varieties of U.S. Spanish. Below I define some of the linguistic concepts associated with U.S. Spanish, before moving on to examples from my data.

Code-switching, as defined by Gumperz (1982) is defined as: “the juxtaposition
within the same speech exchange of passages belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (p. 59). Another definition of code-switching is offered by Poplack and Meechan (1998): “the juxtaposition of sentences or sentence fragments, each of which is internally consistent with the morphological and syntactic (and optionally, phonological) rules of the language of its provenance” (p. 132.) An important aspect of Poplack and Meechan’s definition is that code-switching should be recognized as being governed by grammar rules, rather than an unsystematic usage of more than one code. Code-switching can occur both inter-sententially and intra-sententially. As discussed earlier in this chapter, code-switching is a natural phenomenon in any bilingual community, and an identity marker for Hispanic bilinguals in the United States.

Lexical borrowing, on the other hand, is referred to as, “the incorporation of a lexical item from one language into another, with only the recipient system operative” (Poplack and Meechan, 1998: 129). Thus, loanwords are patterned exactly with the syntax of the recipient language.

Below are some loanword verbs that are found in U.S. varieties of Spanish (adapted from Roca, 2005b, p. 54). As can been seen from the comparisons to English in this list, these lexical borrowings maintain systematicity and order.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Standard Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atachar</td>
<td>To attach</td>
<td>Adjuntar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alocar</td>
<td>To allocate</td>
<td>Asignar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baquiar</td>
<td>To go back</td>
<td>Retroceder, regresar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilear</td>
<td>To bill</td>
<td>Cargar, cobrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipear</td>
<td>To beep</td>
<td>Llamar por el “busca” (buscador)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chusar</td>
<td>To choose</td>
<td>Escoger, seleccionar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caminar el perro</td>
<td>To walk the dog</td>
<td>Sacar el perro a pasear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctar</td>
<td>To grade/correct</td>
<td>Corregir/Calificar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropear</td>
<td>To drop</td>
<td>Darse de baja, dejar, abandonar una clase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsar un cheque</td>
<td>To endorse a check</td>
<td>Endosar un cheque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espelear</td>
<td>To spell</td>
<td>Deletrear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estar supuesto (a)</td>
<td>To be supposed (to)</td>
<td>Suponerse (que)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquipearse la clase</td>
<td>To skip class</td>
<td>Escaparse de clase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faxear</td>
<td>To fax</td>
<td>Mandar un fascimil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faillear</td>
<td>To file</td>
<td>Archivar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flonquear</td>
<td>To flunk</td>
<td>Suspender (un examen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friquearse</td>
<td>To freak out</td>
<td>Asustarse, Asombrarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisar, Frisarse</td>
<td>To Freeze</td>
<td>Congelar, Congelarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guachar</td>
<td>To Watch</td>
<td>Mirar, Vigilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No) hacer una diferencia</td>
<td>(Not) to make a difference</td>
<td>Dar igual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspelear</td>
<td>To inspect</td>
<td>Inspeccionar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janquear</td>
<td>To hang around</td>
<td>Pasear, pasar el tiempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquear</td>
<td>To leak</td>
<td>Tener un salidero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonchar</td>
<td>To have lunch</td>
<td>Almorzar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llamar pa’tras</td>
<td>To call back</td>
<td>Volver la llamada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llenar la forma</td>
<td>To fill out a form</td>
<td>llenar una solicitud, planilla, formulario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llevar pa’tras</td>
<td>To take back, return</td>
<td>Devolver, regresar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manachear</td>
<td>To manage</td>
<td>Administrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapear/mopear</td>
<td>To mop</td>
<td>Limpiear el piso, trapear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meilear</td>
<td>To mail</td>
<td>Enviar, mandar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitorear</td>
<td>To monitor</td>
<td>Vigilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompear</td>
<td>To pump</td>
<td>Bombear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English word calques are defined by Smead (2000) as Spanish words that take on the English word’s semantic meaning, thereby displacing the original Spanish meaning of the word. According to Otheguy and García (1988), calques can occur as single words or phrases and are classified by the degree of convergence or divergence in terms of both the phonological/orthographic form of the word and the semantics. Smead and Clegg (1996) analyzed English calques in a corpus of Chicano Anglicism, finding that the amount of lexical innovations in the Chicano lexicon directly attributable to English is approximately between 7% and 9%. Table 12 below contains calques and loanwords typical of U.S. varieties of Spanish (adapted from Roca 2005b, p. 35-36).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Spanish Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printear</td>
<td>To print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puchar</td>
<td>To push</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taipiear</td>
<td>To type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranquear</td>
<td>To rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regístrar para las clases</td>
<td>To register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitir</td>
<td>To submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Spanish Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imprimir</td>
<td>Empujar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escribir a máquina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clasificar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inscibirse o matricularse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someter o entregar algo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambasador</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aplicación</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apoinmen</td>
<td>Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apología</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumento</td>
<td>Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiencia</td>
<td>Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bil</td>
<td>Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biper</td>
<td>Beeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloque</td>
<td>City block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boul</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecas</td>
<td>Brakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breik</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronche</td>
<td>Brunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpeta</td>
<td>Carpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carta</td>
<td>Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidencia</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crismas</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip</td>
<td>Paper clip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conteiner</td>
<td>Container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuora</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espíquer</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estocks</td>
<td>Stocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friser</td>
<td>Feezer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganga</td>
<td>Gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grados</td>
<td>Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groserías</td>
<td>Groceries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junk o yonque</td>
<td>Junk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaiescul</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby (jobi)</td>
<td>Hpbby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingeniero</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry o londri</td>
<td>Laundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectura</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librería</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipstic</td>
<td>Lipstick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liqueo</td>
<td>Leak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magasín</td>
<td>Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapo</td>
<td>Mop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Méyor</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánacher</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcas</td>
<td>Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marqueta</td>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mofler</td>
<td>Muffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Níquel</td>
<td>Nickel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norsa</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oficina</td>
<td>Doctor’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parientes</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parqueo</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peni</td>
<td>Penny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performans</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Póliza</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populación</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registración</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risor</td>
<td>Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rula</td>
<td>Ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escor</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estarer</td>
<td>Starter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sais</td>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjeto/sujeto</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suiche</td>
<td>Switch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suceso</td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenientes</td>
<td>Tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troca</td>
<td>Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacun clíner</td>
<td>Vacuum cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarda</td>
<td>Yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 below lists some of the lexical-semantic phenomena that were repeatedly evidenced in my data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>“Standard” Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pa’atras</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>devolver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>escuela secundaria/preparatoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>army</td>
<td>army</td>
<td>ejército</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roller patín</td>
<td>roller skate</td>
<td>patinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retirado</td>
<td>retired</td>
<td>jubilado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiking</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>excursionismo/senderismo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text messages</td>
<td>text messages</td>
<td>mensaje de texto/SMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctorate</td>
<td>doctorate</td>
<td>doctorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colegio</td>
<td>college/university</td>
<td>universidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atender</td>
<td>attend</td>
<td>asistir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moverse</td>
<td>To move/change residence</td>
<td>mudarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soda</td>
<td>soda</td>
<td>refresco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirar una fiesta</td>
<td>throw a party</td>
<td>tener/hacer una fiesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realizar</td>
<td>to realize</td>
<td>darse cuenta de (que)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>escuela graduada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring break</td>
<td>spring break</td>
<td>vacaciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papel</td>
<td>paper/essay</td>
<td>trabajo/ensayo/composición</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As an example of a loanword commonly used by SHL learners in my study, in the following excerpt, I had asked Gilberto what his parents do in the U.S. after having sold their store in Mexico.

Example (4)

1 Researcher:  y qué hacen aquí ahora↑

2 Gilberto:   este (.1) mi papá está retirado (.2) tiene sesenta y (.1) y nueve

Gilberto responds that his dad has retired (*retirado*), which is a semantic extension (or *calque*, to use Otheguy and García’s or Smead and Clegg’s terminology) of the Spanish verb *retirar* (to retire/go to bed in formal Spanish). The verb *jubilarse* is the “standard” form to mean *to retire from work*. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no más</th>
<th>just/only</th>
<th>nada más/sólo/solamente</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>formas</td>
<td>forms</td>
<td>formularios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>estudiante de cuarto/último año</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>estudiante de primer año</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audiencia</td>
<td>audience</td>
<td>público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grados</td>
<td>grades</td>
<td>notas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>troque, troca</td>
<td>truck</td>
<td>camioneta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gangas</td>
<td>gangs</td>
<td>pandillas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>gobierno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring training</td>
<td>spring training</td>
<td>entrenamiento primaveral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is an example of a borrowing using the English phonological form, during an interview with Nadia:

Example (5)

1 Researcher: Cómo conociste a tu novio↑

2 Nadia: Fuimos a high school↓

In looking at the loanwords in Roca’s (2005b) table above, high school is a commonly used loanword. Other examples present in the speech of student participants in my study include senior and freshman, as seen in the below dialogue:

Example (6)

1 Gilberto: Yo tengo como dieciocho nieces and nephews↓

2 Researcher: Ah (.1) si↑ Wow=

3 Nadia: =Seriously=

4 Gilberto: =Yeah

5 Andrés: Tiene como (.1) ocho hermanas↑

6 Researcher: Wow (.1) ocho hermanas↑

7 Ana: Y él es el baby pues

8 Gilberto: Él conoce a casi todas

9 Researcher: wow (.1) wow

10 Gilberto: y mis sobrinos, el más grande, va a ir a ASU next year () fui a la

high school con él ↓ Era un senior y él era un freshmen=

11 Researcher: = uh huh wow=

12 Gilberto: = so it’s kinda weird
These borrowings have very exact referents. Also, in my own interpretation, I think if one has experienced something either for the first time or only time in a given language, that particular language will more readily accessible when referring to it. Otheguy and García (1993) refer to phenomena like these one-word contact neologisms that are part of the process of conceptual adaptation to different cultural context. They explain, “Bilinguals, known for their disregard for linguistic boundaries, simply use the culturally appropriate name for each item, irrespective of the language in which outside observers may think they are speaking” (p. 143). Such an idea traces back to Sapir (1929 [1949: 162]), who states: “no two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same worlds with different labels attached.” Thus, borrowings like high school, senior, and freshman can be conceived of as concepts that exist in the U.S. context, and for this reason are elected. In addition, the above dialogue demonstrates the students’ flexibility to express terms either in English or Spanish, as seen in Gilberto’s first line where he says nieces and nephews and a few lines later uses the term sobrinos, and also Ana’s emphatic use of baby.

Code-switching in my data occurred primarily in the interviews and focus group discussions, where the setting was less formal and more intimate. Switching occurred both intersententially and intrasententially in the data. Below is an example taken from an interview with Nadia, where she is describing how she met her boyfriend, who was a classmate of hers in high school.
Example (7)

Nadia: él se sentaba adelante como así (.3) yo me sentaba en esta mesa con mis amigos (.1) él ahí con sus amigos (.2) y actually it was the hottest thing @@@@

In examining Nadia’s switch to English above, it would not fit into Zentella’s (1997) categories of Footing, Clarification/Emphasis, or Crutching. , Nadia’s switch to English is because the coined phrase “hottest thing” is precisely what she means to say. As Zentella, herself, explains, “More important, code-switching occurs for many of the elusive reasons that prompt the selection of one synonym over another in monolingual speech: a code-switch “says it better” by capturing the meaning or expressing a point more effectively” (p. 101). Having access to both languages allows Nadia the linguistic dexterity to choose one language or the other to express her idea in the most precise manner possible. Her switching between the two languages does not indicate a lack of knowledge in one language or the other, but rather a venue through which she constructs her bilingual identity, and demonstrates the fact that she can express herself well in both languages.

A combination of loanwords and translations for clarification or emphatic purposes also occurred frequently during focus interviews with SHL student participants. For example:
Example (8)

Gilberto: so siempre me iba a diferentes como diferentes lugares este como cuando vivíamos en Anaheim mi hermano vivía antes aquí en Ari en Arizona en Arizona entonces siempre me venía pa’ cá con él y ahorita en la en la preparatoria en high school me iba para Texas con él y ha sido (.1) o me iba pa’ California porque se quedaba una hermana pero ya se mudó para acá así que no puedo ir pa’ allá

In the above dialogue, Gilberto narrates in Spanish how he used to travel back and forth between Arizona and Anaheim, California. After he says the word preparatoria he repeats the word’s translation in English, high school. While in this study I classify this as a loanword translation, following Roca (2005), Zentella (1997) classified such behavior in her data as switches for clarification/emphasis strategy. Zentella (1997) explains, “What monolinguals accomplish by repeating louder and/or slower, or with a change of wording, bilinguales can accomplish by switching languages” (p. 96). In agreement with Zentella, however, I interpret such linguistic behavior as a conversational strategy that allows Gilberto to clarify or emphasize what he has just said in the other language. These translations also occasionally occur in the reverse order.

For example:

Example (9)

Gilberto: uhm (.1) cuando estaba en high school en la preparatoria siempre este (.1) todos íbamos a practicar este pero las memorias buenas que cosas que hice pos no no no me recuerdo
And the same type of behavior occurs in the following dialogue, where Gilberto explains that he was always a teacher’s favorite growing up:

Example (10)

Gilberto: uh huh, como mi (.1) mi maestra de último año era de government de gobierno y siempre siempre enviaba text messages en en la clase mensajes de texto y siempre me decía que no, guárdalo guárdalo pero a otros se los quitaba el teléfono y no se los daba hasta el último… hasta el fin del día

In each of the above examples, Gilberto utilizes a loanword from the other language for the first utterance of the word or phrase and then repeats the translation of the word or phrase, returning to the original language of the dialogue. This demonstrates how he is able to make use of his bilingual resources and use both languages to make his message clear to the listener.

Sometimes a switch to English indicates either a lack of knowledge of a word, or a momentary lapse in memory, what Zentella (1997) refers to as Crutching. For example, Teo, in discussing the reason why he thinks English speakers (to whom he refers to as los del inglés) and Spanish speakers (los españoles) should come together, either does not know the word for pride or has momentarily forgotten it:
Example (11)

Teo: entonces por qué no se unen y hacen algo juntos, en vez de
tratar (.1) porque los dos tienen mucho pride entonces los
españoles y los de inglés y tienen mucho pride no quieren dejar su
cultura y qué van a hacer↑ no no no pueden hallar una forma de
juntarse (.1) como un esposo y una esposa me entiendes↑ son
diferentes pero se juntan↓

Overall, switches and loanwords occur in the data as bilingual practices that both
mark students bilingual identity and use of two languages as conversational resources.

Enacting Bilingual Identity through Bilingual Use of Discourse Markers

The use of English punctors, such as *you know* and *I mean*, has been found in
investigations of bilingual or contact varieties of language (Lipski, 1994; Sankoff et al.,
1997; Silva-Corvalán, 1994). Frequently, code-switching in this study’s data included
the use of the English discourse markers *so, like, you know,* and *I mean.* Sometimes the
discourse marker initiated a longer switch in English, while at other times the switch
was solely comprised of use of the discourse marker. SHL learners showed great
flexibility in their switching back and forth between discourse markers in English and
Spanish. For example, below, María describes when she met up with her cousin in
Mexicali:
Example (12)

María: He ido a Mexicali hace unos años, *like probably like 5 years ago*

(.2) y me dijo mi prima, “ay, qué pocha!” y yo estaba por qué ↑ Lo estoy hablando bien!

María’s switch to English is initiated by the English discourse marker *like*, which she repeats again during the switch. In following Zentella’s (1997) categories, this switch is really a realignment under the more general category of Footing. María makes an aside, estimating the number of years ago that the event happened, and shifts languages.

In the following example, Teo responds to Ana’s explanation of why it is important to know English, utilizing various discourse markers:

Example (13)

Teo: *I mean* entiendo… y y como 100% te entiendo y por eso I see (.1) this is my case (.2) I’ve seen people out there who speak Spanish (.1) no (.1) don’t get me wrong (.1) you (.1) everybody has different *you know* (.1) stories (.1) where their Spanish was their first language and it took it a while to learn English and then after that (.1) it’s was already *like* in high school and they were *like you know* what

Here, Teo begins his thought with the English discourse marker, *I mean*, and then switches to Spanish, and then switches back to English. All his discourse markers throughout the dialogue are in English even though he does make the switch to Spanish at one point in the dialogue. However, even when Teo maintains his speech primarily in
Spanish, like in the following example, in which he explains more about the club he is a member of, he utilizes the English discourse marker, *I mean*:

Example (14)

Teo: hacemos, muchas cosas la cosa es que tratamos de ser diferentes de otros club (.1) I mean (.1) pero hay más () o algo así

Discourse markers in Spanish occurred often in the data as well. Such discourse markers included *pos, pues, entonces, o sea, este,* and *como.* In regards to use of the word *como,* both standard and non-standard uses were found amongst participant data.

Standard classifications of *como,* as outlined by Muñoz (2007) and presented in Table 14 below, include use as an adverb, conjunction, and preposition.

**Table 14: Standard Uses of Como (from Muñoz 2007: p. 156)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Way or manner of action e.g. <em>Hazlo como te digo,</em> ‘Do it as I tell you’</th>
<th>Comparative to convey equivalence e.g. <em>Es rubio como el oro,</em> ‘He’s blonde as gold’</th>
<th>Exemplifier to introduce an instance e.g. <em>los genios como Einstein,</em> ‘geniuses such as Einstein’</th>
<th>The meaning of ‘rather’ or ‘approximately’ e.g. <em>llevo aquí como una semana,</em> ‘I’ve been here about a week’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>Causative connector with the meaning ‘since’ or ‘because’ e.g. <em>como llueve tanto no podemos salir,</em> ‘since it’s raining so much, we can’t go out’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Preceding a NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the meaning of ‘in the position of’ or ‘functioning as’
e.g. assiste a la boda como testigo, ‘He’s attending the wedding as a witness’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>Como si = ‘As if’</th>
<th>Como que = ‘That’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Non-standard uses of *como* and its French equivalent *comme* have been found amongst speakers of contact varieties of French and Spanish. Sankoff et al (1997), for example, found use of *comme* as an empty punctor, similar to use of the English *like*, amongst Montreal speakers of French. *Como* has also been found to be used as an introduction to direct quotation amongst SHL speakers (Sánchez-Muñoz, 2007) in the same way that the English *like* has been used (see Blythe et al., 1990; Ferrara & Bell, 1995; Romaine & Lange, 1991 for studies of English *like*). In the current study’s data, both non-standard uses as empty punctor and introduction to direct quotation were found. The following examples demonstrate use as an empty punctor amongst four different focal participants:

Example (16)

María: pero tengo otra familia que es *como* de Hermosillo y eso

está (.2) todavía está en Sonora
Example (17)
Gracia: tengo una amiga que es de Guadalajara entonces si habla muy bien el español académico como y siempre me está corrigiendo y me dice esto no

Example (18)
Guadalupe: no están seguros de cómo se dice una palabra en español pero hacen guess como mi prima (.1) mis tíos siempre la reañoaban

Example (19)
Andrés: es es como si es igual como un ejemplo es como si una persona tiene una casa y dice no (.1) vente o se te quema la casa y otra gente dice (.1) no (.1) vente a quedar a conmigo o sea tú tienes que vivir bajo sus reglas, tú tienes que hacer lo que él dice porque es su casa (.1) entiendes† y si alguien más va y se trata de aprovechar de que no más quiere comer no más quiere dormir ahí pero no saca la basura o algo entonces es que … me entiendes† te quiere aprovechar

In the last example above, Andrés combines standard use of como si with non-standard use of como as empty punctor, the latter which resembles the English discourse marker, like. Andrés also uses the Spanish discourse marker o sea before realigning the speech segment with a new thought.
The following examples demonstrate bilingual use of como as an introduction to quotations:

Example (20)
Gracia: luego vas a México van a decirte como “ay no sabe nada del español”

Example (21)
Gracia: decían cosas así (.1) como “ay voy a tener ese libro de nuevo”

These uses of como as empty punctuator and introduction to direct quotations have not been found amongst monolingual varieties of Spanish (Sánchez-Muñoz, 2007). Such use may be transferred from the colloquial American English use of like, as previously suggested by Sankoff et al. (1997) in his investigation of Montreal French.

Code-switching, the use of loanwords and the bilingual use of discourse markers in my data are linguistic ways in which SHL learners exercise their agency and perform their bilingual identity. Code-switching, as can be seen from the above examples, is used as a conversational strategy that demonstrates how speakers utilize all the linguistic resources available to them in order to get their message across to the hearer in the interaction, and express solidarity and group membership in the group of SHL learners. At times a switch to the other language is due to either lack of knowledge of a word, or a momentary lapse in memory, however with the majority of students, code-switching was not an indicator of low proficiency level in Spanish at all. Quite to the contrary, code-switching was used frequently by the most proficient speakers of the class, not because
they had to, simply because they could and wanted to and it represents their dual cultural identity, like Zentella (1997) found in El Bloque. In the case of these SHL learners, this is evidenced by their contrasting behavior in the classroom, where observations revealed students’ ability to maintain use of only Spanish in classroom discussions and not resort to English to express their ideas. This finding corroborates Sánchez-Muñoz’s (2007) findings, which demonstrate that speakers try not to switch to English in those situations where Spanish is expected, even when switching would be the easier way out when they cannot remember or do not know how to express something in Spanish. The practices of code-switching and the use of loanwords are ways in speakers construct a bilingual identity and give speakers an agentive power over their language use, expressing to others their membership in the group.

Code-switching in interviews and focus group discussions in particular can be contrasted with interaction that took place in the classroom. Code-switching was not a practice performed in the classroom, rather Spanish was maintained nearly all the time. As Guadalupe explains during a focus group discussion:

Example (22)

1 Guadalupe: pues en clase tratábamos de no usar el spanglish pero me imagino que todos con nuestras amistades sí

2 Researcher: y (.1) por qué trataban de no usar spanglish en clases↑

3 Guadalupe: para mantenerlo académico↓

Sometimes students used “non-standard” forms in the classroom, which will be discussed in more detail later, however, there was very little to no English language use
in the classroom. If students did not know how to say something in Spanish, in the class setting, they would ask the teacher, “¿Cómo se dice …?” Recalling Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic capital, code-switching does not hold the same symbolic capital in all social situations or markets. Whereas in the classroom, due to the perpetuation of a standard language ideology (discussed in Chapter 4), Spanish is strictly maintained and is the variety valued for that context, in the more informal situations of focus group discussions over pizza with other classmates and interviews with the researcher, code-switching had more capital, and was used to portray a bilingual identity and express solidarity.

I classify interviews with the researcher as an informal social situation because the student participants and I had known each other already for approximately 6 months when the interviews took place, after the class observation period, and also because of the informal manner in which I conducted the interviews with students. While it should be noted that I am a fair-skinned native English speaker, students recognized me as a multilingual speaker of Spanish, English and Portuguese, who at the time of the study was engaged to a Latino, as this was personal information I had shared with students. Students knew that I had acquired Spanish at a fairly young age, as a Middle School student. Also, in my interactions with students outside of the classroom, when I ran into them on campus for example, and during the interviews and focus group discussions, I regularly code-switched with students. I believe, thus, that students viewed me as a bilingual speaker in the U.S. and for this reason they felt comfortable to code-switch with me.
The conversation that follows expresses how the speech characteristics of code-switching and loanwords also distinguish SHL learners from those immigrants who, unlike heritage learners, did not at least partly grow up in the U.S. and attend American schools. In the interview with Gilberto, when asked what the Spanish spoken in his family was like, he explained to me that he cannot speak “Spanglish” with his oldest sisters or older brother, for they were born and raised in Mexico and, therefore, only know Spanish:

Example (23)

Gilberto: uhm es (.2) lo hablamos así como en México lo hablan porque la mitad de mis hermanos y la mitad de mis hermanas fueron a la escuela en México (.1) y ahí aprendieron o sea lo saben correctamente (.1) no no saben spanglish como (.1) pero los que vinimos aquí sí sabemos como hablar spanglish es la es mitad y mitad (.2) porque son cuatro mujeres y un hombre y esos son los más grandes y luego cuatro mujeres y yo somos hablamos spanglish entre yo y mi hermanas pero las mas grandes no saben inglés tanto so con ellos hablamos el español correcto (.2) ambién con los niños que estamos ahí también aprenden como mi sobrino más grande (.1) tiene (.1) va a cumplir dieciocho años y yo conversamos un poco en spanglish pero también en español él también lo sabe porque su mamá su madre es una de mis hermanas más mayores sabe correctamente (.1) por eso (.1) pero
Thus, as Gilberto explains, “Spanglish” as he calls it is a way of speaking that in his family only belongs to him and his younger sisters, all those who were raised primarily in the U.S. This linguistic practice is thus an identity marker that distinguishes the younger members of the family raised in the U.S. from the older sisters and older brother, who rather speak what Gilberto refers to as el español correcto (the ideological stance expressed here will be discussed in Chapter 4). Even his nephew, who Gilberto explains was born in the U.S., speaks some “Spanglish” with him, but otherwise speaks in one code, Spanish, since he is the son of one of Gilberto’s older sisters raised in Mexico.

Gilberto’s parents do not speak “Spanglish” with him either, as Gilberto explains:

Example (24)

1 Gilberto: no saben spanglish (.2) ellos saben puro español (.2) sólo hablo puro español con ellos ↓

2 Researcher: no hablan inglés↑

3 Gilberto: no=

4 Researcher: =no (.1) oh ok=

5 Gilberto: =mis papás no hablan nada de inglés

6 Researcher: entonces no entienden el spanglish=

7 Gilberto: =no
Gilberto, thus, reports speaking only Spanish, not “Spanglish” with his parents, and how he shifts identities depending on the interlocutors present, just as his young nephew shifts identities when speaking to his parents versus when speaking to Gilberto.

In sum, this study finds that code-switching, the use of loanwords and the bilingual use of discourse markers can be identified as linguistic practices typical of bilingual speakers of Spanish in the U.S. These linguistic practices are tied to the social context at hand, the notion of symbolic capital, and social membership. As members of a the group of SHL learners, the SHL students here share in these linguistic practices as conversational strategies and to assert and reassert their dual cultural identity. Such bilingual practices index solidarity and membership in this bilingual group of learners.

Enacting Ethnic Identity

Through language and other social practices, SHL learners exhibit their multiple identities. The previous section highlighted borrowings, code-switching, and the use of bilingual discourse markers as practices that mark students’ bilingual identity. Now I will turn to the examination of the practices through which perform their ethnic identities.

For Gilberto, English is an outlet for him to express his ethnic identity, as a Chicano. Besides being proficient in the U.S. variety of Spanish, and what Gilberto also refers to as Spanglish, Gilberto is also a fluent speaker of the variety of English known as Chicano English (ChE). As is the case with all varieties of a language, ChE has its own characteristics that distinguish it from other varieties of English, especially
phonological and prosodic features (Fought, 2003). ChE also shares some varietal similarities with African American Vernacular English (AAVE), particularly syntactic elements, and even similarities with California Anglo English (CAE), such as the use of the discourse marker *like* (Fought, 2003).

Below, is an example of Gilberto’s use of ChE in a conversation with two of his male classmates about how he was not permitted in to listen to Hillary Clinton’s speech at the university because he was wearing his backpack. Gilberto explains he gave his pass to his friend Carlos instead (nickname = Teal):

Example (25)

1 Teo: (( to Gilberto))  
did you watch Hillary that day↑

2 Gilberto: ((in ChE))  
you know what↑ No (.1) du::de (.1) I had my backpack on me (.2) they didn't let me in wit it (.3) ((eating pizza)) wit it on

3 Andrés: ((in ChE))  
they thought you had a bomb, dude.

4 Gilberto:  
I did

5 Andrés:  
no (.1) really that's what it is

6 Gilberto:  
O:b:a::m:a:!

7 Andrés:  
no! (.2) a bomb (.1) [a bomb!]

8 Teo:  
[a bomb]

9 Gilberto:  
oh (.1) a bomb! no, but did you see behind my backpack↑ I was in the very front  

du:de (.1) and they didn't (.1) and they
didn't let me in (.2) they even gave me a
little slip to sit behind her=

10 Andrés: =wha::t↑=
11 Gilberto: =yeah=
12 Andrés: =why didn't you crawl in and put the bag
behind the trash↑

13 Gilberto: ok (.3) but I had my work in there
14 Andrés: no (.1) but you put them under the trash
bags (.1) you take the trash bag out and could have
put it in there
15 Gilberto: oh: no (.1) I gave it to Teal (.1) Carlos >was right
in there< (.1) Carlos got one too!

16 Teo: I like Carlos you know↑
17 Gilberto: yeah (.1) I like him

Teo asks Gilberto if he heard Hillary that day, and Gilberto begins explaining how they
did not let him into the event because of his backpack. Andrés teases Gilberto in turn 3,
saying that they probably thought he had a bomb in his backpack. Gerard mishears him
and excitedly shouts out Obaaamaa! Teo and Andrés both then correct Gilberto in turns
7 and 8. Gilberto acknowledges the correction in turn 9, and then goes on to explain
more why they didn’t let him into the speech. Gilberto tells them in turn 9 that they
even gave him a special pass (slip) to go and sit behind Mrs. Clinton. Andrés, in
disbelief, shouts out *whaaat?* Andrés questions why Gilberto didn’t just put his backpack in the trash. Gilberto explains that he had his work in the backpack, but Andrés, still disbelieving what he is hearing, rephrases his suggestion, clarifying that Gilberto wouldn’t have had to actually throw it away, just store it under the trash bag. Gilberto then understands that Andrés thinks he wasted his pass to get in, and quickly offers him the explanation that in fact he gave their friend Teal (aka Carlos) the pass. They then comment on how they like Carlos.

In this entire interaction, in which Gilberto talks to his fellow Latino fraternity brothers (and classmates) about why he didn’t get into Hillary Clinton’s speech, Gilberto utilizes ChE, with all of the prosodic and phonological features typical of the variety of English, such as the increased reduction of vowel and the use of rising glides. Gilberto also makes use of the youth marker *Dude*. In this way, Gilberto is both marking his identity as a youth and as a Chicano, mixing the use of *dude* with the varietal pronunciation features he shares with his buddies. This shows how the ChE variety is, thus, also used as a form of solidarity with his fellow brothers of the Latino fraternity. By interacting through these ways of speaking, Gilberto is indexing his membership in the group and Teo and Andrés are indexing theirs. Through this practice, they have exhibited their membership in another social group, the Lambda Phi Theta Latin fraternity. In contrast, Gilberto did not engage in this way of speaking, employing the ChE variety, during the interview with me. He maintained use of Spanish, with use of loanwords and bilingual discourse markers, but there were no switches to English during the interview. For example:
Example (26)

1 Gilberto: uhm siempre (.2) y me gustaban los deportes

2 Researcher: sí↑

3 Gilberto: Nunca estaba en la casa

4 Researcher: cuáles↑

5 Gilberto: Uhm jugué hockey () este porque en Disneylandia tienen un programa que se llama Disney Goals y este ellos van a escuelas no este (.2) pobres donde hay mucho no hay mucho dinero hum adentro de las escuelas y también está alrededor de la la este las bueno los los vecin vecindarios alrededor de las escuelas no son muy bonitos so llegaron a tratar de ayudar servicio de la comunidad para ayudar a los muchachos para que no estén en drogas en gangas y todo eso (.2) entonces hacen un equipo

And in the following exchange as well, as Gilberto tells a story about a fight that broke out in a bar where they were dining:

Example (27)

1 Gilberto: este (.1) un día nos fuimos a ( ) cenar pero ahí en la tarde nos fuimos a ( ) y estábamos así hablando (.1) este era yo dos amigas y mi sobrino y su novia (.2) estábamos ahí y luego el o sea como una cantina un bar (.1) empezaron a discutir unos muchachos so estábamos ahí como como que de que (.1) ahí estaba toda la atención y se fueron y luego de repente no estábamos comiendo y
pasaron como cinco o diez minutos y de repente entró un
muchach
coa con el que estaba discutiendo se paró y no más le pegó
y se cayó y se fue corriendo so (.2) nosotros nos quedamos

2 Researcher: y nadie no no hizo nada↑
3 Gilberto: no (.1) la gente estaba ahí separando y todo
4 Researcher: uh huh
5 Gilberto: pero la demás gente no hizo nada
6 Researcher: no llamaron a la policía↑
7 Gilberto: no sí!: cuando salimos estaba la policía afuera

Once again, Gilberto’s maintenance of Spanish throughout his narration of the story is
evident. This behavior during the interview with me contrasts with his linguistic
practices in the focus group in which he engages in code-switching and use of ChE with
his peers.

Like Gilberto, other members of the group exercise their speaker agency and
express their style in different ways. Nadia, for example, is very proud of her
Uruguayan identity. As expressed in her interview, for example, Nadia gladly accepts
compliments from others about the way she speaks, particularly in reference to the
pronunciation of Y and LL as alveo-palatal fricatives:
Example (28)

1 Nadia: me encanta como suena (.1) no sé, dicen pero ay qué lindo que

   hablas español. Y digo gracias. Me gusta o sea es ʒo/=

2 Researcher: =sí (.1) sí

3 Nadia: soy “/ʒo/” así como crecí (.1) no sé

Nadia’s pronunciation of y as well as her use of vos are markers of her Uruguayan identity. For example:

Example (29)

Nadia: cuando vine acá me dice (.1) me dice pero no me puedo hacer

   amigos con todos no no no (.1) vos te vestís de esta manera o

   actuás de aquella manera y (.3) es rarísimo. Pero es algo que me

   tuve que acostumbrar uhm no pero en Uruguay si o sea había todo

   el mundo era amigo con todo el mundo (.2) uhm no habían

   diferencia no importa si sos bonita o si sos fea si sos flaca o gorda

   no importa

Here, Nadia describes her experience when she first came here to the U.S. and the
difficulty she had making friends. She felt judged and she had to adjust to the
differences. In Uruguay, as she explains, it didn’t matter if you were pretty, ugly, thin or
fat.
Another reason she felt she did not fit in was because of her Uruguayan accent:

Example (30)

Nadia: Sí y me a cuerdo que ellos también se reían de mí por acento porque digo “ʒo” ellos no dicen eso

Explaining how the other children made fun of her for how she pronounced words, particularly the difference in pronunciation of Y as an alveo-palatal fricative.

Below she explains further how she immediately became part of the Mexican crowd, upon first immigrating to the U.S. in the Seventh grade. As she only spoke Spanish, she explains, the Mexican girls rather automatically became her friends. Yet still she did not feel she fit in:

Example (31)

1 Researcher: y entonces cuándo viniste para acá
2 Nadia: uh (.1) uhm sí (.1) si siete grado (.1) si tenía mis mis amigas pero eran mexicanas porque yo no sabía inglés entonces yo sólo podía hablar español entonces ellas eran mi grupo (.2) y era diferente
3 Researcher: y cómo te parecía como tener estos estos grupos así tan formados?
4 Nadia: y me parecía rarísimo porque al final no podías (.2) o sea tenías que actuar de cierta manera para poder ser amiga de
The above dialogue is a fine example of how Nadia’s speech exhibits characteristics of both the Uruguayan dialect of Spanish, such as her use of vos and her pronunciation, as well as SHL learner Spanish, such as her choice of words (siete grado instead of séptimo grado), borrowing (outcast) and code-switch (you know what I mean?). These characteristics mark her hybrid identity because she is at the same time both Uruguayan and a bilingual.

Gracia expresses her multiple ethnic identities in the below passage, in which as she aligns herself with her conceptualization of the United States: a melting pot:

Example (32)

Gracia: pues desde el principio desde que conquistaron () siempre trataron de cambiar lo que ya tenían hecho los inmigrantes (.1) y está mal que ellos quieran forzar otra cultura si ellos ya tenían la de ellos en otra parte y tratar de forzarla en gente que ya tiene sus orígenes (.1) pero sí está bien (.1) ahora es una combinación porque Estados Unidos hay culturas de todos (.1) yo sé que soy una combinación mi papá es chino y mi mamá es mexicana (.1) entonces se dan varias combinaciones (.2) mi comida es arroz con frijoles @@ entonces it is a melting pot y es algo que tienen que aprender a aceptar en Estados Unidos en lugar de poner barreras para todo y querer sacar o no dejar entrar a ciertas
For Gracia, the United States is a combination of different cultures, and a place where she fits in, as she identifies with both her Chinese and Mexican origins. Her food, as she states is *arroz con frijoles*, a combination of both cultures. She places value on the various cultural combinations that arise out of the United States and argues that people ought to learn to accept other cultures instead of placing barriers and wanting to either kick certain people out or not let certain people in.

Language is just one way in which the participants of my study construct their ethnic identities. Their identity construction goes beyond language, beyond their use of linguistic forms and discourses, to the social and cultural activities in which they participate, such as music, dance, and traditions.

Ana, for example, is a young and confident girl with a vibrant personality, who takes great pride in her involvement in a local Mariachi group. She volunteers this information to the group discussion when the topic of music arises:

Example (33)

1 Ana: pues yo canto pero de mariachi
2 Researcher: a ver↑
3 Gilberto, Teo: @@
4 Researcher: ay sí, eso me gusta
5 M3: qué es eso?
6 Gilberto: esta muchacha es del coro
7 Ana: toco ahí en el mariachi de San Juan
8 Gilberto: San Juan. Ese que está en
9 Ana: está por la Ajo y la doce, es una iglesia, pero tiene su propio mariachi
10 Researcher: y van a eventos especiales o↑
11 Ana: si tocamos en quinceañeras en fiestas, en misa también
tocamos a veces
12 M3: en qué?
13 Ana: en misa
14 Gilberto: tocas este un instrumento?
15 Ana: la vihuela. Es una guitarrita que tiene como una puncita,
16 Gilberto: oh ok
17 Ana: está chiquita
18 Researcher: y no tocan en ningún restaurante?
19 Ana: no, pero la mayoría como cada mes tenemos tocadas, nos llaman por teléfono y vamos
20 Researcher: ah bueno
21 Ana: como para el día de las madres vamos a hacer un,
estamos rifando una serenata y para quien se le gane vamos a ir a tocarles
22 Gilberto: oh ok ok
23 Ana: es lo que te dije, y necesito vender 80 boletos [cell phone sound] estamos tratando de juntar para los trajes otros
trajes

24 Researcher: ah muy bien.

25 Gilberto: deberían de hacer tres para ganar más más más personas, 
            tres serenatas

26 Ana:        yo digo que a lo mejor van a hacer cinco, creo que van a 
               hacer cinco

27 Researcher: hay hay alguien más que hace, que toca mariachi

28 Ana:        uh Patricia tocaba creo en mariachi pero no tocaba en ese, 
                tocaba creo que en una high school

29 Researcher: oh ok

30 Ana:        con el Cuco

31 Researcher: me acuerdo de su presentación

32 Ana:        el Cuco ese señor allá es muy famoso, en el sur de 
               Tucson eh toca el violín, toca la guitarra y toca la 
               trompeta

33 Researcher: wow, sí wow yo no tengo ningún talento así @@@

34 Ana:        él fue también uno de los que me dijo métete a mariachi, 
               porque él está () pero yo ()

35 Gilberto:   a mí me gustaría meterme a cosas así pero en Phoenix no 
               este no hay cosas así por eso, so

36 Researcher: no↑

37 Gilberto:   no pero si me gustaría
In describing the details of her involvement and the instruments she plays, Ana also makes reference to Patricia, another student in the SHL 253 class who is involved in Mariachi. Suddenly this sparks others’ interest, too. Gilberto comments that he, too, would like to get involved in a Mariachi activity like hers, but explains that in Phoenix there aren’t any opportunities like that.

However, Gilberto, as already mentioned is involved in other social activities that relate to his cultural heritage. Not only does he frequent the Chicano studies lounge where he studies and socializes with other Chicano students, he is also a very active member of the university’s Latino fraternity, Lambda Theta Phi. This organization keeps Gilberto busy with a lot of outreach activities to the greater Hispanic community of Tucson.

Raquel, another female student, is involved with cultural activities as well. She participates in Latin dance (salsa) and also is involved with a local Mariachi group as well. It is a way for her to partake in her Mexican-American culture, incorporating her talent for music, playing violin and singing. In this way, Raquel exercises her agency as a member of the Mexican-American community. She explains her involvement during the interview:

Example (34)

1 Raquel: uhm (.2) estoy (.1) muy involucrada you say↑=

2 Researcher: =uh huh

3 Raquel: uhm (.2) cosas como uhm en la iglesia y también con

Mariachi
4 Researcher: ay (.1) con Mariachi↑
5 Raquel: uh huh
6 Researcher: entonces qué tocas?
7 Raquel: violín =
8 Researcher: = violín (.1) huh wow!
9 Raquel: es uhm (.2) empezó a tocar violín cuando tenía o cuando estaba en uhm (.2) sixth grade↓
10 Researcher: uh huh y entonces cantas también↑
11 Raquel: uh huh

As one can observe from the above interaction, Raquel responds with very short answers and fails to elaborate very much on her response. This was the trend during most of the interview. I perceived that she is not very comfortable speaking Spanish. Of all the focal participants, in fact, Raquel is most certainly the student with the lowest proficiency level in Spanish. One of the reasons for her low proficiency and lack of confidence in Spanish that I have observed is that she was not raised with Spanish in the home. Her parents spoke only English while she was growing up. She was always very soft-spoken and shy during the class meetings. For most of the interview she behaved like this, until toward the end when she switched to English and only then did her responses become more elaborate and did she share more information. Her code-switching patterns can be classified as crutching according to Zentella (1997)’s categories. This can be evidenced in the dialogue below, in which Raquel, comments on her experience in the heritage class and why she did not participate much at all:
Raquel’s pauses and giggles when I try to elicit more information from her are in fact the result of her difficulty expressing herself in Spanish. She initiates the switch to English and is able to elaborate her ideas. Also, Raquel’s explanation of why she did not feel the heritage course served her well revolves around her own linguistic insecurity. She feels embarrassed by the way she speaks Spanish and therefore she felt during the course that she should remain quiet in class and not speak out or participate. Raquel’s multiple references to “staying quiet” are quite similar to Giroux’s (1992)
concept of *voice*. Recall that this notion related to speakers’ agency and how speakers are rendered voiceless in certain contexts, since they are silenced by intimidation. This is precisely what has happened to Raquel, who, not confident in her own linguistic abilities in Spanish, has lost her voice and essentially is *silenced*. She is afraid of not *sounding right* (Gee, 1996) and she lacks *audibility* (Miller, 2004). How the dominant language ideologies of the school (the program, the instructor and the textbook) may be involved in negative feelings about language, such as those of Raquel, will be discussed in Chapter 4: Language Ideologies.

Who They Are and Who They Are Not

Just as students are agents in engaging in linguistic practices that index how they identify themselves, they also are agents in *avoiding* practices that index identities they do not wish to perform. In this way, speakers distinguish themselves from other social groups that they do not wish to take membership in. In the below conversation, for example, Guadalupe and Gracia describe a way of speaking, known as *popy* or *fresa*, that they do not like:

Example (36)

1 Researcher: entonces (.1) este popy =
2 Gracia: =niña fresa
3 Researcher: niña fresa↑
4 Gracia: pues así les dicen
5 Researcher: uh huh (.1) y qué opinan de esa forma de hablar↑
6 Guadalupe: yo no pienso que es más al norte pienso que es más como el centro de México como en el DF yo lo descubrí viendo novelas o sea haciéndomelas como Rebelde o Clase 406 así “o sea vamos a ir al antro” así “o sea”

7 Researcher: 

8 Gracia: 

9 Guadalupe: no me gustaba para nada

10 Researcher: por qué 

11 Gracia: es “snob” en español

12 Guadalupe: es como uhm la muchacha típica americana que es like “totally like” “o sea” es el equivalente

13 Researcher: uh huh de California

14 Guadalupe: uh huh

15 Researcher: ay sí

16 Gracia: yo crecí escuchando mucho popy en escuela católica pero yo no recibí

17 Guadalupe: a veces oigo un poco porque he notado que hay muchos estudiantes aquí de comida pollo ¿o qué onda? 

18 Researcher: 

19 Guadalupe: there’s so many different types

20 Guadalupe: pero tampoco se debe juzgar yo sé que ya lo hice con las
popys, pero no sé es no se debería juzgar (.1) ya se que yo
lo hice pero @@ no sé

21 Researcher: @@
22 Gracia: @@
23 Researcher: ok, uh huh @@ por qué te ríes↑
24 Gracia: porque pues ya
25 Researcher: @@
26 Guadalupe: es que creo que se me hace más como chistoso es lo
mismo que si estoy caminando a clases y veo una sorority
girl y dice “oh my god! I was so: () this weekend::” (.1)
me da risa (.1) no digo “ay que idiota” no digo (.1) pero
27 Researcher: uh huh
28 Guadalupe: eso mismo, si así quieren hablar pues allá ellas

Thus, in this excerpt, it is evident that Guadalupe and Gracia distinguish themselves
from speakers of this popy type of talk in Spanish. In the same way, they distinguish the
English variety that they speak as different from the way a sorority girl speaks.

Likewise, Maria, who was born in Nogales, describes the speakers speak Spanish
in Tucson:
Example (37)

1 María: uhm pues está bien (.1) el español pero el muchacho que trabaja conmigo se la lleva con más así como corriente porque dice “guy” mucho y “a la verga” y cosas así pero todos hablan así en mi trabajo

2 Researcher: uh huh y qué opinas de eso↑

3 María: que es corriente (.1) y yo no entiendo porque hablan así y me dicen que no sé porque muchos de ellos son de Nogales también y que (.1) yo no sé

Thus, María is aware of the different expressions used by speakers at her place of work, like wey and a la verga, and she acknowledges that many of her co-workers are from Nogales as well. However, this is evidently not characteristic of her own speech and is an example of how language practices differ. Linguistic practices that are not engaged in, therefore, just as linguistic practices that are engaged in, contribute to the speaker’s agency in performing identities.

SHL Practices of Acceptance and Resistance

SHL learners in this study showed both signs of acceptance of dominant discourses in the classroom as well as resistance. María, for example, is proud of the way she and her family speaks, and it is what she refers to as ranchero Spanish, and real Spanish:
Example (38)

1 María: y en el centro de México, como que, no centro centro pero mi experiencia Sinaloa donde viene mi familia es más tipo uhm más como suelto, en la lengua como más ranchero

2 Researcher: uh huh

3 María: y si va a la ciudad de Cuyacán siempre vas a tener ranchero porque la gente que viven ahí son de rancho

4 Researcher: uh huh

5 María: y yo creo que el sur de México es más tradicional

6 Researcher: uh huh

7 María: como real Spanish↑ so

She later describes an instance in which the instructor of the SHL class insisted she select a variety of Spanish other than the Mexican variety when using the language and grammar review function in Microsoft Word. This offended María:

Example (39)

1 María: uhm pues mis ensayos usé la web uh cómo se dice↑ uh review del Project↑

2 Researcher: uh huh

3 María: en México y dijo que no que lo debo de usar en Colombia y ella no es de Colombia pero dijo ella no es de Colombia no es verdad↑ era de otra parte

4 Researcher: XXX
5 María: sí pero, creo que XXX, pero creo que era Colombia o una
de esas dos que usara esa uhm instead porque es más reconocido
en el mundo

6 Researcher: dijo eso↑

7 María: sí (.1) porque no dijo que en México no lo hablan bien no dijo
nada así, pero me dijo que en este tipo de grammar check que es
más correcto y yo estaba pensando bah mejor porque soy
mexicana me ofendió un poquito (.1) pero también como
pensando más profesional yo no voy a XXX a hacer negocios

8 Researcher: uh huh

9 María: yo soy heritage learner y la mayoría de los estudiantes de ahí son
de México y mi experiencia después de colegio va a ser México
yo no quiero hacer el () para otro país porque no va a ser mi vida
es como corregirme otra vez pero la manera que no voy a usar so
lo pensé así y ahora lo que hago es international sort

10 Researcher: oh

11 María: es lo que hago

María, despite being told that another variety of Spanish was more correct, demonstrates
her resistance to the imposition, expressing her identity as a Mexican and also a heritage
learner. She also expresses her evaluation of Mexican Spanish as providing her more
symbolic capital, for it is this variety, she claims, that she will use in business, not the
variety being imposed by the SHL instructor. Further, she exercises her agency by not
selecting the variety the instructor suggests, and instead selects “Spanish International Sort”.

In contrast to the resistance demonstrated by María, the acceptance of the standard language ideology promoted in the classroom is demonstrated by Guadalupe, who describes her conscious decision to speak a more “academic” Spanish, even with her parents:

Example (40)

1 Guadalupe: pero yo por ejemplo yo lo trato de practicar el español más académico cuando estoy hablando con mis padres por teléfono por ejemplo pues ahorita quise decir papás pero sé que es incorrecto no es que es padres no papás I catch myself sometimes una cosa que estoy tratando de ya no hacer es decir la Sara o la Jesica
digo Sara y Jesica

2 Researcher: uh huh por qué

3 Guadalupe: no sé porque creo que lo quiero corregir

4 Researcher: uh huh

5 Guadalupe: no pienso que en español o spanglish o español corriente es incorrecto pero creo que una decisión que yo hice que yo lo quiero hablar más uhm académicamente correcto

6 Researcher: uh huh
Here, Guadalupe describes the conscious ways she tries to correct her Spanish. She is making an effort to avoid certain terms and ways of speaking that she deems as less academically correct. For example, she reports, here, trying to avoid use of the informal term *papas* and instead use *padres*, and catching herself as she monitors her own speech. She also is making a conscious effort to avoid using definite articles with names, like *la María*, which is a characteristic of Mexican Spanish. In this way, she is also performing an identity shift, as she moves from the variety of Spanish she grew up speaking to what she perceives in her mind as a more correct academic Spanish.

Furthermore, some of the discourses that Guadalupe herself is using in this dialogue, are the same dominant discourses heard in the SHL classroom by the instructor. Her preoccupation with correct forms, for example, as well as her statement that she wants to change the way she speaks so that more people will understand her. These are discourses, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4, that circulated the SHL classroom, and which I argue do not foster the linguistic confidence that heritage learners need, as made evident by Guadalupe’s affirmation that she wants to feel more confident. Again, this reflects some of the dominant ideologies that emerged through both the textbook and the instructor’s discourses in the SHL class, as will be seen in Chapter 4, that promoted a “standard” variety of Spanish as the way to ensure that other speakers would understand speakers of U.S. varieties of Spanish.
Summary of Findings

In summary, Chapter 3 presented, in detail, performances of identity as they relate to theories of symbolic capital, social membership and speaker agency. In this chapter, we saw evidence that identity is not fixed, and static, but rather a dynamic and fluid process that emerges through practice. These practices are both linguistic (e.g. code-switching, the use of loanwords and bilingual discourse markers) and non-linguistic (e.g. the participation in cultural activities such as performing Mariachi music and participating in a Latino fraternity). Examples from the current data, importantly, exemplified how students perceive the relationship between language and identity as well as elucidated the principal linguistic practices that mark these SHL learners’ bilingual and ethnic identities. As seen from this analysis, code-switching is one of the critical practices in which all members of this group of SHL learners engage, that is specific to Hispanics who are at least in part raised in the U.S. It is a way they identify themselves and each other as members of the community practice. That is not to say, however, that these learners make up a homogenous group, for each individual speaker attributes his/her own linguistic style with the linguistic and social choices he/she makes, thereby exercising agency. As discussed, these performances of identity do not take place without the influence of ideologies and relations of power. Chapter 4 will shed further light on how language ideologies and discourses are shared and negotiated amongst this group of SHL learners and how they are indeed implicated in the dynamic social process of identity construction, and the acceptance, negotiation and rejection of language ideologies.
CHAPTER 4: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND DISCOURSES

Introduction

Language ideologies are a form of social production, constructed through everyday linguistic practice. Implicated in relations of power, they are what shape and order the social structure in which we live and interact. They contribute to our ways of speaking, behaving and being. This chapter discusses the concept of language ideologies and discusses how language discourses and ideologies are intertwined with social structures and economic and political agendas. The notion of ‘standard’ language is discussed from a historical perspective as well as the implications of a ‘standard’ language ideology on the teaching of Spanish to heritage learners. Finally, this chapter examines the language ideologies and discourses among SHL learners in the educational context of the current study and addresses the issue of how such ideologies and discourses contribute to and shape the learners’ perspectives of language, the relationship between language and identity and motivations to learn language.

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies, linguistic ideologies, or ideologies of language, terms that have all been used in the literature and will be used interchangeably here, have been defined in multiple ways, both more from more seemingly neutral, cultural perspectives as well as more critical views. Silverstein (1979) for example, takes on a fairly neutral stance in defining language ideologies as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by
users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (p. 193), and Rumsy (1990) in a similar manner discusses ideologies in the broad terms of “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world” (p. 346). Silverstein’s conceptualization of the rationalization of ideologies alludes to metalinguistics and the social-cognitive functions of ideologies. Other more critically perceived notions of ideologies mark ideologies as rooted in social and political structures and as strategies for maintaining social power. Irvine (1989), for example, identifies ideologies as “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (p. 255).

A conceptualization of ideologies that captures both the neutral and critical aspects of ideology as part of our “lived relations” (Althusser, 1971) is that of Woolard (1998), who defines language ideologies as “representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (p. 3) and as “the mediating link between social forms and forms of talk.” This encompassing perspective of ideologies as mediating factors between social organization and linguistic practices is the one adopted in the current study. As contended by Woolard (1998), language ideologies are not related to language alone. Rather, they enact links to identity and sustain “the very notion of person and the social group, as well as such fundamental social institutions as religious ritual, child socialization, gender relations, the nation-state, schooling and law” (p. 3). Language ideologies share characteristics with Schiffman’s (1996) concept of ‘linguistic cultures’, which can be defined as behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, prejudices, and all
other “cultural baggage” that contribute to people’s relationship with language and culture (Valdés, González, García & Márquez, 2003). Both language ideologies and Schiffman’s notion of ‘linguistic cultures’ influence people’s positions, decisions, and cultural and linguistic acts.

**Ideology as a Bridge between Linguistic and Social Theory**

In their scholarly discussion of language ideology, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) argue that the topic of language ideology is a much-needed bridge between social and linguistic theory. Their discussion points to a seemingly mutual connection to language ideology amongst studies in different fields pertaining to language and how such studies, despite their diverse origins, unite in the ways they speak to cultural conceptions of language through a variety of aspects, including “metalinguistics, attitudes, prestige, standards, aesthetics, hegemony, etc.” (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 56). Specifically, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) review previous research conducted in the fields of ethnography of speaking, literacy studies, sociolinguistics, historiography of linguistics and discourse and language policy, which while may not have been originally framed in an ideological analysis, all have contributed to recognition of the relevance of ideology in shaping social, cultural and linguistic behavior.

For example, as Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) highlight, the field of the ethnography of speaking, which set out to study ways of speaking through taxonomies and the description of speech events, acts and styles and with a neutral, cultural
conceptualization of ideology, was marked by Hymes introduction of a focus on beliefs, values and attitudes. Explicit attention has been given to language ideology as playing a role in the shaping of linguistic practices, they argue, for example in the display of gender and/or affect (Bell, 1990; Besnier, 1990, Hewitt, 1986, Irvine, 1990, Katriel, 1986, Kulick, 1993, Ochs, 1992), the power of silence (Bauman, 1983), the display of social affiliations and identities through missionization (Kulick, 1992; Rosaldo, 1973; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1991), and the links between language acquisition and cultural conceptions about personhood in language socialization studies (Clancy, 1986; Crago, 1988; Heath, 1983; Kulick, 1992; Miller, Potts, Fung, Hoogstra & Mintz, 1990; Ochs, 1988, 1992; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984a; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Smith-Hefner, 1988, cited in Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994), to name a few key works in this area.

Likewise, language ideology has been of central importance in studies of struggles over language in multilingual communities, particularly in terms of nationalist ideologies, state politics, and ethnic struggles. Concepts that stand out in this area of research that are particularly relevant to the current study include language authenticity, purist language loyalty for the maintenance of minority languages, and the equation of one language = one people (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). Studies of language policy and planning, such as Cobarrubias’ (1983) taxonomy of the linguistic ideological forces behind planning efforts and Ruiz’s (1984, 2010) work identifying language as resource, problem or right, demonstrate the important role of language ideologies in society. Cultural and language ideologies can also be the driving force behind linguistic change,
as demonstrated by Mannheim’s (1991) study of linguistic variation in Peru, in which phonological markers and stereotypes lead to hypercorrection amongst second-language speakers (cited in Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). Woolard & Schieffelin (1994) urge researchers in these various areas of language study to consider the emerging approach to language ideology as a means of deepening our understanding of the connections between linguistic forms and social life. Through understanding the workings of language ideologies as rooted in social and political structures and interests, we can tie together social forms and linguistic practices.

An ‘Economy of Linguistic Exchanges’: The Notion of Capital

Bourdieu’s social theory rests on the notion that social-historical aspects and relations of power are critical to language. In his seminal work *Language and Symbolic Power*, Bourdieu (1991) discusses the role of language and the construction of social reality, demonstrating how language is more than strict linguistic competence, but a medium of power through which socially characterized speakers’ actualization in linguistic exchanges creates an “economy of symbolic exchanges” (p. 37) According to this view, language is a social phenomenon that concerns power and authority and involves speakers knowing when they are entitled to speak and others recognizing this as an acceptable act that merits attention in the given circumstances.

From the perspective of ‘style,’ or “individual deviation from the linguistic norm,” Bourdieu (1991) explains that distinctive *ways of saying* exist only in relation to other agents who perceive and appreciate the distinctive discourse as systematically
different (p. 38). The production of stylistically marked discourse is then both an individual and collective process. Practices and perceptions result from the relationship between the ‘habitus’ and social contexts, or in Bourdieu’s terms, ‘markets’ or ‘fields,’ in which individuals act. The habitus refers to a socially ordered set of dispositions which predisposes individuals to act and react in particular ways. These dispositions produce practices and perceptions that are fundamentally natural rather than consciously rule-governed. The interrelations of positions in the market or field are determined by the distribution of different kinds of ‘capital’ or resources. Forms of capital include symbolic (e.g. accumulated prestige or honor), cultural (e.g. modes of thought, factual knowledge, world views, skills and educational qualifications; linguistic competence, modes of speech, vocabulary), economic (e.g. financial resources), etc. (p. 14). Structure and agency possess a dialectical relationship whose interaction in the multidimensional field is directly influenced by the amount and composition of the types of "capital" an individual possesses. While cultural capital is acquired via socialization in one's family, social class, neighborhood, etc., institutional forces such as the school and church participate in its reinforcement.

The power of the speech act, Bourdieu (1991) argues, is derived from social institutions, or defined sets of social relations that endow agents with power, prestige, status and various types of resources or capital (p. 12). In terms of linguistic exchange, Bourdieu (1991) critically states:
Every speech act and, more generally, every action, is a conjuncture, and encounter between independent causal series. On the one hand, there are the socially constructed dispositions of the linguistic habitus, which imply a certain propensity to speak and to say determinate things (the expressive interest) and a certain capacity to speak, which involves both the linguistic capacity to generate an infinite number of grammatically correct discourse, and the social capacity to use this competence adequately in a determinate situation. On the other hand, there are the structures of the linguistic market, which impose themselves as a system of specific sanctions and censorships (p. 37).

Thus, central to Bourdieu’s conception of language, which is the product of the relation between the linguistic habitus and the linguistic market, is the fact that language is not ideologically neutral.

Power and the Role of Institutions in the (Re)production of Social Order

As discussed, a more critical view of language ideologies views ideologies as interest-laden, deeply embedded in hierarchies of power, and contributing to the reproduction of social power relations. One of the efficient means by which ideologies exhibit their influence is through educational institutions. As a dominant social institution, the school disseminates ideologies while simultaneously legitimizing them as new true knowledge. In the struggle over legitimate" knowledge, aesthetic taste, and appropriate modes of speech” that takes place in the market or field, the school imposes its power over dominated groups. In the guise of enabling social mobility, educational institutions contribute to the reproduction of existent hierarchical social order by devaluing the cultural capital of the subordinate groups.

Apple (1979, 1982) details some of the various social functions that schools perform: They choose and sanction a workforce; They preserve their social power by
attaining the form and content of the dominant culture and passing it on as legitimate knowledge; They act as agents in the production and reproduction of the dominant culture; They legitmatize new classes, new personnel, new knowledge. In other words, the school is responsible for allocating legitimate knowledge and people. Language serves as a vehicle for everyday activity and the distribution of power relations through the education system.

Similarly, in Critical Discourse Analysis, Fairclough (1995) describes what he terms “the technologization of discourse.” This is defined as “calculated intervention to shift discursive practices as part of the engineering of social change” (p. 3). Fairclough argues that discourse is a tool used by dominant social and political forces, educational institutions, for example— to maintain hegemonic power relations, since “hegemony of a class or group […] is in part a matter of its capacity to shape discursive practices and orders of discourse” (p. 95).

The relationship between hegemonic forces and discourse is reflected in the pedagogical practices that take place in the school. Specifically, it is evident in the attempts to shape U.S. bilinguals’ language use through standardization and eradication of the local stigmatized variety of language, or what Villa (1996) refers to as the “sanitizing of U.S. Spanish in academia” and Cameron (1995) calls “verbal hygiene,” or the use of language to advance some other agenda. Such dynamic relations of power and their influence on language practices render the critical study of discourse crucial to understanding how power relations are instantiated and reproduced in educational settings as well as other institutional settings.
The current study analyzes language ideologies in the context of the university Spanish heritage language program. Within this context, multiple ideologies are propagated from several sources of institutional authority, including the heritage language program itself, the textbook, and the instructor. In addition, discourses circulating in the broader social community of this southwestern city located near the U.S.-Mexico border, the state, the nation and the global context all interact and are negotiated with the ideologies expressed in the school context. Such discourses and ideologies are not always in agreement and, rather, may contradict one another, as this study evidences.

Weedon (1987) discusses the concept of competing discourses in her analysis of Foucauldian theory. Discourses, in Weedon’s (1987) terms, are:

… ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them. Discourses are more than ways of thinking and producing meaning. They constitute the 'nature' of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life of the subjects they seek to govern (p. 108).

Thus, discourses are viewed as more than ways of thinking and creating meaning that are embedded in power relations, but as deeply fused with social practices, becoming part of the conscious and unconscious being—part of one’s identity. Weedon explains that as members of the social world, through interaction we are presented with multiple, competing discourses of varying degrees of power that simultaneously struggle with one another, helping to shape social structures and actions.

In the case of the SHL learners enrolled in this class, they are presented with multiple discourses about language, specifically in terms of standard and local language
varieties, and how their variety compares to other varieties of language in the social field. These discourses shape their thinking, ways of producing meaning, and also their relationship to their language, their culture, their heritage and their identity. These interactions are influenced and driven by relations of power in the (re)production of social hierarchies.

Power, as Weedon (1987) defines it, is “a dynamic of control and lack of control between discourses and the subjects, constituted by discourses, who are their agents. Power is exercised within discourses in the ways in which they constitute and govern individual subjects” (p. 113). These interplays of power through discourses and linguistic and social practices take place in what Foucault (1972) refers to as the ‘discursive field’. In investigating discourses that take place in the educational setting of the SHL classroom, Foucault’s theory provides a valuable perspective from which to analyze the negotiation of discourses and language ideologies.

The SHL learners in my study participate in the economy of symbolic exchanges in their daily social and linguistic practices. For them, both English and Spanish hold distinct values, according to the social context and the interlocutors present. Language choice is influenced by these factors in every day interactions. In addition, stylistic aspects of language are also shaped by the social context and value of different varieties of language, standard and non-standard varieties, in particular. Such usage is also greatly influenced by students’ attitudes toward language varieties, which, as will be demonstrated by the current data, are in part a product of the reinforcement of ideologies about language by authoritative structures in the classroom: the SHL program, the
course textbook and the instructor. Attitudes and discourses about the value, or lack of value, of particular language varieties that circulate amongst this group of SHL learners in the classroom and broader social community influence the way these students view their language, their cultural and familial connections and themselves. Again, this study aims to analyze, from a perspective informed by social theories of discourses and power, the treatment of standard and non-standard language varieties in the classroom, at multiple levels of the authoritative structure, and how such ideological discourses influence students’ relationship to their language and their identity.

The Standard: Critical Issues

The standard language, from a historic and sociolinguistically informed perspective, is a regional or social dialect that has attained prestige due to political and economic forces and has developed into the main form of communication of central administrators, educational systems, and national literatures (Fishman 1972; Giles and Powesland 1975). One of the critical problems with the term ‘standard’ as Villa (1996, 2009) points out, is that the term appears to refer to some empirically based, widely and commonly accepted form when in fact there is no single ‘standard’ form. Rather, the ‘standard’ Spanish language changes from one Spanish-speaking country to the next.

Villa (2009) makes the comparison to ‘standard’ measures in the physical sciences that are empirically defined, broadly accepted measures, such as the meter, gram, roentgen and ohm. While the metric system was established through agreement amongst nations through treaties, he argues, its establishment relies on a scientific
analysis that is not subject to national, political, religious movements. To be more precise, the meter was calibrated based on wavelengths of light, a natural phenomenon that is in Villa’s estimation verifiable by scientific study and devoid of political, economic or ideological interests. Villa (2009) argues that this is not the case for language and explains the ideological underpinnings of standardizing a language:

The concept of a ‘standard’, then becomes tremendously attractive for those who do wish to further ideological interests through language use by appealing to the notion of scientific, empirically based analyses, given that the common notion of a standard implies an invariable norm. However, the standardization process of a language differs fundamentally from one in, say, the physical sciences. Such a process can be understood more accurately as the reification of one variety of a language over another by those who possess a) the means of supporting the standardization process and b) do so to support a particular agenda, be it political or other (p. 177).

While I do not agree with Villa that the metric system is based on an invariable scientific truth and utterly devoid of ideological and political influences—In fact, I would argue that the metric system, as with any measurable system is indeed a social construct. Taking the case of the United States as an example, we can consider the political nature and influence of power status in the country’s opposition to adopt the metric system, and instead continue use of the imperial system. In my view, any standard, whether linked to a mathematical or some other scientific calculation or not, is still ultimately a socially derived construct, as is the adherence to such a standard or noncompliance to it—Albeit, the metric system aside, Villa (2009) critically draws attention to the too often relied upon assumption that there exists a single standard Spanish; However, the notion of the
existence of one standard Spanish has long since been proven a language myth (Train, 2002; Milroy, 2001; Villa, 1996, 2009). Such an ideology of a standard language is grounded in a linguistic culture (Schiffman, 1996) and has important sociocultural, political and pedagogical implications. As Milroy (2001) notes, speakers of standard languages can be described as immersed in “standard language cultures” in which, “Certain languages, including widely used ones such as English, French and Spanish, are believed by their speakers to exist in standardized forms, and this kind of belief affects the way in which speakers think about their own language and about ‘language’ in general” (p. 530).

Villa (1996) explains in detail the various connotations associated with the term “standard.” First, the idea of a standard implies a necessary degree of uniformity across syntax, morphology, phonology, lexicon and pragmatics. Such a language that is uniform in all of these aspects of language is obviously non-existent, as evidenced by the 22 active Academias across different Spanish-speaking countries, all with the same goal of standardizing and codifying the language. Second, the term standard, like other nomenclature commonly used by linguists to describe variation in register, like norma culta and norma rural, “high register” and “low register” or “high language” and “low language”, are not value-free; In fact, such terminology suggests that there is something better or of greater value to aspire to (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Villa, 1996). Metaphors of high or higher suggest superior quality because the notions of high and up are generally associated with better while low and down are generally thought of as worse.
Villa (1996) advocates abandoning the term “standard” and adopting a more neutral term because of these conflicts. Villa (1996) suggests:

A more neutral term which has not yet acquired the semantic baggage of ‘standard’ is ‘variety,’ or *variedad*. Thus, instead of talking about ‘standard’ and nonstandard’ usages, one can speak of Spanish of the southwest, U.S. Puerto Rican, or Cuban spoken varieties versus Latin American-urban-dweller-with university-degree spoken varieties, or formal versus affective written varieties […] shedding some unnecessary baggage created by the ‘standard/nonstandard’ dichotomy will free up precious resources that can be used to pursue important goals of SNS programs, one of which is to integrate language instruction for native speakers of Spanish and heritage language communities into a single, well coordinated entity, a fusion that results in the enrichment of students’ language skills, oral as well as written (p. 199).

I completely agree with Villa on this point since I believe the terms “standard” and “nonstandard” represent a great inaccuracy and, furthermore, conjure up much unneeded negativity when energies could be spent in other necessary places. Abandonment of these terms and adoption of the term “variety” amongst SNS and SHL programs would more accurately represent the real linguistic diversity that exists across Spanish-speaking communities and would recognize both regional and register variation in oral and written language use.

I would like to note that it is important in the discussion of the notion of a standard language to not only consider research on Spanish but research conducted in English as a second language (ESL), English as a foreign language (EFL) and English Language Arts (ELA) contexts as well. Train (2002) and Milroy (2001) argue that speakers of powerful world languages, such as Spanish and English, often adopt the belief in a standardized form of language, thereby ignoring the realities of linguistic diversity. This belief is deeply embedded in relations of power and often transmitted
and reproduced via institutions, including language textbooks, as will be discussed in more detail later. On the topic of standard English, for example, Fromkin and Rodman (1983) explain, “Standard American English (SAE) is a dialect of English that many Americans almost speak; divergences from this ‘norm’ are labeled “Philadelphia dialect,” “Chicago dialect,” “Black English” and so on. SAE is an idealization. Nobody speaks this dialect, and if somebody did, we wouldn’t know it because SAE is not defined precisely” (p. 251). Thus, the so-called ‘standard’ language is an ideological, imagined construction based on inequitable social statuses in which some varieties of language have a higher status than other varieties. Torreblanca (1997) acknowledges the role of status in the construct of a unitary language and asserts that ‘standard’ forms are almost always derived from the language variety of the Latin American capital with the largest number of speakers. As Train (2002) also highlights, “The standard language is ideologically constructed by means of an ongoing sociocultural and sociolinguistic process of standardization involving the codification and institutionalization of the dominant linguistic and cultural norms of the ‘educated native speaker’” (p. 1).

Lippi-Green (1997) on this same note defines a standard language ideology as: “a bias toward the abstract, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class” (p. 64). As Lippi-Green points out, strong ties have been made between spoken and written varieties of language, in which the written form often serves as a model for the spoken variety.
The connection to written language is also evident in standard English; for example, Cheshire (1999) states, “the most relevant aspect of our social background is that linguists have necessarily had many years of formal education and exposure to standard English. Standard English, as is well known, has been heavily influenced by written English.” (p. 130). Thus, the written language often serves as the primary model for the so-called ‘standard.’

What is also very clear about the perpetuation of a ‘standard’ language is that it is deeply laid in notions of power. The standard language is encouraged and maintained by dominant institutions and authorities at the educational and state levels including dictionaries and grammars, such as the multiple Academias discussed above, whose goal is to forge linguistic norms amongst speakers of the language. The concept of a standard as a politically driven force is not at all new, and has rather made its mark throughout history. The discussion that follows details the ideological forces behind language from a historical viewpoint, exposing some of the hidden agendas that coincide with language policy.

Ideological Underpinnings of the ‘Standard’: A Historical Perspective

The creation and imposition of a standard language is related not only to inequality but to the construction of national identity (Gal, 1989). For centuries, there has been a desire for unity of language, nation and state. The implementation of language as a political tool in the building of empires can be traced back to 1492 to Antonio de Nebrija’s publication, Gramática Castellana. The hegemony of the
Castilian variety over other varieties was established during the monarchy of los Reyes Católicos of Spain, Fernando and Isabel when, in the consolidation of territories under the Spanish crown, the Castilian dialect was instituted as the national language. Such use of a language variety as a medium for establishing political authority was sustained by the establishment of the Real Academia Española (RAE) in 1713, whose primary goal was “combatir cuanto alterara la elegancia y pureza del idioma, y de fijarlo en el estado de plenitud alcanzado en el siglo XVI” (Artículo 1°, RAE 1995, retrieved from: http://www.rae.es/rae/gestores/gespub000001.nsf/voTodosporId/CEDF300E8D943D3FC12571360037CC94?OpenDocument&i=0). Protecting the language and maintaining its purity were, thus, objectives of utmost importance.

The RAE’s overarching purpose was also represented by the following organization emblems from 1777, 1868 and 1771, respectively, in Figure 3 below, which contain a fiery crucible stamped with the motto, “Limpia, fija y da esplendor”, meaning “[It] cleans, sets and casts splendor.”

**Figure 3: Emblems of the Real Academia Española**
The RAE, whose early objective was to guard the Spanish language from foreign influences, currently asserts:

La Academia […] tiene como misión principal velar porque los cambios que experimente La Lengua Española en su constante adaptación a las necesidades de sus hablantes no quiebren la esencial unidad que mantiene en todo el ámbito hispánico (Artículo 1°, RAE 1995, retrieved from: http://www.rae.es/rae/gestores/gespub000001.nsf/voTodosporId/CEDF300E8D943D3FC12571360037CC94?OpenDocument&i=0).

While it is evident that the RAE recognizes adapting to the needs of a wider Spanish-speaking community, the RAE proceeds to take on the role of protector of the unity or uniformity of the Spanish language. As argued by Paffey and Mar-Molinero (2009) in their thorough examination of current language policies promoted and maintained by the Spanish government and associated entities, Spain continues to view itself as a leader in the protection and forging of the Spanish language, despite the fact that the global population of Spanish-speakers far outnumbers the population of Spain.

Globalization is an important consideration in the standardization of language today. Coupland (2003) has identified globalization as as “interdependence, compression across time and space, disembedding and commodification” (p. 467). Recognizably, globalization has influenced the ways that languages and dialects interact with each other, particularly in introducing new forms of linguistic contact that differ from contact in the traditional sense of contact along geographical boundaries.

Globalization has meant the ‘interdependence’ of Spanish-speaking communities, for example, shared media and cultural production through technological forms of communication such as television, film, music and the internet (Paffey & Mar-Molinero,
The diminution of boundaries due to high-speed technological advances has signified the interaction between not only different dialects of Spanish but other languages as well. In the spread of the Spanish language across the globe, and the undeniable potential of Spanish as a commercial commodity, Spanish-speaking communities have had to increasingly act as a collective unit in responding to linguistic needs, such as the creation of borrowed terms. This shrinking of boundaries, or what Coupland describes as “compression across time and space”, has impacted the role of Spanish in the international linguistic marketplace in ways not witnessed before.

Nationalist consciousness has naturally translated into the sharing of what Anderson (1983) calls an “imagined community,” in which a sense of unity, of one language or one culture, is created through the unifying effects of print in newspapers, novels and local ways of speaking. As mentioned, globalization has contributed in great measures to the imagined unity of culture and language but also economic and business interests as well.

Language forms an integral part of a political economy (Gal, 1989). Linguistic practices constitute a political economy in which linguistic varieties compete for power and status in the “linguistic market.” The value of a particular linguistic variety is tied to its ability to give access to the preferred positions in the labor market, which is, in turn, determined in large part by the legitimatization by formal institutions such as a school system supported by the state (Gal, 1989).

As the important role of Spanish as a world language persists, the Spanish government as well as Spain-based transnational companies seek economic
opportunities and expansion of their industries into the Spanish-speaking regions of Latin America and the U.S. This has led to the implementation of important language policies, such as the “panhispanic language policy” of the RAE alongside the Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (ASALE) in 2004, which has sought to collaborate with the Spanish American Academies in the pursuit of a standardized ‘total Spanish’ (Paffey & Mar-Molinero, 2009). As Paffey & Mar-Molinero (2009) explain, the objective of this policy has meant expanding the RAE’s approach to maintaining a standard form of Spanish outside of Spain, a goal that is being accomplished through the activities of the Instituto Cervantes including language classes, development programs for language teachers and media and cultural events, and will benefit Spain both politically and economically.

Without doubt, the motives for language standardization throughout history have been politically and economically driven. Technological advances and globalization of the current times have contributed to an even greater strive toward language standardization, combined with political and economic motivations. Following, is a discussion of the implications such standardization of language has in educational contexts, the teaching of Spanish to heritage learners, in particular.

**Implications of the ‘Standard’ for the Teaching of Spanish to Heritage Learners**

In the educational context, the idea that students should learn the so-called ‘standard’ typically goes by unquestioned. The teaching of the standard continues to be a main precept of SHL instruction. However, many questions remain unanswered about
the process and the effects of shifting from a local, home or community variety to a standard variety of Spanish. Research in the emerging SHL field needs to focus on these aspects of language instruction that are often taken for granted and needs to address this gap in inquiry by providing empirical evidence to support pedagogical approaches.

Valdés (1981) in her article on the pedagogical implications of teaching Spanish to the Spanish-speaking in the U.S., discusses the implications of the pedagogical approaches used in the SHL context: (1) eradication, (2) biloquialism, and (3) appreciation of dialect differences. In this discussion, Valdés reveals some of the principal issues with eradication and biloquialism methods, and redefines the SHL curriculum by underscoring the central role of appreciation of dialect differences.

Eradication adopts the belief that elimination of the so-called stigmatized forms of students’ local variety (Faltis, 1990). According to the eradication philosophy, elimination of the students’ local dialect and assimilation to the prestige language variety and culture are thought to grant students academic success (Aparicio, 1993). As Hidalgo (1990) points out, “The traditional response of the school, as well as of the larger society, to linguistic diversity has been an attempt to eradicate varieties other than the perceived standard” (p. 112). However, as astutely argued by Dicker (1996; 2003) language is part of one’s personal and cultural identity. Teachers and researchers in the SHL field, thus, should consider that shifting from a local, home or community variety of Spanish to a prestige or standard variety of the language necessarily involves a shift in identity for students. As Ducar (2006) sensibly notes, such a shift could potentially mean a divide between family members if, for example, the choice of certain standard
forms over forms more commonly used throughout the student’s community and family are noticed by speakers in these spheres. In this regard, the imposition of a standard variety could signify a devaluation of the Spanish spoken by community and family members. These are just some of the important considerations of special needs that should be addressed in SHL classrooms, given the complex intersection of language use and identity.

Biloquialism, also referred to in recent literature as the *appropriateness-based* approach, while admittedly an improved option over the eradication method, still maintains some of the same objectives of eradication as it promotes the prestige variety in the *necessary* contexts (Leeman, 2005; Martínez, 2003, as cited in Ducar, 2006). The problem with biloquialism, as contended by Martínez, is that the approach only addresses the question of which variety should be taught and in what contexts and ignores the important sociolinguistic issues of *why* and *how* the variety should be presented. Thus, students are told to conform to pre-existing societal power structures that dictate *which* variety is acceptable within *which* contexts. Therefore, while on the surface this approach appears to preserve the students’ local variety, by not eliminating it completely, the underlying orientation of this method tells students that their variety is not appropriate in certain contexts.

As Leeman (2005: 38) details, “Telling heritage learners that their language varieties are fine for communication within their own communities but inappropriate in academia or professional environments naturalizes the unequal treatment of language varieties and their speakers by disguising linguistic prescription as ‘innocent’ description
(Cameron, 1995; Fairclough, 1992; Villa, 2002). Such a method, similar to the eradication method, takes on the ‘language as problem’ as opposed to ‘language as resource’ orientation described in detail by Ruiz (1984, 2010), characterized by correction of the local variety and often accompanied by se dice and no se dice approaches in instruction. The appropriateness-based approach has a negative effect on SHL learners because it excludes U.S. varieties of Spanish in academic and professional spheres, and consequently, elevates the social and professional status of speakers of prestige varieties (Villa, 2002). This method potentially has detrimental effects also on students’ sense of identity and relationship to the language, an area within the SHL field that has not been fully explored but remains of critical importance if we consider the complex relationship between language, identity and learning.

Furthermore, Leeman (2005) argues that the appropriateness-based approach, simplifies the complex socio-political situation that surrounds different language varieties, by leading students to believe there is one appropriate variety for a context, which is an inaccurate representation of the linguistic reality. The appropriateness-based approach, Leeman argues, also contributes to the reproduction of existent social hierarchies of power and deprives students of agency in their linguistic choices. Dictating to students which varieties of language they can use when and in which contexts, takes away a fundamental right belonging to any speaker of a language: the ability to make his/her own linguistic choices in a given context. Shouldn’t students be afforded the entitlement to choose how they speak? Shouldn’t they be given the opportunity to arrive at their own opinions regarding the language or language variety
they wish to use? Researchers such as Martínez (2003), Leeman (2005) and Ducar (2006) have pointed to more critical approaches that provide students with awareness about sociolinguistic issues but that still permit student agency in their linguistic behavior. I fully agree with the implementation of programs that provide students with a critical awareness of sociolinguistic issues, as well as an understanding of social power structures and language ideologies, I would argue, with the goal of enabling students to make informed linguistic decisions based on the social, cultural and linguistic realities that surround them.

However, SHL pedagogy today widely maintains the goal of teaching a standard variety of Spanish to students and the contexts in which it is appropriate to use different varieties of the language (Hidalgo, 1990; Peyton, Ranard, and McGinnis, 2001; Valdés, 1981; Villa, 1996; 2002). Peyton et al. (2001) remark:

> Many students who participate in SNS courses speak what may be interpreted as rural or stigmatized varieties of Spanish. Instruction aimed at teaching students the prestige or standard variety involves developing metalinguistic awareness about the differences between the standard and other varieties, teaching traditional grammar, and teaching when it is appropriate to use more or less formal Spanish. (p. 4).

I agree only in part with the goals of SNS language instruction in place across academic institutions as described by Peyton et al. On the one hand, I agree that it is important for students to acquire a more formal or prestige variety of language in order to obtain a greater voice in fighting for maintenance of the heritage language and culture, in accordance with Suárez (2002), who argues that in order for speakers to achieve the clout to overcome existing social hierarchies, they need to be bilingual,
fluent in the dominant language as well as minority language. In the case of SHL learners, I would argue that this means they should be proficient not only in English but in the dominant variety of both languages. Proficiency in a prestige variety of both Spanish and English provides learners with a greater opportunity to be heard. The acquisition of a prestige variety is also supported by Valdés (1995, 2001), who defines four principal goals of SHL instruction, which continue to guide school programs today. These goals include: (1) Spanish language maintenance amongst U.S. Latinos, (2) the acquisition of a prestige variety of Spanish by speakers of other varieties, (3) the expansion of the bilingual range to include formal and academic registers, and (4) the transfer of literacy skills from English to Spanish.

The objective of the current research study is to provide insight into the sociolinguistic issues surrounding the treatment of language varieties in the SHL educational context, and how students negotiate the various language ideologies presented to them pertaining to linguistic varieties of different statuses in the socio-political hierarchy. The aim is to provide a deeper understanding of how these processes influence students’ language perceptions, behavior, learning and relationship to personal identity. To date, no one has performed an ethnographic study of a SHL class to examine the ideologies and discourses at the various levels of interaction with the classroom instructor, textbook and program. This study, therefore, intends to fill a gap in investigative inquiry in this area, to help better serve these language students’ needs.
Language Ideologies in the Intermediate Spanish Heritage Language Class

Once again, the current study is interested in analyzing the discourses and language ideologies in the SHL context and how such ideologies are implicated in students’ relationship to language and language learning. DA is employed as a method of linguistic and discursive analysis to reveal underlying sources of power, inequality and dominance in the SHL classroom context, at the level of interaction between students and the instructor, the textbook and the SHL program. The goal of employing DA in the current study is to determine linguistic-discursive practices linked to socio-political structures of power and domination (Kress, 1990) and to emphasize the role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance (van Dijk, 1993). Through DA, this study seeks to explore the “opaque” relationships between discursive practices and wider social and cultural structures, and how they are ideologically shaped by relations of power (Fairclough, 1995).

The sections that follow will discuss the DA of the various levels of interaction in the course, including the textbook, SHL program and instructor of the SHL course. Also analyzed in the segments that follow will be the discourses of the students themselves, in order to shed light on how heritage students are affected by and how they negotiate these discourses and ideologies.

Language Ideologies: The SHL Textbook

One of the most essential materials used in any classroom context is the textbook. The textbook serves as a central source of knowledge and information to
assist in both instruction and curricular design. As Cruz (1994) contends, despite recent shifts toward more communicative approaches in language teaching, the textbook remains the primary source of content used in classrooms and, thus, dominates what information students are exposed to in the learning context. Potowski (2002) and Potowski and Carreira (2004) assert that due to the rapid growth of SHL programs, coupled with a lack of preparation for SHL teachers, reliance on the textbook in SHL contexts has been even greater. Analysis of textbooks used in secondary level and university classrooms has revealed prevalent racist ideologies and cultural stereotyping of Latinos (Arizpe & Aguirre, 1987; Cruz, 1994; Ducar, 2006; Elisondo, 2001; Ramirez & Hall, 1990; Rodriguez & Ruiz, 2005; Van Dijk, 2005; Wieczorek, 1992). Previous research on textbooks used in Spanish language instruction has also revealed the great inconsistencies in the Spanish presented in the textbook and that used in real life (see Wieczorek, 1992 and O’Connor, 1989). Such issues within textbooks have demonstrated the need for further research that critically examines the ideologies embodied by SHL textbooks, as urged by both Leeman and Martinez.

In a joint project, Leeman and Martinez (2007) do just this, looking beyond ideologies related to standard language alone in their recent analysis of intertextual discourse in SHL textbooks. Their study elucidates the relationship between discourses in textbooks and the valorization of Spanish and the portrayal of cultural and linguistic diversity within academia and society at large. Their analysis demonstrates a shift from the construction of Spanish as ingrained in the local community and tied to students’ identity, towards its construction as a commodity for success in a globalized world.
Their study also demonstrates a move away from students’ perception of Latin America as source of identity and instead a view of the Spanish-speaking region as a space where students can utilize their “commodified language skills” (Leeman & Martínez, 2007, p. 37).

In agreement with Leeman and Martínez’s (2007) findings, my analysis of the discourses of the textbook used in the SHL course in the current study, *Nuevos Mundos* by Ana Roca, also finds the emergence of themes of globalization and the marketization of the Spanish language. From the very title of the textbook, *Nuevos Mundos* is selling Spanish as a bridge to new worlds. This global commodification of Spanish is evident also in the author’s explanation of the purpose of studying Spanish found in the very first few pages of the text: ‘The purpose of expanding your bilingual repertoire and cultural horizons is to help you communicate more effectively, and with more confidence with others—be they from Spain, Latin America, or the United States’” (Nuevos mundos, 2005a, p. x, my emphasis). Thus, acquiring Spanish will open doors to new horizons, and open lines of communication with peoples across the globe. Even *Panoramas Culturales*, the title of the supplementary website used for the course, markets the idea of Spanish as opening new perspectives across vast areas.

The discourse on globalization continues with repeated mention of how widely used the Spanish language is, how it is of great importance in multiple social circles across politics, government, business and education:
Example (41)

Aparte de ser el segundo idioma más usado en los Estados Unidos, el español es de gran importancia global en múltiples esferas profesionales y sociales, gubernamentales, políticas, legales, educacionales, económicas y comerciales (Roca, 2005a, p. 7, my emphasis).

Along these same lines, there is repeated reference to the growth, popularity and strength of Spanish across the world:

Example (42)

Como idioma, [el español] ha adquirido más auge y poder a través de la tecnología, la Internet y los medios de comunicación; la popularidad del cine y de los DVD, que ofrecen audio en español; la creciente publicidad visual y auditiva en español (sean originales o traducciones), disponibles lo mismo en grandes librerías comerciales que en pequeñas librerías independientes de libros en español. En resumen, la presencia del español en los Estados Unidos ha estado presente por siglos, y su influencia, tanto en la política como en la cultura y la vida diaria, seguirá creciendo junto con el aumento proyectado de la población (Roca, 2005a, p. 7, my emphasis).

Spanish has, thus, attained strength and power in its growth across the globe. Its popularity has increased, facilitated by technological forms of communication and its influence and power in many different contexts, including daily life to politics, will continue to grow as the population grows.

The Nuevos Mundos text also aims to teach students about the diversity of Hispanic cultures. The Nuevos Mundos workbook that accompanies the textbook, for example, does discuss the important topics of language variation and registers, as can be seen by the following excerpt:
Example (43)

Es importante poder tener la habilidad de comunicarse con hispanohablantes de cualquier parte del mundo de habla española. Es importante también poder comunicarse en diferentes registros y variantes de la lengua (en contacto o no con otras lenguas) para entender mejor y poder expresarse de la manera más apropiada y aceptable de acuerdo con las circunstancias y el contexto de cada situación (Roca, 2005b, p. 16, my emphasis).

The focus is, thus, on the usefulness of being able to speak different varieties of language and in different registers in order to communicate with more people and also in different contexts. Moreover, it expresses the benefits of being able to communicate in noncontact as well as contact language varieties. However, while the text does indeed address the subject of language variation, it highlights being able to express oneself in an appropriate or acceptable way for the context at hand, which entails all of the issues of the biloquialism method, as discussed earlier in this chapter.

The book also emphasizes the importance of learning more vocabulary with the goal of possessing skills to be able to communicate effectively with a wider community of people:

Example (44)

Mientras más vocabulario tengamos disponible, más poder lingüístico tendremos a nuestra disposición para comunicarnos con más personas y poder tener acceso más amplio al mundo de la lectura y del conocimiento. Las estrategias que siguen le serán útiles para ampliar su vocabulario. Uno de los objetivos de esta clase es ayudarlo(a) a mejorar sus habilidades lingüísticas, de manera que aumente el poder de la comunicación efectiva, con más personas y de muchas más maneras y estilos (Roca, 2005b, p. 16 my emphasis).
Again, the main discourse of the text expresses the utility of having more vocabulary and more styles and ways to use language to be able to communicate with more people.

Regarding the treatment of préstamos, or loanwords, and code-switching, the Nuevos Mundos text presents students with conflicting language ideologies. On the one hand, the text addresses the importance of understanding U.S. varieties of Spanish, but on the other hand, parts of the textbook still take on a “language as problem” approach, in which the bilingual variety of Spanish spoken in the U.S. is in need of correction. Additionally, the overwhelming emphasis on “standard” Spanish throughout the textbook and workbook and repeated reference to monolingual Spanish lead students to believe that standard and monolingual Spanish varieties are favored over the bilingual variety they speak.

The following excerpt, for example, refers to competence in U.S. Spanish as a practical skill, of value to Spanish-speakers, SHL and SFL students alike:

Example (45)

Tanto los hispanohablantes como los estudiantes de español como segunda lengua, deben familiarizarse con las variantes del español que se escuchan en los Estados Unidos. Es, en realidad, una destreza muy práctica en comunidades bilingües que facilita la comunicación oral entre diversos grupos. Para la persona que usa estas variantes, puede formar parte de su herencia cultural y de su identidad (Roca, 2005b, p. 53).

From this segment, we see the apparent recognition of the language variety of SHL students. Furthermore, this fragment points out the connection between one’s language variety and one’s cultural heritage and identity. However, a more critical analysis of this excerpt sees that the text portrays U.S. varieties of Spanish as valuable for oral language
only, not *written* language. Furthermore, while the text emphasizes the relationship between the students’ local U.S. varieties of language and heritage and identity, this can also be interpreted as the *only* use for these varieties of language, since the text fails to discuss other possible uses of these varieties. The text, thus, simultaneously sends the message that U.S. varieties of language are only good for speaking at home and with family, not for literature, communication outside the home or in the business world.

The following discussion of code-switching in the text recognizes the natural tendency to switch between languages when speaking, whether inserting a single word or an entire phrase. It also mentions that such language behavior occurs amongst educated and refined groups as well.

Example (46)

> Cuando las lenguas están en contacto entre sí es normal y natural que se produzca un cambio de códigos, una mezcla de idiomas. A veces se usa una palabra o una frase entera en inglés, se adaptan términos y se inventan vocablos. Esto sucede incluso en los círculos más educados y refinados. Sin embargo, aprender las formas que se consideran estándar o normativas no sólo ayuda a expandir el vocabulario y el poder de comunicación, sino que facilita el vínculo lingüístico con las personas que no dominan el inglés, y abre las puertas a un mayor entendimiento y comprensión (Roca, 2005b, p. 33).

From this excerpt, once again, we can see that the text emphasizes expanding one’s registers to include standard or normative forms to increase communication abilities and facilitate communication with those who do not know English.

On the topic of préstamos, Roca (2005b) also explains the arbitrary nature of the acceptance of loanwords by the RAE:
Algunos préstamos del inglés ya han sido aceptados oficialmente por la Real Academia Española, el organismo semioficial que regula el uso del español (por ejemplo: *stress* se convirtió oficialmente en *estrés*). Pero no todas las palabras derivadas del inglés pasan a formar parte del español estándar. Hay palabras que son más aceptadas que otras y es común escucharlas o verlas en público. En España, por ejemplo, se anuncian con la palabra “Parking” los sitios de estacionamiento y un bar muchas veces le llaman “*pub*” (p. 34).

However, despite the text’s explanations that the use of loanwords and code-switching is natural or normal amongst the bilingual community, the text’s emphasis that the students learn a standard variety of Spanish or at least a variety that is not influenced by English, reinforces the idea that the students’ variety of language somehow does not measure up. Although not stated explicitly, repeated reference to the usefulness of the standard variety and, importantly, a *lack* of reference to the usefulness of the local variety, sends the message that the local variety is not as valued—it is inferior.

Likewise, the unidirectionality of textbook activities designed to highlight the difference between standard forms and nonstandard forms is overwhelmingly slanted toward the standard variety. The unidirectional favoring of the standard, is evident in the following exercise, which asks students to write to a friend who does not speak English, to change the loanwords and calques to standard Spanish:
Example (47)

Diana, una estudiante de El Paso, le escribe una carta electrónica a una amiga chilena que no sabe inglés. Cambie los préstamos o calcos que encuentre por equivalentes en español estándar para que su amiga entienda la carta con más facilidad. Haga todos los cambios necesarios (Roca 2005b, p. 37).

And, instructions for another exercise related to “falsos cognados”, in a similar fashion, state: “Escriba una oración con cada uno de los verbos anteriores, usando el significado que tienen en español estándar. Use el diccionario cuando le sea necesario.”

And yet another example asks students to translate a dialogue to standard Spanish in the instructions for this activity: “En el siguiente diálogo entre dos empleadas de una agencia de publicidad hay veinte palabras y expresiones que se escuchan del habla popular de los Estados Unidos. Reescíbalo en un español más estándar en una hoja aparte” (Roca, 2005b, p. 55).

Admittedly, Roca is quite careful in her treatment of sociolinguistic issues throughout the textbook and workbook, referring in this excerpt here, for example, to the local varieties of U.S. Spanish, as *el habla popular de los Estados Unidos*, and avoiding overt stigmatization of the local variety like referring to it as *bad Spanish*, as some other SHL texts have done (see Ducar, 2006 for an analysis of treatment of students’ variety in a selection of university SHL textbooks). However, it is still the repeated presence of activities that ask students to change local forms to standard forms, I argue, and, critically, the *lack* of activities that ask student to do the opposite, that is, to change standard forms to local forms, that is problematic.
As Leeman and Martinez (2005) assert, SHL textbooks over the past 30 years have imposed a standard language ideology. Textbooks reinforce what Train (2002) refers to as the ideologized nativeness of a standard language. This mythical and inaccurate representation of language draws students to form part of an “imagined community” of speakers—speakers of a socially and ideologically constructed, uniform language. Once again, this so-called standard is sold to students as a somehow superior variety of language, through discourses validated by institutional forms of authority, of which textbooks form a part.

As already mentioned, some of the discourses in language instruction that contribute to this standard language ideology are those that pertain to the ‘language as problem’ perspective. Discourses within the Nuevos Mundos text also propagate the ‘language as problem’ approach, as made clear in the following description of the workbook’s functions: “Este cuaderno…es útil para repasar y practicar aquellos puntos de ortografía, gramática y vocabulario que tradicionalmente les causan dificultades a los estudiantes bilingües” (Roca, 2005b, p. v, my emphasis). Here, bilingual learners are characterized as having difficulties with language in general (spelling, grammar, vocabulary, etc.). Such an orientation not only devalues bilingualism, but it discredits the learners themselves.

In other instances, the textbook uses terminology harmful to students’ conceptualization of the variety of Spanish they speak. For example, the use of the terms “correcto” and “equivocado” in the following activity that addresses calques and loanwords, such as aplicación, grosería, grado, yarda, etc.:
Escriba en inglés el significado de cada una de las siguientes palabras sin consultar el diccionario. Busque después el significado en un diccionario monolingüe español. Haga un círculo alrededor del significado que usted escribió si es correcto. Si no, escriba el significado correcto en el espacio de abajo y tache el significado equivocado. No es necesario que usted supima de su vocabulario personal las palabras tachadas, pero debe añadir a su vocabulario el significado estándar de estas respuestas (p. 37).

On the one hand, the text acknowledges that these words are used differently in bilingual communities than in standard Spanish, and even informs students that they do not need to eliminate these words from their vocabulary. However, examining this explanation more critically, what stands out is the dichotomy between monolingual Spanish and bilingual Spanish and also the dichotomy between correct Spanish meaning and incorrect Spanish meaning. In analyzing the underlying messages in this exercise, we can conclude that this activity is not drastically different from the very prescriptive se dice and no se dice lists found in some other SHL textbooks.

While students may not need to wipe out these terms from their speech, as the textbook clearly states, the simultaneous message that the textbook is sending is that the meanings bilinguales attribute to these words are wrong and that the correct meaning is that used by monolingual speakers of the standard. Furthermore, the students are asked to look up these meanings in a monolingual dictionary, a symbol of authority that is devaluing the meanings they likely associate with these words. Once again, we see the trend that standard forms are favored over nonstandard forms and it is more beneficial for students to know the standard forms. The entire exercise seems to be aimed at
showing students that the meanings they thought these words had are in fact not correct at all.

This non-accepting approach to bilingual forms echoes what Heller (1999) has remarked about bilingualism only being valued positively as long as it maintains the characteristics of the monolingual standard in each language, or what she calls “parallel bilingualisms.” That is to say, bilingualism is respected and viewed favorably, provided that speakers preserve the quality of monolingual norms, and do not participate in any of the practices of language variation or languages in contact (like code-switching, loanwords and calques) that have been documented in investigations of actual language use within bilingual communities. On a similar note, Ortega (1999) claims, “the preferred route to bilingualism is that of a monolingual speaker of an L1 learning the L2 from zero as an adult, and the ideal goal is eventually to be able to ‘pass for’ a monolingual speaker of the learned language” (p. 249). This is the ideology that has been adopted in many contexts, including the one here.

Activities structured like the one above, thus, appear on the surface to embrace bilingualism, by telling students they can keep their bilingual language forms, however, they are really disguising aims to establish monolingual standards amongst students by transmitting the idea that students’ bilingual forms are not of the same quality as monolingual forms.

Another principal issue regarding the treatment of U.S. speakers of Spanish has to do with the burden of effective communication. As evidenced from the design of activities, this burden to be understood and communicate clearly and efficiently is
typically placed solely on the heritage student, as if communication were somehow a one-sided process. This treatment is evident in two of the fragments examined so far from the *Nuevos Mundos* text. For example:

Example (49)

> Cuando las lenguas están en contacto entre sí es normal y natural que se produzca un cambio de códigos, una mezcla de idiomas. A veces se usa una palabra o una frase entera en inglés, se adaptan términos y se inventan vocablos. Esto sucede *incluso* en los círculos más educados y refinados. Sin embargo, *aprender las formas que se consideran estándar o normativas no sólo ayuda a expandir el vocabulario y el poder de comunicación, sino que facilita el vínculo lingüístico con las personas que no dominan el inglés, y abre las puertas a un mayor entendimiento y comprensión* (Roca, 2005b, p. 33, my emphasis).

Example (50)

> Diana, una estudiante de El Paso, le escribe una carta electrónica a una amiga chilena que no sabe inglés. Cambie los préstamos o calcos que encuentre por equivalentes en español estándar para que su amiga entienda la carta con más facilidad. Haga todos los cambios necesarios (Roca 2005b, p. 37, my emphasis).

In each of these examples, the responsibility of being understood in the communicative act is placed on the heritage student alone. It is the heritage student who must use the equivalent forms in *standard* Spanish in order to communicate his/her ideas to the interlocutor. This is despite the fact that communicative acts are not at all one-sided. In fact, if we examine Clark’s cognitive model of the communicative act, we find a model based on mutual responsibility, in which all participants in the conversation collaborate in intricate processes of speech repair, expansion, and replacement until all parties are on the same page (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986). Clark elaborates:
Many purposes in conversation, however, change moment by moment as the two people tolerate more or less uncertainty about the listener’s understanding of the speaker’s references. The heavier burden usually falls on the listener, since she is in the best position to assess her own comprehension (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986, p. 34, cited in Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 70).

According to this model, if anything, it is the listener, not the speaker, who carries the burden of understanding his/her interlocutor.

The *Nuevos Mundos* textbook, by placing the responsibility of being understood on the heritage speaker, dismisses the very natural processes that usually take place in communication. The textbook also overlooks the fact that language variation, including variation of lexical items as was the focus of the activity here, exists outside of the contact situation of Spanish and English in the U.S., and in those linguistic situations, speakers and their hearers find ways to effectively communicate. The textbook problematizes U.S. Spanish as hindering or impeding communication when the fact is, and as also critically noted by Ducar (2006), communication between speakers of different dialects occurs with success all the time.

Despite the issues discussed thus far, the author of the text does make a significant effort to discuss language change and innovative forms of speaking in multiple other instances. For example, the workbook presents a list of slang used by youths in Spain. In the introduction to these terms, the author refers to the youths’ expressions as rich and dynamic. The text states:
Example (51)

El lenguaje de los jóvenes españoles cambia constantemente. Su jerga especial se ve enriquecida con palabras provenientes de Madrid, del caló (idioma Gitano) o del mundo de la música, la tecnología y los deportes. Es el mismo dinamismo que se observa en el lenguaje de los jóvenes de los Estados Unidos. Lea individualmente o con un compañero(a) estas palabras y expresiones del lenguaje juvenil que, a través de los medios de difusión, llegan a toda la comunidad hispanohablante (Roca, 2005b, p. 87, my emphasis).

The view of language as constantly changing and evolving is evident from this excerpt of the text. The author presents such change as a natural phenomenon, influenced by music, technology, sports and even other languages (el caló).

The author makes reference, as well, to the language of youths in the United States. However, it remains unclear whether the author is referring to the English of U.S. youths, Spanish, or both. Additionally, the author does not elaborate on this point, and while the activity that follows the list of innovative Spanish youth expressions asks students to use these creative expressions according to various proposed situations, there is no parallel activity requiring students to discuss their own innovative expressions in Spanish.

Thus, while I applaud the author for incorporating a discussion of the appreciation of language creativity in general, the author has missed what would have been a perfect opportunity to make comparisons to expressions used in U.S. Spanish. Even if the objective of the activities in this section of the workbook were to learn about the culture and language of Spain, exercises that have students make
comparisons/contrasts and draw connections to their own language use, I believe, would be very beneficial for meeting the affective needs of SHL learners, especially in terms of validating their varieties of Spanish. Once again, I feel that although the textbook makes some important strides in discussions of language variation, it could definitely go much further by offering a variety of activities that validate the students’ linguistic varieties.

However, the discussion activities in the Nuevos Mundos text are very well designed and challenge students to consider many different issues relating to bilingualism, standards and language variation. For example, one of the very useful workbook activities that encourage students to think about bilingualism and relate their own personal experiences is an activity that asks students to read the following quote by Guadalupe Valdés, reflect on their ideas and share with a classmate: “Immigrant languages must be seen as a valuable and rich resource if we sincerely desire to increase this country’s capacity to function in an international arena” —Guadalupe Valdés, conocida profesora que se especializa en asuntos sobre el bilingüismo. (Roca, 2005b, p. 21). It is this type of activity that allows students to draw important connections to their own language and cultural experiences, both negative and positive ones.

Another activity, that deals with the topic of préstamos, or loanwords, has students share with the class observations they have made about loanwords and comment on various questions that pertain to the acceptance of words and expressions from other languages, such as English, into the language. Some of the sample discussion questions are below:
Example (52)

- ¿Cómo se decide y quién decide las palabras y expresiones que se aceptan en la lengua?
- ¿Por qué es conveniente y aconsejable tener dominio del llamado estándar de la lengua?
- ¿Por qué sería conveniente también estar familiarizado(a) con las variantes que se escuchan en comunidades bilingües? (Roca, 2005b, p. 37).

And in another section, students are asked to discuss the préstamos that appear in the list:

Example (53)

- De los verbos de la lista, ¿cuáles se utilizan más a menudo en su comunidad? ¿Cuáles menos?
- ¿Puede añadir otros verbos que ha escuchado? ¿Cuáles serían sus variedades en un español considerado estándar?
- ¿Le(s) parece que algunas palabras son más aceptables que otras o no? ¿Por qué? (Roca, 2005b, p. 54).

These types of discussion questions, particularly the last question of each set, could generate some important reflections about bilingual speech and the social issues that relate to language variation and the acceptability of loanwords, for example. This could also lead into broader discussions of language prejudices and stereotypes and connections to social hierarchies and relations of power in general.
However, it is important to acknowledge that the degree of use of these types of discussion questions in the classroom is ultimately left to the discretion of the SHL instructor, and/or syllabus and program coordinator and, as will be discussed in more detail, may not be used very little if at all. As evidenced by the current study’s findings, while the textbook may serve as a guide for the course, what actually takes place in the classroom is greatly influenced by the instructor’s own ideologies and discourses and the dynamic interaction that happens between students and the instructor in the negotiation of identities and ideologies in the classroom.

In sum, the *Nuevos Mundos* textbook and workbook provide students with some valuable information about the linguistic diversity of the Spanish-speaking world. The author takes great care in its sensitivity to issues of language variation and change. Despite this fact, as demonstrated, some parts of the text still treat bilingualism in the context of ‘language as problem’ and the text fails to fully address the relationship between language and social hierarchies of power. In this sense, the textbook falls short of providing SHL students with all of the information and knowledge they so rightly deserve.

The findings here are supported by Ducar’s (2006) analysis of five SHL textbooks, in which she identified three recurring themes relating to the language ideologies present in the texts: “(1) to be acquainted with standard Spanish and its *appropriate* contexts of use, (2) to write using a *correct* form of Spanish, and (3) to help the student to overcome the inherent *problem* of being bilingual” (p. 154). While Ducar (2006) found the *Nuevos Mundos* text to be generally the least problematic of the texts
analyzed in her study, I have found that this text still presents students with competing and conflicting linguistic ideologies, specifically in terms of problematizing characteristics of U.S. varieties of Spanish and demonstrating a bias toward the so-called ‘standard’. The next sections will discuss in more detail the language discourses at the level of the SHL program, and interaction with the instructor and students, respectively.

**Language Ideologies: The SHL Program**

As already discussed, language ideologies implicate power, the exercise of power and the reproduction of dominant and subordinate relations. The current study is interested in examining language ideologies on various levels in the school context as the school represents a form of authority of language use, particularly in the context of the SHL classroom. Taken from the social constructivist perspective, individuals are socialized to language *through* language (Halliday, 1985; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). As SHL students are learning Spanish they are, thus, also negotiating multiple ideologies, and metadiscourses about language.

As students of the SHL program, these learners also come into contact not only with the instructor and textbook’s perspectives of language, but also of the SHL program as a whole. This is due to the SHL program’s small size in comparison to the traditional foreign language class track and also the program’s social construction as more than just a progression of courses to be taken for a major or minor, but its projection as a *community*. From the very welcome message of the SHL program webpage, students
are engaged to feel the sense of community belonging in the program and shared experiences:

Example (54)

¡Bienvenidos a la página del programa de español para hispanohablantes! Me alegro que nos hayan encontrado y espero que en las siguientes páginas encuentren la información que necesitan. El programa de español para hispanohablantes en nuestra universidad tiene una larga y distinguida trayectoria. Desde hace cuarenta años, este departamento ha dedicado una pléyora de esfuerzos y recursos a la enseñanza del español a estudiantes de origen hispano provenientes de diferentes partes de los Estados Unidos. Este compromiso sigue vigente en estos días. Espero que al repasar la estructura y el contenido de nuestro programa, se informen de las múltiples oportunidades que les ofrecemos a los estudiantes para mejorar su redacción, para afinar su autoexpresión, y para cobrar un orgullo renovado en la lengua de nuestros padres y abuelos. Este es un momento crítico en el desarrollo de nuestro programa. Esperamos que ustedes se unan a nuestro esfuerzo por promover nuestra lengua y cultura en la comunidad universitaria. Si hay algo en lo que les pueda servir, no duden en comunicarse conmigo (http://www.coh.arizona.edu/spanish/heritage/under_heritage.cfm, my emphasis).

In these discourses, the multiple references to nuestro programa, nuestra lengua y cultura, nuestros padres y abuelos attract the student to membership in a community—a community of others like them, with similar experiences and similar goals of fine-tuning their language skills and celebrating a newly found pride in their culture—a community that they belong to.

The sense of community extends beyond the classroom to the events sponsored by the program throughout the academic year. At the start of every Fall semester, for example, there is a Welcome Social, in which students have the opportunity to meet the instructors of the program, as well as other SHL students, and find out information about
the program’s courses and events throughout the school-year. They also meet the officers and members of the Club Latino de Arizona and learn about participation in the club. In addition, during both the Fall and Spring semesters students from all course levels within the SHL program, as well as instructors, join together to participate in Interaction Day, a weekend event held in a local park. During Interaction Day, students eat carne asada, play language and culture games, listen to Latin music, dance salsa and merengue, break the piñata and have a chance to socialize and have fun with their fellow SHL students and instructors outside the classroom. Also, every year the program designs and sells t-shirts to the students in the program as a fundraiser. The t-shirts have a slogan on the front and the program name on the back. The students come up with the slogan for these t-shirts themselves, in the form of a brainstorming contest that takes place in the individual SHL classes. The year of this particular study, the slogan selected was, “Hablar español es un privilegio, ¡úsalo!” Thus, overall, the SHL program can be characterized as a small, close-knit community in which students really get to know each other, as well as their current instructor and other instructors in the program. As an instructor who has taught classes in both the SHL and SSL tracks of the department, I can say from my own experience that the SHL program offers a tremendous sense of community to its students, which stems from a shared sense identity as well as ownership and pride in the language and culture—something not typically found in the traditional SSL track. Within this community, discourses are circulated about the skills, needs and goals of SHL students, and they are transmitted to students through interaction and via the SHL program webage.
As a specially designed course for heritage language learners, who share the language and culture, the program aims to develop cultural knowledge, building on students’ own experiences, as well as an awareness of linguistic diversity, as outlined by the following description:

¿Aprenderé sobre mi herencia cultural en esta clase? Todos los cursos de lengua heredada tienen como objetivo aumentar el conocimiento de los estudiantes con respecto a su herencia cultural por medio de sus propias experiencias y el aprendizaje sobre la historia, culturas y literatura de los países hispanos. Este curso tiene un énfasis especial en el aprendizaje de temas importantes para las comunidades hispanas en los Estados Unidos tales como la identidad, la inmigración, los derechos humanos, etc. Los estudiantes también desarrollarán apreciación por la variedad cultural y lingüística de los diferentes países del mundo hispano.

And in examining the design and goals of the SHL course, the program webpage reveals to students the nature of the students who enroll in the course:

¿Para quién es esta clase? El curso español 253 está diseñado para estudiantes de lengua heredada. Estos estudiantes han estado expuestos al español desde una temprana edad y típicamente han crecido en los Estados Unidos. Como consecuencia de este tipo de contacto con el idioma español, estos estudiantes no han estado muy expuestos al español escrito y sus usos formales. Este curso es el tercero del programa de español como lengua heredada: español 103, 203, 253, 323, 333 y 343 (http://www.coh.arizona.edu/spanish/heritage/under_heritage.cfm, my emphasis).

Thus, the webpage reinforces the idea that students in this course typically were raised in the U.S. and have had a type of contact with the language that has not exposed them to written Spanish or formal uses of the language. And provided these characteristics, the program has, thus, defined the following focus for the course:
¿Cuál es el enfoque del curso? Este curso se enfoca en el desarrollo de la confianza en las habilidades en español que los estudiantes ya poseen. El enfoque del curso también busca aumentar el conocimiento de los estudiantes con respecto a las diferencias entre los estilos formales e informales del español y expandir ambos en las áreas de la escritura, la ortografía, la lectura, la gramática, el vocabulario, la producción oral y la comprensión (http://www.coh.arizona.edu/spanish/heritage/under_heritage.cfm, my emphasis).

These official goals of the program will be critically important in the upcoming discussion and comparison with the language ideologies and discourses in the classroom, and how students negotiate them. Importantly, the goal mentioned first and foremost, here, is building the confidence of these students in the linguistic skills they already possess when they come to the classroom. This goal aims at meeting the affective needs of SHL students, as these students tend to demonstrate a lack of confidence in their language abilities, an issue that has been identified in much of the SHL literature (see Martínez, 2003; Potowski, 2000; Villa, 1996). Secondly, the program seeks to build upon the linguistic and cultural knowledge that these students bring to the classroom. In other words, it is sought to add to what the students already know, using this previous knowledge and experience as a resource and building block to the acquisition of new linguistic and cultural knowledge. Thirdly, the program tries to create an awareness of formal and informal linguistic varieties, and most critically, it seeks to expand both of these varieties simultaneously.

The discussion that follows will examine how these goals correspond to the practices of the SHL classroom, particularly in terms of the treatment of standard and nonstandard forms of language. It will also examine the language discourses and
ideologies of the instructor and students to see how ideologies are negotiated on multiple levels within the whole SHL course experience.

Language Ideologies: The SHL Instructor

A discussion of the negotiation of language ideologies amongst the students enrolled in the SHL course would not be complete without also examining the approach of the instructor toward standard and nonstandard U.S. varieties of Spanish in the classroom and, in turn, the students’ attitudes and interpretations of discourses in the classroom. As already discussed in detail, the Nuevos Mundos textbook is a significant source of knowledge for students in this course, providing students with majority of the content material of the course, including cultural and literary readings and grammar exercises. Transmitted to students along with this content information in the textbook, are also multiple discourses and attitudes about language variation, linguistic varieties and standard and nonstandard forms in particular. Also transmitted to students are the language discourses of the SHL program as a whole, which is accomplished through contact with students via the various program functions and events along with the program webpage. Like the textbook and program, the course instructor also represents a vital source of knowledge and authority to students. This is due to the instructor’s social position and the fact that the instructor’s authority is fused with that of the greater educational entity— the university. Research on the influence of language attitudes and beliefs on classroom practices is lacking. As argued by Potowski (2000), “the field of
teacher education can benefit from investigating how language teachers’ beliefs, knowledge, theories, assumptions, and attitudes impact their teaching” (p. 12).

This section will discuss in detail the language ideologies behind actual discourses in the classroom, how these ideologies correspond with the ideologies and goals of the overall SHL program and, finally, how students negotiate these ideologies, as evidenced in discourses during individual interviews and small discussion groups with focal student participants.

One of the most significant findings revealed from ethnographic observations of the interaction between students and the instructor throughout the semester was the instructor’s overall very prescriptive approach to the students’ language. Such language prescription entailed perpetuation of a standard language ideology in the SHL classroom and the continual correction of nonstandard language forms used by the students, regardless of the situational context and whether used in written or oral language. Students who used nonstandard forms in speech, whether before the class started in informal conversation or during classroom discussions, were corrected and instructed to use standard forms. This behavior, as will also be discussed, did not necessarily correspond to either the instructor’s awareness of the objectives of the heritage program or her awareness of what was actually being performed in the classroom.

Most corrections made to students’ language involved use of contact lexical items that the instructor deemed “incorrect” forms and, therefore, unacceptable. These contact forms, which have been identified in Chapter 3 as part of this study’s participants’ linguistic repertoire, are forms whose formation and/or meaning are
influenced by equivalent English forms (for example, *troque* or *troca* for the English “truck”). These forms, which are characteristic of varieties of U.S. Spanish, have generally been stigmatized compared to forms of other varieties, due to the fact that they result from contact with English. In the context of the current study, these forms, while they do not impede meaning, reveal themselves to be a source of great frustration for the instructor, who in her prescriptive approach, demands that students use standard forms instead of these local variety forms. In the following linguistic exchange that took place after class, for example, the instructor corrects a student’s use of the local term *papel*:

Example (55)

Student: ¿Puedo entregar el *papel* el lunes?

Instructor: ¿Papel? Esa palabra no existe. ¡Nunca más quiero escuchar esa palabra! Es “trabajo”.

Here, the student approached the teacher, asking if she could turn in her paper on Monday, using the local term *papel* to refer to the academic paper. The instructor’s response, whose tone quite clearly reflects signs of irritation, includes a questioning repetition of the term, followed by a statement that the word does not exist, a claim that is, furthermore, completely inaccurate. The word *does* exist in Spanish, despite the fact that the student is extending the semantic meaning of the *monolingual equivalent* of the word, which would be one of two meanings: (1) the material paper, or (2) role. It is evident from this context that the student is applying an English semantic meaning to the term, as in English the same word *paper* is used to mean both the material paper and an academic paper in both formal and informal varieties. After the instructor’s claim that
the word is an invention, she raises her tone at the student, forbidding use of the word by saying she does not want to ever hear it again, and she then corrects the student’s word choice, imposing on the student the standard form of equivalent meaning, *trabajo*. In nearly all recorded cases of correction of the term *papel*, which was a term that was corrected very often in class throughout the semester, the instructor delivered the correction in an almost identical fashion, repeating the form with an interrogative intonation and supplying a standard equivalent form such as *composición* and *ensayo*.

On another occasion, in preparation for a test, during the last 5 minutes of class the instructor reviews a list of local vocabulary terms from the workbook and the equivalent standard forms. She emphasizes that on the test she is not going to ask them local forms, just standard forms. The instructor begins to read down a list of words, providing the standard form for each.

Example (56)

1 Instructor: submitir↑ no existe↓ y papel↑ no↓ es tarea, o ensayo es paper
   (.2) aplicaciones no hay (.1) hay so:li:ci:tu:des: (.1) y registrar↑
   ((looking to class for confirmation))

2 Gilberto: ((with an astonished look, pleading)) a::w (.1) register man! @@
   ((giggles from others in class as well))

3 Instructor: matricularse!

Here, Gilberto, is apparently surprised to find the word *registrar* in the list, a word he evidently uses himself. Yet, despite his baffled reaction and his outward humorous
pleading in defense of the term, the instructor makes absolutely no discussion of it and
simply responds prescriptively by firmly stating the standard form, *matricularse.*

The issue of failure to discuss linguistic variation throughout the course is an
important finding in the current study of an SHL class. Ethnographic observations of
the interaction between students and the instructor in this course revealed the coverage
of many topics of importance to heritage students. A wide variety of cultural topics
were covered that helped students learn more about the various cultures in the Spanish-
speaking countries and develop pride in their own culture. There were many discussions
about cultural customs and traditions, as well as discussions about politics, immigration,
human rights, women, the role of the family, etc.; however, considering all of the class
discussions about cultural diversity, my observations revealed an utter lack of classroom
discussion about linguistic diversity and language variation. This is despite the
aforementioned goals of the SHL program, which included developing an awareness of
different linguistic varieties. As evident from my observations, the only variety
accepted in the classroom is a standard variety. First, it is the only variety tested. As
argued by Milroy & Milroy (1999), “Language testing and assessment are often based
on simplistic notions of the nature of language and its use. The tests frequently do not
take account of variation according to dialect and occasion of use” (p. 3). Second, the
standard variety is the only one used in classroom talk, and there is no discussion of use
of different varieties other than the standard. Even when topics could have easily
transitioned into a dynamic discussion of language use, they did not. For example, one
of the chapters covered during the course dealt with the topic immigration. This chapter
perhaps would have been the most logical of all chapters covered to discuss issues pertaining to language, given that immigration experiences usually also entail language experiences, such as learning English, being a speaker of a minority language in the U.S., being bilingual in the U.S., etc. In fact, many of the students in the course either themselves immigrated to the U.S. at a young age or had family members that have. The instructor could have drawn on students’ knowledge and experiences to stimulate a discussion centering on language. However, while class discussions did lead into talk and debates about prejudices and stereotypes, the focus remained on racial and ethnic stereotypes and, rather surprisingly and disappointingly, failed to cross over into stereotypes of language use.

Thus, while class time most clearly provided students with cultural knowledge, readings and substantial opportunity to discuss their own experiences in terms of culture, family, gender, food, values, traditions, race and ethnicity in class, sociolinguistic aspects were ignored. Language, rather, was treated as completely separate entity from any group or pair discussions. When grammar was covered in class, students completed grammar exercises either in pairs or groups and sometimes performed grammar-focused activities related to the reading, as well. The focus of these activities was on learning grammar terminology and rules, accentuation, ‘standard’ verb tenses and moods, and ‘standard’ vocabulary. There was an insistence on becoming familiar with terminology for parts of speech, as well (pronombre, sustantivo, verbo, etc.).

In their definition of language prescription, Milroy and Milroy (1999) explain, “Prescription depends on an ideology (or set of beliefs) concerning language which
requires that in language use, as in other matters, things shall be done in the ‘right’
way’” (p. 1). Language prescription, as Milroy and Milroy explain, shares some of the
characteristics of other cultural behavior, such as table manners, in that the requirements
(for example, to use knives and forks in a particular way) are both prescriptive (i.e.
imposed from ‘above’ by society) and arbitrary (for example, in England the fork
remains in the left hand and the knife in the right hand for eating while in the U.S. the
fork is transferred to the right hand). Deviation from these norms is considered ‘bad’
etiquette. In examining the above-mentioned example from the SHL class, the instructor
is prescriptive in that she, as a figure of authority in the classroom, imposes a particular
way of speaking upon the students; she imposes the use of standard forms. Looking at
the first example shown earlier, the fact that the word *trabajo* is accepted as the formal
variety form and *papel* is not, is arbitrary. In other words, linguistically speaking, all
forms are equally valid. However, their ties to social hierarchies and statuses of power
result in the stigmatization of the form *papel* and the acceptance of the term *trabajo*.

Milroy and Milroy (1999) explain that while both table etiquette and language
are codified in handbooks, the case of language, however, is much more complex, in that
language is also a “much more central aspect of human experience” (p. 1). The
consequences of language prescription and authoritarian attitudes, Milroy and Milroy
argue, are greater and more widespread than most choose to acknowledge. Language
prescription may involve discrimination and affect access to social mobility and
judgments of character. While today discrimination based on race, religion, gender or
social class is not publicly acceptable, discrimination on the grounds of language is often
with language standing as a proxy for these other forms of discrimination (Lippi-Green, 1997; Milroy & Milroy, 1999). Milroy and Milroy (1999) affirm, “Persons in positions of authority are often prepared to be openly critical of a speaker’s language when they would not be prepared to reject publicly other aspects of his identity or culture” (p. 83).

This view is in accordance with Lippi-Green’s language subordination model. In her discussion of the various ways that non-standard accents and varieties of English are dealt with in the subordination process, Lippi-Green (1997) explains that one very frequent way is through the use of threats, and the idea that “no one important will take you seriously; doors will close” (p. 68). The use of threats is evident in the example seen above where the teacher threatens the student saying that she does not ever want to hear the word papel again. And as Lippi-Green (1997) notes, these threats often stem from the belief that no one will take the speaker seriously. This idea is in fact shared by the instructor of the course, who during the post-observation phase interview, in the discussion of the varieties of Spanish spoken by the heritage students, states, “It [the U.S. variety of Spanish] will be judged by people who don’t understand about language varieties, so if I’m speaking like that they will say, it’s low class, doesn’t have a formal education, doesn’t. It will be judged.” This view also contributes to the common justification for acquiring the standard, as will be discussed in more detail later.

The most common way for those in positions of authority to contribute to the subordination of nonstandard forms, however, is through trivialization, or humor (Lippi-Green, 1997). Humor is, indeed, evidenced in the current study as one of the tactics used to establish standard forms and validate the instructor’s authority as educator and
possessor of knowledge. In the following interaction before class began, for example, the instructor came into the classroom to find a few students sitting together. It was a Monday morning and the instructor approached the students and asked what they had done over the weekend. One student responded in the following manner:

Example (57)

1 Lupita: 

2 Instructor: 


Here, humor is used by the instructor in the mocking gestures and goofy dance she performs in order to illustrate her point that moverse in standard Spanish is a reflexive verb, meaning to move oneself, whereas the student had used the verb to mean change residence (the meaning commonly used in U.S. Spanish as a result of semantic extension based on the English equivalent “to move”). However, such use of humor can sometimes be humorous only for the person in the position of authority. For heritage students it can, instead, be a real source of embarrassment or shame.

On another occasion, students were working in groups to practice the imperfect tense, comparing the activities they used to do as children with what they do now. When called on, a student from one group replied:
Example (58)

1 Victoria: Cuando éramos niños jugábamos en casas en los árboles y ahora tiramos fiestas

2 Instructor: @@ Tiramos fiestas↑ ((looking to the class for opinions)) no:: hacemos fiestas. @@

Once again, the instructor’s correction of the student’s word choice does not entail any discussion at all of linguistic varieties or contact forms, even though tirar una fiesta is clearly related to the English phrase throw a party. The teacher does not provide an explanation that hacemos fiestas is merely another way of saying what the student has expressed. The prescriptive response of the teacher intends nothing more than to correct the student because he has somehow used an incorrect form. In other words, the instructor is portraying a very black and white message, that hacemos fiestas is correct while tiramos fiestas is unacceptable, which can be classified as eradication of the student’s local variety. This certainly does not coincide with the goals outlined by the SHL program, which, again, have clearly stated to increase awareness of linguistic diversity and add to what students already know, not try to take away.

When asked during the interview about the corrections made to students’ language, the instructor responded:
Example (59)

I think (.3) um (.5) I think that of course I need to correct my students (.2) otherwise (.4) they need to be corrected because the purpose of the course is to (.2) create awareness and build the formal variety of Spanish. If I never correct them I don’t start the process of creating this awareness this consciousness of ‘oh I just said the wrong word’ for this context.

It is apparent that the instructor is familiar with the goal of the SHL program to create consciousness, however, she only views this as building the formal variety and, moreover, she equates awareness or consciousness with the correction of local variety forms. Furthermore, it is evident from the following statement that the instructor is not fully aware of the approach she takes in actual classroom practice. When asked how she corrects students, she replied, “I ask them, what is another way of saying this? If you were talking to the Head of the Department would you use this word? No. Ok, what word would you use?“ However, in my observations of classes throughout the semester, this type of appropriateness-based approach did not take place. The instructor continually engaged in eradication practices. Also, the instructor revealed in the interviews that she only intends to make corrections to students’ speech during academic presentations:
Example (60)

1 Instructor: when we’re talking about everyday topics (.1) just to like warm up or (.3) in a more relaxed atmosphere, they can use their (.1) local varieties but for presentations I really reinforce that they need to use the formal variety (.1) and for their writing, their writing cannot have slang (.2) so every time there is slang (.1) they know they have to find a more formal way of saying it ↓

2 Researcher: so it isn’t that the students have to speak the standard [all the time] ↑

3 Instructor: [no]

4 Researcher: [in the academic setting]

5 Instructor: [no (.1) no (.1) no] I think that would frustrate them very much

And in the following discussion the instructor reveals that she believes she teaches in a way that values both the students’ local variety and the standard being taught in the classroom:

Example (61)

Usually these students come to our classes with a very narrow way of thinking of what Spanish is (.2) or a diglossic view (.1) of my Spanish is not good enough and there is a formal Spanish that I do not know how to use (.1) that is not part of my repertoire (.1) and I want to learn it (.2) so part of my teaching consists of valuing both (.2) I want them to be able to recognize that what they speak is 100% appropriate for some contexts
and that indeed they need to learn the formal academic variety in order to teach that [to their children] because every language has its standard form and that is what brings us success in our adult and working place, so, so they need to have both varieties (.2) so I am very picky about keeping them writing all the time (.1) and also correcting them in their presentations because I want them to use the academic variety of the language ↓ that is why they are in the course (.1) is to learn this variety ↓ but without making them feel uhm ashamed or (.2) ashamed or I don’t know frustrated because they speak this variety

Here, the instructor comments that she corrects students in their writing and academic presentations, however, as seen from the data from classroom observations, corrections are made at any time during class, and even before or after class in more informal contexts. The instructor’s makes reference to students’ desire to learn a formal variety of Spanish and also her desire to teach the students the “standard” variety without making them ashamed of their variety, thereby acknowledging that heritage students may feel embarrassed about the way they speak, however, her pedagogical practices fail to address issues of social differences between varieties and students’ sensitivity to these issues. Again, this perception of the instructor’s own teaching practices does not match what was actually performed in the classroom observations.

The actual practices of the instructor could be the result of the instructor’s personal language beliefs about the language of heritage learners. As seen in the above example, the instructor expresses the common belief that the standard form is what
“brings us success” in the workplace. She states that students “need to learn the formal academic variety” because “every language has its standard form”. This is part of the language myth that Villa (1996) and others have discussed. She also believes that knowledge of Spanish is a critical skill in a “globalized” economy, similar to Leeman and Martínez’s (2009) discussion of the shift toward the commodification of Spanish, which was also found to be a discourse used repeatedly by the current course’s language textbook, *Nuevos Mundos*. When asked about the importance of Spanish in the world, the instructor responded:

Example (62)

1 Instructor:  
I think it’s absolutely important in a globalized economy (.2)  
being bilingual opens doors (.1) opens job opportunities (.1)  
opens understanding of other cultures↓ if they speak the language  
they understand the culture better I believe (.2) um yeah (.1) I just see it as a plus

2 Researcher:  
how do you think the students in the heritage language program  
perceive Spanish and its importance in the world↑

3 Instructor:  
I think they believe it’s very important personally (.2) they  
believe it is important in all the countries where their ancestors  
are from and in the world (.1) at least in this part of the U.S. being  
a border town (.1) is a gain to be able to use Spanish to use it with  
all these (.2) immigrants because it improves the economy (.1)  
no↑ if you go to a bank and you cannot communicate you would
rather go to a bank where there is a Spanish speaker and can speak Spanish (.1) so it is definitely an important part in the entire country I would say

Thus, again Spanish is viewed as a road to success in a career, because of a globalized world in which business is conducted across languages.

However, as Villa (1996) importantly argues, “The imposition of a variety other than that of the speaker’s community can be detrimental to SNS students in a number of ways, not the least of which is the implication that their community variety is somehow substandard or deficient” (p. 195). In fact, as Villa argues, there are plenty of opportunities for employment for speakers of U.S. Spanish that demand knowledge of community varieties, for example, jobs in healthcare, banking, education, social services, the court system, motor vehicle and voter registration offices, to name a few. The list goes on. Villa even cites the success of native speakers of New Mexican varieties of Spanish in his state, where such speakers have achieved positions of Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the state (p. 195). Thus, I agree with Villa (1996) that we need to assess the reasons for teaching a particular variety to U.S. speakers of Spanish and determine the degree to which the variety being taught in the classroom will be used in real life contexts.

Lipski (1998) also suggests that the status of U.S. Spanish is in a state of advancement to higher prestige. He claims that Central Americans have been making deliberate efforts to approximate the speech of Mexicans in order to blend in with
Mexican immigrants and Chicanos in the Southwest. Thus, Lispki believes that U.S. 
varieties of Spanish are gaining international prestige in their economic utility. 

However, the instructor’s belief that “standard” Spanish will provide 
opportunities for students may be at the root of her imposition of the standard in the 
classroom, since in the instructor’s view, heritage language speech is quite different 
from the standard, particularly in terms of the use of loanwords and code-switches:

Example (63)

1 Instructor: I think the vocabulary of a heritage learner who is second third or 
fourth generation is full of loanwords

2 Researcher: What is a loanword↑

3 Instructor: Or adaptations (.1) transformations of the word (.1) like to say for 
instance instead of camión la troca um (.2) or instead of las 
cuentas pagar las cuentas (.1) to pay the bills or (.1) so many like 
that (.1) um llamar pa’tras instead of llamarte otra vez or 
devolverte la llamada (.2) so they definitely lack vocabulary and 
they use all these loans and all these um (.2) yeah loans to fill in 
the gaps (.2) every time they don’t know something they code-
switch

Regarding code-switching, the instructor further explained:
Example (64)

When they use a lot of loanwords or they code-switch a lot, it’s a little hard because (.7) I think I start listening to the isolated words rather than the entire meaning of what they are trying to communicate.

And when asked if code-switching was something she first experienced here in the U.S., the instructor responded:

Example (65)

1 Instructor: it was something I first experienced as a student in XXX because my degree was in English so (.2) I started doing it unconsciously, but my code-switching has increased tremendously since I am living in the U.S. and teaching Spanish all the time (.2) I actually feel as if my English has eroded a little bit from being surrounded by a Spanish-speaking world about 80% of the time I would say (.2) before (.1) I used to speak English all the time (.1) and Spanish was my letter language (.1) spoken (.1) but now it is the other way around (.2) so (.1) it’s frustrating to find myself making syntactic mistakes and I correct myself of course (.1) but it’s disappointing.

2 Researcher: do you think SHL students have a similar experience↑

3 Instructor: I think so (.2) I think that it frustrates them that they want to say something and they cannot communicate it and they have to
search in their brains to find an equivalent in English to fill in the gap (.2) yeah (.1) I think it is frustrating.

Thus, based on the instructor’s personal experience in a language contact situation, during her study of English in Costa Rica, and her view of her own code-switching as a sign of erosion of her English language skills, she deduces that heritage students share the same experience. She complains about the “mistakes” she herself makes as a result of language contact and how she must “correct” herself, and explains that this is both frustrating and disappointing for her. Her last two statements demonstrate that she thinks heritage students are experiencing a similar “erosion” in that they want to communicate a thought but have to fill in a “gap” with an English word or adaptation, which she assumes must be frustrating for them.

In addition, she views the students’ speech as a result of not making a conscious effort:

Example (66)

1 Instructor: there are many [students] who (.1) no matter how much time you spend trying to teach them this variety (.1) they don’t really make an effort (.1) to learn the formal one (.2) I have students who speak the same way from day one and they finish the course and they still are giving me the most informal slang words in the essays

2 Researcher: and why do you think that is↑ with those particular students↑
Instructor: I think it is a matter of practice (.1) I think that they really don’t make a conscious effort because it is a conscious effort that you have to make.

This view that heritage students speak the way they do because they are not making a conscious effort relates to Milroy and Milroy’s (1999) reference to the characterization of nonstandard varieties of language as lazy, sloppy, and bad. Heritage students’ speech and the use of forms that the instructor describes as “transformations” or “adaptations” from English are somehow the product of lazy speech, and a lack of effort on the part of the students.

The instructor’s view that the standard will contribute to language maintenance may also be an influential factor in her imposition of the standard:

Example (67)

1 Instructor: I think the standard will help them a lot (.3) now I will sound very purist (.1) but knowing the standard will definitely contribute to the maintenance of the language.

2 Researcher: how so↑

3 Instructor: with every generation (.1) in a reduction of contact with native speakers (.1) I believe the language changes and it accommodates more to the dominant language so in the end we are going to have a Spanish made up of English words (.2) and if we are teaching our students that there is a formal academic Spanish I think we are contributing to
its maintenance and that is what they are going to be teaching and they are creating this awareness in all these young kids also so hopefully it will be a chain of awareness

4 Researcher: and what if they didn’t acquire the standard what if they taught the language they know from home

5 Instructor: oh ((sigh)) then the Spanish language of the U.S. will be a very different language from the rest of the countries who are Spanish-speaking countries like it can be noticed already

6 Researcher: like I’m sorry

7 Instructor: like it is to a certain degree right now

Finally, I discussed with the instructor how one of the main goals being the teaching of the standard variety while valuing the local variety and asked about the use of the local variety in the course:

Example (68)

1 Researcher: is the local variety incorporated at all in the course

2 Instructor: local varieties are addressed in the books as the consequences of languages in contact and we address them and the way we address them is I address them by asking the students who uses these terms and then we
provide the formal variety (.1) or the formal equivalent so yeah (.1) we address them (.1) but to a lesser degree

Thus, there is no mention of how varieties are tied to social forms and relations of power in the instructor’s discussion of how the local variety is incorporated in the course. According to the instructor, the local variety is only used as a reference point to provide equivalent forms in a “standard” variety. As seen from the classroom observations, this “providing” of the formal variety is accompanied by corrections that make it clear to students that the forms they use are incorrect and inferior. What is really being performed is eradication of the local variety in order to replace it with the so-called standard.

As García-Moya (1981) points out, denial of the local variety of the students actually impedes the acquisition of the standard. Likewise, Gutiérrez (1997) warns against an injudicious concern for correctness that hinders the lively processes of language. He emphasizes that teaching a standard variety of language requires knowledge about the social motivations that make people speak the way they do, and claims that not enough is known about how to teach a “standard” variety of Spanish to bilingual speakers. What is argued here, however, is that strict instruction in an outside variety of Spanish devalues the students’ local variety of Spanish. Constant correction and disallowing of local variety vocabulary terms on the part of the instructor, such as seen in the instances detailed here, sends the message to students that the outside variety is the only correct means of speaking Spanish and that their variety is worthless.

Language prescription, in the form of correction of non-standard forms has been
mentioned often in the SHL literature (Aparicio, 1993; Hidalgo, 1997; Martínez, 2003; Valdés, 1981), however, research still needs to be conducted on the impact of language prescription on students. This study aims to fill this gap by examining how discourses on various levels have impacted the way students perceive their language and their identity. Martínez argues that such correction leads to heightened linguistic insecurity: “Heritage language students arrive at the university with deep-seated emotional issues about their heritage language. They have been taught, and in many cases have internalized, a feeling of inferiority about their heritage language” (p. 7). Feelings of linguistic insecurity, as described by Martínez, were very much a part of student discourses about their language in the current study, and will be discussed in the upcoming section.

Language Ideologies: The SHL Students

In the following pages, the main findings from student discourses will be discussed. These include: (1) a pronounced lack of confidence in their Spanish; (2) a preoccupation with “correct” forms of Spanish; (3) an assimilation to instructor authority; (4) an idealization of monolingual Spanish vs. bilingual Spanish; and (5) professional motivations for the acquisition of a standard variety of Spanish.

Post-observation interviews and discussion groups amongst focal student participants demonstrated a pronounced lack of confidence in their linguistic skills, influenced by discourses about the inferiority of their variety of U.S. Spanish and, sometimes, humiliating corrections similar to the instructor’s correction of the verb
moverse discussed above. For example, in an interview, when asked about her relationship with Spanish, Guadalupe, responds:

Example (69)

1 Guadalupe: pero no sé con con mi familia estoy (.1) si estoy a gusto (.2) o sea con la familia que vive aquí en los Estados Unidos pero si hablo con mi familia que está en Hermosillo Sonora (.3) por ejemplo unos de ellos son doctores y (.2) los lo hablan muy bien (.2) y yo pues hablo lo mínimo para no equivocarme o decir algo (.1) pues es que me da vergüenza

2 Researcher: pero te han corregido o algo así las personas en tu familia↑

3 Guadalupe: sí (.1) sí me corregen

4 Researcher: por ejemplo↑ en qué te corregen↑

5 Guadalupe: uhm (.2) una vez le estaba pidiendo a mi tío una toalla porque me quería uhm (.1) limpiar la boca porque estaba comiendo (.2) y mi tío me trajo una toalla del baño (.1) o sea una toalla para secarse y dijo “ésta es una toalla” y luego agarró una servilleta (.1) “tú quieres una servilleta” y me dio mucha vergüenza (.3) y dije “ok (.1) gracias”
From this exchange, a few important topics worth discussion arise. One is that Guadalupe feels comfortable speaking Spanish with her family that resides in the U.S., however, she does not feel comfortable speaking with her family in Sonora, Mexico. She relates speaking well with professional success, when she states that some of her aunts and uncles are doctors and speak very well. This episode, thus, demonstrates a standard language ideology. The “standard” variety spoken by her successful family members is idealized. Important to note is that the “standard”, which Guadalupe associates with professional success is also a monolingual variety, demonstrating a monolingual bias. She explains, also, that in speaking with these family members in Sonora, she speaks the minimum amount possible so as not to commit an error, because it embarrasses her. This is in part due to humiliating experiences surrounding her language use, such as the one she describes here, in which she asks for a napkin using the word *toalla*, and her uncle goes to the bathroom and brings back a hand towel to demonstrate that what she really should be asking for is a *servilleta*, the term that he uses in his variety. Guadalupe describes how this demonstration made her feel much embarrassment and she rather quietly replied to her uncle with an ok, ok thank you. Once again, we can see the employment of trivialization as Lippi-Green (1997) has described, to reinforce the subordination of the variety of Spanish spoken by Guadalupe in this situation. We witness how it is not humorous in the eyes of the speaker, who, rather, is made to feel a sense of shame for the way she speaks. As Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (1964) rightfully note, “A speaker who is made ashamed of his own language habits suffers a basic injury as a human being: to make anyone, especially a child, feel so ashamed is as
indefensible as to make him feel ashamed of the colour of his skin” (p. 105).

Such shameful feelings and feelings of insecurity are actually reinforced by practices in the SHL classroom. The following dialogue, for example, explains how, prior to taking the SHL course, she had always thought she spoke Spanish well:

Example (70)

Guadalupe: Pues siempre ... yo yo pensaba que lo hablaba muy bien y me sentía a gusto hablándolo pero recientemente especialmente cuando empecé esta clase me di cuenta que no hablo tan bien como yo quiero [...] y también hice un amigo nuevo que se llama Andrés y él es de México y lo habla muy bien (.2) es bien inteligente @@

It is after her experience in the course, and exposure to the standard variety in the course as well as corrections of her variety of Spanish in the SHL course, that cause this student to feel that her Spanish is less than adequate. She reports that since taking the SHL course, she no longer feels she speaks Spanish well. She also compares herself to a friend she met from Mexico, and attributes his ability to speak Spanish well with intelligence. Again, this is further evidence of a monolingual bias, a favoring of a monolingual variety of Spanish, in this case a Mexican one. This preference for Spanish from Mexico is shared amongst many of the student participants, who are mostly of Mexican heritage and, thus, this is the variety spoken by some of their relatives as well as ancestors. This evidence also supports Rosales-Yeomans’ (2008) findings in her study of dialect perception in Tucson, Arizona, the same local speech community, that
demonstrate that bilingual speakers in the border region tend to view varieties of Spanish from Mexico more positively than other varieties of Spanish, including bilingual varieties. Further, she found that bilinguals in her study prefer varieties spoken in northern Mexico (Sonora) over other varieties of Mexico and bilingual varieties.

The preference for the Spanish of Mexico is also found amongst some language scholars involved in curriculum design. Torreblanca (1997), for example, has expressed prescriptive favor for the variety spoken in la Ciudad de México in discussions of which dialect of Spanish should be taught to non-native speakers and heritage speakers alike in language classes:

Cualquier angloparlante de los Estados Unidos, en cualquier parte del país, que quiera aprender español, debería elegir la variante de la lengua española hablada en México, en la Ciudad de México, pues esta variante le permitirá comunicarse, sin dificultad alguna excepto ocasionalmente en el léxico (este problema es insoluble), con el mayor número de personas en el mundo hispánico. Un hispanohablante nacido en San Antonio de Texas o en Los Ángeles de California, debería también elegir el español corriente de la Ciudad de México si quiere engrandecer sus habilidades comunicativas en español (p. 138).

Preference for one variety or language over another is not at all an uncommon phenomenon (Milroy & Milroy, 1999). Milroy and Milroy explain that some languages are thought to be “better” than others. Such preferences for particular varieties of language over others even occur within language departments. As seen in Valdés, González, García and Márquez’s (2003) investigation of language ideologies and hierarchies amongst native and non-native faculty, lecturers, and graduate students within university Spanish departments with which they have been affiliated, for example, it was found that the Spanish of ethnic minority speakers (U.S. Latinos of
second-, third-, or fourth- generation) is the least valued. In considering the best variety to serve as a model for language instruction, Valdés et al. found Peninsular Spanish to be the most favored, followed by Latin American Spanish, with U.S. Spanish representing the least favorable. Within these categories, however, certain varieties were preferred over others, for example, Andalusian Spanish did not have the same prestige as Spanish from Madrid for the Peninsular variety, and Caribbean varieties of Latin American Spanish had less prestige than the Spanish of Chile and Argentina.

In discussing the topic of academic Spanish with members of one department, Valdés et al. identified a ‘shared essence of monolingualism’, which centered on five main themes: “(1) Spanish as the language of Latin America and Spain; (2) good Spanish as pure, formal, and error free; (3) the native speaker norm as a model of correct usage; (4) the limitations of U.S. varieties of Spanish, and (5) the role of the department in teaching good Spanish” (p. 14). Thus, the U.S. was not included in faculty members’ conceptualization of the Spanish language, rather Spanish was conceived of as the language of Spain and Latin America only. According to these findings, academic Spanish is also viewed as possessing particular qualities: purity, nativeness and correctness. As Valdés et al. conclude, “Talk of correctness, error-free language, and academy-sanctioned usage revealed a purist perspective within which language was seen to be divided into acceptable and unacceptable elements” (p. 16). Finally, with regard to the view of U.S. Spanish, Valdés et al. found quite negative perceptions. They found, for example, the belief that speakers of U.S. varieties of Spanish have the most difficult obstacles to overcome in acquiring academic Spanish, either because of a
marked difference in the variety spoken at home and the variety spoken in the school, or because these speakers have not tried to “fix” their Spanish by either studying it extensively or traveling to Spain or Latin America. Furthermore, U.S. Spanish speakers themselves in Valdés et al.’s study revealed feelings of linguistic insecurity when comparing their variety of Spanish to others’ in the department.

The instructor in the current study also shared her attitudes toward different varieties of Spanish. When asked about her opinion on what variety of Spanish “sounds best”, the instructor responded:

Example (71)

1 Instructor: I like the dialects of Central America and South America (.3) I have a hard time understanding Caribbean Spanish mainly Cuban and Republican Dominican and um (.5) I don’t (.2) it’s awful to say this but I @@ but I don’t think very high of those varieties

2 Researcher: is it [the]

3 Instructor: [it’s the] way they delete sounds from the words (.1) you know (.2) I’m from XXX and we sound out every vowel and consonant (.2) we don’t have any aspiration or consonant deletion, or final –s- deletion or final –s- adding (.2) so (.1) for me to hear that it’s a little harsh (.1) it may sound ugly (.2) but it’s like mutilating the language (.2) and I understand there is a historic reason for all of these
things, but it’s how it sounds (.2) it’s not pleasant to my ears (.1) let’s put it that way

Interestingly, when students discussed the Spanish they thought was the ideal Spanish, as mentioned already, many responded with Mexican Spanish, however, many answers also centered on the notion of monolingual Spanish. For example, Teo, responded in this way:

Example (72)

Teo: pues nomás me gusta el me gusta el español (. ) que se habla en México como en el D.F. (.2) me gusta ese español porque se oye como (. ) se escucha como saben de lo que están hablando y siempre saben la palabra correcta y (. ) como no saben inglés o no sabrian otro idioma entonces saben todo el español y lo hablan muy bien

As can be seen here, Teo relates Spanish spoken in la Ciudad de México with correct Spanish. Further, he associates this correctness with monolingualism. Since these speakers in the capital of Mexico, he reasons, do not know English, and likely do not know any other language, they know Spanish very well and speak it very well. This view reveals the issue of English being perceived as a contaminant—that contact with English has somehow contaminated the purity of bilinguals’ Spanish, as in the case of the Spanish of the U.S.

This is also interesting because in traditional second language classes, the goal is typically bilingualism. Yet here, we see a trend toward the idealization of monolingual
Spanish. I argue that this perspective is the result of the constant comparison made to monolingual Spanish varieties in the textbook and classroom setting. As already discussed earlier in this chapter, in the analysis of the SHL textbook, the textbook contains multiple discourses that slant toward the standard or monolingual variety. This is accomplished by the presentation of exercises comparing lists of bilingual forms as opposed to standard, monolingual forms as well as by the unidirectionality of the exercises requesting students to translate the bilingual variety forms to “standard” forms. In addition, the fact that the instructor only accepts the standard language in the classroom reinforces these notions. All of these discourses, which come from positions of authority, transmit the message to heritage students that their bilingual variety is substandard. Moreover, such constant comparison to monolingual “standard” forms, I believe, sets the student up for failure, since monolingualism will never be achieved for these students who are members of a bilingual community in the U.S.

Another example of the idealization of monolingual Spanish follows:

Example (73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilberto:</th>
<th>pienso que las personas más mayores hablan más correcto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher:</td>
<td>uh huh (.2) como tus abuelos↑=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilberto:</td>
<td>=si (.1) uh huh=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher:</td>
<td>=por qué↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilberto:</td>
<td>porque tienen más experiencia con el español y aprende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.1) aprendieron uhm cuando no más sabían español</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, Gilberto associates the ideal form of Spanish with that of the elderly. The elderly represent wisdom and intelligence, and also, Gilberto explains, they learned Spanish when they knew only Spanish. Again we can see the view that Spanish is somehow better when it is not influenced by any other language. Also evident here is the preoccupation with *correct* Spanish, like in the previous example.

This concern for correctness is overwhelmingly present in students’ discourses. In the next dialogue, for example, the question of whether students agree with the instructor’s corrections of terms used by students is addressed. In this example, the particular situation discussed is the earlier mentioned instructor’s correction of the verb *moverse*, which had been used by a student in making informal conversation with the instructor before class had started. On this topic, Andrés responds in the following way:

Example (74)

1 Andrés: ese tipo de corrección es muy bueno porque yo quizá (.).
antes yo le hubiera dicho yo me moví p’alla yo me moví pa’ Phoenix pero era muy buena enseñanza de la maestra

2 Researcher: uh huh

3 Andrés: y fue buena corrección ya eran *errores* que los estudiantes hacían constante

4 Researcher: errores↑

5 Andrés: no un error (. ) es (.1) un *menor error* podría decir hmm el estudiante ese quizá todo el tiempo creció con la palabra move- mover (. ) mover
Thus, from this excerpt of the interview, we can see Andrés’ reflection of the correction made by the instructor that the instructor had reason to correct the student. The student, in Andrés’ view, made an “error”. And he acknowledges, also, that these types of “errors” were made frequently by students in the class. Andrés shows complete confidence in the instructor’s corrective actions, despite also recognizing, in the last line, that perhaps this use of the verb *mover* was a part of that student’s dialect her whole life. This assimilation to authority is also observed in the next example, which again centers on the instructor’s correction of the verb *moverse*:

Example (75)

Teo:      hmm pues creo que tiene razón porque [la maestra] quiere que usemos el español correcto (.2) que no quiere que usemos el español (. ) que se está adaptando a los Estados Unidos (.1) me entiendes ↑

Once again, the belief is that the instructor is right—*tiene razón*. It is also clear that the prescriptive attitude of the instructor (one that favors the standard variety over the local variety) is perceived by students and, furthermore, that students validate it, because she is trying to teach them “correct” Spanish and not the Spanish of the U.S. or influenced by the U.S. Students perceive that in the instructor’s view, U.S. Spanish is somehow inferior.

This assimilation to the instructor’s authority is evident in the next example as well:
Example (76)

Nadia: uh no I’m (.1) I mean I think they are good teachers (.1) they’re right (.1) they seriously understand what is the right way and the wrong way (.2) because a lot of people do butcher Spanish

Again, we witness a preoccupation with the right way to speak Spanish, accompanied by justification of the instructor’s authority. This student also expresses complete agreement with the instructor’s corrections in general, because many people, in her view, “butcher” the language.

As seen from these examples, there is a tremendous concern for correct language use, which is the result of students’ negotiation of the instructor’s imposition of a standard language ideology in the classroom, and the favoring of the standard forms in the textbook discourse. Importantly, in addition to the presence of these discourses is also the lack of discourses that validate the students’ own variety of language. These discourses come from the top down, and therefore impose their power, resulting in the assimilation to the instructor’s and the textbook’s authority. As Gal (1989) explains, “Although control of this legitimated prestige variety is differentially distributed in stratified societies, even those who do not control the legitimated variety accept its authority, its correctness its power to persuade, and its right to be obeyed” (p. 353). The acceptance of authority is also what Bourdieu calls symbolic domination because it is often an unconscious acceptance and adherence that reflects the unequal power relations between the dominant and subordinate groups.
Another theme repeatedly expressed in the SHL students’ discourses was the professional motivations for studying Spanish. As seen in the next few examples, students expressed a desire to study Spanish, not for reasons of communicating with family members and relatives or because Spanish is tied to their identity, rather because it is an instrumental skill that will serve them in their jobs and career:

Example (77)

1 Researcher: y por qué estudias español↑
2 Nadia: pues porque estudio negocios y me va a ayudar saber el español (.2) en el trabajo

And this student as well, expresses the same notion:

Example (78)

Andrés: no sé pienso que el español es (.1) I mean es mucho el español que hablan personas de Tucsón es español que aprendieron en su casa (.1) no en la escuela entonces no saben uhm (.1) las cosas formales o cosas así

Researcher: uh huh (.1) y es importante uhm saber las cosas formales↑

Andrés: si (.1) si vas a hacer cosas como negocios o or uhm cosas así entonces sí es importante

This data supports Leeman and Martínez’s (2009) arguments that a shift has taken place in the marketization of Spanish as a commodity. Through the discourses of the textbook and instructor, in particular, as well as possible outside discourses in the community, Spanish is being sold to students as a key to professional and economic success.
Moreover, students perceive that *standard* Spanish is the variety of Spanish that will lead them to this success. This is also the impact, I argue, of the repeated discourse of standard Spanish as a *better* and *more worthy* variety. Sadly, in the data retrieved from student interviews and focus group discussions, there was *no* evidence of any student expressing that the local variety could be used in business or a job. Again, I feel this is due to the *lack* of validation of the local variety and its utility.

Overall, this chapter raises some critical issues relating to the treatment of standard and nonstandard varieties of language in the SHL classroom context. As educators we need to consider the impact language ideologies can have on students. As discussed, language ideologies are deeply implicated in relations of power and social hierarchies. As Gal (1989) argues, “What is called dominant discourse is itself rarely monolithic, but rather a field of competition for power among elites” (p. 361). In the case of this particular intermediate SHL class, the so-called standard, unfortunately, I think clearly wins.

Students in the SHL class are exposed to competing discourses and language ideologies at the various levels of authority that they come into contact with as members of this course. On the one hand, the SHL program officially circulates discourses about the value of linguistic diversity. The program expresses its goals to increase students’ awareness of different language varieties and develop both local and formal varieties of language. The textbook is very careful in its portrayal of local varieties of Spanish, expressing that local varieties of U.S. Spanish should be learned by speakers of other varieties just as speakers of U.S. Spanish should increase their ability to communicate in
other varieties of Spanish. However, despite the special care taken to explain issues of sociolinguistic nature, the textbook sends some mixed messages and tends to favor the standard variety over the local variety in some contexts, which students, in turn, perceive, as evidenced by the discussion of students’ negotiation of language ideologies in this chapter. Finally, the ideologies expressed in the SHL classroom on the part of the instructor, which may be the most influential because this contact involves up-close, face-to-face interaction, involve language prescription and eradication of the students’ local variety. Students’ language is repeatedly corrected in the classroom, and the standard variety is imposed on students, regardless of the situational context. In addition, there is a complete lack of discussion of language variation and no discussion of how language forms relate to ideologies, social structures and relations of power.

Comparing the discourses at the level of the SHL program, textbook and instructor, we witness a major break-down in the objectives of the course being accomplished. Rather than increasing students’ confidence in their linguistic abilities, the overall result is a preoccupation with correct forms. Despite the program’s goal for students to develop both formal and informal varieties, classroom practices impose a standard language ideology on students. Students are interpret the competing discourses as a message that their variety is less worthy than a monolingual standard, and, thus, pre-existing social hierarchies are actually reinforced.

This chapter, thus, has important implications for the further development of approaches to HL teaching that validate students’ local varieties while at the same time teaching other varieties, including academic or formal varieties of Spanish, if this should
be a goal. Again, the current findings suggest that educators reevaluate the goals of HL teaching and the choice of language variety or varieties to be taught to HL students. This study also has critical implications for the discussion of sociolinguistics and linguistic variation in the classroom, as well as the discussion of the relationship between language ideologies and social power structures. Finally, this study’s findings on language ideologies suggest a needed improvement in teacher development and an increased awareness of the impact of the treatment of standard and nonstandard language varieties on HL students. These implications will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

This dissertation provided an in-depth analysis of identity practices and language ideologies in an intermediate university SHL classroom in the U.S. Southwest via a combination of sociolinguistic and ethnographic methods and discourse analysis. Data was collected from a variety of sources including questionnaires, ethnographic participant observation, interviews with students and instructor, discussion groups amongst focal SHL learner participants, the SHL program website and course textbook. As evidenced by this dissertation’s findings, these SHL learners, as members of the SHL course and with the shared goal of learning their heritage language, develop common ways of behaving, speaking and viewing language as they partake in the intermediate university SHL class. The findings presented here demonstrate how these SHL learners view the connection between language and identity and how they express multiple identities through language as they simultaneously learn language. In addition, the current study reveals the multiple discourses and underlying language ideologies that SHL learners are exposed to in the SHL classroom and how these SHL learners, in turn, interpret and negotiate these ideologies.

In response to my first research question, regarding SHL identity, the SHL learners of the current study view an important link between language and identity. As discussed in Chapter 3, the heritage language, as perceived by the SHL learners themselves, is a part of who they are and is connected to their family’s experiences,
ethnic identity, cultural background and traditions. The SHL learners of the current study engage in various linguistic and non-linguistic practices that mark their bilingual and ethnic identities. While these practices sometimes index speakers’ individual styles, such as Nadia’s use of alveo-palatal fricatives, marking her Uruguayan identity, and Gilberto’s use of Chicano English amongst his male peers, marking his Chicano identity, data analysis showed that these learners also engage in common practices that mark their identities as bilinguals and heritage learners of Spanish. Such practices shared amongst this group of SHL learners include the use of code-switching, loanwords and bilingual discourse markers. These are practices they perform with other members of the group of SHL learners.

In addition, these SHL learners demonstrate their ability to engage in practices they deem appropriate according to the situational context, as evidenced for example, by their strict use of Spanish and lack of code-switching during classroom meetings versus code-switching during focus group discussions with fellow classmates. The classroom is a setting in which they do not use English because they view English and code-switching as unacceptable in that context. Even in instances when students did not know how to say something in Spanish, they would ask, “¿cómo se dice?” instead of merely resorting to English to express the thought. Overall, the classroom is a place where English as well as contact forms are viewed as unacceptable by the SHL course instructor.

As also demonstrated by the current study, the SHL learners enrolled in this course are presented with conflicting and competing language ideologies. In response to
my second research question about language ideologies SHL learners negotiate, on the one hand, the SHL program, as evidenced by a DA of the SHL program website, aligns itself closely with the goals for SHL instruction proposed by Valdés (1995, 2001), which aim for: (1) Spanish language maintenance, (2) the acquisition of a prestige variety of Spanish, (3) the expansion of the bilingual range and (4) the transfer of literacy skills from one language to another. According to the SHL program’s design of the intermediate level course in particular, it aims for the development of both formal and informal language varieties, expanding both in terms of writing, spelling, reading, grammar, vocabulary, oral production and comprehension. The course also aims to focus on the development of students’ confidence in the linguistic skills they already possess and to increase awareness of the differences between formal and informal varieties of Spanish. In this regard, the program is up to date with the latest research in the HLE field.

Likewise, the SHL course textbook, *Nuevos Mundos* (Roca 2005a, 2005b) maintains an overall cautious treatment of “standard” and local varieties. The textbook on the whole does a good job in implementing the Spanish SHL students use in the textbook. The textbook overtly expresses the usefulness of students’ local varieties, and argues that it would be Spanish speakers around the globe should familiarize themselves with varieties of U.S. Spanish. It shows an appreciation for the way students’ language varieties may form part of their cultural heritage and their identity. Furthermore, the textbook points out the arbitrary nature of the acceptance of loanwords by the *Real Academia Española*, thereby some of the inconsistencies and the role of power relations
in Spanish language policies. Additionally, the textbook contains some useful conversational activities to engage students in sociolinguistic discussions of language variation to increase students’ awareness of different language varieties within the global Spanish-speaking community. These are all clearly very important strides in contributing to the legitimization and elevation of the status of U.S. varieties of Spanish. Nevertheless, the use of these sociolinguistically informed activities offered by the textbook ultimately lies in the hands of program administrators and instructors. If the activities do not explicitly form part of the course curriculum, they can easily be overlooked. In the case of the current study, for example, such discussions of linguistic variation did not take place in the SHL classroom because they were left to the discretion of the instructor.

On another note, despite the SHL textbook’s overall good intentions regarding the treatment of SHL learners’ local varieties, the discursive and presentational framing of the language used by U.S. bilinguals sometimes appears to favor a “standard” or monolingual variety of Spanish over bilingual varieties. This is evident, for example, in the repeated presentation of comparison tables of monolingual versus bilingual forms, as well as the unidirectionality of translation activities instructing students to translate bilingual forms to monolingual forms. Such presentation of bilingual forms in their opposition to monolingual forms sends students the message that monolingual forms are better and their bilingual forms are somehow inferior. The lack of textbook activities that ask students to translate “standard” or monolingual Spanish forms to bilingual forms also sends the message that the bilingual forms are not useful or valued. Given the fact
that language practices do not occur in a vacuum and the inextricable ties between language and identity, such presentation of bilingual forms not only signals to students that their language is inferior, but it also potentially suggests that their family, their culture, and they themselves are in some way inferior. In this way, the textbook still contributes in part to the imposition of a more worthy “foreign” standard Spanish, an issue noted by various researchers in the HLE field (see Leeman, 2005; Peyton et. al., 2001; Valdés, 1981; Villa, 1996; 2002) and at the same time contributes to the reinforcement of dominant discourses and hierarchies that a “standard” variety is better. Hence, the textbook itself provides students with multiple competing language ideologies, albeit, on the surface appearing to completely embrace students’ local varieties.

Finally, this underlying standard language ideology, revealed by a DA of the SHL course textbook, is perpetuated in a much less subtle way in the classroom interaction between instructor and students. Ethnographic participant observations throughout the intermediate SHL course revealed continual eradication of students’ local variety forms in the classroom. Overt correction of students’ language forms (e.g. the use of loanwords and contact phenomena) was a common practice within the SHL class and students were left believing that the terms they were using were “wrong” rather than merely characteristics of another valid variety of the language. Such prescriptive behavior was coupled by an utter lack of activities in the classroom that validate students’ local varieties. This instructional approach conflicted with the SHL program’s overall goals for the course, which, as stated previously, aimed to increase students’
confidence in the variety or varieties of Spanish that they already come to the classroom with. Rather, classroom interaction tended to reinforce the lower social status of the SHL’s variety of Spanish and exacerbate students’ linguistic insecurity, as evidenced by students’ discourses during interviews and focus group discussions. Moreover, as argued by García-Moya (1981) the denial of students’ local variety forms actually hinders students’ acquisition of a “standard.” Thus, if the goal of the SHL course is, as was stated on the SHL program webpage, to help students acquire a more formal variety of the language, rejection of their language may inhibit this process, rather than nurture it.

Overall, in this study, SHL students are presented with multiple language ideologies that contradict and compete with one another. A DA of interviews and focus group discussions shed light on how students actually negotiate these language discourses and ideologies. The SHL learners expressed a pronounced lack of confidence in their Spanish and a preoccupation with “correct” forms. They viewed themselves as speaking “incorrect” or “wrong” Spanish, while the instructor was viewed as knowing the “right” way to speak Spanish. While these language attitudes expressed by the SHL students of my study recognizably cannot be attributed solely to their interactions in the SHL classroom and with the SHL course textbook, what I argue here is that the overall climate and practices of the SHL classroom contribute to the reinforcement of the linguistic insecurity that, as noted by Martínez (2003), many SHL learners already possess when the begin studying the language. Furthermore, the fact that the teacher is both an educator of the university, representing the highest level of the educational system, holding a graduate degree, combined with her native speaker background, place
her in a position of authority that students tend not to question. The general assimilation to the teacher’s authority seen in my study of SHLs in the speech community of Tucson, Arizona can be contrasted with Helmer’s (2008) ethnographic research in this same speech community on high school SHLs, who actually rejected the authority of their non-native teacher. I believe that for all of the factors mentioned, including the university setting, the teacher’s education level and native speaker status, together with the standard language ideology behind the discourses of the SHL textbook, influenced students’ belief in the standard language ideology.

One factor that should not be underestimated is the teacher’s language background, having been raised as a monolingual Spanish speaker in Central America before coming to the U.S. and learning English as an adult. As discussed in Chapter 4, the favoring of a monolingual variety of Spanish was a recurrent discourse amongst the SHL students of my study, which corroborates the findings of a now growing body of research on the Tucson speech community (see Rosales-Yeomans, 2008). When asked which Spanish was the most ideal Spanish or the most correct Spanish, students repeatedly referred to the Spanish of those speakers who knew only Spanish. Often, Mexican Spanish was the variety of monolingual Spanish that SHL students referenced, which makes sense given that the majority of the SHL students in this study were of Mexican heritage. SHL students idealized monolingual Spanish and viewed a bilingual variety of Spanish spoken in the U.S. as a less “correct” form of Spanish due to its contact with English.
Another recurring theme in SHL learners’ discourses was the usefulness of “standard” Spanish to ensure mutual understanding. My analysis found this to be a direct result of the continual discourse in the textbook that learning a standard variety of Spanish is critical for learners to be able to communicate with speakers outside the U.S. The discourse is framed in such a way that SHL learners are led to believe that speakers of other countries will not be able to understand U.S. speakers at all, when in fact, language variation exists even across monolingual varieties of Spanish and speakers communicate just fine in everyday situations. As noted by Lipski (1988: 163) on this topic, “The interfacing of Central American and Mexican American Spanish in the United States poses no major barriers to successful communication, although individual differences are significant and extensive” (cited in Villa, 1996, p. 7). Villa (1996: 7) concurs, “Differences in phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, among other factors, do not create unsurmountable barriers between speakers of differing varieties of Spanish. This is especially significant for classes in which a number of community varieties are spoken.”

The discourse about increased communication was related also to the globalization discourse evidenced in the classroom and textbook. The need for communication across the globe was emphasized as the economy grows in a global fashion. Standard Spanish, once again, was sold as a form of capital, providing success in business and jobs in the ever more globalized world. While Chapter 3 demonstrated the strong connection students perceive between the Spanish language and their heritage, culture and identity, Chapter 4 highlighted another important connection as perceived by
students: that Spanish will serve them in business or a career. This shift to a more instrumental motivation for learning Spanish found in my study agrees with Leeman & Martínez’s (2007) findings in their analysis of SHL textbooks. Their study also showed an important move from the portrayal of Spanish as a heritage language as related primarily to identity toward its depiction as a commodity, which is precisely what the SHL students themselves in my study express in interviews and group discussions.

Study Limitations

While this study provides some critical insights into the areas of identity construction and negotiation of language ideologies amongst intermediate level SHL learners, there are some important study limitations that should be addressed. One major limitation is the short duration of the study. Data for the current study was collected over the course of one academic year. Participant observation of classroom meetings was conducted during one semester, and interviews and group discussions were conducted during the following semester. While observations were conducted for all classes throughout the duration of the intermediate level course, if this observation time were to have been expanded, much more information could have been obtained about students’ practices as well as any possible changes in students’ attitudes over the course of time. In addition, the current study’s observations were limited to the classroom and discussion groups only, thus, no information about participants’ communities or life beyond the SHL classroom was analyzed. Analysis of practices outside the school context would have allowed for a more complete and thorough
analysis of these learners’ identity practices (e.g. negotiation of identity amongst family and friends) and language discourses ideologies in the broader context (e.g. the national context).

Yet another study limitation was that a quantitative analysis was not performed. This is in part due to the technical limitations described below. While a qualitative analysis importantly provided the in-depth *emic view*, appropriate for the study of identity and DA of language ideologies, a quantitative analysis of students’ speech would have provided a different insight into SHL learner practices, particularly when comparing across situational contexts.

Finally, a significant limitation of the current investigation resides in technical constraints. Given the limited budget allotted for this study, observation recordings were conducted using one basic video camera with a built-in microphone. While for small discussion groups recordings this equipment was adequate, it caused limited access to students’ conversations in the classroom meetings, particularly when students were engaged in group work. Had the study had a greater budget and more sophisticated recording equipment, such as individual microphones for students to wear on their person, more discourses could have been captured, aside from the discourses of the instructor and students when addressing the class as a whole. In addition, the basic camera did not allow for a wide angle view of the classroom and sometimes this interfered with complete capture of the observation on camera. In these instances, field notes were relied upon to fill in the gaps.
Pedagogical Implications

Despite the study’s limitations described above, this dissertation takes a critically important step in the direction of bringing together the fields of sociolinguistics and language pedagogy, which, shamefully, is too often not performed. Much can be learned from the intersection of these two important fields, especially on the topic of HLE. Some of the issues raised by this dissertation have valuable implications for SHL instruction.

First and foremost, this study’s findings suggest the need to further develop approaches to HL teaching that validate students’ local varieties of language while at the same time exposing them to other varieties of the language. In this study there was an utter lack of activities for students to utilize their local varieties. In the instructor’s view, this is because they already know this variety; however, if not to expand further knowledge of students’ own and fellow students’ local varieties, such activities would also meet SHL learners’ affective needs, which has been a needed pedagogical task identified in the HLE literature (see Martínez, 2003; Potowski, 2000; Villa, 1996). Some possible activities could be having students use the variety in their community. Students could interview a member of their family or community, analyze the type of language used during the interview and then present their conclusions to the class. Such an activity would require students to engage in the local variety and show students that the local variety is useful. Furthermore, it could help bring about awareness of the local variety’s linguistic characteristics. Another activity could be observation-based, in which students could go out into their community or family gathering and observe and
record the language varieties used. Giving students the tools to analyze language as it is used and recognize the value of different registers or varieties. Finally, even if the textbook does not provide such a bidirectional activity, instructors can have students translate from a “standard” variety to a local variety rather than only vice-versa. The more opportunities for students to use local varieties of language will contribute to building students’ confidence in their language skills.

As demonstrated by the current study’s data, in the classroom, the only variety of language promoted as a form of capital is the so-called “standard.” This variety is packaged as the only variety that will open doors, provide opportunities in business and pave a successful career path for students. However, use of local, home or community varieties of the language in these contexts are completely ignored. As demonstrated by the discussion with the instructor on this topic during the interview, the instructor firmly states that students need the standard for their jobs. The instructor gives the example of needing the standard to work in a bank. However, what about the usefulness of community varieties of Spanish in the instructor’s example of working at a bank? Why is this not considered? Who are the clients that as bank employees they would be communicating with in this setting? And what about other fields such as the health industry and retail? The assumption that a “standard” variety of the language is the only useful variety in the business world is a great one and raises attention to the critical need to further evaluate the recurrent question of which variety should be taught in SHL classrooms. Also, it highlights the important question of which variety or varieties will serve students in real world contexts, as rightfully noted by Villa (1996). Questions that
remain to be addressed are whether the variety taught in the classroom should be a formal written one or a spoken one. If a “standard” is to be taught, should it be an academic variety? What about choosing a spoken variety? Villa (1996) discusses the issue of choosing a spoken standard to use in classes for HL students and concludes that it should not be an issue at all:

Differing spoken varieties do not pose a threat to instructor-student communication. The instructor employs his or her spoken standard, the students theirs, and any confusion resulting from differences between the various standards is resolved through dialogue, through a communicative negotiation in which all participants can name their worlds, to borrow a phrase from Freire (p. 197).

As noted by Villa (1996), choice of a spoken standard will not have effects on the ability to successfully communicate across standards. In my own experience, I believe that there is no “one-size-fits-all” approach to SHL teaching. This study’s findings call for a reassessment of the objectives of SHL instruction, which I argue should be molded and remolded according to the students’ needs and goals of a given SHL class.

Another important implication involves the type of corrective feedback SHL students should receive in instruction. Should students’ local variety forms be overtly corrected, covertly corrected or corrected at all? In what contexts should corrections take place? As seen in this study’s observations, students are corrected in all contexts except student presentations, when students have the floor. Yet, in all other contexts corrections (mainly overt ones) are made to students’ language, even if during conversation before the bell rings.
On the discussion of the effects of a prescriptive approach to teaching, Milroy and Milroy (1999) contend that prescriptive rules have usually been intended for written language, not spoken language, and declare that if such rules are imposed on speech, they can damage the expressive potential and flexible qualities of oral language. Apart from this, Milroy and Milroy (1999) argue, “…prescriptive ideas of correctness can also interfere with a speaker’s sense of appropriateness of language in varying situational contexts” (p. 63). Pérez-Leroux and Glass (2000) agree with Milroy and Milroy on this issue: “An instructor may speak derisively of particular words, pronunciations or grammatical structures that are native to some students, thereby alienating these students or leading them to underestimate their own language skills” (p. 59). Ruiz (1984, 2010) also addresses the issue of treating language as a problem rather than resource and contends that a discursive orientation that views the heritage language as a resource will provide more benefit than harm to the preservation of minority languages.

Treating the language as a problem can be interpreted as insensitivity. For example, in her interviews with students investigating how instructor’s attitudes impact SHL learners enrolled in a foreign language class with non-native learners, Potowski (2000) found that many students believed their instructor’s feedback to be “sound but insensitive.” This is similar to the findings here, in which SHL students expressed being offended by the instructor’s behavior and commented that they believed her behavior to be harsh. Following Roca (1997) and Gutiérrez (1997), Potowski (2000) argues for the need to train teachers on language awareness of students’ varieties.
Potowski argues for different treatment of SHL learners and against correction of SHL learners’ home language:

While it is a valid goal to expose bilingual students to a more formal variety of Spanish and expect it to be used in academic work, ‘correction’ should not be the framework. Non-native students’ Spanish is undoubtedly corrected often by TA’s but bilingual students can have strong reactions to such ‘correction’ of their home language since it pertains to a personal and cultural history (p. 4).

Given the potentially damaging effects of a prescriptive approach in the SHL context, I argue that sociolinguistic discussions of variation in the classroom would better serve students than corrections to their language and, furthermore, would better meet the goals outlined by the SHL program, which include raising students’ awareness of differences between varieties and formal and informal registers. Some of the approaches suggested in recent HLE research to include sociolinguistic aspects in the SHL classroom would be very beneficial for SHL students. For example, the Classroom Based Dialect Awareness (CBDA) approach proposed by Martínez (2003) would incorporate discussions about the functions of dialects, the distribution of dialects and the evaluation of dialects. Martínez’s (2003) CBDA model suggests some useful activities that would provide students with the opportunity to perform ethnolinguistic observations themselves to be used as the basis for linguistic analysis of forms, ultimately leading to increased sociolinguistic awareness. In addition, Martínez’s (2003) CBDA model suggests activities that highlight the relationship between language and social power, such as the proposed apodo activity in which students work in groups to create apodos in jest for fellow classmates based on personality or physical traits. Such
an activity is a celebration of the Latino tradition amongst family and community members. Next, the students are instructed to create an apodo for the teacher, which they inevitably find to be a more difficult task, given the teacher’s higher social status. Students arrive at this conclusion on their own, after contemplation and discussion and are, thus, made aware of the underlying motivations that maintain and reproduce the evaluative differentiation of language forms. Likewise, Ducar (2006) suggests a student-centered Critical Student Awareness (CSA) approach in which students act as ethnographic observers of the linguistic and cultural realities that surround them. According to such a model, students are granted the opportunity to experience language in its everyday context and come to their own conclusions about the relationship between language varieties and power hierarchies. Both the CDBA model proposed by Martínez (2003) and the CSA model put forth by Ducar (2006) would suit SHL students on their path to better understanding linguistic differentiation and the ties to social and power statuses. Such knowledge is imperative for students to take ownership of their linguistic choices.

Fairclough (1992: 6) views the language practices of one’s speech community as an essential right:

People cannot be effective citizens in a democratic society if their education cuts them off from critical consciousness of key elements within their physical or social environment. If we are committed to education establishing resources for citizenship, critical awareness of the language practices of one’s speech community is an entitlement (cited in Pennycook, 2001, p. 95).
Ignoring these sociolinguistic issues and their relations to macro social structures, as was witnessed in the intermediate SHL classroom, is thus ridding students of an essential right over their language. Leeman (2005) is of the same opinion on the matter: “Not only is it misleading to teach students that there is a single set of norms to follow, as if those norms were unchanging and unchangeable, but it is also disenfranchising, as it denies students any agency in the shaping of such norms, and it negates the possibility of resistance or contestation of those norms” (p. 38). MacGregor-Mendoza (1999) discusses an activity in which students observe and analyze their own personal language use to raise consciousness of dominant linguistic hierarchies and their influence on linguistic practices. Activities such as these, as Leeman (2005) points out, can be easily adapted to allow students to make connections to the larger social context by having students perform analyses of institutional practices such as grading criteria, newspaper articles and official and unofficial language policies, to expose the perpetuation of linguistic hierarchies in these broader societal contexts. In order to foster student agency, students can also be asked to propose alternatives, or asked to describe their own role in contesting such hierarchies.

Some of the most critical issues in language education are addressed by Train (2002) in his article titled, “‘Real Spanish:’ Historical Perspectives on the ideological construction of a (foreign) language.” Train discusses the problem with the frameworks so often employed in language classrooms in the U.S., particularly in terms of the imposition of a more worthy “foreign” standard Spanish, as multiple researchers have also noted (Leeman, 2005; Peyton, et. Al. 2001; Valdés, 1981; Villa, 1996; 2002). Train
urges educators and researchers to embrace an “ethical engagement and responsibility” with regard to the richness and diversity of linguistic practices and speaker identities linked to Spanish, and to think responsively, responsibly and critically about the complex relationship between practices and ideologies, grounded in its large sociocultural, political and historical context, that construct the realities of what is Spanish language, and its learning and teaching today. Following Corson (2001), Train (2007) insists that a critically aware educational project involves: (1) the reconceptualization of language acquisition as language, critically acquired; (2) critical awareness on the part of learners and educators of language varieties and ideologies; and (3) the potential empowerment of constantly building upon previous encounters as learners search for meaning and value (p. 225).

I wholeheartedly agree with Train (2007) that as educators and researchers we need to reexamine Spanish language instruction today and engage in a critical reflection about the issues surrounding standardization, language authenticity, and the complex intersection between language practices, identity and ideology. In the SHL context, we need to consider both the methodological approach and the implications of teaching a standard or prestige variety of Spanish to heritage students. We need to develop pedagogical programs that address the concerns outlined in this chapter relating to the effects classroom practices and language ideologies on students’ relationship to cultural heritage, family, language and identity. We also need to educate teachers on sociolinguistic issues of language variation and the relationship between language practices and language ideologies.
As made evident by this dissertation, there was a breakdown in the various levels of language ideologies from the SHL Program to the SHL course textbook to the actual instructional practices in the SHL classroom. Such a breakdown suggests that there was a lack of teacher preparation with regard to sociolinguistic issues pertaining to language. The instructor participant in this study was a graduate student in a pedagogical degree program but lacked sociolinguistic preparation, which shows that teacher development in pedagogy alone is not enough to be able to deal with the types of issues that come up in the HL classroom. Based on the findings here, I argue that teachers in HL programs should receive preparation in sociolinguistics, and on contact phenomena in particular. Such preparation should be a combination of theoretical knowledge and development and practical, hands-on training. A course in HL pedagogy specifically, that highlights the sociolinguistic characteristics of HL speech, in my opinion, should be required of all HL instructors. Furthermore, in a series of workshops, for instance, HL instructors can be educated on how to handle real life situations involving the treatment of language varieties. Such teacher development would provide instructors with the tools to better meet the affective and linguistic needs of HL learners, since for this group of learners, these are really two sides of the same coin.

Concluding Remarks

The current dissertation has provided some valuable insights into the sociolinguistic issues in SHL pedagogy relating to identity and language discourses and ideologies. The findings here have significant pedagogical implications for SHL
instruction and teacher development, for HL instruction in general, and even L2 instruction, such as the importance of awareness of linguistic variation and the relationship between language and social structures. It is suggested by the current study that such awareness of language variation and how varieties of language are embedded in social power structures will help rebuild SHL learners’ confidence in their language skills and empower them to make their own, informed linguistic choices. I would like to end with a quote by Leeman (2005) on this idea, who states that:

In addition to awareness of formal features and sociolinguistic principles, are an understanding of the linguistic subordination of groups, and the recognition of students’ own choices to either conform with or contest sociolinguistic conventions both in their own interactions and in society at large (p.41)

Further research is needed to test the effects of such pedagogical approaches on students’ language attitudes and learning. We need to ensure that as educators we are addressing students’ needs as best we can and providing them with the knowledge and critical lens to understand the workings of language and societal constructs, resist hegemony and maintain their heritage language.
APPENDIX A: SHL LEARNER IDENTIFICATION SURVEY

Please indicate your previous experience with the Spanish language by answering the following questions:

1) As a child, I **spoke** Spanish frequently in the home: Yes / No
2) As a child, I **heard** Spanish frequently in the home: Yes / No
3) As a child, I **spoke** Spanish frequently outside of the home: Yes / No
4) As a child, I lived in a Spanish speaking country for 2 years or longer Yes / No
5) I **speak** Spanish or both English and Spanish when talking with my parents: Yes / No
6) My parents often speak to me in Spanish: Yes / No
7) My grandparents often speak to me in Spanish: Yes / No
8) I **speak** Spanish when talking to my neighbors and/or relatives: Yes / No
9) I **speak** Spanish when talking with my friends: Yes / No
10) At least 30% of my TV viewing/radio listening is in Spanish: Yes / No
11) I can **understand** the main idea when somebody talks to me in Spanish Yes / No
APPENDIX B: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

>word or words<       Rapid speech rate
<word or words>       Slowed speech rate
<<word or words>>     Very slowed speech rate
=                     Latching (no discernable pause/breath between utterances)
[word (word)          Uncertain transcription
(...); (...)         Inaudible utterance or word
(.3); (2.0)          Pause(s) in seconds
*word, phrase*        Laughing voice (speaking while laughing)
@@@; @@@@@           Indicates laughter (soft and loud)
↑                      Rising intonation
↓                      Falling intonation
↑words↑               Series of words spoken at a higher pitch
↓words↓               Series of words spoken at a lower pitch
word                   Emphatic stress
word:                  Colon indicates vowel or consonant elongation
WORD                   Spoken at a louder amplitude
“words”                Indicates speaker’s use of reported speech
°“word or words”°      Aspirated, higher pitched, and softly spoken reported speech
!                      Animated tone
((comment))           Transcriber’s note (includes background noise, gestures, etc.)
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE SOCIOLINGUISTIC INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

General/Background

1. ¿De dónde eres?

2. ¿Cómo es el clima allá?

3. ¿Qué te gusta hacer durante los fines de semana en Tucson?

4. ¿Cómo eras de niño/a?

5. ¿Qué te gustaba hacer como niño/a?

6. ¿Cómo era un verano típico cuando eras niño/a?

7. ¿Tienes buenos recuerdos de cuando estabas en la escuela primaria?

8. ¿Quién era tu maestro favorito? ¿Por qué?

9. ¿Tenías maestros difíciles o estrictos?

10. ¿Ha ocurrido algo cómico alguna vez cuando saliste con tus amigos?

   Cuéntamelo.

11. ¿Has estado en una situación peligrosa?

Language

1. ¿Qué lenguas hablabas en casa cuando eras un/a niño/a?

2. Describe el español de tu familia.

3. Describe tu relación con el español.

4. ¿Qué significa ser bilingüe?

5. ¿Crees que el español es importante? ¿Por qué?

6. ¿Qué opinas del español que habla tu familia?
7. ¿Qué opinas del español que se habla en Tucson?

8. En tu opinión, ¿quien habla el español ideal? ¿y el más correcto? ¿y el más bonito?
APPENDIX D: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _______________________________ (will be kept confidential)

Phone: _____________________ E-mail: _____________________ (will be kept confidential)

Courses you will be enrolled in next semester:

____________________________________________________________________

1. What is your first language? (If you learned two or more languages simultaneously, please list them all.)

____________________________________________________________________

2. What language(s) were spoken at home while you were growing up? (Check all that apply.)

Spanish __________
English __________
Other __________

3. Where were you born? ________________________________

4. Where did you grow up? _______________________________

5a. Did at least one of your parents immigrate to the U.S.? _______________
If so, at what age(s)? _______________
And from where? _______________

5b. Did at least one of your grandparents immigrate to the U.S.? ______________
If so, at what age(s)? _______________
And from where? _______________

6. Have you taken Spanish courses in school before?
Yes _____ No _____
If so, at what level and for how long? (i.e. middle school for 2 years and high school for 3 years)
7. Do you feel more comfortable speaking Spanish or English or there is no difference?


8. Do you speak Spanish in these situations?

At home with mom or dad ______ At school with Latino origin friends ______
At home with brothers & sisters ______ At school with American friends ______
With grandparent(s) ______ With friends outside of school ______
At work with customers ______
At work with colleagues ______

9. What language do you speak most while at school?

English ______ Spanish ______

10. What language do you speak most at home?

English ______ Spanish ______

11. Do you write better in English or in Spanish?

In English ______ In Spanish ______ No difference ______

12. Do you read better in English or in Spanish?

In English ______ In Spanish ______ No difference ______

13. Do you read any of the following in English?

Novels ______ Comic books ______
Pamphlets that come in the mail ______ Newspaper ______
TV guide ______ Bills ______
Magazines ______ Other ______

14. Do you read any of the following in Spanish?

Novels ______ Comic books ______
Pamphlets that come in the mail ______ Newspaper ______
TV guide ______ Bills ______
Magazines ______ Other ______
15. How many hours and how often do you watch TV in Spanish?

1 2 3 4
No time at all Not too many hours Some hours A lot of hours

16. What programs do you watch in Spanish?

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

17. How important is it for you to improve your Spanish?

1 2 3 4
Not really Not very Somewhat Very
important important important important

18. How important is it for you to maintain Spanish?

1 2 3 4
Not really Not very Somewhat Very
important important important important

19. If you have or decide to have kids, how important is it that your kids speak Spanish?

1 2 3 4
Not really Not very Somewhat Very
important important important important

20. If you have or decide to have kids, how important is it that your kids speak English?

1 2 3 4
Not really Not very Somewhat Very
important important important important

21. What language do you believe has more value at home?

English_______ Spanish_______

22. What language do you believe has more value at work?

English_______ Spanish_______

23. What language do you believe has more value at school?

English_______ Spanish_______

24. What language do you believe has more value when communicating with friends?
24. What language do you believe has more value in the U.S.?

English _________ Spanish_________

25. Why did you choose to take this Spanish as a Heritage Language course at the university?

____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

😊 ¡Muchas gracias! Thank you for your time! 😊
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