

HERITAGE LANGUAGE AS COMMODITY OR CONNECTION: MAPPING TEACHERS' VALUE ORIENTATIONS TOWARD STUDENTS' LANGUAGE PRACTICES

Emily Voegler*
Erin Kearney
Maureen P. Boyd
University at Buffalo

As multilingualism is increasingly present and recognized in U.S. schools, exploring how teachers value students' heritage language resources has implications for classroom practice, teacher education, and educational research. Drawing from a larger critical ethnographic case study, this close analysis of eight teachers' value orientations takes up principles of translanguaging theory and locates them in the context of a month-long summer heritage language development program situated within an English-dominant urban district. Discourse analysis of semi-structured interview data reveals the criteria and contexts in which teachers value students' heritage language resources. Most prominent in the way participants (four English as a New Language teachers and four Heritage Language teachers) described their values were the two themes of heritage language as a commodity and heritage language as connection. Within and across interviews participants discussed how their personal experiences and identities shaped their attitudes toward students' heritage language resources.

Keywords: critical translanguaging approach, discourse analysis, heritage language, teacher values, translanguaging

Heritage programs have a particular character. They are dedicated to preserving and nurturing students' home languages, fostering healthy multilingual identities, and connecting school practices with community values. Heritage language programs, however, have not realized their potential—partially because they are still largely relegated to the margins (Saturdays, after school, summers, maybe a special section of a course), and relatedly because schools have failed to effectively engage communities and value linguistic resources as rights. Translanguaging practice is natural in communities and is undeniably present in schools (García, 2009; Li Wei, 2018). Yet schools as institutions, and the program structures they operate through, do not make adequate space for fluid meaning-making across linguistic repertoires; it is not common for teachers to enact translanguaging stances and pedagogies. In this paper, we adopt a critical translanguaging approach (Seltzer, 2019) and focus on teacher value orientations toward heritage languages in an educational space that is intentionally marked as a “heritage” program.

Building on the framework of orientations to language as resource, right, or problem (Ruíz, 1984), and positioning ourselves in a critical language-as-right orientation, we look to understand how educators take up or reshape this model. Such research is relevant to educators as they reflect on their own raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015), build relationships in their school communities, and

*emilyvoe@buffalo.edu

integrate students' diverse language practices into their classrooms. Employing data collected as a part of a larger study, we purposefully focus on the voices of four Heritage Language (HL) teachers and four English as a New Language (ENL) teachers as captured in eight semi-structured interviews (approximately 330 minutes). We discuss how teachers described their value orientations through themes of economic, social, and academic values of multilingualism, and the value of heritage language as connection predominantly through concern about heritage language loss.

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Translanguaging is a theory of language practice that relies on the assumption that language users move fluidly across dynamic, flexible repertoires of linguistic features as they make situated meanings. Such a theory gives rise to a partner theory of translanguaging pedagogy. This framework proposes that educators may adopt stances and practices that promote, invite in, and nurture natural translanguaging in ways that foster learning as well as a sense of belonging and healthy identities in classrooms. In this section, we briefly comment on key tenets of translanguaging theory, describe a critical translanguaging approach, and explain why this critical translanguaging lens was chosen for this study. We then review prior research on translanguaging as a critical pedagogical practice to establish the relationship between teacher stance toward language practices and translanguaging classroom discourse and interaction. Our current study adds to existing research by exploring teacher values toward student language practices across the ENL-heritage language teacher spectrum and in a context that is intentionally aimed at developing students' diverse linguistic resources.

Translanguaging Theory and Critical Approaches

Translanguaging as theory centers the voice and internal experience of language minoritized speakers (García, 2009; Li Wei, 2018). It is therefore necessarily a critical theory that disrupts the hegemony of socially named languages (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006). Translanguaging refers to language practices that fluidly answer a changing multilingual communicative context across real or virtual borders (García, 2009; García & Li Wei, 2015). Underlying principles of translanguaging are: (a) meaning-making constructed from local context; (b) fluid and dynamic linguistic selection from one all-encompassing linguistic repertoire; (c) language practices transcending boundaries between named languages; and (d) inherent voice, agency, and power recognized in bi/multilinguals (García, 2009; Li Wei, 2018).

Taking up the practices and perspectives of language-minoritized communities through translanguaging is itself critical (Flores, 2014, 2020; Flores & Rosa, 2015), and application of critical translanguaging to pedagogy is well established. Critical translanguaging competence (Leeman & Serafini, 2016) and a critical translanguaging approach (Seltzer, 2019) are pedagogical models to support teachers as they guide students to analyze language practices with attention to identity, ideology, and sociolinguistic factors. Students' translanguaging practices are centered in educational contexts with the goal of developing their linguistic autonomy. Building on these principles, we take up a critical translanguaging framework in our discourse analysis of interview data to center student translanguaging practices, and deconstruct teacher values surrounding the etically-termed heritage languages (Otheguy et al., 2015, 2018; Seltzer, 2019) of their students.

Translanguaging as a Critical Praxis

Prior research on translanguaging and multilingualism discusses its practical value in the classroom (Leeman & Serafini, 2016), in daily communication (Li Wei, 2018), and as an individual and community resource (Peirce, 1995; Ruíz, 1984). Teachers who adopt a translanguaging stance value dynamic linguistic practices and students' full linguistic repertoires beyond their externally perceived practical value—that is to say, as part of their pedagogical practice, they center students' linguistic experiences and identities. When teachers adopt a translanguaging stance and purposefully implement translanguaging pedagogies,

such a shift is associated with pluralized academic discourse (de los Rios & Seltzer, 2017; Motlhaka & Mokalela, 2016). By modeling translingual practices and metacommentary for students before discussing bilingual and bicultural texts, teachers have promoted students' bilingual reading identities (Aponte et al., 2021). Positioning students in the role of critical ethnographers to investigate the language practice of their schools and communities makes space for students to reflect on their own linguistic ideologies (Espinet et al., 2021). These strategies open up learning to students' wide-ranging experiences and linguistic resources.

The connections between teachers' language ideologies and language practices in classrooms show that critical translingual praxis is built on ideological reflection. In a heritage language context (or what are called "complementary schools" in England), Blackledge and Creese (2010) present a set of related sociolinguistic case studies carried out across eight sites and four heritage languages, making clear the ideological tensions—especially between language separation ideologies (and the stark divisions that cascade from these) and ideologies of flexible bilingualism or translanguaging—in play for teachers and youth. This ideological tension has also been observed in interviews with teachers in a dual language bilingual Spanish-English program through opposing perspectives that sanctioned ideologies of language separation while also privileging Spanish use over hegemonic English-monolingual practice (Martinez et al., 2014). Teacher norming of language separation ideologies in education spaces designed for translingual speakers shows that exploring teacher value orientations is a critical step in implementing critical praxis.

These studies suggest that when teachers build on translanguaging as a critical pedagogy it encourages students to develop linguistic skills and expand their meaning-making repertoires outside of the normed or privileged languages and culture and beyond static and reductionist practices and identities. On the other hand, our review shows that further research mapping the terrain of language ideologies and classroom linguistic practices is needed. By first investigating teachers' value orientations regarding language practices we can analyze how and why translingual practices and pedagogies emerge to different degrees in different classroom contexts.

Our research recognizes this need as it seeks to learn more about how classroom educators in a heritage language program value translanguaging and how these held values inform pedagogical decisions, teacher education, and program design. We consider: How do educators in a K–12 heritage language development program describe their value orientations toward student linguistic practices?

Methodology

Participants and Context

Data collection took place during the third cycle of a four-week K–12 heritage language program within an urban school district in upstate New York. At the time of data collection, during the 2018–2019 school year, students in this district spoke 84 different languages. The focal heritage language program was designed and facilitated by an ENL teacher (Voegler) and an instructional coach in partnership with community organizations. The mission of the program was to increase student access to linguistically sustaining educational experiences and build connections across the district and community. Classes were offered in Arabic, Karen, Nepali, Somali, Spanish, and Swahili, and each class was led by an HL teacher (i.e., Arabic) with assistance from an ENL teacher. HL teachers and ENL teachers worked in pairs because the HL teachers were not NYS certified and had varying amounts of teaching experience at the K–12 level. The HL teachers took the primary role for instructional design and implementation, with the ENL teachers offering planning, classroom management, and instructional support. Students ages 5–14 worked on a memoir book project as an instrument for heritage language development.

This study focuses on teacher participants from each language class. See Table 1 (teachers who were also parents of children in the program are in bold).

Table 1
Participant Demographic Information

Name	Position	Gender	Class Taught	Linguistic Repertoire	Professional Teaching Experience	Participation in HL Program Cycles
Saw Taw Gay	HL teacher	Male	Karen	Karen Burmese Thai English	–4 weeks as HL teacher in this program –Community liaison in the district	3/3
Lorita	HL teacher	Female	Spanish	Spanish English	–5 years in Argentina, university level –4 months substitute teaching in NYS urban district	3/3
Abdalla	HL teacher	Male	Somali Swahili	Maay Maay Somali Swahili Arabic English	–10 years teaching adults and children in private schools and refugee camps in Somalia and Kenya –Community liaison in the district	3/3
Amir	HL teacher	Male	Arabic	Arabic English	–6.5 years middle/high school in Kuwait, Egypt –Substitute teacher in the U.S.	1/3
Ben	ENL teacher	Male	Arabic	English Studied some Arabic	–4 years teaching ENL in an urban district	2/3
Tammy	ENL teacher	Female	Somali Swahili	English Spanish	–2 years ENL in an urban district –3 years as a PreK advocate	3/3
Megan	ENL teacher	Female	Spanish Nepali	English Spanish French	–Over 20 years of academic English in U.S. and abroad, elementary ENL	1/3
Kathy	ENL teacher	Female	Karen	English	–10 years in an urban district, Special Education teaching assistant	1/3

Data Collection

Teacher interview data were collected as part of a larger ethnographic case study investigating languaging practices and ideologies across micro-macro social levels of this heritage language program. In the broader study, data collection included semi-structured and open-ended interviews with students, teachers, and parents; classroom observations; and artifacts. Policy documents were also collected and examined to understand how the languaging practices of participants intersected with widening spheres of context. The current study is a purposeful look at interview data from four HL teachers and four ENL teachers. The eight interviews ranged from 20 to 60 minutes and totaled approximately 330 minutes.

Data Analysis

In alignment with a critical translanguing framework, grounded coding was used to draw themes from patterns within and across interviews to focus on participants' voices (Strauss & Corbin, 2008). Using critical discourse analysis, participant responses were analyzed within their sociohistoric context and together with their described lived experiences (Fairclough, 2010). This paper focuses on one theme from the teacher interview data—the value of translanguing practices—to get at teachers' expressions of the criteria and contexts in which students' heritage language resources are perceived to have value. There were two codes: heritage language as commodity, and heritage language as connection. Examples and definitions can be found in Table 2.

Table 2
Code Book

Theme	Code	Definition	Example
Value of translingual practices	Heritage language as commodity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Expresses importance of heritage language development because of academic and economic benefits –Heritage language has value in service of end goal or English achievement 	<p>... <i>home language helps students learn another language. They can visualize the other language. They can be good translators</i></p> <p>—interview with Abdalla, Somali/Swahili teacher</p>
	Heritage language as connection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Expresses negativity toward the idea of the younger generation becoming English-dominant or English-monolingual –Focuses on family, community, cultural, social value 	<p><i>Speak Karen; you can speak English at school. We don't want you to forget your language</i></p> <p>—interview with Saw Taw Gay, Karen teacher</p>

Analysis provides insight into the dichotomous tension in teachers' valuing of heritage language. The first value orientation sees heritage language practices as a resource to benefit students and communities (heritage language as commodity). The second values heritage language practices because of emotional, familial, or identity factors (heritage language as connection). Both codes reflect a language as investment stance in which (heritage) language learning is perceived through the lens of symbolic or cultural capital. This is developed through the ways learners interact with a social context, signaling the situational value of language practices (Peirce, 1995). Looking further into how teachers describe these values is relevant because it could point to insights into the value orientations that shape how teachers approach and instruct bi/multilingual students, and how their values align, or do not align, with a critical translingual stance or language-as-right orientation, which is useful for future professional development designs.

Findings

We show how teacher responses delineated the theme and each subcode and provide exemplification and analysis. Tensions in teachers' orientations emerge through presentation of findings, and we interpret these further in a concluding section. First, we discuss the theme value of translingual practice as it emerged in teacher interviews, and then we analyze the ways in which this theme explicates teacher value orientations through the subcodes heritage language as commodity and heritage language as connection.

The Value Teachers Ascribe to Translingual Practices

Teachers' valuing of translingual practices refers to interview responses that expressed positivity toward multilingualism or heritage language development, or negativity toward heritage language loss. Teachers' value orientations—their attitudes toward language practices—surrounding students' translingual resources in the focal heritage language program were identified based on their statements about their students', their own families', and their individual language practices. Incorporating statements that referenced teachers' home lives or personal translingual resources and experiences provided insight into the ways teachers' value orientations were shaped. Grounded coding identified two codes: heritage language as commodity (academic, economic, tangible value; coded 55 times) and heritage language as connection (cultural, family, community, social value, or concern over lost connection because of heritage language erosion; coded 24 times). These were coded far more often in HL teachers than in ENL teachers when grouped together (48 phrases and 31 phrases, respectively), and there was considerable individual variation within and across these groups.

Across the interview data, each of the teachers indicated their expectations for positive outcomes for multilingual students and individuals in general. They noted that multilingualism and translanguaging practices are personal, familial, or communal resources. Many expressed concerns about heritage language loss, including Abdalla as he compares his students' access to education in English to Somali:

We want to prevent "I don't know" in Somali—Abdalla

Although bi/multilingualism is valuable in its own right within translanguaging theory, the majority of participants focused on practical applications for multilingualism, with few participants discussing the human value of being multilingual. Megan's response signals the practical value that teachers described by focusing on economic or academic benefits to multilingualism:

And if they're totally bilingual they may be able to get a job because of that—Megan

Within this theme, HL teachers were coded more often for both codes—that is, reflecting perspectives that cast heritage language as valuable as both a commodity and a form of connection. Saw Taw Gay (coded 16 times) and Abdalla (coded 18 times) had the most phrases tallied for the theme value of translanguaging practices, with Tammy (coded 14 times) just behind them. These three individuals worked in every previous iteration of the program, and advocated for bi/multilingual students within their schools, district, and community. Saw Taw Gay and Abdalla are community liaisons for the focal school district, with critical roles connecting the Karen and Burmese (Saw Taw Gay) and Swahili, Somali, and Maay Maay (Abdalla) communities with predominantly English-speaking schools. Another pattern that emerged across interviews appeared among Saw Taw Gay, Lorita, and Abdalla, the three teachers who also had children participating in this program cycle. Personal reflections on their experiences with their children were found to be significant factors in their described value orientations, and they had the most phrases marked as expressing concern about heritage language as connection. Results for each participant on the theme value of translanguaging practices are shown in Table 3:

Table 3

Results Showing the Number of Times the Theme and Each Subcode Were Found in Each Participant's Interview

Participant Name	Theme Value of Translanguaging Practices	Code Heritage Language as Commodity	Code Heritage Language as Connection
Saw Taw Gay	16	10	6
Lorita	10	5	5
Abdalla	18	11	7
Amir	4	3	1
Ben	1	1	0
Tammy	14	14	0
Megan	8	5	3
Kathy	8	6	2

In the following, we examine how teachers described their value orientations in response to the research question by detailing and exemplifying the subcodes heritage language as commodity and heritage language as connection.

Heritage Language as Commodity

Teachers' valuing of heritage language as commodity is an asset view of multilingualism through discussion of how students or their communities can gain capital by developing their heritage language, how their heritage language skills could help them academically, how they would be able to advocate for themselves, and how there could be economic benefits through college admission or access to better

jobs. This focus on gains or achievement connects to Ruíz's (1984) language-as-resource orientation and Peirce's (1995) language as investment because of the emphasis on the social or cultural capital that can be obtained through heritage language development. This code was similarly identified in interviews with HL teachers and ENL teachers when grouped together (29 phrases and 26 phrases, respectively), and variations among individuals are discussed.

Phrases that shed light on this asset-based and often instrumentalist view include Amir's community-centered assertion that "we" benefit from bilingual and biliterate community members:

We need people who speak and read and write two languages—Amir

Tammy and Saw Taw Gay expressed the tangible benefits of translingual practices for students and their families. They refer to cognitive benefits, assistance in college and career goals, and increases in autonomy, as they discuss increased academic choices for multilingual students:

But I tell the families and the kids that being bilingual makes you smarter because you have more synapses in your brain. Secondly, it makes you more marketable when you try to have a career. If you can read and write in another language that opens more doors—Tammy

I know language is . . . to help them have more choice in school—Saw Taw Gay

These samples suggest that ENL and HL teachers saw multilingualism as a tool that students could leverage in different aspects of their lives. Teachers across the ENL–HL teacher subgroups valued translingual practices as commodities holding a range of material, experiential, and symbolic values. It is notable in Tammy's comments, for example, that heritage learners are positioned as "more marketable" as a result of their bilingualism. There is additionally a strong future orientation in such remarks, emphasizing how heritage language development is a resource that "opens more doors" and unlocks future opportunities.

Lorita exemplifies how teachers could indicate both value orientations in her response:

And in the future can help with the college goals, and better job goals in the future. [. . .] You can help the community too, when you know more than one language—Lorita

Lorita's first sentence reflects on the commodifiable language-as-resource orientation toward heritage language by focusing on the achievements that students can reach because of their heritage language practices. In the end, she aligns with heritage language as connection by focusing on how multilingual people can support their communities.

Ben, the ENL teacher in the Arabic classroom, explains how his view of the academic value of heritage language development and translingual literacy practices grew as a result of his participation in this heritage language program during the prior summer.

I firmly believe that last year in the Somali class when I had those students, looking at what they were able to write by the end of the summer . . . their books were fantastic. That stuff I wouldn't have seen them write in English even. The next school year I saw them writing more in school. That might have been natural development or boosted by the biliteracy—Ben

Ben's comments illustrate that actually seeing students engage with heritage language resources and translingual practices could help teachers see heritage language resources as promoting other goals they deem valuable—academic achievement, gains in English—as a result of bilingual and biliterate development.

Implicit comments referencing the value of multilingualism and heritage language development for non-heritage speakers appeared in the data as well, exemplifying how programs and policy for language-minoritized populations could be co-opted by language-majoritized speakers. All of the ENL teachers commented on learning the heritage language alongside the students, showing that developing

translingual practices had personal value for them. One ENL teacher, Megan in the Spanish and Nepali rooms, committed to speaking Spanish as much as possible in the Spanish class. When asked about this, she states:

It's organic. Anytime I encounter a native Spanish speaker, I'm like . . . Oh you have something that I need, so . . . —Megan

For Megan, opportunities to engage with Spanish speakers are cast in transactional terms, and the heritage language of her students here appears as a commodifiable resource, supportive of her own multilingual development.

In her response to the question, "What do you think the strengths and weaknesses of this program are, and what can we improve?" Tammy offers feedback to engage more families in the future and explains why teacher value orientations toward student heritage language resources are important, bringing up the role teachers can play in norming translanguaging and communicating to families about heritage languages being valued in educational spaces:

Trying to convince the parents that it's valuable for them to be here—Tammy

Having decided to work in a heritage language program and through expressions of support of heritage language development in interviews, Tammy's action and words elucidate that she personally values heritage language development. But she implies that families may feel more ambivalent or even doubtful of the value of such a program, leading her to feel the need to persuade them.

Each participant expressed a heritage language as commodity value orientation (see individual tallies below). This code was recorded 55 times (29 times from HL teachers and 26 times from ENL teachers), and the majority of the phrases from each individual across both groups of teachers that were coded for the theme value of translingual practices were identified with the code heritage language as commodity (see Table 3).

Within individual interviews, Tammy and Ben are notable because both of these ENL teachers had all of their coded phrases within the theme value of translingual practices emerge in the heritage language as commodity code. This concentration on commodifiable language resources signals that for these language-majoritized ENL teachers, heritage language development was not as personal as it was for the HL teachers like Lorita, Saw Taw Gay, and Abdalla.

Heritage Language as Connection

Teachers' valuing of heritage language as connection is a positive perspective toward heritage language resources that referenced the personal, familial, or community significance of heritage language resources. Teachers' expressions could also suggest a language-as-right orientation (Ruíz, 1984), especially when voicing concern for language loss. When teachers characterized heritage language as a form of connection, reference to family or community was often present. Notably, however, teachers, sometimes speaking as parents as well as educators, cited the danger of losing culture and identity connections if children did not learn the heritage language and were drawn into increasing English use.

Only two ENL teachers, Megan and Kathy, took up this value orientation, and their statements were focused on language loss, drawing clear connections between language and culture:

[I]f you don't have literacy in a language that's like a real fast way for a language to die. If you don't have literacy in a language it's like saying that language is important or not as important as the language you get literacy in. That's not good from a language maintenance perspective—Megan

It's so important for kids to keep their . . . I don't want to say culture. Keep their traditions alive, keep their language—Kathy

These statements were coded for heritage language as connection to indicate the importance of heritage language maintenance in sustaining cultural and community connections. They also allude to language-as-right. Megan showed concerns that low literacy rates would lead to these languages dying out in their community. While Megan expresses concern for language loss in abstract terms, Kathy specifies that heritage language loss is detrimental to children who may by extension lose culture and traditions connected through heritage languages. Both teachers' comments suggest a valuing of language maintenance and some level of urgency in developing students' heritage language resources as a human right.

HL teachers also expressed heritage language as connection through concern over language loss, and their concern was often intertwined with their familial and communal experiences. Saw Taw Gay, who had multiple roles in this context—Karen teacher, community liaison, and parent—spoke of protective language practices at home.:

But when we're together with parents we only speak Karen. Because we never talk to English at home with our child. And we hardly speak in English in home. Speak Karen; you can speak English at school. We don't want you to forget your language—Saw Taw Gay

Maintaining heritage languages is, in Saw Taw Gay's comment, situated in a context of family values.

When asked if and how heritage language classes benefit students, Abdalla, the Somali/Swahili teacher, summarized his value orientation as follows:

So, when my child starts speaking English, I change the conversation to Somali. Because if I respond in English, that becomes the home language. I use Somali and Maay Maay all the time. By the time they are out of the house in school they are speaking English anyway. There are even some parents who don't teach the kids the home language. The kids are speaking English all the time and they're losing the home languages. There are some kids who need a translator to talk with the parents—Abdalla

Heritage language as crucial to familial and community connection is clear, as Abdalla explains his concerns about language loss based on his lived experiences. Lorita, the Spanish teacher, echoes Abdalla's apprehension when she describes her family's language practices at home. Her family strategically chooses language practices to protect her children's Spanish resources:

... but when she want to communicate with father, mother, grandfather she needs to speak in Spanish. She knows the rules, you know. She needs something, she needs to communicate something about the school, everything is in Spanish. All the family together is just in Spanish, when they speaking in English the father and mother pretend not [to] understand—Lorita

Looking within and across interviews, heritage language as connection was marked 24 times, 19 times in HL teacher interviews, and 5 times in ENL teacher interviews, which shows that this value orientation was less common among all teachers than the heritage language as commodity orientation (marked 55 times). This code emerged in interviews with 4/4 heritage language teachers but only 2/4 of the ENL teachers, suggesting that HL teachers' personal and familial experience positioned them more toward a language-as-right orientation, while ENL teachers did not have the same personal relationship to heritage language as connection. Perspectives of HL teachers with dual identities as parents point to the challenges in developing heritage language skills in students in English-dominant societies. Results for each individual teacher within the code of heritage language as connection can be seen in Table 3.

Teacher value orientations toward heritage language as connection, and to a greater extent heritage language as commodity, are significant in relation to the lived experiences that shape these orientations. Considering teacher experiences and value orientations together leads to questions about forming more critically translingual pedagogies.

Discussion and Conclusion

Analyzing teacher interview responses can indicate how teachers valued students' heritage language practices. Whereas teachers largely signaled a language-as-resource orientation through descriptions of future usefulness or transactional value of multilingualism and heritage language resources, the appearance of a language-as-right orientation in teacher interviews suggests possible openings for heritage language programming to more explicitly recognize and center the humanity of students and their families.

Theoretical Implications

While heritage language programs intend to nurture heritage language learners and to promote positive resource orientations, notions about the purposes to which these resources can or should be put do not always recognize students', families' and communities' fuller humanity or the human right to connect through the parts of our linguistic repertoires that make us feel like we belong and matter. Findings from this study show that a language-as-resource orientation dominates over a language-as-right orientation in teacher responses and underscores a missed opportunity in the program. The unrealized potential of heritage language programs to address students' human right to learn using their full linguistic repertoires, currently undervalued in schools, can be tapped through adopting a more conscious language-as-right orientation in program design and teacher preparation through further integration of critical translanguaging theory with practice.

Methodological Implications

Findings from this study are relevant for teacher preparation and pedagogical practice of teachers who work with multilingual students. The teachers in this study are a part of a heritage language development program, and could be predisposed to seeing value in language practices beyond English monolingualism because they have seen them sanctioned and operating more freely in a school context. As a result of working in such an educational space, they may be inclined to take up language-as-resource and language-as-right orientations, as opposed to language-as-problem orientations permeating much of U.S. schooling practice. Given that the heritage language teachers drew from their personal, familial, and community-based experiences in expressing their value orientations, it is worth considering how teachers' prior experiences shape value orientations toward student language practices.

Pedagogical Implications

First, heritage language teachers need pathways to access teaching positions. The heritage language teachers in this study had prior teaching experience outside of the United States, and Amir and Lorita were navigating the process of certification in New York State. Fostering heritage language programming and curricula within a public school context could work in concert with policy that expedites this process. Connecting heritage language speakers to classrooms gives students access to teachers who have a breadth of experiences that can inform a language-as-right orientation.

This raises questions, however, about how teachers who are language-majoritized speakers can build language-as-right orientations. For teachers from English monolingual backgrounds, policymakers, administrators, and teacher educators could provide experiences that disrupt English-only environments. Purposeful consideration of translanguaging practices in conjunction with critical reflection prompts teachers to develop value orientations toward heritage language translanguaging practices as a right and pedagogies to match. As seen in ENL teacher Ben's comments above, experience in this heritage language program shifted his view of multilingual children when seeing them again in their elementary school setting. Working in tandem in heritage language programs can be a transformative experience for majoritized and minoritized language users to move toward a collective language-as-right value orientation.

Professional development programs could increase visibility and access for translingual practices and heritage language development for language-minoritized speakers. Teachers value translingual practices and heritage language resources because of the culturally and linguistically sustaining benefits and tangible advantages that teachers expect for multilingual students. Professional development designed with a critical translingual approach could steer these values toward language-as-right orientations (Seltzer, 2019). This could be a time for teachers to grapple with their own value orientations by engaging with raciolinguistic issues of power, ideology, and agency in curriculum design, classrooms, and communities.

Suggestions for Future Research

We recommend that future research examine teachers' value orientations in connection with classroom observations, student voices, and a micro-macro analysis of the socially constructed context. Additionally, we suggest that future research could explore heritage language classrooms, programs, and pedagogical practice that has been explicitly designed through a critical translingual lens to determine if this approach changes teachers' described value orientations toward their pedagogy and their students' linguistic practices and ideologies.

References

- Aponte, G., Espinet, I., & Seltzer, K. (2021). Fostering bilingual reading identities in dual language bilingual classrooms. In City University of New York-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals (CUNY-NYSIEB) (Eds.), *Translanguaging and transformative teaching for emergent bilingual students* (pp. 115–130). Routledge.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. Continuum International.
- de los Rios, C., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, coloniality, and English classrooms: An exploration of two bicoastal urban classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 52(1), 55–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-012-0224-3>
- Espinet, I., Aponte, G., Sánchez, M., Cardenas Fugueroa, D., & Busone-Rodríguez, A. (2021). Interrogating language ideologies in the primary grades: A community language inquiry unit. In City University of New York-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals (CUNY-NYSIEB) (Eds.), *Translanguaging and transformative teaching for emergent bilingual students* (pp. 219–238). Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Longman.
- Flores, N. (2014, July 19). Let's not forget that translanguaging is a political act. *The Educational Linguist*.
<https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2014/07/19/lets-not-forget-that-translanguaging-is-a-political-act/>
- Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory Into Practice*, 59(1), 22–31.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Education Review* 85(2), 149–171.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley/Blackwell.
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2015). Translanguaging, bilingualism and bilingual education. In W. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingual education* (pp. 223–240). Wiley.
- Leeman, J., & Serafini, E. J. (2016). Sociolinguistics for heritage language educators and students: A model for critical translingual competence. In M. Fairclough & S. Beaudrie (Eds.), *Innovative strategies for heritage language teaching: A practical guide for the classroom* (pp. 56–79). Georgetown University Press.
- Li Wei. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39, 9–30.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2006). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Multilingual Matters.

- Martínez, R., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2014). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 26–42.
- Motlhaka, H., & Mokalela, L. (2016). Translanguaging in an academic writing class: Implications for a dialogic pedagogy. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34(3), 251–260.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2018). A translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 10(4), 625–661.
- Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 9–31.
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.
- Saldaña, J. (2011). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Seltzer, K. (2019). Reconceptualizing “home” and “school” language: Taking a critical translingual approach in the English classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(4), 986–1007.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Sage.

