



Conflicting Ideologies and Language use ;: Complexities of language socialization in a majority L1 classroom.”

Miki Mori

► To cite this version:

Miki Mori. Conflicting Ideologies and Language use ;: Complexities of language socialization in a majority L1 classroom.”. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 2014, 13 (3), pp.153-170. 10.1080/15348458.2014.919810 . hal-02910320

HAL Id: hal-02910320

<https://hal.science/hal-02910320>

Submitted on 16 Aug 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Mori, M. (2014). "Conflicting ideologies and language use: Complexities of language socialization in a majority L1 classroom." *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*. 13(3), 153-170. DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2014.919810

Title: Conflicting ideologies and language use: Complexities of language socialization in a majority L1 classroom

Authors: Miki Mori

Keywords: language socialization, ideologies, English-only, language acquisition, identity, bilingualism, language policy, adult ESL

Abstract: This study looks at language socialization efforts in a Spanish language dominant adult ESL classroom, as related to issues of ideologies on bilingualism and language acquisition. It draws on theories and critiques of language socialization (Bayley & Langman, 2010; Garret and Baquedano-López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004), second language learning (Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 1997) and language ideologies (Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994; Wortham, 2008). Qualitative, ethnographic methods are used to address the intersection of language learning, socialization, and ideologies as related to an English-only policy. The study reveals complex language ideologies that value students L1s, as well as adherence and resistance to socialization practices. It also reveals complications related to the teacher's accommodation of languages besides English, particularly Spanish, for the minority non-Spanish speaking students. This paper concludes with implications for teacher pedagogy, policy and ideologies in mixed-L1 classrooms.

Introduction

Research on adult education over the last thirty years has covered a wide array of topics, including addressing issues of gender and literacy (Gowen & Bartlett, 1997; Menard-Warwick 2011), curriculum (Auerbach & Burgess, 1985), gender and narratives (Menard-Warwick, 2009; Vitanova, 2004), pragmatics (Li, 2000), and investment (Norton Peirce, 1995). There has, however, been a recent call for more diverse research on adult education (Mathews-Aydinli, 2008). This includes, but is not limited to, the need to look at how students are socialized into language practices and how language ideologies play into such processes, including those of both teachers and students. Furthermore, analysis of the dominance of one native language in the classroom and how it affects socialization processes into English-only policies and classroom language use has not been as thoroughly investigated. This study seeks to address these issues through a case study that looks at the language practices used by an instructor in a high-beginner adult ESL course, where the majority of students shared the same first language, Spanish, in which the instructor was partially proficient. Language policies and ideologies in conjunction with socialization practices were analyzed, revealing complex and conflicting ideologies and practices from all participants due to classroom dynamics and assumptions about learning

Literature Review and Framework

The Intersection of Language Socialization and Language Ideologies

Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002) define language socialization research as being “concerned with all of the knowledge and practices that one needs in order to function as—and, crucially, to be regarded by others as—a competent member of (or participant in) a particular community or communities...” (p. 345). The research encompassing this framework is vast and impressive and has been extensively critiqued and reviewed (see Bayley & Langman, 2011; Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin,

2004; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). One of the most prominent changes recently made in language socialization theory is the incorporation of a “criticalist” approach in which factors such as power, ideologies, gender and class are incorporated into the research (Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008, pp. 44-45). Furthermore, there has been a call for a re-working of the term “expert” as it relates to communities of practice, as so-called “novices” have been found to socialize other “novices” (Bayley & Langman, 2011, p. 299). These proposed changes help to create a language socialization framework that is dynamic, allowing research to be made that shows people not just getting socialized, but being active agents in their socialization process (Bayley & Schecter, 2003, p. 3). That is, these nuances to language socialization help avoid the pitfall of what Kulick and Schieffelin (2004) call research that is “behaviorism in new clothes” (p. 6). Although seminal research may have thoroughly demonstrated how children are socialized, newer models are asking for instantiations and processes in which people resist or challenge socialization into a particular community of practice.

As a framework for research, language socialization serves as a useful lens through which to view language learning, interaction, and classroom experience. This may be particularly true for adults, who enter classroom settings as students full of histories and attitudes about language learning, education, and culture. Furthermore, practices may be challenged or complied with and the classroom itself may be a place of conflict. Language socialization theory looks for patterns of both adopting new linguistic practices and also resisting and changing such practices, all within the understanding that language socialization is non-linear, dynamic, and bi-directional. However, utilizing a language socialization framework with language classroom research works best when it includes how language ideologies play into socialization processes. Using Woolard’s (1998) definition, Wortham (2003) emphasizes the importance of understanding

ideologies and stresses the importance they play in social interactions, since they represent “belief systems shared by members of a group--ones that apply to language” (p. 256).

Played out in the classroom and other learning environments, language ideologies can serve to undermine, challenge or support particular political alignments and social identities, such as with language revitalization and socialization amongst adult Gaelic learners in Scotland (McEwan-Fujita, 2010). Because language use is inevitably linked to a particular world view and ideology, it is crucial to incorporate analysis of such ideologies in language socialization research. Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002) discuss this view, explaining how language socialization research can incorporate ideologies in order to show change and flexibility, saying:

language socialization researchers are finding that ideologies of language intersect in complex and interesting ways with local notions of...language acquisition as a developmental process. While the specific language socialization practices motivated by these intermeshing systems of ideas and beliefs are always a central concern, these studies stress the inherent dynamism and mutability of language socialization, as a locus of reproduction as well as change, by exploring the channels of mutual influence linking ideology, practice and outcome.” (pp. 354-355)

Indeed ethnographic research that incorporates frameworks of critical language socialization as it relates to ideologies and power proves to be a fruitful avenue for revealing the complex ways people learn and challenge language and socialize into certain communities.

Ideologies of Mono- and Bilingualism in the Language Learning Classroom

Language is “a powerful semiotic tool for evoking social and moral sentiments, collective and personal identities tied to place and situation, and bodies of knowledge and belief” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008, p. 8). If we agree most speakers, including those who operate educational

institutions, think language is used to communicate and is a “socially purposive action,” then it is critical for linguists to assess what exactly these people think of language in terms of “meaning, function, and value” (Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994, p. 70). It is important to study language ideology because it can articulate a connection between micro-level linguistic phenomena and macro-level aspects of language, politics and power, as seen in language policies in the classroom (as stressed by Kroskrity in Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 72). That is, it is important to look at “signs in use and more enduring social structures” (Wortham, 2008, p. 43). Addressing the effects of language ideologies in education is critical if we are to understand how the education system works and how it can be challenged and changed for the better.

In the context of language classroom settings, particularly ESL classrooms, it is nearly impossible to look at ideologies without addressing issues behind mono- and bilingualism (and really multilingualism), power, and identity (Valdés, 2004). Language learning is not an apolitical process, but is one wrought with ideologies and struggle. As seen in Rajadurai’s (2010) research with Malay students learning English in Malaysia, students’ use of English was greeted with resistance from other Malays. Some Malays maintained an ideology of “Malays speak Malay,” such that there was no room for English to be spoken amongst Malays, even those studying English. This ideology affected language learning and socialization processes for these learners, as they were limited in how to use English and with whom.

In regards to American language ideologies, one major undercurrent relates back to the Herderian notion of “one nation, one language,” which understands that a state stands strongest when only one language is spoken (Bauman & Briggs, 2003, pp. 169-170). This notion of “one nation, one language” and the thought that monolingualism is the answer for a unified U.S. can be seen to have “trickled down” into the ESL classroom with the enforcement of “English only”

policies.¹ Indeed, students themselves also may express these ideologies, as seen in Miller (2009): in interviews, adult ESL students expressed their desire to learn English not because they wanted to communicate with others but because “this is American,” thus voicing the notion that Americans speak English and only English. It is important to keep in mind, however, that ideologies “are neither simple nor monolithic” (Blackledge & Creese, 2010, p. 27). Rather, they exist in multiple forms and often contrast with one another (Gal, 1992). Conflicting ideologies, whether about language or learning, have been observed, as in the case of beliefs behind classroom learning and speaking (Olivo, 2003). Furthermore, ideologies are often realized through practice and much can be gleaned by looking at what people do and say (Gal, 1992), as in Gal’s (1993) study of varying and at times contradictory practices and ideologies towards German language use and study in Hungary. Practices may often be connected to policies on language, whether *de facto* or explicit, as they are typically designed to implement change in practice and are wrapped up in language ideologies. Indeed, others have stressed the importance of looking at power with language ideology (Gal, 1992) and in the context of language instruction in the U.S., issues of English hegemony and the subordination of other languages, particularly Spanish (Shannon, 1999).

Scholars (Auerbach, 1993; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Wright, 2004) have criticized the use of English only ESL/EFL classrooms as being ineffective for learning and detrimental to L1 maintenance. The perseverance of this policy may be due to prevailing concerns stemming from a language ideology where English monolingualism is highly valued. This policy may also continue to be enacted in response to theories on language acquisition, even if false, and questions of linguistic equality amongst non-English languages in the classroom. Regarding the

¹ It should be noted that this study, while recognizing the official status of English-only in California state policies such as EC 30 and Proposition 227, does not address these macro issues. Indeed, looking at both macro, state-level policies and micro, “on the ground” enactments of such policies is merited but beyond the scope of this research article. There may very well be a strong top-down influence on such classroom realizations and/or a push from the bottom-up, the study of which deserves further research.

latter issue, Cook (1997) criticizes SLA research and researchers for incorporating an underlying framework in which L2 learners are always less than and not as “complete” as native speakers. Thus SLA research understands the L2 learners as people who “are failures” (p. 37). In terms of bilingualism, Cook states how “virtually all linguistics assumes that bilingualism can be tacked on as an appendix to the study of monolingualism rather than being a topic of its own, deliberately ignoring the competences of most human beings in the world” (p. 44). This underlying assumption may very well have an effect on curriculum development, classroom management, and language policies in L2 and ESL classrooms. Because monolingualism is perceived as the more essential, legitimate state of language, bilingualism gets framed as illegitimate. Cook pushes for the legitimacy of bilingualism in its own right and the need for SLA research to adopt such a notion, saying, “a second language is as vital to the lives and occupations of many people as a first; why should their activities be denigrated by being seen as pale imitations of the ‘true’ lives and occupations of monolinguals?” (p. 44). The enforcement of such ideologies in a language classroom signals the power of English, and monolingualism, just as much as it diminishes the value of students’ L1s.

Furthermore, there are arguments for the benefits of bilingual education in the more canonical sense (Baker, 2003), with Shannon’s (1995) study of a fourth grade bilingual Spanish/English classroom revealing the potential to socialize students into seeing themselves as bilinguals and participating in bilingual education. Others stress the need to look at the diversity of bilingual and multilingual educational settings in order to get a better grasp on the benefits and challenges of language learning (Hélot & de Mejía, 2008). This includes English language learning settings, where studies have found benefits in utilizing and valuing students’ first languages in the classroom (Hardman, 1999; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Malicky & Derwing, 1993). Looking at an adult ESL classroom consisting entirely of Cambodian students and a bilingual

teacher in Canada, Malicky and Derwing (1993) found that incorporating students' native languages helped not only the classroom environment and engagement but also literacy practices, camaraderie and self-esteem. The students, who had a range of literacy skills in Khmer, were better able to help one another, gain a sense of community and worth, and all were able to build on their knowledge of their L1 in their efforts to learn English. What is more, in the context of the U.S. there are researchers who warn against the persistent monolingualism in classrooms, even those that appear to be bilingual (García, 2008; Hélot & de Mejía, 2008). It has been pointed out that discussion around bilingual education and ideologies must focus not only on institutions and students, but also teachers. Having not only a space for bilingual learning but also bilingual instructors is something that is important (Hardman, 1999). In addition, it is important to understand teachers' ideologies of learning and language and for teachers to be reflective of this in order to create spaces for agency and change (Pease-Alvarez et al, 2010). Given, it is also crucial to look at the overall institutional practices and what "the nature of the beast" is when it comes to adult ESL education (Warriner, 2007).

Any approach to language learning research, including adult ESL educational settings, must be able to incorporate various aspects into the picture. As a framework, language socialization is incredibly useful for analyzing how adults maneuver through classes, learn a language, and maintain or develop a sense of self in a new language and perhaps environment. It is only made stronger by incorporating analysis of participant ideologies, whether they are about language or learning, since these ideologies drive classroom practices. These include analysis of both students and teachers, since both play an important role in socialization. Lastly, it is nearly impossible to look at any language learning setting without reflecting on mono- and bilingual ideologies and how languages and people get positioned in terms of status and power through classroom practice and interaction.

Methods

Focus and Analysis

In order to address the concerns of language learning, ideologies and socialization practices discussed above, I focus on a case study of an instructor and a few focal students in a high-beginner adult ESL class and how they participated in the language socialization practices of English language learning and the ideologies surrounding them. It reveals a number of conflicts over language use and ideology that partially stem from contextual factors, such as the presence of Spanish and Spanish speakers and the relative absence of a minority L1 student's language(s).

Findings are based on qualitative analysis of over 40 hours of classroom interaction and fieldnotes taken from March through May 2010, continued observations from October through December 2010, one teacher interview, and texts such as the school website, handouts, and books. My involvement was one of a participant observer and while no audio recordings were used, detailed field notes were taken. I employed a Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) framework for methodically coding and organizing my observations, while also employing ethnographic field methods and a language socialization framework.

After observing for several weeks and re-reading fieldnotes, some themes emerged from the data. One in particular was the issue of language use, policy and classroom dynamic, particularly the dominance of one L1 in the classroom and how it affected the language socialization processes and revealed language ideologies. I decided to focus on this issue because it was a salient phenomenon in the classroom and its apparent unpredictability had me wondering why certain languages were being used at times. I was guided by the following questions: How does the instructor use and enforce her English only policy in the classroom and

how do students respond to such efforts? What are the socialization processes that occur regarding regulation of language use in the classroom?

Guided by these questions, I continued observations and began coding. Data coding was iterative and my coding went through the process of open, axial and selective coding (Strauss, 1987). That is, once initial categories about language use (both first language and English) were made in open coding, I then proceeded to look at exactly how language was being used through axial coding. I made connections between codes such as why students were using a particular language, how the dominance of Spanish related to this use, and how the instructor reacted to such use and then proceeded to create subcategories until I refined and finalized my codes through selective coding.

Positioning

Regarding my interest and background as they relate to the observation site and subjects, I was raised in a town similar to that of the school's location: Both have an economy centered on agriculture, supported by predominantly Mexican migrant labor; both have a population mostly consisting of Caucasians and Hispanics. Although there are clearly differences between these two places, their similarities demonstrate how I came into this study with a personal history and interest in this population. In terms of my ethnic background as it relates to positioning at the site, my mixed background of Japanese and White has leant itself in the past to people asking me "what I am" or if I was Hispanic or Filipina and me passing for Thai and Chilean. Because of this, it was not clear how the students and staff would "view" me but through interacting with students, I take to understand that they see me as Asian.

Setting

Westlake Adult School² is located in the historic neighborhood of a small city in the central valley of California and is part of the local K-12 public school district, which labels this adult education school as being a type of “alternative education,” serving adults from age 18 to “older adults” beyond the age of 50. Besides ESL there are GED, high school diploma, and CBET classes, as well as those for “older adults” and adults with “disabilities”. The school provides free day care and classes are free, but there are fee-based courses such as motorcycle license classes, which help provide funding. Four levels of ESL classes are offered during the day and evening. The class I observed was a high-beginner ESL class that operated from 8:45 am until 1:00 pm Monday through Friday. On the days I observed, the students worked in the computer lab from 8:45 until 11:00 am. The class that year was taught by two instructors, Hannah and Cindy, but I only observed on the day that Hannah taught, Thursday.

Participants

The instructor, Hannah, a Caucasian woman in her thirties, had been teaching at the school for several years and had taught high school English before coming to the adult school. As far as I understood she had no formal ESL training or certification and was able to teach at the adult school because of her degree in English and teaching credential. She was from Northern California, received a bachelor’s degree in English and had studied Spanish and was semi-proficient in it, having also spent time in Mexico. Overall, Hannah had a very cheerful and positive demeanor and was a very involved instructor. She started a community garden for all of the adult school students and staff and regularly supplied free plants and seeds from local farms. Holiday potlucks and birthday parties were typical in her classroom.

The roster listed the enrollment of the class at 37 students, but I only met 27 of them. Attendance ranged from 17-22 students. The majority were from Mexico, though there were a

² All locations and names are pseudonyms.

few from Pakistan, El Salvador and Peru. There was a mix of men and women, although there were usually more women. Most were in their 30's or 40's and reported using English in school and the store and their native languages at home. When asked why they were studying English, most reported doing so because of work, location in the U.S., and enjoyment. Attendance varied on the days I observed and students left and arrived on a regular basis, including arriving and leaving throughout the class period and the school year, which Hannah and Cindy termed "the trickle in effect." Some students went through the entire program while others attended levels intermittently. Because of this flux, I focused on the students who were in most regular attendance and who were the most vocal in class, simply because they were the ones whose language use I could most saliently observe. The focal participants, Guadalupe and Huma, attended regularly and were active participants-- volunteering, asking questions, talking with me and other students. The other participants, Fernando and Virginia, attended less frequently but were active participants in the class. Though only present for a few observations, Harvir proved to be an interesting classroom participant.

Guadalupe (29 years), Virginia (35 years), and Fernando (42 years) were all from Mexico and had lived in the U.S. for seven years, two months, and four years, respectively. Huma (19 years) and Harvir (estimated 18-22 years) were from Pakistan and had lived in the U.S. for six months and 4 days, respectively. Guadalupe, Fernando, and Huma reported being able to speak a "little" English in addition to their native languages (Spanish and Urdu). Virginia, however, reported only Spanish (Harvir did not complete the information form). Furthermore, while Virginia reported only using English at school, Guadalupe, Huma and Fernando reported using it at school, at the store, and at home. When asked why they were studying English, Fernando, Guadalupe, and Virginia all stated because they lived in the U.S. ("here"), though Fernando did

add “work” (it appears Huma did not understand the question, so her answer is omitted). Virginia further added that she was studying English because it was a goal and she did not speak English.

Findings

My overall findings reveal that the instructor had an English only policy but that it was at times tenuous and her socialization practices into classroom language use revealed complex and conflicting language ideologies. That is, instantiations of the instructor’s policy to use only English in the classroom showed ideologies supportive at times of ideologies of English monolingualism while at other times a limited sort of bilingualism. Further analysis illustrates ideologies behind second language learning, classroom management, and the role of speaking in class. What is more, the context in which the instructor teaches, in a classroom where the vast majority of the students speak Spanish, which she also does to a semi-proficient extent, made for very different and complex reactions to such socialization processes from the students.

The two focal students, Guadalupe and Huma, responded in different ways to the instructor’s attempts to socialize their language use in the classroom, often due to the circumstances of the dominance and subordination of their native languages, respectively. While Guadalupe vacillated between using English and Spanish in the classroom, Huma more consistently complied with the English only rule set out by the instructor. However, both revealed in their instantiations of compliance and resistance to the English only policy conflicting language ideologies. What is more, the students had very different classroom experiences and complied and resisted for different reasons. That is, Huma used English and called upon others to use English more because she was often the only non-Spanish speaker in the class and had no one to speak Urdu or Farsi with, and could not understand the Spanish being spoken by the other students and the instructor. Guadalupe, on the other hand, was surrounded by Spanish speakers and could also speak with the instructor in Spanish if she needed to. The

dominance and valorization of Spanish in the classroom created tensions between Huma and the other students and the instructor. This opened up the “problematization of the relationship among the individual, the group, and the social order” (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002, p. 352). The results are divided into two sections: The instructor’s language practices in the classroom and the students’ responses to such practices and to one another, particularly looking at the Spanish speaking students and the Urdu speaking students.

English only for language learning and classroom management; Spanish and other language as semi-validated classroom languages and tools for learning English

An anecdote of how I was introduced to the class helps illustrate how ideologies of language learning and monolingualism were expressed at times by the instructor and the students. When I first introduced myself in front of the class at the beginning of observations, Guadalupe asked me if I spoke Spanish. I hesitated, thinking that whatever way I positioned myself could have consequences for classroom interactions with the students. Concerned after having read Menard-Warwick’s (2009) accounts of problems she faced at her site regarding her speaking Spanish to students in class (pp. 20-22), I let out a half-hearted “yes” and Guadalupe said “¡ah, qué bueno!” (Oh how great!). However, Hannah immediately said, ‘yeah but she can’t speak it with you in the classroom. She only can speak Spanish with you outside of the classroom’” (Fieldnotes, 3/25/2010).

What this vignette demonstrated in terms of ideologies and positioning is a telling account of how there were conflicting ideologies in the classroom. Hannah from the beginning of my observations set up the ideology that an English language classroom is a place where only English can and should be spoken. The literal space of the classroom denoted when she said “in the classroom” has no figurative space for Spanish or any other language besides English. She invoked a language learning ideology that students learn a language, in this case English, “by

being taught in English” as is stated in California Educational Code 305, by which all California public schools, including public adult schools like Westlake, must abide. Spanish is delegated to an informal sphere, “outside the classroom” where it is not used to help language learning but to converse informally. What is more, the instructor not only operates under the ideology that students learn English best by using English most but also that speaking Spanish in the classroom can only be used for non-learning related activities. Yet, as will be discussed in further detail below, there were many times in which Hannah used Spanish in the classroom and encouraged students to speak Spanish.

What this anecdote also illustrates is how Hannah’s ideologies were in contrast to how Guadalupe positioned herself through practice and her ideologies. The fact that she asked me if I spoke Spanish to begin with suggests that not only was it the norm for many of the instructors and aids to speak at least a little bit of Spanish but also that it was an asset. Her reaction of “¡ah, qué bueno!” (Oh, how great!) in Spanish to my hesitant “yes” reveals through practice an ideology that Spanish is a valuable language to know and speak. However, there were times where Guadalupe would not align herself as an English speaker, thus seeming to reject the dominance and hegemony of English in the classroom. This anecdote served as one of the many times Hannah discussed the use of English and only English in the classroom and also a look into the conflicting language practices and the ideologies shown through them taking place in the classroom.

In terms of enforcement and socialization of an English only policy, on numerous and various occasions throughout observations Hannah would announce to students to speak only English, saying things like “Eeeenglish,” “English only in the classroom!”, “English, English,” “English in the classroom, you two,” “Let’s speak English,” “English please,” “Eduardo you need to speak English in class” and “Eeeeengliiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiish. The Spanish-- you can go

outside and speak Spanish.” Her intonation and volume varied from being emphatic and loud to softer and “sing song.” Often this occurred as students arrived in the morning into the computer lab sat down next to their classmates and started talking. However, this also occurred in the regular classroom during individual and group exercises and student demonstrations in front of the class. Furthermore, students would enforce the rule on one another in ways that varied in degree of seriousness. Sometimes the students would say in a mocking tone while smiling, “English please.” For example, one student said aloud “I can hear someone talking Spanish,” referring to a group of girls who were quietly speaking in Spanish. The girls started laughing and Hannah said “I knooooow...and laughing too”.

I use the term “English only policy” as an emic term that was formed during the course of observations in the classroom. It is related to Jeria’s (1999) explanation of how English only policies and “monolingual policy” are realized “in practice if not in policy” (p. 56). So in this case I refer to the teacher’s enforcement of the use of only English in the classroom, regardless of whether or not this was a mandated policy. Indeed, in an interview Hannah told me that she did not know if there was an official English only policy at the school (Interview, 11/25/10). She had also noted that it was important for students to get practice and exposure in English, which reinforces a notion that English is learned best by being spoken the most, such as in a monolingual ESL setting. Furthermore, the assumed and naturalized underlying language learning theory represented by the stress on using only English in the classroom is one that sees language learning, in this case English, as something that needs to be learned by solely speaking in and using that language (see Auerbach, 1993; Farr & Song, 2011).

Besides the use of English only as a way to learn English, the instructor also enforced the rule of speaking in English in order to manage the classroom and socialize students into her practices for classroom language use. It appears that at times this was due not only to the

ideology that a person needs to speak English exclusively in order to learn English, but also the need to keep students on topic, quiet, and focused in class. Thus a language policy was being used in the class at times as a tool for classroom management. The instructor enforced the English only rule on one occasion in order to get a student to comply with typical computer lab conduct, although it did not seem clear to the students that this involved complying with classroom behavior and language use. To illustrate, when a new student, Harvir, came to the computer lab class for the first time, he began talking very loudly with Huma in another language (I presumed it was Urdu or Punjabi but at some point Huma said it was Farsi) (Fieldnotes, 5/13/2010). Both of them were seated right next to Hannah, and for a period of about 10 minutes, Hannah tried to get Harvir and Huma to “speak English.” At one point Hannah said it was ok for Huma to translate for Harvir, but then she continued to “remind” them to speak English. She did not stress, however, that they were talking loudly and needed to be quiet due to this reason, but that they needed to speak English, presumably because the conversation would end once they had to converse in English.

A similar incident occurred in the computer lab, only this time rather than enforcing an explicit language rule, the instructor called upon her own sanctioned classroom activities to keep students from speaking Spanish and to use English. During class in the computer lab, Hannah told Virginia to “stop selling your puppies!” but then told me that Virginia could not do this in class because it would make her speak too much Spanish (Fieldnotes, 6/6/2010). Hannah frames the argument for Virginia to stop selling puppies not in terms of appropriate classroom activities, but in terms of the use of Spanish. She is stressing the limited use of Spanish in the classroom and that a conversation about puppies is not an appropriate use of Spanish. Though it may not have been clear to Virginia that her use of Spanish was the root of the issue rather than the

selling of puppies, the instructor's underlying argument is that Spanish and discussing one's personal life are not appropriate classroom behaviors for an ESL class.

These tensions are related to Olivo's (2003) study on the role of speaking in the classroom for middle school students. The teacher of the classroom also demonstrated conflicting ideologies, in this case the desire to have students speak and discuss while at the same time be quiet and "do their work." Speaking was associated with not working, such that the students were silenced. So too, speaking in the language Huma and Harvir were speaking in was associated with not working or following the English only protocol as well as Virginia speaking Spanish in class. This shows how students were exposed to English only socialization efforts that had less to do with English language use and more to do with classroom activities viewed as acceptable by the instructor.

Regarding the English only policy as it relates to the use of Spanish, on only one occasion did Hannah say it was OK to speak a language besides English in the classroom, which was directed to the two Pakistani students mentioned earlier, Huma and Harvir, and was in the context of translating only (Fieldnotes, 5/13/10). Indeed, this seemed to be the rule Hannah herself used when speaking Spanish in the classroom, in addition to other reasons. For the most part, Hannah used Spanish in order to explain information that was deemed too important to just speak in English, to give directions, to explain directions after failed attempts in English, to explain vocabulary and for other classroom-directed activities. Most often students were not told exactly when they could speak their L1 and when they could not and there was no explicitly stated rule on how students could use their L1s in class and how she used it, though on one occasion after a student explained that she could not discuss a topic in English, Hannah told her to "say it in Spanish" (Fieldnotes, 4/15/2010). However, most of the time the students had to observe how Hannah used Spanish and try to match their use accordingly.

Typically Hannah would give directions in English or explain a concept in English and when it still appeared that students did not understand, would switch to Spanish. For example, one morning Hannah was asking in English for the students' rough drafts of a paragraph they wrote in class:

Hannah stands in the front, where Serena, Aurelia, Alisa, and Miranda A. are in the front row and asks in English if they have their original drafts from the medical experience (points at board) that they wrote in class. She pretends to hold a pen and moves it across her other hand, motioning to them what she means, since no one is reacting. She asks a couple times if they have the paper that they wrote for class and then switches to Spanish, saying "El ensayo que escribimos, ¿tienes el ensayo? [The essay that we wrote, do you have the essay?] And asks if they will get it out. Some nod and then she says "¡Ahora!" [now!] and sort of laughs and smiles. (Fieldnotes, 5/6/2010)

After multiple tries in English to explain what she means, Hannah switched to Spanish, as no one seemed to be reacting verbally or non-verbally. She spoke Spanish in order to clarify what she was asking and once the students nodded, she did not explain more. Thus Spanish is set up as a tolerated but secondary language in the classroom, to be used only as a last resort when communication has failed and as a tool for English language learning rather than an end in itself.

Other times Hannah used Spanish not after multiple tries with English, but rather when giving directions. For example, during class before a pair work conversational activity, after explaining the rules in English, saying that the person acting is not allowed to have notes and that the other person should read and listen, Hannah switched to Spanish, saying "Una persona va a leer, otra persona actor. No nota" (One person will read, the other person actor. No note). Another example comes from Hannah telling the students to practice their English during spring break, saying "I'm going to know who practiced and who didn't... 'Voy a conocer- eh saber

quien practica' ("I'm going to know, eh know, who practices")" (Fieldnotes, 4/1/2010). Giving directions in English and Spanish puts the two languages on more equal terms, suggesting the ideology that Spanish is a necessary tool for translation and classroom communication. Thus Hannah reveals through her socialization processes conflicting ideologies of language use and learning.

Student Compliance and Resistance to Classroom Language Policy and Socialization: Majority Spanish versus the Minority Urdu Speakers

In order to further contextualize the reactions to the language use socialization efforts of the instructor from the Spanish speaking and Urdu speaking students, I give an example of an interaction between Huma and Guadalupe and their conflicting ideologies and practices. During an activity in which Guadalupe and Silvia were practicing a dialogue in front of the class, Guadalupe was explaining in Spanish to Silvia which part she needed to read and how. I noted that at one point Huma says,

'English please!' and everyone starts laughing. Guadalupe says 'I'm sorry, I don't speak English.' Either Silvia or Guadalupe then orients back to the dialogue they are performing, saying, 'Ya es diferente' [it's different] and Hannah soon after says 'English, English.'" (Fieldnotes, 4/22/2010)

Huma asked quite directly and seriously for the performers to speak in English, which while being similar to how Hannah addresses the issue was different from how the other students asked one another to "speak English" in that she did not seem to be joking. Guadalupe positioned herself as someone who does not speak English (despite being one of the most proficient English speakers in the class), revealing a language ideology for herself of a monolingual Spanish speaker. She enacted this notion by continuing to speak in Spanish in front of the class despite Huma's plea to speak English, which shows a disregard for Huma and the English only rule.

As for Huma, her tone expressed little interest in or tolerance of Spanish, which suggests ideology that English language classrooms are to be monolingual and in English only, at least for languages she did not understand. Unlike Paris's (2010) study, where the non-Spanish speaking high school students were interested in learning Spanish and being part of the dominant Latino culture, Huma shows little interest in learning Spanish, which is true of her interactions in general with the other students. Hannah's attempt to socialize the students into English only language use is met with opposition based on tensions between students and competing language ideologies, including the subordination of their own first languages. Students seem to resist such efforts because of what such socialization would mean regarding the value placed on their L1s and what associations may be made with using English, such as the devaluing of their L1.

Regarding the Spanish speaking students, which were the majority in the class, students for the most part would stop speaking in Spanish once Hannah asked them to, but would not continue their conversations or discussions in English. Students seemed to be complying with the socialization process of functioning in and becoming members of a classroom that is structured around only using English in the classroom or how Hannah used it. Some of the students at times used English in the classroom in similar ways to how Hannah used it, suggesting a similar language ideology of a monolingual English classroom. On one occasion Fernando employed such a way of communicating with his classmates. He was in the computer lab talking with Miranda and Enrique about when the last day of school was:

Enrique asks (in Spanish) when the last day of school was. Fernando says "June t(h)ird" [said with an aspirated t]. Enrique and Miranda seem confused and react saying, "What? June t(h)ird?" He repeats "June t(h)ird" and Enrique asks "Thirteen?" Fernando says "No, June t(h)ird." Miranda says "Three?" Fernando finally says in Spanish "Como

primero, segundo, tercero.” [like first, second third] They let out a kind of “ah!” and seem to finally get it. (Fieldnotes, 5/13/2010)

Rather than immediately switching to Spanish once Enrique and Miranda express a lack of understanding of what “third” means, Fernando waits until his fourth turn to explain in Spanish through exemplification the ordinal system of English. Though he does not succeed in extensively explaining in English or Spanish, Fernando seems to be trying here to maintain English use in the classroom, against all odds. His persistence suggests that he does not resist the English only language socialization attempts by the instructor and that he has little conflicting ideologies of language and its use in the classroom.

Guadalupe, on the other hand, proved to have a much more complex approach to the use of English in the classroom. In general and as illustrated in the previous examples, Guadalupe vacillated between positioning herself as an English speaker and conforming to monolingual ideologies and practices, and positioning herself as a Spanish speaker. While she often spoke to me and others in English in class (and Spanish out of class), she also often spoke in Spanish in class. Furthermore, Guadalupe chose to conduct our interview in English when given the option, but was warned by Hannah before a classroom game that she could not play if she did not stop speaking Spanish (Interview, 5/6/2010; Fieldnotes, 4/29/2010). Thus Guadalupe seemed to struggle with these language socialization efforts and how they fit with her own ideologies of language. However, towards the end of observations, Guadalupe would come in to the computer labs in the morning and speak English immediately, saying “good morning” and speaking in English to the other students such as saying “thank you” to students and asking me in English for help (Fieldnotes, 5/6/10, 5/13/10). What is more, her conflicting ideologies seemed to stem from conflict with the non-Spanish speaking student, Huma, as illustrated in the example above. It could have been the presence of a non-Spanish speaker who expressed little interest in Spanish

and called upon her to speak English that lead to Guadalupe's resistance to aligning herself with monolingual English ideologies and practices.

As for Huma's responses to the instructor's language socialization attempts and related ideologies of learning and language use, Huma had on various occasions called on other students and Hannah to only use English in the classroom, in seeming compliance with the English only policy. This is in part due to the fact that Huma did not have the luxury of choice when it came to which language she would speak in the classroom. Unlike Guadalupe and the other Spanish speaking students, Huma had only English to speak with the others and the instructor. Her socialization into English monolingual ideologies of ESL classroom practice is inextricably tied to the circumstances of the makeup of the classroom. Furthermore, I got the sense that she often felt left out of goings on in the classroom and at times did not enjoy a sense of camaraderie with the other students. Huma was positioned as an outsider and she and her L1 did not have a strong presence. Indeed, other students may have forgotten this aspect of the classroom dynamics too, as with the following occasion that happened during a game of Pictionary:

At one point Huma guesses one of the words and Virginia (on a different team next to them) looks at Huma and smiles and points at her saying something like “¡porque miraste a mi dibujo!” [because you looked at my drawing!] and Huma says loudly “I don't understand you!” People laugh and Virginia says in English something like “You looked at my drawing.” (Fieldnotes, 4/29/10)

Virginia makes it clear that Spanish is a dominant and legitimate language to be spoken in class, even if this means speaking it to a non-Spanish speaking student. She also violates the English only policy and does not speak in English until Huma urges her to out of apparent irritation. Furthermore, this example shows Virginia's ability to express herself in English for the task at hand; this was not an issue of her not being able to express herself in English.

However, one incident did occur where Huma seemed to be resisting such a policy, the dominant presence of Spanish in the classroom and Hannah's control of language use. Huma's resistance problematized the relationship between herself as an individual, the other ESL students, and the ESL classroom. Huma's isolation and the relative disregard for her L1 and presence set up a situation in which she decidedly acted out against the dominance of Spanish in the classroom and her isolation. When a new student from Pakistan named Harvir came to the class, there occurred what Hannah herself called "a small uprising." Huma, typically a very cooperative and astute student, became a bit bold and brazen, refusing to speak English or do the assignments for that day's computer session. Importantly, before this Hannah had just been talking with Huma about how she had been learning some Urdu online and she and Huma practiced a few color words. Hannah appeared to be valorizing Urdu and stressing her interest in languages besides Spanish, which highlighted a language ideology that included Urdu being not only worthwhile to study, but also speak (if briefly and broken) in class. She had also positioned herself as a learner and Huma as an expert, thus empowering her and exemplifying what Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002) describe as the "bi-directionality of socialization" (p. 346). Huma, the typical ESL novice, was able to teach Hannah about how to pronounce color words in Urdu.

However, after this conversation ended and Hannah tried to get some students to stop speaking Spanish in class, as was typical at the beginning of class, Huma and Harvir could be heard speaking a language other than English. Harvir, who had only been in the U.S. for 4 days and appeared to speak or understand little to no English, was speaking much louder than any of the students, who typically talked quietly in the computer lab. Hannah and Huma were sitting next to each other with Harvir in between them when the following conversation ensued:

Hannah says gently “OK no more Urdu” and Huma quickly responds with “I speak Farsi” [sounds like /fart[h]i/. Hannah says “OK no more Farsi”. They continue to speak in another language and Hannah says “Let’s speak English.” Huma says “No!” in a high pitch, sort of whining, and Hannah says “It’s ok to translate, but not...” just conversing. Huma says “No! He no understand.” Hannah and Huma go back and forth about this for a few more turns until they stop speaking. Later Hannah walks by me and tells me how now there is someone else who speaks Punjabi, they aren’t speaking English.

(Fieldnotes, 5/13/2010)

What is interesting here is not only Huma’s staunch opposition to Hannah and the English only policy, but Hannah’s apparent awareness of how her just speaking in Urdu may have brought confusion and an initial mark of approval for its use in the classroom. Her use of “no more” contrasts with her usual “English please” or “you need to speak English,” thus conceding the dialogue she and Huma just had about colors in Urdu. Hannah’s legitimizing of one of Huma’s languages through its use serves to re-enforce notions that the English classroom is a space where languages besides English can be spoken. Hannah’s use of Urdu and Harvir’s presence and newness to the classroom (and the U.S.) opened the floodgates, so to speak, for Urdu to be used on par with Spanish in the classroom.

Another crucial point is that there are three languages referenced here: Farsi, Urdu and Punjabi. It is not clear what languages Harvir and Huma speak, but what is clear is that unlike the Spanish speakers, Hannah has no clue as to what Huma and Harvir are talking about. This complicates Hannah’s adjustment of her language policy, because it requires a high level of trust on Hannah’s behalf that the non-Spanish speaking students are in fact translating rather than conversing off-topic. This is not to say that Hannah listened to every conversation in Spanish, but that enforcing the “English only except to translate” policy can be complicated.

This resistance continued throughout the next hour or so, with Hannah more explicitly directing Harvir to be quiet rather than speak English by saying “shhh!”; this effort seemed to have little effect, as Harvir continued to talk very loudly to Huma, who would come to Harvir’s defense. At some point Hannah said “English please” to the two of them and Huma responded, saying “He don’t like!” I noted how “Hannah says ‘Sorry, this is English school.’ Her tone is calm” (Fieldnotes, 5/13/2010). Hannah asserts her power by referencing the institution and its purpose, to teach English and have others speak English, thus showing the intricate relationship between language, ideologies, and power (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). She also associates “English school” and English language learning as a monolingual process. However, Huma resists such assertions and challenges the notion that the students had no choice in what language got spoken in the classroom.

Discussion and Conclusion

Adult English language classrooms are complex sites where not only language and culture are learned, but language practices are contested and resisted. Adults learning English bring with them their own ideologies of language, how it should be used and what it looks like, as well as how it is learned in a classroom. The same can be said about the instructors in these classrooms and can be particularly complicated when the majority of the classroom participants speak a common language besides English. What this means for language socialization efforts on behalf of teachers who are trying to socialize students into using language in the classroom in a particular way is that these attempts may be challenged, complied with at times and resisted at others. What is more, being socialized into a way of speaking and interacting is complex and seldom linear (Bayley & Langman, 2011).

Although current language socialization theory pushes for dissolving the vertically oriented novice/expert notions in understanding the bi-directionality, this notion of fluidity of

influencers and influences needs to be expanded to look at novice-novice language socialization in a more horizontal perspective. This may be particularly useful in classrooms where some learners have tensions amongst one another due to the dominance of one language besides English. The students in this study appeared to have a strong influence on one another in terms of how they appropriated language use as set out by the instructor, particularly due to the ideologies about their first languages and what speaking English indexes (Paris, 2010).

Furthermore, it is essential for language socialization research to leave space for the incorporation of ideology frameworks since the latter play a role in how the former is realized. Ideologies about the world, in this case about language and learning, influence how people interact with one another and perform in any given situation. The “culturally sanctioned roles” (Bayley & Langman, 2011) that instructors and students enact are embedded in their own language ideologies, which may very well be conflicting and incongruous with their actions at times. Nevertheless, understanding and teasing apart these ideologies may help with understanding language socialization processes and efforts and lead to a richer understanding of how people socialize into certain linguistic practices.

Not only can inquiry into language ideologies lend itself to understanding language socialization processes but so also can looking at ideologies of learning, particularly in formal educational settings. Understandings of how people learn languages is informed by research and their researchers, who inevitably bring with them their ideologies about language and education, both of which influence how and what gets studied and naturalized. It is important to uncover and question these assumed natural processes of language learning for the ideologies behind them, including folk theories and Herderian notions of monolingualism (Auerbach, 1993). Furthermore, these understandings fuel or at least make default English only policies and

monolingualism in classrooms, which may very well not only impede English language learning but also not be what students desire, particularly in adult classroom settings.

Regarding pedagogical applications, there are a number of aspects that can be useful for instructors and educators. For one, regarding ideologies as realized through language policies and use, it is important for instructors to not only reflect on their language socialization practices and policies but to also make clear these rules and ideologies to students. Students have a right to know not only what exactly the language policies are of a classroom but also why such policies are in place. Taking the time to write out rules or guidelines for students may help instructors to reflect on their own language uses and beliefs and may reveal aspects that are conflicting and confusing for students, such as in this study. Training and classes that discuss language acquisition research and theory as well as pedagogical applications may be another possibility for educators in adult education. Another issue that still needs continuous discussion is the purposes behind adult ESL education and the role this plays with monolingualism. Given that bilingual education has proven to be useful for adult ESL education, not only in terms of English learning but building a sense of community and self worth (Malicky & Derwing, 1993), it is lamentable that classes such as the one observed are complex sites of struggle over the use of languages besides English and that bilingual education is not supported.

Lastly, this study has shown a need to address the language minority students in classrooms and tensions between students. Because of (mis)understandings like the ones observed in this study, it seems necessary to integrate inter-ethnic and cultural lessons and activities for these types of classes and incorporate more communal understandings of student backgrounds. At the same time, it is important to give extra support for students who do not have peers, teachers, or teacher's aides to help them in their L1 in the classroom; better yet, language minority students need to be provided with aides or paired with more English proficient

peers (Lucas & Katz, 1994; Wright, 2004). In addition to the need to hire personnel to assist these students, one simple direction can be to make available bilingual texts for these students, since beginning ESL students may benefit greatly from having available bilingual texts as well as translated documents for them (Lucas & Katz, 1994).

References

- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- Auerbach, E. & Burgess, D. (1985). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(3), 475-495.
- Baker, C. (2003). Education as a site of language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 95-112.
- Bauman, R. & Briggs, C. (2003). *Voices of modernity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bayley, R. & Langman, J. (2011). Language socialization in multilingual and second language contexts. In Eli Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning, Volume 2* (pp. 291-302). New York: Routledge.
- Bayley, R. & Schecter, S. R. (2003). Introduction: Toward a dynamic model of language socialization. In R. Bayley and S. R. Schecter (eds), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*, (pp. 1-6). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Bronson, M.C. & Watson-Gegeo, K.A. (2008). The critical moment: Language socialization and the (re)visioning of first and second language learning. In P.A. Duff and N.H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition, Volume 8: Language Socialization*, (pp. 23-55). New York: Springer.

- Cook, V. (1997). Monolingual Bias in Second Language Acquisition Research. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 34, 35-49.
- Farr, M. & Song, J. (2011). Language ideologies and policies: Multilingualism and education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(9), 650-665.
- Gal, S. (1992). Multiplicity and contention among ideologies: A commentary. *Pragmatics* 2(3), 445-449.
- Gal, S. (1993). Diversity and contestation in linguistic ideologies: German speakers in Hungary. *Language in Society*, 22, 337-359.
- García, O. (2008). Teaching Spanish and Spanish in teaching in the USA: Integrating bilingual perspectives. In C. Hélot & A.M. de Mejía (eds.), *Forging multilingual spaces: Integrated perspectives on majority and minority bilingual education* (pp. 31-57). Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Garrett, P. & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339-361.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Gowen, S.G. & Bartlett, C. (1997). "Friends in the Kitchen": Lessons from Survivors." In G.A. Jull (ed.), *Changing work, changing workers: Critical perspectives on language, literacy, and skills* (pp. 141-458). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hardman, J.C. (1999). A community of learners: Cambodians in an adult ESL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 3(2), 145-166.
- Hélot, C. & de Mejía, A.M. (2008). *Forging multilingual spaces: Integrated perspectives on majority and minority bilingual education*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Jeria, J. (1999). The quest for visibility in adult education: The Hispanic experience. In T. Guy

- (ed.), *Providing culturally relevant adult education: A challenge for the twenty-first Century* (pp. 49-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (ed.), *The handbook of linguistic anthropology*, (pp. 349-368). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(1), 58-87.
- Lucas, T. & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(3), 537-561.
- Malicky, G.V. & Derwing, T. (1993). Literacy learning of adults in a bilingual ESL classroom. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 39(4), 393-406.
- Mathews-Aydini, J. (2008). Overlooked and Understudied? A survey of current trends in research on adult English language learners. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 58, 198-213.
- McEwan-Fujita, E. (2010). Ideology, affect, and socialization in language shift and revitalization: The experiences of adults learning Gaelic in the Western Isles of Scotland. *Language in Society*, 39, 27-64.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2009). *Gendered identities and immigrant language learning*. Clevedon UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2011). L1 and L2 reading practices in the lives of Latina immigrant women studying English: School literacies, home literacies, and literacies that construct identities. In C. Higgins (ed.), *Identity formation in globalizing contexts* (pp. 99-118). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Miller, E. R. (2009). Orienting to “being ordinary”: The (re)construction of hegemonic ideologies in interactions among adult immigrant learners of English. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 6(4), 315-344.

- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In P.A. Duff and N.H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2nd Edition, Volume 8: Language socialization, (pp. 3-15). New York: Springer.
- Olivo, W. (2003). "Quit talking and learn English!": Conflicting language ideologies in an ESL classroom. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 50-71.
- Paris, D. (2010). "The second language of the United States": Youth perspectives on Spanish in a changing multiethnic community. *Journal of Language Identity and Education*, 9(2), 139-155.
- Pease-Alvarez, L., Samway, K.D., & Cifka-Herrera, C. (2010). Working within the system: Teachers of English learners negotiating a literacy instruction mandate. *Language Policy*, 9, 313-334.
- Rajadurai, J. (2010). "Malays are expected to speak Malay": Community ideologies, language use, and the negotiation of identities. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9(2), 91- 106.
- Shannon, S. (1995). The culture of the classroom: Socialization in an urban bilingual classroom. *The Urban Review*, 27(4), 321-345.
- Shannon, S. (1999). The debate on bilingual education in the U.S.: Language ideology as reflected in the practice of bilingual teachers. In J. Bloomaert (ed.), *Language ideological debates*, (pp. 171-200). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge University Press.
- Valdés, G. (2004). Between support and marginalization: The development of academic

- language in linguistic minority children. In J. Brutt-Griffler & M.N. Varghese (eds.), *Bilingualism and language pedagogy*, (pp. 10-40). Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Vitanova, G. (2004). Gender enactments in immigrants' discursive practices: Bringing Bakht in to the dialogue. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3(4), 261-277.
- Warriner, D.S. (2007). Transnational literacies: Immigration, language, learning, and identity. *Linguistics and Education*, 18, 201-214.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 331-350.
- Woolard, K. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies*, (pp. 3-47). New York: Oxford University.
- Woolard, K. & Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 55-84.
- Wortham, S. (2003). Accomplishing identity in participant-denoting discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 13(2), 189-210.
- Wortham, S. (2008). Linguistic anthropology of education. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 37, 37-51.
- Wright, W.E. (2004). What English-only Really Means: A Study of the Implementation of California Language Policy with Cambodian-American Students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(1), 1-23.