Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education

NELSON FLORES
University of Pennsylvania

JONATHAN ROSA
University of Massachusetts Amherst

In this article, Nelson Flores and Jonathan Rosa critique appropriateness-based approaches to language diversity in education. Those who subscribe to these approaches conceptualize standardized linguistic practices as an objective set of linguistic forms that are appropriate for an academic setting. In contrast, Flores and Rosa highlight the raciolinguistic ideologies through which racialized bodies come to be constructed as engaging in appropriately academic linguistic practices. Drawing on theories of language ideologies and racialization, they offer a perspective from which students classified as long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners can be understood to inhabit a shared racial positioning that frames their linguistic practices as deficient regardless of how closely they follow supposed rules of appropriateness. The authors illustrate how appropriateness-based approaches to language education are implicated in the reproduction of racial normativity by expecting language-minoritized students to model their linguistic practices after the white speaking subject despite the fact that the white listening subject continues to perceive their language use in racialized ways. They conclude with a call for reframing language diversity in education away from a discourse of appropriateness toward one that seeks to denaturalize standardized linguistic categories.

Despite popular debate about the perceived threat of language diversity to U.S society, there is near-universal agreement among language education scholars about the legitimacy of minoritized linguistic practices.[1] For example, there is widespread consensus among language education scholars that African American English is not an example of "bad" English but, rather, a legitimate variety

Harvard Educational Review Vol. 85 No. 2 Summer 2015
Copyright © by the President and Fellows of Harvard College

of English that has a system of linguistic patterns comparable to Standard English (Delpit, 2006; Smitherman, 1977). Similarly, there is a growing body of research that illustrates the value of bilingual education that builds on, rather than erases, the home languages of immigrant children (Cummins, 2000). These scholars have critiqued prescriptive ideologies, which dictate that there is one correct way of using languages and arbitrarily privilege particular linguistic practices while stigmatizing others. Such critiques include a long history of studies establishing "the logic of nonstandard English" (Labov, 1969), the importance of valuing different communities' "ways with words" (Heath, 1983), and the "funds of knowledge" that multilingual children bring to the classroom (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992).

Building on these critical views of linguistic prescriptivism, scholars have called into question assimilationist approaches to language diversity (Cummins, 2000; Valenzuela, 1999). Specifically, these analysts have critiqued subtractive approaches to language education in which language-minoritized students are expected to replace their home language varieties with the standardized national language. In contrast to subtractive approaches, many language education researchers and practitioners have embraced additive approaches that promote the development of standardized language skills while encouraging students to maintain the minoritized linguistic practices they bring to the classroom. Additive approaches attempt to reframe the problem of language diversity by emphasizing respect for the home linguistic practices of minoritized students while acknowledging the importance of developing standardized language skills.

In this article we seek to enter into critical dialogue with advocates of additive approaches to language education. We stand in solidarity with the view that subtractive approaches to language diversity are stigmatizing and contribute to the reproduction of educational inequality. However, we question some of the underlying assumptions in many additive approaches—specifically the discourses of "appropriateness" that lie at their core. These discourses of appropriateness, we argue, involve the conceptualization of standardized linguistic practices as objective sets of linguistic forms that are understood to be appropriate for academic settings. In contrast, we seek to highlight the racializing language ideologies through which different racialized bodies come to be constructed as engaging in appropriately academic linguistic practices. Specifically, we argue that the ideological construction and value of standardized language practices are anchored in what we term *raciolinguistic ideologies* that conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices. That is, raciolinguistic ideologies produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects.

This raciolinguistic perspective builds on the critique of the white gaze—a perspective that privileges dominant white perspectives on the linguistic

and cultural practices of racialized communities—that is central to calls for enacting culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris & Alim, 2014). We, too, seek to reframe racialized populations outside of this white gaze and hope to answer the question of what pedagogical innovations are possible if "the goal of teaching and learning with youth of color was not ultimately to see how closely students could perform White middle-class norms but to explore, honor, extend, and problematize their heritage and community practices" (Paris & Alim, 2014, p. 86). The framework of raciolinguistic ideologies allows us to push even further by examining not only the "eyes" of whiteness but also its "mouth" and "ears." Specifically, a raciolinguistic perspective seeks to understand how the white gaze is attached both to a speaking subject who engages in the idealized linguistic practices of whiteness and to a listening subject who hears and interprets the linguistic practices of language-minoritized populations as deviant based on their racial positioning in society as opposed to any objective characteristics of their language use. As with the white gaze, the white speaking and listening subject should be understood not as a biographical individual but as an ideological position and mode of perception that shapes our racialized society.

Here we explore the ways that raciolinguistic ideologies affect the education of students in three different linguistic categories: long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners. These educational categories are typically thought to classify distinct populations and linguistic practices and are thus conventionally analyzed separately. However, by theorizing raciolinguistic ideologies, we offer a perspective from which long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners can be understood to inhabit a shared position as raciolinguistic Others vis-à-vis the white listening subject. Throughout the article we illustrate how appropriateness-based approaches to language education are implicated in the reproduction of racial normativity by expecting language-minoritized students to model their linguistic practices after the white speaking subject despite the fact that the white listening subject continues to perceive these students' language use in racialized ways.

Theorizing Raciolinguistic Ideologies

Our conception of raciolinguistic ideologies links the white speaking and listening subject to *monoglossic language ideologies,* which position idealized monolingualism in a standardized national language as the norm to which all national subjects should aspire (Flores, 2013). Subscription to monoglossic language ideologies can be understood as part of what Silverstein (1998) describes as "a culture of monoglot standardization" (p. 284), in which powerful allegiances to imagined linguistic norms persist regardless of whether anyone actually adheres to those norms in practice. That is, people embrace notions such as "Standard English" even if they cannot locate them empirically.

Thus, it is important to understand such normative categories as language ideologies rather than discrete linguistic practices. As Silverstein (1998) points out, "Since monoglot Standard is a cultural emblem in our society, it is not a linguistic problem as such that we are dealing with" (p. 301). Such insights suggest that seeking to identify the specific linguistic practices that constitute Standard English is a futile effort; instead, we should concern ourselves with the ways that Standard English is produced as a cultural emblem and how the circulation of that emblem perpetuates raciolinguistic ideologies and thereby contributes to processes of social reproduction and societal stratification.

This critical perspective brings into focus the ways that Standard English should be conceptualized in terms of the racialized ideologies of *listening subjects* (Inoue, 2006) rather than the empirical linguistic practices of *speaking subjects*. In her theorization of the listening subject, Inoue shows how the language use of particular groups can be overdetermined (for example, as feminine/masculine, correct/incorrect, etc.), thereby skewing the ideological and linguistic perceptions of listening subjects.[2] For example, conceptions of "accent" in the U.S. context demonstrate the ways that listening subjects systematically perceive some linguistic practices and ignore others. Thus, while we know that everyone has an accent—a typified way of using language—listening subjects perceive only some groups' accents while leaving others' linguistic practices unmarked. Thus, if we were to analyze accents by focusing exclusively on different groups' linguistic practices, we would be unable to apprehend the disparate ways in which listening subjects perceive these practices as relatively "accented" or "accentless." This focus on listening subjects helps us understand how particular racialized people's linguistic practices can be stigmatized regardless of whether they correspond to Standard English. Altering one's speech might do very little to change the ideological perspectives of listening subjects.

Placing an emphasis on the white speaking *and* listening subject illustrates the limits to appropriateness-based models of language education. Specifically, while appropriateness-based models advocate teaching language-minoritized students to enact the linguistic practices of the white speaking subject when appropriate, the white listening subject often continues to hear linguistic markedness and deviancy regardless of how well language-minoritized students model themselves after the white speaking subject. Thus, notions such as "standard language" or "academic language" and the discourse of appropriateness in which they both are embedded must be conceptualized as racialized ideological perceptions rather than objective linguistic categories. Building from this perspective, linguistic stigmatization should be understood less as a reflection of objective linguistic practices than of perceptions that construe appropriateness based on speakers' racial positions. In this sense, advocates of appropriateness-based models of language education overlook the ways that particular people's linguistic practices can be stigmatized regardless of the extent to which they approximate or correspond to standard forms.

Raciolinguistic Ideologies in Educational Contexts

Subtractive and additive approaches have been developed as alternative ways of managing language diversity in U.S. classrooms. In subtractive models, the singular goal is to increase competence in Standard English, with little or no value placed on the linguistic practices that students from language-minoritized backgrounds bring with them (Cummins, 2000). The implied linguistic assumption that undergirds these efforts is that students must lose the linguistic practices with which they were raised in order to acquire proficiency in Standard English. In contrast, the goal of additive approaches is to valorize students' diverse linguistic repertoires by positioning their skills in languages other than Standard English as valuable classroom assets to be built on rather than handicaps to be overcome. For advocates of additive approaches, the goal is to promote the ability to code-switch between different varieties of English and/or across languages when appropriate (Delpit, 2006). In other words, additive approaches to language education affirm nonstandard varieties of English and nonstandard varieties of languages other than English as practices that are appropriate for out-of-school contexts but insist that students add standard conventions to their linguistic repertoires because these are the linguistic practices appropriate for a school setting.

Though many critiques of subtractive approaches to language education have been offered (Cummins, 2000; Delpit, 2006; Valdés, 2001a; Valenzuela, 1999), critical examinations of additive approaches to language education are only beginning to emerge. García (2009) argues that additive approaches to bilingual education continue to perpetuate monoglossic language ideologies that position monolingualism as the norm and bilingualism as double monolingualism (Heller, 1999). That is, additive approaches to bilingual education continue to interpret the linguistic practices of bilinguals through a monolingual framework that marginalizes the fluid linguistic practices of these communities. For example, McCarty, Romero-Little, Warhol, and Zepeda (2009) document the ways that monoglossic language ideologies led to the marginalization of the fluid linguistic practices of Native American children growing up in a multilingual environment. These monoglossic language ideologies led many educators to dismiss the dynamic linguistic practices of youth that combined English with indigenous languages, with many educators insisting that these children were "semilingual" or not proficient in either English or their indigenous language. Similarly, Otheguy and Stern (2011) point out that because the Spanish linguistic practices of U.S. Latinas/os develop in a bilingual context, they are qualitatively different from the linguistic practices of monolingual Spanish speakers in Latin America. In short, populations whose linguistic practices emerge within a context of language contact are not adding one language to another as part of the development of double monolingualism but, rather, are engaging in dynamic linguistic practices that do not conform to monolingual norms.

García (2009) advocates for replacing monoglossic language ideologies with *heteroglossic language ideologies*. Unlike monoglossic language ideologies that treat monolingualism as the norm, heteroglossic language ideologies position multilingualism as the norm and analyze the linguistic practices of language-minoritized students from this multilingual perspective. In this framework, languages are seen as interacting in complex ways in the linguistic practices and social relations of multilingual people. García challenges static language constructs that privilege monolingualism and advocates for conceptualizing linguistic practices and linguistic identities as dynamic phenomena. Her framework challenges the idealized monolingualism of constructs such as "first language" and "second language" and argues for more dynamic language constructs that resist privileging monolingual populations and their linguistic practices. This emerging critique has offered an important starting point for examining the ways that additive approaches to language education may marginalize the linguistic practices of language-minoritized students.

Another growing body of literature that offers insights into challenging additive approaches to language education is *critical language awareness,* which Alim (2005) describes as an approach to language education that both incorporates the linguistic practices of language-minoritized students into the classroom and provides spaces for students to critique the larger sociopolitical context that delegitimizes these linguistic practices. He proposes two overarching questions that can be used to inform critical language awareness: "'How can language be used to maintain, reinforce, and perpetuate existing power relations?' And, conversely, 'How can language be used to resist, redefine and possibly reverse these relations?'" (p. 28). The ultimate goal of critical language awareness is for "students [to] become conscious of their communicative behavior and the ways by which they can transform the conditions under which they live" (p. 28).

We believe that combining a heteroglossic perspective with critical language awareness opens up space for unmasking the racism inherent in dominant approaches to language education. Theorizations of culturally sustaining pedagogies (Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014), which describe efforts to develop a critical view of cultural practices and acknowledge their dynamic nature, offer an important starting point for conceptualizing this critical heteroglossic perspective. Yet, because such an approach does not explicitly critique appropriateness-based models of language education and continues to focus on the speaking subject rather than the listening subject, it might be misconstrued as suggesting that individuals can control the production and perception of their language use and should, therefore, appropriately deploy their linguistic repertoires based on the context in which they find themselves (for example, using standard conventions when communicating in mainstream school settings). However, this is not the case. Here we use the lens of raciolinguistic ideologies to extend the work of culturally sustaining pedagogies and critical heteroglossic perspectives to examine how additive approaches to lan-

guage education fail to challenge appropriateness-based discourses and reify the racial status quo by perpetuating the presumption that individuals can control the ways their speech patterns are interpreted by their interlocutors. In particular, we focus on the discourses of appropriateness that lie at the core of additive approaches to language education.

As Leeman (2005) notes, "The basic premise of appropriateness-based approaches is that all language varieties are legitimate, but that some are more appropriate in specific contexts" (p. 38). Leeman offers a strident critique of the ways that telling students "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" (p. 38). We build on Leeman's critique of notions of appropriateness at the core of additive approaches to language education by adding a raciolinguistic ideologies perspective. We argue that the appropriateness-based model of language education not only marginalizes the linguistic practices of language-minoritized communities but is also premised on the false assumption that modifying the linguistic practices of racialized speaking subjects is key to eliminating racial hierarchies. Our argument places *racial hierarchies* rather than *individual practices* at the center of analysis. This allows us to put aside the question of whether individuals from racialized communities should model themselves after white speaking subjects as a matter of necessity or as a pragmatic coping strategy. Instead, we seek to question the efficacy of appropriateness-based language education in challenging racial inequality. In particular, we argue that appropriateness-based models place the onus on language-minoritized students to mimic the white speaking subject while ignoring the raciolinguistic ideologies that the white listening subject uses to position them as racial Others. To advance this assertion, we examine how appropriateness-based models of language education have been conceptualized for three sometimes overlapping racialized student populations—long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners. We use examples from our own previous research alongside research of other language education scholars to illustrate how members of these student populations are heard as speaking deficiently by the white listening subject regardless of the ways they attempt to model themselves after the white speaking subject.

Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Long-Term English Learners

Long-term English learners have been defined in the literature as students who have been officially designated as English learners for seven or more years (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). Though the term itself is fairly new, it continues in a long tradition of terms used to describe language-minoritized students who experience low academic achievement. A prominent precursor was *semilingualism,* which was originally used by Scandinavian scholars attempting to explain

the low academic achievement of Finnish migrant children in Swedish schools (Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukomaa, 1976). The term was then taken up by Cummins (2001), who defines it as "the linguistic competence, or lack of it, of individuals who have had contact with two languages since childhood without adequate training or stimulation in either" (p. 40). Cummins uses the term to develop a general theory of why elite bilingualism (bilingualism of affluent communities) appears to lead to improved cognitive ability while minoritized bilingualism (bilingualism of marginalized communities) appears to lead to cognitive deficiencies. His argument is that elite bilingualism occurs in a context of additive language education where the second language is added to the first language, while minoritized bilingualism occurs in a context of subtractive language education where the second language is gradually replacing the first language, thereby leaving minoritized communities with a lack of strong proficiency in either of the two languages. Cummins (2000) has subsequently built on this work to argue for the development of additive language education programs for minoritized students in the form of bilingual education.

Though the term *semilingualism* has since been abandoned in response to strong criticism of the deficit perspective it reinforces (Edelsky et al., 1983; Martin-Jones & Romaine, 1986), calls for additive forms of bilingual education continue to frame certain populations of language-minoritized students as lacking appropriate proficiency in any language (Valadez, MacSwan, & Martínez, 2000). Building on the framing introduced by Cummins, scholars have argued that subtractive language education that has failed to build on the home linguistic practices of long-term English learners has led to their "native language having not been fully developed and instead have been largely replaced by English" (Menken & Kleyn, 2010, pp. 399–400). Based on this framing, Menken and Kleyn (2010) argue that "the education of these students must be additive, particularly in the area of academic literacy, so that we provide students with a strong foundation as they move to higher grades" (p. 414). Though we support the idea of building on, rather than replacing, the home linguistic practices of students who are categorized as long-term English learners, such framing places the brunt of the responsibility on these students to mimic the linguistic practices of the white speaking subject while reifying the white listening subject's racialization of these students' linguistic practices.

This reification of the white listening subject can be found in deficit perspectives that are often used to describe the linguistic practices of students categorized as long-term English learners. In a widely circulated policy report on long-term English learners, Olsen (2010) describes these students as having "high functioning social language, very weak academic language, and significant deficits in reading and writing skills" (p. 2). She also describes them as lacking "rich oral language and literacy skills in scholastic English needed to participate and succeed in academic work. They exhibit little to no literacy skills in either language and often only a skeleton academic vocabulary in their home language" (p. 23). In short, long-term English learners are seen

as deficient in the academic language that is appropriate for a school context and necessary for academic success.

The solutions Olsen (2010) offers for confronting the challenges faced by long-term English learners focuses exclusively on changing their linguistic practices. One recommendation calls for long-term English learners to master the language deemed appropriate for school by placing them in "Academic Language Development" classes that focus "on powerful oral language, explicit literacy development, instruction in the academic uses of English, high quality writing, extensive reading of relevant texts, and an emphasis on academic language and complex vocabulary" (p. 33). Another calls for long-term English learners to receive additive instruction that develops their home language through placement in "native speakers classes" that are "designed for native speakers, and include explicit literacy instruction aligned to the literacy standards in English and designed for skill transfer across languages" (p. 35). In both of these recommendations, the solution to the problem posed by long-term English learners is squarely focused on molding them into white speaking subjects who have mastered the empirical linguistic practices deemed appropriate for a school context.

This appropriateness discourse overlooks the ways that the very construction of a linguistic category such as long-term English learner is produced by the white listening subject and is not based on discrete linguistic practices. In fact, if we look at their complete linguistic repertoires across languages and varieties, we find that these so-called long-term English learners are adept at using their bilingualism in strategic and innovative ways—indeed, in ways that might be considered quite appropriate and desirable were they animated by a privileged white student (Flores, Kleyn, & Menken, in press).

An example from an interview with a New York City high school student classified as a long-term English learner (Menken & Kleyn, 2010) illustrates this point. At the time of the interview Tamara[3] was a sophomore who was classified as a long-term English learner because she had failed to pass the state English language proficiency exam throughout her schooling career. Her parents were both born in Mexico, but Tamara was born in the Bronx. Tamara and her parents communicate primarily in Spanish, though Tamara claimed to sometimes "mix English with Spanish." Like Tamara, her siblings are bilingual, and she reported frequently moving back and forth between the languages in her interactions with them. She also reported texting and e-mailing in both languages, depending on the person. During an interview, she described the ways she strategically uses her English and Spanish to communicate:

Researcher: So you mix English and Spanish a lot? A little?

Tamara: It depends, cause some people they know English and Spanish, but not a lot of Spanish. And sometimes they don't know Spanish at all. I'll have to talk to them in English. Well everybody I know speaks English.

Researcher: Anyone you know who speaks Spanish, is there usually some mixing?

> *Tamara:* Yeah, like I have these friends downstairs. There's some that speak English, but it's less than 50 percent that they speak English, so I have to speak Spanish. And there's some that I speak English, English only.

Were Tamara a privileged white student engaging in English linguistic practices in the ways that she did in this interview, her linguistic practices would likely be perceived differently. In fact, were she a privileged white student who was able to engage in the bilingual language practice that she described, she might even be perceived as linguistically gifted. Tamara not only showed her competence in English during the interview (which was conducted entirely in English), but also demonstrated her understanding of appropriateness—namely, that she should use English, Spanish, or a combination thereof in ways that accommodate her interlocutor. She understands the necessity of adapting her speech to the situation in which she finds herself. Yet, the language proficiency exam continues to "hear" Tamara as an "English Language Learner." In this sense, the state language proficiency exam operates as a particular form of the white listening subject by classifying students like Tamara as linguistically deficient despite evidence that illustrates their linguistic dexterity.

An argument that may be posed by supporters of the current framing of long-term English learners is that while Tamara may understand appropriateness outside of an academic context, she and other long-term English learners have failed to master the language that is appropriate for success in school. Indeed, Olsen (2010) articulates this dichotomous framing of home and school linguistic practices when she describes the home language of long-term English learners "as commonly referred to with terms such as 'Spanglish' or 'Chinglish,' and while it is expressive and functional in many social situations, it is not a strong foundation for the language demands of academic work in Standard English" (p. 23). In other words, the home linguistic practices of long-term English learners are seen as appropriate for outside of school but inappropriate for inside of school. In addition, their home linguistic practices are seen as contributing little to the development of the linguistic practices deemed appropriate in a school context.

Another excerpt from the interview with Tamara also complicates this dichotomous framing of home and school language proficiencies. This is best illustrated by her response to a question about how she felt taking a Spanish for native speakers class that was explicitly designed to teach her and other long-term English learners the Spanish deemed appropriate for school:

> I felt like it was good. I thought that I was actually learning more about my original language that I have at home, and I think it was very helpful because I had to do some speech in church, so actually working in this class actually helped me with that speech. It was good.

In contrast to Olsen's assertion that the home linguistic practices of long-term English learners are not a strong foundation for academic work, Tamara articulated the ways that the linguistic practices in which she engages at church

and at school complement one another. Tamara is able to build bidirectional relationships between home and school that transcend the crude dichotomy of academic versus nonacademic that lies at the core of the long-term English learner label. Were Tamara a privileged white student, questions would never be raised as to whether her home linguistic practices provide a "strong foundation" for what she does in school. Instead, these connections would be seen as a natural outcome of the education process—a natural outcome denied to Tamara because of her racial positioning in U.S. society.

Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Heritage Language Learners

Heritage language learning is often framed as addressing issues of language loss and/or recovery, or of language shift away from one's "native language" to state-sponsored languages. Indeed, there are "problems of definition" (Valdés, 2005, p. 411) in determining what constitutes a heritage language and its speakers. Definitions range in focus from membership in a particular community and personal connection through family background, on the one hand, to particular kinds of linguistic proficiency on the other (Carreira, 2004). Fishman (2001) notes that based on this range of definitions, heritage language can be used in the United States to alternately refer to languages of peoples indigenous to the Americas (e.g., Navajo), languages used by the European groups that colonized the Americas (e.g., German), and languages used by immigrants arriving in the United States after it became a nation-state (e.g., Korean). Many languages fit into more than one of these groups (e.g., Spanish, which was a colonial heritage language before it was an immigrant heritage language). Focusing on applied perspectives, Valdés (2001b) points out that "foreign language educators use the term [*heritage language learner*] to refer to a language student who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or at least understands the language, and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English" (p. 38).

Similar to the interventions proposed for long-term English learners, many heritage language programs distinguish between the acquisition of language skills that are relevant only to restricted domains outside of school settings (e.g., homes and communities) and skills that are associated with success in mainstream educational institutions. From these perspectives, the goal of heritage language learning is to build academic language proficiency in one's "native language." These programs seek to value the skills students bring to the classroom while expanding their "academic" language repertoires in their "native" language. At the same time, they often reproduce standard language ideologies that draw rigid distinctions between appropriate "academic" and "social" language use. This constructed distinction between appropriate "academic" and "social" language obscures the ways that "academic" language is effectively used outside of formal school contexts and "social" language is effectively used in conventional classroom settings. Despite the constructed nature

of this distinction, only some groups are stigmatized for using "social" linguistic practices in academic settings. As with the case of long-term English learners, the discourse of appropriateness here serves as a vehicle for the white listening subject to position heritage learners as deficient for engaging in practices that would likely be seen as dexterous for privileged white students.

It is clear that advocates and theorists of appropriateness-based models of heritage language education seek to value the linguistic and cultural practices of language-minoritized students. For example, Valdés (2001b) calls into question the notion of the "mythical" bilingual with equal proficiencies in two languages. Instead, she advocates a view of bilingualism in which language abilities are conceptualized as a continuum from more or less monolingual to more or less bilingual. She also emphasizes the arbitrary nature of characterizing "prestige" varieties of linguistic practice as inherently more sophisticated than "nonprestige" varieties. The distinction is based on the sociolinguistic concept of diglossia (Fishman, 1967), which refers to the ways that language varieties are positioned as formal or "high" (i.e., prestige) and informal or "low" (i.e., nonprestige). In her effort to point to the ideological nature of this distinction, Valdés (2001b) notes that there are features of language that are familiar to nonprestige speakers yet unfamiliar to prestige speakers and vice versa. In this formulation, the problem is not that nonprestige speakers possess "a somewhat narrower range of lexical and syntactic alternatives" (p. 46) but that they do not use the prestige variety. We extend this argument to suggest that the notion of prestige language reflects a form of linguistic normativity anchored in raciolinguistic ideologies which serves as a coded way of describing racialized populations that are unrelated to empirical linguistic practices. We argue that people are positioned as speakers of prestige or nonprestige language varieties based not on what they actually do with language but, rather, how they are heard by the white listening subject.

Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci (1998) provide us a point of entry into illustrating this claim through their description of Estela, a second-generation Chicana from Texas who grew up speaking English and Spanish, has a BA in Spanish, and is a "doctoral student in a Spanish literature department at a prestigious university" (p. 473). Despite these bilingual experiences and academic credentials, some of Estela's professors described her Spanish as "limited" and question the legitimacy of her admission to the doctoral program. Meanwhile, some of her fellow students laughed when she spoke Spanish in class. Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci face significant difficulty when they seek to identify the specific linguistic issues involved in the stigmatization of Estela's Spanish:

> When pressed to describe what they perceive to be her limitations, Estela's professors can give few details . . . Most of the faculty agree that Estela's written work . . . is quite competent. Still, there is something about her speech that strikes members of the Spanish department faculty as not quite adequate and causes them to rank her competence even below that of Anglophones who have acquired Spanish as a second language. (p. 473)

Estela has clearly enjoyed a great deal of academic success, and yet her professors continue to "hear" her as having linguistic deficits that they cannot quite identify. Taking a raciolinguistic perspective allows us to situate this hearing within the racial hierarchies of U.S. society. As a second-generation Chicana, Estela's Spanish language use is stigmatized vis-à-vis European and Latin American varieties of Spanish, which are privileged in mainstream Spanish language learning at the university level in the United States. This stigmatization is based on the notion that U.S. Latinas/os are not socialized to correct Spanish or English linguistic practices by their families and communities, which reflects the deficit-based perspectives from which their bilingualism is viewed—as a problem rather than a strength (Rosa, 2014; Zentella, 2005). What if the problem is not Estela's limited communicative repertoire but the racialization of her language use and the inability of the white listening subject to hear her racialized body speaking appropriately? The notion that there is something unidentifiable, yet inferior, about Estela's speech—so much so that it is viewed as less proficient than that of students who learned Spanish as a second language—suggests that raciolinguistic ideologies are at play in shaping perceptions of her language use as somehow insufficiently academic.

This raciolinguistic regime combines monoglossic language ideologies and the white listening subject. Monoglossic language ideologies, which promote the hegemony of monolingualism in a standardized national language, suggest that the prestige variety is an objective linguistic category. In contrast, we argue that the notion of prestige variety should be understood as an assessment of language use that is anchored in the racializing ideologies of the white listening subject. These ideologies lead to situations in which racialized students such as Estela, whose lived experiences of bilingualism could be interpreted as significantly more sociolinguistically dexterous than her classmates and even many of her professors, are perceived as linguistically inferior and in need of remediation.

Valdés (2001b) is aware of these contradictions, noting that heritage learners often possess the ability to "carry out conversations on everyday topics with ease and confidence and may even be able to understand rapidly spoken language that includes the subtle use of humor" and goes on to state that "in comparison to students who have acquired the language exclusively in the classroom, the heritage language student may seem quite superior in some respects and quite limited in others" (p. 47). Her solution to this contradiction is to embrace an additive approach to heritage language education where heritage language learners must build from proficiencies developed outside of the classroom in order to master the language that is appropriate in an academic setting. However, from a raciolinguistic perspective, heritage language learners' linguistic practices are devalued not because they fail to meet a particular linguistic standard but because they are spoken by racialized bodies and thus heard as illegitimate by the white listening subject. That heritage speakers with highly nuanced language skills are positioned as less

skillful than their counterparts "who have acquired the language exclusively in the classroom" is precisely the power of raciolinguistic ideologies as they apply to conceptions of heritage language issues. An additive approach to heritage language education, which is rooted in the rigid distinction between linguistic practices that are appropriate for academic and social uses, is not sufficient in addressing these raciolinguistic ideologies produced by the white listening subject.

By approaching heritage language learning with the understanding that the social positions of different language users, rather than simply their linguistic repertoires, impact how their linguistic practices are heard, we can move beyond the idea that establishing the legitimacy of all linguistic practices will somehow lead to the eradication of linguistic stigmatization. This involves shifting the focus of both research and practice in language education from analyzing linguistic forms to analyzing positions of enunciation and reception; such a shift makes it possible to see how different linguistic practices can be stigmatized in strikingly similar ways based on marginalized speakers' shared, racialized positions of enunciation and particular listeners' hegemonic positions of reception. Conversely, similar linguistic practices can be valued in strikingly different ways based on raciolinguistic ideologies. For example, Hill's (2008) analysis of "Mock Spanish" practices (e.g., "no problemo," "el cheap-o," etc.) shows how "language mixing" can be celebrated for white monolingual English speakers and yet stigmatized for Latinas/os positioned as "heritage speakers." When U.S. Latinas/os engage in similar practices, such as using *rufo* instead of *techo* for "roof" or *parqueando* instead of "*estacionando*" for "parking," they are often chastised for using inferior Spanglish forms as opposed to "pure" Spanish. In fact, heritage language learning is often regarded as an effort toward cleansing particular populations of these so-called impurities. Linguistic purity—like racial purity—is a powerful ideological construct. We should seek to understand the perspectives from which such forms of purity and impurity are constructed and perceived rather than focusing on the forms themselves. Thus, we must redirect attention away from empirical linguistic practices and toward raciolinguistic ideologies that overdetermine people as particular kinds of language users.

Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Standard English Learners

Raciolinguistic ideologies in the context of long-term English learners and heritage language learners are closely related to the language ideologies associated with long-standing discussions of teaching Standard English to speakers of "nonstandard" English. Historically, there has been a concerted effort among sociolinguists to validate nonstandard varieties of English. African American English (AAE) is prominent in these discussions, with generations of scholars documenting and analyzing its structural and social properties (Green, 2002; Labov, 1969; Smitherman, 1977). These efforts developed in

response to the widespread view that the linguistic practices of African Americans are degenerate and in need of remediation. At times, African American linguistic practices have risen to the level of widespread national debate. A recent example of public discourse surrounding AAE is the language use of President Barack Obama, who has been shown to strategically blend mainstream and African American modes of communication in ways that legitimize both forms of expression (Alim & Smitherman, 2012). Yet, most times AAE has reached national attention have been much more contentious and delegitimizing. One prominent example was the debate surrounding the Oakland Unified School District's "Ebonics" resolution in the mid-1990s, which focused on the Oakland Unified School District's declaration that AAE is a legitimate and distinct language that needs to be validated by teachers while African American students learn Standard English (Baugh, 2000; Perry & Delpit, 1998).

For the purposes of this discussion, we contend that the Oakland Unified School District's Ebonics resolution and the subsequent public debate about the status of AAE in mainstream educational settings were deeply informed by ideas about English language and heritage language education—specifically that Ebonics was an integral component of African American cultural heritage distinct enough from Standard English that speakers of AAE required extra language support. The resolution positioned Ebonics as the official language spoken by the district's twenty-eight thousand African American students. By claiming that Ebonics is a distinct language and not simply a dialect of English, the school board sought to locate the linguistic practices of African American students within the context of English language education. If Ebonics were designated as a distinct language, then, based on existing district policy, students would require access to additional educational resources geared toward teaching Standard English. Yet, the resolution was popularly interpreted as an attempt to position Ebonics within a heritage language education curriculum; many people assumed that the school district was attempting to teach Ebonics to its students. This decision led to a massive multiracial backlash, with many whites considering the resolution an attack on American culture and many African Americans considering the resolution as at best misguided and at worst an orchestrated effort to continue to perpetuate the marginalization of African American children. Besides the board of education and some teachers, the only major support for the Oakland resolution came from linguists who, using an additive framework, argued for the importance of validating AAE while teaching students standard English conventions (Perry & Delpit, 1998).

Despite differing interpretations of the resolution and the linguistic relationship between Ebonics and English, there was continuity across these perspectives in their view that Standard English is an objective linguistic category which provides access to societal inclusion and should be a primary focus of mainstream educational curricula. As with long-term English learners and

heritage language learners, this raciolinguistic ideology serves to naturalize the idealized linguistic practices of the white speaking subject and position these idealized linguistic practices as integral to social mobility. As such, the inability to specify Standard English as an empirical set of linguistic forms does not prevent it from being constructed as a powerful language ideology and social fact. It also does not prevent AAE from being viewed as a problem to be overcome. Indeed, even many who support the legitimacy of AAE as having a coherent linguistic structure accept the notion that students should develop competencies in both AAE and Standard English and use each in its "appropriate" context.

For example, Delpit (2006) argues that users of AAE must be provided with a skills-based curriculum that focuses on "useful and usable knowledge which contributes to a student's ability to communicate effectively in standard, generally acceptable literary forms" (pp. 18–19). According to Delpit, this skills-based curriculum should focus on teaching students the "codes of power" that consist of specific "codes or rules . . . relate[d] to linguistic forms, communicative strategies, and presentation of self; that is, ways of talking, ways of writing, ways of dressing, and ways of interacting" (p. 25). She argues that "success in institutions—schools, workplaces, and so on—is predicated upon acquisition of the culture of those who are in power" (p. 25) and that "if you are not already a participant in the codes of power, being told explicitly the rules of the culture makes acquiring power easier" (p. 24). Delpit's basic argument is that users of AAE and other nonstandard varieties of English must be provided explicit instruction in mainstream linguistic practices and learn to use these linguistic practices when appropriate in order to gain access to upward mobility.

Using the terminology we have developed in this article, Delpit's approach could be framed as perpetuating a raciolinguistic ideology that uses an appropriateness-based model to advocate explicitly teaching language-minoritized users of English the idealized linguistic practices of the white speaking subject. Her conception of the "codes of power" reifies particular linguistic practices associated with groups in positions of power and presumes that engaging in those practices will provide access to socioeconomic mobility for disempowered groups.

Importantly, Delpit situates this teaching of the codes of power within an affirmation of AAE. Building on work that emerged in second language acquisition related to the "affective filter" (Krashen, 1982), which posits that students are more open to learning a language when they feel safe and affirmed, Delpit (2006) argues,

> If we are truly to add another language form to the repertoire of African American children, we must embrace the children, their interests, their mothers, and their language. We must treat all with love, care, and respect . . . then, and only then, might they be willing to adopt our language form as one to be added to their own. (p. 48)

That is, AAE users are most likely to learn the codes of power if they feel that their home linguistic practices are affirmed. Similar to the above examples of long-term English learners and heritage language learners, this involves the promotion of an additive approach to language development where "the point must not be to eliminate students' home languages, but rather to add other voices and discourses to their repertoires" (Delpit, 2006, p. 163). The theory of change underlying this approach is the need for students to assimilate into linguistic practices associated with the white speaking subject in public spaces while maintaining their home linguistic practices for private use.

Delpit is aware of the tensions produced by such a framework. In response to this tension, she advocates for a critical additive approach where students learn the codes of power while they are also "helped to learn about the arbitrariness of those codes and about the power relationships they represent" (Delpit, 2006, p. 45). In her view, the road to social transformation is for teachers to both affirm AAE and acknowledge the inequity of the status quo while teaching their students "the discourse which would otherwise be used to exclude them from participating in and transforming the mainstream" (p. 165). She proposes to instill in students a critical awareness of linguistic hierarchies while simultaneously teaching them how to conform to these language hierarchies by using Standard English when appropriate.

It is clear that Delpit views the codes of power as a discrete set of practices, and that these practices should be understood as pathways to mainstream institutional inclusion. This approach reifies the relationship between linguistic practices and upward socioeconomic mobility by viewing the codes of power as objective linguistic practices rather than ideological phenomena. Without an analysis of the codes of power as a raciolinguistic ideology, we are unable to scrutinize how nonracialized people are able to deviate from these idealized linguistic practices and enjoy the embrace of mainstream institutions while racialized people can adhere to these idealized linguistic practices and still face profound institutional exclusion based on the perceptions of the white listening subject.

An example of how African American students can engage in normative linguistic practices and still be perceived as engaging in non-normative linguistic practices is offered by Alim's (2007) research in a predominantly African American high school and surrounding communities in the San Francisco Bay Area. One teacher Alim interviewed reported that the major problem in the school "is definitely like issues with standard English versus vernacular English. Um, like, if there was like one of the few goals I had this year was to get kids to stop saying, um, he was, she was" (p. 164). Alim clarifies that the teacher means "they was," referring to a specific African American English syntactic construction (e.g., they was talking), and the teacher agrees, but she then goes on to state that the problem is that students think phrases such as "she was" are correct. The teacher later states that "everything just 'was'" (p. 165). In this case, the teacher construes phrases such as "he was" and "she

was" alongside "they was" as examples of "vernacular English" that should be combated. Phrases such as "he was" and "she was" correspond to prescriptive Standard English norms, yet this teacher hears them as vernacular linguistic practices that are in need of correction. While phrases such as "he was" and "she was" might sound like Standard English when uttered by a privileged white student, in this example they are construed as nonstandard practices that should be fixed when uttered by African American students. This example demonstrates the powerful ways that raciolinguistic ideologies of the white listening subject can stigmatize language use regardless of one's empirical linguistic practices. Thus, even when Standard English learners use forms that seem to correspond to Standard English, they can still be construed as using nonstandard forms from the perspectives of the white listening subject.

In order to bring our argument full circle, we want to examine a statement made by Olsen (2010) that seeks to compare long-term English learners with Standard English learners. On the one hand, we agree with her claim that long-term English learners "share much in common with other Standard English Learner groups" (p. 22). On the other hand, we disagree with the explanation she provides for the commonality. For Olsen the commonality is purely linguistic, with both groups of students engaging in "the mix of English vocabulary superimposed on the structure of their heritage language and the use of a dialect of English that differs from academic English" (p. 22). For us, the commonality is raciolinguistic, with both groups of students inhabiting similar racial positions in society that impact the ways that their linguistic practices are heard and interpreted by the white listening subject. Failing to acknowledge language-minoritized students' common racial positioning and the ways that such positioning suggests deficiency, which has been typical in appropriateness-based approaches to language education, normalizes these racial hierarchies and provides them legitimacy through the perpetuation of a meritocratic myth: the idea that access to codes of power and the ability to use these codes when appropriate will somehow enable racialized populations to overcome the white supremacy that permeates U.S society.

Undoing Appropriateness in Language Education

In this article we introduce a raciolinguistic perspective that links the white speaking and listening subject with monoglossic language ideologies. We use this perspective to examine the ways that discourses of appropriateness, which permeate additive approaches to language education, are complicit in normalizing the reproduction of the white gaze by marginalizing the linguistic practices of language-minoritized populations in U.S. society. Specifically, we examine the raciolinguistic ideologies that connect additive educational approaches to teaching long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners. We argue that what links members of these three different (though sometimes overlapping) groups is not their lack of

proficiency in objective linguistic practices but their racial positioning in society and how this position affects how their linguistic practices are heard.

Therefore, the solution the marginalization of language-minoritized students cannot be to add objective linguistic practices to their linguistic repertoires—as additive approaches to language education suggest—but instead to engage with, confront, and ultimately dismantle the racialized hierarchy of U.S. society. Simply adding "codes of power" or other "appropriate" forms of language to the linguistic repertoires of language-minoritized students will not lead to social transformation. As our examples show, even when long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners adopt idealized linguistic practices, they are still heard as deficient language users. Attempting to teach language-minoritized students to engage in the idealized linguistic practices of the white speaking subject does nothing to challenge the underlying racism and monoglossic language ideologies of the white listening subject. Additive approaches to language education inadvertently legitimate and strengthen, rather than challenge, the marginalization of language-minoritized students.

We are not suggesting that people from racialized or language-minoritized communities should not seek to engage in linguistic practices deemed appropriate by mainstream society. However, we contend that the question of whether members of racialized communities are accepted as appropriately engaging in these linguistic practices continues to be determined by the white listening subject, not by the speakers' actual practices. Therefore, antiracist social transformation cannot be based solely on supporting language-minoritized students in engaging in the linguistic practices of the white speaking subject but must also work actively to dismantle the hierarchies that produce the white listening subject. We are also not suggesting that advocates of additive approaches to language education should abandon all of their efforts to legitimize the linguistic practices of their language-minoritized students. Instead, we suggest that shifting the focus to scrutiny of the white listening subject may open up possibilities for reconceptualizing language education in ways that move beyond appropriateness-based approaches.

A critical heteroglossic perspective that both legitimizes the dynamic linguistic practices of language-minoritized students while simultaneously raising awareness about issues of language and power marks an important starting point for developing this alternative approach. We believe that engaging with raciolinguistic ideologies and the white listening subject that produces them adds an important element to this framework. Specifically, it allows for the development of a framework that moves away from a sole focus on the speaking subject and examines the role of the listening subject in producing "competent" and "incompetent" language users. This shifts the conversation from trying to improve the linguistic practices of language-minoritized students toward challenging the ways that their linguistic practices are taken up and interpreted by the white listening subject.

Offering an example of how to challenge the white listening subject, Gloria Anzaldúa (1987), a Chicana lesbian feminist, theorizes her life and the lives of others in the borderlands through a joint critique of language ideologies that reify and police linguistic borders, on the one hand, and racial ideologies that reify and police boundaries of race and ethnicity on the other. She develops a theory of the "borderlands" as a challenge to monoglossic and racially hegemonic Euro-American understandings of the world. Anzaldúa's argument parallels a critical heteroglossic perspective in that it critiques idealized monolingualism, which she argues is designed to marginalize borderlands populations. She positions the dynamic nature of the borderlands within epistemological ideals that challenge the universalizing discourse of the white gaze and explicitly and consciously refuse to conform to the monoglossic language ideologies of the white speaking subject. Yet, Anzaldúa is also well aware of the fact that no matter how she uses language, she will always be racialized by the white listening subject. Therefore, she explicitly refuses to embrace an appropriateness-based model of language and consciously uses language in ways that transgress the white supremacist status quo. She is aware of how she will always be heard and embraces this knowledge as a form of resistance to her racial subordination.

Lu (1992) builds on Anzaldúa's work to critique approaches to language education that seek to teach language-minoritized students the appropriateness of different discourses in different contexts. Instead, she advocates placing the conflict that language-minoritized students experience in negotiating the many different linguistic communities that they must navigate at the center of instruction. Were Lu's approach applied in the educational contexts analyzed in this article, the challenges faced by long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners could be reconceptualized not as problems produced by linguistic deficits but as products of racial and linguistic hierarchies. This approach would also empower teachers to move beyond pedagogies geared toward responding to students' purported linguistic deficiencies or "gaps" and to develop a more robust vision of how language-minoritized students' educational experiences could combat raciolinguistic ideologies. These insights open up the possibility of theorizing the education of language-minoritized students as part of broader conflicts and struggles that provide these students with tools to challenge the range of inequalities with which they are faced. This is a powerful shift from teaching students to follow rules of appropriateness to working with them as they struggle to imagine and enact alternative, more inclusive realities.

Collectively, these critical perspectives point to the benefits of reframing language education from an additive approach embedded within a discourse of appropriateness toward one that seeks to denaturalize standardized linguistic categories. This offers the possibility of shifting language education from inadvertently perpetuating the racial status quo to participating in struggles

against the ideological processes associated with the white speaking and white listening subject. While this approach to language education cannot in and of itself lead to social transformation, it can disrupt appropriateness-based approaches to language education in ways that might link to a larger social movement that challenges the racial status quo.

Notes

1. Our use of *minoritized* as opposed to *minority* is intended to highlight the processes through which linguistic valuation and devaluation take place and to disrupt the notion that "minority" status is either a straightforward numerical calculation or intrinsic to a given set of linguistic forms. In fact, many so-called minority linguistic practices are actually quite normative and/or prevalent in contexts throughout the United States. Throughout, we also use *racialized people* as opposed to *people of color* for similar reasons.
2. Inoue (2006) develops her theorization of the "listening subject" to analyze the ideological construction of "Japanese women's language." She argues that this should not be understood as an empirical linguistic category but as a language ideology that reflects political and economic dynamics in particular historical moments. In the case of "Japanese women's language," these dynamics involve anxieties surrounding Western influences on traditional gender roles in the context of Japan's political and economic modernization. Inoue argues that the expectation that Japanese women should speak in a particular way produces the category of "women's language." By redirecting attention from women's empirical linguistic practices to the ideological construction of this category, Inoue is able to show how seemingly innocuous conceptions of language are linked to broader social processes.
3. This example is drawn from a larger study on long-term English language learners in which Flores was a member of the research team. "Tamara" is a pseudonym.

References

Alim, H. S. (2005). Critical language awareness in the United States: Revisiting issues and revising pedagogies in a resegregated society. *Educational Researcher, 34*(7), 24–31.

Alim, H. S. (2007). Critical hip-hop language pedagogies: Combat, consciousness, and the cultural politics of communication. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 6*(2), 161–176.

Alim, H. S., & Smitherman, G. (2012). *Articulate while Black: Barack Obama, language, and race in the US*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Baugh, J. (2000). *Beyond Ebonics: Linguistic pride and racial prejudice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term "heritage language learner." *Heritage Language Journal, 2*(1), 1–25.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2001). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: A synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. In C. Baker & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins* (pp. 26–55). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. (Original work published in 1976)

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Edelsky, C., Hudelson, S., Flores, B., Barkin, F., Altwerger, B., & Jilbert, K. (1983). Semilingualism and language deficit. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 1–22.

Fishman, J. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues, 23*(2), 29–38.

Fishman, J. (2001). 300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States. In J. Kreeft Peyton, D. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 81–99). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Flores, N. (2013). Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual education in the United States. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 10*(4), 263–287.

Flores, N., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (in press). Looking holistically in a climate of partiality: Identities of students labeled 'long-term English language learners.' *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education.*

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Green, L. (2002). *African American English: A linguistic introduction.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography.* New York: Longman.

Hill, J. H. (2008). *The everyday language of white racism.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Inoue, M. (2006). *Vicarious language: Gender and linguistic modernity in Japan.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Labov, W. (1969). *The study of nonstandard English.* Washington, DC: National Council of Teachers of English.

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

Lu, M. (1992). Conflict and struggle: The enemies or preconditions of basic writing? *College English, 54*(8), 887–913.

Martin-Jones, M., & Romaine, S. (1986). Semilingualism: A half-baked theory of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics, 7*(1), 26–38.

McCarty, T., Romero-Little, M., Warhol, L., & Zepeda, O. (2009). Indigenous youth as policy makers. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 8*(5), 291–306.

Menken, K., & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13*(4), 399–417.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.

Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English learners.* Long Beach: Californians Together.

Otheguy, R., & Stern, N. (2011). On so-called Spanglish. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 15*(1), 85–100.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93–97.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 85–100.

Perry, T., & Delpit, L. (Eds.). (1998). *The real Ebonics debate: Power, language, and the education of African-American children.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Rosa, J. (2014). Learning ethnolinguistic borders: Language and the socialization of U.S. Latinas/os. In R. Rolón-Dow & J. G. Irizarry (Eds.), *Diaspora studies in education: Toward a framework for understanding the experiences of transnational communities* (pp. 39–60). New York: Peter Lang.

Silverstein, M. (1998). Monoglot "standard" in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In D. Brenneis & R. Macaulay (Eds.), *The matrix of language: Contemporary linguistic anthropology* (pp. 284–306). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Toukomaa, P. (1976). *Teaching migrant children's mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the sociocultural situation of the migrant family*. Helsinki: Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.

Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of black America*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Valadez, C., MacSwan, J., & Martínez, C. (2000). Toward a new view of low-achieving bilinguals: A study of linguistic competence in designated "semilinguals." *Bilingual Review, 25*(3), 238–248.

Valdés, G. (2001a). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Valdés, G. (2001b). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. Kreeft Peyton, D. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 37–80). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Valdés, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *Modern Language Journal, 89*(3), 410–426.

Valdés, G., & Geoffrion-Vinci, M. (1998). Chicano Spanish: The problem of "underdeveloped code" in bilingual repertoires. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(4), 473–501.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Zentella, A. C. (Ed.). (2005). *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

This article has been reprinted with permission of the *Harvard Educational Review* (ISSN 0017-8055) for personal use only. Posting on a public website or on a listserv is not allowed. Any other use, print or electronic, will require written permission from the *Review*. You may subscribe to *HER* at www.harvardeducationalreview.org. *HER* is published quarterly by the Harvard Education Publishing Group, 8 Story Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, tel. 617-495-3432. Copyright © by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. All rights reserved.