REFERENCES
Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/chiricu.1.2.06?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Transgressing Standard Language Ideologies in the Spanish Heritage Language (SHL) Classroom

Sergio Loza, Arizona State University

Abstract: This study examines language ideologies within the Spanish Heritage Language (SHL) classroom. Involving six SHL instructors from a four-year university in the U.S. Southwest, the study's data collection instruments included a questionnaire, an interview, and a written correction task. Thematic analysis of the data suggests the instructors upheld counter-hegemonic ideologies that challenged notions of standard Spanish and accepted SHL leaners' non-standard varieties within the classroom. Instructors also encouraged students to enrichen their linguistic repertoires in both their standard and non-standard varieties. The results also indicated that some instructors reproduced standard language ideologies in defining and explaining what the "standard" language is and when making decisions at the moment of editing students' written work. Additionally, the corrective task indicated that the instructors deployed distinct strategies for providing corrective feedback, and conveyed no clear distinctions between standard and non-standard varieties. The pedagogical implications of this study are discussed, including the need to strengthen SHL instructor training programs so that instructors are able to operationalize counter-hegemonic ideologies and extend these practices to their written feedback to students.

Keywords: Bilingualism, educational institutions, heritage language pedagogy, language ideologies, language variation, standard Spanish

Heritage language pedagogy is a field tasked with investigating the needs of students that are learning their heritage language within the language classroom. Spanish heritage language (hereafter, SHL) programs have been on the rise throughout post-secondary educational institutions. Beaudrie and Fairclough (2012) note a 40 percent increase in SHL programs in the United States in contrast to the 1990s and early 2000s. The emergence of SHL as an area of study is a response to the clear lack of instructional objectives, teacher training, appropriate textbooks, and curriculum guidelines for SHL learners (Beaudrie, 2012). These pedagogical inadequacies are related to how SHL learners differ in their experiences with Spanish

in contrast to second language learners. Typically, traditional Spanish classes do not adhere to SHL learners' historical, linguistic, educational, affective, and cultural dimensions (Beaudrie, Ducar, & Potowski, 2014).[1] As Potowski (2008) discerns, SHL learners have natural and familial connections with their heritage language; in comparison, second language learners' contact with Spanish is usually only with formal school instruction. Thus, SHL learners tend to have knowledge of "informal" varieties of Spanish from their home or community, while second language learners are exposed to formal Spanish in the classroom. In addition, SHL learners are not native monolingual speakers of Spanish because, for most, formal schooling is received in English. To this end, innovative approaches to the teaching of Spanish were incorporated and seven pedagogical goals were established in response to instructional shortcomings with the aim to provide "high-quality" language education to these learners (Beaudrie, 2012).[2] Furthermore, central to the mentioned pedagogical goals are the students' varieties that they bring with them into the classroom.

It is apparent that, in line with the various SHL pedagogical goals (e.g., the development of a prestige variety, the transfer of literacy skills, developing positive attitudes towards the heritage language or to the many varieties of Spanish), students bring linguistic varieties into the classroom. The language experiences of SHL learners are the essential starting point for achieving these goals. The approaches that pedagogues and SHL programs have towards their students' varieties matter and, in fact, are ideologically driven. Bernal-Enríquez and Hernández-Chávez (2003) argue that SHL learners' varieties can be seen as problematic due to inappropriate pedagogical approaches and materials that are better suited for foreign language classes. In the classroom, SHL learners become conscious that their varieties diverge from the "standard." In some cases, the authors argue, the

---

1. Beaudrie et al. (2014) summarize the dimensions by which SHL learners can vary with their experience of the heritage language. The historical dimension is related to the generation of immigration, historical, social, linguistic, and demographic realities of the particular heritage language. The linguistic dimension encompasses age and order of English and heritage language acquisition and prestige of the varieties spoken. This dimension also includes registers, domains, and overall use of the heritage language. The educational dimension is related to the amount of schooling heritage learners receive in the dominant and heritage language. The affective dimension is connected to the motivations, attitudes, and linguistic self-confidence of heritage speakers. Lastly, the cultural dimension englobes ethnolinguistic identity, family cultural practices, travel to countries of family origin, and interactions with local heritage community.

2. Valdés (1995) first added four goals, and later two more were added. Finally, Aparicio (1997) added a seventh (cultural awareness). These goals are: 1) language maintenance, 2) acquisition or development of a prestige language variety, 3) expansion of bilingual range, 4) transfer of literacy skills, 5) acquisition or development of academic skills in the heritage language, 6) positive attitudes toward both the heritage language and various dialects of the language, and its cultures, and 7) acquisition or development of cultural awareness.

standard is taught by comparing and contrasting it to the learners' "deficient" varieties. Consequently, this only serves to exclude the learners' varieties from the classroom space. SHL learners' varieties should be the basis for instruction to avoid telling students that what they bring to the classroom is unvalued. The risks involved in educational institutions not adopting SHL pedagogy into courses offered for SHL learners has unprecedented implications for raising their linguistic self-esteem and willingness to continue to maintain their Spanish (Bernal-Enríquez & Hernández-Chávez, 2003; Carreira, 2000).

Beaudrie (2015), who offers perhaps the most detailed summary of approaches to language variation in the SHL context, indicates that several approaches to learners' language varieties have developed throughout the trajectory of SHL educational research, e.g. the eradication, expansion, appreciation, appropriateness-based, and critical language awareness approach. According to the author, the standard has been the central focus of instruction in many SHL programs since the early years: "SHL educators have long considered that their main task is to help their students acquire more formal registers and the so-called prestigious, or standard, variety of Spanish" (p. 2). More specifically, the eradication approach seeks to replace learners' "inferior" varieties with a more prestigious standard (Valdés, 1981; Villa, 1996, 2002, as cited in Beaudrie, 2015). After much criticism from experts, this approach was replaced by the expansion approach, which recommends adding a prestige standard to learners' already existing repertoire rather than eliminating their varieties. Later, the appreciation approach aimed to go beyond simple comparisons between learners' varieties and the standard. Carreira (2000) suggests highlighting the inherent linguistic naturalness of SHL students' varieties in order to raise linguistic self-esteem and expose society's subjective evaluations of lesser prestigious varieties by delving deeper into the commonalities between varieties rather than the differences. The appropriateness approach emphasizes the equality of all language varieties but indicates that some are better suited in certain contexts, e.g. formal vs. informal (Leeman, 2005). Lastly, the critical approach utilizes critical frameworks towards language and pedagogy with the intent of exposing to learners the sociopolitical ideologies that create power relations between dominant groups of language users and subordinate groups (Leeman, 2005). As exemplified before, researchers gained new critical perspectives towards SHL learners' varieties and new approaches were developed as a means to empower and promote language maintenance. However, Beaudrie (2012, 2015) has called into question the extent to which the principles and pedagogical practices best fitted to SHL speakers have disseminated to US post-secondary programmatic practices.

In response, this present study is primarily concerned with the language ideologies promoted by SHL instructors. Language ideologies have serious

consequences in how SHL learners' non-prestigious varieties (US Spanish) are viewed and treated within the classroom. Speakers often believe standard ideologies due to misinformation and long-standing institutional promulgation of the superiority of the so-called standard. In order to further address this issue, the objective of this investigation is to examine SHL instructor language ideologies towards both standard Spanish and SHL learners' non-standard varieties of Spanish at a university in the US Southwest.

Language Ideologies

The decisions that pedagogues and SHL programs take with respect to learners' varieties have underlying ideological implications. As noted above, the protagonist role, which the standard has in the classroom, is in fact under the premise that learners' come into the classroom in need of replacing an "impure" variety of Spanish. Leeman (2012) defines language ideologies as "consisting of values and belief systems regarding language generally, specific language or language varieties, or particular language practices and ways of using language" (p. 43). A quick Google search for the definition of "standard Spanish," for example, results in the repetition of several key words: "proper," "pure," "correct," etc. (Leeman & Serafini, 2016). As Leeman (2012) notes, these descriptors of the standard are not neutral but rather serve to legitimize the privilege and power of its speakers at the expense of others. The standard is defined by the marking of less-prestigious varieties of Spanish and its speakers, essentially relegating them to the periphery. Despite the standards prevalence, Lippi-Green (2012) notes that, in reality, the standard is a "hypothetical construct" that is idealized, exclusive, and often associated with the educated (p. 55). To this end, the notion of what is standard relates to those varieties that are seen as free of stigmatized regionalisms and untouched by the linguistic effects of bilingualism. Non-prestigious varieties, such as US Spanish, are disparaged and do not fit these aforementioned criteria of the standard. Leeman (2012) states, "monolingualist ideologies of language . . . imagine monolingualism as a universal norm and link multilingualism to cognitive confusion . . . [contributing] to the portrayal of bilingual speakers as intellectually compromised" (p. 44). SHL learners are bilingual and, therefore, their varieties of Spanish reflect the contact between their two languages. It is common for US Spanish and its connection to bilingualism to be associated with notions of erroneousness.[3] A testament to this

---

3. Sociolinguists would agree that spoken language is always changing and evolving, as "all living languages change" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 8). Four main linguistic phenomena characterize US Spanish commonly associated with language contact phenomenon: 1) code switching, 2) semantic extensions, 3) borrowings, and 4) calques. US Spanish is not a corruption of Spanish, Potowski

idea is the fact that US Spanish is often described by prejudicial labels as *pocho, mocho, Tex-Mex,* and *border lingo* (Galindo, 1995; Silva-Corvalán, 2005). Zentella (2008) notes that bilingual varieties of Spanish are seen as "linguistic deforma-tion…corrupting the heritage language" (p. 6). On the contrary, all sociolinguistic evidence points to the fallacy of this belief that SHL learner varieties are somehow "wrong."

Despite US Spanish's inherent linguistic legitimacy, it is relegated to a subor-dinate status. Language ideologies are related to the political interests and agendas of particular dominant groups. Leeman (2012) argues that notions about which varieties are considered standard and which are not are constructed by those with social power to rationalize the subordination of other language varieties and its speakers" (p. 45). In addition, the standard is seen as belonging to educated groups of speakers and is promoted by institutions that represent these select groups. Lippi-Green (2012) illustrates this idea with an example of how certain pronunci-ations are included and excluded from English Dictionaries. This is primarily done by consulting with the elite, for example, professors, artists, curators, doctors, jour-nalists, etc. According to the author, "the lexicographer assumes that those with lesser education will bow to the authority of those with more education, because that is what we are trained to do" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 57). Likewise, the Real Academia Española (RAE) is traditionally considered the foremost institutional authority on the Spanish language by speakers and educators alike.

An example of the subordinate pressures the RAE and its associated branches instill on US Spanish can be seen in their recently published book *Hablando bien se entiende la gente* (Piña-Rosales, Covarrubias, Segura, & Fernández, 2010). Its pur-pose is to essentially correct the use of Spanish and the most common errors made by Spanish speakers in the United States. Lynch and Potowski (2014) criticize the bias and lack of sociolinguistic awareness of this book. Their critique emphasizes the misinformation "divulged" by *Hablando bien se entiende la gente,* by erroneously mislabeling US Spanish linguistic phenomenon (e.g., calques and loans). Potowski and Lynch note that the book discusses the "errors" in usage of loanwords, such as *chatear, facebuqear,* and *tuitear,* and laments that more traditional Castilian words are not used (p. 37). This book denies the existence of many words, such as those mentioned above, despite their usage by millions of Spanish speakers around the world, and perpetuates negative stereotypes about US Spanish (Lynch & Potowski, 2014). Publications like this text reinforce linguistic hierarchies because society views them as manuals for "correct and proper" language use. Due to the prestige and authority of institutions like RAE, speakers adhere to prescriptivist

---

(2008) points out. These varieties are rule governed and not completely open to any influence by English. For instance, a code switch will never violate a grammatical rule of either language.

approaches to Spanish, thus contributing to the acceptance of hegemonic ideologies supported by these dominant institutions.

Language Ideologies in Educational Practices

Given the context in which the standard thrives through institutional legitimization, it is not surprising that in-classroom approaches to SHL learners' US Spanish varieties often reflect hegemonic ideologies of the standard. Institutions play a crucial role in the dissemination of language ideologies, as exemplified in the previous section. Specifically, educational institutions are key in socializing speakers to ideas about which varieties are deemed as standard, neutral, uniform, and free of regionalisms (Leeman, 2012). Many universities offer classes for heritage speakers but too often do not provide the necessary curriculum and proper considerations towards their varieties (Beaudrie, 2015). To illustrate, Valdés, Fishman, Chávez, and Pérez (2008) found an emphasis on the teaching of the standard in a large sample of SHL programs. These findings suggest that even today programs support hegemonic language ideologies that are detrimental to US Spanish and to language maintenance. In a survey, Beaudrie (2011) found that, of 173 four-year universities in the US Southwest, only 66 offered SHL programs. Moreover, these 66 universities mainly focused on literacy and writing, so the students' heritage cultures were not part of the objectives of the programs. This approach provides further evidence that many educational institutions operate on very narrow and exclusive programmatic practices that alienate SHL learners' cultures and varieties from the classroom.

Other important studies have found specific evidence of how speakers of Spanish within educational institutions support the standard ideology. Valdés et al. (2003) investigate ideologies within Spanish departments and found that academics assigned a special value to native-like proficiency. Notably, native speakers were found to be perceived as "inherently" superior to non-native speakers of Spanish. US Latinos were assumed to have the most difficulty in acquiring academic Spanish by both second language and native speakers. In another study, Lowther Pereira (2012) conducted an extensive ethnographic investigation that examined the instructor and student language ideologies in a SHL classroom. Her observations indicated that the instructor consistently corrected SHL learners' varieties in various contexts before class, during informal conversations, and during classroom instruction. The students revealed that they lacked self-confidence in their Spanish. They communicated being anxious about the "correct" Spanish forms and assimilated in response to the instructor's authority. More importantly, the students demonstrated an idealization of monolingual Spanish. In another study, Reznicek-Parrado (2015) found that SHL students regard Spanglish as important to their identity. However, the results also showed that the participants regarded

Spanglish as unacceptable within an academic context (i.e. the language classroom). According to the author, these findings leave pending questions as to the internalized ideologies that go unquestioned within the educational institution. The repercussions of leaving these ideologies unchallenged impact the self-esteem, self-value, and linguistic agency of SHL learners.

Despite SHL educational research progress and innovation, programmatic practices do not always reflect these advances. The approaches SHL programs take to their learners' varieties have ideological consequences. To illustrate, Beaudrie (2015) analyzed 62 SHL course syllabi from 35 post-secondary universities. The objective of this study was to identify the course goals and objectives. The investigator notes that the "key goal" of the data analysis was to determine the approach to language variation that each course adopted in their goals and objectives (Beaudrie, 2015). The categorization of the goals and objectives were: 1) eradication, 2) expansion approach, 3) appreciation approach, 4) appropriateness-based approach, and 5) critical approach. Interestingly, the results indicated that the two most common approaches were the expansion (52%) and the appreciation approach (30%). The least common approaches were the critical language awareness (2%), eradication (4.2%), and appropriateness-based approach (13%). These findings are telling of how institutions' approaches to SHL learners varieties support the standard ideology despite attempting to include learners' varieties. These approaches are crucial in either upholding or challenging hegemonic language ideology of the standard in the classroom. Leeman (2005) indicates that the eradication and the expansion approaches place the standard as a central component of the classroom under the guise of instrumental and economic value. In contrast, the appropriateness approach seeks to avoid the disparagement learners' varieties by establishing domains for its use in personal contexts while leaving the standard for more public and professional contexts. Although the learners' varieties seem to be respected, Leeman argues that appropriateness falsely suggests a shared homogenous linguistic norm shared between speakers. Moreover, the appreciation approach strives to teach SHL learners the way language naturally changes and demonstrates the inherent validity of all varieties. The downfall of this mentioned approach is that it does little to go beyond the subordination of specific varieties to engage students in discussions that address how oppressive ideologies "marginalize specific groups" (Leeman, 2005, p. 41). The critical approach, as Leeman (2005) puts it:

> demands that educators see language—like education—as a site of struggle, and that together with our students, we explore its sociopolitical implications. . . . Central to critical approaches to language pedagogy . . . [is] the dialogic examination and questioning of dominant sociopolitical hierarchies . . . the role of language in those hierarchies, the promotion of student voice and agency, and commitment to democratic change. (p. 36)

Indeed, a critical approach can lead students to be vigilant observers of oppressive power structures that justify the privilege and dominance of certain groups. Supporters of this approach are not advocating to remove the teaching of a prestige variety but, as the author discusses, work with SHL learners to be critical and empower them to make their own language choices. Martinez (2003) argues that SHL education should guide learners to the see the "arbitrary nature" of the linguistic market and use it to their advantage.

The language ideologies propagated by educational institutions can potentially deter SHL learners from maintaining their heritage language and undermine the future of Spanish in the United States. Given the importance of language ideologies, this present study aims to add research findings that demonstrate how SHL instructors support or challenge this ideology. All evidence suggests that this ideology is supported, reproduced, and reflected in the educational context by materials, beliefs, corrections, and approaches to SHL learners' varieties. This present work seeks to add to what is known about ideologies by investigating the ways instructors engage with the notion of the standard.

Research Questions

1. How do HL instructors understand "standard" Spanish varieties in relation to nonstandard varieties?

2. How do instructors perceive the role of these same varieties in the classroom?

3. How do instructors incorporate these personal beliefs into practice while correcting a journal entry containing various US Spanish linguistic phenomena?

Participants

This study had a total of six participants (n=6) who are all current and former graduate teaching assistants of Spanish heritage language courses at a four-year university in the US Southwest. Participants are all at different points in their academic careers, which gives them a range of teaching experiences with SHL. All participants were given pseudonyms for the purpose of keeping anonymity in the data presented. The participants' pseudonyms are Martin, Luis, Lupe, Bruno, Alfredo, and Kim (see table 1). Half of the participants are heritage speakers of Spanish except for two. Moreover, all but one instructor (Kim) has taken a graduate linguistics course specifically for Spanish heritage language pedagogy. In addition, Luis, Lupe, and Kim have taken a sociolinguistics course as graduate students.

Table 1. Participant information

Participant	Language Experience	Sociolinguistics	Heritage Pedagogy	Area of study
Martin	Heritage		✓	Literature
Luis	Heritage	✓		Literature
Lupe	Heritage	✓	✓	Literature
Bruno	Native		✓	Literature
Alfredo	Native		✓	Literature
Kim	L2	✓		Linguistics

Regarding prior teaching experiences, the participants' backgrounds are very diverse. Kim, Lupe, and Luis have prior experience teaching Spanish in secondary school. Bruno taught language arts for native speakers in a Latin-American country. Martin and Alfredo started their teaching careers as teaching assistants in their Masters programs. All participants are in the literature PhD program, except Kim, who is in the linguistics program. Finally, all of the participants began teaching SHL courses at this present university.

Procedures

The data were elicited from three instruments to provide insights into the SHL instructors' teaching background and their ideologies towards their students' Spanish varieties. These consisted of a semi-structured interview, a questionnaire, and a correction task. In the first part of the study, the participants completed a questionnaire with the purpose of knowing more about their prior teaching experiences, areas of expertise in their graduate studies, and experiences in taking courses related to US Spanish or heritage language pedagogy. The semi-structured interview covered a range of topics centered on the instructors' ideologies toward SHL learners' varieties in the context of the classroom (see table 2). The interviews were done in the language the participants chose; however, Spanish was used almost exclusively with some instances of code-switching. The construct investigated (e.g., the standard ideology) was operationalized based on prior observations and expert discussions on the ways this ideology is manifested in the SHL context (e.g., materials, instructor perception of the SHL learners' varieties, approaches to learners' varieties, corrections of the SHL learners' varieties). Thus, the participants were asked to share their perceptions of SHL learners' varieties and how they fit into the SHL classroom. Furthermore, the instructors discuss their class objectives, what they think their students' needs are, what classroom materials they think are the most beneficial, and how they understand the concept of the standard. These different aspects of the SHL classroom give insight into the

role that the standard takes in these instructors' SHL classes. Approximately a total of 6 hours and 55 minutes of audio were recorded with all six participants. The longest interview lasted one hour and 32 minutes and the shortest was 34 minutes. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed by utilizing a thematic analysis to code identifiable themes from the data (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012).

Table 2. Examples of semi-structured interview questions

Perceptions of SHL learners' varieties	In your classroom, what kind of Spanish do you expect your students to use?
Instructor objectives	What type of Spanish should be taught in the classroom?
SHL learner needs	In your opinion, what are the most important needs of SHL learners?
Materials	What kind of literature do you think benefits students most?
Understanding of the standard	How do you define to students the concept of the standard?

The final part of the study consisted of a writing task in which participants were asked to provide corrective feedback. The participants were instructed to correct a diary supposedly written by an SHL learner on "mi identitdad" or "my identity." This instrument was modified by the researcher to include common linguistic features found in US Spanish varieties (e.g., semantic extensions, calques, borrowings, and code switching). More specifically, regionalisms from Mexican-Americans and Mexican varieties (Escobar & Potowski, 2015) were included based on the population of SHL learners found at this particular university. The purpose of adding these features was to have an instrument as authentic as possible, although the diary itself is artificial. In addition, the diary included grammatical errors, such as conjugation regularizations, missing accent marks, missing prepositions, and several missing prepositions as distractors. The principal objective of this instrument was to measure the way these participants corrected errors vs. US Spanish variation. Since the study could not include actual learner-instructor interactions, the correction task is a way to find out if there are gaps between ideology and practice.

Literature and Writing as a Priority

The results from the data regarding SHL learners' needs was indicative of the instructors' awareness of their students' difficulties with the use of prestige varieties in relation to writing. The participants noted that writing was a priority for

learners, which is no surprise, given that they may not be familiar with Spanish orthography and writing conventions (Leeman, 2010). There was no indication that they viewed their SHL learners' variation as problematic, but they discussed the difficulties faced in formal writing.

> . . . *principalmente pienso que es la escritura . . . pienso que el habla puede ir cambiando a base de la escritura, verdad . . . este, siento que ya cuando ellos entienden, verdad, las diferencias entre los diferentes registros y todo esto, ellos solitos lo incorporan al aspecto oral, y vaya, yo también lo he hecho de esa manera o sea estando en literatura estando estudiando literatura en español me he dado cuenta de cómo se dicen ciertas cosas porque las he leído entonces eso también de alguno lo he incorporado a como hablo.—Luis*

> . . . *la escritura, que definitivamente, este, el tomarse el tiempo para desarrollar un trabajo escrito que sea coherente que lo haya revisado entonces creo que sí, creo que una de las dificultades es la escritura . . . . Después sería su escritura creo que tendría que venir a lo oral, creo que es importante también lo oral, obviamente porque uno debe entender que el hablar es como cualquier otra cosa una habilidad que se debe de ir puliendo que se debe ir practicando. Y por último sería la gramática y la ortografía.—Martin*

> . . . *o sea que podrían dar unas ideas más complejas, y creo que si podría hacer una diferencia muy grande sobre todo en la manera en que escriben y en la forma que hablan hay veces porque para dar como . . . llegar a ese nivel en que tu transmites ideas más complejas . . . en mi caso en el inglés hay veces como . . . me quedo corto . . . en ese punto. Pero son detalles tan pequeños que en las clases de segunda lengua no se dan cuenta.—Alfredo*

SHL learners are described by the participants as having difficulties writing coherently, expressing "complicated" thoughts in their writing, and using formal registers. For some SHL learners, their use of Spanish has been within their homes or communities and not necessarily in academic contexts (Potowski, 2008). This is significant because SHL courses can help students in their overall growth, especially given that minority students often struggle in achieving academic success in post-secondary education. An important goal of instruction is the transfer of literacy skills, since students may or may not have developed literacy skills in their dominant language (English) and can work towards developing them in the heritage language (Beaudrie et al., 2014). The participants regarded literature as a tool that can aid the development of their students' oral and writing skills. As Lippi-Green (2005) discusses, written language is a form of standardized language. In the following examples, literature is seen as the most effective tool in helping the SHL learner in expanding their knowledge in Spanish.

> *Creo que la literatura sería lo principal para mí porque lo puede hacer dentro de un contexto más relajado, este, puede hacerlo en la casa leer un cuento pequeño y nada . . .—Martin*

> *Creo que el leer es esencial para que una persona desarrolle su vocabulario como te digo hablantes por herencia la cantidad de literatura que recibimos es mínima . . . el tipo de literatura es limitada y digo limitado en el sentido no de calidad sino en el sentido no tenemos una gama de texto de donde escoger . . .—Luis*

Furthermore, the participants leaned towards Mexican-American literature and Chicano literature as the most appropriate for their SHL classrooms. This literature was viewed as the most representative of their students' cultural and social experiences and as a way to include the learners' voices in the curriculum. Luis, in particular, rejected the idea of peninsular literature as feasible for heritage learners by sharing his experiences:

> *Pero, personalmente yo se me dificulta al máximo conectarme con la literatura peninsular no le encuentro sentido. No me puedo imaginar yo en una situación así no, por más que trato de aprender, digo, no hay una conexión, y no es por demeritarla no conecta conmigo y eso está bien.—Luis*

In the following example, Martin talks about specific gains an SHL learner can obtain through literature. Some of these mentioned gains are vocabulary and the sense that US Spanish is valid, a broader view of the world, and greater writing abilities.

> *. . . hay mucha literatura Chicana escrita en el español que no se nos presenta no en la primaria ni en la secundaria ni en la preparatoria. . . . hay literatura en español, escrita en estados unidos que creo que es importante para no solamente para desarrollar el español . . . para incrementar nuestro vocabulario sino también para reconocer que el español es un lenguaje válido . . .—Martin*

Kim shared an anecdote from her class, which exemplifies that students care about Chicano literature and, given the space, students will share their voice within the classroom context. Heritage language pedagogy is precisely geared towards providing a space for the HL students' voices in the classroom, their varieties, and their interests. The participants appear to be calling for authenticity that is relatable to their students' lives and cultures, thereby, in the process, validating their stigmatized language variety.

> *Hay una chica que se llama Rosa y está estudiando la literatura Chicana . . . y siempre que abro espacio para comentarios ella siempre lo menciona . . . yo siento que es importante . . . mi queja mayor con ese libro es que no conecta muy bien con sus experiencias, con lo suyo . . . Literatura chicana no porque ves mucho code switching y para normalizar todo eso que o sea también es literatura es o sea no sé tiene valor . . .—Kim*

This, in fact, was a very common theme in the interviews. Literature was seen as the most important and beneficial tool for their students' linguistic development

and as a means to deconstruct ideologies that oppress SHL learners' varieties. This tendency might also be because most of the participants are students of literature (specifically Chicano literature) and this may also be influential. Chicano literature is seen as culturally and linguistically relevant and beneficial to heritage learners. This is significant because as Leeman (2010) notes that for "Spanish language teaching in the United States . . . course content has foregrounded literature from Spanish and portrayed varieties of Spanish spoken in Spain as the best or the most authentic" (p. 312). This advocacy from the participants to include the learners' culture and varieties is an anti-hegemonic ideology against the standard.

US Spanish As a Marked Variety

As illustrated in the examples below, the participants are aware that their students utilize stigmatized and rejected varieties of Spanish that are seen as inappropriate for academic contexts.

> *Creo que lo primordial es que entiendan cual es la realidad del español en la sociedad creo que lo primordial es que puedan observar las dinámicas de poder en las que está entretejido el español. Y que reconozcan los estigmas que se desarrollan dentro del español como uno mismo reproduce esos estigmas y esas ideologías dominantes de la sociedad. Eso creo que es lo esencial.—Martin*

> *Creo que no tengo opiniones negativas al respecto de mis estudiantes y sus variaciones tengo opiniones profundamente negativas al respecto del prejuicio lingüístico que existe incluso sobre las personas que estudian lingüística . . . —Bruno*

> *. . . siento que muchos estudiantes vienen a la clase y ellos no lo piensan en términos de que yo hablo una variación que es menos prestigiosa. Eso lo escuchan aquí, ese lo escuchan aquí porque ellos en su español lo están hablando bien . . . creo que ese pensamiento de prestigio y todo lo demás que cargamos al hablar el estándar eso lo aprenden aquí. Eso les puede causar un poco de ansiedad o también quizás animarlos a que lo aprendan, pero en mi experiencia dependiendo del instructor sienten más ansiedad.—Luis*

Interestingly, Bruno discusses his personal conflicts with individuals in the university that have prejudices against SHL learners' varieties. Although he chose not to elaborate further, it is quite clear that he is alluding to standard language ideologies within educational institution settings (e.g., as is seen in Valdés, 2003). Similarly, Luis holds educational institutions responsible for creating a context that makes SHL learners aware that their varieties are non-standard or somehow "wrong."

US Spanish as a Valid Variety in the SHL Classroom

The participants discussed their expectation of the use of Spanish within their classrooms. The general consensus was very welcoming to their students' varieties.

Bruno illustrated his opinion with a comparison to monolingual English speaking students. He argues that it is unrealistic to expect a monolingual English speaking student to use a "professional" register in the classroom, contrary to SHL contexts where there is a double standard to "correct" them. Moreover, Bruno depicts the SHL classroom as a safe-space where learners can communicate while expanding their abilities.

> *El que traen es el español que debería usar . . . separaría para que ellos pudieran ampliar su vocabulario y registro y también porque es algo que ya saben hacer ellos en inglés . . . si yo empiezo con decirle a mis estudiantes "Ah, pero aquí vamos a hablar profesionalmente" o sea . . . si empiezas haciendo eso como vas a hacerle para que el estudiante hable . . .—Bruno*

> *Depende de lo que estén haciendo si es algo más formal no pero cuando estamos nada más platicando en clase . . . como lo hablarían con en sus hogares . . .—Kim*

> *Los debates son un poco apasionados . . . pero los que me han tocado . . . llega hasta un punto donde empiezan a salir palabras hasta en inglés y no es tanto porque no creo que no la sepan . . . simplemente se apasionan. Está bien por lo menos se están animando a debatir y eso es lo que me interesa más.—Luis*

In general, this acceptance became a widely-seen theme that surfaced through all of the interviews. None of the instructors openly discredited their students' use of their variety in the classroom. According to the participants, even formal activities, such as class debates, did not seem to be strictly regularized. Kim frames the classroom as an extension of SHL learners' homes and welcoming of their varieties.

The Standard as a Means for Universal Communication or Resistance

Two themes were drawn from the data demonstrating different views of the standard's definition. In particular, Lupe and Luis defined the standard variety as the medium between different varieties, thus allowing for easier communication. They define it by its "basic" and "universal" characteristics, thus making it possible to understand those who have linguistic forms unfamiliar to them. As discussed previously, the terms "uniform" and "universal" are not neutral but rather serve to justify the oppressive effects of the standard. Interestingly, Luis tried to be critical of who "owns" the standard by criticizing the hierarchy with his comment about the Spaniards. Nevertheless, he did not problematize the idea of having a standard and accepted its existence as a "basic" form of Spanish.

> *Todos nos podemos entender o comunicar entonces y luego arriba y abajo hay estas otras diferencias en las variedades por ejemplo uno dice pues niño sabemos que es la palabra estándar for kid . . . pero se tiene otro, huerco, chamaco, guache, zipote . . . todas estas variedades y todas son lo mismo . . . o buquí no sabía, apenas*

> *me aprendí esta . . . bueno allí está . . . todos sabemos que es niño el estándar pero hay estas otras . . . entonces les digo . . . "its just that mid point where we are all able to communicate" tú vas a otro país, tu sabes español, pero de pronto alguna expresión no les vas a entender porque no estás acostumbrado.—Lupe*

> *El español estándar es el sistema lingüístico universal simplemente el más básico, el sistema, verdad, que se puede usar para comunicarse entre todos verdad que hablamos español ese es todo y no le pertenece a nadie ni a España perdón, pero porque ellos, no te creas, ni les entiendo hay veces . . . el español estándar para mi es eso es un sistema básico de comunicación en los que todos encajamos de alguna forma . . .—Luis*

Conversely, in the following example, Martin is aware of the ideological problems associated with the standard. He challenged its validity by questioning its homogeneous and oppressive nature.

> *Personalmente creo que la idea de tener un estándar es una tendencia . . . del heteronormativismo de nuestra sociedad y creo que esa tendencia es de homogenizar la experiencia humana y es problemático para mí de tener un estándar o una homogeneización de la experiencia humana. Porque cuando homogeneizas le das validez a una experiencia sobre las otras . . .—Martin*

> *Lo primero que me viene a la mente es . . . la lengua es dialecto con ejército y navy pero digo o sea, no entro tampoco a temas así de . . . no trato lo que implica eso porque podríamos entrar en muchas cosas que yo no sé . . . pero yo nada más les digo que es igual como el inglés que tenemos en Webster y que ellos dicen cuales son palabras o hay un uso estándar. . .—Kim*

Essentially, Martin is questioning the subordination that accompanies dominant and oppressive power structures by acknowledging that different language experiences exist. Kim provides a quote by the linguist Max Weinreich that alludes to the power a specific dialect can possess through the support and dominance of its speakers. Although she is aware of power structures of language, she mentions that it is a topic not discussed in her class. She is not quite as critical as Martin, as she accepts the dictionary's authority in making decisions about language and acknowledges the existence of the standard.

US Spanish as a Valid Variety within the Community

The participants were asked to speak on where or how SHL learners' variety could be used or accepted. They indicated that learners' varieties can have value in professional contexts when servicing their communities. Luis notes that there are consequences for SHL learners that lose the ability to use their community's variety. He indicates that students have the impression that they need to learn "correct" Spanish to communicate with family members.

Muchos estudiantes me han dicho a mí, quiero aprender español porque ... quiero aprender español correcto porque me quiero comunicar con mi familia, okay, yo conozco a muchos estudiantes que han estudiado el español de manera muy formal que han hasta perdido la conexión con su familia porque ya no hablan igual que su familia si me entiendes ... bueno ya no solamente estamos hablando de que si se daba ese español estándar o no, estamos hablando de tú como tu persona y tu carrera lo que tú quieras hacer con tu vida, eso es mucho más grande de simplemente decidir bueno cual registro usar, las consecuencias son más grandes.—Luis

Sí, depende que carrera los estudiantes deben tener la habilidad de escoger la variedad y el registro que más les convenga en contextos específicos para que sean exitosos. Entonces si eres una enfermera o un doctor o una doctora ... y tienes un paciente que se accidentó per el paciente habla un lenguaje totalmente coloquial y la doctora no está preparada ...—Martin

Yo creo que depende del trabajo, porque por ejemplo tenemos un colega que una vez contó que trabajaba en un call line ... un centro de llamadas y que le decían no señora tiene que entregar su solicitud y entregarla por correo o ... entregarla por internet y que la gente se le quedaba come que de que hablas ... okay, tienes que entregar tu aplicación y someterla en internet, entonces todo depende ... obviamente si trabajas en negocios internacionales y te toca viajar por todo Latinoamérica puede que ...—Lupe

Luis discusses that the use of Spanish is not a simple dichotomous situation between standard and informal uses of language, rather, it depends on the students' goals and aspirations that drive the decisions they make with their use of Spanish. Martin talks about the way SHL learners can use the linguistic market for convenience; it is not a matter of right or wrong use. Likewise, Lupe also discusses the contributions that SHL learners can offer in professional contexts by being able to communicate and use their varieties as an advantage in the workplace.

Task Results

The instructors marked instances of grammar and orthography mistakes in the correction task. As for the features of SHL learners' varieties, four categories are used to identify if the participants corrected or did not correct them in the task (see table 3). Instances where features of US Spanish are crossed-out and the standard alternative is written fall into the category "corrected." At times, some features were highlighted, either by an underline or circle, and the standard" form was written over the word. These fall under "formal option given." It was the case that some features were not identified by any kind of marking; these are "not identified." Lastly, participants sometimes only circled or underscored the features without giving a standard alternative, which is called "highlighted."

Table 3. Correction Task Results

Word	Corrected	Formal Option Given	Not Identified	Highlighted
Haiga	1			5
Muncho	1		4	1
Nadien	4		1	1
Aplicar		2	3	1
Lonche		1	4	1
Descansaron			6	
Chequerla	1	2	1	2
Troca			6	
Puedamos	3	1		2
Vuelvamos	2		2	2
Dijieron	3	1	2	

The participants used an array of markings to indicate these mistakes by under-lining, crossing-out, and using arrows to give examples. Interestingly, features of SHL learners' varieties were in some instances marked as "wrong" and in other cases either left unmarked or the participants gave an alternative standard option. For example, *haiga* seemed to receive the participants' sympathy as it was circled and, in one case, *haya* was given as a standard option. Although both *haiga* and *nadien* are archaisms, *nadien* was corrected many more times than *haiga*. The semantic extensions, *aplicar* and *descansaron* were interesting in that the former seems to be more salient, while the latter was not identifiable. The words that were corrected the most were *nadien*, *puedamos*, and *dijieron*. These regulariza-tions were, in most cases, corrected but were not always identified or explicitly "corrected." Interestingly, *muncho* was not identified by four of the participants and only corrected and highlighted once. *Chequerla* and *lonche* received wide-spread treatment from the participants while *troca* was not identified by any of the participants.

Discussion

The results from this study have several implications in terms of standard language ideologies in the SHL classroom. With respect to the first research question, all evidence suggests that the participants are aware of the social implications linked to their students' varieties and permit its use within the classroom. It is imperative that instructors of SHL are conscious of the cultural and linguistic background of their students. Given the widespread misinformation and language ideologies that

subjugate SHL learners' varieties, instructors must be able to expose and challenge these real-world power structures in the classroom. The consequences of not doing so can result in learners internalizing beliefs about their Spanish and promote their acceptance of the standard ideology (Lowther-Pereira, 2010; Reznicek-Parrado, 2015). The data related to the second research question demonstrates that many of the instructors emphasized a distinction in register depending on the classroom activity or writing assignment. While this is not rejecting US Spanish in the classroom, this conceptualization is in line with the appropriateness approach. The participants did not have any ideologies that would intentionally marginalize SHL learners' varieties from the classroom; however, this approach is problematic as it does not address the standard in a critical manner.

These data also showed a placing of writing at the forefront of the SHL learners' needs. The participants seem to be acquainted with the linguistic and educational dimensions of their learners. The participants advocated for Chicano literature as a resource to empower their students (both linguistically and culturally) and include culturally relevant materials in their curriculum. They saw Chicano literature as an opportunity to engage learners with materials that reflect their linguistic and cultural realities. In light of this data, there is evidence that these participants reflect counter-hegemonic ideologies and understand the social and educational problems associated with SHL learners. Nevertheless, not all of the participants were critical in their definition of the standard. Some provided the prototypical definition that justifies the oppression of disparaged varieties. Defining the so-called standard in this manner is problematic because instructors are unknowingly reinforcing and institutionally validating its hegemony. SHL classes should guide learners to think critically and question these language "norms" that are widely unquestioned and accepted as fact. As Leeman and Serafini (2016) argue, "key elements in critical pedagogy are the inclusion of students' experiences and knowledge in the curriculum and the promotion of students' agency or purposeful engagement with the world" (p. 63). In addition, the standard can be reinforced by correcting learners' varieties without an awareness of what features US Spanish includes.

The grading task is significant because, on the one hand, the interview data demonstrates that participants have counter-hegemonic ideologies, but, on the other hand, they did not know how to respect learners' varieties in the correction task. The results indicate the opposite of what the thematic analysis results yielded. The participants sympathize with the discrimination of SHL learners' varieties; in fact, some of the participants were SHL learners themselves. The participants were proponents of including the learners' voices and cultures into the classroom through culturally relevant literature. The data suggests an inability of the participants to distinguish US Spanish from actual orthographic and grammar errors,

despite having been exposed to sociolinguistics and heritage language pedagogy. This is a call for further investigation into instructor training as a means to enhance how SHL classes can resist oppressive ideologies through different facets of the SHL classroom.

This study is limited due to its few participants. Future studies should include in-class observations to see what instructors actually do and how the standard ideology is challenged or supported. Although the correction task results were interesting and lead to future questions, the instructors were given an artificial diary to correct. Future studies should analyze authentic samples from assignments corrected in SHL courses and interview both instructors and SHL learners. Furthermore, the participants who truly wanted to respect US Spanish could have potentially declined to correct the task; however, they may have felt pressured to correct because it was the researcher's expectation at the time of the study.

The interview data resulted in five occurring themes: 1) literature and writing as a priority, 2) US Spanish as a marked variety, 3) US Spanish as a valid variety in the SHL classroom, 4) the Standard as a means for universal communication or resistance, and 5) US Spanish as a valid variety within the community. The data were conclusive of the participants having counter-hegemonic ideologies towards SHL learners' varieties. This was evidenced by the participants welcoming their SHL learners' varieties into the classroom. Moreover, the participants advocated for the inclusion of US Chicano literature as a way to incorporate the learners' voices and cultures. The participants discussed the stigmatization of US Spanish and the problems learners can face in society and in educational institutions. All evidence suggests these participants wanting to include learners' voices into the classroom by allowing them to use their varieties while learning formal uses of Spanish. Nevertheless, they showed a preference for the appropriateness approach to their leaners' varieties. As Leeman (2005) notes, this approach does not challenge the power structures of language ideologies from a critical point of view. In addition, many of the participants defined standard Spanish with hegemonic terminology, e.g., "*el más básico.*" Furthermore, the correction task demonstrates that the participants were not able to discern features of US Spanish and therefore could not practice their counter-hegemonic ideologies. These findings are significant because there seems to be a gap between instructors wanting to respect US Spanish but not having the necessary know-how to challenge it.

The decisions instructors make in the classroom, such as allowing learners' varieties into the classroom or supporting culturally relevant literature etc., can

challenge language ideologies. However, problematic definitions of the standard and a lack of linguistic knowledge about US Spanish can indeed perpetuate dominant views of the standard. The contribution of this study is the identification of the subtle ways SHL instructors can conform to ideologies that promote the standard despite having intentions to be culturally and linguistically inclusive. The risks involved in not addressing the standard in SHL classes have real-world implications for learners and their communities. These findings emphasize the importance of instructor training to more critical aspects of language and pedagogy. Instructors should be aware of the linguistic features of US Spanish so that they may choose the contexts where they deem appropriate to correct and not correct. The goal of such training is to avoid reinforcing oppressive language ideologies within educational institutions and work with learners to become conscious of the social justice issues as stake.

References

Aparicio, F. (1997). La enseñanza del español para hispanohablantes y la pedagogía multicultural. In M. C. Colombi & F. X. Alarcón (Eds.), *La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes: Praxis y teoría* (pp. 222–232). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Beaudrie, S. M. (2012). Research on university-based Spanish heritage language programs in the United States: Current state of affairs. In S. M. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field* (pp. 203–221). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Beaudrie, S. M. (2015). Approaches to language variation: Goals and objectives of the Spanish heritage language syllabus. *Heritage Language Journal*, *12*(1), 1–21.

Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. (2012). Preface. In S. M. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field* (pp. 1–17). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Beaudrie, S., Ducar, C., & Potowski, K. (2014). *Heritage language teaching: Research and practice*. Nueva York: McGraw Hill.

Bernal-Henríquez, Y., & Hernández-Chávez, E. (2003). La enseñanza del español en Nuevo México: ¿Revitalización o erradicación de la variedad chicana? In A. Roca & C. Colombi (Eds.), *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States* (pp. 78–95). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Carreira, M. (2000). Validating and promoting Spanish in the U.S.: Lessons from linguistic science. *Bilingual Research Journal, 24,* 423–442.

Escobar, A. M., & Potowski, K. (2015). *El español de los Estados Unidos.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Galindo, D. L. (1995). Language attitudes toward Spanish and English varieties: A Chicano perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *17*(1), 77–99.

Leeman, J. (2005). Engaging critical pedagogy: Spanish for native speakers. *Foreign Language Annals,* *38*(1), 35–45.

Leeman, J. (2010). Introduction. The sociopolitics of heritage language education. In S. V. Rivera &

D. J. Villa (Eds.), *Spanish of the U.S. Southwest: A language in transition* (pp. 309–317). Norwalk, CT: Iberoamericana Vervuert.

Leeman, J. (2012). Investigating language ideologies in Spanish as a heritage language. In S. M. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field* (pp. 43–59). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Leeman, J., & Serafini, E. F. (2016). Sociolinguistics for heritage language educators and students: A model for critical translingual competence. In S. M. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Innovative strategies for heritage language teaching: A practical guide for the classroom* (pp. 56–79). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lippi-Green, R. (2005). Language ideology and language prejudice. In E. Finegan & J. R. Rickford (Eds.), *Language in the USA. Themes for the twenty-first century* (pp. 289–304). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Lipski, J. M. (2008). *Varieties of Spanish in the United States.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lowther Pereira, K. A. (2010). *Identity and language ideology in the intermediate Spanish heritage language classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305185056).

Lynch, A., & Potowski, K. (2014). La valoración del habla bilingüe en los Estados Unidos: Fundamentos sociolingüísticos y pedagógicos en Hablando bien se entiende la gente. *Hispania*, 97(1), 32–46.

Martínez, G. (2003). Classroom based dialect awareness in heritage language instruction: A critical applied linguistic approach. *Heritage Language Journal*, 1(1), 1–14.

Potowski, K. (2008). ¿Por qué ofrecen una clase de español para hispanohablantes? In J. D. Ewald & A. Edstrom (Eds.), *El español a través de la lingüística: Preguntas y respuestas* (pp. 228–241). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Reznicek-Parrado, M. L. (2015). "Spanglish": Bringing the academic debate into the classroom. Towards critical pedagogy in Spanish heritage instruction. *EuroAmerica Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages,* 2(2), 50–66.

Silva-Corvalán, C. (2005). Spanish in the Southwest. In E. Finegan & J. R. Rickford (Eds.), *Language in the USA: Themes for the twenty-first century.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Valdés, G. (1981). Pedagogical implications of teaching Spanish to the Spanish-speaking in the United States. In G. Valdés, A. Lozano, & R. Garcia Moya (Eds.), Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims and methods (pp. 3–20). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Valdés, G. (1995). The teaching of minority students as academic subjects: Pedagogical and theoretical challenges. *Modern Language Journal,* 79(3), 299–328.

Valdés, G., González, S. V., García, D. L., & Márquez, P. (2003). Language ideology: The case of Spanish in departments of foreign languages. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 3–26.

Valdés, G., Fishman, J., Chávez, R., & Pérez, W. (2008). Maintaining Spanish in the United States: Steps toward the effective practice of heritage language re-acquisition/development. *Hispania,* 91(1), 4–24.

Villa, D. (1996). Choosing a "standard" variety of Spanish for the instruction of native Spanish speakers in the U.S. *Foreign Language Annals,* 29, 191–200.

Villa, D. (2002). The Sanitizing of U.S. Spanish in Academia. *Foreign Language Annals,* 35, 222–230.

Zentella, A. C. (2008). Preface. In M. Niño-Murcia & J. Rothman (Eds.), *Bilingualism and identity* (pp. 3–9). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Sergio Loza is a doctoral student at Arizona State University. His research interests include Hispanic sociolinguistics and Spanish heritage language pedagogy. He is currently working on critical perspectives of language ideologies in the Spanish heritage language classroom and language attitudes in the metropolitan area of Phoenix, Arizona.