Est. 1841 | YORK ST JOHN UNIVERSITY

Cunningham, Clare ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3767-7624 (2019) When 'home languages' become 'holiday languages': teachers' discourses about responsibility for maintaining languages beyond English. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 33 (3). pp. 213-227.

Downloaded from: https://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/3852/

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07908318.2019.1619751

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. Institutional Repository Policy Statement

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorksj.ac.uk

Paper as accepted for publication in 'Language, Culture and Curriculum' on 13 May 2019

When 'home languages' become 'holiday languages': teachers' discourses about responsibility for maintaining languages beyond English

Clare Cunningham

School of Languages and Linguistics, York St John University, York, UK

Corresponding author:
Clare Cunningham, School of Languages and Linguistics, York St John University, Lord Mayor's Walk, York, YO31 7EX
01904 876753, c.cunningham@yorksj.ac.uk
ORCiD iD: 0000-0003-3767-7624
Twitter: @CCunninghamyork

When ‘home languages’ become ‘holiday languages’: teachers’ discourses about responsibility for maintaining languages beyond English

Despite research evidence showing that home language maintenance is important both individually and societally, the task of managing and encouraging it has traditionally fallen to minority language communities and families, tending to lead to inter-generational language shift. Teachers’ discourses about responsibilities for language maintenance, attrition and shift have not been researched adequately. This paper addresses this gap by offering a critical discourse analysis of research interviews with British primary school educators. Research on this topic is important because it is well known that teachers’ attitudes impact on local policies and classroom practices.

Findings show that teachers construct parents and children as responsible for maintenance and attrition of languages beyond English. Teachers hold varying attitudes on language maintenance, some perceiving it as important, whilst others do not. However, few participants claim any significant sense of personal or institutional responsibility for home language maintenance. Parents are construed as denying their children the chance to develop their home languages and children are negatively appraised for not taking opportunities to use them. Globally, teachers need to be empowered to challenge societal ideologies embedded in language policies and the education system should take a role in home language development to help prevent language shift.

Keywords: EAL; languages beyond English; language maintenance; language attrition; language shift; teacher attitudes

Introduction

Previous research has confirmed that maintaining home languages is important for multilingual children because of the positive impact that doing so has on academic achievement (Thomas & Collier, 1997), ethnic identity and societal integration (Cho, 2000) and on the wider society (Brown, 2011; Cho, 2000). Home languages can act as a “bridge that links intergenerational families across countries and are a valuable asset

that can open up educational and career options […] for the future" (Kwon 2017, p. 505). In the UK context, children's other languages are officially constructed as an "asset" in National Curriculum documents (Conteh & Brock, 2011, p. 348) and claimed as a resource required for the future prosperity of the country (Nuffield Foundation, 2000). In practice however, those languages are more often seen as problematic and as impeding transition to English. Assertions of English being "fundamental" to life in the UK and to getting a job (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government [henceforth MHCLG], 2018, p. 14), are echoed in the policies of other countries with a strong dominant language (Padilla et al., 1991; Priven, 2008), seemingly forcing individuals into making a choice between maintaining their languages or falling behind (Genesee, Nicoladis, & Paradis, 1995).

Despite the known educational and societal benefits of bilingualism (Bialystok, Craik, Green, & Gollan, 2009), the rhetoric of the home language as a resource and an asset does not really reflect social or political reality (Priven, 2008). There is, for example, extremely limited mention of languages beyond English in the recent British governmental paper on the Integrated Communities Strategy (MHCLG, 2018) and the rhetoric against languages beyond English in Australia has been rising alongside the rise in multilingualism (Clyne, 2005; Rubino, 2010). The responsibility for home language maintenance in the UK (along with many other countries with dominant languages and largely monolingual language ideologies) has been seen (both officially and within the broader society) as belonging with the language communities rather than the education system (Overington, 2012; Weekly, 2018). The majority of teachers not trained as language educators participating in Lee and Oxelson's study also reported that they felt heritage language maintenance in California was a "personal or family activity" (2006, p. 465). This also seems to be true for the Australian context (Eisenchlas & Schalley,

2017) and, even in countries where mother tongue instruction has long been supported by provisions in law, such as Sweden (Ganuza & Hedman, 2015), there have recently been threats made to this provision by right wing politicians.

This paper presents findings focusing on teachers' discourses around language maintenance and attrition. Whilst some recent work in this area (Weekly, 2018) has focused on heritage language speakers teaching in further education, this current paper offers an original contribution to research in an area that has not been addressed adequately to date, particularly in the UK context, that of the discourses of mainstream, mainly monolingual teachers. The scarcity in the research in the US context in this vein is, however, also highlighted by Lee and Oxelson (2006). This study's significance lies in the fact that understanding how language maintenance and attrition is perceived and discussed by educators is important, because of the centrality of the teacher in deciding on and promoting language policies for their classrooms (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). Lee and Oxelson (2006) point out that heritage language maintenance is a societal process, not just an individual one. As others have also noted (Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, & Tsokalidou, 2015; Van Dijk, 2008), it is important to systematically investigate how entrenched language ideologies are, given how influential teachers and schools are for children (Lee & Oxelson, 2006). In fact, it has been observed that individual educators and their beliefs can often be more influential on classroom practices than school policy (Durán & Palmer, 2014; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), although Pulinx, Van Avermaet and Agirdag (2015) did find that teacher beliefs tend to coincide with policy in the Flemish context. Any mismatches between individual teacher beliefs and institutional beliefs can have an impact on perceptions of teacher agency and have begun to be explored (Biesta, Priestley, & Robinson, 2015). Therefore, the aim of research in this area needs to be focused towards understanding how individual practitioners can best

work for the social change that is required to allow children to develop all of their languages to their fullest potential and fight the assimilative pressures of the societally-dominant language (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996; Sook Lee & Oxelson, 2006). This study takes place within a wider international context of increasing insularity and a rise in nationalistic discourses (Fekete, 2017), with such seismic political shifts as that seen in the UK referendum vote to leave the European Union (Buckledee, 2018). A focus on educators' individual discourses can reveal underlying dispositions stemming from these wider discourses and socially-created ideologies. The contexts of this study may be limited in geographic scope, but readers internationally should be able to observe similarities between the settings presented here and those that are more familiar to them.

A discussion of further relevant literature on issues related to language maintenance in communities and schools follows, before the theoretical framework, research design and systematic analytical framework for the study are introduced in the subsequent sections. The discursive data itself is then presented and discussed, with key implications of the analysis being offered at the end of the paper.

Language maintenance in the home and at school

Whilst additive bilingual development is often considered by teachers to be the responsibility of local communities and parents in particular (Gkaintartzi & Tsokalidou, 2011; Jamai, 2008; Lee & Oxelson, 2006), it is known to be a difficult task for parents to manage, with O'Bryan suggesting that it is "quite possibly beyond them" (1976, p. 176, cited in Cummins & Danesi, 1990). The practical challenges to language maintenance in families have been well documented and discussed (Danjo, 2018; Raschka, Wei, & Lee, 2002; Wong Fillmore, 2000). Educators ignoring vital home experiences (Genesee, Nicoladis & Paradis, 1995; Hélot & Young, 2002) leads to what

Conteh and Brock describe as “dissonance” between home and school (2011, p. 350), with school staff being unaware of the extent to which language attrition may be affecting children and their family networks, which can be sorely damaged through the loss of the home language (Wong Fillmore, 2000).

With the knowledge that language shift and attrition continue to be experienced by many (Fishman, 1991; Wong Fillmore, 2000) and that the negative and sometimes traumatic effects mentioned above are therefore a reality for many, it is important for mainstream school educators to understand the unique situation of each multilingual child in their schools. Some children will be offered “multilingual learning and transnational experiences […] outside of their classroom walls” (Kwon 2017, p. 506) while others will not. There are significant differences in family language policies, defined as the “explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members” (King, Fogle, & Logan-Terry, 2008, p. 907). Additionally, the patchy distribution of complementary schools, and the provision of travel opportunities for some communities mean that some children will be getting more language maintenance and development opportunities than others (Raschka, Li Wei, & Lee, 2002). Weekly (2018) suggests that the success of the complementary school systems in the UK has perhaps, in part, played into the hands of those who insist that home language maintenance should be the domain of the community. However, the uneven playing field with regards to home language provision in the classroom leads to further inequality depending on geographical location and, when the responsibility for home language maintenance is left solely to the minority language communities, the potential for serious injustice. Jamai (2008), for example, discusses the negative impact of a lack of political will to provide institutional support for the minority Moroccan community in the UK.

The visibility, use and encouragement of home languages in school environments as a factor in their maintenance and development has been discussed in the research literature from around the world for some time (Cho, 2000; Cunningham, 2019) as well as in the literature on dual language (or two-way immersion) programmes (Meier, 2010; Palmer, 2007) in the USA and Germany. However, it is often still the case that "children receive an unmistakeable message that English only is acceptable" (Brown, 2011, p. 31), a message also transmitted with regards to French in parts of France (Helot & Young, 2002). This reflects an increasingly nationalistic policy environment, and, for children, means that a choice has to be made between being successful (in the sense of achievement in the form of good examination results) in school using the dominant language, and maintaining the home language (Briceño, Rodriguez-Mojica, & Muñoz-Muñoz, 2018)

It has been observed in research settings globally that, as children move up the school, they tend to become resistant to using home languages and exhibit an increasing desire to conform to the majority language speakers (Cunningham, 2017; Kwon, 2017; Wong Fillmore, 2000). To counteract and potentially delay this resistance, Brown (2011) holds that teachers should all encourage children to use their home languages so that children feel they are accepted. It has been suggested that by "integrating the linguistic and cultural resources that immigrant children hold" (Kwon, 2017, p. 506) language and literacy development could be facilitated in both the home languages that the children bring as part of their "funds of knowledge" (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) and in the societally-dominant language. However, many studies focused on teachers' attitudes towards language diversity and language learners of the majority language find that, while there is often a positive rhetoric towards languages beyond English (or other majority languages), in practice, those minority languages do

not find a significant place in the classroom and are seen as problematic (Flores & Smith, 2009; Gkaintartzi & Tsokalidou, 2011; Pulinx et al., 2015; Lee & Oxelson, 2006). Where a more multilingual ideology is in place, either through school or national policy, or individual teachers' innovation, however, there has been a tendency towards practices that see using all of a student's languages as a resource, as reported by Kirsch (2017) in Luxembourg, French (2017) in Australia and Makalela (2015) in South Africa. These papers all report on the positive impact that allowing space for all languages has on classrooms and learning.

Theoretical framework

Ruíz's (1984) study of orientations to language, defined as a 'complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society' (1984: 16), remains a valuable theoretical framework with which to examine language ideologies constructed through discourse. His language as a right orientation has been articulated in many language policies at a global level, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child to use his or her own language (UN CRC, 1989, cited in MacKenzie, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010), and has been echoed in governmental guidance documents in the UK (DES, 2006). However, despite the existence of a rhetoric around language as a resource, seen earlier in this paper in reference to the National Curriculum documents, for example, the dominant discourse in mainstream education in the UK towards languages beyond English continues to draw heavily on an orientation to language as a problem (Ruíz, 1984). This is typical of many countries with a dominant language (Durán & Palmer, 2014; Eisenchlas & Schalley, 2017; Helot & Young, 2002; McPake et al., 2007).

Children with languages beyond English in the UK have seen a strategic withdrawal of guidance and support structures, with no governmental publications on

EAL (English as an Additional Language) since 2009, funding devolved to schools since 2011, and even more recently, the removal of the stipulation to capture English proficiency levels for children who come to school with languages beyond English (National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum, 2018). Maintenance of languages beyond English in the current political context is therefore no longer being construed as a right, a change from the discourses of earlier publications.

Briceño et al. (2018) observe that "educators are subject to the pervasive influence of linguistic ideologies" in which the "interests and status of privileged classes are preserved" (Briceño et al., 2018, p. 4). Teachers' beliefs and discursive practices have been seen to be inextricably linked with classroom practices and policies (Durán & Palmer, 2014; Lourenço, Andrade, & Sá, 2017; Pulinx et al., 2015; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), which is why they are important to understand, and why adopting Ruiz's theoretical framework, which was at the forefront of what has been described as the discursive turn (Macías, 2016), makes sense.

The Study

This paper reports on some of the findings from a broader study (Cunningham, 2017) to "explore a field" (David & Sutton, 2011, p. 27) that has been under-explored: that of UK primary school educators' discourses about their experiences with, and attitudes to, working with multilingual children. Adopting a critical focus on discourses around home language maintenance and attrition, the following research question is addressed in this paper:

> *What do educators' discourses about children's languages beyond English reveal about where the responsibility for their maintenance is seen to lie?*

My preferred term languages beyond English (LBEs) is used here alongside more

familiar terms such as home languages, as it does not imply any particular number of languages (unlike ‘second language’) and also offers a more positive and language-as-resource focus on the languages that children *do* speak rather than the deficit-model-thinking and the ‘monolingual fallacy’ (Phillipson, 1992) associated with an orientation to language as a problem that more often prevails (Alexander, 2012). For further discussion around this term, see Cunningham (2018).

Research participants and settings

This paper reports on a sub-set of the results from a wider study comprising over thirty participants, undertaken over three academic years in one junior (age 7-11) and five primary (age 4-11) suburban schools across the north of England. For this current study, there were 13 participants who were involved in semi-structured and/ or open interviews. Relevant information on the participants, who comprise all those from the original study who held a leadership role within their school, can be found in the table below, with a further table (provided as a supplementary file) detailing relevant information about the participating schools.

Table 1 about here.

Data collection and analysis

A broad and open-ended interview approach was adopted as the principal data collection method because of the desired focus on participants’ discursive practices in this exploration of their attitudes. In the first round of interviews, questions focused around school structures for supporting children who spoke LBEs, about funding for that support, and about the presence of bilingual resources. Other prompts related to family-school connections and the use of home languages in the classroom. All questions were open. The second stage of interviews was non-structured with

participants (the majority of whom had been involved in the previous stage) simply being asked how things had been going with regards to EAL in the school. This approach was taken to allow for the issues that were dominant for the participants to take centre-stage, rather than the researcher having control of the agenda.

Research interviews were then transcribed and subsequently analysed adopting a critical discourse studies approach to observe the presence of societal and institutional discourses that are, as Van Dijk (2013) claims, embedded in individuals' discursive practices (Fairclough, 2010). The principal analytical framework adopted for this paper is Appraisal (Martin & White, 2005), which extends on Halliday's (1978) Systemic Functional Linguistics model (Hadidi & Mohammadbagheri-Parvin, 2015) and focuses on linguistic resources and choice in expressing attitudes (see table 2).

Table 2 about here.

This systematic approach to coding participants' discourse allows for a rigorous investigation for how the *language of evaluation* (Martin & White, 2005) is employed with regards to attitudinal discourses related to the maintenance, development, attrition or shift of LBEs. Whilst the discussion of analysis following a more complete application of the framework to participants' discourses can be read elsewhere (Cunningham, 2017), for the purposes of this paper, and to ensure readability, only highlighted sections of excerpts below will be discussed using Appraisal.

Findings and discussion

A range of attitudes towards maintenance and attrition of children's LBEs was revealed through the analysis of interviews. In the following sections, excerpts from a range of participants will be discussed, considering the discourses of teachers about LBEs and multilingualism, notions of a preferred domain for LBEs, perceptions of language shift in families, and discussion of the impact of and responsibility for language shift in

schools.

Orientations to languages and multilingualism

The majority of teachers were notionally keen on children being able to maintain and develop their LBEs alongside English as a resource and an asset, with some being passionate about this point:

> **Lucy:** I think keeping their **natural** language is an **extremely important characteristic** (.) it's part of their culture (.) it's who they are (.) it's <u>what</u> they are (.) it's what makes them **unique**

Lucy (the EAL coordinator and an HLTA at school 6) adopts the *positive* VALUATION term 'natural' language here, which is interesting in that it is a rarely-used expression in the literature or wider discourse, suggesting that this topic may be one that she has not considered in a professional sense before and one that may be rarely discussed.

However, the highly positive attitudes expressed through the *positive* GRADUATION ('extremely') and NORMALITY JUDGEMENTS ('unique') here are not echoed by all participants. Two senior managers (in schools 4 and 5) explicitly articulate that they did not consider it 'a shame' if children lost their home language. An excerpt from school 4 here illustrates the stance:

> **CC:** do you think that's a shame
> **Irene:** (4.2) no (1.2) because (0.8) you have to differentiate between white people and a:nd **which ever other colour** you want to talk to because (.) in two or three generations you don't even notice for example (.) you wouldn't walk along the street for example and assume that they would have any other culture without asking (.) would you but because somebody has a **different** (.) umm (.) coloured skin then I think it takes extra generations to (.) not just because of the people themselves but because of other people who put their culture back onto them and go (.) oh well obviously you're (.) **whatever you are** and maybe obviously they're

> not but they just look **different** in this area because – whether it's Asian or Chinese **or whatever**

When directly asked whether she thought it was a shame that children were not using their 'heritage' language anymore, Irene (the head teacher in school 4) said 'no', though only after a significant pause. Pauses are highlighted by Tileagă (cited in McKinlay & McVittie, 2008) as suggesting reluctance on the part of the speaker to commit to a particular point. Her discourse from then on was entirely devoid of reference to language itself, but rather became a discourse conflating language with skin colour. Language or language proficiency is used as a proxy for race or ethnicity in much societal, governmental and media discourse, for example that about residency and citizenship (Dabach, 2014; UK government services, n.d.) and we can see that in Irene's discourse in this extract. A straightforward question about home language use has become inextricably linked with issues pertaining to expectations about assimilation and the greater difficulties of being a visible minority and looking 'different', a *negative* NORMALITY JUDGEMENT which Irene uses twice here. The 'othering' is enhanced here through adopting a dismissive stance when clarifying using *lowering* FOCUS GRADUATION linguistic resources, as if what community the 'othered' person belongs to is of little import. We see that in three phrases in the above excerpt: 'white people and whichever other colour', 'whatever you are', and 'Asian or Chinese or whatever'. Language is most certainly being constructed as a problem here, although not explicitly.

Perceptions of legitimate domains for languages beyond English

Participants' discourse suggested that there was a strongly ingrained sense of an appropriate domain for LBEs, the home, and parents and children are held accountable for language attrition and language shift.

In interviews at schools 2, 3, 4 and 5, children are represented as feeling that their home language belongs in the home and that English is the only language they should speak at school. Kelly's discussion of this is in the context of telling me that home languages are respected in the school (albeit with numerous caveats adopting *lowering* GRADUATION features that, in essence, mean that they are welcome only until the children do not absolutely need them):

> **Kelly:** it's **ok** to speak in your own language in the classroom (.) which (.) children **find difficult** I thin- a lot of the teachers are now are (.) **quite willing** to let people use first language in the classroom **particularly when they have new children** but (.) we're finding even in year two that children are **embarrassed** to do it (.) so
> **CC:** where do you think that embarrassment comes from
> **Kelly:** I'm not sure (.) I- I'm not sure that's to do with the sort of du- sort of dual language thing I think (.) they're not in foundation (.) cos they're just learning language

The explicit attribution to children of the *negative* AFFECT of being 'embarrassed' by their linguistic and cultural difference, as manifested in their finding home language use 'difficult', is a feature of the discourse at schools 1, 2 and 4. The inability to fully articulate why children may be embarrassed over using their LBEs suggests that this question is not one that is regularly discussed or considered in schools. There is no explicit consideration of the possibility that the attitudes and (in)action of the staff may be relevant in terms of whether they legitimise or inhibit LBE use, whether they are welcomed as a resource, or side-lined as a problem.

Orientations to language shift in families

Language shift has taken place in some families connected to school 5, and also shows signs in the participants' discourse of being present in schools 2, 3 and 4. Helen bemoans the situation of having "the strange anomaly now of having some children who

are from an Asian background that don't speak in any language other than English". However, it is actually neither a strange nor anomalous situation, as is made clear in the research literature, which demonstrates that migrant languages often disappear between the second and third generations (Bortolato, 2012; Parameshwaran, 2014). Irene in the North-East is also seeing this process underway and says:

> there is a slide happening (.) so a slide goes **downwards** (.) so whatever (.) on a gradient **upwards** (.) in less (..) less obvious use and (…) and their own language I think (..) because their mums are (..) once your mum speaks your language or whichever language you are using I- I (.) I presume (.) I hypothesised (.) you're **much more comfortable** (.) you don't have to **rely** on the other language so much at home (.) so I think the next generation coming through needs to remember what we've got here (.) and their mums and dads (.) it's **not going to be important** to them is it (.) **a second language** (.) it's **a holiday language** then

The shift between 'downwards' and 'upwards' seems to show a reformulation of the thought process Irene is going through in which she initially uses the common 'downwards' collocation of a slide but then reconceptualises to communicate a more positive message about language attrition in 'a gradient upwards' (presumably in English use). This, coupled with her later reference to not having to 'rely on' what becomes a 'holiday language', paints the attrition of the home language as a positive projection of the near future. The current reliance on the home language seems therefore to be construed as *negative* CAPACITY and attrition or shift is therefore not an unfortunate outcome but rather a positive change, with the *negative* VALUATION of the home language as a 'holiday language'. This minimally orients to language as a resource but the fact that this limiting of children's linguistic repertoire is framed positively demonstrates the overriding language as a problem stance.

The research literature on multilingual families highlights that changes in migration patterns can negatively affect inter-generational relationships (Canagarajah,

2008; Hua, 2008) with children less able to communicate with grandparents (particularly) and parents, because they are less adept at the 'home' language as English becomes more dominant generation by generation in a settled migrant community. Research has suggested that this is being, at least partly, led by the younger generation (Canagarajah, 2008; Wong Fillmore, 2000), but Helen observes that parents play their part in denying the home language to their children too:

> **Helen:** they don't understand it and then they'll say well **mum and dad speak it but we- (.) not to me anymore** an- an' so (.) they've missed out (.) they then don't understand then what the parents are spe- which I s'pose is good i- in some ways (.) you don't understand what your parents are talking about (.) which is a good plo:y (.) to be quite honest (.) but- **by that very fact they're being excluded then from a part of their own family** as well

We see above the blame for the language shift being laid at the door of the parents, rather than actually being caused by broader societal challenges or educational pressures such as assessment concerns documented elsewhere (Wyman et al., 2010). Furthermore, the Family Liaison Manager at School 5 commented that she was aware of children often communicating in Panjabi only when their father was home, and in English the rest of the time.

The impact of language shift on schools

The educational challenges presented by language shift are discussed by participants in school 2, 3 and 5, suggesting that it is an increasingly pressing problem that the English being spoken in families that are undergoing language shift may be attenuated. Sarah expresses concern about parents speaking 'bad English' in the home in preference to the language of their own parents and notes the impact in terms of "EAL traits and issues going on".

In a similar discussion, Kate also falls into the trap of conflating language with ethnicity when she describes some of the challenges for educators in her *negative* JUDGEMENTS of families' English CAPACITY and *negative* APPRECIATION appraisals as follows:

> **Kate:** my first impressions here was that- that families generally were (.) a lot more westernised an' that- that there was a lot more language in- in- in- um English in their homes (..) but the more I've worked here (.) I- I've realised that- that actually that's a sur- (.) a surface level and that **there isn't the depth of language** still in the homes an' and so ok parents might speak English in the playground but **it's still at a very superficial level**

Sheila, the head teacher in school 3, addresses the fundamental concerns about language shift in *negative* CAPACITY terms, from a perspective attuned to research findings on maintaining and developing LBEs:

> **Sheila:** what I have concern about is what's going on in the community, but even within our school community there was a (.) lack of understanding about the development and use of first language (.) what we're finding is that children are coming and (.) and more and more and more their parents for instance are **impoverished** in language and it's because they've started to learn in the first language and stopped (.) and then they've tried to pick up English and then they end up not speaking either that well so we do have a number of children that are coming in with **a lack of (.) of first language developed**, **a lack of any language developed**

Sheila is aware that changing inter-generational language practices will be challenging and not be "something that can be done over a short period of time". She additionally notes the societal pressures on parents saying:

> **Sheila:** it's a cultural thing as well isn't it, you know (.) that expectation that er (.) that when people come to live here they learn the language but that lack of understanding, that (.) in order to do that **they need** to preserve their first language.

It is interesting to observe above, however, that despite Sheila's clear understanding of the benefits of language maintenance, the responsibility for that maintenance remains with the family, seen in the pronoun choice "they" above.

Participants expressed concerns for potential community and societal problems that could come from denying children the opportunity to develop their full potential and self-esteem, utilising their LBEs and feeling validation for the entirety of their life experiences, impacts that Wong Fillmore (2000) discusses at length. The loss of expertise following devolution of funding to schools is bemoaned by most participants in the study, but Helen in School 5 also observes that the curriculum is now so "structured", "tight" and "inflexible" that teachers simply don't have time or headspace for language maintenance and development work as they have to be "blinkered on this furrow they've got to plough", to the "detriment of the children".

Conclusions and Implications

This paper has considered the mixed discourses of teachers in northern England about orientations to LBEs and views on responsibility for language maintenance and attrition. Present in a number of teachers' discourses was rhetorical support for language maintenance from an orientation of language-as-resource. However, an orientation to language as a right was not clearly seen in the data, LBEs discussed as "a very important characteristic" not quite going so far as a language-as-right construction. The construal of language-as-problem, however, especially in school, is more regularly observed, echoing Alexander (2012). Whilst the impact of language shift is discussed highly negatively by participants, this has not led to a shift in discourses about responsibilities for language maintenance and development. Parents, children and the wider community are held responsible in teachers' discourses, which mirrors Weekly's (2018) findings and reflects the governmental ideological stance (Overington, 2012).

A move away from a language-as-problem orientation, with the inherent pedagogical focus on transitioning children to English even if this risks language attrition, may well be challenging, as Ruíz (1984) observed. Planning for a shift to a language as resource orientation, in which LBEs are valued as part of the "funds of knowledge" (Moll et al., 1992) that children bring to the school, has practical implications for teachers and schools. Moving towards a view of LBEs in terms of "resource conservation" (Ruiz, 1984, p. 26), and shifting to seeing them as a resource for the broader society as encouraged by the Nuffield Foundation (2000) will take a significant societal ideological shift. Societal ideologies are rarely reshaped and renegotiated by those in the strongest positions of power, as it does not serve their interests to challenge structures that perpetuate their privilege (Briceño et al., 2018; Van Dijk, 2013). A socio-cognitive construction of ideology makes it clear that it is *individuals* who are crucial in the (slow) process of ideological change (Van Dijk, 2013). Therefore, as Ricento and Hornberger (1996) make clear, the language educator's role here is crucial and individual teachers are agents for social change (Biesta et al., 2015; Gkaintartzi et al., 2015).

The challenges of changing discourses about language attrition and developing practices to avoid it in schools are, however, myriad. Teachers who are "blinkered on [a] furrow they've got to plough" as a result of curriculum and other demands are ill-placed to begin the process. Rather it is school leaders (the participants in this study perhaps) that should be developing a more positive rhetoric around schools' role in language maintenance, followed by more practical steps to facilitate this in schools, in order to better support language communities. Researchers in this area should therefore collaborate more effectively to improve engagement with research and sharing of ideas with these key individuals.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Matthew Clarke, Helen Sauntson and Chris Hall for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. She would also like to thank the participating teachers and support staff for generously agreeing to take part in the study.

References:

Alexander, R. (2012) '*Children, their World, their Education' Final Report and Recommendations of the Cambridge Primary Review*. London: Routledge.

Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., Green, D. W., & Gollan, T. H. (2009). Bilingual Minds. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *10*(3), 89–129. http://doi.org/10.1177/1529100610387084

Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Robinson, S. (2015). The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and Teaching*, *21*(6), 624–640. http://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1044325

Bortolato, C. (2012). *Language maintenance-attrition among generations of the Venetian-Italian community in Anglophone*. University of Exeter.

Briceño, A., Rodriguez-Mojica, C., & Muñoz-Muñoz, E. (2018). From English learner to Spanish learner: raciolinguistic beliefs that influence heritage Spanish speaking teacher candidates. *Language & Education: An International Journal*, *32*(3), 212–226. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1429464

Brown, C. L. (2011). Maintaining Heritage Language: Perspectives of Korean Parents. *Multicultural Education*, *19*(1), 31–37. Retrieved from https://auth.lib.unc.edu/ezproxy_auth.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ986889&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Buckledee, S. (2018). *The Language of Brexit: How Britain talked its way out of the*

European Union. London: Bloomsbury.

Canagarajah, S. (2008). Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *12*(2), 143–176.

Cho, G. (2000). The Role of Heritage Language in Social Interactions and Relationships: Reflections from a Language Minority Group. *Bilingual Research Journal : The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, *24*(4), 369–384.

Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's Language Potential*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Conteh, J., & Brock, A. (2011). 'Safe spaces'? Sites of bilingualism for young learners in home, school and community. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *14*(3), 347–360. http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2010.486850

Cummins, J., & Danesi, M. (1990). *Heritage Languages: the development of denial of Canada's linguistic resources*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Cunningham, C. (2017). *Saying more than you realise about "EAL": discourses of educators about children who speak languages beyond English*. University of York.

Cunningham, C. (2018). Terminological tussles: taking issue with "EAL" and "languages other than English." *Power and Education*. http://doi.org/10.1177/1757743818806919

Cunningham, C. (2019). 'The inappropriateness of language': discourses of power and control over languages beyond English in primary schools schools. *Language and Education*. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1545787

Curriculum, N. A. for L. D. in the. (2018). *Position statement: Withdrawal of English as an Additional Language (EAL) proficiency data from the Schools Census*

returns. London. Retrieved from Curriculum,

Dabach, D. B. (2014). “You Can’t Vote, Right?”: When Language Proficiency is a Proxy for Citizenship in a Civics Classroom. *Journal of International Social Studies*, *4*(2), 37–56.

Danjo, C. (2018). Making sense of family language policy : Japanese-English bilingual children’s creative and strategic translingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–13. http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1460302

David, M., & Sutton, C. D. (2011). *Social Research: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

DES. (2006). *Excellence and Enjoyment: learning and teaching for bilingual children in the primary years*. London.

Durán, L., & Palmer, D. (2014). Pluralist discourses of bilingualism and translanguaging talk in classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *14*(3), 367–388. http://doi.org/10.1177/1468798413497386

Eisenchlas, S. A., & Schalley, A. C. (2017). Reaching out to migrant and refugee communities to support home language maintenance. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1281218

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Fekete, E. (2017). *Europe’s Fault Lines: Racism and the Rise of the Right*. London: Verso.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual

Matters.

Flores, B. B., & Smith, H. L. (2009). Teachers' Characteristics and Attitudinal Beliefs About Linguistic and Cultural Diversity. *Bilingual Research Journal : The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, *31*(1–2), 323–358. http://doi.org/10.1080/15235880802640789

French, M. (2017). Students' multilingual resources and policy-in- action: an Australian case study. *Language and Education*, *30*(4), 298–316. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2015.1114628

Ganuza, N., & Hedman, C. (2015). Struggles for legitimacy in mother tongue instruction in Sweden. *Language and Education*, *29*(2), 125–139. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.978871

Genesee, F., Nicoladis, E., & Paradis, J. (1995). Language differentiation in early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language*, *22*, 611–631.

Gkaintartzi, A., Kiliari, A., & Tsokalidou, R. (2015). 'Invisible' bilingualism – 'invisible' language ideologies: Greek teachers' attitudes towards immigrant pupils' heritage languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *18*(1), 60–72. http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.877418

Gkaintartzi, A., & Tsokalidou, R. (2011). "She is a very good child but she doesn't speak": The invisibility of children's bilingualism and teacher ideology. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(2), 588–601. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.014

gov.uk. (n.d.). Prove your knowledge of English for citizenship and settling. Retrieved May 11, 2017, from https://www.gov.uk/english-language/overview

Hadidi, Y., & Mohammadbagheri-Parvin, L. (2015). Systemic Functional Linguistics as Interpersonal Semantics: Appraisal and Attitude in the Stylistic Analysis of an English Novel. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *7*(1), 129–148.

http://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v7i1.7199

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Helot, C., & Young, A. (2002). Bilingualism and Language Education in French Primary Schools: Why and How Should Migrant Languages be Valued? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *5*(2), 96–112.

Hua, Z. (2008). Duelling Languages, Duelling Values: Codeswitching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*, 1799–1816.

Jamai, A. (2008). *Language use and maintenance among the Moroccan Minority in Britain*. University of Salford.

King, K. A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *2*(5), 907–922. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818x.2008.00076.x

Kirsch, C. (2017). Young children capitalising on their entire language repertoire for language learning at school. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *31*(1), 1–17. http://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2017.1304954

Kwon, J. (2017). Immigrant mothers' beliefs and transnational strategies for their children's heritage language maintenance. *Language and Education*, *31*(6), 495–508. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1349137

Lourenço, M., Andrade, A. I., & Sá, S. (2017). Teachers' voices on language awareness in pre-primary and primary school settings: implications for teacher education. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *8318*, 1–15. http://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2017.1415924

Macías, R. F. (2016). Language ideologies and rhetorical structures in bilingual education policy and research: Richard Ruiz's 1984 discursive turn. *Bilingual*

Research Journal, *39*(3–4), 173–199. http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1230566

MacKenzie, P. (2009). Mother tongue first multilingual education among the tribal communities in India. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *12*(4), 369–385. http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902935797

Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: the effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education*, *29*(3), 200–217. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.994524

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: APPRAISAL in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. http://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511910

McKinlay, A., & McVittie, C. (2008). *Social Psychology and Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

McPake, J., Tinsley, T., Boreder, P., Latomaa, S., Maryniuk, W., & Mijares, L. (2007). Valuing All Languages in Europe, Project Report. *Languages for Social Cohesion*, 1–62. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2006.10.027

Meier, G. S. (2010). Two-way immersion education in Germany: bridging the linguistic gap. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(4), 419–437. http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050903418793

MHCL. (2018). *Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper*. London.

Moll, L. C., 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.

Overington, A. (2012). A summary of government policy in relation to EAL learners.

Padilla, Amado, M., Lindholm, K. J., Chen, A., Duran, R., Hakuta, K., Lambert, W., & Tucker, G. R. (1991). The English-Only Movement: Myths, Reality, and

Implications for Psychology. *American Psychologist*, *46*(2), 120–130.

Palmer, D. (2007). A dual immersion strand programme in California: Carrying out the promise of dual language education in an english-dominant context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*(6), 752–768. http://doi.org/10.2167/beb397.0

Parameshwaran, M. (2014). Explaining intergenerational variations in English language acquisition and ethnic language attrition. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *37*(1), 27–45. http://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.827794

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Priven, D. (2008). Grievability of first language loss: towards a reconceptualisation of European minority language education practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*(1), 95–106.

Pulinx, R., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2015). Silencing linguistic diversity: the extent, the determinants and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–15. http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1102860

Raschka, C., Wei, L., & Lee, S. (2002). Bilingual development and social networks of British-born Chinese children. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *153*(2002), 9–25.

Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(3), 401–427.

Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, *8*(2), 15–34. http://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Dunbar, R. (2010). *Indigenous Children's Education as Linguistic Genocide and a Crime Against Humanity? A Global View*. *Journal of*

Indigenous Peoples Rights (Vol. 1).

Sook Lee, J., & Oxelson, E. (2006). “It’s Not My Job”: K–12 Teacher Attitudes Toward Students’ Heritage Language Maintenance. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*(2), 453–477.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington DC: US House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2013). Ideology and Discourse. In M. Freeden, L. Tower Sargent, & M. Stears (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. (pp. 175–196). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weekly, R. (2018). Attitudes, beliefs and responsibility for heritage language maintenance in the UK. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1–22. http://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1554324

Wong Fillmore, L. (2000). Loss of Family Languages: Should educators be concerned? *Theory Into Practice*, *39*(4), 203–210. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249901053_Loss_of_Family_Languages_Should_Educators_Be_Concerned

Wyman, L., Marlow, P., Andrew, C. F., Miller, G., Nicholai, C. R., & Rearden, Y. N. (2010). High stakes testing, bilingual education and language endangerment: a Yup’ik example. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(6), 701–721. http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050903410931

Table 1: participants

School	Participant pseudonym	Role	Langs. *	Years of experience	Gender	No. of interviews (duration in mins)
1	Thomas	Head teacher	Eng.	>30	M	2 (53/43)
	Jenna	EAL Coordinator	Eng./ Urdu	<5	F	1 (27)
2	Kelly	EAL Coordinator	Eng.	20-30	F	2 (34/31)
	Caroline	Deputy head	Eng.	20-30	F	1 (8)
	Sheila	Head teacher	Eng.	>30	F	2 (20/18)
3	Sarah	Deputy head	Eng.	10-20	F	1 (43)
4	Irene	Head teacher	Eng.	>30	F	2 (28/29)
5	Luke	Deputy head	Eng.	>30	M	1 (26)
	Helen	Family Liaison	Eng.	20-30	F	1 (21)
	Kate	Class teacher/ Multilingualism lead	Eng.	10-20	F	1 (43)
6	Lucy	Higher Level Teaching Assistant/ EAL Coordinator	Eng.	30-40	F	1 (54)
Local Authority service	Margaret	EAL specialist	Eng.	40-50	F	1 (33)
	Theresa	EAL specialist	Eng.	40-50	F	1 (33)
	*some participants noted 'school language learning' but those listed as Eng. consider themselves to be monolingual.					

Table 2. Overview of the Appraisal Framework for Analysis of Attitude (adapted from Martin & White, 2005)

Appraisal sub-system	System	Sub-categories	Lexical examples
Attitude *(ways of feeling)*	Affect *(emotional reactions)*	e.g. dis/inclincation	*fear, desire*
		eg. in/security	*disquiet, confidence*
	Judgement *(assessing behaviour)*	Normality +/-	*lucky, everyday*
		Capacity +/-	*strong, weak*
		Tenacity +/-	*brave, unreliable*
		Veracity +/-	*honest, fake*
		Propriety +/-	*good, mean*
	Appreciation	Quality	*appropriate*

	(assessing the value of things)	Composition	*balanced*
Engagement *(speaker's commitment)*	Monogloss *(non-dialogic)*		
	Heterogloss *(dialogic)*	Contract	*e.g. counter/ agree*
		Expand	*e.g. entertain/ attribute*
Graduation *(grading evaluations)*	Force	Raise (*e.g. Intensification)*	*loads of, completely*
		Lower *(eg. tone down)*	*few, slightly*
	Focus	strengthen	*a true friend*
		weaken	*kind of*

Word count: 7482