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Abstract

This thesis takes a critical look at the broader ideologies ensconced in English-Only approaches to English-language education and considers their impacts on Latino students, families, communities, and identities. Consistent with the objectives and methodologies found within Chicano Studies, this thesis is concerned primarily with eliminating racial hierarchies by decentralizing hegemonic practices that emphasize English monolingualism as a key signifier of American identity and as a primary goal of the U.S.’s educational system. In short, the thesis argues that English-Only methods of language instruction work to keep the boundaries of American identity protected, albeit narrowed, within a white and middle-class framework; and characterizes Latinos as a group whose culture and language lacks legitimacy within the United States. This has significant impacts not only on their education, but on their family life and representations within popular culture. To better understand the complicated nexus of race, ethnicity and class in which the debate over language education is situated, the thesis draws on recent developments in Language Studies and Critical Pedagogy to outline the relationship between social identity, language, power and education.

This thesis is also an attempt to broaden the Chicano Studies tradition by emphasizing epistemology over subject matter. Widening the scope of Chicano Studies beyond a unique Chicano experience moves the tradition forward allowing researchers to effectively adopt a Chicano Studies framework for discussing other Latino ethnicities (Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc) and other minority language communities.
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Terms and Terminology

‘Latino’, ‘Hispanic’, ‘Chicano’

Latino is a term used to identify people who have ancestral ties to territories in the Americas, previously or presently, colonized by Latin Nations.¹ This definition includes communities with ties to the French, Portuguese and Italian languages and accordingly, encompasses a diverse group of people with a wide range of socioeconomic, cultural, and national backgrounds.² In the context of the United States however, ‘Latino’ is more often reserved for communities with present or past ties to Spanish-speaking cultures. While this narrow definition has been the subject of critique in both academic and popular discourses, this discussion is outside of the scope of this thesis. Furthermore, this thesis recognizes this definition as the most current and prevalent trend in America for referring to communities with ties to the Spanish language, namely individuals from Latin and South American countries. Exceptions to this referral will be when statistical or other research data specifically uses the term ‘Hispanic’ rather than ‘Latino’ in defining this population, in part to remain consistent with this language usage but also to highlight the political statement that is made through this specific categorization.

The complicated nature in which Latinos and Hispanics have been formally defined as a racial and ethnic category, is rooted in their history as a colonized and colonizing people and their connections to the Spanish language. Mexicans in the United States for example, had been distinguished as a distinct racial category up until the 1940s when the category was changed to amalgamate a variety of people that used ‘Spanish as the mother tongue.’ In the 1950s and

² I use Latino instead of Hispanic, a common ethnonym used in very similar ways in the United States, to distinguish a category of social and racial stratification within the United States’ population. These differences and my preference for Latino over Hispanic are discussed in the Preface.
1960s, the United States Census changed this label to ‘persons of Spanish surname.’ Today, ‘Latino’ and ‘Hispanic’ are the most common ethnonyms used to describe, as mentioned above, communities with present or past ties to the Spanish language or of Latin and Southern American descent. Although sometimes used interchangeably, the terms ‘Latino’ and ‘Hispanic’ vary politically and geographically in meaning. ‘Latino’ is a shortening of Latinoamericano and thus refers to Latin America and its cultures while ‘Hispanic,’ from the Spanish *Hispano*, has a broader application and so can also refer to Spain or Spanish culture. For some, the term ‘Hispanic’ can be a source of ethnic pride, a link to Spanish or European heritage. In some places within the United States, Mexican-origin elites often self-identified as *Hispano* to mark their Spanish heritage, their class and racial superiority over other Mexicans.

In New York, where the Latino population was generally more diverse, ‘Hispanic’ was more widely used as a pan-ethnic ethnonym. This changed during the 1960s and 1970s with the emergence of cultural nationalism that accompanied larger struggles for civil rights by Chicanos and Puerto Ricans. This process of cultural determination came with a rejection of their indigenous and colonized roots making terms like ‘Hispanic’ increasingly problematic as it became recognized as a symbol of domination and a reminder of Spanish or Anglo colonial suppression. Despite this wide rejection however, the United States Census officially adopted the term ‘Hispanic’ in 1970, believing it to be more ‘politically sanitized’ in contrast to ‘Latino’ which was more often used to convey ethnic pride.

‘Hispanic’, as Chicana novelist Ana Castillo writes, ‘gives us all one ultimate paternal cultural progenitor: Spain. The diverse cultures already on the American shores when the Europeans arrived, as well as those introduced because of the African slave trade, are

---

3 Gustavo Chacon Mendoza, ‘Gateway to Whiteness,’
6 Dávila, *Latinos Inc*.
completely obliterated by the term.’ ‘Hispanic,’ she continues, ‘is nothing more than a concession made by the U. S. legislature when they saw they couldn't get rid of us. If we won't go away, why not at least Europeanize us, make us presentable guests at the dinner table, take away our feathers and rattles and civilize us once and for all.’

Expressing similar disdain for the term ‘Hispanic,’ Mexican American writer Sandra Cisneros perhaps more controversially states that “Hispanic” is English for a person of Latino origin who wants to be accepted by the white status quo.’ Latino, on the other hand she argues, ‘is the word we have always used for ourselves.’

For some of the reasons expressed by Castillo and Cisneros above, ‘Latino’ is the preferred term for many communities in New York, California and other southwestern states. This is precisely because ‘Latino’ also refers to people who come from territories in the Americas colonized by Latin nations, such as Portugal, Spain and France, whose languages are derived from Latin. Within this logic, people from Brazil, Mexico and Haiti are also considered Latinoamericanos. Because of its increasing popularity after the Chicano and Puerto Rican movements, ‘Latino’ is thought to be a name chosen by the Latino community and thus more often considered part of a broader process of self-determination. This indignation is heightened by its insistence and use in the Spanish form—that is, Latino rather than Latin, or Latin American.

The term ‘Latino’ was incorporated in the 2000 United States Census where ‘Hispanic’ was amended to ‘Hispanic or Latino.’ The 2000 Census was further significant because it was the first time that residents were able to select more than one racial category.

---

8 Ana Castillo, Massacre of the Dreamers: Essays on Xicanisma (1994)
9 Sandra Cisneros, Caramelo, (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2003), 31
10 Metcalf, How We Talk.
13 See Oquendo, ‘Re-Imagining the Latino Race’, 37.
The term Chicano is used to characterize a more nuanced identity. Some scholars believe the term Chicano dates back to the 1930s when workers from Mexico in the United States referred to themselves as “Mesheecanos.” It is usually used as a way of acknowledging both a sense of ethnic identity among Mexican-Americans combined with a political consciousness. The term gained widespread acceptance in the late 1960s and early 1970s amidst the Chicano Movement. The increasing popularity of the term, alongside the development of the Chicano Movement and emergence of Chicano Studies as a discipline will be discussed in greater depth in the Literature Review.

**Bilingualism, Bilingual Speaker and Bilingual Education**

Although the term ‘bilingual’ refers only to two languages (bi from the Latin, ‘having two’), this thesis understands bilingualism as a dynamic process that goes beyond the use, or possession, of two autonomous languages and therefore uses the term ‘bilingual speaker’ to refer to people with a number of different language skills—having in common only that they are not monolingual. This understanding of bilingualism and bilingual speaker is informed by a shift in bilingual language studies that challenges the view of bilingualism as two separate systems in which one language is purely additive or dormant while the other language is in use.

Early in the study of bilingualism, Jim Cummins posited that the proficiency of bilinguals in two languages was not stored separately in the brain—that is, each proficiency did not behave independently of the other but rather behaved interdependently. Bilingualism gained further complexity as scholars began to emphasize the ideologies and social conditions that surround language and our processing of language. M. Heller (2007) for example, recognizes bilingualism as ‘sets of resources called into play by social actors, under social and

---

historical conditions which both constrain and make possible the social reproduction of existing
conditions as well as the productino of new ones.'

Taking into account some of these newer approaches to bilingualism and bilingual
learning, which will be discussed at greater length in Chapter Three, this thesis uses the term
‘bilingual education’ to refer to the educational efforts to develop children’s plurilingual
(emphasis authors own) abilities or to use those abilities to educate bilingual students. It also
uses the term ‘bilingual education’ as an umbrella term to encompass what is also-known as
dual-language and multilingual education.

With reference to bilingual education another term that emerges frequently throughout
this thesis is ‘linguistically minoritized student.’ Contrary to popular belief, a linguistically
minoritized individual does not only refer to bilingual or non-native English speakers but
rather, and most often, refers to a student or individual who speaks a non-standard form of
American English—that is, the individual speaks with a regional or ethnic dialect. The thesis
uses this term because it confronts the constraints on language and behavior to a political and
economic consideration of power and social inequality. Linguistic variance is a natural
phenomenon that occurs all the time and linguists consistently argue that all spoken languages
and language varieties are equal in linguistic (scientific and structural terms). As Chapter Two
will demonstrate, language changes and develops to suit the needs and interests of the linguistic
community. Language minorities (referring to linguistically minoritized group in the plural
form) thus, develop through a politically, culturally and socially constructed process that
involves careful and constant tending. The term ‘linguistically minoritized’ then highlights the
active process of creating a status in which one becomes a linguistic minority. These terms will
be further elaborated in Chapter Two.

18 For more on this understanding of bilingual education please refer to Ofelia Garcia and Li Wei,
Introduction

‘Taming Wild Tongues’: English-Only Education and U.S.-Born Latinos

‘El Anglo con cara de inocente nos arrancó la lengua. Wild tongues can’t be tamed, they can only be cut out.’¹⁹

This thesis takes a critical look at the broader ideologies ensconced in English-Only approaches to English-language education and considers their impacts on Latino students, families, communities, and subjectivities. The title borrows from Gloria Anzaldúa’s 1987 essay, ‘How to Tame a Wild Tongue,’ a reflection on the linguistic discrimination faced by Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans raised in the United States. Here, the wild tongue is a euphemism for the non-conforming tongue and its removal, a poignant reference to the social and political measures that are taken to ensure its obedience. Within the context of the United States, we might understand the wild tongue as that which deviates from the linguistic norms of Standard American English or the English language altogether. What then might we consider the process in which these wild tongues are tamed? Exploring such ideas, this thesis takes a critical look at the ideological justifications for educating language minorities with English-Only approaches. More specifically, it focuses on the gradual decline of bilingual education programs in the state of California brought on by Proposition 227, and their replacement with programs that emphasized English-Only instruction for monolingual speakers of a language other than English and bilingual speakers.

With an epistemological approach that is rooted in Chicano Studies, this thesis also draws from the theoretical advances yielded by Critical Pedagogy and Language Studies. Using these disciplinary traditions to interrogate the relationship between social identity, language,

¹⁹ Anzaldúa, Borderlands, 76.
power, and education this thesis argues that the United States’ preference for English monolingualism is part of a more complicated nexus of race, ethnicity, and class that works to keep the boundaries of American identity protected, albeit narrowed, within a white and middle-class framework.

For the United States, a country with no official language, English has been recognized as the language of public communication. Custom rather than federal law has determined that English is the language spoken and written in city hall, the courthouse, the public school, the library and so on. But if America does not have an official language how could it be that custom determined this should be so? We have come to understand the concept of a ‘national language,’ rather like the nation itself, as a system of ideologies. Benedict Anderson argued that the nation was an ‘imagined community’ that was conceived, in part, through a shared language. It is through language, he wrote, that one is ‘invited into the imagined community.’ The question that emerges for multilingual societies is who decides what that shared language should be. Of course there are very few societies that are not multilingual societies. Even Great Britain, home of the English language is today a multilingual nation, but given that its constituent parts included Welsh and Scots speakers, the notion that it was ever a nation purely of English speakers, is plainly incorrect. A national language is a political construct, every bit of a construct as the nation itself. Nevertheless, the idea of a national language, like the national community, is central to the process of self-determination. It is used to set and rationalize the terms of public communication and participation.

Absent from Anderson’s analysis however is an explicit discussion of the forces or social groups that have access to the means of communication necessary to construct or invent a universal version of the ‘imagined’ national ‘community.’ He wrote about the importance

21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
of the printing press—the means by which national languages were disseminated and
popularized—but largely overlooked the question of who owned or had access to these
resources. This thesis is concerned precisely with the matter of ownership of the means of
construction and representation, not the printing press as such, but a larger social machinery
that cultivates an understanding of the United States as a homogenous community with one
language and one culture. In this context, the English language has become the universal
medium, which defines the nation-state and American national identity. Language, as
Anderson argued, informs ideas about the self and wider socio-political community. Language
education thus is an extremely political issue. Policy and practice questions regarding the
education of bilingual or linguistically diverse students are ultimately situated in debates
regarding the legitimacy of the language and culture in question. We have thus arrived to the
issue of power—that is, the power of those who can use language for their various vested
interests and to secure their cultural dominance.

Within the United States, hegemonic power is structured almost exclusively on the
foundational basis of Anglo American cultural supremacy. For it is, as Anzaldúa states in the
opening vignette, ‘el Anglo con cara de inocente [que] nos arrancó la lengua,’ or translated into
English, ‘the Anglo with the innocent face’ that tames and eventually tears out the wild tongue.
Her assignment of responsibility here is less a commentary on individual Anglo-American
whites and more a recognition of a white power structure that continues to privilege Anglo
American culture at the expense of non-Anglo American cultures. For Anzaldúa, attacks on
the native tongue is an attack on an entire community as it diminishes a sense of self by
suppressing the ethnolinguistic identity.\textsuperscript{23} The taming of wild (patois) tongues therefore is an
attempt to delegitimize specific groups of people by denying them their language, their voice
and their identity.

\textsuperscript{23} Anzaldúa, ‘Taming Wild Tongues,’ 80
The relationship between group identity and language is complex and throughout this thesis I will explore some of the nuances of this relationship. To do this, the thesis examines the broader discourses ensconced in English-Only approaches to English-language education. This work inevitably involves an examination of bilingual education as well as the broader discursive practices that further inform the ways in which Standard American English is conceptualized and following from that, the ways in which non-English and non-Standard American English languages are conceptualized.

Race, Linguistic Assimilation and Bilingual Education

Debates regarding the issue of language in education are severely racialized. Most monolingual Standard American English speakers are white and many of the bilingual, or non-standard American English speakers are brown and black. However, by emphasizing language rather than race and ethnicity, the stratification of people along racial, ethnic and class lines is instead enshrouded in a rhetoric of assimilation and national cohesion. Politically, the use of language as a yard-stick in which to measure assimilation has been very beneficial in an American context that has in recent years defined itself as ‘post-racial,’ or viewed itself closer to a socio-political climate that sees overt racism and exclusionary practices as politically incorrect, unjust and inappropriate. A political rhetoric around language rather than race is used to conceal the targeting of minority groups.

We might relate this phenomenon to what Stuart Hall referred to as inferential racism whereby interpretations of situations and events relating to race have become naturalized, regardless of the truth behind them. Hall suggests that because of this naturalization the racial dynamics remain unchallenged and are assumed as common sense. 24 This creates an environment by which racist declarations or assertions can be established without any need to

24Ibid., 91.
consciously invoke the racist foundations through which these statements are based. As Standard American English is supported by collective institutions, its cultural dominance is often mistaken for an inherent superiority or more natural part of American identity. This assumption overlooks the institutional influence that legitimizes its use in public space and within United States national borders. Larger forces of domination and lingering ideologies linked to the supremacy of Anglo American culture have structured this contemporary arrangement. This will be the subject of discussion in Chapter Two. Additionally, it will demonstrate the extent to which this arrangement is supported by the United States’ educational system and implementation of bilingual education.

Reflected in bilingual and multilingual education programs is not only an understanding of bilingualism and monolingualism but also constructions of national identity. Efforts to Americanize immigrants and assimilate diverse ethnic groups through the promotion of English-language learning has been more or less a policy constant in American history. Perhaps predictably this has meant that schools became the primary sites in which assimilation efforts became concentrated. Americanization efforts were directed against Eastern Europeans who came as part of an upsurge of immigration to the United States at the end of the nineteenth century. Here, for Progressive Era policy makers, English-language instruction served as an assimilating device. It was not only immigrants who were required to conform. Before the twentieth century, the United States government actively, aggressively, imposed the use of the English language among Native Americans and the inhabitants of the incorporated territories of the Southwest. By the 1880s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs implemented a policy of forced Anglicization for Native Americans sending Indian children to boarding schools. While such

25 Ibid., 259.
26 For more on this see Cecilia Elizabeth O’Leary, To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism (New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 1999).
policies did not always succeed in eradicating the children’s native languages, it did instill in
them a sense of shame that guaranteed the exclusive use of English for future generations.27

The great awakening of ethnic nationalism that happened during the Civil Rights Era
however, began to challenge such conceptions however. While the modern Civil Rights
Movement had been driven by an ambition to dismantle barriers of race, to break down
segregation and promote integration, by the latter 1960s there was also a growing political
consciousness that emphasized the value of distinct ethnic identity in political struggle. It was
typified by Black Nationalism and later the Chicano Movement. At the time many people were
anxious about the turn toward ethnic nationalism fearing that it represented a surge of reverse
racism, but in reality, as scholars have recently shown for most of those involved it was a
natural progression in the liberation struggle.28 There was tension but no real contradiction
between the old Civil Rights Movement and the new radicalism. A major goal of the Civil
Rights Movement had been to combat discrimination in public accommodations, housing,
employment and education. During that period of radicalization in the later 1960s, demands
for equality soon became demands that schools and other educational institutions restructure
their curricula to reflect the experiences, histories, cultures and perspectives of their students
of color. The new ethnic nationalists took that agenda forward into their own communities and
as they did so it evolved as they began to see themselves as a distinct people with more nuanced
needs. One outcome of this period of reflection was the development of Multicultural
Education, a reform movement designed to specifically effect change in schools and other

27 For more on this see J. Crawford, ‘Anatomy of the English-Only Movement: Social and Ideological Sources
of Language Restrictionism in the United States’, in D.A. Kibbee (Ed.) (1998), Language Legislation and
Linguistic Rights. Selected Proceedings of the Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights Conference, the
1998); T.L. McCarty, ‘Between Possibility and constraint: Indigenous language education, planning, and policy
in the US,’ In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

28 Van Gosse, ‘A Movement of Movements: The Definition and Periodization of the New Left,’ in Jean-
Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig (eds) Companion to Post-1945 America (Malden, Massachusetts and
educational institutions ‘so that students from diverse racial, ethnic, and other social-class groups will experience educational equality.’\(^{29}\) Part of this struggle was fought to gain recognition for the fundamental language and cultural differences between minority communities and the Anglo American bias often built into institutions like the public school. Bilingual Education emerged from this socio-political climate as Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and Native Americans began demanding maintenance bilingual education programs where students from these communities could be taught in both English and their ethnic language.

What followed was a set of changes to government education policy that recognized the demands of these ethnic groups. The same 1964 Civil Rights Act that is celebrated for demolishing the basis of Jim Crow segregation in the South also required public schools to provide special services for ‘English-Language Learner’s. Further legislative reform followed. In 1968, Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act, also known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This has been considered the most important piece of federal legislation in regard to language rights because it acknowledged that language minorities had rights to ethnic autonomy that the United States is responsible to protect. While the law did not force school districts to offer bilingual programs, it encouraged them to experiment with new pedagogical approaches by funding programs that targeted principally low-income and non-English speaking communities. The program’s primary goal was to provide part of the instruction in the student’s native language in order to ease her/his transition into the mainstream or public society.

The notion that bilingual education was a right became accepted as the new political consensus in the 1970s. In 1974, the Bilingual Education Act was amended to more explicitly define bilingual educational programs, its goals, and to stipulate the requirements for feedback and progress reports. At the time, the lack of a systematic means of determining the success of bilingual programs was considered one of the failures of bilingual education. During that same year, the Supreme Court ruled in Lau V. Nichols that schools must take ‘affirmative steps’ to ensure equal educational opportunities and help students, who did not speak English fluently, ‘overcome language barriers that impede equal participation’ in education. The Lau decision is significant because it confirmed that the responsibility for overcoming language barriers that impeded the full integration of students fell on the school boards and not on the parents or children, effectively establishing the educational rights of language minorities. This was part of a new consensus that only a year previously had determined that the academic failure and social stigmatization experienced by language minorities was part of a cultural deficit rather than any structural inequalities embedded within the educational system. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 1973 for example, argued that, ‘the discrimination suffered by these children [was] not the result of laws passed by the state of California, presently or historically, but [was] the result of deficiencies created by the children themselves in failing to know and learn the English language.’ Despite these legislative gains, the goal of the federal governments bilingual education program, demonstrated by both the Lau Case and the Bilingual Education Act, appeared to be a quick acquisition of the English language by, very often poor, minority students. Their position on bilingualism often suggested that the use of the students’ heritage language in education is meant only to ensure their comprehension and

---

30 For more on this see Abdul Karim Bangura and Martin C. Muo, *United States Congress and Bilingual Education* (Texas: Peter Lang, 2001).
transition into the English language—that is, they viewed bilingualism as transitional rather than something to be celebrated. In very limited ways did the Lau Case or the Bilingual Education Act actually recognize bilingualism as a reality of the United States and for a large number of American citizens.

Having been the accepted consensus in the 1960s-70s, bilingual education became increasingly stigmatized during the 1980s when President Reagan was at the helm. Policies focusing on support for bilingual education were positioned as a public handout for immigrant families and students awkwardly refusing to assimilate into an English-speaking American mainstream. By the 1990s bilingual education had become stigmatized as an approach that was not only a hindrance to building national social cohesion but something that was detrimental to the successful integration and academic performance of language-minority students. The evidence said otherwise but a political rhetoric largely motivated by a fear of immigration prevailed. Mexican immigrants often received the brunt of this inflammatory rhetoric as immigration to the United States from Mexico reached its zenith during the 1990s on the back of the NAFTA reforms. As a result, having once been more open-ended, bilingual education became increasingly situated more specifically as a Mexican and Latino immigration issue.

The bilingual education debate was exceedingly intensified in the state of California due to changes in the California Education Code in the late 1990s brought about by the voter approved initiative Proposition 227 and its reversal of the state’s official support of primary language instruction in 1998. The Proposition secured English-only teaching methods as the preferred approach for the education of the state’s ‘‘English-Language Learner’’ population and effectively rid the state of its bilingual education programs. The structural impacts of this particular initiative has been the topic of sustained and often critical debates among scholars, educators and policy-makers who ultimately argue that the initiative was a direct attack against Mexican immigrants and Americans of Mexican descent more broadly. Proposition 227 and
its corollaries will be the subject of review in Chapter Three. More specifically, the Chapter considers the structural impacts of the Proposition for Latinos nearly twenty years after its passing. The continued assessment of initiatives like Proposition 227 is important given the racial and ethnic demographic shifting of the United States.

The significant growth of the Latino community over the last fifteen years is a significant contextual aspect in which to analyze the social and political climate that surrounds the contemporary debate over the education of linguistically minoritized students. This is especially so given that the most recent growth of the Latino population has less to do with the number of immigrants entering the United States and more to do with the number of U.S.-born Latinos. Trends from the Census reveal that English is the preferred and primary language utilized by most second and third generation Latinos under the age of nineteen. The vast majority of U.S.-born Latinos in other words are predominantly English speakers. Nevertheless, the majority of ‘English-Language Learner’ s throughout American public schools are Latino. In fact, eighty percent of all ‘English-Language Learner’ s are Latino. This is a paradox is it not? How can it be that of the children from communities in which English is the primary language that so many of them can be classified as ‘English-Language Learner’ s? This question is key to understanding the predicament of U.S. Latino communities today and will form one of my central research questions in this thesis. In order to consider this further, it is necessary first, to understand how ‘‘English-Language Learner’’ is defined. And in order to answer that question we need to understand how the English language is defined.

---

34 For more on this see Carmen Fought, ‘Language as a Representation of Mexican American Identity,’ English Today, vol. 26, no. 3 (2010).
36 U.S. Census Bureau, ‘Hispanic Americans By the Numbers’.
within the United States. This might seem like an unnecessary question given that there’s an entire book—Webster’s Dictionary—that catalogs the entire English language as it is used in America. Of course, that is to say it is not just about the English language as it is formally recognized but how it is used in American culture, in its diverse communities, as it is actually spoken and written, in all of its accents and dialects and regional and ethnic peculiarities. In short, there is more than one way in which English is used in the United States.

As I will show in Chapter Three, ‘English-Language Learner’ is defined by how Latinos are measured against an idea of Standard American English. That is to say, ‘English-Language Learner’ could be understood more precisely as ‘Standard American ‘English-Language Learner’.’ To put it another way, the category of ‘English-Language Learner’ might describe someone that already knows and uses the English language every day, however their labeling as an ‘ELL’ declares their form of the language invalid for the purposes of public communication and participation.

Schools however, are not the only spaces in which individuals acquire language or develop ethnolinguistic identities. A significant body of research has discussed the various ways in which the pervasiveness of images, representations, messages, discourses and symbolic models disseminated by society’s institutions and social structures, like the school, family, community, and media profoundly shape how children and adolescents think about the world and their position—in relation to gender, sexuality, body image, race, ethnicity, and class—within it.\(^{37}\) Taking this further, my research focuses on how language is disseminated from these institutions and how this informs the way in which linguistically minoritized groups are defined, or culturally produced, in contemporary American society.

This thesis argues that in the context of the U.S. the system of advantage operates in favor of Standard American English speakers. While many in the cultural studies field are very

\(^{37}\) Please refer to Literature Review
familiar with the approach to white privilege and pressure investment of whiteness that underlines the ways in which white people have established their position of economic security and fore-fronted class as a mechanism of social stratification, this thesis sees language, in the case of Latinos, as key to this stratification. Still, the distinction between Spanish-speaking and English-speaking communities is also one of race and ethnicity and so the debate over language education in the United States and bilingualism more generally, is still a racialized one. While the thesis is sensitive to the nuances of class embedded in discussions about language and language education, this thesis is primarily concerned with language as a racial and ethnic signifier.

1.2 Chapter Breakdown

The thesis is presented in six chapters, all of which draw their chapter titles from passages or key terms presented in Anzaldúa’s ‘How to Tame a Wild Tongue.’ Broadly, the chapters analyze the extent to which monoglossic ideologies emphasizing the superiority of the English language infiltrate the public school, family-life, community spaces, and wider discursive productions and the specific impacts this has on the Latino diaspora. With the Introduction serving as first chapter, Chapter Two, “If You Want to be American, Speak ‘American:’” Language and Identity in the United, questions the primacy of Standard American English over what are ultimately considered non-standard American dialects or, minority-language dialects. This inevitably requires an understanding of how Standard Language Ideologies operate in the United States and how language policies and practice influence, and define, the prestige and value of languages in a ‘linguistic market’ that often impinge on individual and collective identity-politics.  

In order to demonstrate this, the chapter presents and interrogates some of the conventions of language usage in the United States to show how language functions as an
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ethnic signifier and the ways in which some conventions have been institutionalized in American schooling more broadly. The task therefore, is to show how the mechanisms of language standardization, embedded as they are in the politics of identity, develop into language policies and customs that stigmatize speakers of minority-English dialects within public spaces.

After this initial theoretical and broader contextual groundwork is laid, Chapter Three, ‘We’re Going to Have to do Something About Your Tongue:’ Latinos and Proposition 227 looks at the specific effects of California’s English-Language in Public Schools Statute, more commonly known as Proposition 227, a voter-approved initiative that effectively eliminated California’s bilingual education programs, nearly twenty-years after its initial passage in 1998. As anti-immigrant sentiments and rallies for the preservation of ‘traditional’ American values significantly increase in states like California, where Latinos constitute the majority of the population, it is both practical and salient to understand the intersection of ideology, policy and practice that unfolds for Latino ‘English-Language Learner’s in this context. To this end, the Chapter examines the political discourse and zeitgeist that surrounded the Proposition, a campaign championed as ‘English for the Children’ to critically analyze the ways in which Latinos were constructed through this political measure. Ultimately, the Chapter argues that the political agenda which produced Proposition 227 reflected a more profound malaise for the growing prevalence of the Latino people and culture that continues to have significant implications for Latino students and teachers today. The latter portion of this chapter explores the process of translanguaging through the presentation of empirical research from classrooms comprised primarily of Latino students labeled ‘English-Language Learners.’ Focusing on these daily instances of translanguaging allows the thesis to more adequately demonstrate how language functions in daily-life and how current approaches to
language education for bilingual or minority speakers work to undermine the linguistic realities and bicultural contexts of the students.

Of course, it is difficult to separate approaches to language education from the stakeholders involved—students, parents, and communities. Empirical work from the field of sociolinguistics, social and cognitive psychology, and education emphasize the role parents, communities, and peer groups play in directly and indirectly shaping children’s value system, ethnic identity, orientation toward language choice, speech patterns, and overall view of the world. The central preoccupation for Chapter Four, ‘Linguistic Terrorism’ and the Impact on Latino Families and Communities therefore, broadly documents the experiences of Latino communities and families as they navigate competing ideologies of assimilation and acculturation that stem from language usage, policy, and practice within the public and private spheres. Influenced by the analytical perspectives offered by Chicano Studies and Critical Pedagogy, the general interventions made by this portion of the research concern the study of home, community, and family life in relation to schooling. That means to say, the Chapter seeks to understand how discourses from the public school are mediated in the home and community, particularly when these discourses conflict. To this end, the Chapter presents ethnographical material gathered from local community centers and after-school programs that provide services for many of the Latino students observed from the school case studies presented in the previous Chapter.

Over the last fifteen years, the task of language education has become a concern for commercial television networks. Since the turn of the millennial century, children’s television programming has become progressively engaged with language education through bilingual programming. Though this process began in the early 1970s with the likes of Sesame Street,

the rate in which bilingual programming is produced increased significantly alongside the growth of the Latino population and more generally, the changing demographics of the United States. The penultimate chapter, ‘The Struggle of Identities Continues:’ Bilingual Television and the Production of Latino Characters, reviews the specific contributions made by children’s television media in shaping people’s beliefs towards Latino ethnicities as they engage in bilingual language instruction for mass audiences outside of the school. This chapter more specifically analyzes the construction of Latino characters in children’s television programming emphasizing character language usage to better understand the racial stereotypes that are bound to Latino ethnicities.

While the shows discussed in this Chapter are not the first to incorporate Spanish dialogue or Latino characters, a variety of wider sociocultural factors make the increased portrayal of Latino characters and bilingual programming particularly unique. Though numerous studies have focused on how Latinos and other racial minorities have been portrayed in both film and prime-time television, fewer studies have focused on Latino representation in children’s bilingual animated programming and furthermore how these are informed by and define broader discourses on the bilingual education debate. This is primarily the result of limited case studies. It is only in the last fifteen years that the development of children’s animated programming that feature lead Latino protagonists has been evident. Ultimately, the Chapter argues that networks’ decision to portray bilingual Latino characters and teach bilingual education through these Latino personas contain social, cultural and political significance because their portrayals shape, produce and perpetuate discourses about Latino identities and the very political issue of language education. As such, this chapter relies on a media-studies framework for understanding discourse and text. Together these chapters shed light on the multifaceted ways that language ideologies inform language practice and
approaches to language education; and the specific ways in which this impacts the Latino community.

The thesis’s final chapter, *Looking to the Future and Overcoming the Tradition of Silence: Bilingual Education and Transformative Pedagogies* explores how transformative pedagogies and alternative approaches to language education have the potential to not only transform structures and practices of educating bilingually but to improve the way in which Latinos are viewed socially, culturally and politically.

1.3 Literature Review

This thesis adopts a conceptual, theoretical and methodological framework refined by traditions in Chicano Studies, Critical Pedagogy and Language Studies to highlight some of the primary issues facing Latino communities in twenty-first century America. The forthcoming literature review highlights some of the most relevant scholarly contributions to these respective fields before discussing my own contribution to the field of Chicano Studies (1.4)

*Chicano Studies*

Chicano Studies has been an important field of intellectual development and a vehicle for social activism. It emerged as a product from the Chicano Movement and student-driven efforts to open spaces in higher education that would be controlled by Chicanos and serve the interests of their students, staff, faculty and communities. Ironically, the existence of Chicano Studies programs in institutions of higher education diluted the radical critique and transformative epistemologies of the early Chicano tradition. Some have referred to this as the ‘racialization of the field.’ This process, argues Michael Soldatenko, ‘fragments and individualizes
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members of the groups as they strive to access positions of power and prestige...The collective values of Chicanismo,’ he continues, ‘became substituted for the individualistic ethos of the Anglo academy. The struggle to transform the Mexican American community became an individual ascent through the hierarchy of institutions of higher education.’ The programs have been emphasizing social issues since they first appeared on campuses in the 1960s and 1970s and the concern among many is that the current state of Chicano Studies is a radical departure from the original purposes of having established the field.

Following the gains of the Civil Rights Movements, the 1960s and 1970s was a time when distinct minority groups challenged many of the cultural institutions that perpetuated the dominance of ‘Anglo’ society. The public education system received some of their greatest attention. One of the primary objectives of the Chicano Movement—for instance—was to bring public attention to the poor quality of education for Mexican American students and the bias of the school curriculum and of their teachers. As a discipline, Chicano Studies has contributed significantly to our understanding of Mexican American culture and American culture more broadly through interdisciplinary approaches. Most commonly, anthropological techniques are employed to gather data on social problems, community needs, patterns of community organization, cooperation and conflict and the effects of social stratification and of various institutions upon communities. Utilization of these methods can be seen in some of the earliest work by some of the most prominent contributors to the Chicano Studies field. The work of George I. Sanchez, Ernesto Galarza, Julian Samora and Americo Paredes challenged and questioned existing canons of knowledge to point more towards an oppositional praxis that critically reviewed some of the organizing principles of American society.

41 Ibid., 266.
Sanchez’s work in particular was concerned with Mexican Americans and education in the U.S. More specifically, his work focused on documenting and correcting the inequities forced upon Chicano children in the early to mid-twentieth century, through language and mental ability testing, segregation and tracking. Galarza played an active part in the labour movement for farmworkers brought to the United States on the Bracero program. Galarza himself was a farmworker who used his bilingual skills to communicate the plights of the Mexican farmworker. Paredes’ work attempted to capture the history of resistance and struggles of Mexicans by studying the music and folklore of Texas Mexicans and finally, Samora focused on political leadership in the Chicano Movement. From these four individuals, who contributed to the training of young Mexican American scholars, we can see the varied topics often addressed within Chicano Studies. Theirs was a scholarship and politics of protest that gave rise to a cultural nationalism, an ideology that stressed a Mexican identity and rejection of assimilationist and integrationist strategies.

In April 1969, the Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education drafted El Plan de Santa Barbara, a manifesto for the implementation of Chicano Studies educational programs throughout the state of California. El Plan outlined a strategy for the creation and institutionalization of various Chicano programs aimed at promoting access to institutions of higher education for Latinos. It offered education as an agent for social change:

‘The role of knowledge in producing powerful social change, indeed revolution, cannot be underestimated...research will not only provide Chicanos with action-oriented


analysis of conditions, it will also aid significantly in politically educating the Chicano community...it will help measurably in creating and giving impetus to that historical consciousness...Chicanos must posses in order successfully to struggle as a people toward a new vision of Aztlan.45

The primary objective of the Chicano Studies field is to conduct research that is critical of society and that simultaneously contributes to shaping consciousness and in this case, Chicano consciousness. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Chicano Studies programs were established at California community colleges located in areas with a substantial Mexican American community as well as many of the California State University campuses. The programs took on various forms throughout the country more gradually and this eventually led to dissent among Chicano Studies scholars and Chicanos about the applications of the field.46

Discussion of the Chicano Studies discipline would be incomplete without noting the significant contributions made by Anzaldúa and other Chicana scholars. Through her framework mestiza consciousness, Anzaldúa opened up the way in which Chicano identity was constructed by the Chicano movement: from a static definition to one that is characterised by plurality and flexibility. Mestiza consciousness seeks to undo dualistic thinking in a variety of discursive practices such as identity formation, and feminist and ethnic/racial oppositional movements. In order to transform existing unequal social relations, Anzaldúa argues, it is necessary for all parties to participate in this new form of consciousness—that is, she argued that we could not speak of Chicana/o liberation when we continued to reproduce forms of oppression such as racism (negating the Indian and African), sexism, classism, and homophobia an idea poignantly exemplified here: ‘it is not enough to stand on the opposite

river bank, shouting questions, challenging patriarchal white conventions. A counter stance locks one into a duel of oppressor and oppressed; locked in mortal combat, like the cop and the criminal, both are reduced to a common denominator of violence. As a result, she suggested a politics of liberation that moved beyond nationalistic discourses based on dialectical oppositions between oppressors and oppressed.

Language Studies

Interest in the use of cross cultural approaches and perspectives has increased markedly among scholars, particularly within the sociolinguistic field. Many have observed or emphasized the importance of ‘intertextuality’ ‘intersectionality’ and ‘recontextualization’ of competing discourses in various public spaces and genres. The analytical perspectives on language, identity and power to be addressed in this section encourages a consideration of the way language is used, or adjusted, according to social situation, audience, and context. In doing so, this section highlights studies, which have addressed the effects of language-use, structure, policy and practice on society. The point is to recognize the forces that normalize the terms of language use in specific situations and the systems and social institutions in place to enforce these norms. It is through this critical lens that we can begin to see how language education is situated in larger discourses about immigration, assimilation, race, power, cultural domination and legitimacy and further the way in which it specifically impacts Latino students and communities within the United States. For now however, the research review introduces some of the analytical perspectives on language use, policy and practice that have been

47 Anzaldúa, Borderlands, 78.
previously explored by academics primarily within the social sciences and which guides the thesis’s critical analysis of language education.

A rich repository of research from within the Social Sciences discusses language—choice, usage, structure and practice—as part of identity construction, both individual and collective, that is informed by our specific contexts.49 This perspective recognizes language beyond its communicative function and acknowledges it as an instrument that also gives individuals, groups, institutions, and cultures their identity. The distinction between the communicative and symbolic aspects of language, argues John Edwards more specifically, is the distinction ‘between language in its ordinarily understood sense as a tool of communication, and language as an emblem of groupness, as a symbol, a rallying-point.’50 Because language, and other symbolic systems, is used to determine and define similarities and differences, that draw boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’ explains Paul Ricoeur, the specific aspects of language communication help us frame and define our social and political realities.51 The analytical perspectives outlined by Edwards and Ricoeur echo the basic assumptions presented in Anderson’s thesis outlined in the Introduction: that language functions as a group signifier.


50 Ibid.,17

There is also a general consensus that views language as a fluid and ever-changing cultural product. In her critical framework for language policy, E. Shohamy argues, language is not ‘stagnated and rule-bound’ but primarily ‘personal, open, free, dynamic, creative and constantly evolving.’\(^\text{52}\) As language is socially consequential, issues of language policy, custom and standardization gives rise to important issues of power. A standard language is the language most recognized by the national community as the ‘correct’ and most articulate form and thus, the most appropriate for public use.\(^\text{53}\) Because of the various levels of institutionalization that standard languages require, linguists and sociolinguists consider standard languages as an institution that is maintained by the more dominant and prestigious groups of a specific language community. Specifically, those who have access to the means of communication and importantly, the means of cultural production—dictionaries, school curriculum and media. Language communities that deviate from the standard are often marginalized in various ways: economically, politically, and socially. The development of a national standard therefore is illustrative of how language choice, usage and preference is used to socially stratify language communities.

Socio-linguist Frederick Field describes the concept of the ‘proper language’ as part myth and part indoctrination that become the basis and rationale for language legislation, therefore affecting the language societies use for business, the languages included in public spaces and the languages taught in public schools.\(^\text{54}\) Antonio Gramsci was one of the earliest critics to suggest that societies were controlled more and en masse through the dissemination of mass media and ideas ‘because it [disarmed] and [immobilized] its audiences by engineering popular consensus through the power of persuasion.’\(^\text{55}\) More contemporary scholars appear to


\(^{53}\) Field, *Bilingualism in the USA*; Lipp-Green, *English with an Accent*.


be situating Gramsci’s broader assertion within the specifics of language custom, policy and practice.  

Ruth Wodak for example, interrogates the norms of language usage, the structures in place to enforce these norms and the purpose of language standardization in her analysis of the ways in which national and European identities are tied to language and communication.  

Because the relationship between language and identity is dialectical, she argues, attempts at standardization are often indicative of efforts to normalize the culture of the more dominant groups as a means to preserve and prioritize their interests.  

Teun van Dijk more specifically identifies the dominant groups in society as a social elite that has greater access to the means of communication which grants them greater power to define, disseminate and institutionalize their own interests.

While drawing on critical approaches to language policies and custom such as those proposed by Wodak, Field and van Dijk, this thesis also applies the concept of language ideologies as elaborated in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, and discourse as outlined in critical discourse studies. Language ideologies are defined as ‘cultural ideas, presumptions and presuppositions with which different social groups name, frame and evaluate linguistic practices.’ Because language-ideological debates take place in public spheres, argues Wodak, language ideologies are produced in discourses—news, media, politics, narratives of national belonging, academia and popular culture. In this way, language
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becomes something that can publically, and through institutions like those mentioned above, index, legitimatize and express power.\textsuperscript{62}

\textit{Critical Pedagogy}

The Chicano Studies discipline was founded as a pedagogical tool. As such, an understanding of the development of Critical Pedagogy is critical in developing our understanding of Chicano Studies. Critical Pedagogy is an educational philosophy that aims to challenge the reproduction of inequality by grounding the politics of education within a wider societal framework. This philosophical perspective significantly informs the research’s methodological approach: its critical analysis of language acquisition, education and usage across multiple sites (schools, families, communities, and media).

Critical pedagogy’s inquiry into the ways in which particular forms of knowledge are legitimated and celebrated by the dominant cultures while others, in contrast, are marginalized and discredited reveals the privilege of some forms of knowledge over others and most significantly, the social construction of knowledge. The contributions from early critical pedagogues, and later advocates of the multicultural education movement, laid the groundwork for researchers, educationalists, and social activists to reflect on the intersection that occurs between the wider sociocultural context, the home, the local community network and more traditional realms, like the formal school system.\textsuperscript{63} Their interrogation of institutions, which


constructed knowledge, highlighted the ways in which knowledge and public schooling are inherently political and deeply rooted within a nexus of power relations reflective of wider socio-political contexts.

The roots of critical pedagogy are often tied to the Progressive Movement, which saw an eagerness to address the nation’s largest social ills and injustices through educational reform during the nineteenth century. Public education in the United States has a long history of distributing both education and privilege unequally according to race, ethnicity, gender and socioeconomic status, among other factors. Educational philosophers such as John Dewey and Horace Mann hoped to make schools effective agencies of a more democratic society in hopes of ‘equalizing’ an increasing level of class disparities throughout the late nineteenth century. Dewey’s articulations of education planted important philosophical roots for the development of progressive education and later Critical Pedagogy, as did the sociological inquiries into the impacts of racism presented by W.E.B DuBois and Carter G. Woodson during the early twentieth century. Racism, they argued, is not only a personal ideology based on racial prejudice, but a system involving cultural messages and institutional policies and practices as well as the beliefs and actions of individuals. In the context of the United States, this system operates to the advantage of whites and to the disadvantage of people of color.

---


DuBois’s, *The Souls of Black Folk* (1901) is considered a groundbreaking piece in critical race studies. His concept of ‘life behind the veil’ and the resulting ‘double consciousness’ illuminated the ways in which racially oppressed groups, particularly African Americans, experienced the impacts of a wider sociocultural and political context on a daily basis.\(^6\) Carter G. Woodson’s *Mis-education of the Negro* (1933) more specifically addresses the destructive nature of public education for young African Americans, which he argued was inherently biased and degrading to the African American community’s self-worth.\(^7\) He proclaimed that in order for racialized and historically disenfranchised groups to excel socially and academically, they had to be prepared to critically challenge socially prevailing notions of the time, particularly those which sought to suppress distinct communities. These early gestures towards the need for critical pedagogies provided the impetus for many of the subsequent educational struggles associated with anti-racism, multiculturalism and social justice that we saw emerge during and immediately after the Civil Rights Movement. Discussions concerning education for minority groups sparked a more nuanced awareness of some of their particular needs and challenges presented at local, state and Federal level.

While the term Critical Pedagogy did not come into academic use until the publication of Henry Giroux’s, *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*, in 1983, articulations of its concepts and general philosophies were evident in the works of social activists Jonathan Kozol, Maxine Greene and Paulo Freire during the 1960s and 1970s.\(^8\) Their work continued to highlight the ways in which knowledge and public schooling were inherently political and yielded significant theoretical developments for critically engaging with the impacts of capitalism, sexism, racism, class inequality and homophobia within the context of
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schooling. Freire’s influential *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, more specifically discussed the need for education to critically and openly address education’s relationship with the political process and its lack of neutrality.⁶⁹

Throughout the latter half of the twentieth century, Freire’s goals were significantly practiced and expanded by followers of the multicultural education movement, an educational reform movement conceptually aligned with some of the main principles of Critical Pedagogy. One such founder of the Multicultural Education Movement was educational philosopher, James A. Banks. During the early 1990s, multicultural education evoked a divisive national debate, in part because of the inconsistent definitions, approaches and understandings of ‘multiculturalism’ as well as divergent views on what constitutes an American identity.⁷⁰ Ultimately, the debate was one that sparked a power struggle over who should participate in formulating the ‘canon’ used to shape the curriculum in the nation’s schools.⁷¹ Assimilationist ideology, explains Banks, maintains that in order to construct a cohesive nation and civic culture individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds must surrender the heritage or community culture. To this end, assimilationists often claim that multiculturalism is detrimental to the nation-state and the civic community and therefore it is necessary for citizens from diverse groups to establish allegiance to the nation-state and to become effective participants in the civic community by relinquishing ethnic and cultural ties that do not conform to the host culture.⁷² While this melting-pot approach to education may have opened avenues of economic advancement for members of some minority groups, it produced frustration and a negative self-concept and consciousness for many others. It was

⁶⁹ Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.


⁷¹ Ibid.

precisely this negative self-concept for minority groups that leaders and advocates of the Multicultural Education hoped to dismantle. One of the ways this was to be achieved was by emphasizing the role and value of ‘personal and cultural knowledge.’

Many educators and critical pedagogists recognized the frequency in which language received from the home clashed with the discourses found within the formal school system, especially among students drawn from minority backgrounds and those from families who held a low socio-economic status. \textsuperscript{73} This tension is known as the home-school continuity-discontinuity framework, or home-school mismatch. \textsuperscript{74} The dissonance felt between school and home for an overwhelming number of students of color prompted educators, scholars and sociologists to more critically reflect on the ‘lessons’ transferred by the community and ‘homespace’ and the intersection between school, community and home. \textsuperscript{75} Several scholars of color have written about the importance of cultural knowledge and the need for its centralization in understanding children’s construction of knowledge and academic performance. \textsuperscript{76} Attention to the knowledges and discourses gained from the ‘homespace’, is sometimes referred to as educational responsiveness, an approach to policies and practices that promote positive educational outcomes through recognition, understanding, and utilization of students’ cultural, linguistic and psychological assets. \textsuperscript{77}

For Banks, this was described as ‘personal and cultural knowledge’ and included the concepts, explanations and interpretations that students receive from their personal experiences, homes, family and community life. Bank’s notion of ‘personal and cultural knowledge’ is conceptually aligned to other descriptions of the social context both within and

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 2.
\textsuperscript{74} James A. Banks, \textit{An introduction to Multicultural Education}, 5\textsuperscript{th} edition (Pearson, 2013).
\textsuperscript{75} Dolores Delgado et al., Chicana/Latina Education in Everyday Life.
\textsuperscript{76} Beverly Daniel Tatum, \textit{Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?} (USA: Basic Books, 1997); Molefi Kete Asante, \textit{The Painful Demise of Eurocentricism}, (Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press, 2000). See also Woodson, \textit{The Mis-Education of the Negro} and Dolores Delgado et al, \textit{Chicana/Latina Education in Everyday Life}.
\textsuperscript{77} Cadier-Kaplan and Rodriguez, 2008).
outside of Critical Pedagogy.\textsuperscript{78} Findings of differences in definitions and terminology indicate the continued development and contested nature of critical pedagogies and other sociological inquiries to how the social context contributes to socialization.

Prior to the 1960s, schools and other educational institutions paid little attention to the personal and cultural knowledge of students. However, when disparities in ethnic minority achievement became a concern of the American federal government the opportunities for public funding influenced a range of ethnographic studies exploring the schooling experiences of various minority groups. Significantly throughout the decade, educators and policy-makers became increasingly concerned with how the unique cultural and historical views of their students impacted on the education they received and how responsive they were to it.\textsuperscript{79} Initial research however emphasized cultural deficits as the primary reason behind minority student failure, a model which emerged as ‘deficit theorizing’ within the literature.\textsuperscript{80} Deficit theorizing blames the underachievement of ethnic minority and low-income groups in schools on the perceived deficiencies of the minority students themselves, their families and their cultures. As a result, cultural deprivation theorists view the individual and their culture as the major problem rather than the culture of the school or wider structural inequalities.

In fact, many of the pejorative images linked to the Latino population stem from stereotypes about the Latino family that were legitimated by the sociological and cognitive

\textsuperscript{78} See Bourdieu on ‘habitus ’in \textit{Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste}, (London, Routledge, 1984) and Moll et al. ‘funds of knowledge’ in \textit{Funds of Knowledge for Teaching}.


development literature that emerged prominently throughout the 1960s. In 1961 for example J.M Hunt argued that Mexican children came from ‘culturally deprived homes.’ Several years later in 1966, Oscar Lewis described the daily practices and experiences of families in Spanish Harlem as a ‘culture of poverty.’ Cultural deprivation theorists, like Hunt and Lewis helped to legitimate popular conceptions of ‘culturally deprived (Latino) homes’ by suggesting that poor student achievement was unrelated to schooling, or a wider culture of economic inequality and exploitation, but rather symptomatic of the ‘culture of poverty’ in which they were socialized. In emphasizing internal cultural practices previous scholars, educators and policy makers were able to place the blame for many social problems, such as poverty, poor academic achievement and a difficulty assimilating into the American mainstream on Latinos themselves by ignoring the impact of larger forces, such as racism, and class hierarchies, that limited opportunities for success. It is from within this climate that the development of Chicano Studies, and Ethnic Studies more broadly, emerged. Mexican American students and activists sought not only to rectify a long history of racism and cultural neglect but also patriarchy and economic exploitation.

Since the 1980s popular and mass culture has increasingly become a topic of critique among academics in the field of education and Critical Pedagogy. ‘Popular knowledge,’ as defined by Banks, is conceived as the interpretations and beliefs that are institutionalized within television, movies, music and other forms of mass media. Media therefore is often viewed as an institution, which simultaneously reflects and perpetuates popular knowledge. The images, messages, and effects of popular culture, whether in the form of advertising, fashion,
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Media is an institution that, like the public school and family, can develop, sustain, and challenge discourses on ethnic, cultural and social identities. Media therefore, plays a significant role in the construction of people’s identities, sensibilities and interests. Media thereby forms part of an individual’s relationship to reality. In this way, and as John Street more explicitly states, media wields discursive or ideological power that creates a popular ‘common sense’ that can consistently shape ideas and cultural norms about specific groups of people. Banks’ conceptualization of ‘popular knowledge’ is in many ways conceptually aligned to this wider educational and discursive process-taking place within media and popular culture more specifically. His identification of popular culture as an institution of knowledge construction bridged media literacy to the educational field. As an institution that teaches individuals about the society in which they live, he claimed, educators are responsible for understanding the way in which media impacts students’ classroom experiences and their responses to prevailing pedagogies and the curriculum.

Together these studies point to the multiple ways that media teaches and consolidates social rules and norms. They further highlight the way in which access to communicative formats like mass media is often limited to members of an elite and dominant group. Mass media as an institution therefore sustains the tacit legitimation of the power, and beliefs, exercised by these groups. It not only shapes how groups are viewed by others but how they
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view themselves. The pervasiveness of images, representations and symbolic models disseminated by television, and other media, inform how children and adolescents think about the world and their own position—in relation to gender, sexuality, body image, race, ethnicity, and class—within it.

The contributions made by the sociological work from Carter and DuBois alongside the work from educational philosophers like Freire and Banks informs the methodological and conceptual framework of this thesis in various ways. My research encompasses the three spaces of inquiry often discussed within Critical Pedagogy: classroom, homespace and popular culture. As such, it recognizes, as legitimate and influential, the resources, skills and accumulated knowledge that people acquire from their personal, family, and community history as well as wider discursive practices such as the construction of group subjectivities within popular culture. The methodological framework is also heavily influenced by the Chicano Studies discipline. This will be discussed further in the Methodology section (1.5).

1.4 Field Contributions

This thesis is an attempt to broaden the Chicano Studies tradition by emphasizing epistemology over subject matter. Chicano Studies emerged as a distinctly political discipline designed to highlight and address oppressive structures as a means to empower marginalized communities through community based activism, research and education. Widening the scope of Chicano Studies beyond a unique Chicano experience moves the tradition forward allowing researchers to effectively adopt a Chicano Studies framework for discussing other Latino ethnicities (Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc) and other minority language communities.

It has been nearly fifty years since the first Chicano Studies programs were initiated on campuses across the United States. Over the last ten years however, Chicano Studies programs have been under siege not only by right wing and conservative critics seeking to eradicate the programs altogether but by an academy that seeks to define the program by its content rather than its commitment to social activism. Additionally, the question of whether Chicano Studies can sufficiently capture the diversity of the Mexican American community and other Latino ethnic groups has been raised by scholars both within and outside of the discipline. These criticisms have their merit: how can Chicano Studies respond to the needs of other Latino students who come from places like Cuba or Puerto Rico? My suggestion is that we return to the epistemological traditions in which the Chicano Studies tradition was founded. In short, we need to remember how and why Chicano Studies came about.

While the nuances of the Mexican American experience should not be overlooked we must remember that ‘Chicano’ emerged as a political term to identify a group of people (Mexican Americans) subjugated by Anglo American discrimination and cultural dominance. Chicano Studies is part of a larger constellation of cultural nationalism that accompanied larger struggles for civil rights throughout the 1960s and 1970s when distinct minority groups challenged many of the cultural institutions that perpetuated the dominance of ‘Anglo’ society. Like many of the Ethnic Studies that sprang in response to the demands of these various minority groups, Chicano Studies developed as a way to address a long history of racial, gendered and economic oppression by mainstream (Anglo) American culture. The shared objectives that stem from this common experience with the dominant Anglo society suggests that other Latino ethnic groups (and perhaps other ethnic minority groups) can benefit from the critical studies and theoretical advances yielded by Chicano Studies. The issues regarding the nature and extent of cultural and linguistic pluralism raised by this thesis for example do not
solely impact the Chicano community but—in various ways—Latinos of all ethnic backgrounds and to a larger extent, language minorities outside of the Latino diaspora.

Situated in a Chicano Studies framework committed to motivating Latinos to learn (and un-learn), to contest and correct negative images that have come about through a process of cultural discrimination and by drawing from developments in Critical Pedagogy and Language Studies, this thesis is able to elucidate the wider discursive practices that inform the United States’ preference for English monolingualism and the disproportionate implications this has for the Latino community. Doing so allows us to more critically review current approaches to educating linguistically minoritized students and consider options that may sustain more complex conceptualizations of language usage and practice that eventually recognize bilingualism as a facet of American identity. With Latinos making up the largest and fastest growing ethnic group in the United States, Chicano Studies programs and the research it develops has perhaps never been more important.

1.5 Methodology

The ultimate goal of this project is to reveal the necessity for social justice and transformative pedagogies in overcoming a tradition of Latino marginalization and de-legitimacy. Bilingual education is a highly contested pedagogical arrangement especially when implemented with and for students from non-dominant language communities. Against a backdrop of an increasing Latino population, anti-immigrant sentiments and rallies for the preservation of “traditional” America, this investigation drew on the methodological and epistemological traditions of Chicano Studies, which are heavily grounded in the pursuit of new knowledge that moves toward group empowerment.

The research employed a mixed methods and multiple case study research design to investigate the perspectives of those most affected by monoglossic ideologies and English-
Only approaches to language education: the students, their teachers, their parents, and the Latino community more widely. The Multiple Method Case Study approach allows the researcher to make two or more observations of the same phenomenon within various mediums. This variant, Felipe M. Santos and Kathleen M. Eisenhardt explain, enables replication—that is, the ability to use ‘multiple cases to independently confirm emerging constructs and propositions.’

Anthropological techniques are primarily employed to gather data on the community under investigation and to address the following research questions:

What ideologies underpin English-Only approaches to English-language education and how do these approaches affect Latino students, families, and subjectivities?

With Chapters One and Two serving as contextual chapters that introduce the research topics, key terms and relevant secondary information, Chapters Three and Four utilize an ethnographic approach to compile a detailed, in-depth description of everyday life and practice for Latino students labeled ‘English-Language Learner’, their teachers, families, and local community as they navigate monoglossic ideologies and English-Only approaches to English-language education.

Going into the community is an essential aspect of the Chicano Studies tradition. The underlying logic is that scholars need to know the communities they are researching in order to provide the adequate tools to transform it. Ethnographic approaches are therefore used to maintain a connection with the community under investigation and to assert the voices of the participants. Studying the everyday processes of schooling allows the research to explore how
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the everyday relational dynamics between students, teachers and curriculum contributes to the notion that English is the native language and Spanish is the foreign language, or what some have referred to as the ‘hidden curriculum.’

The ‘hidden curriculum’ contains the implicit biases and messages that stem from the formal curriculum and school ethos—a mixture of the relationship and communication between students, faculty, and staff—that, although not openly intended, contribute to the transmission of norms, values, and beliefs. The values emitted by the ‘hidden curriculum’ often reinforce the status quo, which arguably perpetuates existing social inequalities by educating students according to their class and social status. For critical educational theorists like Banks, the curriculum represents ‘the introduction to a particular form of life; it serves in part to prepare students for dominant or subordinate positions in the existing society.’

Observational Research

The research presented in Chapter Three uses in-class observations to consider the ‘hidden curriculum’ embedded in the English Language Development Program, an instructional method for teaching students who have been labeled ‘English-Language Learner.’ This work inevitably pays attention to language instruction, content delivery and interaction between students and teachers. The primary material presented in this Chapter derives from in-class
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observations and interviews with classroom teachers and administrators at two majority Latino and ‘English-Language Learner’ schools in Los Angeles during the 2012-2013 academic year. Analysis of the material focuses primarily on the classrooms of two teachers from two separate schools: Ms. Gonzalez from Braddock Drive and Ms. Riojas from ICEF Vista.96

I observed the teachers in a host of different situations including classroom language and literacy instruction and daily classroom routines. During classroom observations, I focused on the nature of language instruction and communication between teacher and student—primarily, practices of translinguaging (to be described in subsequent chapters). Written-notes were taken alongside audio recordings from observations to create detailed field notes. Teachers and school administrators were also interviewed using open-ended questions. After leaving the research site in November of 2012, I completed a close reading of the entire set of field notes looking for ‘certain words, phrases, patterns of behavior, subjects’ ways of thinking, and events that stand out’.97 To address each question, analytic commentaries grounded in the data and supporting literature were written. The analytic commentaries served as the basis of the themes generated from the data and were central to the development of codes and data analysis. Themes and activities noted throughout participant observation will be cross-referenced with the appropriate personnel when and where appropriate.

Given the extremely targeted discourses about Latino identities and the Spanish language embedded within monolingual educational measures like Proposition 227, Chapter Four investigates the extent to which these discourses permeate and affect linguistic practice and expectation among Latino families and communities outside of the school. Learning to communicate after all is a collaborative affair. Before schooling the language practices of the ‘homespace’ are what largely contribute to a child’s communicative skills.

96 These are pseudonyms for the teachers as their real names were not used. This is in compliance with their agreed participation as outlined in the Participant Consent Forms located in the Appendix.
97 R. Bogdan and S. Biklen, *Qualitative Research For Education: An Introduction To Theory And Qualitative Methodology* (Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon, 1992) p. 166
The primary methodological procedures for this phase of the research are once again consistent with traditional ethnographic study—namely, interviews and observation. Access to student families however was not feasible under the research guidance of the University. This being so, the research had to employ more creative ways to examine how an emphasis on English monolingualism in the schools, and elsewhere were impacting Latino family life. For this, the thesis draws on a definition of the ‘home’ that incorporates a wider range of social relationships—what emerges in the literature as the ‘homespace.’ The concept of the ‘home,’ argue anthropologists Moira Munro and Ruth Madigan, comprises both a physical and social space.98 An abundance of sociological literature defines the home as an ‘ideological trinity’ that consists of the family, home (physical space), and community.99 Working off of this definition, this chapter enters the ‘homespace’ by way of local community centers and after-school programs. It documents the experiences and opinions of community leaders, outreach directors and after-school programs that service a large majority of Latino students, especially those who attend the schools presented in Case Study 1 (CS1). Wanting to truly emphasize the way in which families from minority language communities are impacted by English monogloissic ideologies, the chapter also draws from the experiences of Chicano writers who have previously reflected on how conforming to language standards has affected the relationships with their families. Due to the ethical restrictions imposed by the University of East Anglia, no minors were approached throughout the duration of this study. While there was interaction with the students observed in the classrooms, they could not be formally approached and therefore their responses could not be formally recorded. Any primary material presented throughout this thesis comes from 1:1 interviews with consenting adults.

Acquisition of Research Participants and Ethical Procedures

Participating schools were recruited for the study by the researcher upon meeting the research criteria. I specifically sought schools 1) in Los Angeles County 2) with large numbers of Latino students and 3) with high numbers of ‘English Language Learners.’ An initial school search was completed online having accessed the school demography files on the school websites and on the California Department for Education website. Once a short list had been compiled the school principals were contacted directly via email where I introduced myself and the research objectives of the project. If the principals responded and showed interest they were provided with full disclosure statements outlining the research, the duration and methodological procedures of the observation, their right to anonymity and their right to withdraw from the research at any time (see Appendix A) Upon their approval, arrangements for the field research were made. At the close of the research trip all participants were administered a debriefing document. The debrief document thanked participants for engaging with the study and further informed them of the purpose of the research as a doctoral thesis, their right to withdraw and their right to anonymity. The document also provided the contact information of my supervisors and myself (See Appendix E).

The researcher also recruited participating afterschool programs and community centers. Programs in close proximity to the schools observed in CS1 were specifically targeted in the hopes that these programs would be servicing the Latino students from the observed schools. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding of this particular community. After initial online research highlighted some of the after-school programs in the preferred area, contact was made directly with program leaders. Having explained the outlines of the research and details of my observational study via email, consent for on-site visits and 1:1 interviews with personnel were organized. As with the previous field research, all voluntary participants were given written documentation of the research proposal and purpose before my
visit. This was sent via email and detailed their right to anonymity, and to withdraw from the study at any time before, during or after their participation (See Appendix F). At the end of each meeting with the consenting participant, a debriefing document was handed to interviewed participants (See Appendix H).

**Positionality**

This section focuses and reflects on my positionality as a researcher and the impact it may have had on the students, teachers, administrators, and community members who participated in this study during data collection and analysis. Positionality has been defined by Wanda Pillow as a ‘focus on how does who I am, and who I have been, who I think I am, and how I feel affect data collection and analysis.’ Reflexivity requires the researcher to be critically conscious through personal accounting of how the researcher’s self-location (across for example, gender, race, class, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality), position, and interests influence all stages of the research process. To reflect on my work as a participant observer, I am adopting the model and set of principles outlined by Alan Peshkin.

Defining subjectivity as ‘the quality of an investigator that affects the results of observational investigation, Peshkin emphasizes the requirement for any observer of, or participant in, educational events to be ‘meaningfully attentive’ to their own subjectivity as they conduct and reflect on their teaching and research activities. The foundations for Peshkin’s subjective I’s are drawn from a range of sources, including: his own belief and value systems; his experiences of a particular environment or place; his ongoing experiences of life within the particular school; the wider community and the relationships that he, and other
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members of his family, established within that community. For Peshkin these subjectives fall into two main categories: ‘Situational Subjectives,’ that change from place to place and are a subset of what he refers to as ‘Intrinsic Subjectives’ that make up his reflective ‘being.’ Peshkin’s subjective I’s are a useful strategy for helping researchers to understand the root values that underpin their conceptions of education and their out-workings through policy and practice.

Using Peshkin’s work as a model, this section considers the multiple I’s carried with me through my observation of the schools and community centers. These are identified as ‘I’ as (a) Chicana (b) educated woman (c) local community member. I am a Chicana that comes from the housing projects on the westside of Los Angeles. Despite my academic achievements, I grew up very aware of the multiple forces at work in the troubling history of Latino school performance. As an undergraduate at my predominantly white and private liberal arts college, these forces only became clearer: my own path was an exception and not the rule. It was at this time that I began to focus my attention to the specific obstacles in place for marginalized communities of color and in particular Latinos.

Applying for the doctorate, I knew I wanted to continue producing work that shed light on the Latino experience in the United States and having spent my first year out of undergraduate school teaching at a primary school in Baltimore, I knew this time I wanted to say something about education. My vision of education and teaching centers on social justice and constructing counter-narratives that offers alternatives to contemporary hegemonic discourses of race, class, gender, and sexuality. This philosophy can be described as a multicultural liberal arts perspective that is more concerned with constructing knowledge and critical thinking than with more pragmatic and vocational aims of education.

Throughout the research I have been very cognizant of how research participants and students engage with me on account of my race, class, gender, age, personal trajectory and
language abilities. I was an insider looking in and I could see that this established a more expedited and intimate rapport between myself and the research participants, especially given that most of the teachers, administrators, community organizers and students featured in this research were themselves Latino.

**Discourse and Content Analysis**

Taking a radical shift from the methods employed by Chapters Three and Four, the penultimate chapter considers more broadly how monoglossic ideologies affect Latino subjectivities. More specifically, it considers the extent to which this notion of English as a native language and Spanish as a foreign language is communicated in wider discursive practices, such as the construction of Latino identities on screen and in particular in children’s bilingual television programming. This work is inevitably relevant given the increasing rate in which commercial television networks have engaged in language education. To understand the extent to which these programs either challenge or reinforce the ideologies embedded within the educational approaches to language found in the public school, this chapter performs a content and discourse analysis of a number of shows which have utilized the Spanish language as an ethnic signifier for Latinos. The primary focus for analysis however will be on Nickelodeon’s *Dora the Explorer*.

The chapter highlights specific elements of the show—namely Dora’s cultural and ethnic signifiers as they are depicted on screen. It also discusses the socio-cultural context in which the increased production of bilingual language programming aimed at the ‘Hispanic’ market emerged and finally, interrogates Nickelodeon’s production process. The primary concepts deployed for the analysis of language as a racial and ethnic signifier in media content, like most research of this kind, are: image, stereotype, ideology, representation, discourse, and text. Whereas some academic disciplines have made a distinction between *text* and *discourse*,
relating to the tradition in text linguistics as well as to rhetoric, critical media studies views *discourse* as ‘interactive’—that is, as negotiated between producers and audience, as a process in construction’ and *text* as the (oral, visual, or written) manifestation of this. Fundamental in understanding the continued ‘othering’ and stigmatization of Latinos, a discourse analysis provides a methodological tool through which to examine the explicit and implicit forms in which dominant majority members shape social understanding of minority groups through broader discursive practices.

*Linguistic Objects at the Micro Level*

Traditional studies of discourse focused primarily on the written or verbal linguistic devices however, a recognition of the interaction between the verbal and visual in texts and discourse as well as on the meaning of images has turned attention to semiotic devices as well. Theo van Leeuwen and Gunther Kress provide a useful framework for considering the communicative potential of visual devices in the media. This theoretical development becomes increasingly useful in discussing Dora’s Latina signifiers. Van Dijk and Norman Fairclough both express the importance of analyzing the micro-level of the text. This is achieved through analyzing linguistic objects that include but are not limited to vocabulary choice, content, grammatical structures, metaphor and rhetorical devices in written or spoken discourse. When combined these micro-level aspects of language can form part of a racialized discourse. Van Dijk’s ‘ideological square’ paradigm highlights the ‘basic propositions of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation’ which exist in political and popular discourses that shape social understandings of the ‘other.’
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The study of linguistic objects and the framework of the ideological square provide a critical starting point for the study of how Latinos are defined and produced through discourse and more specifically, through language education. This makes a critical discourse analysis particularly apt as a method to study the subtle ways in which Latinos are constructed as a product for consumption and more so as ‘foreign others.’ Alongside an examination of micro level language use and its role in the construction of identities, discourse analysis requires an in depth consideration of the discursive practices of text production and consumption to reveal the functions of particular productions.\(^\text{107}\) This second dimension of critical discourse analysis is primarily concerned with how the text is subject to wider power relations in the way it is produced and consumed. Such an analysis allows the chapter to explore the incentives and ideas behind Dora’s creation and production.

By adopting an interdisciplinary approach we can better understand the complexity of twenty-first-century America, and specifically the experiences of Latino communities at a time of rapid social change.

\(^{107}\) Ibid., 98.
Chapter Two

“If You Want to be American, Speak ‘American:’” Language and Identity in the United States

2.1 Introduction

In January 1919, just days before his death, the former President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, wrote a letter to the American Defense Society. The war in Europe had ended only months earlier, and Roosevelt was looking ahead to America’s future in peacetime. As always, Roosevelt was anxious that the American future should be stamped in the image of the English-speaking elite. ‘We have room for but one language in this country and that is the English language’, he wrote. Continuing, ‘we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house.’

Despite Roosevelt’s rallying cry for an English only America, the defining story of the rest of the twentieth century was arguably one of growing multiculturalism. America today has never looked more like Roosevelt’s ‘polyglot boarding house.’ Above all, the remarkable growth of Spanish-speaking Latino populations during the past decades has come to challenge the ways in which Americans define national identity in relation to language. If we assume that with this population growth comes, through democratic weight of numbers and increasing visibility, the ability to redefine what it means to be an American, then the future will be very different from Roosevelt’s dream of an English-speaking nation. But we have to be careful not to assume that numbers, demographics, will inevitably shape America’s destiny. This thesis argues it is more profoundly about the negotiation between language practice and policy, whether language policy will recognize a changing social reality or try and keep non-English speakers in check.

There is a notorious historical precedent for the repression of language minorities in America. The form of nationalism Roosevelt defined was one predicated on English language conformism. When he wrote to the American Defense League in 1919 to express that—by then firmly established—view he went so far as to question the loyalty of those who did not embrace with enthusiasm the English language:

Let us say to the immigrant not that we hope he will learn English, but that he has got to learn it. Let the immigrant who does not learn [English] go back. He has got to consider the interest of the United States or he should not stay here. He must be made to see that his opportunities in this country depend upon his knowing English and observing American standards.109

World War I had of course been a moment of fervent nationalism, during which the battle against German imperialism on the Western Front had been twinned with an almost equally ferociously fought cultural battle against German Americans on the home front. Attacks against the German language in particular provided a focus for the growing nativism and hostility towards the German-American community. Many of the German bilingual schools that were established in parts of the Midwest during the nineteenth century, for example, were closed and many of the bilingual resources available to German speakers, such as the publication of German-language newspapers and the printing of legal documents in German as well as English, were discontinued.110 By the time of the armistice in November 1918 campaigns against the German language in the United States had considerably reduced its use in public.111

While use of the German language among German Americans was slowly waning before the war, it remained the language of many German social clubs, newspapers, churches and parochial schools. The widespread use of the German language in the United States during the early half of the twentieth century attests to the strong German diaspora that had been formed in the middle of the eighteenth century when large numbers of Germans settled in Pennsylvania. Their considerable size enabled them to maintain a strong ethnic identity that was most visibly signified through their use of the German language. There had been targeted attacks against the German community and what was said to be their ethnic exclusiveness and tendency to defend their own separate ethnic identity in the past—Benjamin Franklin famously complained about the ‘Palatine Boors’ in many of his early writings, for example. However, World War I presented a unique opportunity for Anglo Americans to legislate stringent immigration and English-language laws under a guise of national unity and American loyalty.

The sentiment evident in Roosevelt’s letter to the American Defense League, in short the axiom ‘one nation, one language’, expressed what arguably continues to define a form of nativist ideology. It was an ideology that reached fever pitch in the early twentieth century, when under the pressure of World War I. But it is the contention of this thesis that a comparable attitude holds in the United States today. In the 1990s, particularly in the era of NAFTA, it was fueled by concerns about Mexican immigration. Today, the same anxieties prevail but have been heightened by concerns about the birthrate of U.S. Latinos and the fear that demographic changes will inevitably create an English-speaking minority.

This is frightening for so many people because it is not just about language as an instrument of communication as such, but the relationship between language and identity. This
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is what Edwards meant by language serving as a ‘rallying-point.’ With that in mind, this chapter presents and critically analyzes some of the conventions of language usage in the United States in order to highlight how language functions as an ethnic signifier: something that helps express and convey social identities as well as serving as a means of communication. Furthermore, it seeks to demonstrate how language policies and practices serve to institutionalize the conventions of particular social groups; this is how a specific language acquires its political significance. The task therefore, is to show how the mechanisms of language standardization, embedded as they are in the politics of identity, develop into language policies that disproportionately and negatively affect members of minority groups.

The arguments presented here help elaborate the core contention of this thesis: that language custom and control is one way that ideological dominance is asserted. These arguments will be developed in Chapters Two-Five, which consider the bearing this has on Latino communities today. However, the remainder of the present chapter outlines the deeper historical and the broader political context. Specifically, as a project that emphasizes the application of language policy within educational institutions, this chapter looks at how the public school in particular has functioned as a site of ideological struggle, a site of intervention by those who view English language as the cornerstone of American identity. Here the German-American experience during World War I is again, instructive. Schools, then as now, were the focus of efforts to establish English as the American national language. While wartime proponents of Americanization recognized that they could do little to prevent the use of the German language among adults, they had hoped that they could break the German language cycle by eradicating the German language from the schools. This made children the primary target of their nativist campaign. Between 1917 and 1922 several states eliminated German from their school curriculum and many of the well-established Midwestern German bilingual
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schools were closed. The heightened suspicion of German-Americans during wartime encouraged numerous and zealous patriots to demand that the German language should be extinguished in public education. Some feared that the learning of the German language would inspire admiration for the German culture and society, which they viewed as barbaric. As one county attorney complained to the Minnesota Public Safety Commission, German-language schools taught ‘principles destructive of democracy’ to children ‘at the most impressionable age.’ The California State Board of Education called German a language of ‘autocracy, brutality and hatred.’ Other critics argued that German-language schools undermined the quality of public education. One public school teacher in Minnesota reported that students in German-language schools learned ‘next to nothing in those schools except German reading, writing and their catechism.’

While German Americans bore the brunt of the cultural chauvinism inspired by a heightened sense of American nativism and patriotism, the war set the tone for later restrictions on immigration more broadly. Political campaigns against immigrants, their languages and cultures continued after the war. In 1918, the governor of Iowa proposed that ‘English be the only medium of instruction in public, private, denominational and other similar schools’ and furthermore that any ‘conversation in public places, on trains, and over the telephone should be in the English language.’ ‘Let those who cannot speak or understand the English language,’ he continued, ‘conduct their religious worship in their home.’ In similar fashion, the state of Nebraska forbade the use of foreign languages in public in 1919. Of course, these policies had added significance for particular groups of people, particularly ethnic and racial minorities.
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Through similar state statues enacted throughout the Midwest, as many as 18,000 people were charged during and immediately following World War I with violating the English-only statutes. ¹²⁰ By 1920, the number of German-language newspapers had been reduced to 276, a third of the number that were available twenty years earlier and only one percent of high school students now studied German. In banning or discouraging the use of the German language, state authorities condoned and reinforced some of the prevailing and negative discourses about the German language, culture and community. The 1920 Census showed a 25 percent drop in the number of Americans declaring themselves to have been born in Germany, something that was attributed not purely to a drop in population but and perhaps considerably in part to a desire by many German-born Americans to conform, assimilate and hide their ethnic origins. ¹²¹

Clearly, this is not the way in which a liberal democracy is supposed to work. It raises a question about whether American nationalism, as it developed in the twentieth century, has been, or even can be, truly compatible with democracy. In the case of World War I the anti-German campaign focused ostensibly on public use of the German language and infringed civil liberties in respect in how one operated in public life. However, in the case of schools, which are public institutions, the eradication of German language nevertheless also reached into private life, the home and the family, through children who were the targets of that policy. It was not just a moment in which patriotism rallied a conformist campaign for English to be the only language acceptable in public life but it seemed to attempt the re-engineering of family life by changing the very way in which members of ethnic minority communities communicated with each other.

¹²¹ See Ross, Forging New Freedoms.
Today, attacks against the German American community during World War I are viewed as an infringement of civil liberties, an aggressive attempt to exclude members of a language minority from public life. Liberals, at least those who remember that notorious era, rightly abhor this. Nevertheless, this thesis argues that what we see in language policy today is an emphasis on the need to conform to English monolingualism, which subsequently, has the net effect of disrupting family and community life. The climate in which this is happening is not as politically heated, clearly, as that of World War I, although it has to be admitted that hysteria over immigration and the perceived erosion of the English language is fevered.

This thesis will return to focus on the effects of monoglossic ideologies and practices on Latino families and communities in Chapter Four. But for the time being, we need to move on and consider the broader context. Next, we will look at the way in which different value judgments—assumptions about class, region, ethnicity and so on—have been attached to variants of the English language, to dialects and accents, and how schooling has played a part in establishing and maintaining a social hierarchy which reflects these preconceptions. As we shall see, assimilationist efforts, and attempts to create a standard national culture in the image of the ruling elite on its terms, have focused not just on the speaking of English but the way in which it is spoken.

Some of the earliest public, tax-supported school systems used English-language acquisition for the cultural assimilation of ethnic minority groups for precisely this purpose. The historian Jacqueline Fear-Segal has documented the history of the campaign in effect to eradicate Native cultures and communities through schooling throughout the late nineteenth century. These institutions, argues Fear-Segal, became arenas where members of a majority group debated and defined the terms of both Indian and American citizenship by predisposing students to Anglo American ideals and practices, like the English-language, as a means of
creating a cohesive national culture. Similarly, in her critical interrogation of American national icons and memory, Cecelia Elizabeth O’Leary catalogued the way in which early progressive educators used English-language instruction as a strategy for Americanizing the substantial number of eastern European immigrants entering the United States throughout the late nineteenth century. Importantly, her work questions who or what has the power of inculcation necessary for establishing the elements of a common core culture implicit in concepts like ‘Americanization.’ What this chapter does next is look at one way in which the notion of Americanness has been defined: through language, and specifically through dialect and accent.

2.2 Language Standardization and Standard American English

As has been extensively documented in etymological and linguistic research, language is an incredibly flexible and responsive social tool that is subject to change upon contact with other languages, changing patterns of immigration, population movement, and expanding communication and transportation. Languages’ susceptibility to change makes variation, manifested through lexicon, phonology, morphology and syntax, an intrinsic part of spoken language. The nuances of these linguistic manifestations are most often categorized as accent and dialect. Accent is used to describe the differences in pronunciation in an individual’s speech (phonology), rather than the broader set of linguistic differences that might be contained within a regional, group or social variation of a language. For this broader variance, sociolinguists and linguists refer to dialect, the regional and social varieties of a language that extend beyond phonology, or sound systems. Whereas accent is often restricted to the way
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an individual sounds, dialect encompasses the differences in morphological structures, syntax, lexicon, and semantics of the same language. Accordingly, accents can be a feature of specific dialects which are motivated by a number of social variables like location, socio-economic status, ethnicity and contact with other languages.\(^{126}\) Consider American English and British English as an example. These are two different dialects of the English language with a variety of accents within each.

The conditional nature of language and its reactional relationship to numerous social variables has highlighted, for many in the social science field, the conscious effort necessary to institutionalize particular languages and language forms—the mechanics i.e. vocabulary, grammar, spelling and punctuation and phonological elements (accent). Upon their institutionalization both the mechanical and phonological elements of a particular language variety become the linguistic forms that are adhered to in dictionaries, textbooks, classrooms, government, business and the media and therefore become naturalized as the ‘proper’ use of a language and the socially preferred mode. In the United States this language variety is commonly known as Standard American English, the nuances of which will be discussed at greater length in the following section.

Standard American English is used to describe the American accent and dialect that sounds the most unvaried and the most mainstream.\(^{127}\) It does not therefore carry the speech specifics of any particular region.\(^{128}\) As a result it is often heavily contrasted against non-standard dialects such as Southern American English accents, several Northeastern accents, the California Valley Girl accent and ethnic minority accents like Chicano English or African
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\(^{127}\) Accent refers to the sounds and pronunciations present in an individual’s speech. Dialects are greater than individual accents and are attributed to the version of a language that is spoken by a particular region and specific group. Accents for example can be a feature of another dialect. Consider American English and British English; two different dialects of English with a variety of different accents within each.

\(^{128}\) Field, *Bilingualism in the USA*.
The careful tending necessary for language standardization has produced an abundant scholarship, which critically interrogates the intention, function and desirability of state language standardization. The consensus among scholars is that language standardization is an attempt to stop language change in order to assert cultural dominance through linguistic dominance. The presupposition within this argument is one that emphasizes language as a symbolic system with socio-symbolic significance—that is, language has the ability to signify particular social identities and groups and therefore also has the capacity to represent and promote the interests, social viewpoints and political objectives of distinct groups and asserts their social dominance.

Read this way, language standardization, or the primacy of one language variety over another can be viewed as a system of self-preservation for those with access to the means of standardization. Consider the dissolution of German language usage in the United States presented in the chapter introduction and its intention to assert American patriotism and a strictly Anglo American English-speaking identity. Stringent English-Only laws and literacy requirements were used to govern entry into the United States, and citizenship and ‘Americanization’ efforts became the ideological framework within which Anglo American elites could stress the universality and superiority of their language and culture more widely. English language proficiency thus became a powerful symbol of American identity and heightened the distinction between Anglophones and non-Anglophones.

Though Congress’s first use of the phrase, ‘American Language’ was recorded in 1802, efforts to standardize a uniquely American English has roots in the Revolutionary Era. Seeking
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129 The Telsur Project of the Linguistics Laboratory of the University of Pennsylvania locate three major dialect regions of the United States: the Inland North, the South, and the West. See the map.
131 See Anderson, Imagined Communities; Elliot L. Judd; Field, Bilingualism in USA; Pam Morris 1993; Anzaldúa, Borderlands; Rodriguez, Hunger of Memory.
to encode a distinct American identity in a unique American dialect, leaders of the new republic deliberately emphasized the differences between American English and British English. In a letter to the president of Congress (1780), John Adams explained that,

Separated as we are from the British dominion, we have not made war against the English language any more than against the old English character. An academy instituted by the authority of Congress for correcting, improving, and fixing the English language would strike all the world with admiration and Great Britain with envy.

Emerging from these early distinctions between British and American English was a unique American standard. Several early prominent American figures contributed fervently to the institutionalization of this new standard. Perhaps the most significant is Noah Webster who published his first *Dictionary* (1806), a text that cemented the standardization of the American language and its separation from its British parent. Webster’s *Dictionary* had a profound impact on American spelling, diction and, an overall understanding of Standard American English. Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (11th edition 2003) defines Standard English as,

The English that with respect to spelling, grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary is substantially uniform though not devoid of regional differences, that is well established by usage in the formal and informal speech and writing of the educated, and that is widely recognized as acceptable wherever English is spoken and understood.

---


133 J. Adams to President of Congress, 1780, in the *Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States*, Vol. 4.
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As Standard American English became more widely utilized by elite groups and institutions, it gained a reputation as the language of the literate and the prestigious and thus became recognized as the ‘normal,’ ‘correct,’ and even ‘superior’ use of the language. As the United States grew more globally powerful and influential, particularly after WWII, so too did the American language. By 1945 the dominant voice in the English-speaking world was no longer British but American.  

A standardized form arises for most language communities (Standard Spanish, a Standard British English, Standard Italian, etc.) and while the frequency in which standard languages develop may suggest an organic element in its evolution, etymological investigations and historical traces of state national development often reveal that a standard language is a above all a social institution charged with instating an idealized way of speaking for the purpose of social control and national cohesion. In fact, most of the research on the concept of the standard, or national language, define it as a bias toward a set of abstract norms to which actual language usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent. Each standard however does possess a unique and complex sociopolitical history and ideological rationalization that makes standardization appear necessary and desirable. Within the literature, this ideological rationalization is referred to as Standard Language Ideology (SLI) and it is predicated on the belief that a nation-state has one perfect, homogenous language. 

Several linguists, among them the prolific Rosina Lippi-Green, James and Lesley Milroy, and Walt Wolfram, have however presented significant critiques against the existence of a homogenous language within a national language community. Their work describes language as a cultural and social system that is subject to change. Sociolinguists James and

137 Milroy and Milroy, *Authority and Language*, 22-23.
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Lesley Milroy more specifically state that a standard language should not be conceptualized as a specific language but rather, ‘as an idea in the mind rather than a reality,’ a notion conceptually aligned to Anderson’s ‘imagined communities’ discussed in the thesis introduction. Importantly the work of Lippi-Green, Milroy and Milroy and Wolfram highlight the ways in which the process of standardization requires access to the means of communication and institutionalization. The standard of any language, they propose, is an idealized variety consciously instated by the more dominant groups of a language community. For this reason, standard languages rarely resemble the speech patterns of the vernacular of any particular region and as such, are often considered *un-accented* or *un-varied* in the way that other accents which deviate from the standard are perceived.

There are many versions of the English language however, some English-language varieties are more privileged than others. Dissent over how to define American English has contributed to many of the debates regarding language education in the United States, particularly over the last fifty years. This contention is largely centered on how the phonological aspects of the language and the grammatical structures are used within it. While Webster’s definition acknowledges that regional differences may be found in Standard American English it makes no concessions for any of the social differences found in American English. This would include race, ethnicity and class.

Language acquisition is culture-specific—that is, as cultural anthropologist Carlos Ovando maintains, it develops to fit and meet the needs of specific language communities. As such, language choice and behavior often reflect the communities from which they develop and can be important signifiers of group membership. How one speaks therefore is bound to notions of social identity (class, race, and ethnicity for example) as well as ideas of status.
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intelligence and authority. Accents and dialect for example, can indicate the locality in which its speakers reside (a regional or geographical accent); the socio-economic status of its speakers; and sometimes the racial identity of its speakers (social accent). The difference between Standard English and non-standard varieties thus signifies more than a difference in phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon. Webster’s oversight of social language varieties in his definition of Standard American English presupposes that American English dialects which deviate from the standard are either non-standard, or sub-standard. The definition also emphasizes the relationship between Standard English speakers and their educational qualifications. Standard English, it states, is ‘the formal and informal speech and writing of the educated.’ This description recognizes Standard English as the variety ‘that all civilized, educated people in the U.S. must emulate as the standard performance and unifying language of society.’

What is meant by ‘educated’ in this context however is not fully elaborated. The notion that an educated person is one synonymous with Standard American English defines anyone who does not speak English or English in that way as uneducated. George Vandenhoff declared in 1862, Lynda Mugglestone tells us, that pronunciation ‘distinguishes the educated reader and speaker from the vulgar and uneducated one.’ It is one of the assertions of this thesis that this more or less holds true today.

Standard American is most commonly recognized as the dialect used by professional communicators like news broadcasters, partly because it is the standard accent that is taught by accent coaches and speech classes. News anchors Walter Cronkite and Dan Rather are often
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cited as examples of Standard American English speakers when sociolinguists attempt to define and capture the Standard American sound system.\textsuperscript{147} Having been born and raised in Texas, Rather inherited some of the peculiarities of a Texas dialect that he modified with the help of Standard American elocution lessons. He reasoned that these modifications were necessary for the sake of clarity, or for seeming neutrality for his wide audience.\textsuperscript{148} The Standard American accent is believed to have evolved from the English spoken by the colonials in the Mid-Atlantic States, a well-educated, well-traveled and predominantly white group of people who often held superior social positions and therefore retained institutional influence.\textsuperscript{149} The methodical collection of data on regional dialect variation in North America began during the 1930s when the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada began conducting extensive surveys on the differences in regional dialects.\textsuperscript{150} While some linguistic researchers are apprehensive about quantifying the number of U.S. dialects, the emergence and development of American dialects within a single language community and national border continues to fuel sociological, political and etymological study. William Labov’s \textit{Atlas of North American English} (2006) more recently demonstrates the geographical distribution of dialects throughout the United States.\textsuperscript{151} The research, which focuses primarily on phonology, identifies six major dialectical regions within the United States and wide linguistic variance within each of these larger panoramic regions. The major dialectical regions have been identified as: the West, Mid-West, Northeast (New England), the North, Mid-Atlantic States and the South.\textsuperscript{152} Some consider the dialect divisions in the U.S. to reflect the regional differences established in colonial America by people from different parts of the British Isles, Europe, West Africa and North America.


\textsuperscript{148} McCrum et al., \textit{The Story of English}, 35.

\textsuperscript{149} Baker-Shirer, ‘Standard American Accent Coaching.’

\textsuperscript{150} Wolfram and Schilling-Estes. ‘Language Evolution or Dying Traditions?’.
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These linguistic differences were preserved in earlier cultural hubs like Richmond, Boston, and Philadelphia and later moved westward as settlers moved inland.\textsuperscript{153} Although laced with influences from various parts of the world, Standard American English is largely based on the grammatical structures of the well-educated and the speech patterns of the Anglophones.\textsuperscript{154} Recognition of the historical influence of white elites in colonial America has made Standard American English a signifier for whiteness. In particular it is common for members of minority language groups and racial and ethnic minority groups to associate Standard American English with white speech. Indeed, African American comedians like Richard Pryor and Dave Chappelle have capitalized on this unstated understanding of white speech in America.

Of course, there are many so-called ‘white’ accents that are excluded from the category of Standard American English. To some extent this demonstrates the complexity and fluidity of the very notion of whiteness historically in the United States. The historian Mathew Frye Jacobson’s study of race and European immigrants helps to illuminate the political history of whiteness more explicitly in his appropriately titled \textit{Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race}. Between the 1840s and the 1920s, Jacobson notes, a shift in the understanding of whiteness as a racial category transformed the ‘unquestioned hegemony of unified “white persons” to a contest over political “fitness” among a now fragmented, hierarchically arranged series of distinct ‘white races’.”\textsuperscript{155} This slippage in meaning within the context of the United States was prompted contingently by the increasing immigration from Eastern Europe during the late 1880s. However, it was the development of the field of eugenics before that time that provided intellectual rationalization for establishing hierarchies within the category of whiteness. Out of one race, nineteenth century intellectuals created many races, lending simple prejudice, anti-immigrant sentiments, and the veneer of scientific credibility.

\textsuperscript{153} Walt Wolfram and Ben Ward, \textit{American Voices: How Dialects Differ from Coast to Coast}.
\textsuperscript{154} Field, \textit{Bilingualism in the USA}.
A heightened awareness of race and ethnicity influenced the demands for Americanization and a single homogenized American culture and identity. The writings of eugenicists, sociologists and anthropologists seemed to grant credibility to policies spanning immigration and assimilation, segregation and miscegenation, and all of which touched on schooling.\textsuperscript{156} Research by Madison Grant—a lawyer, race theorist and eugenicist—for example, provided the quantitative data used to set a national origins quota, which limited the number of immigrants allowed entry into the United States from certain European countries, for the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act of 1924. Although this completely excluded immigrants from Asia altogether,\textsuperscript{157} Grant believed that the influx of new immigrants coupled with the low birthrate of native white women threatened the foundations of American civilization and therefore should be massively curtailed and from certain countries denied altogether.\textsuperscript{158} While it is tempting, as Jacobson notes, to identify the likes of Grant and other eugenicists (such as Harry Laughlin, Lothrop Stoddard, and Albert Johnson) as being extreme in their views, it is ‘critical to recognize that figures far more central to American political and intellectual life shared many of their basic assumptions—Calvin Coolidge, Frederick Jackson Turner, Henry Ford and Theodore Roosevelt are among them.\textsuperscript{159} Although the Johnson-Reed Act did not invent the hierarchy of white races it did institutionalize, and in many ways formalize, a refined understanding of whiteness that steadily gained currency throughout the early twentieth century.

These ‘white others,’ or sub-categorical white groupings, typically included eastern Europeans like Slavs, Jewish people and other Mediterranean populations. While the decades

\textsuperscript{156} See for example Johann Blumenbach, \textit{On the Natural Varieties of Mankind} (Bergman Publishers, 1795); Samuel Morton, \textit{Crania Americana: Or a Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of America}. (J. Dobson, 1839); William V. Ripley, \textit{The Races of Europe: A Sociological Study} (D. Appleton and Company, 1899).

\textsuperscript{157} ‘The Immigration Act of 1924 (The Johnson-Reed Act),’ \textit{U.S. Department of State Office of the Historian} accessed on September 2013. \url{https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigration-act}


\textsuperscript{159} Jacobson, \textit{Whiteness of a Different Color}. 74
between 1840 and 1920 observed a general pattern of Anglo Saxon exclusivity, a pattern of Caucasian unity developed after the 1920s. Eastern European immigrants, despite their varying nations of origin were almost uniformly white and this removed many of the social and economic blockages for their entry into the American mainstream political economy. For this reason the process of assimilation for them depended largely on the decision to relinquish their immigrant culture in place of an American culture. This advantage, or fluidity in racial category was less available for blacks, Asian or Latino immigrants and residents. Indeed while the Johnson-Reed Act heavily curtailed immigration from Eastern European countries it completely blocked immigration from Asia. WWII produced a profound revision in the categorization of races.\textsuperscript{160}

This understanding of whiteness has in many ways translated to the United States’ understanding of Standard American English, or more acceptable regional variations of the standard as Webster’s definition demonstrates. Standard American English is not an absolute category but a reference point around which all other accents are arranged. This means that other accents can be considered acceptable deviations from the standard if they are closely associated with membership of elite institutions, prestigious schools, colleges, universities, fraternities, business, finance and land interests, clubs, lodges and the like—in short, with the trappings of the upper middle class. Consider the southern senator’s drawl, or JFK’s upper-class modification of Standard American English. Consider that before the 1960s many accents associated with inner-city, blue-collar ethnic minorities—Italians, Poles, Jews—today shade into what would be considered a standard version of American English. That transition after the 1960s occurred as those communities moved from the inner city to the suburbs in growing numbers and established their middle-class credentials.

\textsuperscript{160} Ibid.
The exception that demonstrates the rule here to some extent is the Valley Girl accent of California. The jargon of the Valley Girl is perhaps best captured in Frank and Moon Zappa’s 1982 song, “Valley Girl.” One of the key features of this accent, Eckert and Mendoza-Denton explain, is the use of the discourse marker, ‘I’m like’, or ‘She’s like’ or even ‘that’s like’, as a way to introduce quoted speech. A group of linguists from the University of California at Berkley also found that California whites (and whites in other parts of the West) tend to move their vowels forward so that the vowels in words like hawk, cot and caught are pronounced the same—‘so awesome rhymes with possum.’ This vowel movement impacts the pronunciation of other words as well. The vowel in but and cut is also moved forward so that its sounds more like bet and ket. These examples are just some features of a particularly distinctive California accent, but more important than the form itself is its associated cultural meaning. Specifically it is most associated with young middle-class whites, and is a way of marking out their status. It appears to communicate a lack of education through its distance from the polished Standard American accent. What speakers of this accent show us is that adherence to the standard is not always strictly necessary. They are able to demonstrate their privilege and class status, despite their apparent contempt for education and their lifestyle of leisure. It effectively mocks American meritocracy by reveling in their financial security and inherited middle-class privilege.

What we have done so far is briefly consider the accents associated with some elite social groups. We have seen that there is a Standard American accent which serves as a reference point for the extent to which other accents deviate. Accent and class are closely related and one serves as a signifier of the other. But, American society being what it is, class
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is also tied to race and ethnicity. This means that when we look at accents associated with marginalized social groups in the next section, we will be thinking about minority racial and ethnic communities. How those accents function in the construction and perpetuation of American social hierarchy, specifically through schooling, is the subject of this thesis. However, before we get there we need to look more closely at the non-standard American dialects of minority communities, and in particular Chicano and African-American communities. We begin with Chicano English.

2.3 Non-Standard American Dialects

Chicano English is a variety of American English spoken natively by some U.S. born Chicano-Latinos—that is, people of Mexican ethnic origin often concentrated in the Southwest. The most notable feature of the Chicano English dialect is within the sound system which is heavily influenced by the Spanish language. For this reason it is often referred to as a contact dialect. It should therefore not be confused with ‘English-Language Learner’ English, which is typically used to describe the language behavior of those who are learning English as a second language rather than the idiosyncrasies of speech characteristics used by native English speakers in the United States.\(^{164}\) Chicano English speakers tend to reduce vowels in unstressed syllables less often than speakers of other dialects and use patterns of intonation that differ from Standard American speakers.\(^{165}\) Most notably, Chicano English has developed Spanish-like vowels. The vowel in the second syllable of *nothing*, Eckert and Mendoza-Denton explain, has come to sound more like *ee* among some groups of Chicano English speakers. This is because speakers of Chicano English tend to have a higher vowel sound in these words, more like the ‘*i*’ of Spanish (as in *sí*), so that words like *nothing, going* or *talking*, end up sounding

\[^{164}\text{Ibid.}\]

\[^{165}\text{Fought, ‘Language as a Representation of Mexican American Identity,’}\]
more like ‘notheeng, goween’ and ‘talkeen.’ As such, when people hear Chicano English they often assume that they are hearing an accent of someone who is a non-native English speaker, and more specifically, a native Spanish speaker. Research shows however that most Chicano English speakers are monolingual English speakers and only that their dialect retains hints of contact with the Spanish language that may be reflected by their particular bilingual or predominantly Spanish-speaking community.

Chicano English also has its own distinct vocabulary and grammatical structures distinct from Standard American English. Professor of linguistics and expert on Chicano English, Carmen Fought, highlights the special use of the word ‘barely’ in Chicano English as a stand in for ‘just recently’ as in: ‘These were expensive when they barely came out’ or, ‘Don’t leave, you barely got here!’ Fought explains that this is likely a derivative of the Spanish adverb apenas, which can mean that something almost did not happen but then it did—which is what barely in the English language usually signals. Apenas can also mean that something just happened recently. This use of ‘barely’ would seem, to many speakers of Standard English, as being incorrect but this use would be perfectly acceptable and coherent to many Chicano English speakers. Also characteristic of Chicano English is the use of Spanish lexical items. While Chicano English speakers tend to be monolingual English speakers they can infuse Spanish words or phrases. This occasional use of a Spanish word, Fought explains, differs from the more complex phenomenon of code-switching, the mixing of lexical items and structures from English and Spanish in a single discourse: Es un little boy for It’s a little boy.

Code-switching is a language contact phenomena where individuals habitually switch from one language to another in a single discourse or utterance for interpretive purposes.
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is typically a linguistic phenomenon that happens in communities where two languages are spoken on a regular basis. Because code-switching is the alternation of languages within a single discourse in a single utterance (*Es un little boy*), it requires some level of proficiency in both languages. The switch between languages is often triggered by a shift or change in topic or contextual situation. Speakers therefore switch to the code they consider more appropriate for a given topic or audience. As a linguistic phenomenon, code-switching is the result of a variety of factors. The two most general include language history and language usage of a community where language history refers to how the languages were acquired or learned within a community and consequently, the levels of proficiency acquired in each language; and language usage conveys the language patterns of a community: where, when and with whom the language is used. Depending on the environment and audience, individuals may choose to speak one way with members they consider to be part of their ‘in-group’ and another way with members they believe to be part of an ‘outside group.’ ‘In group’ language interaction, formally known as discourse related code-switching, is when a specific or “right” language is chosen for use among specific groups, discussions of specific topics and for specific situations.

In some Chicano English communities, Spanglish, the blending of Spanish and English lexical structures (code-mixing) or switch between the two (code-switching), can be quite common. The level of code-switching in a given community is contingent upon several environmental factors. For example, if the language environment is susceptible to highly influential models of language mixing, then code-switching becomes common practice and
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socially accepted behavior for a particular language community. It can therefore be indicative of group membership in particular types of bilingual speech communities and form part of a larger ethnic identity for specific groups.\textsuperscript{175} Fought’s research on Mexican American youth in California shows that Spanglish speakers in this particular region associate the language with a distinctly Mexican American ethnicity, rather than a Mexican immigrant identity. Mexican immigrants are more likely to be learning English as a second language whereas Mexican Americans born in the U.S. typically have a strong enough grasp of both the English and Spanish language to mix the two. As she states, ‘by code-switching, Mexican Americans born in the U.S. are able to index simultaneously their Mexican heritage (through Spanish) and their claim to a specifically U.S. identity (through English).’\textsuperscript{176} Thus while, code-switching is a conversational function, it is also connected to larger facts about an individual’s life world as it indexes elements of the wider social context including interaction histories and cultural context. As such, code-switching is equally a switch between language ideologies and social assumptions about particular language forms as it is a switch between language systems.\textsuperscript{177}

Conversation analyst Giovanna Alfonzetti argues that the complex nature of code-switching requires the linguistic and cultural knowledge from two distinct language systems.\textsuperscript{178} Because both languages contain their own ideologies, knowledge about when and with whom to use the language with requires an ‘in-group’ schemata or knowledge of a specific cultural context. The linguistic varieties spoken in such communities therefore represent the complex and multifaceted identities of their speakers and serve as markers of particular ethnic identities and bilingual communities.\textsuperscript{179} These varieties therefore can serve as symbols of affinity or ethnic pride. Having inherited features from the Spanish language, both Chicano English and
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Spanglish reflect a distinct second or multiple-generation Latino culture within the United States; however the two should not be conflated. Whereas Spanglish requires enough fluency in both the English and Spanish language to effectively mix the two (Es un little boy), Chicano English has no such requirements because it is an English-speaking dialect that is merely influenced by the accentual sounds of the Spanish language. It requires no fluency in the Spanish language in the same way that Spanglish does. It does however require a particular cultural knowledge and inheritance.

Earlier studies on immigrant communities similarly highlight code-switching as an iconic form of expressing multiple identities and specifically, the hybridity of second-generation speakers. Speaking specifically to the Mexican American experience, Anzaldúa describes the linguistic repertoire of the Mexican American community (Chicano English and Spanglish) as exemplars of their unique experience within the United States. These ‘border tongues,’ she argues, developed out of a necessity for Chicanos to identify themselves as a distinct people apart from the Anglo mainstream. As discussed earlier, speakers of minority dialects are often socially and economically marginalized on account of their linguistic deviancy. Use of these languages, Anzaldúa asserts, represents in many ways this struggle between the two cultures. Her words are worth quoting at length:

We needed a language with which we could communicate with ourselves, a secret language. For some of us, language is a homeland closer than the Southwest—for many Chicanos today live in the Midwest and the East. And because we are a complex, heterogeneous people, we speak many languages…For a people who are neither Spanish nor live in a country in which Spanish is the first language; for a people who live in a country in which
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English is the reigning tongue but who are not Anglo; for a people who cannot entirely identify with either standard (formal, Castillian) Spanish nor standard English, what recourse is left to them but to create their own language? A language which they can connect their identity to, one capable of communicating the realities and values true to themselves—a language with terms that are neither español ni ingles, but both. We speak a patois, a forked tongue, a variation of two languages.\footnote{Gloria Anzaldúa, ‘Taming Wild Tongues’ in \textit{Borderlands/The New Mestiza}, 3rd ed. (San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books, 1987), 77.}

As Anzaldúa demonstrates here, communities that utilize non-standard language varieties tend to enforce their own language usage loyalties based on priorities and issues of solidarity which are different from those of the mainstream language community. However, speakers who are bilingual or who speak in multiple dialects can find themselves oscillating between two competing language ideologies and social pressures. Indeed one of the central questions that often emerge among sociolinguists on the subject of code-switching is one related to power—that is, how language choice reflects power, status and inequality. This question is at the heart of this thesis and will continually be addressed throughout the subsequent chapters. Chapter Four more specifically, will consider the process in which bilingual students define one language as the dominant (or public) language and the other as the heritage (or private) language and the implications this has for their public and private selves.

Standard American English loyalists is that it is a broken version of English spoken by people whose first language is Spanish. As such, it is common for people within this school of thought to believe that the Spanish language hinders bilingual Latino children from learning English “properly.” Chicano English speakers and users of Spanglish are also criticized from Standard Spanish speakers for using the Spanish language “incorrectly” and more specifically for infusing it with pochismos, or Anglicisms. In Spanish, pocho means ‘cultural traitor’ and pochismos are Spanish words that are distorted by the English language (a common characteristic of Spanglish).

Take the following example where the English infinitive to watch has been conjugated with the Spanish language rule for the present participle. Conjugating the infinitive into the present participle in English typically involves adding (–ing) to the end of the verb: I am watch-ing a movie (where watch is the infinitive and watching is the present participle conjugation). This process of verb conjugation works very similarly in Spanish. In Spanish, the infinitive to watch is mirar. Translating this to the present participle usually involves adding (–ando) to the infinitive to produce: mirando.  

| I am watching a movie | Estoy mirando una película |

In certain Latino communities, most notably Chicano communities, it is not uncommon to hear the word watchando—which takes the English infinitive (to watch) and the Spanish present participle conjugation (–ando) to create a new word with communicative meaning (watching) as in: estoy watchando un película (I am watching a movie). Fusing these two elements from both languages, such that a third language or code emerges is known linguistically as code-mixing. More recently however, scholars have begun to more critically return to the concept of code-switching and code-mixing by introducing the concept
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of translanguaging. We will explore this concept in section 2.4 and discuss the ways in which this new approach to the discursive practices in language are affecting approaches to bilingual education and pedagogy.

Applying Spanish language rules to English words and vice versa is not uncommon in bilingual Latino communities, especially in Southern California. In fact, the Spanish language has become so infused with the English language that in some cases, some speakers of Chicano English or in this case Spanish, are unaware that the words they use are *anglicismos* (Anglicisms), and not standard Spanish.’ 184 This particular phenomenon is unlike code-switching, because there is a blend of two differing language elements rather than a to and fro shift between two languages. As a word neither formally a part of Spanish or English, the word *watchando*, might more colloquially be recognized as Spanglish. While this linguistic expression may be familiar in some Latino communities throughout the southwest, it can as discussed above, be the subject of severe ridicule amongst both native Spanish and English speakers. 185 In fact, the word *pocho* is also commonly used as a pejorative for Mexican Americans who speak Spanish with an accent characteristic of Standard American English or behave in ways that are stereotypically viewed as white, or Anglo. 186

Chicanos who have grown up speaking either Chicano English or Spanglish, Anzaldúa describes, often internalize the belief from members of their own ethnic group that they speak an illegitimate Spanish, ‘a bastard language.’ 187 However, more recent research suggests a decline in this attitude among younger speakers of Spanglish and Chicano English. Fought’s 2010 research shows that young Chicanos in California feel that Chicano English and Spanglish distinguishes them from people who live or come directly from Mexico. This change
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in attitude, Fought argues, might have more to do with the increasingly noticeable representation of Latino linguistic codes in the media which reinforce its use by a distinct ethnic community with particular needs, tastes and heritage. Others have similarly observed an increasing sense of ethnic solidarity associated with Chicano English and African American Vernacular English. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes argue that this growing affinity is the result of increased community based activism that developed most rampantly during the 1970s and as a result of increased portrayals of Latinos and African Americans in the media. In the process, Wolfram and Schilling-Estes contend, Standard English became more widely viewed as “white speech.”

Not all features of Chicano English are thought to stem from the Spanish parent language. Chicano English also uses multiple negation verb patterns as in: ‘He didn’t say nothing to nobody.’ This marker of negation is by no means distinct to Chicano English. In fact, some scholars believe that the double negation feature might have been directly inherited from contact with other English dialects, in particular African American Vernacular English (AAVE), an English language variety that tends to make use of double negation structures in very similar ways to the Spanish, French and Italian language.\(^{188}\) Double negation is perhaps one of the most stigmatized aspects of AAVE, especially within the formal school system. But as linguists argue, there is no logical basis for this stigmatization—that is, acceptance or non-acceptance of the double negative is arbitrary.\(^{189}\) Matters of grammaticality are distinct from communicative effectiveness and therefore are independent issues.\(^{190}\) However, as discussed in the beginning of the chapter, language is more than a system of linguistic communication. Language is a symbolic system that communicates social identities and socio-political histories and experiences. The myth of a standard dialect, and its corollary the standard accent however,

\(^{188}\) Ibid.,
\(^{189}\) Whatley, ‘Language Among Black Americans in C.A.’
\(^{190}\) For more on this see Lippi-Green, *English with an Accent*; Fairclough and Wodak, ‘Critical Discourse Analysis; William Labov, et al. ‘A National Map of The Regional Dialects of American English.’
reveals the level of significance that is given to particular linguistic varieties and by extension particular language communities.

Like other language varieties, AAVE has specific rules of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and syntax but at different volumes and intervals than the others examined. Unlike speakers of Chicano English, speakers of AAVE might pronounce *nothing*, or *notheeng*, as *not’n*. The roots of AAVE are thought to derive from the wider and rich assortment of West African languages that were transplanted to North America as a result of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. What developed was a creole language, a language specially formed and adapted when groups not sharing a common language need to communicate.\(^1\) The Creolist Hypothesis asserts that an English-based creole language spread throughout the African diaspora and onwards to the plantations of the American South.\(^2\) While AAVE has changed significantly over the centuries, this creole language served as a prototype and therefore traces of its grammatical structure can still be found in a number of AAVE traits. For example, the absence of a linking verb as in ‘*You ugly*’, the loss of inflection suffixes such as the –s on verbs (e.g. *she like school*) as well as certain distinctive verb particles, such as *done* to indicate completed action (*He done went*). All of these traits are typical of well-known English-based creoles.\(^3\)

This has not been so much of a comparison of the two non-standard dialects as an attempt to demonstrate how much they deviate from Standard American English. That deviation, as we shall see in the next section, has been stigmatized in the public school system. The rest of this thesis will focus on the way in which Chicano English has been subjected to that same marginalization. But before we can fully understand the process by which that has happened and its significance we need to consider the broader context of recent attempts to


\(^3\) Wolfram and Torbert, ‘*When Linguistic Worlds Collide*,’ 227.
impose language standardization in public schools. The last section of this chapter therefore looks at the Ebonics debate of the 1970s and 1990s.

2.4 Translanguaging

As discussed in the previous section, bilingual individuals’ flexible and strategic language practice has long been described as code-switching or code-mixing. The emphasis on code-switching and code-mixing in research has offered extensive and valuable insights into the linguistic experiences of bilingual speakers; however they almost exclusively detail the habits of bilingual speakers in speech and oral communication. Conceptualizing language in this way, however, has limited our ability to think complexly about language and bilingualism. To an extent, terms like bilingual, multilingual, and plurilingual fail to adequately account for the complexities involved in communicating with one or several language systems. In an attempt to acknowledge the multiple discursive practices in which bilingual speakers participate, educational researchers and bilingual education advocates have turned their attention to the notion of translanguaging. 194

Translanguaging is a new and developing term that is used to refer to the various formations and wider processes of communicative practice among bilingual language users. This includes code-switching and code-mixing, but also literacy practices—reading and writing strategies, translation and trans-enunciating. 195 Translanguaging is also a pedagogic theory rooted in an epistemology that is further distanced from how code-switching and code-

---

194 The term ‘translanguaging’ was created by Cen Williams, a well-known Welsh educationalist in the 1980s, for the planned and systematic use of two languages for teaching and learning inside the same lesson. For more on her work see C. Baker, ‘Biliteracy and Transliteracy in Wales: Language Planning and The Welsh National Curriculum.’ In N.H. Hornberger (Ed.), Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research and Practice In Multilingual Settings (Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2003): 71-90.
mixing have previously been conceptualized. Studies of code-switching and code-mixing often describe the practice as either a switch or blend between two autonomous languages.\textsuperscript{196} Translanguaging on the other hand, views this practice as part of a process of accessing the full extent of a singular linguistic repertoire that draws on features from languages that are socially constructed as two separate languages.\textsuperscript{197} Accessing this range of linguistic tools, the bilingual speaker is able to strategically communicate, articulate thoughts, process information and effectively make meaning.\textsuperscript{198}

In earlier scholarship, translanguaging is most often examined in the context of bilingual education and as a pedagogy that builds on the fluid language practices that bilingual students use to interpret, learn and communicate material.\textsuperscript{199} Relatively recently however, scholars have shifted their focus from translanguaging practices in the classroom to translanguaging practices in everyday life.\textsuperscript{200} The work of Ofelia Garcia in particular, was key to this shift in scholarship. Based on observations of translanguaging practices in bilingual communities, her work valuably extends the practice of translanguaging beyond the context of pedagogy and bilingual education to one that encompasses the use of translanguaging as a strategy for navigating bicultural contexts and the complex realities of the home and community.\textsuperscript{201}

\textsuperscript{196} Refer to the research presented in the previous section.


\textsuperscript{198} Ibid.


Many of the examples of Chicano English and Spanglish provided in the previous section therefore are examples of individuals translanguageing: they are accessing the full extent of their linguistic range to strategically communicate meaning, process information and participate in processes of inclusion and exclusion through verbal expressions like code-switching and mixing. Translanguageing as a concept is useful because it challenges traditional understandings of bilingualism and language in general. Ultimately, translanguageing supports an approach to bilingualism that ‘is centered, not on languages, as has often been the case, but on the practices of bilinguals that are readily observable in order to make sense of their multilingual worlds.’\textsuperscript{202} Following from this logic, we are all language— that is, we use language in strategic ways to maximize communicative and cognitive.\textsuperscript{203} Translanguageers are those who perform this practice across languages that are often conceptualized as separate. Conceptualizing language in this way has limited our ability to think complexly about language and bilingualism. To an extent, terms like bilingual, multilingual and plurilingual fail to adequately account for the complexities involved in communicating with one or several language systems.

While scholars have begun to review translanguageing beyond the sphere of pedagogy, they continue to recognize the potential implications that this conceptual approach has for bilingual education. Transformative pedagogies like translanguageing offer the opportunity for bilingualism and language to be re-conceptualized in ways that recognize bilingualism as a resource rather than a liability. Chapter three will explore examples of translanguageing in the classroom as part of this thesis’s observational study and Chapter six will return to the suggestion of translanguageing as a transformative pedagogy that has the potential to redress the asymmetry of language use and value and the implications of this for language minorities.

\textsuperscript{202} O. Garcia, ‘Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging,’ 40.
2.5 Language and Education

As discussed, the educational system in the United States has never been a neutral system. The education of American children is situated in larger issues about national identity, liberalism, democracy, race and capitalism. Respectively, bilingual education and English Immersion Programs are situated in larger conversations about immigration, status and power, multiculturalism and individual rights. The U.S. education system makes little accommodation for dialects beyond Standard American English and this has significant consequences for students who speak a non-standard form. The grammatical differences between AAVE and Standard American English for example, presented additional obstacles for AAVE speakers within the public school. In his essay, ‘Bridging the Divide: African American English’ John Baugh provides linguistic illustrations which detail the subtle and yet substantive barriers that speakers of AAVE are confronted with when they come into contact with the Standard American dialect that is demanded from them by their school setting. Baugh’s critiques ultimately give rise to questions about the purpose of public education and the extent of individual language rights. Similar questions are raised in the more contemporary debate over bilingual education and Latino ‘English-Language Learner’s. Indeed there are significant parallels to be drawn between the Latino community and the African American community in relation to language rights, language education and public schools.

The alarming school failure of African Americans led some educators to believe that AAVE was an important contributor to the achievement gap between blacks and whites.\(^{204}\) Indeed, a common assumption about speakers of AAVE is that they are language deficient.\(^{205}\) Although the debate over whether to recognize African American Vernacular English in the


\(^{205}\) Ibid.
public school has been waging vehemently since the 1970s when activists called attention to the subtractive institutional policies in place in the school setting, the most controversial attempt at addressing the achievement gap occurred in Oakland, California in 1996. Responding to the alarming rate of academic failure among African American students, the African American Task Force of Oakland, California recommended to the school board that Black English be used in schools. They argued that AAVE would serve as a springboard to affirm African American students’ linguistic and cultural experiences, to develop competency in Standard American English and raise academic achievement. In December of 1996 the Oakland school board passed a resolution recognizing the legitimacy of African American Vernacular English and officially recognized it as the language of some 28,000 African American students in the Oakland county public schools. The declaration was met with robust political and social backlash. The Linguistic Society of America however, proclaimed that:

> The systematic and expressive nature of the grammar and pronunciation patterns of the African-American vernacular has been established by numerous scientific studies over the past thirty years. Characterizations of Ebonics as ‘slang,’ ‘mutant,’ ‘lazy,’ ‘defective,’ ‘ungrammatical,’ or ‘broken English’ are incorrect and demeaning. There is evidence from Sweden, the U.S., and other countries that speakers of other varieties can be aided in their learning of the standard variety by pedagogical approaches which recognize the legitimacy of the other varieties of a language. From this perspective, the Oakland School Board’s decision to recognize

206 Ovando, ‘Language Diversity and Education.’
the vernacular of African-American students in teaching them Standard English is linguistically and pedagogically sound.\textsuperscript{207}

By recognizing the Oakland School Board’s efforts, the Linguistic Society of America accomplished two important tasks. Firstly, it affirmed the linguistic integrity of AAVE. Secondly, it asserted that AAVE be recognized as a dialect of English rather than a separate language. Significantly, the debate over Ebonics, as it unfolded in Oakland, brought the racialized undercurrents of the language debate back to the surface. The non-standard grammatical structures of AAVE were explained as the inability of African Americans to learn English properly rather than as the nuanced and rule-governed system that linguists have long defended it to be. This highlighted the racialized natures and issues of social control embedded in language policies and practice.

Linguists consistently argue that all spoken languages and language varieties are equal in linguistic (scientific and structural) terms.\textsuperscript{208} Thus, while the dialects differ greatly in grammatical organization, syntax, vocabulary and accent, each variety, as Lippi-green argues, is ‘equally capable of expressing a full range of ideas and experiences, and of developing to meet new needs as they arise.’\textsuperscript{209} Therefore, no language or language variation is linguistically superior to another. However, the process of standardization and the institutionalization of particular language forms however calculates the extent to which all other dialects deviate. When the standard is tied to a reputation of formality, propriety and idealism variance, or deviancy, the language form will be correspondingly tied to notions of informality, impropriety and un-idealisms. Lippi-Green explains that statements such as ‘I ain’t got none’ or ‘I gotta do this’ are grammatically correct statements in the English language because they abide by the rules of their own grammatical system and structure.\textsuperscript{210} Its designation as ‘slang speak’ by the
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larger national culture however is what categorizes this way of speaking as incorrect. This variety, though recognized, is often interpreted as ‘bad English,’ primarily because it deviates from the accepted norms found in Standard American English. Thus, while the linguistic literature contends that the structural variations of non-standard dialects are as linguistically viable as the structural variation of the standard dialect, the significance assigned to the non-standard variation is socially governed.

The value assigned to certain languages—and language varieties—is often determined by the social conventions and value placed on those who speak it. When certain varieties of the English language become associated with an unfavorable group it becomes stigmatized.\textsuperscript{211} This stigmatization tends to be predicated or at least distinguished by specific racial markers. Chicano English and African American Vernacular English for example, two dialects associated with two ethnic minority groups, are often viewed as substandard versions of the English language. That particular varieties of the English language are publically sanctioned and standardized conveys the extent to which there are socially favorable and socially unfavorable dialects of the same language. These can often, as discussed throughout this chapter, be traced along racial and ethnic lines. The general conception of what comprises ‘good’ English and, following that, what comprises ‘bad’ English are seemingly stratified among racial and class lines, and continue to perpetuate ideologies of elite social groups. This continues to result in the production of policies with a signage of Anglo-American supremacy.

There are striking similarities between the assumed norms of speaking in a standard English/non-accent and other hidden norms codified in legal institutions and culture. As several feminist theorists have pointed out, everyone has a gender, but the hidden institutional norm is male. Similarly, as critical race theorists have pointed out, everyone has a race, but

\textsuperscript{211} Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, ‘Language Evolution or Dying Traditions?’
the hidden norm is white. ‘When the parties are in a relationship of domination and subordination,’ M.J, Matsuda argues, ‘we tend to say that the dominant is normal and the subordinate is different from normal.’ And so it is with language and more specifically, how one speaks.

The Ebonics debate reveals how language standardization is used to shape language behavior and how the institutionalization of particular language forms affects speakers of minority dialects. For many, use of non-standard dialects like African American Vernacular English suggest not only an unwillingness to learn Standard American English but an inability to learn the language, further fueling ideas of intellectual inferiority among minority groups. For those who prefer the norms of Standard American English, non-standard varieties represent, ‘an obstacle to advancement, something better unlearned, denied or forgotten.’

2.6 Conclusion

The language policies and practice that began ferociously at the beginning of World War I with an attack against the German language seem to continue nearly one hundred years on as an attack against the Spanish language and arguably, against the Latino people. The assimilative strategies practiced by the public schools during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century strike a significant resemblance to the demands for English-language monolingualism in contemporary American society. In this opening chapter I have attempted to establish language as an institution supported by ideologies so the chapters that follow can more clearly elucidate the ways in which these ideologies affect Latinos labelled ‘English-Language Learner’s.’
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As outlined in the thesis introduction, the topic of education for Latinos in the United States is an issue inextricably bound to language. The myths associated with Chicano English, outlined in this chapter, continue to have considerable repercussions for Latinos in the educational system. This subject will be explored more extensively in the following chapter, which focuses on California’s 1998 passage of Proposition 227 and its impact on Latino English-Learners and educators nearly twenty years on. Policy and practice questions regarding the education of bilingual or linguistically diverse students are ultimately situated in debates regarding the legitimacy of the language and culture in question. As anti-immigrant sentiments and rallies for the preservation of “traditional” American identities significantly increase in states like California and throughout the United States, it is both practical and salient to understand the intersection of ideology, policy and practice and the resulting impact on the growing number of Latino ‘English-Language Learner’s.’
Chapter Three

‘We’re Going to Have to do Something About Your Tongue:’

Latinos and Proposition 227

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explores how ideology informs our views towards bilingual speakers and our approaches to the education of language minorities. As a case study this chapter focuses on the gradual decline of bilingual education programs in the state of California brought on by Proposition 227, and their replacement with programs that emphasized English-Only instruction. At the same time, the chapter looks closely at the process of translinguaging. Building on the research of translinguaging practices in the classroom discussed in Chapter Two, the qualitative portion of the research presented here explores the nature of the translinguaging practices of two bilingual Latina teachers. Focusing on these daily instances of translinguaging allows us to see how language functions in daily-life.

Proposition 227 was written in response to widespread discontent over California’s pedagogical and political approaches to the education of non-English speaking children in public schools, a student demographic that developed rapidly alongside increased immigration from Mexico throughout the 1990s. In the years preceding the Proposition, the academic underachievement of bilingual students and the low rate in which they developed into ‘Fluent English Proficient’ learners convinced many that bilingual education had failed as a pedagogical strategy. The campaign in support of the initiative, championed as ‘English for the Children,’ promised to provide language minority students with the English-speaking skills necessary to excel academically and by extension within the employment sector. The measure’s intent was to inject more English instruction into the then titled ‘English as a Second Language’ curriculum. In so doing, Proposition 227 drastically altered the education of
language minority students in California’s public schools.\textsuperscript{215} Passed in 1998, Proposition 227 effectively eliminated the state’s bilingual education programs by significantly limiting the opportunities for students to receive instructional support in their heritage language. In the United States, the term heritage language refers to the languages of immigrant, refugee, and indigenous groups. In principle, this includes all languages, including English but in practice, the term is used to refer to all languages other than English.\textsuperscript{216} As demonstrated in the previous chapter, debates over the education of language minorities often emerges in response to a growing number of language minority students. As such, the debates are ones often situated among larger discourses about immigration, assimilation and national identity. Let us more closely examine the political and social climate from which Proposition 227 emerges.

3.2 Proposition 227

Twenty years prior to the passage of Proposition 227, California had a legislative tradition of encouraging and even mandating bilingual education programs. Compared to the rest of the United States, California had implemented some of the most progressive laws protecting the educational rights of language minorities. Its passage of the Chacon-Mascone Bilingual-Bicultural Act in 1976, for example, was the first state legislative act that required school districts to provide language minority students with bilingual instruction when more than ten students of the same language background were enrolled in the same grade. The Act was developed in part as a result of the federal declarations made in Lau vs. Nichols.\textsuperscript{217} Unlike the federal legislation, California’s bilingual legislation was actually very progressive and explicitly proclaimed that bilingual education was a ‘right’ of ‘English-Language

Learner’s—but it was one that it would revoke twenty-two years later with the passage of Proposition 227.218

It bears emphasis that while once bilingual education was considered a right to be honored, from the 1980s-1990s it was increasingly defined in political discourse as something that was harmful to social cohesion and would even hold children back despite research that suggested otherwise. In fact, in 1980, the Department of Education concluded that native language instruction was a key component in the education of language minority children. Researchers sponsored by the Department of Education argued that in order for students to achieve at the highest rate possible, students should be kept on grade level using native language instruction until they gained grade-level proficiency in English. An attempt to put the framework into practice began in late 1981. After five years of initial case study work, the research revealed that the median scores of the 3,500 students tested in English reading, writing and mathematics showed a positive trend. Unfortunately, the study’s funding was terminated early precluding the possibility of further research.219 Findings advocating the benefits of additive bilingual education were later eclipsed by a political discourse that suggested a strong contempt for immigrants and which strongly encouraged the use of the English language in public spaces.

In 1986 California voters overwhelmingly supported the declaration of the English language as the state’s official language, a measure that significantly affected the state’s obligation to provide students with bilingual education. Proposition 63, approved in the same year, made speaking a language other than English when seeking state services illegal. Nationally, the Reagan administration was leading a major campaign against bilingual education and immigrants more widely. Believing the United States to be ‘a nation at risk of

218 Jacinta Ma, ‘What Works for the Children? What We Know and Don’t Know About Bilingual Education’, The Civil Rights Project (Harvard University, 2002).
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balkanization’ Reagan’s administration urged increased militarization of the U.S.-Mexico border and ‘back to basics’ education that seemed synonymous with an emphasis on English-Language Immersion programs and the eradication of bilingual education.  

An increasingly hostile climate towards immigrants—particularly Mexican immigrants—and multiculturalism ensued in the strong political discourse wielded by Reagan and his administration. Research shows that the environment against Mexican immigrants was so aggressive that many Mexican Americans felt compelled to take a stand against large-scale immigration from Mexico and show support for English immersion programs in the schools. Historian David G. Gutierrez argues that Latino support for policies that effectively targeted Mexican immigrants was the result of the indiscriminate homogenization of Mexican Americans and other U.S. born Latinos by Anglo Americans. His research shows that in an attempt to protect their own tenuous position in U.S. society, ‘increasing numbers of Texas Mexicans began to take exception to Anglo Americans dismissal of them as mere Mexicans.’ Their separation from this group, he claims, often came in their political objections for policies that appeared sympathetic to the immigrant cause.

This anti-immigrant rhetoric and political trend continued into the 1990s. Proposition 187, passed in 1994, prohibited undocumented immigrants from receiving health and education services; two years later, Proposition 209 effectively eliminated affirmative action in housing, employment, and admission to institutions of higher education.  

These earlier initiatives were instrumental in paving the way for Proposition 227, which ultimately viewed bilingual education as a public handout for immigrant families who refused to assimilate into

---

a English-speaking American culture. However, lead author Ron Unz and fellow proponents championed it as a pro-immigrant initiative.

Unz and other supporters of Proposition 227 argued that bilingual education was the principle cause of underachievement among immigrant groups, particularly Latinos. Concerned by the widening achievement gap between Latino students and their white and Asian counterparts, some Latino politicians publically showed their support for the bill. Advertisements promoting the initiative also appeared prominently on Spanish-language media making the proposition well known among the Spanish-speaking community. Of the 70 percent of California voters who supported the bill, a significant number were Latinos. Polling figures from 1999 reveal that 50 percent of Latinos supported Proposition 227 while only 32 percent opposed it. Research since the passage of Proposition 227 reveals that Latino families, pessimistic about their children’s future possibilities with respect to education at the time, voted in support of the bill in hopes that it would improve their child’s education.

Previous studies on immigrant communities reveal that the frequency with which non-English speaking minorities inherit the belief that bilingualism is harmful to their child in English-only environments is quite common. Furthermore, the rate in which second or third generation immigrants develop a preference for the English language is high. Each new generation of Latinos living in the United States, Herbert Gans documented in 1992, preferred the English language more than the previous generation. This, he argued, was because second and third generation immigrants were more attuned to and familiar with the
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cultural values embedded in American life.\textsuperscript{228} Even though passage of Proposition 227 has had the most negative affect on Latinos, its positioning as a pro-immigrant initiative—with an assimilationist slant—that would enhance the educational opportunities afforded to English learners assuaged fears of academic failure for many immigrant and non-English speaking communities. Statistics from the Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanics, however, reveal that at the time of its passage, less than one-third of all English Learners were enrolled in bilingual programs prior to the passage of Proposition 227. Latinos’ poor academic achievement therefore cannot sufficiently be attributed to the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of bilingual programing.\textsuperscript{229}

Nevertheless, these statistics and the research demonstrating the benefits of primary language instruction produced at the time, could not compete with the incensed political rhetoric targeting Latinos. In a fundraising letter for the campaign, Unz expressed explicit beliefs about Latinos’ unwillingness or inability to assimilate when he compared Spanish speakers unfavorably to his own Jewish grandparents who, according to Unz, ‘came to California in the 1920s and 1930s as poor European immigrants…to WORK and become successful . . . not to sit back and be a burden on those who were already here!’\textsuperscript{230} Implicit in his assertion is the assumption that the immigrants of the 1980s and 1990s came to drain the resources of the United States by demanding programs that catered to their minority culture rather than assimilate into the host culture.

It is this kind of anti-immigrant rhetoric that critics of Proposition 227 often highlighted in their campaigns against the initiative. Legal scholar Nirej Sekhon more specifically argued that Proposition 227 created an “us” versus “them” binary by

differentiating “them” as non-English speakers: ‘Proposition 227 not only demands that “they” learn our language,’ but, Sekhon continues, the Proposition ‘demands that they forget their own’ which ‘unleashes a salvo in the bilingual education debate, but is a crucial moment in the broader debate over assimilation and acculturation.’ Additionally, the subtractive approach to language education embedded in Proposition 227 prohibits the development of proficient bilinguals. Research consistently reveals that teaching students in their primary language enhances their learning of content subjects like math, science and social studies. Ultimately they argue that an appropriate perspective for teaching language minority students is one that recognizes that learning becomes enhanced when it occurs in contexts that are socio-culturally, linguistically and cognitively meaningful for the learner. The failure of elementary and secondary schools to recognize or value the languages that learners bring to the classroom, adversaries argued, can contribute to the diminishment of students’ psychological well-being in addition to language loss. Rather than view the heritage language and culture through a lens of deficit, multiculturalist and additive multilingual perspectives urge schools to see these as valuable educational resources.

This basic premise of Proposition 227 challenges the notion that languages other than English have a legitimate and valuable place in the education of students and in American society more broadly. This bias against non-English languages positions the language and culture of non-English speaking students in a subordinate and inferior role. This thesis argues that the curriculum that emerged from Proposition 227 effectively places speakers of minority dialects in a position of failure. Specifically the problem arises from the English-Only emphasis on language education and instruction.

3.3 English Immersion and ‘English-Language Learners’

The English immersion program adopted by the state of California in 1999—known as the English Language Development program (ELD)—focuses on structural language learning methods: the instruction of phonology and Standard English grammatical structures. The central aim is for students to ‘indicate that he or she can produce most of the English phonemes when reading and responding aloud.’ This proficiency is measured by the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), a required state test for any student whose home language is not English (by law) or for any student who does not appear to have a firm grasp of the English language (by teacher referral). The latter is often subject to the teachers’ expectations of what adequately suffices as a firm proficiency of the English language. As discussed in Chapter Two, this subjectivity is often guided by larger language ideologies and discourses surrounding bilingualism and bilingual communities.

Given the variances found within American English alone, the production of Standard English phonemes can prove difficult or simply unfamiliar to speakers of non-standard English dialects who may not conform to the same grammatical structures and phonemes found within Standard American English. This does not (and should not) indicate a lack of fluency in the English language. Their performance on the CELDT however may very well indicate a lack of English fluency regardless of whether or not the student can communicate effectively in English. Failure to demonstrate a proficiency in the English language would have the student labeled as an ‘English-Language Learner.’

---
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One out of four students attending California public schools is classified as an ‘English-Language Learner’ (ELL)—that is 1.5 million students. California’s ELL population represents one-third of the nation’s 4.4 million ‘English-Language Learner’ population. The previous chapter demonstrated that there are several kinds of English. ‘English-Language Learner’ as it applies in the educational context however, does not account for this vast linguistic repertoire. Instead, the term and accompanying statistics suggest that an overwhelming majority of the United States student population have little or no schema for the English language and that they are learning formal English for the first time when they enter the school. While this may be the case for some students, mainly first generation immigrants, for most students within the English Language Development Program, this is not the case.

The term has received considerable criticism from educators, sociolinguists and bilingual education advocates for subverting the fact that the majority of ‘English-Language Learner’s are bilingual speakers to varying degrees, or predominantly English speakers of a minority dialect. The term ignores the varying and complex ways in which languages are acquired, processed and used; it does not account for or give credit to an individual’s ability to translanguge. The term and superficial classification system to which it yields however, is an accurate reflection of America’s negative view towards bilingualism and how languages are used; ELL describes the central deficit we see in one’s inability to speak English fluently. The implication is that ‘English-Language Learner’s are less cognitively developed than their English-Only counterparts.

The content standards for the English Language Development (ELD) program issued by the California Department of Education for example, state that ‘English-Language
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Learner’s enter school with language abilities very different from monolingual English-speaking students, who begin school with speaking vocabularies of between 2,000 and 8,000 words.\textsuperscript{238} The comparison between the vocabulary development of monolingual-English speakers and ‘English-Language Learner’s suggests a discrepancy in ability levels. The inference is that monolingual English learners begin formal schooling ‘with speaking vocabularies between 2,000-8,000 words’ whereas ‘English-Language Learner’s do not. The purpose of the ELD program, like those outlined by Proposition 227, is to assist ELLs in ‘[catching] up with the state’s monolingual English speakers.’\textsuperscript{239} Immediately, ELLs are placed in a position of inferiority—that is, at a lower level of intelligence or slower pace of cognitive development.

Research on language development in children consistently reveals that bilingual and monolingual speakers develop at a similar rate and gain familiarity with the speech patterns and words of their respective language within the first year of development.\textsuperscript{240} Thus any issues in language development are likely to be cognitive or a reflection of wider outside forces. This nuance is completely undermined by the program’s implementation plan, which implies that the vocabularies of ‘English-Language Learner’s are underdeveloped in comparison to monolingual English speakers. What the standards mean to say is that monolingual English learners begin formal schooling with English speaking vocabularies between 2,000-8,000 words. Its omission of this key word implicitly suggests that monolingual English speakers are more advanced in their language and cognitive abilities.

Furthermore, the ELD curriculum has been criticized for isolating ELLs in remedial classrooms that subtract from the content areas of the curriculum, subjects like Science, Math

\textsuperscript{238} California English Language Development Standard Implementation Plan Nov. 25, 2013, California Department of Education, pg. 4.

\textsuperscript{239} English Language Development Program Content Standards for California Public Schools, California Department of Education (July 1999), 11.

\textsuperscript{240} Auer, \textit{Code-Switching in Conversation}; Field, \textit{Bilingualism in the USA}, 2011; Lippi-Green, \textit{English with an Accent}.  
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and Social Studies. The ELD classes are designed first and foremost to teach students English, with only a secondary focus on academic content. This has a significant effect on the ‘English-Language Learner’ population, a majority of which are Latino. Indeed, Latino students are among the lowest-performing student groups throughout the United States and this is especially true for those labeled English-Language-Learner; their academic performance falls below that of all other students nationwide. In a 2008 review of more than 500 studies on ‘English-Language Learner’s, Stanford University education professor Claude Goldenberg observed that one consistent finding was that learning to read in a child’s first language boosts reading achievement in the second language. Language policies and pedagogies that block the use of the primary language in class ignore the scientific evidence, which suggest that bilingual immersion is constructive.

3.4 Participants and Context

The primary case material presented here was collected through on-site observations and interviews with classroom teachers and school principals. Data was collected from two majority Latino elementary schools southwest of downtown Los Angeles: Braddock Drive Elementary and ICEF Vista Academy. The two schools are located a half-mile away from each other and therefore occupy the same community space and share the same pool of residents. With the schools situated less than a half-mile from the largest government public

housing projects on the Westside many of the students attending Braddock Drive and ICEF Vista are residents of this housing project.244

Both schools operate under the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles School Unified District, the largest public school system in California and the second largest in the nation. Spanning 710 miles of the greater Los Angeles area, LAUSD is responsible for over 200,000 students and represents students from over 92 different language groups. Between 2010-2011, LAUSD served 667,251 students of which 73 percent was made up of Latino or ‘Hispanic’ students. At the time of the study, Braddock Drive Elementary had a student population that was 77 percent Latino and ICEF Vista Academy had a student population that was 90 percent Latino. In both schools the ethnicity of the staff is comparable to the student body. Both schools contained an English-Language-Learner population that was 40 percent or higher indicating that a large portion of the student body was either a fluent bilingual speaker or learning English as a second language.245 A majority of the school faculty and staff on both campuses are bilingual. In the event that a faculty member did not speak Spanish, translators were brought in. Braddock Drive, in particular went to great lengths to provide effective communication by providing a parent meeting, which contained roughly 10 female parents, with head-sets allowing for the translator to speak into a microphone and deliver the translation while the English speaker was still talking.

This particular area of Los Angeles, contains a large population of Spanish speakers, both monolingual and English-Spanish bilingual. As discussed in the previous chapter, this will inform the models of both Spanish and English available for acquisition. This becomes significant in an educational context where Standard American English is privileged and taught exclusively as the “correct” and superior mode of the English language. With varying

---

244 The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles http://www.hacla.org accessed on May 2015.
degrees and varieties of the Spanish language spoken within the community, it is not uncommon for individuals from this particular neighborhood to resemble the speech patterns and language behaviors associated with Chicano English.\textsuperscript{246}

Research indicates that ELL’s are placed and kept in a limited selection of low-level school courses with the rationale that their English is not proficient enough to allow them to cope with more advanced classes.\textsuperscript{247} This often gives the impression that ELL classes are remedial and stigmatizes the students within these classes. My observation at Braddock Drive revealed that only an hour of the school day is allocated for math instruction while 3.5 hours of the school day is dedicated to Language Arts. In a school day that is only 6.5 hours long, 3.5 hours on Language Arts takes up more than fifty percent of the day. The time spent on Language Arts instruction is not the primary issue; most schools emphasize lessons in Language Arts and Maths however, the time spent on the Language Arts subjects becomes an issue of concern given the content for those in the ELD program. ELL Language Arts instruction at Braddock for example focused primarily on pronunciation. This would happen every morning as the teacher guided the phonetic sounds of each letter of the alphabet for the students to repeat. In fact most of the Language Arts instruction for ELD classes under observation was dedicated to Phonemic Awareness. This is in keeping with the move toward phonics-based reading instruction that accompanied the implementation of Proposition 227. Throughout the 1990s, a series of laws and collaborative efforts between the state legislature, the Governor, and the California Department of Education culminated in the California Reading Initiative. The new policy advocated a ‘balanced’ approach to literacy instruction, stating that:

\textsuperscript{246} For more on the idiosyncrasies of this dialect please refer to Chapter Two. For more details on the schools’ population, staff-to-student ratio and staff-to-student ratio please see Appendix.

\textsuperscript{247} Cummins, ‘Empowering Minority Students’
A balanced approach involves considerable time and effort dedicated to basic decoding while attention is given to important meaning-based aspects of reading. For most students, however, intensive direct teaching of phonemic awareness, sound-symbol relationships, blending skills, and reading fluency is of primary importance.\textsuperscript{248}

The initiative ultimately positioned phonics and phonemic awareness as the primary concerns for early literacy instruction. Consistent with the move on the state level toward phonics-based instruction, in February of 1998 the school adopted Open Court Collections for Young Scholars (hereafter, Open Court) as the school wide Language Arts series. Open Court uses explicit teacher-directed instruction to teach phonemic awareness, phonics, and reading comprehension. During the instructional components of the program, which include teacher-directed writing and reading exercises, teachers use scripts for all teacher questions, prompts, and responses. During blending, a center-piece of the program, teachers read all sounds of a word and have students repeat them. The teacher tightly controls Reading and writing activities.

Observations of the English-Only classrooms—classes with students of the same grade level who were labeled as proficient in English, revealed that students in this group cover a wider range of Language Arts topics, including thematic modes of writing and literary techniques. The English-Only class I visited at Braddock Drive for example, was discussing the differences between fiction and non-fiction writing as well as studying poetry. The walls of the classroom were adorned with more creative writing samples something completely absent from the ELD classroom of the same grade next door. While the guidelines

\textsuperscript{248} California Department of Education, California State Board of Education, \textit{California Reading Initiative and Special Education in California: Critical Ideas Focusing on Meaningful Reform}, 1999 (California Special Education Reading Task Force), 4.
for the Language Arts Content Standards state that, with the exception of the ELD component, the standards for the two classes should not vary in content there is clearly a distinction in the presentation of information and content. For example, three of the students in the ELD class were technically classified as EO students yet they were placed in the ELD classes because they were thought to have some learning differences. This would reinforce the notion that the ELD classes are ‘different’ from the English-Only classes and that students in these classrooms learn less rigorous material at a slower pace. This reinforces the stigma that bilingual or minority dialect students are less academically able than English monolingual speakers.

The negative stigmatization of these students, and the ‘English-Language Learner’ label is so severe that parents have been known to lie about whether English is the primary language spoken in the home. Spokesperson for the Center for Applied Linguistics, a Washington, D.C.-based research organization, Julie Sugarman, mentions that ‘bilingual education has basically become a dirty word.’ Interviews with the ELD teachers from Braddock Drive and ICEF Vista reveal that parents fear that the ELD program presents academic material at a slower pace than the English-Only classes and as that their children will suffer from being ‘held back’ academically if they are labeled as an ‘English-Language-Learner.’

The overwhelming number of Latino ‘English-Language Learner’ also further stigmatizes the Spanish language and Latinos as an ethnic group. Interviews with the ELD teacher from school 1 described a case where a Japanese-English bilingual student was removed from her ELD class on special request by the parent.

---

[The parent] pulled the child out because she was afraid that I was
going to be speaking to the kids in Spanish all day long. [People]think their children are going to be held back.\textsuperscript{251}

The connections made between bilingualism and academic differences is part of a longhistory of how bilingualism and bilingual education has been viewed in the United States andmore specifically how speakers of non-English languages have been viewed. Assumptionsabout Latino academic performance in particular are connected to sustained stereotypes aboutLatinos and the Spanish language. For decades Latinos’ elusive academic success has beenexplained as a cultural pathology, or an unwillingness, or an inability, to assimilate.\textsuperscript{252} Thisunderstanding conveniently disregards the systemic, economic, and ideological barriers toacademic success. These stereotypes not only affect the way non-Latinos view bilingualeducation but also the way Latinos view bilingual education and bilingualism in general. Aninterview with Ms. Riojas from ICEF Vista, revealed that the Latino parents from her classprefer English immersion programs over more traditional bilingual programs because it isthey are viewed as a deterrent from academic success.

Most of the teachers and administrators interviewed for this portion of the researchviewed the English-Only instruction deeply problematic. Ms. Riojas from ICEF Vista forexample, linked the English-Only emphasis of the curriculum as an example ofethnocentrism. In my interview with her she further explained that the inherent belief in thesuperiority of the English language is one reason why ‘even some Latinos frown upon[bilingual education].’ \textsuperscript{253} In the following section, I demonstrate more explicitly, by focusingon selected exchanges between teachers and students, the extent to which teachers’ culturalawareness and translanguaging can redress some of the issues they have expressed with the

\textsuperscript{251} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{252} Bruce Fuller, ‘Learning from Latinos: Contexts, Families, and Child Development in Motion’,\textit{Developmental Psychology} vol 46, No. 3 (2010): 559-565.
pedagogical approach forwarded by the likes of Proposition 22 and which stand in sharp contrast to the subtractive positions it advances.

3.5 Translanguaging in the Classroom

This section explores the ways in which bilingual teachers used their two languages in the classroom to convey, mediate and process meaning, which in many ways validated the bilingual and bicultural domains of their students’ lives. The material presented here focuses on the interactions between two bilingual Latina classroom teachers and their students: Ms. Gonzalez from Braddock Drive and Ms. Riojas from ICEF Vista.254 Throughout the school day, the teachers engaged in translanguaging practices to construct and negotiate meaning with their students, many of whom are Latino Spanish-English bilingual speakers. Their ability to translanguage not only strengthened meaning in communication but also helped establish a cultural rapport between themselves and their students. While English is the primary communicative tool used throughout the school day, Spanish words or expressions were regularly introduced during ‘teachable moments’ to add additional layers of meaning.255 Here is one example: In a short discussion on student responsibility and school cleanliness, Ms. Riojas substitutes the Spanish word for boogers, mocos, in a primarily English-language dialogue.

You should really pay attention to your trash because it’s not [the janitors] responsibility to pick it up. Do you want to pick up anybody else’s trash? Sometimes when I have to pick up the

254 These are pseudonyms for the teachers as their real names were not used. This is in compliance with their agreed participation as outlined in the Participant Consent Forms located in the Appendix.

255 A ‘teachable moment’ is an unplanned opportunity that arises in the classroom where a teacher has an ideal chance to offer insight to his or her students. See Steven Carr Reuben, *Children Of Character: Leading Your Children to Ethical Choices in Everyday Life*. (Santa Monica,CA: Canter and Associates, 1997).
classroom after you leave, I find your used up tissues and we all
know what’s in those tissues …mocos!\textsuperscript{256}

Here, Ms. Riojas code-switches to change her role and enhance her story. The switch is used to signal a climactic turn in the story—‘we all know what’s in those tissues …mocos!’ Once the effect is achieved, Ms. Riojas switches back to English as it signals the end of the story. The switch first of all is discourse related. However, in addition to encompassing flexible alternations from one language to another in interaction (code-switching), translanguaging also encompasses community identity enactment through language choices and interaction. Code-switching after all is often influenced by the situational context: topic and audience and links to the larger facts about an individual’s life world, indexing elements of the wider context including interaction histories and cultural context.

In similar ways, Ms. Gonzalez from Braddock Drive, would also code-switch during conversations with her class. She commonly used the Spanish expression, ¡orale! (all right!) for student praise and gratification which the students responded to with much eagerness. Here the code-switched utterance introduces a new footing: it marks the contrast between two new topics. Ms. Gonzalez’s use of ¡orale! for motivational praise signals a switch from a more formal way of speaking to an informal display of celebration. With this small gesture she is able to expresses her own linguistic identity, which will resonate with many of her students. By extension therefore, as a figure of authority, she is able also to validate the linguistic and cultural identity of her students.

In both instances Ms. Gonzalez and Ms. Riojas are using their ‘in group’ awareness to produce more subtle meanings and to connect more personally with their class. This is indicated not only by their use of code-switching as a conversational function but as that which draws upon a wider cultural context of the student’s bilingual world. This case clearly

\textsuperscript{256} Ibid., 16 Oct. 2012.
demonstrates that the functionality of code-switching is essentially that of achieving a contrast. This contrast is something that the concept of translanguaging as an epistemology attempts to interrupt so that spaces in which language learning takes place can build on the multiplicities of languages as they are used in everyday exchanges in particular community settings.

The particular nuances of navigating and making meaning of multiple language systems was a frequent topic of conversation among the class. In several occasions students would ask for clarification on why certain sound systems in English were inconsistent with their spelling. For example, one student wanted to know why the word good did not make the long ōō sound, like the word food. Ms. Riojas explained in the following way:

The problem with English is that we have borrowed words from a lot of different languages so sometimes words that look like one word really sound like another because we’re really speaking a different language. In Spanish, it’s just usually Spanish and Latin so there’s not a lot of confusion but in English you’re gonna[sic] have the same spelling make different sounds and you’re gonna[sic] have to scratch your head and say, ‘does that make sense? Do I read the word good as /god/ (short /ō/) or /guwd/ (long /ōō/)? Do I say very /guwd/ job?’

There are several elements of translanguaging that manifest in her response. First, she highlights cognate relationships across languages when she explains the way in which English (and Spanish) borrows from multiple languages. This contributes to the students’ larger knowledge about language or what is referenced in the literature as ‘metalinguistic knowledge.’ Metalinguistic knowledge refers to knowledge about the ‘abstract structure of

---

language that organizes sets of linguistic rules’ for syntax and phonetics. Developing students’ metalinguistic knowledge enhances their metacognitive abilities—the ability to use metalinguistic knowledge. Furthermore, she explains that the decision to use the sound system of one language over another requires a broader cultural schema, a recognition of the relevant sound systems for each language: ‘you’re gonna[sic] have to scratch your head and say, ‘does that make sense?’

As her narrative continues, she also recognizes this particular mispronunciation of the double oo as something that is particularly common with native Spanish speakers. She does this by sharing a personal anecdote about her mother.

somebody who’s learning English is gonna [sic] make that mistake. Like my mom, she only speaks Spanish and I teach her English; she knows a little bit but she makes mistakes like that, she’ll be like “very /gʊd/ (long / ōō/), hija” and I’ll be like “mom, it’s very /gʊd/ (short /ō/ )” and she’s like, “oh I’m sorry.” But that’s because she’s learning the language so she has to scratch her head and say ‘does that sound right?

Previous research on translanguaging practice has shown that bilinguals tend to acquire several dispositions and attitudes as a result of their linguistic fluidity and strategic practices of negotiation. Canagarajah’s work more specifically documented the ways in which translanguaging practice in the classroom contributed to students’ tolerance and patience for individuals attempting to construct meaning through different languages. Here Ms. Riojas does a similar thing. She allows a space for empathy to develop by relating an experience

---

from the classroom to one that more largely resonates with individuals developing a second language. Her mother might make a mistake with the English language but ‘that’s because she’s learning the language’ and like her students, will have to ‘scratch her head and say ‘does that sound right?’

The insertion of the Spanish word *hija* also functions interestingly. Linguistically, the code-switch signals a new character voice. Contextually however, it emphasizes a generational gap between parents and children and the awkward dynamic that can develop as a result of a language barrier. Because these students are likely to have an English language fluency that is greater than that of their parents, they will likely assume the role of translator. Translating is an integral part of the translanguaging process; it is a collaborative process where multiple parties engage in translating or paraphrasing words or expressions from one language to another to clarify and negotiate meaning.\(^\text{260}\) While the following exchange does not in itself involve an act of translation it recognizes translation as part of an everyday reality for some bilinguals. Ms. Riojas continues on the subject of her mother:

I’ve always taught [my mom] English, even when I was your age because when we had to go meet the teacher and if the teacher didn’t [sic] speak Spanish, who had to translate? And you guys might have to do that for your parents one day.\(^\text{261}\)

Through her attention to the practice of translation, Ms. Riojas is able to express empathy with her students for the additional responsibility that some students may have in translating for, or even correcting, their parents. Through these translanguaging practices Ms. Riojas is able to subtly index her Latino (and specifically Mexican identity) and her experience as a bilingual and bicultural individual living in the United States.

\(^{260}\) Kwangok Song, “Okay, I will say in Korean and then in American.”

\(^{261}\) Ibid.
While the injection of a Spanish word or phrase typically functioned as a story-telling or expressive device, a more prolonged switch into the Spanish language was used to communicate an entirely different message and elicit a different response from the code-switching practices discussed earlier. After a student observed that some students responded to the teachers instructions and disciplinary warnings more attentively when she said them entirely in Spanish, Ms. Gonzalez from Braddock Drive attempted to explain this shift in language and tone to her students by discussing her own experiences.

When I was growing up and my mom was mad at me I could tell because she would speak to me in Spanish. So when I heard that I knew it was time to listen. So when I have to tell Raul (a student) something, and I really want him to listen, I say it in Spanish.²⁶²

The use of Spanish language dialogue in this case is used to communicate firmness. In fact, both teachers used Spanish language dialogue during one-to-one conversations with students that needed disciplinary warnings about their behavior. The switch in this case signals a more stern footing. The real message of the Spanish language in many of these exchanges arrives through the use of the Spanish language and not the Spanish language in itself—that is, the message is sub-textual.²⁶³ When I asked Ms. Gonzalez about why she felt this technique was more effective she explained that the extra attentiveness or quick response from students who have been warned in Spanish is because it resonates with the language of the students’ parent. ‘Spanish is the language of mom or dad,’ she explained and as a bilingual speaker, Ms. Gonzales is able to adopt the authoritative language of the parent to discipline.²⁶⁴ Similar explanations are provided by Ms. Riojas, who in an interview with me expressed how the

parents of her students were thrilled by her ability to speak Spanish: ‘they tell me, we’re glad you understand and that you know how we discipline.’

It is important for these teachers to realize the significance and value of their translanguaging practices. Too often bilingual teachers attempt to prevent translanguaging practices because they have been taught to believe that only monolingual ways of speaking are “good,” “valuable” and “correct” that translanguaging in particular, demonstrates a weak grasp of not one but two languages when the reality is much different. Research by Blackledge and Creese more specifically, suggest that code-switching in classrooms is typically viewed as “embarrassing”, “wrong” or as “bad practice” as the two languages “contaminate” each other. Through translanguaging the two teachers create new ways of engaging their students in literacy activities. Previous research has shown that translanguaging practices enable students to develop skills in using both languages to clarify and refine meanings of unfamiliar words or expressions in one language. This allows the students to become aware of potential meaning connections across their two languages and to learn unfamiliar words and expressions in their other language with the help of stronger or more familiar language. In some ways, translanguaging also acts as a form of defiance against the subtractive and deficit views of language use propagated by school and educational policy.

A series of studies of classroom teaching from the 1990s shows that learning is enhanced when teachers make use of language and speech styles from students’ homes and from popular culture. This bridging pedagogy between official school knowledge and unofficial school knowledge, argues Frederick Erickson, creates an intermediate ‘third space’—a hybrid discourse that validates the voices students bring to the classroom as they

267 Kwangok Song, “Okay, I will say in Korean and then in American.”
begin to affiliate with school voices and discourses and to appropriate them as their own.’

However, we must also be aware that the discourse markers for Spanish are more tied to expressions that signal referrals to home or family life: translating for parents, being disciplined by parents, code-switching.

If the switch into Spanish signals emotive, expressive functions that are related almost exclusively to family life then the switch back to English can be interpreted as a withdrawal from the domestic sphere and a return to the more formal school sphere. When Spanish is used in class it creates a cultural space that is associated with the home. The exclusive use of Spanish in the classroom as an emotional or domestic signifier however may lead the student to equate informal and emotional utterances in the heritage language and formal academic registers in English. As a result, Spanish-English bilingual students might learn to and feel more comfortable discussing academic topics in English and more emotional or personal topics in Spanish reinforcing the idea that the literate world is an English-speaking world. It distinguishes the two languages as one that is public and one that is private. Spanish and or non-standard English dialects should be restricted to the home and neighborhood, saved for informal situations like the sharing of stories and cultural heritage. The relationship between language and space will be discussed further in the following chapter.

3.6 Conclusion

The research presented here demonstrates that the net effects of Proposition 227 were more negative than positive. The measure has ultimately produced the deficits it was ostensibly intended to reverse having been put in place to address Latino academic underachievement. Latino students however, are among the lowest-performing student groups within the United

States. State standardized test scores from 2003 to 2010 show that the gap between English Learners particularly, and all other students has actually widened. Proposition 227 has done little to address the Latino achievement gap and should therefore be considered a failure. That bilingual education is rarely even considered as a policy response to the underachievement of Latino students nearly twenty years after Proposition 227, illustrates the extent to which bilingualism is viewed as a liability.

The core assertion of Proposition 227 is that Standard American English is the only language that has any place in education and in public society more widely. Underlying this premise is an assimilationist perspective that demands that non-English speaking immigrants and non-standard speaking Americans relinquish their language or linguistic variance—tame their tongue—in exchange for more mainstream versions. The subtractive language practices currently supported by policies like Proposition 227, not only contributes to the academic underachievement of ‘English-Language Learner’s but also discourages the development of proficient bilinguals and multi-linguals in public and private spaces. The latter has significant consequences for Latino families and home life the specifics of which will be discussed in the next chapter. But beyond its effectiveness as an educational strategy, the underlying assumptions embedded within Proposition 227 and its curricular corollaries, have wider implications for the ways in which Latino identities are viewed, educated, and defined. The initiative perniciously makes a statement about the value of Latino culture and the Spanish language. In many ways it created hostile learning environments that are culturally, educationally, and linguistically unresponsive to the needs of a majority of its student body.

The empirical evidence presented in this chapter are congruent with previous studies on translanguaging practices in classroom contexts. The instances of translanguaging cited

269 ‘Most Children Younger Than Age 1 are Minorities,’ Newsroom, United States Census Bureau, May 17, 2012.
here recognize the importance of affirming the languages and experiences brought in from the home. Translanguaging was complexly interwoven into these classrooms as the teachers used both languages to construct and negotiate meanings. This flexible translanguaging is used by teachers to make links for their students between the social, cultural, community, and linguistic realities of their lives. Offering meanings in familiar language allowed the children to build their understanding of words or expressions in both English and Spanish and to become aware of how two different languages can work concomitantly.

Though this chapter speaks to the cultural resonance that can be had when educators reflect on the ways in which their own cultural frameworks relate to that of their students, it does not contend that students of a particular race or ethnic group need to be taught by teachers of the same group but rather that there needs to be some reflection on the way in which ideologies universalize the English language and the way it impacts students who do not conform to the language conventions that they reinforce. The hope is that engaging with critical questioning and new ideas will lead to more responsive pedagogies that might more adequately meet the needs of a growing demographic. The need is urgent not only for their academic achievement but for their experiences at home and within their communities as well. The impacts of language ideologies, expectation, practice and pedagogies on families and communities are to be discussed in the next chapter.

4.1 Introduction

As discussed throughout this thesis so far, one of the greatest challenges facing immigrant communities and communities of color in the United States are the institutional and social preference for Standard American English. While the previous chapter looked at the structural impacts of Proposition 227 on curriculum and the translanguageing practices of teachers in classrooms, this chapter documents the experiences of Latino communities and families as they navigate competing ideologies of assimilation and acculturation that stem from language usage, policy, and practice. More specifically, this chapter focuses on how language defines public and private spaces and determines the people who participate in them. As outlined in Chapter Three, Proposition 227 was campaigned as a policy intended for the ‘public good’ but just as we interrogated the definition of ‘English-Language Learner’ in Chapter Three and the English language more generally in Chapter Two, so too we must engage with the concept of the ‘public’ in Chapter Four in order to understand whose interests are represented by the ‘public good.’

Language minoritized parents seldom have social capital and yet, both parents and communities play a central role in language transmission. As a marginalized community within U.S. society, Latinos are often forced to negotiate their place in a political economy that demands linguistic and cultural conformity in order to participate in public life. However, participation in public life—as will be discussed in this chapter—often comes at the expense of participation in what has been politically defined as the ‘private’ life—linked to the family, communities, and ethnic heritage. This chapter argues that for Latino communities, the political
distinction between the public and private sphere is less rigid and that this has significant consequences for Latino families, communities and students.

The chapter analysis begins with a broader conceptual understanding of how the public/private dichotomy functions within a liberal state and the way in which language is used to define these two distinct spheres. This will develop into a discussion of how Latino communities navigate the distinctions between the public and private spheres as it is politically and linguistically defined in policies like Proposition 227. While discussions about the public and private have tended to distinguish them rather than view them as intertwined, the analysis and review of research presented in this chapter recognizes that the public and private spheres are imbricated for many communities of color. We can use political initiatives like Proposition 227 to see this overlap more clearly for Latinos. Although Proposition 227 has legal jurisdiction within public spaces, like the public school, it was not designed to disrupt the activities or way of life within the ‘private’ sphere. Nevertheless, its theoretical foundations have wider implications for bilingual communities or communities who use non-standard English dialects.

4.2 English as ‘Public’ and Spanish as ‘Private’

In his 1982 autobiographical discussion of race in America, Mexican-American writer Richard Rodriguez reflects on the costs of his social assimilation and academic success, or as he describes, the discovery of his ‘public’ self, as well as the broader intersection between language and citizenship. The book more specifically documents Rodriguez’s journey through the U.S. educational system as a second-generation Mexican immigrant and in particular, the effects that his academic success—spurred by his acquisition of the English language, had on his relationship with his non-English speaking parents, his ethnic community, and the Spanish language. Rodriguez admits that as he progressed through the U.S. educational system, his native tongue, Spanish became increasingly associated with home and not life in public: ‘I
couldn’t really believe that Spanish was a public language, like English’, Rodriguez wrote. He explains that this was a result of several factors, including the pressure from his non-English speaking parents for him to speak in English when Spanish had been their primary language of communication, and Rodriguez’s native language:

Again and again in the days following, increasingly angry, I was obliged to hear my mother and father: ‘Speak to us en inglés.’ (Speak.) Only then did I determine to learn classroom English. Weeks after, it happened: One day in school I raised my hand to volunteer an answer. I spoke out in a loud voice. And I did not think it remarkable when the entire class understood. That day, I moved very far from the disadvantaged child I had been only days earlier. The belief, the calming assurance that I belonged in public, had at last taken hold.²⁷²

Of particular significance to this chapter, discussions of Rodriguez’s public identity are often contrasted against what he describes as his ‘private’ identity. For Rodriguez, this distinction is wedded to language and power. In the above extract for example, Rodriguez’s participation and acceptance in the public sphere is contingent upon his English fluency. By contrast, the Spanish language, used among his family and wider ethnic community is retained for use primarily within the home. United by their ‘public separateness’, as Rodriguez describes it, this community develops a sense of solidarity and intimacy that is built around the Spanish language but also a shared sense of exclusion from mainstream Anglo-American (public) society.

²⁷² Ibid, 21(emphasis added for public).
But then there was Spanish. Español: my family's language. [...] Spanish speakers [...] seemed related to me, for I sensed that we shared--through our language--the experience of feeling apart from los gringos...I was reminded by Spanish of my separateness from los otros (the others), los gringos in power...Spanish seemed to me the language of the home...It became the language of joyful return.273

Articulated in his reflections above is the distinction between English as an institutionalized language and Spanish as a non-institutionalized language and the dichotomy that ensues as a result. This is essentially a political definition, the result of political decision-making. Access to Standard American English, he explains, underscores participation in public life, which he identifies as a space of privilege, whiteness and power. Accordingly, his logic follows, that if the English language is the language of power, privilege, and whiteness then his family’s language—the Spanish language—is the language of ‘disadvantage.’ However, this shared disadvantage, he explains, is a source of intimacy and affinity for those who use the Spanish language; they are defined and therefore united by a shared ‘public separateness’—that is, a shared sense of ‘otherness’ and oppression. His is a community united by their place outside of the public sphere. Correspondingly, the Spanish language becomes a source of comfort and solidarity. As Rodriguez describes, Spanish signaled to him that he was part of a community, ‘someone special, close, like no one outside,’ and that he ‘belonged with [his family],’ as they navigated an exclusion from the public sphere together.274 In this example we see that language is central to the construction of both the public and private sphere because it helps determine who participates in which spheres. Rodriguez’s experience in the American education system, taking place long before Proposition 227, led him to conclude that Spanish is a domestic

273 Ibid., 14.
274 Ibid., 15.
language that should be confined to spaces like the home. Spanish, he argued, is fine for expressing feelings and for family life but has no place in school, politics, or the workplace. Arguably, his view romanticizes this dichotomy and overlooks the political implications of this distinction. What he could not have seen in his time but perhaps ought to have anticipated is precisely the outcomes flowing from a political initiative like Proposition 227, which makes the same assertions Rodriguez does here.

At the most general level, lying behind the dichotomy that exists between the public and private sphere is the basic assumption that the former is visible and the latter is hidden. This same dichotomy is embodied in the ideological premise set out by Proposition 227. Having institutionalized Standard American English as the official language of California public schools, the Proposition restated the public and therefore visible (or audible) status of the language, while positioning languages or English variances beyond Standard American English to the periphery or private sphere. It is the contention of this thesis that this political distinction between institutionalized and non-institutionalized languages is indicative of greater inequalities in American society such as the lack of access to the means of communication and by extension inculcation. From this perspective, the public is viewed as the powerful space and the private as a powerless space. One is heard, the other is silenced.

The English language is the public, audible, and ‘loud voice’ which exercises power, while the Spanish language, is a ‘disadvantaged,’ silenced, and private voice which has limited value in public society.

As he progresses through the educational system, the material benefits of English language fluency and drawbacks of Spanish language fluency become increasingly difficult to ignore. Eventually, Rodriguez chooses to exchange his private identity for the benefits of his

---

275 Ibid.
277 Rodriguez, Hunger of Memory, 22.
new assimilated and public identity. While Rodriguez reflects on his experiences in a California before the passage of Proposition 227, the choice he is confronted with is now the same one politically restated by the measure. It requires students and families to choose between the political and social capital to be gained from Standard American English and the communal capital to be gained from one’s family and ethnic community.

For Rodriguez, failing to encourage Standard American English is synonymous with failing to encourage access to public society and all of the economic benefits that are promised as a result. As such, and despite the isolation he experiences from his family, the Spanish language and his cultural heritage, Rodriguez is an avid supporter of monolingual English in the public schools. Consider for example, his view on supporters of bilingual education:

...the bilingualists simplistically scorn the value and necessity of assimilation. [...] So they do not realize that while one suffers a diminished sense of private individuality by becoming assimilated into public society, such assimilation makes possible the achievement of public individuality.278

There are several nuances that Rodriguez’s argument overlooks that continue to obscure the unrelenting issue of racial and ethnic prejudice present in language education, language policy, and language standardization. While Rodriguez is speaking from his own experience as a second-generation Mexican immigrant who struggled to place his identity and language within an American context, he ultimately neglects the social and ideological factors that have structured his experience.279 ‘A day in Mexico, elsewhere in Latin America, or Spain,’ Renato Rosaldo argues, ‘should suffice to make it clear that the linguistic limitations Rodriguez experiences are built into social arrangements, not the language.’ This thesis highlights that the
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‘ones’ expected to suffer a diminished sense of the private individuality in exchange for a public individuality are currently overwhelmingly Latino. Their expected sacrifice is predicated on the definition of public society as predominantly Anglo American. The deeper sociological assumptions embedded in this conceptualization of public society overlooks the structural apparatus that favors assimilation over acculturation. That is the ultimate message underpinning Proposition 227 and the impacts on Latino families, communities and students is profound.

Returning to Rodriguez, it was that writer’s preference for fluency of Standard American English that granted him access into the public sphere, at least so far as he described in his autobiography. Having gained access to that public realm, Rodriguez found himself able to excel academically, but he made a point of stating that this decision, so far as he remembered, effectively disrupted his relationship with his family. Throughout the book, Rodriguez’s descriptions of academic success and public participation are consistently counterpointed by a description of his increasing estrangement with his private identity—his family, the Spanish language, and his Mexican heritage. Consider for example his description of his diminishing sense of family intimacy that follows his increasing use of and preference for the English language:

But the special feeling of closeness at home was diminished by then.
Gone was the desperate, urgent, intense feeling of being at home;
rare was the experience of feeling myself individualized by family intimates. We remained a loving family, but one greatly changed.
No longer so close; no longer bound tight by the pleasing and troubling knowledge of our public separateness...Matching the silence I started hearing in public was a new quiet at home. The family’s quiet was partly due to the fact that, as we children learned
more and more English, we shared fewer and fewer words with our parents. Sentences needed to be spoken slowly when a child addressed his mother or father. (Often the parent wouldn’t understand.) The child would need to repeat himself. (Still, the parent misunderstood.) The young voice, frustrated, would end up saying, ‘Never mind’--the subject was closed.  

The developing silence between Rodriguez and his family described here suggests that the cost of his public autonomy is his ‘private individuality.’ Research on immigrant adaptation more generally, discuss the various ways in which immigrant communities must negotiate the potential benefits of cultural assimilation and its potential strains on the familial relationship build around ethnic ties.

Substantial research shows that immigrant children and second-generation immigrants, more generally acculturate into mainstream society more rapidly than their parents. As a result, immigrant children tend to gain English fluency sooner than their parents and typically prefer English to the language of their parents. This can result in the development of a language barrier between parents and children and an overall lack of communication between them as they increasingly fail to share a common tongue. As we witnessed in the case of Rodriguez, families confronted with this language and cultural barrier can end up feeling estranged from each other because of a lack of language fluency. This can also play a significant role in the transfer of power between parents and children that can estrange families even further. Because second-generation children’s English fluency is often greater than that of their parents, they often assume the role of translator, a position that can undermine the authoritative role of the parent as children assume adult roles to help their parents negotiate the bureaucratic structures
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of their new social environment. Claudia Dorrington found in her study of Central American refugees in Los Angeles, that a young child may accompany her/his parents to a local utility company to act as their translator thereby taking charge of the more public aspects of life in the new environment. In the previous chapter, the teacher from ICEF Vista, Ms. Riojas, alluded to this added responsibility for her students. This role reversal, argues Alejandro Portes and Ruben Rumbaut, creates a situation where the children, fluent in American customs and English, come to hold more power in the family because of their knowledge of the society and their ability to engage with it when compared to their parents. The shift in power is further exacerbated by the long work hours that many immigrant parents tend to perform, which in turn leads to a parental absence. This absence, argues Karen Pyke can further subvert parental authority. Although these scenarios are most commonly associated with immigrant groups, research shows that similar situations unfold for U.S.-born Latinos and their families.

They often worry about assimilating too much, and being accused of ‘selling out,’ forgetting the ethnic community and abandoning the family, or not assimilating enough, often measured through their use, proficiency and preference for Standard American English. Assimilation can be linked to cultural betrayal. In Spanish this is referred to as *agringado*—to become gringo, or whitewashed. It is very similar to the word *pocho* introduced in Chapter Two that specifically refers to one’s adoption of Standard American English or, the blending of Spanish and English, Spanglish.

The lack of opportunities for parents to use their heritage language in intellectual rather than emotive or public spaces prevents the transmission of literacy in the Spanish language and continues the languages’ privatization as it is consistently relegated to the domestic sphere. As a result, children of Spanish speakers tend to learn Spanish as an oral language and the transmission of knowledge in Spanish is more likely constrained to a daily household vocabulary. This restricts the Spanish language to a domesticated, cultural and emotive sphere.
where technical terms, extensive vocabularies and literacy activities are limited or seemingly non-existent. Unable to participate in the initial literacy activities of their children, parent’s comprehensive abilities are either unrecognized or considered narrow, once again undermining the authority of the parent. Because language is central to the generational transmission of culture and heritage, parent-child language barriers can often instill fears in the parents that their culture is not being carried forward. In Mexican immigrant and Mexican American families for example, the intergenerational preservation of the Spanish language serves to transmit Latino cultural values.\textsuperscript{282} According to this research, ‘parents associate the loss of Spanish among their U.S. schooled children with a potential diminution of parental authority and a disruption of cultural values.’\textsuperscript{283} The tendency for second-generation immigrants to lose their Spanish and dissociate themselves from their parents Latino cultural practices has been noted in previous research on Latino immigrant families.\textsuperscript{284} Latino immigrant parents see Spanish as a marker of ethnic and cultural identity and key to relationships within the family. It is Spanish that is spoken in the family home, after all, in many Latino immigrant communities. The children of immigrants often find themselves under pressure to reserve the speaking of English for school and work. This creates a distinction between English as the language of social mobility and material success in the United States and Spanish as the language of home and by association the old country, ironically out of which immigrants came in search of greater opportunity.


Research shows that second generation immigrants are confronted with the competing theories and expectations of assimilation versus acculturation. In their 1995 study on second-generation immigrants, Alejandro Portes and Rubén Rumbaut identified two primary types of ‘dissonant acculturation.’ The first they argue, is when immigrant children take up the customs of American society, but their parents remain isolated in the ethnic community. The second type of dissonant acculturation is when children take up the customs of American society, and parents neither participate in American society or an ethnic community; they are therefore entirely marginalized. Previous observations of multi-generational immigrant groups have found that immigrant youths who ‘remain firmly ensconced in their respective ethnic communities may...have a better chance for educational and economic mobility through use of the material and social capital that their communities make available.’

The anthropological research surveyed above demonstrates more pointedly the way in which these spheres are imbricated for immigrant communities and more specifically, Latino communities. The case studies presented in this Chapter will discuss some of the strategies used by community centers to mitigate the challenges presented by the persistent overlap between the public and private spheres.

4.3 Proposition 227 and the ‘Public Good’

Rodriguez’s experiences in school and with his family show a clear division between the public and private self that is wedded to language. In order to elaborate on how the language policy affects Latino families and communities in California, it is necessary to introduce some of the previous interrogations of the political implications of a public/private dichotomy.
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The concept of and distinction between the *public* and *private* sphere has been a central preoccupation for several disciplines, including economics, politics, social history, law, and feminist studies. In his classic work, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1989) Jurgen Habermas argued that the ‘public sphere’ emerged as the result of an increasing separation between the political and everyday life that took place during the eighteenth century amidst the centralization of power which followed the rise of the nation-state. The private sphere, he continued, evolved out of a necessity to distinguish and mediate between the private individual and the public state. While Habermas’s work has been the subject of sustained and often critical debate, several scholars maintain that the contemporary conceptualizations of the public as divorced from the private are ultimately rooted in the central tenets of liberal thought and the politics of the liberal state—that is, they are labels used to demarcate the specific dimensions or activities that are outside of the legitimate bounds of government regulation, or the political economy more generally, from those subject to political and legal governance.

Within this framework, argue legal scholars Karl Klare and Robert Mnookin, the private sphere carries with it a strong presupposition against paternalistic government control and allows individuals the freedom to decide what to do and how to behave whereas the public sphere, understood as the space designed to meet the needs and serve the interests of the ‘public good’ is liable to democratic dialogue and political execution. Understood this way, institutions like the public school—believed to serve the interests of civil society, are considered part of
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the public sphere and the home, considered a sphere of individual autonomy which government is bound to respect, is assigned to the private sphere. This conceptual distinction, as Habermas originally argued, is ultimately used to identify the boundaries between the private individual (home and family life) and the public world of the market and political economy (the state)—a binary also recognized as the distinction between the domestic and the economic, or the personal and political.

Critical discourse scholars such Michelle M. Lazar and Ruth Wodak however recognize that conceptions of the ‘public good’ and categorization of particular spaces or activities as ‘public’ or ‘private,’ ‘domestic’ and ‘economic’ or ‘personal’ and ‘political’ are often defined by the political systems that enact them and as such tend to reflect the deeper sociological differences in society that create and perpetuate asymmetrical power relations between specific groups of people. In their work, Wodak and Lazar, emphasize the gendered division that is often mirrored in the social dichotomization of these spaces and activities that occur in each.288

Assigned to the private sphere, the home and activities contained within it are often removed from the public policy agenda and consequently political scrutiny. This has significant consequences for women because of the way in which domesticity, childcare and housework has been gendered as female. Because of its association with ‘female activities’ argues Lazar, the private realm, is often characterized as ‘emotional, personal and particular’ and therefore not a part of the larger public sphere which has greater access to the means of democratic participation and emancipation. Indeed discussions on the public sphere occupied a central focus for second-wave feminists in the 1960s and 1970s. Their insistence that ‘the personal is political’ encapsulated a critique against the social demarcations between the public and private spheres which, they argued, naturalized the oppressive social conditions experienced routinely

by women as ‘personal’ because of their occurrence within the home. In contrast, they argued, the public sphere, ‘characterized as rational, impartial and universal’ has given greater privileges to men. The difference in access to the public realm, or means of democratic reconciliation, Lazar continues, not only highlights the relations of difference in power and privilege between men and women but simultaneously naturalizes them. 289 It is worth noting that the feminist critique against the separation between the public and private did not seek to remove the distinction altogether. Rather, the core assertion behind ‘the personal is political’ was an attempt to highlight the fluidity and flexibility between these boundaries so that politicians and institutions could strike a better and more democratic balance between the two spheres. Politicizing the personal, Lazar adds, ‘means that any and all matters should be brought into the open for critical democratic dialogue, instead of predefining the nature of the issues as public versus private, and thence excluding those considered private from public discussion and expression.’ 290

The relegation of the home to the private sphere not only disproportionately affects women but also communities of color. Indeed race and gender are significant intersecting categories when discussing the division between the public and private sphere. However, as this thesis is primarily concerned with analyzing the relationship between race, ethnicity, and language education in the United States, my analysis of the public/private dichotomy emphasizes the racialized aspects of this dichotomy and its implications for Latino communities. Nevertheless, attention to the gendered division, very briefly discussed above, is essential to understanding the ways in which particular ethnic communities, spaces and practices are gendered as well as racialized.
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While the ideals of liberalism have long promised equality for ethnic minorities and immigrant communities the liberal yardstick used to measure, and subsequently grant, participation within the public sphere is often dominated by the rules set up by the group with the power to define the norms of cultural practice. Within the context of the United States, the norms of cultural practice are overwhelmingly controlled by the perspectives of Anglo American men. As a result, the public sphere has been criticized for excluding the most disadvantaged groups and ‘limiting their capacity to contribute with their issues and concerns to the political agenda.’

Although the United States’ liberal principles allow for diverse cultural expressions these are more easily tolerated at the private level. When displays of diversity are ‘public,’ the sociologist Nathan Glazer points out, the liberal state requires that they do not burden state resources dedicated to the greater ‘public good’ requiring them instead to be self-sufficient.

We heard echoes of these principles during the political campaign for Proposition 227, which ultimately viewed bilingual education as a program that specifically catered to immigrant needs, and drained, or burdened, America’s financial resources. As such, support for Proposition 227 was positioned in its political discourse as support for the ‘public good.’ The measure’s residual effects on the Latino community and family specifically however, highlight that what is good for the ‘public’ in this case may not be compatible with the needs of this privatized community. The concept of the public good is recognized by scholars such as Emanuela Lombardo, as an ideological assertion that emerges from the cultural value systems that correspond to the appropriate political forms and socio-historical contexts of a
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In short, the notion of what constitutes the ‘public good’ depends on the society from which this relative sense of ‘good’ is developed and defined.

In relation to initiatives like Proposition 227, the core assertion is that Standard American English is good for the majority of the public because communicative literacy in English is equated with material and economic success. Substantial research on U.S.-born and immigrant Latino communities reveal that in a struggle to benefit from an American liberal economy, families are forced to reconcile cultural and ethnic identities. The experiences captured by writers like Rodriguez, and in previous chapters Anzaldúa, show the way in which members of the Latino community, irrespective of their birthplace are confronted with having to choose between a public and private identity and the intricacies of navigating the two simultaneously. This process, as discussed by Rodriguez in his autobiography, can significantly impinge the family and home life. Often left undiscussed in conversations about ‘public society’ is the way in which participation within the public sphere requires an adoption of interaction styles that are more culturally aligned with Anglo American men. Feminist studies have addressed this with regard to women seeking to enter the public sphere. Likewise, communities of color held in stark contrast to the dominant cultural and political economy, are forced to conform to a seemingly naturalized code of social conduct used within the educational and professional sphere.

In many ways we can see the extent to which the identity associated with ‘public society’ or the ‘public good’ reflects the values, norms, behaviour (language codes) of the dominant political and cultural economy. In fact, a groups’ Americanization is often assessed by the degree of commitment they demonstrate to the main elements of the nation-state—that is, to what extent groups adopt the dominant cultural norms of the host culture and become
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involved in mainstream social institutions, networks, laws, and behavioural expectations. The
dominant traits of U.S. society, as discussed throughout the thesis thus far, include speaking
fluent and un-accented English. The more that a person can exhibit this trait—among others—
the more they are able to participate in the public sphere given its powers of legitimation.
Conforming to the bureaucratic regulations and institutions of the nation state furthers one’s
Americanisation and thereby participation in public. This is also directly related to a broader
market economy. To inculcate the value system of the United States, such a strategy must be
insinuated into education systems and media outlets.

Returning to the passages included by Rodriguez in the chapter introduction, we can
see the extent to which he, as a young student attempting to reap the material rewards of the
public sphere via his education in the United States, seeks to mirror the behaviour of those he
dems more valuable or worthy of the ‘right to speak the public language’ a language he always
recognizes as the language of ‘los gringos.’ In postcolonial studies, the act of mirroring in
the hopes of accessing power or public participation is discussed primarily as mimicry.
Mimicry is often described as opportunistic behaviour where one copies the person in power,
in hopes of accessing that same power. While postcolonial scholars like Franz Fanon and Homi
Bhabha discussed mimicry in relation to colonialism, it can also be discussed within the context
of immigration. Latino students, like Rodriguez, operating within a hegemonic social order
that requires the adoption of cultural norms often scripted by the dominant classes in society
are obliged to adapt to normatively Anglo American styles—albeit, ones misrecognized as
‘performing well’ in school. The acceptance of his public identity thus, is viewed not as an
opportunistic form of racialized mimicry but simply as availing himself to the opportunities
and rights granted by the American liberal state. Conversely, non-participation or absence from
sustained participation is a reflection of individuals’ lack of motivation and unwillingness to
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learn. This view of ‘public society’ fails to recognize the ethnocentrism and sexism embedded within the separation of the public and private realms and furthermore, is used to substantiate the proposal and passage of public policies like Proposition 227, which has wider repercussions for communities of color.

Throughout the campaign for Proposition 227, use of the ‘family language’ was discussed as appropriate for use in the home, among private individuals; its use in the public school however was deemed harmful for student efforts to enter the public mainstream. The core assertion made by a measure like Proposition 227 is that no other language aside from the English language has a valuable place in public education or in the public sphere more generally. This ethnocentric aspect of the public/private binary is significantly tied to the gendered tropes of the dichotomy. Relegated to the domestic sphere, familial and cultural practices or intelligences, like the use of a non-English language is considered less valuable because it does not directly contribute to the economic sphere. As discussed above, the domestic-economic binary is one that can be translated onto the private-public one. As a result, the suggestion is made that the language, and by extension culture, of diverse students is subordinate and inferior to the English language and the cultural and racial identity attached to it. Any cultural knowledge separate from the mainstream will be of little value to the wider cultural and political market and so, like housework and child-care, are seen to have little currency. The initiative therefore, supported by a distinct separation between the public and private spheres, positions certain groups in a peripheral role in American society creating, sustaining and reinforcing an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ binary that is etched along linguistic and racial lines. While the obfuscation of the personal as political has historically rendered women invisible within the public sphere, in the particular case of Proposition 227 in California, it has rendered many communities of color, particularly Latinos, not only invisible but also voiceless.
Consequently, the specific impacts of the public/private division on Latino families, students, and communities have been removed from the public conversation, particularly those regarding education. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the failure of schools to recognize or value the languages that students bring to the classroom—a factor ostensibly prohibited by Proposition 227, hinders students’ opportunity to integrate and build upon their heritage language, and obstructs non-English speaking parents from fully engaging in their student’s academic journey or everyday-life.

4.4 Emphasis on the Family

As with the previous chapter, this chapter takes an ethnographic approach. While the previous chapter highlighted the structural implications of Proposition 227 within the public school, this chapter is primarily concerned with analyzing its affects in spaces typically considered outside of the legitimate bounds of policy control—that is, the home and the family.

The family plays a considerable role in the development of an individual’s ethnic and cultural identity. Parents and family members are often children’s first teachers and children come to school with what they have learned from their parents and communities. As such, the family has been described as the first agent of socialization; it is a space in which identities are formed and adapted.\(^{296}\) The Latino community encompasses numerous ethnic subgroups traceable to various regions throughout the Americas and the Caribbean. As such they possess a wide range of socioeconomic, cultural, and national backgrounds. Familial generalizations about such a diverse group therefore will not apply to many groups and individuals who are Latinos. However, research has shown that some common family characteristics and socialization patterns do exist among several Latino groups in the United States: Mexicans,

Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. Bruce Fuller’s research on Latino families reveals that many of these common patterns are a result of similar historical experiences and colonial conditions, proximity to or contact with their homelands, and exposure to similar forms of discrimination because of their juxtaposition to a white mainstream. While the first Mexicans became Americans through annexation of northern Mexico after the Mexican-American War, Puerto Ricans through their Commonwealth status and political territorial relationship with the United States, and Cubans through their arrival as refugees, each group had to survive and adapt to a dramatically different social, cultural, political, and economic context in the United States. These historical conditions, scholars argue, generated common family characteristics and socialization patterns that were ultimately rooted in Latinos’ attempt to cope with economic, social, and political marginality within the United States.

Indeed, research from Social Scientists Kathleen Ethier and Kay Deaux, reveal that a majority of Latino students derive their ethnic identity from their family socialization and was an important dimension of the self. David Alvirez and Frank Bean’s research on the Chicano community more specifically, found that the Chicano emphasis on the extended family had roots in the historical marginalization of Latinos throughout the United States. Other scholars have noted how these extended family structures have played central roles in the establishment of Latino ethnic enclaves throughout the United States because of their role in generating economic resources. Social work professors Andres G. Gil and William A. Vega noted the important role of the family in buffering stress associated with immigrant adaptation.
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among Cuban and Nicaraguan families. Using these extended family structures, Cuban exiles in the early 1960’s generated funds for investment within ethnic enclaves. In this way, the kinship relations extends to the communal level, creating ethnic communities and generating upward mobility for those that share a common experience, one that is ultimately tied to an economic position. Out of this common experience, a strong ethnic community and identity develops. This network of support is not unique to the Latino experience but rather a common strategy for groups who experience life as the ‘Other.’ Anthropologists Michael Silverstein adds that familism is in important means through which Latinos are able to affirm their ethnic identity.

While immigrant groups differ according to national origin and may experience varying degrees of discrimination, it has historically been the case that many have drawn support from their communities and families as a survival strategy. Stack uses the term ‘fictive kin’ to describe the network of people relied on for support. For Stack, ‘fictive kin’ refers to non-kin, or nonrelatives, who conduct their social relations within the idiom of kinship. More recent studies, like Ebaugh and Curry’s observation of new immigrant communities have used ‘fictive kin’ to describe the family-type relationship that develops among some neighborhood communities that are not based on blood or marriage but rather religious rituals or close friendship ties. First, economic action by immigrants is affected by the resources that the ethnic and the immigrant community affords to its members through ethnic networks. As
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pointed out by Roger Waldinger, ethnic networks affect the decisions and actions of immigrants by providing information, employment, credit, and emotional support that are otherwise unavailable.  

Within the Latino community specifically, there has been much work done to describe the ways in which fictive kin networks might operate. The *compadrazgo* system, for example, establishes relations between parents and godparents or co-parents (English translation of Compadrazgo), a union often solidified through a religious ritual, that provides a larger network of support and reciprocity that is financially and service based.  

Research on compadrazgo in the U.S. has previously emphasized the specific roles of comadres/compadres as adults that help promote physical and mental well-being, help with family relationships, and as socioeconomic support.  

Familism encompasses strong feelings of family unity and loyalty, relies on the family for logistical, financial and emotional support, and prioritizes family needs over the needs of the individual. Compadrazgo redefines the familial network allowing it to extend beyond the nuclear family to include extended and nonrelative family, or ‘fictive kin.’  

Compadrazgo emerges as a tactic for dealing with economic and social deprivation as well as a way to build social networks. Both ethnic community resources and external conditions affect educational attainment and economic mobility.

Until very recently most research on Mexican-American communities was done by white, English-speaking social scientists. From the 1970s onwards, Chicano scholars began to
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undertake research on those same communities, revolutionizing the field. With their insider understanding of the complexities of those communities they were able to cast new light on the critical questions raised by the previous generation of scholars. They challenged the established view what was known as the cultural deficit model that the retention of traditional Mexican-American culture would impede children as they sought to integrate into mainstream American society. That earlier view had provided the rational for arguments that promoted the complete assimilation of Latinos into mainstream culture. The acceptance of assimilationist thought fueled social and familial pressure for Latinos to abandon traditional values in order to achieve educational and economic upward mobility.

Educational philosophers and Critical Discourse scholars have long argued for more nuanced understandings of the interplay between community, homes, families, and the public schools in order to effectively meet the needs of students. Chicana feminist writers C. Alejandra Elenes, Francisca E. Gonzalez, Dolores Delgado Bernal, and Sofia Villenas in particular, argue that the lessons transferred by the community and ‘homespace’ significantly contribute to a child’s ‘way of knowing’ and furthermore, can highlight and interrupt the transmission of dominant ideologies often gained from institutions such as the public school. Research that has looked at ‘homespace’—the home, community, and family—and its relationship to school helps this chapter to situate larger debates around education within a
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dialogue on the family and community as institutions separate from the public school and the contrasting ways that language functions within these distinct institutions.

4.5 Context and Participants
The primary case material presented in this chapter documents two organizations that serve a substantial portion of the Latino students attending Braddock Drive and ICEF Vista—the schools discussed in the previous chapter, they include The Mar Vista Gardens Family Center, founded in 1977, and the Mar Vista Gardens Boys and Girls Club, opened in 2013. Mar Vista Gardens is a predominantly Latino community located southwest of downtown Los Angeles. It houses the largest housing projects on the west side of the city, the residents of which are primarily Latino.

The family centers and after-school programs under study here work to alleviate the influences of poverty that severely threaten this community. While the programs under study vindicate the knowledge received from the public schools, including the acquisition of the English language, and the lessons of the wider socio-cultural context—such as education as an acceptable and assured pathway out of poverty—they simultaneously enact pedagogies, driven by the participants and staff, that cultivate their own community specific wisdoms and strategies for navigating the day-to-day activities and realities of their immediate environment and wider socio-political environment. The community centers and after-school programs referenced in this research, share the focus of providing community members with the space to engage in broader social networks that facilitate increased educational engagement, familial relationships, and community transformation. In providing these spaces along with logistical, legal and emotional support, these programs ultimately seek to address the influences of poverty, neighborhood isolation and social and economic marginality. But they also mitigate the tensions between families and the expectations between mainstream society. The way in
which this is accomplished contributes to the socialization of the Latino children within this neighborhood and informs their development of the ethnic, national, and cultural self and contributes to their understanding of American society and their place within it. What follows is a brief description of the two sites under study.

(1) The Mar Vista Family Center

The Mar Vista Family Center (MVFC) is an early childhood, youth, and neighborhood community center that provides pre-school, after-school and recreational activities for all members of the family. Founded in 1977, by educational therapists Betty and Monte Factor, MFVC was established to provide free childcare to working families within the area and provide ‘a safe space’ for residents. While not advertised as a specifically Latino community center the racial composition of the local area means that its patrons and employees are predominantly Latino. The overall aim of this private institution is to develop strong community members that are able to give back to the community. These core goals are incorporated into MVFC’s various programs which includes a pre-school, an after-school youth initiative, and a variety of family wellness courses that offer recreational and educational classes like yoga, cooking, gardening, and computer literacy for all members of the family. The center itself is located 0.8 miles away from the Mar Vista Gardens Housing Projects and serves a significant portion of its residents. It also serves over 600 students from the surrounding schools—99 percent of which are Latino. Running operations of the center depends on the small staff of 18 and former MFVC users, community volunteers, and the financial support of private investors.

(2) The Boys and Girls Club of America

The Boys and Girls Club of America is a national non-profit after-school program for students aged between 6 and 18 years that provides recreational activities and academic support for its participants during the after-school hours and through the summer. Founded in 1860 by Mary Goodwin, Alice Goodwin, and Elizabeth Hammersley as a way to keep unruly youth off the streets of Hartford, Connecticut, the club has transformed into a coalition of Boys and Girls Clubs throughout the United States.  

While the Boys and Girls Club has been in operation for over one hundred years, this particular branch, located directly within the Mar Vista Gardens Housing Projects, was established in 2013. Boys and Girls club programs are typically located in neighborhoods most vulnerable to gang violence, drugs, crime and low student test scores. Located 2.5 miles away from the initial school and research site, the Boys and Girls Club of Venice has specific Latino Outreach initiatives which provides the local youth with ‘effective strategies to reach and empower Latino youth and families.’

On average, 90.5 percent of the school population served by the Boys and Girls Club qualify for the federal subsidy for free or reduced lunch, often an indication that they and their families are living close to or below the national poverty line. Students who use this program nationally are on average 82 percent Latino. The prevalence of Latinos within these programs is part of a larger pandemic of Latino poverty.

Studies have found that living in low-income and high crime neighborhoods can have a severe impact on the psychological well-being of its residents who are commonly exposed to community violence, poor municipal services, underfunded schools, and deteriorating housing
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While the consequences of poverty transcend racial and ethnic lines, statistics show that Latinos experience poverty at a rate disproportionate to their overall population. Social science research on urban youth in low-income areas has largely focused on how social networks shape urban communities and the lives of youth within them. This portion of the research details some of the strategies in place in Latino communities that make use of public and private services seeking to address the needs of low-income urban communities.

The decision to focus on community centers rather than individual families is supported by research that recognizes community and neighborhood spaces as part of a wider ‘homespace.’ Conceptualizing the ‘home’ as a space in which individuals negotiate their daily-lives with family and community members, this portion of the research examines community centers and neighborhood spaces as part of a larger extension of the family and homespace. This allows this portion of the research to gain insight into the ways in which Latino communities reconcile between their public and private selves within the context of schooling, family, and community life and review some of the challenges and strategies that Latino families and communities confront in adapting to American society and expectations. More specifically it will review the dynamic ways in which family service centers and community recreational centers in predominantly Latino neighborhoods mitigate the pressures to assimilate and preserve a heritage culture. This facilitation occurs both through the ways that


groups use ethnic ties to link to the dominant norms or institutions of United States but also through the ways that individuals defend their decisions to express their ethnicity in relation to the broader principles of the US nation-state.

The data collected through participant observation, interviews with community organizers and members, and visits to the community and school sites also reveal how the local community network contribute to ideas about language preference usage, identity, and the U.S. education system. As a result of collective engagement in community alliances and networks, the community centers are able to build and foster individual and collective prosperity and create spaces where students can benefit from some of the promises of assimilation while retaining elements of their familial and heritage culture.

4.6 ‘Safe Spaces,’ Education, and Family

Several themes emerged from my observation of these localized services. First, the emphasis on the creation of ‘safe spaces’ surfaced as a common goal for the institutions cited in this study. The emphasis on safe spaces recognized Mar Vista Gardens’ particular vulnerability to gang violence, drugs, theft, poor municipal services, underfunded schools, and inadequate housing— influences of poverty that overwhelmingly affect Latino students and households. In fact, the National Poverty Center showed that in 2010 26.6 percent of ‘Hispanics’ were living below the poverty line, a figure greater than their current overall population. Among children living in poverty, Latinos are disproportionately overrepresented and often reside in socially isolated neighborhoods where they face high concentrations of poverty, have families that are locked into low wage paying jobs that lack access to greater resources, like health care, and are exposed to threats of community violence.325
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In some cases however, the need for and creation of ‘safe spaces’ recognized a more specific need for spaces away from prejudice and stigma. These community centers provided members with a ‘safe space’ that is, a physical area in which they could affirm one another and ‘practice their ethnicity.’ In their article on acculturation in relation to diasporic cultures and postcolonial identities, S. Bhatia and A. Ram discussed the ways in which social marginalisation contributed to ‘informants’ desire to come together and practise their ethnicity’ and the way in which ‘ethnic organisations’ provided these spaces and opportunities.326 More specifically, they discussed the ways in which marginalized minority cultures are challenged severely by racism and the lack of a protective community available to ‘normalise’ self-image or guide them through.327

Given the composition of the community itself and racial composition of the staff at both MVFC and the Boys and Girls Club, these particular community organizations provide spaces for families to reconnect with a heritage language and culture in ways not always permitted within public schools or other public spaces. For members who attend MVFC and live in its area for example, ‘Spanish is the norm.’328 These were the words spoken by the community leader of the MVFC, ‘Marisol’, during my interview with her. She explained that while English is the dominant language spoken by the children throughout the community center, many of the adults address each other and the children in Spanish. Marisol’s observations of language preference among younger children and adolescents are consistent with the linguistic composition of this particular community. While English is the primary language spoken and taught within the two public schools observed in Chapter Three (Braddock Drive and ICEF Vista), the Spanish language is prevalent in the community spaces

328 MVFC organizer and staff member, ‘Marisol’ interviewed by Becky Avila, Los Angeles, CA. March 2014.
outside of it. In fact, one can walk the four blocks between Braddock Drive Elementary and ICEF Vista without needing to communicate in English at all. This is not necessarily a reflection of the residents’ inability to speak English but rather indicative of the community’s demographics and ability to exercise preference in language communication. The local amenities are either owned by or predominately staffed by Spanish-speaking Latino employees; storefront signage is also often in Spanish. Even still, the degree of Spanish fluency within the community will vary significantly and the type of Spanish, or English for that matter, is a blend and closely resembles Chicano English. Nevertheless, as described above, the Spanish language plays a significant role in the daily-lives of the students and families from within this more localized area.

The language practices of Latinos described by Marisol within MVFC is also consistent with national trends which indicate that eighty-five per cent of Latinos under the age of 19 are second or third generation Latinos and as such are more likely to use English as their primary language.\textsuperscript{329} However, given the likelihood of their exposure to the Spanish language—either from first-generation parents or grandparents, research shows that most Latino children will have some relationship to the Spanish language. Indeed an overwhelming number of Latino children throughout the United States are cared for by their grandparents, indicating a likelihood that they will be exposed to the Spanish language in some ways.\textsuperscript{330}

In creating Spanish-language spaces, therefore the parental voice or voice of those of older generations gain access to the means of communication not readily available to them in spaces outside of the home or community. This demonstrates the potential for community organizations to cultivate and bridge familial relations and pass on cultural heritage through language communication within these designated spaces as they are often excluded from access


\textsuperscript{330} Tara Bahramour, ‘As Families Change, Grandparents are Stepping in to Take Care of Grandchildren, Study Says,’ \textit{The Washington Post}, November 5\textsuperscript{th} 2013.
to communication within the public schools. Furthermore, these community spaces provide instances where parents and children and neighborhood members meet, not to mention those of varying immigrant or generational status.

An important challenge for Critical Pedagogy is to promote students’ agency in language issues outside the classroom. Previous research has suggested that by providing heritage language and bilingual speakers with structured contexts outside of the classroom in which they serve as ‘language experts,’ critical service learning programs can promote student engagement and allow students to resist the subordinating ideologies that devalue their language and language experiences. Such programs can provide spaces for bilingual speakers to exercise their agency by becoming language activists engaged in shaping the language policies and practices for the future. Such spaces also encourage translanguaging.

The second theme found within my observation of these community spaces was an emphasis on education as an acceptable (and guaranteed) pathway to economic and social success. In fact, prominent within each of the community centers and after-school programs cited in this study is an emphasis on raising or maintaining high academic performance. A majority of the after-school activities and weekend or summer workshops provided for example are dedicated to ensuring that students are completing their school-work and performing well academically. The organizations often provide tutoring, mentoring, and after-school homework help. The Mar Vista Family Center and Boys and Girls Club take additional educative measures by providing a range of programs that seek to develop an early passion for learning, support learning outside the classroom, and promote learning within the family. MVFC for example provides early childhood education in the form of a pre-school as well as a number of youth and family development programs held throughout the week and weekend. Some of these

courses include computer literacy, health and wellness programs and creative recreational activities like dance, art, and photography. Likewise, the Boys and Girls Club offer a number of programs as part of their ‘Learning Zone,’ ‘Discovery’ and ‘DIY’ programs. These programs seek to instill student curiosity and skills in subjects such as science, reading, environmental science, art and dance.

While the emphasis on academics is likely a response to the statistical research which indicates the degree to which educational attainment is lacking in low-income neighborhoods across the country, where Latinos feature overwhelmingly, implicit within the organization’s emphasis on school work is the belief that (1) the U.S. is an economically and socially mobile society and (2) that education and schooling is a route for ensuring equal opportunity for all individuals irrespective of class or race. This is one of the primary, albeit implicit, lessons offered by the community centers. This neo-liberal perspective characterizes U.S. society as a meritocracy whereby barriers to success are mainly personal and therefore access to the mainstream is a question of choice, of whether one simply wants to participate.

In this view, education is an institution which mitigates gender, class and, racial barriers to success. Economic inequalities therefore, ‘result from differences in natural qualities and in one’s motivation and will to work.’\textsuperscript{332} While studies have found that involvement in organized after-school activities is advantageous, especially for youth at greater risk of high school dropout, one of the implicit lessons within this emphasis on education is the suggestion that schooling’s capacity to deliver equitable access.\textsuperscript{333} Of course, in order to ‘perform well in school’ one must adopt specific behavioral norms. Here we return to the issues raised at the


beginning of this chapter. A capitalist system and liberal economy spurs the philosophy that competence or academic achievement should be rewarded with success and incompetence or underachievement punished with failure. It might serve the illusion that anyone can make it within the existing socioeconomic order if the participants work sufficiently at it by acquiring computer literacy skills, becoming competent in mathematics, science or engineering.

The community centers seeming acceptance and promotion of this ideology affects their objectives and methodologies but also influences, in tandem with parental and community knowledge, their approach to the school system, their view of the Spanish and English language and their role in society as Latinos. Indeed, when we look at the rhetoric used by these organizations, we can see that the educational and self-development components emphasize the individual—that is, the message is one that attempts to prepare students for individual competition within the job market. Consider for example the mission statement for the Boys and Girls Club included on their website: ‘inspire and enable all young people, especially those who need us most, to realize their full potential as caring, responsible and productive citizens.’

Here the individual is encouraged to think of himself or herself as competing for an elite position that is part of their right as an American to seize. This kind of discourse instils loyalty to the system and conventional attitudes are cultivated in the process of preparation for this possibility. Social stratification theory has highlighted that the ultimate aim of any hierarchical order is to ensure loyalty from the most disadvantaged classes toward a system in which their members receive less than a proportional share of ‘society’s goods.’ Social stratification theory however, leaves little room for the resistance efforts or strategies employed by these groups to either slow assimilation or segment it.
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In their observation of Haitian second-generation immigrants in the 1990s for example, Portes and Zhou found that immigrant youths who ‘remain firmly ensconced in their respective ethnic communities may [...] have a better chance for educational and economic mobility through use of the material and social capital that their communities make available.’

Disadvantaged groups like low-income Latinos often have little recourse but to adopt mainstream cultural norms in hope of gaining any social or economic mobility. It is thus unfair to blame members of these groups for seeking to participate in the American political economy. Fanon characterised those who accepted and conformed to the rules of colonial society as people who mimicked their oppressors. He argued that ‘copying the ‘master’ suppresses one’s own cultural identity. Legal discourse scholar, Margaret E. Montoya recognizes this suppression as a strategy of self-preservation. While she too discusses mimicry as an aspect of subordination in which oppressed communities are forced to ‘mimic the styles, preferences, and mannerisms of those who dominate us, even when we have become aware of the mimicry’ Montoya simultaneously recognizes it as a survival strategy.

The options that many students living in low-income communities who are also marginalized by the mainstream culture are limited: they can remain in their present condition and keep their bonds (of poverty), assimilate into white middle class society or upwards within their ethnic group but even this latter option has limits on how high it can go when parity between whites and communities of color are not yet economically and socially matched. Latino students in this hegemonic social order are obliged to adapt to normatively Anglo styles, albeit misrecognized as ‘performing well in school’ in this context, or else risk failure in the job market and as such, families must learn to reconcile these choices or preferences made by
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their children or sometimes, make them for the children. To support their children’s academic progress and success in American families, immigrant families and other oppressed communities have encouraged their children to speak Standard American English and ‘tolerated’ other aspects of acculturation such as changes in clothes, recreational preferences, and friends. Like Rodriguez, Montoya similarly discusses this choice in terms of a distinction between the public and private binary. In her essay on Latina stories, Montoya recalls her preparation for school:

As I put on my uniform and my mother braided my hair, I changed;
I became my public self. My trenzas (braids) announced that I was clean and well-cared for at home. My trenzas and school uniform blurred the differences between my family’s economic and cultural circumstances and those of the more economically comfortable Anglo students. I welcomed the braids and uniform as a disguise which concealed my minimal wardrobe and the relative poverty in which my family lived.340

Similar to Rodriguez, it is only when Montoya dons her mask, which erases some of the traces of her private cultural life, that she feels able to present herself in public.

While much of the academic focus on diaspora suggests that the stronger the diasporic consciousness the less integrated the group, the evidence from this case study suggests that these organizations are still largely supporting a greater American structure. More recent research also demonstrates the way in which ethnic boundaries facilitate a commitment to the host country. By affirming ethnic practices and networks, Bandana Purkayastha found in her study of U.S.-Born South Asian Americans, that individuals integrate more easily into the

public sphere when they have a supportive ethnic identity that they can turn to in times of discriminatory treatment from the Anglo American mainstream. With a diasporic identity, she argues, these ethnic communities can interact more comfortably with white peers and in mainstream spaces, while remaining proud of their distinct way of life. Involvement in ethnic, including religious, organisations also can facilitate integration. Further research reveals success within key institutions, namely, the education sphere. Research by Usha George and Ferzana Chaze document that members of minority groups found that being able to participate in the cultural practices of an individual’s ethnic group gave people a sense of ‘roots’, which helped them interact with those outside of the group, primarily Anglo Americans. By knowing more of one’s ancestry and taking part in ethnic associations, her research found, informants felt more secure in their differences and better able to mingle with others. The result, they found, was that these groups were able to assert ethnic and pan-ethnic commitments as a means of becoming American.

The sociological research continuously finds that youth in poor urban communities utilize social networks through family members, social organizations, peers and after-school programs to make healthy choices and participate in civic activities that build individual and collective capacity to respond to educational and social development needs of the state. Individuals participate in these community centers because of an interest in the resources

provided to this specific ethnic and low-income community and as a way to participate or engage with their ethnic community in response to both external (poverty, schooling) and internal (social) factors. Both organizations value the recruitment of local staff who are sensitive to the specific needs of the community. For the Boys and Girls Club, forty-seven percent of its staff comes directly from the community it serves (many within two miles); sixty-seven percent are Latino. This ‘close to home’ approach, as described by the program director, allows them to draw upon community members who are locally invested: ‘our staff not only care very much about the futures of our children, but also are geographically and culturally rooted to the neighborhoods in which they work.’ As such the centers appear in some ways motivated to maintain the close ethnic or cultural ties of their patrons.

Hiring staff directly from the community is more likely to engender trust and rapport between staff and parents and might encourage wider participation within the programs. ‘Network recruiting,’ according to Waldinger, ‘increases the frequency of interaction among group members, in turn strengthening their group identity.’ A stronger group identity leads to clearer and more established boundaries between insiders and outsiders. Relationships between insiders and outsiders, according to this argument, lack the characteristics that are conducive to trust, which leads to a preference for continual interaction with insiders. The negative side of this is that network recruiting restricts access to occupational and industrial niches for members of other ethnic groups, giving rise to a perception of competition and conflict on the basis of group membership. Waldinger and Lichter illustrate this process by documenting patterns of conflict between African Americans and Latino workers in Los Angeles, as well as among Latinos—mainly between Mexican and Central American
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immigrants. In such scenarios, both initial recruitment opportunities and subsequent mobility prospects are reduced by monopolization of resources by other ethnic groups.

MVFC also hire from within the community hoping to promote community agency through extended community networks. According to one community organizer, numerous students have expressed interest in working for MVFC summer program as camp counselors. My interview with one of the organizers revealed that many of its participants were happy to do so: ‘it’s a program for youth by youth,’ she confirmed as she discussed in particular the eagerness of older students to become camp counselors or tutors: ‘having been through the program themselves they are keen to take on the leadership roles, continue to be a part of something that they themselves have been a part of. There is a sense of responsibility and commitment.’

The centers help foster a sense of community. They provide a local network of parents for members to use when in need of additional support. Parents from the community centers, especially within MFVC often provided additional hours of childcare after club activities for other parents. In an interview, the director at MFVC, explained the value of having these adult connections: ‘Not only do we watch each other’s kids,’ she states, ‘but we talk, we have lunch and we, ya know, support each other. We tell each other where to go for what.’ Telling each other ‘where to go’ is about sharing information about issues directly relevant to the local and ethnic community. The emphasis on the community network and family is central to MVFC. Their main goal, as stated on their website, is to ‘help families make positive changes in their lives and their communities.’
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services and programs that encourage and sustain parental involvement in their child’s education and social and recreational development.

Research has indicated that the pressure to resist a complete Americanization comes from within the ethnic group. Even when ethnic groups may not explicitly criticize the mainstream, their diasporic interests still can signal continuity with a homeland. They often worry about assimilating too much, and being accused of ‘selling out,’ forgetting the ethnic community and abandoning the family, or not assimilating enough, often measured through their use, proficiency and preference for Standard American English. The former, assimilation, can be linked to cultural betrayal. In Spanish this is referred to as agringado—to become gringo, or whitewashed. It is very similar to the word pocho introduced in Chapter One that specifically refers to one’s adoption of Standard American English or, the blending of Spanish and English, Spanglish. They are creating spaces in which the Spanish language can flourish but in understanding the structural demands of policies like Proposition 227 also recognize the importance of subscribing to the current demands of the political economy. More widely evident is how community-based organizations in low-income urban communities can provide youth access to networks, ideas and experiences that help them overcome structural constraints in their communities whilst encouraging them to become active participants in changing neighborhood conditions. By confronting the influences of poverty that shape their daily-lives community members learn to confront unjust social and economic conditions. MVFC for example,

Through planned activities, moderated discussions, and opportunities for self-reflection, participants of all ages learn how

to create safe environments that foster teamwork, how to break
down barriers of cultural and racial differences, how to build
healthier families and communities, and how to transform
destructive community systems and bring about social and
economic change.\textsuperscript{353}

This model from MVFC shows how these community centers contribute to the influence of young people’s consciousness of their own existence, culture and neighbourhood. In many ways this community is trying hard to achieve the ‘‘best of both worlds’’ by enjoying aspects of both an ethnic enclave and American national identity. ‘Selective acculturation’, explain Portes and Rumbaut, is when children and parents learn the customs and language of American society whilst maintaining the customs and language of the original culture and finding a place within their ethnic community. This typically results in the second-generation children being bi-cultural and at times bilingual and therefore works to assuage fears of heritage loss among the family and ethnic community.\textsuperscript{354} While Portes and Rumbaut recognize that selective acculturation requires supportive co-ethnic networks, their work fails to consider the need for a supportive political infrastructure. Selective acculturation can only take hold if and when policies begin to cater or support this method of adaptation. Otherwise the process of selective acculturation is hindered by a society with strong anti-immigrant sentiments and pro-assimilationist policies. Segmented assimilation is only a workable strategy when institutions can support the varying degrees of assimilation ongoing within marginalized communities.

Evident in policies such as Proposition 227 is the presupposition that Spanish is not a public language and as such, has no place in public institutions like the public school. This premise, as demonstrated through the experiences of authors like Rodriguez, Montoya and
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Anzaldúa, forces many Latino students and families to choose between the material, social and economic success granted by the public mainstream or the preservation of a familial and cultural heritage that is often sustained through linguistic preservation. As a result, complex mediations between language, identity and familial heritage unfold for students labelled ‘English-Language Learner’ who must reconcile between the demands of the public and private realms. While Proposition 227 was drafted with intentions to affect only the public sphere, the wider implications for non-English or bilingual speakers in the private sphere is clear. By accelerating the process by which new generations acquire English in order to participate in economic activity and the public sphere, Proposition 227 hinders the development of a student’s heritage/familial language, a process that can create a language and cultural barrier between the student and the families.

4.7 Conclusion

A discussion of the community centers in Mar Vista Gardens is used to demonstrate some of the real and everyday ways that Latino communities and families are mitigating the pressures and expectations of an American liberal economy with maintaining a strong ethnic identity and collective sense of self. Given the rapid social changes taking place within the United States, we should be inclined to consider whether there is a way to relieve the Latino population of some of the burdens unintentionally caused by policies like Proposition 227. For example: how would bilingual or translingual approaches to language education help alleviate some of the pressures (academic, familial, and personal) often experienced by Latino students?

In their longitudinal study of second-generation immigrants, Portes and Rumbaut found that the preservation of the home culture and language was repeatedly linked with higher self-esteem, educational and occupational expectations, and achievements.\(^{355}\) Additionally, they
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found that it reduced parent-child conflict (because it assuaged parental fears over a loss of the heritage culture) and contributed to a confident development of the child’s ethnic identity.\textsuperscript{356} Any hesitations to implement bilingual approaches to language education are the result of specific fears with which typically Anglo Americans regard Latinos as a group. For example, many believe that one of the reasons that Latinos find it particularly difficult to integrate into U.S. society is because of their strong linguistic and cultural distinctions.\textsuperscript{357} However, as the research consistently reveals the majority of Latinos are 1) U.S.-born and 2) primarily dominant English speakers. Therefore this should no longer be a valid area of concern. The suggestion is not to replace English with the Spanish language; this would harm multiple communities including Latinos for whom English is the primary language. The suggestion rather, is for policy-makers to understand the way in which the public and private spheres are imbricated for specific communities and to implement an educational infrastructure that supports communities in navigating this overlap. If we remove the pressure to assimilate completely by institutionalizing pathways for more segmented assimilation by introducing language initiatives that recognize the growing presence of Spanish-English bilingual speakers, and bilingual speakers more generally, as well as eradicating archaic and ineffective measures like Proposition 227, this might relieve families and communities of the burdens of having to choose between assimilation or cultural preservation.

The community organizations discussed in this chapter go some way to rebuild the familial relationships often disrupted through English language communication. However, in recognizing the material benefits to be gained from participation in the public sphere, where communication in the English language is essential, they also, in many ways conform to the demands of the public agenda. The analysis presented here reveals the consistent complexities
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for Latino communities in navigating the public and private spheres, spheres often divided along economic and domestic lines and in which language plays a central role in defining the boundaries between the two. While some studies on immigrant communities are quick to suggest that second-generation Latinos are highly assimilated, my observations reveal a more complex approach to acculturation and demonstrate a simultaneous commitment to the cultural demands of the liberal state while they attempt to retain elements of their ethnic culture. Although the ideals and rhetoric of the liberal state continue to maintain that the division between the public and private sphere are separate and unrelated, substantial research from within the Social Sciences reveals the way in which these spheres are more imbricated for specific communities. The arguments provided by Mnookin, Klare, Lazar, and Wodak on the public/private spheres and research from within the Social Sciences help to situate my analysis of the public/private binary into a more nuanced discussion on language, race, and education for Latino communities in California and the inequalities that emerge from the social dichotomization, gendering, and racialization of these spaces.

The distinction between the public and private sphere, like the distinction between the standard and non-standard languages, is not a natural one but rather a rhetoric put in place to justify a social and political stratification. Indeed, the scholars named above assert that the public/private distinction and accompanying rhetoric is used to conceal the hierarchical demarcations of everyday-life. The ideals and rhetoric of the liberal state continue to maintain that the division between the public and private sphere are separate and unrelated; the discussion presented here attempts to complicate this narrow view.

While the case material presented here is not intended to represent all Latino communities, not even those within this geographic region, it serves as an indicator of possible trends and ways in which language expectations and customs in schools might affect daily-life

outside of the formal school system. More specifically, it demonstrates the way in which assimilative policies like Proposition 227 can constrain family and community life for many immigrant students or students of color. The community centers and after-school programs referenced in this research, share the focus of providing community members with the space to engage in broader social networks that facilitate increased educational engagement, familial relationships, and community transformation. In providing these spaces along with logistical, legal and emotional support, these programs ultimately seek to address the influences of poverty, neighborhood isolation, and social and economic marginality while also mitigating the tensions between families and the expectations between mainstream society. The way in which this is accomplished contributes to the socialization of Latino children in this neighborhood and informs their development of the ethnic, national and cultural self and contributes to their understanding of American society and their place within it.
Chapter Five

‘The Struggle of Identities Continues:’ Bilingual Television and the Production
Of Latino Characters

5.1 Introduction

So far this thesis has discussed how the ideologies ensconced in English-Only approaches to English-language education affects Latinos in the classroom and in the community. This chapter considers these ideologies as they exist in a broader context and more specifically, reviews the contributions made by children’s television media in shaping people’s beliefs towards Latino ethnicities as they engage in bilingual language instruction for mass audiences outside of the school. Just as Proposition 227 curtailed bilingual education formally in California public schools, a trend in media programming has ironically introduced bilingual education to viewers at home. In the last twenty years, Latino characters and Spanish-language dialogue has been increasingly depicted in English-language television. Children’s animated programming, in particular, has become one of the few places that the Spanish language and Latino characters enjoy a leading presence. This visible influence of Latino culture is for many a tangible symbol of a changing America.

The noticeable development of Spanish-language dialogue in English-language media acknowledges a shift in Latino language habits. Earlier market research had indicated that linguistically segregated programming was the best way to target the growing number of Latino viewers in the United States. Accordingly, Spanish-language networks such as Univision and Telemundo held the great share of audience ratings for Latino viewers. According to the Census however, eighty-five per cent of Latinos in the U.S. under the age of 19 are second or
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third generation Latinos and as such, more likely to use English as their primary language.\textsuperscript{361} As young Latinos have become less Spanish-language dominant, English-language networks have begun to capitalize on their preference for English-language communication while acknowledging a heritage link to the Spanish language as a way of specifically attracting Latino viewers.

Market research from the early 2000s, shows that Latino children highly value the Spanish language as something that makes them unique, ‘even if they are not using it much.’\textsuperscript{362} A New American Dimensions study indicated this same trend among adult third-generation Latinos. Fifty-seven per cent of which reported that they ‘intend to make sure [their] children speak Spanish’ even though language trends among this same group showed that only fifteen per cent said they themselves spoke Spanish ‘well or very well.’ Regardless of their own language usage, research shows that the Spanish language remains important to multiple generation Latinos. A 2005 report from the Cultural Access Group, commissioned by Nickelodeon, indicated that sixty-eight per cent of the young Latinos that they surveyed said that it was ‘very or kind of important to see [their] ethnic group represented on television.’

What this research reveals is the way in which Latino demographic data, population growth and language behavior is influencing the broader mainstream market with cultural and media productions that reflect these larger demographic trends and up until most recently, gaps in the market. This thesis argues however that while Latino purchasing power may be able to influence the cultural productions designed to meet their consumer demands, they are not in control of their own design, or representation and by extension not in control of the way in which they are constructed, mediated or consumed. Arguably, these productions have co-opted Latino interests and culture in an attempt to turn a quick profit. This produces overly simplistic
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discourses about Latinos that serve to perpetuate and sustain the way Latinos are understood socially, politically, and linguistically. Nevertheless, these trends continue to be compensated and celebrated uncritically by audiences. The purpose of this analysis is to encourage us to think more critically of the increased representation of Latino identities within popular culture to highlight the continuation of an elite dominance and white gaze that defines, constructs, and markets Latino identities. What looks like greater representation in culture and in the market is a superficial expression of social and cultural change that companies seek to profit from at the expense of those who are constructed.

By focusing on Nickelodeon’s *Dora the Explorer*, a show that made television history as the first animated program to feature a leading Latino protagonist, this Chapter critically examines character language usage and other ethnic signifiers to highlight the racial stereotypes that are continually bound to Latino ethnicities and depicted on screen. Significantly, *Dora the Explorer* is also specifically designed to encourage young children to expand their vocabularies in not one but two languages—English and Spanish. Featuring a young Latina heroine as its protagonist, *Dora* for many symbolized the changing face of children’s television and the United States. For those on the left, this trend in children’s television is demonstrative of an increasing acceptance and embrace of Latino cultures. An optimistic Erin L. Ryan for example, argues that *Dora* upset an ‘established balance’ by empowering Spanish-speaking and bilingual children across the country, and Latinas more specifically.\(^{363}\)

As has been discussed throughout this thesis thus far, language education in the United States is an extremely political issue that is cloaked in competing theories about immigration, acculturation, and assimilation. Nickelodeon’s decision to assume the role of bilingual language educators through its production of *Dora the Explorer* actively engages the show in

the broader discourses that this debate engenders. While their pro-bilingual stance is demonstrated through the production of *Dora*, and later *Go Diego Go!* their position on the more nuanced aspects of the bilingual education debate and Latino identities deserves critical attention. This chapter ultimately argues that the implicit treatment of bilingualism and the Spanish language in *Dora the Explorer* continues to position Latinos as ethnic or foreign others.

### 5.2 Dora the Explorer

*Dora the Explorer* made its Nickelodeon television debut on August 14, 2000. The Emmy Award-winning show can be seen today in over seventy-four countries. In the United States, the show can be found on three separate networks: Nickelodeon, Noggin, and CBS. Each of these networks air the program weekly, capturing an audience of over 25 million people each month. A show specifically designed for preschoolers, *Dora the Explorer* utilizes an interactive pre-school curriculum based on Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligence model.

Gardner’s model posits that in addition to skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic, children should be encouraged to engage in linguistic, musical, and bodily-kinesthetic skills. While the show’s bilingual component is only one aspect of Gardner’s model it is this aspect of that receives the most attention from scholars and popular press alike, as it distinguishes *Dora* from other similar children’s programming.

Each episode revolves around Dora solving a puzzle or mystery with her sidekick, Boots and the enlisted assistance of the viewer. Together Dora, Boots and viewer solve the obstacles that they encounter along the way. In overcoming these obstacles, viewers are encouraged to count, identify shapes and colors, and to physically model the actions in which
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Dora and other characters are engaged.\textsuperscript{367} This is part of the bodily/kinesthetic intelligence outlined by Gardner’s curriculum. Once they achieve their end goal, Dora encourages the audience to celebrate with her in her signature end of episode dance, ‘We Did It! ¡Lo Hicimos!’ While the main narrative of the show emphasizes the solving of the daily mystery, a core aspect of the show’s curricula is to introduce viewers to Latino culture and enhance pre-schoolers’ appreciation for communicating in another language—in this case Spanish.\textsuperscript{368}

The program’s bilingual component was added after it was decided that Dora would be Latina, a ‘deliberate and premeditated’ move made by Nickelodeon as part of an initiative to expand the presence of Latino characters on television.\textsuperscript{369} According to Nickelodeon president Herb Scannell, programs like \textit{Dora} were ‘the results of a conscious effort to again find new voices with great stories to tell for kids.’\textsuperscript{370} Interviews with \textit{Dora} executive producer, Chris Gifford, reveal that Dora was not initially constructed as a Latina. ‘She began,’ he explains, ‘as a series of woodland creatures before she became Nina, a little girl who was not Latina.’\textsuperscript{371} However when Scannell asked the \textit{Dora} executive team to ‘turn the girl into a Latina’ they sought to create a character with a ‘multicultural bent, someone who would resonate with kids who grew up in bilingual households.’\textsuperscript{372} Today \textit{Dora} is one of the most-watched pre-school television shows in the United States and part of an increasing trend in American media over the last fifteen years that features lead Latino bilingual personas. Since \textit{Dora}, children’s animated television has seen Nickelodeon’s spin-off to \textit{Dora, ¡Go, Diego, Go!} (2005), Warner Bros. \textit{Mucha Lucha} (2002), PBS’s \textit{Maya and Miguel} (2004) Disney’s \textit{Handy Manny} (2006)

\textsuperscript{368} When \textit{Dora} is broadcasted in countries outside of the U.S. her language instruction shifts to meet the needs of this specific language community. That is she teaches English and the host language.
\textsuperscript{369} Banat-Weiser, \textit{Kids Rule!}
\textsuperscript{371} ‘Coffee with Chris Gifford’
\textsuperscript{372} Fernandez, ‘Respect, Trust, Create’
and soon to be Disney’s first Latina heroine, *Elena of Avalor* (2016). The popularization of Latino identities in children’s media as seen here gives the impression that American culture is becoming not only more tolerant of Latino cultures but more inclusive. Before analytical treatment is given to *Dora*, it is useful to consider how Latinos have been historically scripted and depicted for the screen. This is done so that we may consider the extent to which contemporary shows like *Dora*, differ or adhere to some of the previous tropes used to signify “latin-ness”

### 5.3 Latinos, Language, and Television

Language has played a central role in signifying and emphasizing the difference between Latino characters and non-Latino characters represented in popular culture. In American English-language media, it is typical to see depictions of Latinos who either speak Spanish or some kind of heavily accented—with traces of the Spanish language—English.\(^{373}\) This is evident in some of the earliest portrayals of Latino characters: CBS’s depiction of Ricky Ricardo in *I Love Lucy* and Warner Bros. characterization of Mexicans in *Speedy Gonzales* are just two examples.

Critical inquiries into the racial and ethnic representation of minority identities on television captured academic interest during the Civil Rights era of the 1960s and 1970s. Initial studies found that non-white characters were either portrayed in particularly stereotypical ways or erased altogether.\(^{374}\) Without exception Latinos have been traditionally underrepresented in television and when presented are often deferred to the most stereotypical of views. CBS’s *I Love Lucy* (1951-1957), for example emphasized Desi Arnaz’s ostentatiously accented English and use of the Spanish language to convey the Cuban identity of his character, Ricky Ricardo.
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*I Love Lucy* is significant because it is one of the first instances where the Spanish language was commonly incorporated into every episode. Furthermore, Arnaz was the first Latino star of prime time English-language television. While the show’s main narrative arc was one that emphasized the differences between husband and wife, or men and women, there were also moments when the show stressed the cultural differences between Lucy (an Anglo American) and Ricky. These cultural differences were most often demonstrated through the couple’s linguistic differences. Indeed, Ricky’s precarious command of the English language and impassioned use of the Spanish language provided much of the show’s comic relief; the latter fueled more so by Lucy’s—and the audience’s’ presumed—inability to understand Spanish. However, the ability to translate Ricky’s Spanish is unnecessary as his Spanish outbursts are primarily a signal of his frustration with Lucy and the audience’s cue to laugh at his aural otherness.375 This formulaic use of Ricky’s foreignness is included in most of the *I Love Lucy* episodes.

Ricky’s heavily accented English is just as integral, if not more so, to the audience’s comedic pleasure. As we have seen in previous examples throughout this research poor English skills are often measured by one’s accent. Ricky has a thick Cuban accent, he says, ‘dunt’ for ‘don’t’ and ‘wunt’ for ‘won’t.’ ‘Lucy, you’ve got some ‘splaining to do’ is also a common catchphrase of his. Ricky’s thick accent often causes the audience and Lucy to overlook the fact that Ricky spends most of the show speaking in fluent and grammatically correct English. In a 1952 episode entitled, ‘Lucy Hires an English Tutor,’ Lucy attempts to improve Ricky’s English to prevent their unborn child from acquiring his poor English skills and accent:

Lucy: ‘Ricky, promise me you won’t talk to our child till it’s about eighteen or nineteen years old.’

Ricky: ‘What’s wrong with the way I talk?’
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Lucy: ‘Well I haven’t told you this but you speak with a slight accent.’

In this scene Ricky’s accent is the target of ridicule and comic relief for the audience. His ‘strange accent,’ as the English tutor in the following scene describes, is heavily contrasted with the tutor’s Standard American English for the audiences’ enjoyment. The scene’s humour relies on the English tutor’s difficulty with understanding Ricky’s English.

In his analysis of Latino representation in Hollywood films, Charles Ramirez Berg argues that Arnaz’s portrayal of Ricky Ricardo is informed by the Male Buffoon archetype, one of six Latino archetypes that are based on prevailing stereotypes about Latinos as bandits, buffoons or lovers. The Male Buffoon, Berg argues, serves as the ‘second-banana comic relief,’ meaning that what is funny about the character and what is given to the audience to laugh at, ‘are the very characteristics that separate him from Hollywood’s vision of the WASP American mainstream.’ The Male Buffoon is often characterized as simpleminded, unable to master Standard English, and one who childishly regresses into emotionality—as Ricky does with his Spanish outbursts. Ricky’s hyperbolic accent and specific use of the Spanish language is, for Berg, part of a larger Latino caricature that is there to be laughed at and mocked by the audience. This is a reoccurring formula within the show and it uses preconceived notions of Latinos to set the scene and Ricky’s place within it.

In very similar ways, Warner Bros used Latino stereotypes as explicit markers of ethnic difference/otherness in their 1955 children’s character Speedy Gonzales, an animated Mexican mouse featured in the Looney Tunes cartoons. Described as the ‘fastest mouse in all of Mexico’ Speedy Gonzales’ ethnic identity was further signified through his brown fur, his yellow

sombrero, his extremely exaggerated Mexican accented English, and his use of the Spanish language. In many of the earlier Speedy Gonzales episodes, the Spanish dialogue between Speedy and his fellow Mexican mice is incoherent—that is, a lot of the dialogue is gibberish meant to pass as Spanish. The following dialogue is taken from the very first episode of Speedy Gonzalez.

Mouse 1: Hey Speedy! Polada! Comraro...el cheese se le mete el gringo pussycat.

Speedy: El gringo pussycat problemente?

Mouse 1: Problemente gros, Gonzalez, asistiano comearos?

Speedy: Si, si, Gonzalez apolado asistante comearos

Mouse 1: Gracias Señor Speedy, Gracias.

While there are gestures towards real Spanish words, for example, ‘asistiano’ as the Spanish verb *asistir* (to help or assist), ‘apolado’ for the Spanish verb *apoyar* (to support) and ‘comrares’ for the Spanish noun *compadres* (comrades), most of the dialogue here is gibberish, the primary objective of which is to convey ‘otherness,’ and more specifically Mexican otherness. These early associations between the Spanish language, the heavily accented English, and Latino identity continued to perpetuate stereotypes about the way Latinos speak.

*Sesame Street* was one of the first television shows to positively represent Latino characters and to introduce the Spanish language on English language television. This began in 1971 with the introduction of Mexican American actor Emilio Delgado whose character, Luis, was the first human addition to the original all-puppet cast. In the show, Luis runs the Fix It Shop with his Puerto Rican wife Maria, played by Sonia Manzano, another *Sesame Street* veteran. As of today (2015) Delgado and Manzano remain prominent characters on the show and continue to teach children about Latino traditions and simple Spanish phrases. Between 1971-1972, Puerto Rican actor Raúl Juliá also made frequent appearances on the show and
taught Spanish to the neighborhood kids. Beyond these real-life representations, *Sesame Street* also introduced Latino puppet characters.

In 1979, audiences were introduced to Oscar the Grouch’s Puerto Rican counterpart, Osvaldo (voiced by Latino puppeteer Gabriel Velez), the first bilingual Muppet on *Sesame Street*. Muppets with hints of various Latino dialects (traces of Spanish pronunciation) continued to make appearances throughout the show’s duration but the program’s first regularly featured Latino bilingual puppet, Rosita La Monstrua de las Cuevas (voiced by Mexican puppeteer Carmen Osbahr) came in the early 1990s. Rosita became the center of an ongoing segment called, ‘The Spanish Word of the Day.’ Rosita was specifically authored as a Mexican immigrant who spoke (with a noticeably Mexican accent) fondly and nostalgically of Mexico. Rosita’s characterization therefore was able to highlight themes of migration, acculturation, and attempts to preserve one’s heritage—some of the cultural politics experienced by many Latino families. This cultural specificity is at the heart of the co-productions’ global success. Airing in more than 130 countries with over 120 million viewers, *Sesame Street* has been adapted into 19 different international versions, each with its own characters, sets, and curricula. ‘Each local production,’ Davies states, ‘has the same essence as the series produced in the U.S. in a context that reflects local values and educational priorities.’

Now that some of the contemporary and historical context of bilingual programming and Latino depictions on television in the United States have been discussed we can turn our
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attention to the preschool television audience to which *Dora* more specifically is aimed, before engaging in a critical analysis of the show itself.

5.4 Children as Television Audiences

Research shows that young children form a unique audience that, because of the way in which they develop cognitively, mediate messages differently than adults do or from those at later stages of cognitive development. The general assumptions about children’s cognitive development guide media literacy scholars in their understanding of and analysis of how children as audiences engage with media. Review of these perspectives, and research that more specifically investigates the extent to which children adopt the sensibilities presented to them on television (and other media), are necessary for supporting this thesis’s focus on *Dora* ‘immediately observable’ aspects. This includes her physical signification (how she looks) and her linguistic patterns (how she sounds).

Recognizing media as one conduit through which information is passed and as an important part of the socialization process, several scholars conclude that children learn about the society they live in, and their position within it, from the cultural products offered to them by that society. One of the major concerns about the impact of television therefore has been its impact on social perceptions. Building on Albert Bandura’s 1977 model of social learning theory, which acknowledges the role of the environment in directing the process of socialization and cognitive development, scholars have examined the increasingly complex role that media and other communication technology play in the process of identity development for children and adolescents. Media studies scholars in particular, are often
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concerned with how viewers—especially children—who are continually exposed to television’s stereotyped roles may develop conceptions and perceptions about people that reflect the stereotypical images they see in the media.  

In her study on television and gender, Signorelli utilized Bandura and Walters 1963 theory on ‘social or observational learning’ to suggest that viewers, especially children, imitate the behavior of television characters in much the same way that they learn social and cognitive skills by imitating their parents, siblings, and peers. Although no one image or program will necessarily alter a child’s consciousness or behavior, she states, the quantity and frequency of media images can overall inform part of the childhood experience. Child development theories are often used alongside critical interrogations of how children consume media to understand more specifically, how television (and other media) can engender specific sensibilities about particular social groups. In fact, the extent to which negative, demeaning or trivializing images or representations of a particular gender or race encouraged equally negative perceptions of these groups in young viewers became the subject of heated academic and public debate.
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Initial research on the origins of racial bias focused primarily on the development of bias among adults. It was not until 1928 that academics within the sociological field began to focus on the development of racial awareness and racial bias in children. In his 1928 paper, ‘The Basis of Race Prejudice’, urban sociologist Robert E. Park proclaimed that children were ‘racially innocent’—that is, unaware of racial categories and therefore incapable of displaying racial prejudices. In 1929, contending literature argued that children develop racial attitudes from an early age. In his book *Race Attitudes in Young Children*, Bruno Lasker (1929) refuted Park’s position that children were color-blind and without race consciousness. For Lasker, children’s knowledge and contextualization of race was based on their social contexts, or what they were taught by adults, what they had experienced in light of America’s racial segregation and ‘by the profoundly biased nature of knowledge in the U.S. school curriculum.’ This thesis forwards Lasker’s position as it also identifies, schooling, families (adults), and media (social contexts and products) as institutions that constructs a knowledge which ultimately informs wider political discourses. These discourses inform children’s understanding of themselves, the world around them, and how others perceive them.

Woodson’s, *Mis-Education of the Negro* (1933) applied these theories to the specific experiences of African American students in the educational system. Woodson more specifically argued that the inherent biases of the school curriculum depleted the African American community’s self-worth. Indeed, and perhaps building off of Woodson’s initial claims, African American psychologists Kenneth and Mamie Clark, examined the extent to
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which preschool children noticed physical markers of race. In their experiment, the Clarks presented their subjects with photos, drawings, and dolls that represented a variety of racial physical markers and asked the children whether they resembled the people in the images. When children accurately matched themselves or others to the racial representation of those in the images, they were believed to demonstrate a level of racial awareness and racial difference. Clark and Clark concluded that the greatest amount of development in self-consciousness and racial identification occurred between the third and fourth years.

Further research documented the ways in which the lack of diversity on television, affected levels of self-esteem for children of color. Although no one image or program will necessarily alter a child’s consciousness or behavior, the quantity and frequency of media images can overall inform part of the childhood experience. As George Comstock (1993) states:

The influence of the medium [television] resides not in affecting how people behave but in what they think about. The medium [television] becomes a socio-cultural force not because people are what they see, but because what they see and talk about are important parts of their experience.

This accumulated experience, as Comstock states, contributes to the cultivation of the child’s values, beliefs, and expectations, ‘which shape the adult identity a child will carry and modify
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throughout his/her life. Out of this perspective Cultivation Studies emerged and measured the correlations between frequency of exposure to media representations and people’s attitudes, which it assumed to be linked.

The general hypothesis of Cultivation Theory is that the more time people spend watching television, the more likely their conceptions about the world and its people will reflect what they see on the small screen. This emphasizes the frequency and regularity of particular narratives or attitudes rather than the specific content that is expressed. Significantly, this approach moved away from the ‘effects’ theory of individual texts and rather, sought to reveal how higher exposure to media can create a greater likelihood for an individual to possess certain conceptions of social reality reflected in media outputs. Messenger-Davies argues that this frequent exposure from multiple mediums creates a ‘relationship’ between what children are repeatedly exposed to on the screen and their attitudes in ‘real-life’ and that stands a potential guide to behavior or attitude, a potential source of identification, a human exemplar that adolescents (and adults) may use to define and construct identity.

As Huntemann and Morgan argue, social interactions are partly informed by the shared understandings or stereotypes about people that the media provide. The application of both cognitive and social development theories can add further layers of analysis to the texts and the way they are consumed. Together this research illuminates some of the varying ways that media can

401 It is important to note Davies’ use of the word ‘relationship’ over ‘effects.’ Cultivation studies measures the correlations between frequency of exposure to media representations and peoples attitudes, which are then assumed to be linked.
402 Huntemann and Morgan, Media and Identity Development, 305.
facilitate, complicate, and contribute to the development of racial awareness, identity and biases. A basic grasp of this research is essential for supporting the analysis on Dora and children’s ‘decoding’ of the broader cultural messages embedded within it.

5.5 Exploring Dora the Explorer

As we have learned from previous interviews with the executive producers of Dora the Explorer, Dora was ‘turned into a Latina’ by way of her “Latin look” and Spanish-speaking skills. In this close reading of Dora the Explorer, I will discuss how Nickelodeon constructs and markets Latino identities by drawing on the ‘discursively familiar’—the stereotyped forms, both visible and audible signs of racial and ethnic difference that inform popularized ideas about Latinos.402 Furthermore, I will demonstrate how the discursive practices employed in the creation and popularization of Dora are similar to those utilized by a larger political and social discourse that positions Latinos as foreign others either to be tamed or exoticized for entertainment.

Dora’s “Latin” Look

Dora’s light skin, brown hair and brown eyes contribute to what Casanova refers to as the ‘generic Latina’ look.403 These characteristics gloss over any difference in national origin for Latinos as well as any racial differences. These obscurities become exceedingly problematic when Nickelodeon producers discuss, describe, and promote Dora as an ‘authentic’ Latina.404 Dora’s ‘generic’ Latina look, argues Guidotti-Hernandez, constructs a version of Latinidad that
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specifically emphasizes the Spanish European legacy of Hispanics, ignoring their indigenous and black roots. Continuing, she argues, that this is most apparent in Dora’s representation as a light skinned Latina with ‘good’ hair—read as straight, non-African hair. The overly simplistic and one-dimensional view of Latino identities encouraged by the show develops a narrative in which Latino ethnicities are fixed across borders or regions. This is only further demonstrated by the way Dora speaks.

*Dora’s “White” Accent*

As discussed in Chapter Two, the diversity of Latino English-language dialects and varying degrees of bilingualism is the product of national origin, immigration history, community composition, education level, exposure to other languages, and class. Dora’s accent does not demonstrate explicit language markers that would help audiences decode the kind of Latina Dora is meant to represent. Nickelodeon’s decision to omit such significant indicators by deliberately casting *Dora* actors with more standardized language forms can be read as an attempt to neutralize the political, cultural, social, and economic heritages of distinct Latino cultures as a means to situate Dora as a safe and more palatable Latino identity for mass consumption. The removal, or ‘extraction’ of the Spanish language from national origin, political, and social history permits social constructions of Latino subjects that are equally devoid of historical, national, and linguistic specificity. One problem with language neutralization, argues Colombian journalist Eduardo Caballero, is that ‘it’s a myth’ and ‘like Walter Cronkite, who, wanting to reach all, would not reach anyone... It’s generic, but it is not
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absolutely relevant or direct.\textsuperscript{410}

The neutralization of Dora’s accent carries with it strong associations with assimilation. This is perhaps why some Latino parent viewers have expressed some reservations about the way Dora speaks: ‘As a parent I like the show, but some of the Spanish sometimes bothers me because she [Dora] has a white accent.’\textsuperscript{411} Arguably, the viewer’s choice to distinguish her favor for the show ‘as a parent,’ suggests that she appreciates the show on the grounds that her [presumably Latino] child is in some ways represented by Dora and learning or hearing Spanish through Dora. Through Dora’s erasure of nuance, Nickelodeon as language instructor, advocates an assimilated approach to the language.

\textit{Sound, Setting, and Content}

It is not just Dora’s language or look that is neutralized but her overall construction as a Latina identity. She has no ethnic or cultural specificity. Nickelodeon producers reveal that Dora was deliberately designed as a ‘pan-ethnic’ Latina meaning that the specifics of her ethnic background (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican and so on) are left purposefully unspecified. This ‘pan-Latino’ identity, Gifford explains, would ‘appeal to kids of all ethnic backgrounds.’\textsuperscript{412} In practice, the show’s pan-ethnic strategy sees the amalgamation of various Latino cultures throughout \textit{Dora} episodes. The show’s opening theme song for example uses sounds from the Guatemalan \textit{marimba}, a percussion instrument, but the individual episode may find musical sounds and rhythms (salsa, merengue and sometimes more regional folk songs) from other Latin American countries. The home in which Dora’s family resides has been described as Spanish in style with an adobe building and red tile roof and episodes which emphasize Latino traditions similarly draw from different cultures. A Christmas episode for

\textsuperscript{410} Eduardo Caballero qtd in Arlene Dávila. Latinos, Inc (2001) p.605
\textsuperscript{412} In an article entitled, ‘Adorable Dora is Opening the Doors of Diversity,’ producers of the show comment specifically on her pan-ethnic representation.
example, features a Mexican parade called a *parranda* while another episode is based on a Puerto Rican legend. The show’s setting is equally elusive referencing vague tropical landscapes through the depiction of palm trees, coconuts, and various jungle creatures.

While white characters in children’s television programs often lack ethnic, cultural, and even regional specificity they are often not deliberately marketed as ‘authentic’ representations of particular white ethnic groups but rather as individuals. Texts which feature unspecified white characters therefore are less likely to function as a homogenising force. In fact, they are less likely to focus on ethnicity at all because their ethnicity is viewed as the norm, or the standard in which other ethnicities are set against. This is consistent with trends in the market documented by Dávila who noted that while the ‘general’ or ‘mainstream’ market was moving away from marketing strategies that targeted demographics and focusing instead on individual lifestyle preferences, that the ‘Hispanic’ market continued to aggregate or constitute this particular community of people into markets. By classifying and commercializing Dora as a pan-ethnic Latino, the producers at Nickelodeon—primarily whites—continue to subjugate Latino identities for the convenience of consumer consumption under a banner of racial inclusion and diversity.

*Nickelodeon as Bilingual Educators*

In the same way that bilingual education, for some, appeared to cater to minority language groups and immigrant cultures, the increasing development of bilingual television programs today engenders the same concerns. Consider this testimony from a parent viewer on Nickelodeon’s *Dora the Explorer*,

Dora used to be an ok show. Now I do not let my children watch it. There is way too much Spanish speaking in it. I do teach my kids to be willing to accept others as they are, but I feel that if the Spanish
speaking descent are going to come here and live then they need to be taught to learn and speak our language. We shouldn’t have to learn Spanish. It’s bad that even our cartoon programs have gone so far as to teach our children Spanish as much as it has. I feel that if you live here you need to speak our language. If not then leave. It should be a parent’s choice to teach our children other languages, not a cartoon network.⁴¹³

There are significant parallels to be drawn between the political anxieties that this particular viewer feels about bilingual programming and those felt about bilingual education in the public schools. In both circumstances, bilingual education, irrespective of its delivery is viewed as an encroachment by foreigners on what is ‘ours.’ Debates around English-language instruction are continually cloaked in larger discourses on assimilation, immigration, and public education. Significantly, the response also highlights the complexity of media as a space. ‘It should be a parent’s choice to teach our children other languages’, the parent argues, ‘not a cartoon network.’⁴¹⁴

A closer look at the type of bilingual education provided by Dora however reveals a firm commitment to a view that emphasizes monolingual English speakers as the standard and bilingual speaker as the ‘other.’ The use of the Spanish language in Dora is instrumental—that is, the language devoid of any social signifiers and not necessarily linked to specific Latino cultures, is more easily viewed as a skill to be acquired by young viewers. In this way, ethnic difference and cultural nuance is muted, or tamed, and the Spanish language therefore functions purely as a form of non-specific cultural capital (Spanish as a second language). The definition of bilingualism promoted by the show focuses on comprehension and basic vocabulary that

emphasizes the benefits of learning another language as a ‘tool for getting ahead’ rather than a product of a specific cultural heritage belonging to a distinct group of people.

Unlike Nickelodeon’s *Dora* and *¡Go Diego Go!*, PBS’s *Maya and Miguel*, which also features lead Latino characters, specify the children’s cultural heritage. Rather than employ a strategy that privileges pan-ethnicity, PBS’s *Maya and Miguel* uses cultural specificity as an entry point to diversity and Latino representation. *Maya and Miguel* debuted on PBS in 2011. Unlike *Dora*, *Maya and Miguel* does not actively seek to teach children Spanish or English but the show is nevertheless bilingual. Its two main characters, Maya and Miguel, and many of the shows secondary characters, are bilingual. Though viewers may learn a few Spanish phrases and words by watching, the show’s primary objective is not language instruction—that is, the character’s use of two languages is an organic part of their everyday existence rather than a method of instruction for viewers seeking to learn a ‘foreign’ language. In fact, the primary language spoken by most of the characters is English although they occasionally pepper their English-language dialogue with Spanish words or phrases. Also significantly different from *Dora* is the show’s explicit identification of the characters as mixed Mexican and Puerto Rican born and living in the United States. PBS’s portrayal of Latino characters is highly contrasted against a character like Dora, arguably the product of a more color-blind approach to racial and cultural politics where universality is the safest option so as not to exclude or offend. In practice however, Nickelodeon’s ‘pan-Latino’ strategy sees the aggregation of Latino identities, a group that as discussed throughout the previous Chapters, is incredibly diverse.

The show’s removal of context from the language is able to support the use of bilingual education without encouraging the need to engage with the cultures of the people who speak the language or making an explicit statement about bilingual education as it exists formally (or informally) in the United States.\textsuperscript{415} In some ways, this depoliticizes the bilingualism debate

\textsuperscript{415} de Casanova, Erynn Masi. ‘Spanish Language and Latino Ethnicity in Children’s Television
making it a skill to be gained rather than an association with a specific group of people. In other ways however, the show’s positioning of the Spanish language as devoid of social influences provides a greater insight into the ways in which Latinos and the Spanish language are viewed. Consider the way in which Nickelodeon describes the bilingual language component of the show on its website:

For many of our preschool viewers, *Dora* is their first encounter with a foreign language...the show might teach them a little Spanish and make them curious and interested in learning more, or simply make them aware of and comfortable with foreign languages. For our Spanish-speaking preschool viewers, seeing *Dora* use Spanish might encourage them to take pride in being bilingual.416

Here, *Dora* is presented as an opportunity for second-language acquisition among non-Spanish-speaking children. Spanish is situated as a ‘foreign language’ and not a language frequently used by many throughout the United States as a home or primary language. Nickelodeon creative director Brown Johnson describes the Spanish language as ‘magical.’ ‘The ability to speak another language’, he states ‘[becomes] really cool and powerful.’417 In his description the Spanish language is described as an exotic power as opposed to a method of communication commonly used throughout the United States. As in *I Love Lucy* and *Speedy Gonzales, Dora the Explorer* uses the Spanish language as an explicit marker of Latino identity, an identity which remains fastened to ideas of foreignness or ‘otherness.’ The process of ‘othering’ is a discourse borrowed from the social sciences and a framework that Said emphasized to describe the distorted lens in which oppressive powers categorized
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and marginalized ‘other’ communities.\textsuperscript{418} This is achieved not only through Nickelodeon’s positioning of the Spanish language but also the way in which it ‘tropicalizes’ Dora to evoke the image of the exotic Other. In their analysis of \textit{Dora}, Harewood and Valdivia (2005) apply Aparicio and Chávez-Silverman’s (1997) concept of ‘tropicalization’ to discuss how Dora’s depiction of palm trees, coconuts, stucco housing and jungle creatures is able to connote vaguely Latin American landscape.\textsuperscript{419} Because the Spanish language is depicted as a foreign other and not part of an American narrative per se, the issue of bilingualism is somewhat removed from a United States context. Dora’s cultural erasure can be read as part of an assimilative process or her having undergone a process of Americanization despite the fact that this specific American context is conspicuously absent from the show.

Arguably, the show’s simplistic depiction of Latino ethnicity is a response to theories in cognitive development that suggest that children are more limited than adults in placing descriptive features in wider social contexts—that is, they are less likely to understand the significance of what it means to be specifically Mexican versus specifically Puerto Rican because they lack the cultural schemata to place these distinguishing features within greater social contexts. The stereotypes provided in television, Signorelli argues, are particularly suited to the processes of social learning and cognitive development because they provide simplistic, often one-dimensional models of behaviors, strategies, rules, and tropes that will appear regularly in many different genres of programs.\textsuperscript{420}
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5.6 The ‘Hispanic’ Market

The generalization of Latino identities found in *Dora* does not end with specific network representations but rather is symptomatic of a larger perception of Latinos as one homogenous (consumer and cultural) group. When *Dora* premiered in 2000, the Latino population in the United States was estimated at 35 million—that is, 12 percent of the overall population. The ‘Hispanic’ market accounted for one of the fastest-growing sectors of the marketing industry.\(^{421}\) Today, the profitability of this ‘culture-specific’ market, as it is described by Arlene Dávila, continues to feed one of the largest sectors of the marketing industry in the United States. At 17 per cent of the population today, the Latino community’s purchasing power is estimated at $1.5 trillion.\(^{422}\)

Dávila’s analysis of the ‘Hispanic’ market documents that whereas the ‘general’ market in the United States is increasingly forgoing compartmentalization based on basic demographic data, such as gender, age-group and ethnicity, and focusing instead on more nuanced differences in lifestyle, tastes, and other sub-cultural preferences, the ‘Hispanic’ market remains bound to an understanding of Latinos as a homogenous and ‘culture-specific’ group. It is this aggregation of people, she argues, ‘that makes all Latinos part of the same undifferentiated ‘market’—whether they live in El Barrio or in an upscale New York high rise, or whether they watch *Frasier* or only Mexican novelas, or love Ricky Martin or consider him a sell-out.’\(^{423}\) While the erasure of nuance in the market is often discussed as a product of globalization and corporate conglomeration—and therefore an experience shared by most irrespective of race or ethnicity—the construction of the ‘Hispanic’ market as recognized by Dávila seems to evade this trend. Furthermore, she argues that the terms ‘general’ and ‘mainstream’ are pseudonyms for whiteness that help express the WASP ideal, ‘devoid of


\(^{422}\) Ibid.

\(^{423}\) Arlene Dávila. *Latinos, Inc: The Marketing and Making of a People* but from the actual book this time
blacks, Latinos, or any other “ethnics,” that provides the dominant reference against which Hispanic marketers produce their creations.\footnote{Dávila, \textit{Latinos Inc.}, 19.} As critical race theorists have similarly pointed out, ‘everyone has a race, but the hidden norm is white...When the parties are in a relationship of domination and subordination we tend to say that the dominant is normal, and the subordinate is different from normal.’\footnote{M.J Matsuda, ‘Voice of America: Accent, Antidiscrimination Law, and a Jurisprudence for the Last Reconstruction,’ \textit{Yale Law Journal} 100 (1991): 1329-1407.}

While keeping Dora monolithic may suit the purposes of marketing and mass production—it’s good business—this market imperative perpetuates the idea that Latinos are one homogenous group by categorizing the variety of Latino cultures and societies as a single entity and paying little attention to the social and cultural diversity of Latinos.\footnote{Ibid.}

\section*{5.7 Conclusion}
The notion that speaking Spanish, having brown skin, and dark features (hair and eyes) makes someone Latina raises many difficult questions about difference and authenticity. Through \textit{Dora}, Nickelodeon has made Latinos both visible and invisible, audible and inaudible. The simplistic representation of Dora as Latina presented in the show, seems to serve the cultural categorization processes of a particular audience or world-view—often dominated by white, monolingual English-speaking Americans. The show caters to a white gaze despite claims to accommodate Latino or ‘multicultural’ audiences. This gaze continues to position Latinos as ethnic ‘others.’ Dora’s basic Latino cultural signifiers benefit audiences less familiar with the nuances of Latino ethnicities, mainly non-Latino communities. Latino children are more than likely to possess the cultural schema necessary, regardless of developmental stage to differentiate and compare between these differences and similarities. This simplistic portrayal of Latinos, even though it is disconnected from actual realities of Latinos’ various
backgrounds, allows those in the commercial industry to draw from existing stereotypes of Latinos as a homogenous group, linked through their use of the Spanish language, while ‘positioning themselves as the “politically correct” voice with which to challenge stereotypes and educate consumers about Hispanic language and culture.’ \textsuperscript{427} Using this pan-ethnic strategy television companies are able to present themselves as networks committed to diversity while providing a neatly packaged, easily marketable, and palatable Latino identity that is ready for mass consumption.

While Latino personas are slowly gaining greater depictions on screen and recognized within the market, we continue to see the same kind of representation: Latinos as others—linguistically and culturally. Research has found that when children and adolescents do not see characters like themselves represented in the media that they are learning a fundamental lesson about their group’s—and by extension their own—importance in society: ‘Daily, they are being sent a loud and clear message that they do not count very much.’\textsuperscript{428} While this message has changed slightly given the increased portrayals of Latinos in media, the lessons transferred by shows like \textit{Dora} are not entirely positive. Rather than receive the message that they do not matter very much audiences are learning to overlook the nuances and differences within, between and among Latino communities. Despite the rich linguistic variance, diversity in national origin and racial composition, and varying experiences across the generations: ‘the funny name, the accent, the different (non-Anglo) culture, and the brown skin’, is enough to signify Dora as ethnically ‘other’—as Latina.\textsuperscript{429}

This overly simplistic way that Latino identities are signified, mediated, and consumed is as narrow as the way in which Latinos, with varying degrees of bilingual language fluency and variations of the English language are educated. Both the political and social discourse

\textsuperscript{427} Arlene Dávila, \textit{Latinos, Inc: The Marketing and Making of a People}; Sarah Banat Weiser 151
\textsuperscript{428} Huntemann and Morgan, ‘Media and Identity Development,’ In \textit{Handbook of Children and Media} (Eds) Singer and Singer (Los Angeles: Sage), 2012.
\textsuperscript{429} Vice President of Nickelodeon Jiménez.
undermines the complexities of Latino communities.
Chapter Six

Looking to the Future and ‘Overcoming the Tradition of Silence:’

Bilingual Education and Transformative Pedagogies

Introduction 6.1

The questions posed throughout the thesis raise difficult and pressing issues regarding the nature and extent of cultural and linguistic pluralism in the United States and the future of public education. More specifically, this thesis has discussed the ways in which Proposition 227, and the United States’ preference for English monolingualism impacts Latino students, families, and subjectivities. The ongoing debate about the schooling of linguistically minoritized students, Latinos in particular, ultimately addresses the kind of citizens that U.S. society wants and needs. Despite the fact that linguistically and culturally diverse students are disproportionately represented in school failure categories (such as high drop-out rates and low test scores), few of the prescriptions for school reform specifically address the causes of educational failure among such students and even fewer contemplate bilingualism and biliteracy as part of the solution. Throughout this thesis I have demonstrated the ways in which English-Only approaches to English-language education have detrimental effects for Latino students, families, communities and subjectivities. In this concluding chapter, I argue that bilingual education must become an essential component of educational reform efforts, especially those directed at under-achieving Latino students. More specifically, this final chapter explores Bilingual Education Programs—namely dual language programs, and Transformative Pedagogies as potential strategies for helping language minority students and communities overcome a tradition of being silenced. Before this work is undertaken, a brief
chapter summary is included to remind the reader of the main research questions and findings from each chapter.

6.2 Thesis Chapter Summary

Using qualitative approaches, which emphasized ethnographic perspectives, this thesis investigated a broad educational experience that is conceptually and theoretically refined by Critical Pedagogy and Chicano Studies. The interdisciplinary approach utilized by this thesis is an attempt to underline the value of drawing on insights gained across a variety of disciplinary fields and as a result, blur the boundaries between academic disciplines to encourage a broader approach to the Latino diaspora, the politics of language, and education in the U.S.A. By adopting such an interdisciplinary approach we can better understand the complexity of twenty-first-century America, and specifically the experiences of Latino communities.

Chapter One (Introduction) outlines the main research questions, objectives and methodological approaches and surveys the relevant literature. Chapter Two, “If You Want to be American, Speak ‘American:’” Language and Identity in the United States, questions the primacy of Standard American English over what are often considered non-standard, or minority-language dialects. More specifically, the chapter examines the categorization of some dialects as ‘inferior’, ‘incorrect’ and ‘disadvantaged’ while others are considered ‘ideal’, ‘correct’ or ‘proper.’ The primary objective was to demonstrate how the mechanisms of language standardization, embedded as they are in the politics of identity, develop into language policies and customs that stigmatize speakers of minority-English dialects which are most often composed of communities of color. It argues that the institutionalization of the English language within the United States is part of a more complicated nexus of race, ethnicity and the vestigial effects of cultural discrimination. Language is an innately neutralized system
that is given symbolic meanings by the societies and language communities in which it operates; language hierarchies therefore often reflect the power dynamics and systems of stratification of a given society. This chapter suggests that in the U.S. this system of stratification is still heavily guided by racial and ethnic prejudices that coalesce around the way one speaks and which disproportionately stigmatizes communities of color.

Chapter Three, ‘We’re Going to Have to do Something About Your Tongue:’ Latinos and Proposition 227 assesses the extent to which the language ideologies, customs, and practice discussed in the previous chapter inform the development of English-language education in public schools. Moreover, this chapter focused on the discourses of race and ethnicity embedded within Proposition 227, the educational measure that banned bilingual education in the state of California. Through a case study analysis of two schools, the Chapter critically analyzes the impacts of Proposition 227 on the personal and academic development of Latino students. The central preoccupation of this chapter therefore, was to understand how Proposition 227 and its corollaries impact curricular content and delivery, and language communication within the classroom (between teachers and students). Documenting the ways school districts, local schools, and teachers interpreted and implemented Proposition 227 is integral to understanding its short and long-term effects. The case study analysis indicated that the curriculum shaped by California's Proposition 227 exposed students to negative values and essentializing identities about Latinos and the Spanish language whilst it constructed favourable, privileged, and positive identities and subject positions for Anglo Americans and the English language. This learning environment proved culturally, academically, and linguistically unresponsive to the needs of many Latino students who currently constitute the highest portion of the student body in the state of California—and nationwide—and yet represent the lowest academic performance among a single ethnic group.
The findings presented in Chapter Three raised significant questions about how the emphasis on English monolingualism affected the primary stakeholders—students, families, and communities. Given the extremely targeted discourses about Latino identities and the Spanish language embedded within the English Immersion Program and Proposition 227 more specifically, Chapter Four, ‘Linguistic Terrorism’ and the Impact on Latino Families and Communities investigates the way in which these discourses permeate and affect linguistic practice and expectation in the ‘homespace.’ This portion of the research highlights the ways in which the linguistic and cultural demands of English-Only measures—which advocate linguistic and cultural assimilation as an effective strategy for success in the United States—impacts Latino parenting and expectation, familial relationships and community responses. The added obstacles for Latino families and communities raised significant questions regarding systems of power and privilege that underscore participation in the public and private sphere. My approach to this analysis, as with the previous chapter, drew on ethnographic perspectives and more specifically, highlighted the negotiations that take place within Latino families and communities in Mar Vista Gardens, a predominantly Latino community in West Los Angeles.

The thesis’ penultimate chapter, ‘The Struggle of Identities Continues:’ Bilingual Television and the Production of Latino Characters, considers wider discursive practices that shape broader social understandings of Latinos and reviews the specific contributions made by children’s television media in shaping people’s beliefs towards Latino ethnicities as they engage in bilingual language instruction for mass audiences outside of the school space. This chapter more specifically analyzes the construction of Latino characters in children’s television programming emphasizing character language usage to better understand the racial stereotypes that are bound to Latino ethnicities. It uses a content analysis to examine the physical, linguistic and cultural representation of Latinos in children’s television with specific emphasis on Nickelodeon’s Dora the Explorer to demonstrate the continued ‘othering’ of Latinos even in
shows that are deemed progressive. Together these chapters shed light on the multifaceted ways that language ideologies inform language practice and approaches to language education and instruction and the specific ways in which this impacts the Latino community.

Despite the increasing rate at which Latinos are born within the United States, and despite the fact that most Latino students speak English as their primary language, they are consistently defined and read as foreign ‘others’ by a political, cultural, and educational discourse that continues to marry Standard American English to a more legitimized American identity. This has a tremendous impact on their ability to perform well academically and within the job market. The messages delivered through their curriculum, both public and commercial, not only perpetuate ideas of de-legitimacy but of incompetency. So what can be done?

6.3 Dual Language Immersion (Bilingual Education)

As we saw in Chapters Two and Three more specifically, a number of educational measures are dedicated to reducing bilinguals to monolinguals and often impinge in some ways on the student’s ethnolinguistic identity as a result. This thesis has more specifically discussed the ways in which Proposition 227 implicitly defines language minorities—particularly those of Mexican descent—as linguistically and cognitively deficient; and furthermore, continues to frame bilingualism as part of the problem rather than as part of the solution.

Despite the considerable impact of Proposition 227 on bilingual education, dual-language or two-way bilingual immersion programs as they are also commonly called, have been growing in popularity within the state of California and nationwide. Dual language programs are bilingual educational programs that aim to develop bilingualism and biliteracy among both language minority and language majority students. Native English speakers and native speakers of another language are integrated in the classroom where instruction is provided in both languages. Rather than teach a second language explicitly as a “foreign”
language, dual immersion programs use an additional language as a medium of instruction to teach content.

There are typically two major models for dual language programs: 90/10 and 50/50 representing the portion of time devoted to minority and majority languages. The 90/10 model aims to promote the minority language as much as possible in the early grades on the assumption that this is the language that requires the most support since it is generally of lower status in the wider community. The 50/50 model is based on the belief that both languages need to be acquired from the beginning and thus split instructional time. Both methods have been shown to work well. According to the Center of Applied Linguistics, roughly 42 percent of the dual language programs in the United States utilize the 90/10 model as their primary method of instruction while 33 percent of dual language programs use the 50/50 model; the remaining 25 percent were differentiated. This means they provide a range of ratios for instruction in the two languages.

Immersion bilingual education programs started to develop popularly in Quebec during the twentieth century as an effort to make the majority Anglophone children bilingual. Such programs, used the child’s second language as the primary, if not only, medium of instruction at the beginning, followed by the equal use of the child’s first and second languages (the 50/50 model). Immersion classrooms in many parts of Canada have produced millions of bilingual children fluent in both French and English. Figures from schools in Canada show that the students within these programs perform as well as or better on standardized English language tests than their native or monolingual English-speaking peers. According to Genesee et al., the
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success is due to the programs allocation of equal status to both languages and further, the true integration that takes place within these schools. Schools with dual language programs attempt to enroll an even mixture of students who are native English speakers and students who are fluent in another language. Moreover, dual language programs offer students the opportunity to maintain and strengthen academic skills in their primary language, while learning English vocabulary and literacy concepts.

The first dual language immersion education programs in the United States started nearly forty years ago in Massachusetts and Florida. While the program model has existed for quite some time, their growth in popularity and expansion is a more recent phenomenon. As of 2002, there were 266 documented dual language programs throughout the United States—an exponential leap considering that there were only roughly 30 documented programs during the mid 1980s.\(^\text{432}\) The majority of these programs are public Spanish/English programs at the elementary level however there are a small number of schools that offer dual language programs with French, Chinese, Korean, and Navajo alongside English-language instruction.

As they were relatively rare at the end of the twentieth century, dual language programs were not the intended targets of Proposition 227. When the U.S. began developing bilingual education programs for language minorities, these programs were transitional in nature—that is, they used the child’s first language for subject instruction, along with English as a second language instruction. This approach is only used until the child speaks enough English and then is transferred into monolingual English-only classrooms. It is subtractive bilingual education rather than additive. This is the kind of bilingual education programming that was eradicated by Proposition 227. The prime criticism of this form of bilingual education was that it did not move children quickly or efficiently enough toward English literacy. In the context of

Proposition 227, bilingual advocates argued that bilingual education itself could not be regarded as a cause of continued high levels of academic failure among bilingual students since only 30 percent of limited English proficient (LEP) students in California were in any form of bilingual education.

In fact, figures show that less than 18 percent of LEP students were in classes taught by a certified bilingual teacher, with the other 12 percent in classes most likely taught by a monolingual English teacher and a bilingual aide. Thus, they argued, educational failure among bilingual (and particularly Latino) students is more logically attributed to the absence of genuine bilingual programs than to bilingual education in a general sense. In fact, evaluations of dual language bilingual education programs have consistently shown strong academic performance over the course of elementary school for both language minority and language majority students. Further research has shown that dual language programs produce superior academic outcomes for both Latino students whose first language is Spanish and for non-Spanish speakers, while also developing a strong competence in a second language. Minority language students in these programs attain or come very close to grade norms in English academic skills by grade 6 or 7. The transference of skills provided by the two-way model often equips ‘English-Language Learner’s who possess strong academic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics in their native languages to outperform their U.S.-born peers. Reinforcing children’s conceptual base in their first language throughout elementary school appears to provide a foundation for long-term growth in English academic skills.

---

The last 15 years has witnessed the increasing popularity of dual language programs throughout the nation with states such as California and Texas leading the way. As of 2008, California had 224 programs in 100 school districts.\footnote{Having rechecked these figures prior to submission (2015) there appears to have been a slight drop in the number of dual language schools in the state.} Los Angeles currently has twenty-six schools with dual immersion programs, nineteen of which are dual Spanish-English language and the remaining seven are dual English-Korean language.\footnote{Guiffoyle, ‘Dual Language Immersion Schools,’} Let us consider one dual English-Spanish program in Los Angeles, Edison Language Academy, to illustrate some of the benefits and challenges of the curriculum.

\subsection*{6.4 Edison Language Academy}

As with the previous schools cited within this study, interviews with Edison Language Academy faculty and administrators were conducted by the researcher. Edison Language Academy is the longest running 90/10-immersion model in Los Angeles.\footnote{As discussed in the previous section 90/10 model refers to the instructional time designated to each language.} Ninety percent of the academic instruction is in Spanish with increasing amounts of English added each year until 4th and 5th grades, when the day is approximately 50 percent in English and 50 percent in Spanish. Edison’s dual language immersion program was developed in 1986. Since then the school has won numerous awards, including having received a Seal of Excellence from the California Association for Bilingual Education; it also has four Title I Academic Achievement Awards from the California State Department of Education (2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009) for substantially exceeding academic growth targets for all groups of students. It is one of the highest-ranking schools in the state according to their Academic Performance Index, which measures the academic performance and growth of schools on a variety of academic measures. For Edison, ‘the Two Way model offers a unique opportunity for both native English-speaking children and Spanish-speaking children to come together in a way that benefits both groups’
and ‘provides students [with] the opportunity to learn a rigorous curriculum in a nurturing environment while concurrently learning a second language.’

Students that enter the program (from the beginning) are initially taught overwhelmingly in Spanish. On average students receive only twenty to thirty minutes of English language oral instruction during the designated English language period and the rest of the school day is communicated in Spanish. Students read in both languages each day so there is simultaneous development of literacy in the two languages. With each academic year, more English is added to the curriculum until the instruction is evenly divided between the two languages. Providing content courses in Spanish, ‘English-Language Learner’s are given the opportunity to progress through the content areas while developing proficiency in both Spanish and English. Unlike the schools observed in Chapter Three, the students are not tracked into remedial classes on account of the way they speak and bilingualism is viewed as a resource rather than a liability. This ethos is projected not only in the classroom space amongst teachers and students but within the entire school environment. The school’s motto is ‘Together in two languages; Juntos a través de dos idiomas.’ Arguably Edison is promoting social change on the local level by socializing children differently from the way children are socialized in mainstream US educational discourse.

The cycle structure and proficiencies of the teaching staff provide a highly varied spectrum of classroom language use. At Edison, it is not only the teaching faculty who are bilingual but members of the teaching support staff are also fluent bilinguals; this includes administrative staff, yard aids, school janitors and cafeteria service staff. Indeed fluent bilingualism is a job requirement for any and all employees on the school campus.

Despite the growing popularity of dual language programs throughout the country and Edison’s own long wait list of student applicants, school administrators have noticed a pattern of reluctance among Latino native Spanish-speaking parents in enrolling their students at Edison. More specifically, during interviews with Edison’s school coordinator Donna, she compared the reticence among the Latino community to the eagerness found within primarily white native English-speaking families:

The English speakers, they know, they’re the ones on the waiting lists—they know bilingual speakers have the upper-hand. It’s always the Hispanics who are the hardest to convince. They think they can teach them [their children] at home, but it’s [the Spanish language spoken at home] not the same… they are not going to be able to teach them how to read an article or do science.

The trends noticed by Donna are consistent with some of the data presented in Chapter Three and Four. Previous studies as well as the case material presented in the said chapters reveal that many Latino parents believe that bilingual education will harm their child’s educational advancement. As discussed in Chapter Three more specifically, this belief may have contributed to the overwhelming number of Latino voters who voted in support of Proposition 227. Myths about bilingualism remain pervasive and many, including Latinos, are plagued with doubt as they receive conflicting messages about the costs and benefits of bilingual education.

While some Latino parents remain unconvinced by bilingual education programs, research from the Center for Applied Linguistics documents increasing popularity of dual language immersion programs among white middle class parents who want ‘to give their children an edge in the increasingly globalized world.’ The trends reported here also match the patterns of enrolment at Edison as noted by Donna above. So how do we market dual language programs to parents previously unconvinced by bilingual education programs, especially those from Latino families as well as relevant policy makers?
Empirical evidence that points to bilingualism and bi-literacy as a feasible (and readily attainable) educational goal for culturally-diverse students has been either ignored or distorted by media and academic opponents of bilingual education. Xenophobic discourses about linguistic and cultural diversity make it exceedingly difficult for policy-makers to appreciate what the research on bilingual education is actually saying and to imagine educational initiatives that view linguistic and cultural diversity as individual and societal resources. The attempt to limit the framework of discourse so that promotion of bilingual education is not even considered as a policy response to the underachievement of Latino students illustrates the extent to which bilingualism is viewed as a liability; far from it, bilingual education programs can be transformative.

6.5 Transformative Pedagogies

Rather than embracing the dominant instruction paradigm whereby faculty transmit knowledge to students (or what Freire called ‘banking education’), a transformative pedagogy is one ‘that relentlessly questions the kinds of labor, practices, and forms of production that are enacted in public and higher education.’ Although this form of pedagogy has many elements, the key epistemological foundation for transformative pedagogies is concerned with the elimination of racial, gender, class, and sexual orientation hierarchies by destabilizing hegemonic practices that perpetuate the marginalization and oppression of minority groups.

Viewing education as an agent for social change, transformative pedagogies push public and higher education beyond a purely technical and pragmatic function (i.e., as a means of getting a better paid job) to change the conditions that limit and undervalue marginalized identities and cultures through transformative knowledge that challenge ‘coercive relations of

power.' Coercive relations of power refer to the exercise of power by a dominant group to the detriment of a subordinated group. Collaborative relations of power on the other hand, operate on the assumption that power is not a fixed pre-determined quantity but rather can be generated in interpersonal and intergroup relations and thereby become ‘additive’ rather than ‘subtractive.’ In educational contexts, cooperative learning activities, like dual language learning, constitute documented examples of the academic and personal benefits that accrue when coercive relations of power shift to collaborative relations of power.

Having students locate educational philosophies and practices within the structure of particular societies, transformative pedagogies identify the personal, political and pedagogical dimensions that I believe schools need to be attentive to in aiming for a pedagogy that might transform students’ lives and more specifically empower them. Transformative pedagogies are a key part of the epistemological foundations for Chicano Studies. In 1969, El Plan de Santa Barbara, the manifesto for the implementation of Chicano Studies education programs argued: ‘The role of knowledge in producing powerful social change cannot be underestimated.’

The mainstream view of language minority students is that the native language and culture is a problem to be overcome and a handicap to full public participation. The current solution to this problem is for language minorities to assimilate to Standard American English monolingualism (e.g white middle-class norms of interaction and interpretation) in order to participate and succeed in school, and later, in the market place. Dual language bilingual education programs by design communicate a different message altogether about the value of bilingualism, biliteracy, and the specific heritage language and community. The use of
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bilingual instructional strategies not only enables bilingual students to bring their two languages into productive contact but also communicates to them that their LI proficiency is an important accomplishment that is acknowledged and appreciated within the classroom and within their local community.

For bilingual students, promotion of bilingualism and biliteracy is a necessary part of the empowerment process since, in its absence a student’s identity is unable to be shaped by their bilingual and bicultural context. Consider the impacts this has on the student’s family and home-life as discussed in Chapter Four. There the experiences shared by Anzaldúa, Rodriguez, and Montoya illuminated the stress, emotional trauma and familial separation that is often involved in the process of mono-linguistic assimilation, or the taming of their wild and deviant tongues. Dual language programs however, encourage linguistic/cultural minorities to maintain their language and heritage. Concomitantly, they teach all students the value of cultural and linguistic diversity. Given the evidence of an increasingly global economy, bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural awareness are key assets. Dual language programs thus are timely educational models that will help participating students meet the demands of the society they inherit and to maintain grade-level academic achievement.

Still these programs are not without their valid criticisms. Like the maintenance bilingual education programs of the past, dual-language immersion programs continue to strictly compartmentalize languages either through their allocation to certain periods of the day, specific teachers, or subjects. This, argues Ofelia Garcia, is in stark contrast to the fluid language practices of the students in these programs: some monolingual in English, others monolingual in the minority language and yet others bilingual and thus, contributes to the myth that languages are used autonomously. 445

So while implementing these programs on a wider scale would be a step in the right direction, their implementation may not be enough to redress the language inequalities that have been created through the invention of separate autonomous languages. To do so, requires transformative pedagogies like translanguage where the use of multiple languages is encouraged and lauded as a resource. But this requires that the United States sufficiently acknowledge its bilingualism as a facet of American identity, only then will language education be adequately addressed. Dual language programs currently operate in a society that is not always supportive of bilingualism and bilingual education and there is minimal organized resistance to the negative and inaccurate messages children receive within the school about the status and utility of their heritage languages. Children understand very quickly that the school is an English-only zone and they often internalize ambivalence and even shame in relation to their linguistic and cultural heritage.

In an attempt to transform this, we must examine not only the language of instruction but also the hidden curriculum being communicated to students through that instruction, or what Jim Cummins refers to as critical language awareness. The development of language awareness would include not just a focus on formal aspects of the language but also explore the relationships between language and power. Students, for example, might carry out research on the status of different varieties of language (e.g. colloquial “non-standard” languages versus the “standard” language) and explore why one form is considered “better” than the other. They might also research issues such as code-switching and translanguage and some of the functions it plays within their own lives and communities. We might also consider the cognate relationships across languages.

Standard American English is derived predominantly from Latin and Greek sources. As such, it has many cognate relationships with other Romance languages. Drawing students’
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attention to cognate relationships and encouraging them to search their own lexical repertoire for similar meanings as they develop a new language is particularly useful. The research evidence supports the effectiveness of second language acquisition learning by drawing attention to cognate relationships. Clearly not all heritage languages have cognate relationships with English and so this strategy will not work across the board however, the vast majority of ‘English-Language Learner’ s in the United States are Spanish speakers. Attention to the cognate relationships between English and Spanish can help these students develop their knowledge of and vocabulary Spanish and English at the same time. For example, as Cummins acknowledges,

‘if students come across the low-frequency word encounter in an English text they will soon connect it to encontrar which is the Spanish (high frequency) word for meet or encounter.’

These transformative pedagogies not only allow culturally-diverse students to engage in the critical literacy process but opens up spaces for translanguaging. The current structure of dual-language programs compartmentalizes languages across designated times of the school day keeping languages separate, in theory, by using them on either alternate days or various sections of the day. However, in focusing on how languages are related and used functionally as communicative devices in order to maximise understanding and performance between groups and individuals, bilingualism and bilingual education are transformed and opportunities for translanguaging are introduced. The underlying assertion is that children can use both languages to maximize learning and literacy. The finds of this study—as with previous study—


reveal translanguaging, to be a promising practice for communication but also a promising pedagogical practice for emergent bilinguals. Acknowledging the skills and strategies that bilingual children bring to the classroom from their home language practices can be a first step in supporting their acquisition of state-mandated skills but also of dispositions which increase tolerance and multicultural contexts. Furthermore, encouraging and even advocating bilingual families’ efforts to support their children’s development of their heritage language could empower bilingual families by recognizing their cultural and linguistic capital as valuable resources.

Monoglossic approaches to language education not only assert deficiencies in the heritage language and culture but simultaneously delegitimize bilingualism and biculturalism as part of a larger American heritage. Plurilingual approaches to language education and practice break the cycle of power that has held monolingual practices as dominant. Languaging bilingually or translanguaging, thus, is considered the norm. Affirmation of students’ heritage languages within the school (and in after-school programs) influenced by bilingual education programs and transformative pedagogies can play a crucial role in encouraging bilingual speakers to view their multilingual talents as a valued component of their identities, a strategy that can ultimately aid in overcoming a history of being delegitimized in the United States and a tradition of being silenced.
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Appendix A

School Participant Information Sheet

Research Project: The Browning of America and the Impact on Public Education

Researcher: Becky Avila  
Supervisors: Dr. Rebecca Fraser:
School of American Studies  
University of East Anglia, 
Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK.

Contact Information: 
Tel: (US) 310 915-7593  
Email: b.avila@uea.ac.uk

Dr. Malcolm McLaughlin
Tel: (00 44) 1603 59 3426 
Email: M.Mclaughlin@uea.ac.uk

Outline:

The purpose of my research project is to examine the ways in which Los Angeles public elementary schools address increasingly multicultural classrooms. Los Angeles is home to the most diverse student population in the United States. As a result, the research documents curricular and pedagogical responses to an increasingly racially and ethnically diverse student body and how these responses may fare amidst a significant racial and ethnic demographic shift.

For the first time in American history racial and ethnic minorities make up a majority of the youngest Americans. This is the beginning of a new racial and ethnic milestone for the U.S. where traditionally racial and ethnic minorities are expected to become America’s majority. Given the steady growth in the number of young minority children, American public schools are expected to be the primary witnesses of America’s shifting population. With this, it is important to consider the ways in which an increasingly multicultural student body might impact American approaches to education.

I am therefore looking to observe 3 first grade classrooms across 3 different elementary schools within Los Angeles County. Your school has been selected as a particular point of interest. Classroom observation would happen once a week for a full school day until the week of November 5th, 2012. Observation will include the observation of formal instruction (the curriculum), informal instruction (i.e. story time), daily classroom routines and any structured and unstructured play within the classroom.

The aims of the participant observations are to build an understanding of what students are learning, how they are learning it and how they respond to the learned material. All
participating classrooms and students will require parental consent and the necessary consent forms will be provided by the researcher. Participant observation will at times be coupled with a series of stock questions delivered informally within the school environment to randomly selected students. The stock questions are as follows:

- Do you have a favorite school subject? What is your favorite school subject and Why?
- Do you like school? Why or Why not?
- Do you have a favorite part of the school day? What is your favorite part of the school day?

Any answers delivered by students will be made confidential and recorded in a journal by the researcher. At no time shall any real or identifiable names be used in any research outputs. At no time shall any student without parental permission be subjected to questioning.

Students will also be asked to take part in a drawing exercise where they will be asked to draw a self-portrait. During their research on the racing of children in Australia, the Preschool Children’s Constructions of Racial and Cultural Diversity (PCCRCRD) utilized various methods of ethnographical study as well as self-portraiture. Self-portraiture allows the researcher to gain insight into the way a child interprets his/her own racial identity. This drawing exercise will allow the researcher to situate the theories of childhood racial awareness and development within the classroom.

The researcher will provide all necessary materials for the drawing exercise which should take place some time within the school day to fit in with the teachers planned lesson activities. The activity should take up no more than an hour of the school day. The portraits will be analyzed and coded on the school premises (they will not be taken home by the researcher) and returned to the students to take home after analysis is complete. At no time shall any real or identifiable names be used to associate the portraits with the artists in any research outputs.

Teachers of the designated classroom and administrators will be approached for one to one interviews. Teacher interviews will focus on curriculum, classroom dynamics, classroom demographics and daily routines and administrator interviews will focus more closely on the inter-workings of the California Educational system, curriculum standards and local school policies. Interviews will also document the opinions of schoolteachers and administrators concerning America’s increasing diversity and the way this might impact public schooling or the ways in which it has already.

All interviews will be kept anonymous so that teachers can feel free to express themselves without being identified. Teachers are under no obligation to complete the interviews and may refuse to participate altogether. Upon the adults consent, such interviews will be tape recorded, analyzed and then destroyed. Any answers delivered by the faculty will be made confidential. At no time shall any real or identifiable names, including the name of the school, be used in any research outputs. All interviews will take place on the school grounds.

Your school is under no obligation to take part in the research and participants may withdraw their consent at anytime by informing the researcher directly (b.avila@ueac.ac.uk). Withdrawal will remove any responses given by the child, teacher or administrator. Please contact me should you have any queries about this research or to confirm your participation.
Any and all responses attained throughout the research process—including the self-portrait drawings—will be analysed solely by the researcher. With the exception of faculty interviews, all other collected data will be stored in a research journal to be carried by the researcher at all times during school observation. Student self-portraits will be logged by the researcher into the journal and faculty interviews will be tape-recorded upon the permission of the interviewee. All data will be destroyed after use. The results of the research will be presented in my Ph.D dissertation due in the spring of 2014 and other academic publications. Should you have any concerns about this study please feel free to contact one of my two supervisors whose contact details are identified above.

Many thanks for taking the time to read this information sheet.
Becky Avila
Appendix B

School Consent Form

1. I have read the information sheet about this research project and agree to participate in the described aspects of the research.

2. The purpose, nature and duration of the research has been explained to me.

3. I understand that any student participating in the research will require parental permission.

4. I understand that all research publications as a result of this project will only use anonymized data.

5. I agree to allow anonymised statements I have made during an interview to be published in academic journals, used for conferences and other relevant publications for this research project.

6. I understand that I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time during, before or after the research by contacting the researcher or research advisors.

7. I can confirm that I am over 18 years of age.

School………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

School
Principal/Teacher………………………………………………………………………………………Date………

Signature……………………………………………………………………………………..
Dear Parents/Guardians,

Your child’s classroom has been selected to participate in the following research project conducted by a visiting Ph.D student from the University of East Anglia in England.

The Browning of America and the Impact on Public Education

Below is a brief outline of the research aims and methods. Please indicate whether you grant or deny permission for your child to participate in the research on the attached page.

Outline:
The purpose of my research project is to examine the ways in which Los Angeles public elementary schools address increasingly multicultural classrooms. Los Angeles is home to the most diverse student population in the United States and for the first time in American history racial and ethnic minorities make up a majority of the youngest Americans.

This is the beginning of a new racial and ethnic milestone for the U.S. where traditionally racial and ethnic minorities are expected to become America’s majority. Given the steady growth in the number of young minority children, American public schools are expected to be the primary witnesses of America’s shifting population. With this, it is important to consider the ways in which an increasingly multicultural student body might impact American approaches to education.

Your child’s classroom has been selected for participant observation. This means that I will observe your child’s classroom once a week until the week of November 5th. I will observe several aspects of the school day including: formal instruction (the curriculum), informal instruction (i.e. story time), daily classroom routines and any structured and unstructured play within the classroom.

The aims of the participant observations is to build an understanding of what students are learning, how they are learning it and how they respond to the learned material. Participant observation will at times be coupled with a series of stock questions delivered informally within the school environment to randomly selected students. The stock questions are as follows:
• Do you have a favorite school subject? What is your favorite school subject and Why?
• Do you like school? Why or Why not?
• Do you have a favorite part of the school day? What is your favorite part of the school day?

Any answers delivered by students will be made confidential and recorded in a journal by the researcher. At no time shall any real or identifiable names be used in any research outputs. At no time shall any student without parental permission be subjected to questioning.

All student interviews will take place informally but always in the presence of faculty chaperones be it within the classroom or on the playground and will last only as far as the student wishes to engage in conversation with the researcher.

Students will also take part in a drawing exercise where they will be asked to draw a self-portrait. The self-portraiture activity allows the researcher to gain insight into the way a child interprets his/her own racial identity. The portraits will be analyzed on the school premises (they will not be taken home by the researcher) and returned to the students to take home after analysis is complete. At no time shall any real or identifiable names be used to associate the portraits with the artists in any research outputs.

Your child is under no obligation to take part in the research and parents may withdraw their consent at anytime by informing the researcher directly (b.avila@ueac.ac.uk) or indirectly via the schoolteacher or school principal. Withdrawal will remove any responses given by your child, including the self-portrait from the research project.

Any and all responses given by the students—including the self-portraits—will be analysed solely by the researcher and the two advisors; any documentation of data will be destroyed after use. The results of the research will be presented in my Ph.D dissertation due in the spring of 2014. Should you have any concerns about this study then please feel free to contact one of my two supervisors whose contact details are identified below.

Many thanks,
Becky Avila
Appendix D

The ‘Browning of America’
Parental Consent Form

Becky Avila is a Ph.D student from the University of East Anglia in the U.K. who is conducting a research project as part of her dissertation for this course. The project examines the impacts of increasingly multi-racial and multi-ethnic diversity in Los Angeles public elementary schools.

Child Name:…………………………………………

1. I can confirm that I am the parent or legal guardian of the above child.

2. I have read the information sheet about this research project and I agree to allow my child to participate in the described aspects of the research.

3. The purpose, nature and duration of the research have been explained to me.

4. I understand that all research publications as a result of this project will only use anonymized data.

5. I agree to allow anonymized statements my child has made during an interview to be published in academic journals, used for conferences and other relevant publications for this research project.

6. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my child from the study (i.e. by informing the researcher, school teacher or school principal) at any time either during, before or after the research.

I grant permission for my child to participate in the research as described by the information sheet. Please circle one:

Yes                             No

Name of Parent/Guardian…………………………………………………………………………………………..Date…

Parent/Guardian Signature…………………………………………
The Browning of America and the Impact on Public Education: Debrief Notice

Research Project: The Browning of America and the Impact on Public Education by Ph.D student Becky Avila, School of American Studies, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ.

Tel (US): 310 915-7593 (until Nov 13,2012)
Tel (UK) : 01603 627136
Email: b.avila@uea.ac.uk

Supervisors:
Dr. Rebecca Fraser, Dr Malcolm McLaughlin
Tel (UK) : (00 44) 1603 592288 Tel (UK) : (00 44) 1603 59 3426
(becky.fraser@uea.ac.uk) Email: M.Mclaughlin@uea.ac.uk

Dear Participant,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project.

Your contributions will be used anonymously and only within academic publications. Primarily the results will be included in my Ph.D dissertation that shall be submitted for examination and available in the University of East Anglia Library for public access after I have completed my degree (from July 2014).

You are reminded that you may withdraw your involvement up until the editing process in early October 2013 by contacting me either by phone or email on the above provided details or by contacting one of my advisors (see above).

I may need to contact schoolteachers and administrators again for further clarification of issues discussed during my on-site participant observations or faculty interviews. If you do not wish me to contact you again then please let me know by contacting me via email. Students and student parents will not be contacted.

If you have any concerns about this research then please feel free to contact me at any time.

Thanks again for your co-operation

Becky Avila
Participant Information Sheet

Research Project: ‘Lost in Translation: Latino Identities and the Browning of America

**Researcher:**
Becky Avila  
School of American Studies  
University of East Anglia,  
Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK.

**Supervisors:**
Dr. Rebecca Fraser:  
Tel: (00 44) 1603 592288  
Email: beckyfraser@uea.ac.uk

Dr. Malcolm McLaughlin  
Tel: (00 44) 1603 59 3426  
Email: M.Mclaughlin@uea.ac.uk

**Contact Information:**
Tel: (US) 310 915-7593  
Email: b.avila@uea.ac.uk

**Outline:**

The purpose of my research project is to understand the rising influence of the Latino community and Spanish language in Los Angeles and assess the larger impacts of this influence on American national identities. The research focuses specifically on bilingual Latino students in English Immersion Programs within Los Angeles public schools.

Previous research trips have brought me into the Los Angeles Unified School District to observe English Immersion Programs for schools that are predominantly Latino and English Language Learning. Widening the communal sphere, this second research trip hopes to observe the way in which local community groups, organizations and resources work alongside the school system to support the Latino bilingual community. The research also hopes to observe alternative language programs to English Immersion, like Dual Language Learning Programs, for comparative purposes.

I am therefore seeking participating organizations and individuals willing to speak on behalf of the work they do within said organizations. This would involve a visit to your community center, school or organization by myself the researcher, and a series of stock questions about your organization’s mission and available programs. The questions will always be targeted to a designated spokesperson for the organization, community center or school and or willing
users of the organization, community center or school with the exception of minors. Note that minors will never be subjected to questioning or interviews.

Any answers delivered by an individual will be made confidential and recorded in a journal by the researcher or with a tape recorder upon permission by the participant. At no time shall any real or identifiable names, including the name of the organization, community centre or school be used in any research outputs. All interviews will take place on the grounds of the organization, community centre or school.

Any and all responses attained throughout the research process will be analysed solely by the researcher and destroyed after use. The results of the research will be presented in my Ph.D dissertation due in the summer of 2014 and other academic publications.

Your organization, community centre or school is under no obligation to take part in the research and participants may withdraw their consent at anytime by informing the researcher directly (b.avila@ueac.ac.uk). Withdrawal will remove any responses given by the participant. Please contact me should you have any queries or concerns about this research or to confirm your participation. Alternatively, you can contact one of my two supervisors whose contact details are identified above.

Many thanks for taking the time to read this information sheet.

Sincerely,

Becky Avila

Associate Tutor and PGR
School of American Studies
University of East Anglia
Appendix G

Participant Consent Form

1. I have read the information sheet about this research project and agree to participate in the described aspects of the research.

2. The purpose, nature and duration of the research have been explained to me.

3. I understand that all research publications as a result of this project will only use anonymized data.

4. I agree to allow anonymised statements I have made during an interview to be published in academic journals, used for conferences and other relevant publications for this research project.

5. I understand that I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time during, before or after the research by contacting the researcher b.avila@uea.ac.uk or research advisors.

6. I can confirm that I am over 18 years of age.

Organization:
.........................................................................................................................

Participant
.........................................................................................................................
Appendix H

Debrief Notice

Research Project: *Lost in Translation: Latino Identities and the Browning of America*

**Researcher:** Becky Avila,
School of American Studies,
University of East Anglia,
Tel (US): 310 915-7593
Tel (UK) : 07572 546314
Email: b.avila@uea.ac.uk

**Supervisors:**
Dr. Rebecca Fraser,                             Dr. Malcolm McLaughlin
Tel (UK) : (00 44) 1603 592288                       Tel (UK) : (00 44) 1603 59 3426
Email: becky.fraser@uea.ac.uk   Email: M.Mclaughlin@uea.ac.uk

Dear Participant,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project.

Your contributions will be used anonymously and only within academic publications. Primarily the results will be included in my Ph.D dissertation that shall be submitted for examination and available in the University of East Anglia Library for public access after I have completed my degree (from July 2015).

You are reminded that you may withdraw your involvement up until the editing process in early July 2014 by contacting me either by phone or email on the above provided details or by contacting one of my advisors (see above).

I may need to contact individuals and organizations again for further clarification of issues discussed during my on-site participant observations or interviews. If you do not wish me to contact you again then please let me know by contacting me via email.

If you have any concerns about this research then please feel free to contact me at any time.

Thanks again for your co-operation,
Becky Avila
Associate Tutor and PGR
School of American Studies
University of East Anglia