

# **Mobility or Erasure? Ethical Concerns of English Language Teaching for Spanish-speaking Latin American Immigrants in the US**

Bella R. Gerstmann

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for  
the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics

Bryn Mawr College

December 2023

## **Abstract**

This thesis examines the ethical context of English teaching for adult Spanish-speaking immigrants from Latin America in the US. I argue that English dominance over Spanish in the US emerges from a history of imperialism, nativism, and white supremacy. Further, I demonstrate how the demand that Spanish-speakers in the US acquire and use English is based on a monolingual ideal that ignores the prevalence and history of Spanish in the country. Finally, I suggest that English proficiency's association with socioeconomic mobility envisions a false meritocracy and blames Spanish speakers for a marginalization that is truly racial in nature. The English language classroom emerges from this discriminatory context, and can further marginalize students through reproduction of the monolingual ideal. However, I do identify several benefits of English language teaching for Spanish-speaking immigrants. Though I find evidence of a glass ceiling for Spanish speakers in the US, acquiring English does seem to lead to a real degree of economic mobility. Moreover, individual Latine immigrants evaluate their unique needs and desires and have agency in the choice to acquire English, and often do so while simultaneously resisting linguistic erasure. To conclude, I suggest that the linguistic and racial marginalization of Latines be addressed directly through activism, and identify liberatory teaching methods that can be used to transform ELT from a practice of subordination to empowerment.

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Background.....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Spanish and Latinidad in the US	
2.2 Immigration: Trends and Demographics	
2.3 The Trauma of Immigration	
<b>3 Positionality &amp; Methodology.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4 ELT as a Political, Discriminatory Project.....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 Problematizing notions of assimilation	
4.2 “Blaming marginalized people for their own marginalization”	
4.3 Marginalization in the classroom	
<b>5 Benefits of ELT for Latine Immigrants.....</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1 Economic Benefits of English Acquisition	
5.2 Latine Agency and Resistance	
<b>6 Recommendations - to ELT or not to ELT?.....</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1 Liberatory Strategies in ELT	
<b>7 Conclusion.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>19</b>

# 1 Introduction

Although the US has no official language, English enjoys a hegemonic status in policy and in the public imagination (Fuller and Leeman, 2020). Spanish-speaking immigrants from Latin America, a substantial demographic that is growing by the day, often feel pressure to learn and use English not only for economic and social reasons, but because it is the “American thing to do” (Mori, 2014; Fuller and Leeman, 2020). However, the extensive history of Spanish on US land, and its status as the second most spoken language in the country raise the question of whether English acquisition should be upheld as a requirement for Spanish speakers to integrate and succeed (Jenkins, 2018). In this thesis, I challenge the motives behind English language teaching (ELT) for adult, Spanish-speaking Latine immigrants in the US. I identify discriminatory language ideologies from which assimilation through ELT precipitates, and examine how ELT perpetuates these ideologies. However, I also explore the benefits of ELT for this demographic, including economic mobility, and in that it responds to a common, self-determined desire among Latine immigrants to study English (Velázquez, 2018; Schechter and Bayley, 2002). After examining both the ethical dilemmas and positives involved in ELT for this demographic, I provide my conclusions and recommendations for a way forward.

# 2 Background

This thesis focuses on English language education for adult, Spanish-speaking immigrants from Latin America. This demographic excludes Spanish speakers from Europe, and includes Latin American immigrants who are proficient in one or more indigenous languages as well as Spanish. Spanish proficiency does not always correspond with Hispanic or Latin American identity or origins, as many US residents claim one trait but not the other. Indeed, some US residents report Spanish proficiency and some “Hispanic or Latino” ancestry without themselves identifying as Hispanic or Latino (Lopez et al. 2018). Still, others consider Spanish proficiency to be a defining element of their ethnoracial identity, and even identify their race as “Spanish” without necessarily asserting or highlighting descent from Spain (Taylor et al. 2018; Fuller and Leeman, 2020).

There is ongoing discussion on how to refer to people of Latin American descent living in the US. Notable institutions like the US Census Bureau and the Pew-Research Center use the terms “Hispanic” and “Hispanic or Latino”. Other sources use “Latin@”, “Latino/a”, “Latina/o”, or “Latinx” to both center Latin American (non-european) identity and avoid positioning maleness as unmarked as in “Latino” (Fuller and Leeman, 2020). Fuller and Leeman, along with many others, choose the term “Latinx” to avoid connotations of a male/female binary as in a/o or @ (meant to represent an a within an o). For this paper, I use the term “Latine”, which similarly avoids binary representation and is more easily pronounced in Spanish. It is also important to note that Latin Americans within and outside of the US are an extremely heterogeneous group.

The US Census Bureau considers “Hispanic” an ethnicity identified separately from race, which reflects the fact that Latines have a variety of phenotypes, heritage, and racial identities. Inequalities are present within Latin American nations as well as between origin groups in the US (Fuller and Leeman, 2020). Ethnic and racial categories are generally abstract, subjective, and hard to define. Latinidad, defined by the Latina Feminist group as “Latina/o identity” (2001: 2) is all the more so, as it varyingly centers linguistic, geographical, cultural, and phenotypic traits (Leeman 2013). To illustrate the context that Spanish speaking Latin American immigrants step into when they enter the US, the following sections explore the current and historical situations of both the Spanish language, and of self-identified Latines in the US.

## **2.1 Spanish and Latinidad in the US**

The US has one of the largest populations of Spanish speakers in the world. With over 41 million residents reporting home use of Spanish, the States outnumber many Latin American countries in terms of native Spanish speakers (American Community Survey 2019; Jenkins, 2018). Spanish use on land that is now part of the US dates back to before US Independence; two-thirds of what is now the US was once controlled by the Spanish crown (Fuller and Leeman, 2020). Today, the majority of those who report using Spanish at home in the US are “natural born” citizens, with 54.8% being born in the US or having at least one parent who was a citizen. Rates of Spanish use at home by US residents aged five or older have increased over past decades, rising to 13.5% in 2019, from 12.8% in 2010, and only 5.3% in 1980 (American Community Survey 2019).

Still, the continued vitality of the language in the US is driven by continued immigration from Latin America, not by cross-generational language maintenance. Indeed, Spanish seems to follow the “three generation” pattern of language shift, with new immigrants reporting Spanish dominance, and a complete shift to English dominance in their grandchildren’s and later generations (Jenkins 2018; Hugo Lopez et al. 2017). Interestingly, Hugo Lopez et al. also note that Hispanic and Latino identity also declines among later generations.

The Latine population in the US has increased substantially in recent decades, with 35.2 million in 2000 and 62.5 million in 2021. A higher proportion of US Latines are now US born, increasing from around 60 to nearly 70% in the same period (Moslimani and Noe-Bustamente, 2023). The majority of both Latines and Spanish speakers live in the Southwest, with other notable populations found in Florida, New York, and New Jersey. However, areas with historically smaller Latine populations have seen the most growth in recent years (Jenkins, 2018; Fuller and Leeman, 2020).

Latine populations have been historically underprivileged in the US, subject to segregation, disenfranchisement through language policy, and discriminated against in “redlining” practices, among many other injustices (Fuller and Leeman, 2020). Today, Latines have a poverty rate of 18% as compared to the general poverty rate of 13%. Latines also have lower levels of education than the general population, with 56% having a high school degree or

lower by the age of 25, compared to 37%. Higher degrees are especially rare among foreign-born Latines, of which 69% have a high school education at most (Moslimani and Noe-Bustamente, 2023). Poverty rates, along with all measures of privilege, vary greatly among national origin groups, with 26% of residents of Honduran descent living in poverty, but only 7% of residents of Argentine descent (Moslimani, Hugo Lopez and Noe-Bustamente, 2023).

## **2.2 Immigration: Trends and Demographics**

Latin Americans make up half of all immigration to the US. Though Latin American immigration has declined in the last decade, recent immigrants are more diverse in their countries of origin. Mexicans, who are the largest population of Latines in the US, continue to make up the majority of Latin American immigrants, but have decreased somewhat. Meanwhile, an increasing percent of US immigrants have been Guatemalan, Honduran, Dominican and Venezuelan in origin (Haner and Hugo Lopez, 2023). Additionally, an increasing number of recent Latin American immigrants are speakers of indigenous languages (Fuller and Leeman, 2020).

Recent Latin American immigrants have higher levels of education, with 11% holding a bachelor's degree in 2000, and 27% in 2021. 62% of recent Venezuelan immigrants held at least a bachelor's degree, while this was only true of 5% of Guatemalan immigrants. Likewise, English proficiency is more common among recent immigrants, with rates varying according to national origin. English proficiency among overall Latine immigrants was 21% in 2000 and 26% in 2021. 34% of recent Venezuelan immigrants are proficient in English, but only 15% of Guatemalans (Haner and Lopez, 2023).

## **2.3 The Trauma of Immigration**

The journey from one's home country to the US is a dangerous and traumatic one for many Latin American immigrants, especially those who enter without documents. Strengthening of the US-Mexico border in the last few decades has failed to "deter" these migrants, as was intended in the legislation. Rather, it has forced migrants to enter through more hazardous but less monitored parts of the landscape, leading to a dramatic increase in deaths among entrants (Caminero-Santangelo, 2017). In *Underground America: Narratives of Undocumented Lives (Voices of Witness)* (2017), Peter Orner compiles oral histories of undocumented immigrants in the US. One of his interviewees, who is identified by his nickname, *El Curita*, shares,

The desert was tremendous. We walked almost nonstop for four days and nights... A lot of people hurt themselves. The branches of certain plants and small trees that grow in the desert have no leaves, only thorns, and you can really feel them, especially when they hit you in the face. But there was no time to shake them off because we couldn't stop. We had to keep walking. There was no time to stop and check to see if you were injured or

bleeding, to clean up a wound. When I left Guatemala my feet were white. But after walking through the desert they became purple. Other people got blisters on their feet and couldn't walk any longer. I don't know what they did to keep going because even without blisters, sometimes it felt as though I just couldn't walk another step (135-136).

Violence along the journey is all too common. Another migrant in Orner's work shares, "You hear stories about the border, of women who are raped. People who are assaulted. Money stolen. So in different places, depending on where you pass there are different problems you encounter" (172).

Many immigrants from Latin America are not merely "migrants"; they are survivors. They carry with them the trauma that may have caused them to leave their home countries in the first place, that which they accrued over the long journey to the US, and that of the discrimination they face here. By the time they step into an English Language classroom in the US, they have accrued vastly varying and often horrific life experiences. It is essential, then, that educators working in this field make every effort not to further the injustice or dehumanization of their students.

### **3 Positionality and Methodology**

In "Critical Race Theory, Latino Critical Theory, and Critical Raced-Gendered Epistemologies: Recognizing Students of Color as Holders and Creators of Knowledge" (2002), Dolores Delgado Bernal calls for the application of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Latina/Latino Critical Theory (LatCrit) in educational research. To her, "CRT and LatCrit in education can be defined as a framework that challenges the dominant discourse on race, gender, and class as it relates to education by examining how educational theory, policy, and practice subordinate certain racial and ethnic groups" (109). She adds that LatCrit addresses areas that CRT may gloss over, such as "language, immigration, ethnicity, culture, identity, phenotype, and sexuality" (108). In this thesis, I engage with these approaches by questioning the policies and ideologies from which Latine-immigrant-targeted English language teaching has emerged in the US, and those that it may reproduce. Following Delgado Bernal's call, I emphasize the role of firsthand experiential knowledge of Latines and Latine immigrants to contextualize and give meaning to non-narrative data, and often stand alone. I collected no original data for this thesis, but rather chose to draw on data and writings already published. The sources of experiential knowledge I use include interviews, ethnographies, a poem, and, centrally, *testimonios*. *Testimonio* is a genre of personal testimony with an extensive history in Latin America that "differs from oral history or autobiographical narratives in that it involves the participant in a critical reflection on his or her personal experience within particular sociopolitical realities" (Martínez-Roldán and Quiñones, 2016: 156). According to the authors of *Telling to Live: Latina Feminist Testimonios* (2001), "Testimonio has been critical in movements for liberation in Latin America, offering an artistic

form and methodology to create politicized understandings of identity and community” (3). It is this power, agency, and generative engagement with critical theory that I hope to draw on by featuring self-identified *testimonios* and other personal narratives, alongside non-narrative data, in my analysis of racial and linguistic identities in ELT.

Crucially, I am not Latine, an immigrant, or a native Spanish speaker myself. Instead, I am writing this thesis as someone who has worked, and currently works, in English language education for Latin American immigrants. Because my intent is to empower and benefit my students, I find it necessary to be critical of the impacts of my work and of my intentions themselves. As Sharon D. Welch writes in *A Feminist Ethic of Risk (Other Feminist Voices)* (2000), “If we wish to break out of our self-justifying moral worlds, we must relinquish the justification of ‘intent.’ For the ethical issue here is precisely the disparity between intent and effect: we may well intend the good and yet perpetuate systems of injustice” (34).

As a non-immigrant, non-Latine, and non-heritage Spanish speaker, I cannot produce the firsthand experiential knowledge I identify to be crucial in exploring the ethical concerns of ELT for Spanish-speaking Latine immigrants. Instead, I hope to model critical reflection and investment in Latine voices as an outsider English language teacher.

#### **4 ELT as a Political, Discriminatory Project**

In *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation* (2013), Bonny Norton writes, “Language teaching is not a neutral act but a highly political one” (47). That is, language teaching takes place within a context where different languages and linguistic communities are valued differently, and power differences between speaker/non-speaker and teacher/learner are prevalent. The goal of language acquisition is often framed by learners as a means to access power (opportunities, socioeconomic mobility) and undergirded by states’ political projects, such as assimilation or access to global markets (Norton, 2013). For adult Spanish speaking immigrants in the US, learning English is motivated in part by the need to improve their social and economic situation. The conditions that have positioned English acquisition to provide these opportunities are a result of a historical and ongoing assimilationist political project (Fuller and Leeman, 2020; del Valle and García, 2013).

The Spanish language arrived to what is now the US before English did. Indeed, two thirds of the US was once ruled over by the Spanish crown, during which time Spanish was installed as a language of power and began to be spoken among residents (Fuller and Leeman, 2020). del Valle and García (2013) highlight that the US project of acquiring these lands, and later intervention in Latin America, emblemized in the Monroe Doctrine but visible in much more recent history, “had obvious glottopolitical implications and brought Spanish to the center of political struggles” (252). That is, Spanish speakers have been historically positioned as inferior in imperial rhetoric. Fuller and Leeman (2020) elaborate that post-conquest, territories in the Southwest were required to shift from official bilingualism to English monolingualism to

gain full statehood, and gained broader support for incorporation only after demographics shifted to be more white, in two linked policies of linguistic and racial hegemony. These territories were conquered under US expansionism, but only given equal political power once they were seen as adequately white and English-speaking.

In their *testimonios*, Martínez-Roldán and Quiñones (2016) reflect on US policy over their homeland, Puerto Rico, which involved strategies to erase Puerto Rican identity. They write, “One of the many strategies used to pursue Puerto Ricans’ assimilation, which we identify here as an erasure strategy, was the language policy that substituted the Spanish vernacular for English as the language of instruction” (157). The same project of erasure, they emphasize, at one point involved systemic sterilization of Puerto Rican women (156).

The relationship between the English and Spanish languages, particularly in terms of US policy, is one steeped in colonial and imperial motives and racial discrimination. Norton’s (2013) point that language teaching is a political act is all the more salient in the context of English teaching to Spanish speakers, and when motivated by the goal of “assimilating” them into the US.

#### **4.1 Problematizing notions of assimilation**

Fuller and Leeman (2020), as well as Lippi-Green (2011), outline several ideologies about languages which they associate with public discourse on Spanish in the US. First, they identify the “one nation-one language ideology” as constructing monolingualism as the ideal state for a nation, with the presence of distinct speech communities, or even multilingualism among individuals, supposedly posing a threat to national unity and prosperity. The authors argue that holding such a belief requires one to ignore several truths: that the US has always been home to speakers of many languages (and expansionist projects have only made this more true); that many nations are multilingual; and that the majority of the world population is believed to be multilingual. Fuller and Leeman add that the “Standard Language Ideology” prescribes one language variety as objectively superior to others, and similarly elevates speakers of that variety as superior— more intelligent, hard-working, honest, etc. The authors clarify that no language is linguistically superior (more complex, more rule-governed, more “sencical”) than any other; rather, the Standard Language Ideology chooses the variety spoken by an already elite group as the “correct” or superior way of speaking.

Both of these ideologies contribute to the positioning of English and Spanish in the US. de Valle and Garcia (2013) assert that, “Unquestionably, English – or, rather, certain varieties of English – is privileged as the legitimate language, and others – often portrayed as threats to the health of the nation – are relegated to inferior positions in the linguistic market” (250).

Leeman (2013) notes that English’s reputation as the standard language of the US came about out of nativist, anti-immigrant and racially discriminatory rhetoric:



“At the beginning of the twentieth century, nativists portrayed certain immigrants as racially inassimilable. In the early twenty-first century, anti-immigrant discourse tends to foreground linguistic difference, which is then deployed in the racialization of minority language speakers in general and speakers of Spanish in particular” (306)

Thus, English’s widely acknowledged status as *the* language of the US emerged not from a reality about what the residents of the nation universally spoke, or historically had spoken, but out of a desire to associate the country with select members, as contrasted with racially and linguistically “undesirable” newcomers.

Importantly, Leeman’s point asserts that linguistic requirements for immigrants are a front for racism. The next subsections will explore more deeply the racialization of Spanish. However, even in isolation of this racialization, the push for individuals to use a standard language in lieu of their own can be a cruel imposition. Lippi-Green (2011) writes,

“We use variation in language to construct ourselves as social beings, to signal who we are, and who we are not and do not want to be. Speakers choose among socio linguistic variants available; their choices group together in ways which are obvious and interpretable to other speakers in the community. This process is a functional and necessary part of the way we interact. It is not an optional feature of the spoken language. When an individual is asked to reject their own language, we are asking them to drop allegiances to the people and places that define them.” (66)

The assimilationist project pushes for Spanish speaking immigrants to adopt English to integrate into the US, and in doing so deemphasize identification with their countries and communities of origin. In line with the one nation-one language ideology, this is supported by “public discourse”, which “often portrays Spanish as a language not just of immigrants, but of unauthorized immigrants” (Fuller and Leeman, 2020: 10). For Latin American immigrants, speaking Spanish, and specifically their varieties of Spanish, may indeed be a way of identifying with their home countries and communities abroad. However, the notion that Spanish impedes integration into US society, or that it indexes foreignness, is counterfactual. Spanish is the second most commonly spoken language in the US. The majority of Spanish speakers in the country are natural-born citizens, excluding immigrants who have since gained citizenship. This assimilationist demand on new Spanish-speaking immigrants, then, invalidates the membership of over 41 million residents of the US. English monolingualism is not a reality in the US; rather, monolingual ideologies position English acquisition as an urgent requirement for membership in the country. These ideologies are not harmless in their origins or their implications. They hold the native-born, white upper and middle class’s ways of speaking as arbitrarily superior, and frame linguistic nonconformity among others as a national threat and justification for marginalization. English Language Teaching, as a tool to assimilate Spanish speakers, draws on

an imperialist history between English and Spanish speakers, and reproduces the discriminatory idea that only English speakers are valid members of US society.

#### 4.2 “Blaming marginalized people for their own marginalization”

The authors of *Making Meaning, Making Change: Participatory Curriculum Development for Adult ESL Literacy* (1990) find in the federally-prescribed family literacy programs of their time a “deficit hypothesis which blames marginalized people for their own marginalization” (40). I argue that this way of thinking is present in the broader attitude that Spanish speakers should learn English to become true members of US society.

Firstly, the desire for Spanish speaking immigrants to learn English is often coupled in public discourse with the notion that the immigrants themselves do not already speak English, do not want to learn it, and that they do not want their children to learn it (Fuller and Leeman, 2020). However, data shows a “three generation” language shift among Latin American immigrants, with first-generation US citizens generally being bilingual and English dominant (Jenkins 2018; Lopez et al. 2017). Fuller and Leeman (2020) maintain that “both quantitative and qualitative research has shown that the myth of Latin American immigrants’ refusal to learn English is just that – a myth...with time, they *do* learn it and so do their children and grandchildren” (16-17).

This supposed refusal to “linguistically assimilate”, then, is based not on dominant trends, but on beliefs held about Latin Americans. Leeman (2013) analyzes the evolution of the Census Bureau’s racial and linguistic categories, along with their historical contexts, to argue that it is Latines themselves who are seen as “inassimilable”:

Whereas language was once seen as a racial indicator, it is now commonly represented as a question of personal choice, and those who ‘choose’ to speak languages other than English seen as refusing to assimilate... Nonetheless...language continues to index particular ethnoracial identities, allowing linguistic discrimination to step in as a surrogate for racial discrimination (322).

Focusing on the unstable construction of Latinidad as a racial/linguistic identity, Leeman concludes, “In effect, Spanish is inscribed on Latino bodies, rendering them inherently inassimilable and permanently Other” (323).

Desiree, an interviewee in *Underground America* (2017), shares her motivation to study English:

“The thing is, I had a lot of reasons to learn English; that’s why I put so much into learning the language. There was no way around it. Sometimes you have to feel the pressure, something has to push you. To me it was pain, anger, and humiliation. I didn’t

want to be always in the back, in the kitchen. I looked forward to the time when I could talk to a white person in America in the same way they talked to me.” (219)

For Desiree, the discrimination and verbal abuse she faces fuels an urgency for her to master English, though she says she has other motives as well. *Underground America* does not provide an epilogue to her story; neither does Desiree indicate that she believes her disrespect will cease if she acquires a higher level of English proficiency. She identifies her abusers as “white people in America”— a racial, not linguistic, category. If Desiree learns English, she will still be Latina. English seems to represent not an escape from oppression for Desiree, but merely an opportunity to talk back.

Another factor is that, for adults especially, acquiring English may not mean being seen as an “English speaker”, race notwithstanding. In *English with an Accent : Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States* (2011), Rosalina Lippi-Green focuses on how retaining an accent that indexes one as a non-native speaker can lead to continued discrimination. Just as Desiree’s customers ridicule her for what she and they perceive as a lack of English knowledge, Lippi-Green asserts that native English speakers can reject accented, but otherwise normative, speech. That is, retaining traits of a non-native English speaker, even while speaking English, is still grounds for exclusion and discrimination. Lippi-Green extends Leeman’s (2013) principle that linguistic discrimination serves as a surrogate for racial discrimination to encompass accent difference as well. She writes, “In the wake of ever tighter antidiscrimination laws, language and accent have become an acceptable excuse to publicly turn away, to refuse to recognize the other or acknowledge their rights” (67).

Jonathan Rosa, like Leeman (2013), argues in *Looking like a language, sounding like a race : raciolinguistic ideologies and the learning of Latinidad* (2019) that inassimilability is part of the racial construction of Latinidad, and cannot be shaken by English acquisition:

On the other hand, Latinxs are positioned in relation to a distinctive social tense of *always not yet*, or perhaps, *never quite yet*. If you would just learn English; no, unaccented English; no, the right variety of English. If you would just enter the country the right way; no, get in line and traverse a pathway to citizenship; no, act like a good citizen. This is a racialized social tense of the always already and never quite yet.

To Rosa, the conviction that English acquisition will result in upwards social mobility for Latines plays into “an imagined American meritocracy”. He cites 2010 Pew Research data naming Puerto Ricans and Mexicans as having the highest rates of English proficiency among Latines, yet also having the second and third highest poverty rates in that demographic. More recent data from 2021 shows that, excluding Spaniards, Panamanians have the highest rates of English proficiency among US Latines (87%), followed by Puerto Ricans (83%). While Panamanians had a poverty rate of only 12%, 21% of Puerto Ricans were living in poverty. While this data

does not support Rosa's assertion in as clear-cut a way, it certainly challenges the supposed correlation between English proficiency and economic mobility. Indeed, the same survey finds that Venezuelans, with a rate of English proficiency well below that of Puerto Ricans, (56% compared to 83%) had significantly lower rates of poverty (13% compared to 21%) (Moslimani et al., 2023).

Social mobility, then, cannot be directly tied to English proficiency. Rather, the notion that Latines can improve their conditions by acquiring English is both not strictly true, and ignores the racism and xenophobia oppressing Latines regardless of language use. We have seen why the project of assimilating Latine immigrants is problematic, now we see that it is impossible. Latines are constructed as inassimilable outsiders, and even English fluency or monolingualism does not prevent them from being seen as linguistic others. Presenting English Language Teaching as a pathway out of poverty and discrimination for Latine immigrants unfairly shifts the impetus onto these immigrants to escape marginalization that is not about their language abilities, but rather their race and Latinidad.

#### **4.3 Marginalization in the classroom**

The risk of English language teaching is not simply that it may emerge from historical and current framing of Spanish and Latine inferiority and need to assimilate, but that it may *reproduce* these hierarchies. The urgency to acquire English to become a valid member of US society is sustained in the learning process.

In Chicana poet Pat Mora's *Elena*, the speaker expresses an internalized discrimination that is, at best, not alleviated by her study of English:

My Spanish isn't enough.  
I remember how I'd smile  
listening to my little ones,  
understanding every word they'd say,  
their jokes, their songs, their plots.  
*Vamos a pedirle dulces a mamá. Vamos.*  
But that was in Mexico.  
Now my children go to American high schools.  
They speak English. At night they sit around  
the kitchen table, laugh with one another.  
I stand by the stove and feel dumb, alone.  
I bought a book to learn English. My husband frowned, drank more beer.  
My oldest said, "Mamá, he doesn't want you  
to be smarter than he is." I'm forty,  
embarrassed at mispronouncing words,  
embarrassed at the laughter of my children,

the grocer, the mailman. Sometimes I take  
my English book and lock myself in the bathroom,  
say the thick words softly,  
for if I stop trying, I will be deaf  
when my children need my help.

(from *Tongue Tied Tongue-tied: The Lives of Multilingual Children in Public Education*, 2004)

Through this poem, we catch a glimpse of the speaker's pain as a Spanish-speaking immigrant in the US, where English monolingualism rules. She drifts away from her children, who transition to English dominance. Her language is devalued, not "good enough", and she is discriminated against by "[her] children, the grocer, the mailman". For Mora's *Elena*, English acquisition is a process steeped in feelings of shame and inferiority.

The ELT classroom is aptly positioned to reproduce and foster notions of Spanish/Latine inferiority and English/monolingual superiority in students. Delgado Bernal (2002) identifies formal education as a common site of subordination for Latine learners in the US. She writes, "Although students of color are holders and creators of knowledge, they often feel as if their histories, experiences, cultures, and languages are devalued, misinterpreted, or omitted within formal educational settings" (106). The ELT classroom in particular can devalue Spanish speakers' language in its objectives of linguistic assimilation. Manuel Martínez's 2021 *testimonio*, documented in partnership with Brenda Rubio and Deborah K. Palmer, discusses Martínez's experience as an adult immigrant from Mexico, living in the US, studying English and eventually training and working as a bilingual school teacher. Speaking on his own English education and teacher certification, he writes:

¿Por qué en la escuela que te hacen sentir que tu lengua, que tu cultura no es una cultura de la que te tienes que sentir orgulloso sino tienes que sentir avergonzado?

(*Why, in school, do they make you feel like your language, like your culture is not one that you should feel proud of but rather one that you should feel ashamed of?*) (52)

He adds, "It's like a hidden message. The message that you're receiving is that you need to be part of the American culture because that's the only culture" (53). For Martínez, these feelings of English supremacy and the importance of assimilation began to develop only after his move to the US, both through immersion in the culture and studying English and bilingual education. Martínez does not identify specific pedagogical strategies that resulted in his feeling this way, but reacts to the monolingual ideology held at large and upheld by the requirement that he learn English in order to progress professionally.

Mori (2014) does highlight how monolingual ideology shapes ELT practices, both as a general phenomenon and particularly in English-only classroom policies. In California, where

her study took place, an English-only policy in ELT was legally required of public schools, including the adult education center she studied. Mori argues that banning use of non-target languages contradicts findings that capitalizing on students' known languages supports student confidence and facilitates learning. To Mori, English-only classroom policy represents not an effective teaching strategy, but a view of English monolingual superiority that has seeped into the ELT classroom.

The ideological pressures for US Spanish speakers to acquire English also transform the learning process into one of shame and subordination. While English acquisition is framed as a path out of marginalization, ELT is capable of further dehumanizing students by reproducing rhetoric of English monolingual supremacy.

## **5 The Benefits of ELT for Latine Immigrants**

In an extensive analysis of the literature on bilingualism and language learning, Fox, Corretjer, and Webb (2019) find that acquisition of more than one language results in increased cognitive abilities, such as working memory, creativity, and lifespan maintenance of cognitive ability. In this respect, ELT can serve to benefit Latine immigrants simply on a cognitive level. Beyond this, English acquisition can lead to economic and social benefits for Latine immigrants living in the US. For the purposes of this thesis, I will examine the economic and social benefits ELT can provide.

### **5.1 Economic Benefits of English Acquisition**

Section 4.2 references Jonothan Rosa's (2019) model of comparing English proficiency and poverty rates among Latine national origin groups to find no straightforward correlation between English and social mobility. However, studies focused on this very issue suggest otherwise. In *The Bilingual Advantage: Language, Literacy and the US Labor Market* (2014) editors Rebecca M. Callahan and Patricia C. Gándara remind us that "Language... is not a simple, neutral economic commodity; in a racially stratified society like the US, language use is delicately interwoven with questions of class, status, culture and identity" (8-9). With this in mind, the reader can interpret the data offered in subsequent chapters. In Chapter 3, "Exploring Bilingualism, Literacy, Employability and Income Levels among Latinos in the United States", Moore et al. find that Spanish-English bilingual Latines had higher incomes and higher employment rates than Spanish-dominant Latines in all age groups ("Youth" 16-29, "Middle" 30-49, and "Oldest" 50-65). Among the oldest cohort, bilingualism presented an advantage over English monolingualism, though not in the younger cohorts.

In Chapter 5, "The Occupational Location of Spanish-English Bilinguals in the New Information Economy: The Health and Criminal Justice Sectors in the US Borderlands with Mexico", Alarcón et al. report similar findings. Evaluating employment stratification in the healthcare and criminal justice sectors near the US-Mexico border, the authors found that in this

highly multilingual environment, Spanish monolinguals tended to occupy lower level positions than Spanish-English bilinguals and English monolinguals. Generally, they worked jobs that required little or imprecise communication with clients or physical jobs. Still, the study noted that, controlling for level of education, social mobility for Spanish speakers was limited even when they were fluent in English:

Fluent Spanish–English bilinguals are broadly found in the middle, with more occupational prestige, power and pay than limited English proficient workers, but less than English monolinguals. We suggest that this may represent a ‘glass ceiling’, where individuals rise in the occupational hierarchy, but encounter barriers preventing entry into the top levels. (133)

The authors also note how Spanish fluency, while especially useful in this region, was not regarded as a “high value skill”. Indeed, in contrast to Spanish monolinguals, English monolinguals were able to occupy the highest positions, such as doctors and nurses, even when this made it impossible for them to directly communicate with (Spanish-speaking) clients. In these situations, the Spanish-English bilingual “lower-ranking, lower-paid personnel become de facto interpreters” (116).

Moore et al. find economic advantages of English proficiency among US Latines, and Alarcón et al. support this. Though the latter study is more limited in terms of region and economic sector, they do not limit their study to Latines only, and thus fill in an important gap. The “glass ceiling” they find for Spanish speakers, even in a region where Spanish is so common, suggests the racial, linguistic, and xenophobic discrimination identified in section 4 are indeed at play. Additionally, Moore et al.’s findings can be contextualized by the fact that the poverty rate among US Latines (18%) is measurably higher than the average (13%). That is, while Moore et al. find an association between English proficiency and higher earnings among Latines, Latines as a whole are economically disadvantaged compared to the general population.

Though Alarcón et al. do not explicitly study race or Latine identity, the implications of their findings are still relevant to this thesis. Adult Spanish-speaking immigrants, if they acquire English, will be Spanish-English bi- or multilingual. Thus, their social mobility would be limited in the ways Alarcón et al. identify. Though these findings do not negate, and in fact demonstrate, the systemic oppression of Latines and Spanish speakers, they do associate a (perhaps limited) social mobility with English proficiency. As such, English Language Teaching for this demographic can result in real positive outcomes. The practice may not mend the larger societal issues at play, but can provide better opportunities for Spanish-speaking immigrants.

Latine immigrants recognize the opportunities afforded them by English acquisition, and uniquely understand the value of such opportunities. Schecter and Bayley (2002) share the testimony of Dolores, a Mexican immigrant and mother struggling to make ends meet on disability leave at the time of the interview:

Yo necesito un trabajo donde no utilice mucho mis manos ya porque están acabadas. Entonces si yo hubiera sabido inglés yo hubiera tenido escuela, yo hubiera otra clase de trabajo pero por mí situación de mi limitación de inglés no he tenido escuela. Nada más trabajé veinte y un años hasta la fecha. No sé qué va a ser mi futuro.

*(I need a job where I don't use my hands so much because they're shot. If I had known English I would have had more schooling, I would have another type of work but because of my situation of limited English, I didn't go to school. I just worked 21 years up until now. I don't [know] what my future will be) (67).*

Economic mobility, however limited, is often not a trivial prospect. Moore et al. and Alarcón et al. demonstrate that English proficiency does correspond with financial prosperity for Latines in the US. Individual Spanish speakers alone have the ability to weigh the ideological implications of linguistic assimilation against the monetary gain it may pose for them. In the next section, I discuss learning English as a personally determined goal for Spanish speaking immigrants.

## **5.2 Latine Agency and Resistance**

In their *testimonios*, Carmen M. Martínez-Roldán and Sandra Quiñones (2016) reflect on their conflicted experiences of studying English. They explain, “It was clear in our personal narratives that while being bilingual has been an intellectual and cultural resource for both of us and is an educational agenda we are invested in promoting, it has also been a source of tension and ambivalence” (157). For the authors, learning and teaching English does carry connotations of cultural erasure, particularly because of the federal government’s assimilationist tactics in their homeland of Puerto Rico. At the same time, they see English as a resource for themselves and others.

The view of English as a desirable resource is common among Latine immigrants living in the US. In her 2018 ethnographic study of Latine immigrant mothers in the Midwest, Isabel Velázquez reports,

contrary to xenophobic discourses that posit the immigrant as unwilling to learn the majority language, all the women in this group were motivated to learn, and saw it as an inescapable precondition for being successful in the United States, not only for economic success, but as a counter-measure to social isolation. (74)

Velázquez’s point touches on both the discriminatory rhetoric surrounding Latines and English—that they refuse to linguistically assimilate—and the reality that her participants themselves wanted to learn English. Schechter and Bayley (2002) find a similarly widespread motivation to learn English among Latine immigrants in California and Texas. Importantly, both studies



emphasize that many participants saw both English acquisition and Spanish retention as beneficial economically and socially. While monolingual ideology creates a systemic pressure to learn English, Spanish speakers do not always internalize this ideology. Rather, while deciding to learn English, many see Spanish maintenance as a way to resist the cultural erasure and discrimination they face. Schechter and Bayley share another insight from study participant Dolores, who feels her children should both master English and maintain their Spanish:

Principalmente yo pienso que lo que se debe de tener en los niños es que respeten su identidad- su idioma de ellos y que los hagan sentirse cómodos como cualquier persona, que no los hagan sentirse menos porque también es el hecho que les hace sentirse rebeldes y que no tengan en sus corazones esa cosa de ser menos y lo que son igual que todos. Sea cualquier raza pienso que es la misma.

*(First I think that that what needs to be instilled in children is that they respect their identity- their language and that they are made to feel as comfortable as anyone, one needs to be sure that they don't feel themselves to be inferior because this is the thing that makes them rebellious, and that they don't have in their hearts this feeling of being inferior and that they are equal to anyone. Regardless of race, I think that one race is the same as any other race.) (68-69)*

While English monolingual ideology in the US has created pressure for Spanish speakers to learn English, Spanish speakers themselves make informed decisions on whether to do so. Moreover, many Spanish speakers maintain pride in their language and use it to resist subordination. The choice to learn English is also one of agency, and is not incompatible with resistance.

## **6 Recommendations - To ELT or not to ELT?**

In the end, while the ethical problems surrounding, and potentially emerging from, ELT are real and substantial, true dedication to Latine immigrant liberation requires a belief in self-determination. That is, one should not make prescriptive decisions on whether studying English is “worth it”, ethically or otherwise, for other individuals, families, or communities. Individuals themselves know their particular situations and personal goals, and have their own understandings of the subjective matters of ethics, language, and identity. The fact that the Spanish-speaking immigrant community in the US (even when defined with such specificity), is markedly heterogenous makes generalization all the more misguided. My findings support the notion that Spanish speakers in the US should not be pressed to linguistically “assimilate” by learning English. While educators and concerned community members might want to encourage English study as a path to economic mobility and social inclusion, it would be deceitful to gloss

over the racial and xenophobic barriers that generally limit this mobility. Rather, a true desire for greater mobility and inclusion for Spanish-speaking Latine immigrants might be better pursued in addressing these systemic inequalities.

English language teachers whose core goal is to ensure just conditions for Spanish-speaking immigrants might shift resources or pivot entirely to activism addressing Latine marginalization and the monolingual ideal. In my work as a language teacher, I've dedicated time to educating English speakers in the Spanish language, with the explicit goal of bridging the language gap with Spanish-speaking immigrants in the community. My aim in doing so has been to shift the burden of linguistically "assimilating" off of immigrants, and foster a culture of multilingualism in the community.

Still, it is my belief that if an individual or a community concludes that English language education is in their best interest, this decision should be respected. Educators may choose not to offer English language classes out of the belief that they are ethically questionable, but could be doing so against the self-determined interests of potential students. A more productive path in this situation would be to engage in dialogue with communities and English learners about their motives, goals, and views of the politics surrounding ELT.

Coincidentally, the language classroom can be a very effective space to foster this dialogue. The act of discussing sociolinguistic ideologies and inequalities in a language classroom can itself be a way of liberating students they affect. Delgado Bernal (2002) writes that, "Critical race and LatCrit theorists acknowledge that educational structures, processes, and discourses operate in contradictory ways with their potential to oppress and marginalize and their potential to emancipate and empower" (109). While the ELT classroom can indeed be a product and disseminator of harmful language ideologies, it can under some conditions have a liberatory effect. In his *testimonio*, Manuel Martínez (2021) attests to this liberatory potential and its significance in his experience both as a Mexican immigrant and eventually an educator:

Me parece fascinante el . . . poder que debe de tener la educación de luchar contra la alienación. También me satisface sobremanera el leer acerca de la educación como cambio, transformación y humanización. . . . Solamente alguien con deseos de transformar la realidad se atreverá a cambiar la situación de discriminación y exclusión que viven muchos de los estudiantes en nuestros salones de clases y sus familias.

*(It seems to me fascinating . . . the power that education can have in the fight against alienation. It also satisfies me overall to read about education as change, transformation, and humanization. . . . Only someone with desires to transform reality will dare to change the situation of discrimination and exclusion that many students live in our classrooms and their families.)* (Rubio, Palmer & Martínez 2021: 45)

For Martínez, education can have the power to combat the very issues that Spanish-speaking Latine immigrants face in classrooms and in the US at large— alienation, exclusion, and discrimination. Further, he attributes a transformative ability to education, suggesting that liberatory education can uplift students to change societal inequalities beyond the classroom. Rosa (2019) argues that the imperative to learn English places the impossible burden on Latine immigrants to escape systemic marginalization. Yet liberatory teaching can empower them to transform the inequitable system.

Rubio, Palmer, and Martínez (2021) explain, “The very act of naming a reality—of developing the language to talk about an injustice—has in itself transformative power, and it serves as the first step toward overcoming that injustice” (46-47). Under this logic, classes dedicated to developing language, as in ELT, are well-positioned to help students transform unjust realities. Of course, educational programs can enable students to “name realities” in already known languages, and courses that capitalize on known language skills and focus on discussing justice and activism may be best positioned to meet this end. Educators who question the assimilationist implications of ELT may choose to pivot to offering purely justice-centered education for Spanish-speaking Latine immigrants. In the interest of not pushing an agenda of linguistic assimilation, this may be the most ethical option for communities who want to alter their situations, but are ambivalent about acquiring English.

In cases where individuals identify English acquisition as a goal, several authors offer ideas on how liberatory teaching can be integrated with ELT. I explore these briefly in the next section.

### **6.1 Liberatory Strategies in ELT**

In his seminal *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Friere calls for “ a pedagogy which must be forged with, not for, the oppressed (whether individuals or peoples)” (48). Auerback et al. (1990) apply this notion to family literacy programs for adult English learners. They argue that “the complex and often problematic social context of participants' lives should be seen as a rich resource for learning rather than an obstacle” (40). To them, English and literacy education is most effective when its content and methods are grounded in students’ lived realities and therefore socially significant. The “particular realities of each group of participants” should determine the goals and strategy of the class (40). This approach to language education can maximize students’ investment and practical benefit from language education, and valorizes their funds of knowledge. Bringing students’ experiential knowledge to the forefront of the education process is key to avoiding alienation and subordination in the classroom, and in supporting student potential to name and change the inequities they face (Delgado Bernal 2002). A key way of valorizing students’ knowledge is to welcome and integrate their known languages into the English teaching process. Ridding the ELT classroom of an English-only policy challenges monolingual ideology, and supports effective teaching (Mori, 2014).

Beyond this, Delgado Bernal (2002) proposes a practice of “counterstorytelling” wherein marginalized students study and share their own stories of “nonmajoritarian” life. She argues,

By incorporating a counterstorytelling method based on the narratives, testimonios, or life histories of people of color, a story can be told from a nonmajoritarian perspective—a story that White educators usually do not hear or tell (Delgado, 1989, 1993). At the same time, counterstorytelling can also serve as a pedagogical tool that allows one to better understand and appreciate the unique experiences and responses of students of color through a deliberate, conscious, and open type of listening. In other words, an important component of using counterstories includes not only telling nonmajoritarian stories but also learning how to listen and hear the messages in counterstories. (116)

Crucially, the counterstorytelling method centers the knowledge and experiences of marginalized students where they might be excluded or subordinated, and provides an opportunity for student realities to shape learning. In *Narratives of Adult English Learners and Teachers* (2019), Clarena Larrotta presents examples of how students’ cultural expertise from their homelands can serve as topics for oral presentations and written work in ELT. For Larrotta, centering student experiential knowledge facilitates new learning, and builds confidence in the transition from oral use to literacy in the target language.

I propose that students’ own counterstories and stories of marginalization and resistance can be used similarly as “cultural expertise” in dialogic language activities. More broadly, I advocate for a language curriculum that helps students name and discuss the racial, political, and linguistic inequalities they face in and beyond the ELT classroom. This can be done in the target language as a form of socially significant language use, or take place in reflective discussions that accompany the English learning process. Finally, language classrooms can minimize the reproduction of monolingual ideology by valorizing and integrating students’ known languages and scrapping English-only rules.

## **7 Conclusion**

The hegemony of English in the US has emerged from an imperialist and nativist history. It is sustained by a monolingual ideology that invalidates the membership of 41 million Spanish speakers, most of whom are natural born US citizens. The ideologies that construct non-English languages as a threat to national unity, or as linguistically inferior, function as a front for racist and xenophobic logics. Indeed, the notion that acquiring English will lead to socioeconomic mobility for Spanish-speaking Latine immigrants draws attention from the marginalization they face regardless of language use. English Language Teaching as a response to hardship among Latine immigrants does not address the core issue of raciolinguistic discrimination, and in fact can contribute to it. Still, Latine immigrants do see economic gain with English proficiency. Individuals have the sole authority to evaluate the ethical, financial, and social implications of

studying English in their unique situations. For adults, who are not required to attend English-language public schools, learning English is often a choice that involves agency, and is accompanied by measures to retain their cultural and linguistic vitality. Given this complicated context, I suggest that English language educators respect and engage with immigrants' decisions to pursue or forgo English acquisition. Activism to address the linguistic, racial, and xenophobic marginalization that oppresses Spanish-speaking Latine immigrants visualizes a long-term transformation that does not blame this demographic for said marginalization. Still, when Latine immigrants do decide to pursue English education, I suggest liberatory teaching methods that can both combat linguistic subordination and provide students with the tools to communicate and change the inequities they face.

## Works Cited

- Acevedo, L. del A. (2001). *Telling to live: Latina feminist testimonios*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Auerbach, E. (Ed.). (1990). *Making meaning, making change: Participatory curriculum development for adult ESL literacy*. Washington, DC : Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Bazo Vienrich, A. (2019). Indigenous Immigrants from Latin America (IILA): Racial/Ethnic Identity in the U.S. *Sociology Compass*, 13(1), e12644.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12644>
- Bernal, D. D. (n.d.). *Critical Race Theory, Latino Critical Theory, and Critical Raced-Gendered Epistemologies: Recognizing Students of Color as Holders and Creators of Knowledge*.
- Callahan, R. M., & Gandara, P. C. (Eds.). (2014). *The bilingual advantage: Language, literacy and the US labor market*. Bristol ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Del Valle, J., & García, Ofelia, O. (2013). The making of Spanish: US perspectives. In *A Political History of Spanish* (1st ed., pp. 248–325). Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511794339.021>
- Dietrich, S., & Hernandez, E. (n.d.). Language Use in the United States: 2019. *American Community Survey Reports*.
- Fox, R., Corretjer, O., & Webb, K. (2019). Benefits of foreign language learning and bilingualism: An analysis of published empirical research 2012–2019. *Foreign Language Annals*, 52(4), 699–726. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12424>
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (30th anniversary ed). New York: Continuum.
- Fuller, J. M., & Leeman, J. (2020). *Speaking Spanish in the US*. Multilingual Matters.  
<https://doi.org/10.21832/FULLER8281>
- García, O., Kleifgen, J. A., & Cummins, J. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for english learners* (Second Edition). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Haner, J., & Hugo Lopez, M. (2023). *8 facts about recent Latino immigrants to the U.S.* Pew Research Center. Retrieved from Pew Research Center website:  
<https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/09/28/8-facts-about-recent-latino-immigrants-to-the-us/>
- Hugo Lopez, M., Gonzalez-Barrera, A., & Lopez, G. (n.d.). Hispanic Identity Fades Across Generations as Immigrant Connections Fall Away. *Pew Research Center*.
- Jenkins, D. (2018). Spanish Language use, Maintenance, and Shift in the United States. In K. Potowski (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Spanish as a Heritage Language* (1st ed., pp. 53–65). New York, NY : Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, [2018]: Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315735139-4>

- Larrotta, C. (2019). *Narratives of adult English learners and teachers: Practical applications*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Leeman, J. (2013). Categorizing Latinos in the history of the US Census: The official racialization of Spanish. In *A Political History of Spanish: The Making of a Language* (pp. 305–323). Cambridge University Press.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed). London ; New York: Routledge.
- Martínez-Roldán, C. M., & Quiñones, S. (2016). Resisting Erasure and Developing Networks of Solidarity: *Testimonios* of Two Puerto Rican Scholars in the Academy. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 15(3), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2016.1166059>
- Mora, L., & Lopez, M. H. (n.d.). *Latinos' Views of and Experiences with the Spanish Language*.
- Mori, M. (2014). Conflicting Ideologies and Language Policy in Adult ESL: Complexities of Language Socialization in a Majority-L1 Classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 13(3), 153–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2014.919810>
- Moslimani, M., Hugo Lopez, M., & Noe-Bustamente, L. (2023). *11 facts about Hispanic origin groups in the U.S.* [Fact Sheet]. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from Pew Research Center website: <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/08/16/11-facts-about-hispanic-origin-groups-in-the-us/>
- Nash, A. (1992). *Talking shop: A curriculum sourcebook for participatory adult ESL*. [Washington, D.C.], McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics ; Delta Systems.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090563>
- Rosa, J. (2019). *Looking like a language, sounding like a race: Raciolinguistic ideologies and the learning of Latinidad*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rubio, B., Palmer, D. K., & Martínez, M. (2021). Si no estás defendiendo tus alumnos, que estás haciendo en el salón? A Mexican Immigrant Teacher's Journey to Critical Consciousness. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 20(1), 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1864208>
- Santa Ana, O. (Ed.). (2004). *Tongue-tied: The lives of multilingual children in public education*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Schecter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (2002). *Language as cultural practice: Mexicanos en el norte*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum.
- Urrea, L. A. (2015). *Underground America: Narratives Of Undocumented Lives*. San Francisco, CA: McSweeney's Books.
- Velázquez, I. (2018). *Household Perspectives on Minority Language Maintenance and Loss*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/VELAZO2272>

Welch, S. D. (2000). *A Feminist Ethic of Risk (Other Feminist Voices)* (Rev. ed).  
Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.