



“I'm embarrassed and scared to speak a different language”: The complex language beliefs and emotions of bi/multilingual children of immigrants in monolingual U.S. schools

Yalda M. Kaveh & Ashley Lenz

To cite this article: Yalda M. Kaveh & Ashley Lenz (2022): “I'm embarrassed and scared to speak a different language”: The complex language beliefs and emotions of bi/multilingual children of immigrants in monolingual U.S. schools, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, DOI: [10.1080/01434632.2022.2062367](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2062367)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2062367>



Published online: 27 Apr 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 312



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



“I’m embarrassed and scared to speak a different language”: The complex language beliefs and emotions of bi/multilingual children of immigrants in monolingual U.S. schools

Yalda M. Kaveh  and Ashley Lenz 

Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this sociolinguistic study is to examine language beliefs, emotions, and practices of twenty bi/multilingual fourth-grade children of immigrants in monolingual U.S. schools in relation to societal language ideologies. This qualitative multiple case study included individual semi-structured interviews with bi/multilingual children focusing on their language beliefs, emotions, practices, and agencies. We utilised qualitative thematic analysis to examine links to societal language ideologies and issues of power. Children generally identified positively with their heritage language(s) and considered bilingualism beneficial, but they also displayed negative emotions towards their heritage language(s), English, and bi/multilingualism depending on the context and the audience. Additionally, children’s evolving language proficiencies and practices at home and school favoured English. We connect the children’s emotions, beliefs, and practices to hegemonic language ideologies in U.S. society and schools and propose a solution towards change.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 22 November 2021
Accepted 28 March 2022

KEYWORDS

Language ideologies; language beliefs; emotions; bi/multilingual children of immigrants; monolingual schools; children’s agency

Introduction

Bi/multilingual children who grow up in contexts of linguistic power imbalances are more likely to connect to the dominant societal language, as they understand it to be a powerful means of attaining their social placement (De Houwer 2009; Orellana, Ek, and Hernandez 1999; Sevinç 2016). School is one of the first and most powerful sites where children encounter inequitable dynamics between languages. Reflecting societal language ideologies, educational policies view minoritized languages as problems (Ruiz 1984) that need fixing in the service of the majoritized language(s). Such power imbalance is particularly apparent where forces such as colonisation have established one language as legitimate while systematically marginalising other languages (Flores 2013). Other societal factors such as race, socioeconomic status, and schooling play essential roles in defining the status, value, and utility of languages for children (Armstrong 2014; Chaparro 2019; Curdt-Christiansen 2018; Ricklefs 2021). Thus, children as young as ten can internalise language ideologies represented through language practices at their schools (Henderson 2016). When children perceive linguistic and cultural disconnects between home and school, they are likely to question the value of their heritage language(s) and prefer the language of schooling (Kaveh 2020). Reduced heritage language use contributes to language loss and self-perception of linguistic incompetency, which can trigger anxiety with heritage language use (Sampasivam and Clément 2014). This ‘vicious cycle’ of language use, proficiency, and anxiety (Sevinç and Backus 2017) disrupts language maintenance and

children's connection to their parents, grandparents, and elders, resulting in adverse social and emotional consequences (Braun 2012).

Current study: purpose and contribution

Language decisions in bi/multilingual families are sociolinguistic processes related to power, identity formation, and sense of belonging (Sevinç 2020; Tannenbaum 2012). Children from bi/multilingual families who attend monolingual schools have to navigate these complex dynamics. Only in recent years have the perspectives and agency of children at the intersections of educational and family language policies been studied more closely in the field of family language policy (see King 2016; Bergroth and Palviainen 2017; Choi 2021; Kaveh 2020; Smith-Christmas 2020, 2021). The current study contributes to this body of emerging work by presenting the voices of twenty bi/multilingual fourth-grade children of immigrants who attended English monolingual public schools in Massachusetts, United States, where schools had been operating under an English-only educational policy for 15 years (Chapter 71A of Massachusetts General Laws).

The study focuses on children's language beliefs, emotions, and practices and their links to societal language ideologies and issues of power. The children had different heritage language(s), including Arabic, Bengali, Cape Verdean Creole, Greek, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Spanish, and Vietnamese. By examining first-hand accounts of bi/multilingual children's language use and beliefs through the lenses of language ideologies and language planning orientations, this study adds to our understanding of the nuances of bi/multilingual children's complex beliefs. Importantly, this study also represents the voices of Cape Verdean Creole-speaking children, who are largely unrepresented in the literature on bi/multilingual children (Kaveh and Sandoval 2020; Malloy 2021; Wagner 2018). The research questions framing this study are:

1. What are bi/multilingual children's beliefs and emotions about their bi/multilingualism?
2. What are the bi/multilingual children's recounts of language practices at home and school? How do these practices, if at all, intersect?
3. What are the underlying language ideologies of children's expressed beliefs, emotions, and language practices?

Theoretical framing: distinguishing children's language beliefs and emotions from language ideologies

This study distinguishes children's 'language beliefs' and 'language ideologies.' While there are many overlapping themes between them, these concepts have specific defining characteristics. For example, language beliefs refer to specific stances, on an individual level, regarding certain aspects of language and language learning, whereas language ideologies are related to larger social discourses connecting individuals to society and encompassing power relations, such as traditions, customs, gender, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (Gal 2006; Leeman 2012). Language ideologies determine linguistic behaviours articulated by users, explicitly or implicitly, through communicative practices (Silverstein 1979). In other words, language beliefs are manifestations of language ideologies rooted in societal power structures at the local, national, state, and global levels (Blackledge and Pavlenko 2002; McGroarty 2010).

Examples of language ideologies include ideas about 'standard' or 'correct' language usage, which gives an advantage to speakers of dominant languages or varieties (Leeman 2012). Standard language ideologies portray language as uniform and invariable and promote an idealised language or variety to which all other languages or varieties are compared (Milroy 2001). As a result, using any language form other than the 'standard' is considered unnatural and illegitimate, leading to the subordination of those language varieties and their speakers (Achugar 2008; Lippi-Green 1997).

Rosa and Flores (2017) connect normative perspectives on language use to historical and contemporary co-naturalizations of race and language that frame the ways linguistic practices of racialized populations are systematically stigmatised regardless of their adherence to standardised norms.

Ideologies are powerful, unobservable forces that come to be accepted among all social groups, whether or not these groups benefit from the proliferation of such hegemonic ideologies (Fuller 2015). The acceptance of dominant language ideologies makes them difficult to recognise and or challenge, as they become known as ‘common sense’ (McGroarty 2010). Language ideologies also play a pivotal role in forming identity (Kroskrity 2004), which is essential to consider, given that identity narratives are linked with emotions related to language, particularly for children. From a cognitive viewpoint, emotions are subjective experiences understood as ‘organizers of behaviors, essentially modifying a child’s thinking, learning, and action’ (Calkins and Bell 2010, 4). Examples of emotions related to bilingualism include interest, anxiety, joy, and fear (MacIntyre, Gregersen, and Mercer 2019). Emotions have been increasingly studied in relation to their effects on learning, identity, communication, second language acquisition (SLA), and maintenance of minoritized languages (Arnold 2011; Gregersen et al. 2014; Pavlenko 2012). Monoglossic ideologies, which interpret monolingualism as the social norm and ignore bilingualism (García and Torres-Guevara 2009), are linked to negative emotions, such as anxiety, towards marginalised languages and their development in bi/multilinguals (Sevinç 2020). While negative emotions such as anxiety have been widely researched in SLA for decades, positive emotions are a new area of focus in SLA and foreign language studies (Imai 2010; MacIntyre, Gregersen, and Mercer 2019). Combining the study of the positive and negative emotions in language development studies expands theory and research beyond monolithic descriptions of emotions, attitudes, and cultures (Dewaele and MacIntyre 2016; Snyder, Lopez, and Pedrotti 2011; Wong 2011). This research explores children’s emotions related to language through a sociolinguistic lens. Unlike SLA studies, we are not focused on emotions related to language outcomes (e.g. Dewaele and MacIntyre 2016). Instead, we examine connections between expressed emotions, language beliefs, and societal language ideologies. We believe this is a unique contribution of our work to the fields of sociolinguistic and SLA studies.

Analytic framework: orientations in language planning

In order to unpack and organise the patterns regarding language beliefs, emotions, and practices among the children and their connections to language ideologies, we used Ruiz’s (1984) framework for orientations in language planning as our analytic lens. Ruiz proposed three orientations:

- 1) Language-as-problem: focuses on the identification of problems with minoritized languages.
- 2) Language-as-right: is concerned with human rights, protection of linguistically marginalised groups, and legal entitlement to identification with one’s language.
- 3) Language-as-resource: views multilingualism as a resource to society and language communities.

Although Ruiz did not explicitly mention language ideologies, the overlap between orientations, beliefs, and ideologies is important for understanding bi/multilingual children’s dispositions toward languages. As Pagán (2021) argues, ‘language ideologies and orientations can coexist, but are not necessarily interchangeable, and that the study of ELP [*Educational Language Policy*] can benefit from the distinction’ (p.37). Orientations function as a conduit between ideologies, beliefs, and practices. The framework provides a helpful lens to explain the ‘shifting social and ideological discourses around languages and bi/multilingual speakers’ (Zúñiga 2016, 340). A few studies have linked language ideologies and orientations to examine teachers’ language practices (Zúñiga 2016), dual language school principals’ discourses (Bernstein et al. 2020), education policy documents (Alstad and Sapanen 2021), and outcomes for multilingual students (Pagán 2021). In this study,

we used Ruiz's (1984) orientations to classify children's language beliefs and emotions into three categories (i.e. language-as-problem, – right, and – resource) and connect them to underlying language ideologies.

Literature review: language ideologies and bi/multilingual children

Even though the United States has never officially established a national language, standardised English has been accepted as the epitome of American identity by mainstream society and policy-makers (Flores 2014; Wiley 2000). In turn, children from culturally and linguistically minoritized backgrounds in the U.S. learn to assign different values to their languages and cultures, resulting in negative beliefs about marginalised languages and cultures, and language loss (Baker 2011; Krogstad, Stepler, and Lopez 2015). For example, language-minoritized students may interpret their home language practices as less valuable, inappropriate, and deviating from the 'standard' language used in school (García 2011). In the following sections, we unpack these issues further by reviewing three relevant areas of the literature.

Societal language ideologies reproduced within educational contexts

Societal language ideologies significantly influence language practices within educational contexts (Howard, Sugarman, and Christian 2003; Slavkov 2017). In the United States, societal language ideologies have influenced educational practices through shifts in federal legislation away from the development of native languages and towards English language acquisition (Johnson 2010). Monoglossic ideologies and educational policies, such as the one in place in Massachusetts at the time of this study, view languages other than English as a 'problem' (Ruiz 1984) that schools need to fix or silence (Flores 2013). These hegemonic language ideologies even seep into bilingual education programmes through the expectations of 'pure,' 'correct,' and 'standard' use of both languages, thereby undermining bilingual students' sense of belonging in schools, particularly those who speak the so-called non-standard language varieties (de Jong, Coulter, and Tsai 2020). As Farr and Song (2011) argue, the 'standard' English-only policies directly contrast with the lived realities of bi/multilingual students, deprive them of learning opportunities such as developing their home languages, and also further an ideology of contempt and refusal toward children's languages, dialects, and their speakers.

Language ideologies, beliefs, and practices of bi/multilingual children

As children acquire new information and are exposed to the ideologies of those around them, their own beliefs about languages can change (Cho, Shin, and Krashen 2004; Lee, 2009; Oller and Eilers 2002). For example, while bi/multilingual children initially demonstrate positive beliefs towards their heritage language(s), as they age, their beliefs about their heritage language(s) as well as their bilingualism may become increasingly negative (Baker 1992; Oller and Eilers 2002; Cho, Shin, and Krashen 2004; Tse 1998). Tse (1998) describes a period of 'ethnic ambivalence' that typically occurs for language-minoritized children during childhood and adolescence, which can result in apathy towards and rejection of the heritage language and culture. This means that bi/multilingual children are susceptible to changing their language beliefs and forming attitudes that mirror their monolingual peers' language beliefs (Henderson 2016). Even children in diglossic contexts, where multiple languages can be used for various purposes, tend to demonstrate favourable beliefs towards the dominant societal language due to its association with higher social mobility compared to heritage languages (Dragojevic 2017).

Schools are among the most influential societal contexts impacting bi/multilingual children's language beliefs, dispositions toward languages, and sense of belonging and identity (Armstrong 2014; Creese and Blackledge 2015; Slavkov 2017). Bi/multilingual children faced with English-

only school practices are especially susceptible to language ideologies that challenge multilingualism (Choi 2021). Ideologies that portray children's bi/multilingualism as an impediment to their learning can cause them to exhibit negative emotions, such as shame or embarrassment about their heritage languages (HL), which contributes to a shift in their language preferences during the school years and ultimately results in HL loss (Martinez-Roldán & Malavé, 2004; Sevinç 2020; Sevinç and Dewaele 2018).

Researchers have documented bi/multilingual children's preference for the societal language as early as kindergarten, even within programmes that promote bilingualism (Babino and Stewart 2017; Block and Vidaurre 2019; Potowski 2007). For example, in her study of language ideologies among fifth-grade dual language students, Henderson (2016) found that these children demonstrated a preference for English, deeming it as the 'correct' language in the school context. Gerena (2010) attributes the shift in language preferences to the hegemonic ideologies favouring English in society. Furthermore, the dominant ideologies that challenge multilingualism in monolingual schools may pressure bi/multilingual children to assimilate to the English-speaking norms, in some cases at the expense of their home languages (Kaveh 2020; Valdés 2004).

Bi/multilingual children's agency Navigating Monolingual family and school policies

Children's beliefs about languages can be shaped, in part, by their home and school experiences. Recent research centred around language practices among bi/multilingual children, specifically within school contexts, has also explored how children navigate and interact with language ideologies in different contexts and demonstrate their agency (Schwartz 2018). The concept of agency, which has been defined as 'the socially mediated capacity to act' (Ahearn 2001, 112), is used to describe how linguistic choices are both formed by and help shape interactions within diverse social, cultural, and political contexts and across time (Choi 2021; Smith-Christmas 2021). Child agency has often been studied in terms of resistance to speaking the 'appropriate' language or abiding by the linguistic norms within a specific setting. Studies that have focused on the agency of bi/multilingual children have found that children as young as three years can express agency through evaluating their own and their peers' language use (Schwartz 2018). As a result, children can participate in various social situations and, in some instances, assert their agency by switching the language of a given situation based on their linguistic interests (Fogle 2012).

Children may use their agency through linguistic choices and language practices as a mechanism to modify, resist or conform to the identities and language use imposed on them at home and school (Guardado 2018; Tannenbaum 2012; Choi 2021). In some cases, children's agentive acts can facilitate the development of the heritage language and resist monoglossic practices both in educational and familial contexts (Kheirkhah 2016). Instead, bi/multilingual children are shown to use translanguaging as an agentive way to construct heteroglossic realities (García et al. 2011). Translanguaging is defined as the discursive practices that bi/multilinguals engage in to make sense of their bi/multilingual worlds and communicate by drawing strategically from a single linguistic repertoire to communicate (García and Torres-Guevara 2009; García et al. 2011). Yet, it is also important to remember that bi/multilingual children's use of the dominant language does not necessarily suggest a lack of desire or agency to interact in the heritage language(s) if they do not have the linguistic proficiency to do so (Smith-Christmas 2021).

Methods

This study was designed as a qualitative multiple case study (Merriam 1998). The multiple-case design allowed us to look both within and across the twenty cases to understand the commonalities and uniquenesses in the experiences of the bi/multilingual children who came from different language backgrounds but attended two English monolingual public schools in the same state. The following sections provide a brief introduction to the schools the participating children

attended to characterise the research context. We also describe the participants and the methods used to collect and analyze data.

Context

The participating children attended four fourth grade classrooms in two public elementary schools (two classrooms per school) in two districts (one urban and one suburban) in Massachusetts, U.S., that operated under an English-only educational policy. The schools were purposively chosen because of the distinct ethnolinguistic characteristics of their student populations.

Urban school

The school in the urban district was comprised of Latinx (52%), Black (30%), Asian (11.2%), multi-race (3.5%), and White (2%) children who represented HLs including, but not limited to, Spanish, Portuguese, Vietnamese, Cape Verdean Creole, and Haitian Creole. Nearly 80% of children at this school qualified for free/reduced fee lunch. According to the school's ESL coordinator, the school enrolled 263 students that were identified as 'English language learners' and 'formerly limited English proficient (FLEP)' at different levels of English proficiency at the time of this study.

Suburban school

The suburban school enrolled White (69.6%), Asian (12.5%), Latinx (8.3%), Black (3.8%), and multi-race (5.4%) children. According to the ESL coordinators, English was the predominant language spoken by children and families. However, bi/multilingual children represented various HL backgrounds, including Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese), Japanese, and Russian. Only 15% of children at this school qualified for free/reduced fee lunch.

Participants

The participants were twenty bi/multilingual fourth-grade children, ages 9-10, who attended monolingual public schools in an urban (N = 15) and a suburban (N = 5) district. They were selected based on the criterion that they came from families with one or two immigrant parents who spoke HLs. The selection was not exclusive to children from a specific language background, race, or ethnicity. Once the parents consented, the assent process was performed with the children before data collection.

The HLs represented by the children included Cape Verdean Creole (N = 7), Spanish (N = 7), Arabic, Bengali, Greek, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, and Vietnamese (see [Table 1](#)). The children had diverse heritage countries, documented through their parents' countries of birth. All but two children (Imad and Adrian) were born in the United States. Two children (Arturo and Imad) spent most of their upbringing outside the U.S., in the Dominican Republic and Bangladesh, respectively.

Data sources

The primary form of data for this study was individual semi-structured interviews with the children. Although gaining insight from young children through interviews is challenging, their voices are powerful and essential to be heard if they are engaged ethically as research participants (see Maguire 2005). Sociolinguistic researchers have increasingly used interviews with young bi/multilingual children (Eksner and Orellana 2012; Wagner 2018).

The interview protocol for this study was developed to examine children's language beliefs and practices at the intersection of home and school. The questions were piloted with eight bilingual children from the same two schools where the current project was conducted. Following the pilot study, the interview protocol was revised in consultation with four experts in the fields of

Table 1. Children's Demographic Information.

| Context | Children (<i>All names are pseudonyms</i>) | Place of Birth | Country of Heritage | Heritage Language |
|-----------------|--|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Urban School | Peter Coval | U.S.A. | Cape Verde | Cape Verdean Creole |
| | Marcus Souto | U.S.A. | Cape Verde & Trinidad | Cape Verdean Creole |
| | José Jiménez | U.S.A. | Ecuador & Dominican Republic | Spanish |
| | Leo Pimentel | U.S.A. | Cape Verde & Egypt | Cape Verdean Creole & Arabic |
| | Felicita Cruz | U.S.A. | Dominican Republic | Spanish |
| | Lidia Fontes | U.S.A. | Cape Verde | Cape Verdean Creole |
| | Imad Fakour | Bangladesh | Bangladesh | Bengali |
| | Hien Nguyen | U.S.A. | Vietnam | Vietnamese |
| | Anabella Da Rosa | U.S.A. | Cape Verde | Cape Verdean Creole |
| | Veronica Marquez | U.S.A. | Dominican Republic | Spanish |
| | Jenise Luis | U.S.A. | Cape Verde | Cape Verdean Creole |
| | Claudia Mendes | U.S.A. | Guatemala | Spanish |
| | Arturo Valdés | U.S.A. | Dominican Republic | Spanish |
| | Marcelo Ferreira | U.S.A. | Cape Verde | Cape Verdean Creole |
| | Jorge Báez | U.S.A. | Dominican Republic | Spanish |
| Suburban School | Bruno Montez | U.S.A. | Brazil | Portuguese |
| | Valentina Alvarez | U.S.A. | Argentina | Spanish |
| | Adrian Nikolaou | Greece | Greece and Korea | Greek and Korean |
| | Oliver Kim | U.S.A. | Korea and U.S.A. | Korean and English |
| | Tara Hien | U.S.A. | China | Mandarin |

bi/multilingual education and language policy. The modified protocol asked the children about their language practices at home and school, beliefs regarding English and their HL(s), feelings associated with their languages, as well as their hopes for school language practices.¹ Interviews lasted around 20 min and were audio-recorded. The audio recordings were transcribed verbatim for analysis. Prior to conducting the interviews, the first author observed the participating children in their classrooms for several months during the same academic year to build rapport with them.

Data analysis

The interview data were analyzed qualitatively using thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006) conducted through inductive within-case and cross-case analysis in 5 stages. We (the two researchers) each analyzed one case independently during the first stage, focusing on our research questions. Then, we met to discuss our initial codes and emergent findings and solidified a coding scheme for analyzing other cases. In the third stage, we randomly assigned the remaining cases and continued our independent within-case analysis with the unified coding scheme. We met a few times during this stage to discuss new codes and findings that emerged with the latest cases. In the fourth stage, we each conducted a cross-case analysis of our assigned 10 cases. We then met for the fifth and the final step to discuss overall themes that emerged from our analysis. The major themes included language as a problem, language as a right, and language as a resource, which were further divided into categories for discussing English and heritage languages.

Findings

The participating children at both schools expressed conflicting beliefs and emotions towards their languages and bi/multilingualism. Although the children generally identified positively with their HL(s) and considered bilingualism beneficial, they occasionally displayed negative emotions, such as shame or embarrassment, towards their HL(s), English, and bi/multilingualism, depending on the context and the audience. We use Ruiz's three-part framework to categorise children's language beliefs and emotions. In addition to orientations, we discuss children's evolving language

proficiencies and agentive language practices in the context of schooling. We close by interpreting our findings and theorising about the ideologies that undergird the children's language beliefs, practices, and conflicting emotions such as joy and fear.

Language-as-right

The children's statements describing close affinity and positive emotions concerning their languages were categorised under 'language-as-right.' Notably, this orientation was found only in comments about HL(s) in both school contexts. The children claimed rights to their HLs in three ways. First, some used first-person pronouns, singular and plural, to describe lineage, belonging, and possession of their HLs (e.g. 'my family's language,' 'it represents where we're from,' 'my parents' and their ancestor's language'). Second, a few implied that their HL speech community members had exclusive rights to the language. For example, Lidia expressed her dismay with Spanish-speaking peers attempting to learn Cape Verdean Creole:

Lidia: So, people don't know a lot of it, and now a lot of people are trying to teach people how to say Creole, and it bothers me because it's not their language ... It's not their real language, and they're all saying it wrong.

Similarly, several other children viewed their teachers as outsiders to their HL community and did not want them to use their language. We discuss this further with children's wishes for their schools.

The third and the most common pattern of language-as-right orientation was that all children associated positive emotions with using HL(s). These emotions included happy (N = 12), good, great, confident, comfortable, energised, alive, and proud:

Imad: I feel **comfortable** because I could explain more.

Marcelo: I feel **happy** because I am learning more about my language ... it represents where we're from.

Jorge: I like speaking Spanish. It makes me feel **happy** because my mom knows how to talk Spanish, my sister knows how to talk Spanish, a lot of people know how to talk Spanish.

Anabella: **Energized!** ... Because when I use Creole, it makes me feel **good**. It makes me know that I'm using my parents' and their ancestor's language.

Felicita: When I speak Spanish, I feel **alive** [because] I speak the language I've been speaking since I was a little girl. I just like talking it, talking the language because it's my first language.

Valentina: because most people, a lot of people don't really have the opportunity to learn another language at home, but I feel **proud** because I have that opportunity.

Language-as-resource

Children's language beliefs displayed a language-as-resource orientation towards their HL(s) and English in distinct ways. In addition to the positive emotions mentioned above, the children cited benefits for speaking their HL(s), including cognitive gains, success in life, travelling abroad, translation for others, and facilitation of communication:

Oscar: Yes, because it [bilingualism] helps them [children] get smarter. It's better how you can say multiple things in different ways.

José: If you know only one language, then you wouldn't get very far in life [because] if you travel to foreign countries, you wouldn't know what you're doing.

Leo: I think it's useful because what if you meet someone that can't speak English and then speaks the different languages as you can speak, you could translate for them.

Claudia: It's important because if someone says something in English and they don't know what they're saying, then they can probably say, 'Can you tell me that in another language that I know?'

Tara: If I go to China again that way, I'll know more of what people are saying to me and what they're saying to other people.

On the other hand, when children were asked how important it was for them to know English, their responses signified an awareness of an absolute necessity, rather than an added benefit:

Hien: Important, I think that because like everybody speaks English in the U.S. and we speak English in the school, so we had to use that to communicate with the teacher and our friends.

Veronica: I think it's important because in the US most other people speak English, so you need to know how to speak to them.

Bruno: because if I would only know Portuguese, if I didn't go to school, then I wouldn't know English, I couldn't get anything.

Imad: Because this is America. So, in America, most of the time, you need to speak English.

These examples demonstrate an understanding of the hegemonic power of English as *the* language of schools and the country. Children in both contexts were also sharply aware when their languages and cultures were underrepresented in their schools and society. For example, Anabella believed that her heritage country was not represented in the media and the society. Thus, she fondly recalled an opportunity to introduce Cape Verde to her school community:

Anabella: We all did a poster once in third grade about our country, and we had a publishing party where we got to tell all the other students and parents about our country.

Interviewer: How did you feel when you did that?

Anabella: I felt good knowing that other people can learn about my country because where ever you go, you've never seen a celebrity or people famous talk about Cape Verde. It's like it's not known.

Language-as-problem

The children's negative emotions, such as shame, fear, and embarrassment, about their HL(s), English, and bi/multilingualism were categorised as language-as-problem. This orientation presented three patterns: 1) others' negative perceptions of children's HL(s), 2) children perceiving their bi/multilingualism as challenging, and 3) English-as-problem. There was overlap between these patterns as well as within and across cases, which means that some children (e.g. Lidia and José) expressed negative feelings towards their HL, English, and bi/multilingualism simultaneously. Yet, it is noteworthy that the theme of English-as-problem was considerably less common (N = 4) than descriptions of HLs and bi/multilingualism as problematic (N = 12).

Others' negative perceptions of heritage language(s)

When children were asked if they had ever felt uncomfortable speaking their HL(s), 10 out of 20, in both contexts, responded affirmatively and connected it to others' negative perceptions of their language(s). 'Others' included both non-HL speakers and HL speakers in distinct ways. When speaking their HL in the presence of those who did not understand it, the children were concerned that they would be perceived as malicious, rude, or out of the norm:

Jenise: They'll [*peers who did not speak Creole*] think that we're talking about them when we're not talking about them. Then they'll just get mad at us.

Marcelo: [*I feel*] Uncomfortable because I am thinking that they may think I am saying some stuff about them, you know, something in another language that they don't know, and they think it's rude.

Leo: When I'm out in public because I'm afraid of people, and I'm scared because it's not usual for our families to speak Creole or Arabic in public because it's like an Egyptian language, and I'm scared to say it in public. I decided I'm embarrassed and scared to speak a different language. I'm just scared that people are going to look at me like I'm crazy.

On the other hand, the children felt embarrassed by being judged for speaking their HL incorrectly when proficient HL speakers were present:

José: [I was] Embarrassed because I used to pronounce words wrong.

Jenise: Because when I talk to adults [in Creole] when they stare at me, I feel uncomfortable, and I feel embarrassed.

Adrian: [I feel] Scared because I am always afraid that I would say something wrong and they [Korean and Greek speakers] would just freeze up.

Children's perceiving their bi/multilingualism as challenging

In addition to demonstrating discomfort with how others perceived their HL use, children were critical of their own bi/multilingualism and thus, described it as challenging:

Jenise: Yes, because sometimes I burst things up, and I even don't know what I'm saying.

Marcelo: Yes, I get mixed up ... Like when some words, like saying the words in Creole, think of it and then say it in English.

Bruno: Yes, because sometimes I forget how to say words.

Lidia: Yes ... because sometimes I have to go to this language and then, then mix it up with English and then I'm like where should I go in English or in Creole.

Children who claimed to be bilingual and biliterate held similar views. Veronica mentioned she only forgot some words in Spanish. Yet, she would not recommend bilingualism for other children: 'Because if you have your own language, and also if you have more than one language, it will be harder for you.'

English-as-problem

In four cases, the children identified English as a problem concerning negative judgments by English speakers and subtractive effects of increasing English use on HL maintenance. Arturo was the only child who associated negative emotions with using English in the presence of English speakers. He had lived in the Dominican Republic for most of his life and was Spanish-dominant at the time. Arturo was embarrassed to speak English in general and felt particularly uncomfortable raising his hand in class to ask for help when he did not comprehend something. Additionally, Arturo described feeling the proudest of speaking Spanish when he was back in his hometown due to the absence of English speakers: '*Porque allá casi no hablan inglés, no hablan inglés allá.* Because hardly anyone speaks English there, they don't speak English there.' Arturo's discomfort with speaking English in the U.S., coupled with his pride in using Spanish in Santo Domingo, due to the absence of English speakers, point to his internalised concern for judgments by speakers of the language of power (i.e. English) and confirms his awareness of linguistic power imbalances in his surroundings.

The other three children identified their increasing English proficiency as a problem because it caused subtractive bilingualism and interfered with HL maintenance:

Hien: I feel like ... I think nervous about using both of them [the languages] because if I speak English too much, I will forget Vietnamese, so I can't respond to my family members.

Response to schooling: shifting language practices, but not loyalties

During the interviews, all children reported fluid use of English and HL(s) (albeit to varying degrees) at home with their family members. On the contrary, the children reported using mainly English at school with their peers and teachers in the urban and suburban contexts. This disconnect between language use and linguistic practices at home and school creates additional negative emotions among children, such as sadness and frustration. Lidia and José linked their subtractive bilingualism to English monolingual practices of schooling and described their emotions related to losing their heritage language:

Lidia: I don't understand that much Creole anymore, because all the school work and all the, like so much stuff I have to do it's making me lose some Creole. [*I feel*] sad ... because I am losing a part of my language.

José: I'm not really good at it [*Spanish*] ... Because for school, I talk in English, then write in English, and I forgot, really, everything.

It is also important to add that the changes in language practices and proficiencies did not negatively impact the perceived value of HLLs for the children. For example, when Lidia was asked if the language loss had changed how she viewed Creole, she said: 'No, same love, same love.'

Agentive responses: bi/multilingual children's Navigating monolingual contexts

Decreased use and loss of proficiency in the HL with years of schooling were shared amongst all but one child. In some cases, children's language shift carried over into homes where, despite persistence by parents, children used English at the expense of the heritage language:

Felicita: When I go home, my dad says, 'You need to speak Spanish.' I actually end up speaking English ... because I'm used to English instead of Spanish. Because I've been going to school every day. We have two days off, so I actually feel more comfortable listening to English.

Felicita's use of the majority language at home goes against the linguistic norms of the home setting, demonstrating a discordance in language practices between Felicita and her father, a pattern that has been linked to intergenerational conflict among families (De Houwer 2020; Wilson 2020). While her English use may be considered an agentive act of rejection, through which she resists her parents' expectations to use the heritage language, it is unclear if this is due to language ideologies or her proficiency in the heritage language (Smith-Christmas 2021). For Felicita, this disconnection between language proficiency and desire to maintain the heritage language produces other negative emotions associated with using the heritage language: 'I do like speaking Spanish, but sometimes when I mess up, I get so mad.' Felicita demonstrates her desire to speak Spanish but at the same time expresses her frustration when she 'messes up.'

Despite the overwhelming evidence suggesting the predominant use of English at both schools, eleven out of the fifteen children at the urban school reported using their heritage language at school with their friends. None of the participating children at the suburban school reported using non-English languages with their peers at the school. We attribute this to the small number of speakers of each language in the suburban context, limiting the children's having a common language with their peers. It is noteworthy that even the children's reports of non-English language use with their peers at the urban school exclusively occurred during the non-instructional periods, such as lunch and recess. The only exception was providing peer support in Spanish to Arturo during class. These findings suggest that children at the urban school resisted the monolingual policy and created opportunities for bi/multilingual use, albeit in the margins. In one case, a multilingual child (Leo) powerfully described how he relied on his entire linguistic repertoire (García et al. 2011) during independent reading to make sense of monolingual texts in school:

Leo: But when I read my book, I'd read in Creole. I'd read one page in Creole, one in Arabic, and I say the words in my head.

Interviewer: At school?

Leo: Yes. When I'm independently reading. I'd read one page in Creole and one page in Arabic.

Interviewer: In your head?

Leo: Yes.

Children's agentive language use also involves using their heritage language(s) in the monolingual educational context to include some peers while excluding others. For example, when describing her heritage language use at school, Anabella explains:

Anabella: Yesterday, when we were at the gym, Kelly said that there will be people talking about her from another school. Then she kept on trying to tell me something, and I was like, 'Don't speak English, they can hear you; speak Creole.'

Since the children reported increasing English use with school while maintaining generally positive attitudes towards their HLs, we asked if they wished their HL(s) were used by their teachers. The responses were mixed. Twelve out of twenty children welcomed the idea because they believed it would help with HL development, communication with the teachers, and provide a break from monolingual practices:

Marcus: Because then I'll learn a lot more, and I'll learn quickly.

Hien: So I can communicate with them [*teachers*] more better because I'm better at Vietnamese than English.

Leo: I want to speak a language that I could learn. That means people and the teachers could communicate easier. Sometimes it bores me just to speak one language all the day and time.

Peter: I just want at least one teacher to like at least be Creole cause like I can speak [*to*] her in Creole, and except for just English all the time. I can learn new words.

Yet, eight children mentioned that they did not want their teachers to speak their HLs because they wished to maintain privacy and boundary against non-HL speakers:

Lidia: No [*I don't teachers to speak Creole*] ... because they would understand everything I say.

Oliver: Kind of ... Because then it would be like a secret message where only some people would understand it, a lot of people couldn't.

This finding confirms that children used their heritage language(s) as gatekeepers to exclude non-heritage language speakers, including peers and teachers. This finding also suggests that monolingual schools' that intend to incorporate translanguaging practices may need to start by earning the trust of bi/multilingual children who have been witnessing their monoglossic ideologies.

Discussion: the power of underlying language ideologies

The participating children's language beliefs, emotions, and evolving language practices demonstrate perceptions of the power and value of languages determined by the societal context. Except for urban school children's use of HL with peers during non-instructional time, we found no significant difference in the emotions, beliefs, and language practices between the urban and the suburban contexts. Children's orientations towards languages provide insight into underlying societal ideologies. The children portrayed both counter-hegemonic ideologies favouring linguistic pluralism and hegemonic ideologies favouring English dominance. These findings support previous research that reports bi/multilingual children can value bi/multilingualism and believe in functional benefits of speaking their HL(s) while showing a preference for standardised varieties of languages of power (Babino and Stewart 2017).

Regarding the underlying language ideologies of children's expressed beliefs, emotions, and language practices, it is clear that the children viewed their HL(s) and bi/multilingualism as a

right and resource for connecting to their family and community, making cognitive gains, traveling, and communicating with more people. These orientations point to ideologies of linguistic pluralism, as children rejected the English-monolingual identities imposed on them by the dominant societal and educational norms favouring English monolingualism. These counter-hegemonic ideologies are significant because these children were being educated in English monolingual schools and lived in a society in which the power of English is pervasive.

At the same time, some of the children's statements represent hegemonic ideologies, as they highlighted the importance of English as *the* language of school and *the* language of the United States. Although the children did not necessarily favour English monolingualism, they demonstrated an awareness of the pervasive power of English while limiting the value of their HL(s) to the context of their families, HL speaking community, or outside of the United States. Our findings confirm previous research that children as young as ten can internalise monoglossic ideologies and believe in the natural predominance of English in society and schools (Henderson 2016). In addition, our study highlights that even children such as José and Tara, who spoke the second and the third most commonly spoken languages in the country (i.e. Spanish and Chinese), linked the importance of their HLs to foreign countries. These beliefs further point to the pervasiveness of national ideologies favouring English.

Our study shows that the children displayed a similar awareness of the power imbalances between language(s) in their problem-oriented views of their HL(s), English, and bi/multilingualism. Furthermore, findings indicate that the social status of languages can trigger negative emotions towards marginalised languages among bi/multilingual children. For example, children shared negative emotions, such as fear, embarrassment, and anxiety, regarding how others perceived their HL, bi/multilingual proficiencies, and themselves as individuals. These negative emotions linked to judgment by HL speakers point to normative language ideologies that dictate the standard way of speaking languages. By internalising these standardised ideologies, children believed they would be negatively perceived if they did not speak their HL 'correctly' or lacked 'balanced' proficiency in both languages. Additionally, the children mentioned negative emotions significantly less frequently about their perceived English proficiency when compared to their HL(s).

Although the children were critical of their HL proficiency, they also recognised the root cause of the issue. Hien, José, and Lidia cited the harmful effects of monolingual school practices on their HL proficiency. Furthermore, Anabella recognised the invisibility of people from Cape Verde at her school and the larger society. Thus, the children in this study showed awareness of linguistic power imbalances and portrayed sharp, painful cognisance of what the power imbalance took away from them.

The fact that the majority of the participating children are from racially minoritized backgrounds is also worth noting, given that standardised language ideologies can function as racialized acts of language policing that position racially minoritized language users as foreign, illegitimate, and out of place (Achugar 2008; Lippi-Green 1997). These racialized speakers are, in turn, considered incapable of producing any language. Rosa (2016) has termed these ideologies 'racialized ideologies of languagelessness' that call into question 'linguistic competence— and, by extension, legitimate personhood—altogether' (p.163). These racialized ideologies and linguistic power imbalances face children with negative emotional consequences, even when they exercise agentive bi/multilingual practices in monolingual contexts. For example, Leo's agentive act of using his heritage language in public still resulted in negative emotions because it diverged from the linguistic norm of the country. His repeated expression of being 'scared' of speaking Arabic in public for being perceived as 'not usual' or 'crazy' is arguably rooted in the anti-Arab and anti-Muslim rhetoric in the U.S. society (Antoon 2016) that has created a bias against speakers of Arabic language (Niedt 2011).

In terms of the intersections between bi/multilingual children's recounts of language practices at home and school with language ideologies, children's reports of their evolving language practices showed that the power of English exceeded ideologies. All children linked schooling to a degree

of HL loss. For example, although they reported fluid use of English and HL(s) (albeit to varying degrees) at home with their family members, they observed using mainly, and increasingly, more English at school. This finding confirms previous research that shows a shift in language practices towards the dominant societal language and away from heritage languages since beginning school in a monolingual educational context (Armstrong 2014; Yazan and Ali 2018). Cases such as Felicitas's, show that children's language socialisation can influence language practices in family contexts in favour of the dominant language, despite parents' determination to preserve their heritage language.

Unlike previous research, the children's increasing English use and proficiency did not cause them to devalue their HLs. Thus, while all children indicated that their language use has shifted to favour English since beginning school, they also expressed positive emotions regarding the use of their heritage language(s). Nevertheless, their increased use of English contributed to their insecurity towards their perceived HL proficiency and triggered negative emotions, such as shame and embarrassment with its use. Therefore, we can confirm that language ideologies disregarding children's bi/multilingualism as a resource or portraying them as a problem can lead to a range of negative emotions towards HLs, reluctance to speaking them, and detrimental effects on children's competency in the marginalised languages (Babino and Stewart 2017; Martinez-Roldán and Malavé, 2004; Sevinç and Dewaele 2018).

Despite awareness of dominant monoglossic ideologies, children described agentive acts, such as using the heritage language in monolingual school spaces when possible, demonstrating a resistance to the monolingual school policies. Furthermore, some of the bi/multilingual children used their respective heritage languages to exclude non-HL speakers, citing that they did not want others, including their teachers, to speak the heritage language as it was their special code. This finding is similar to García's (2011) study that found that kindergarteners used translanguaging to include and exclude others. Still, some of the children's agentive acts resulted in negative emotions as they received pushback from using the heritage language in specific contexts. For example, Marcelo indicated his discomfort speaking his heritage language because he felt that others who do not speak the language would consider it rude.

Conclusions, limitations, and implications for practice and research

The children in this study reported complex, positive and negative, emotions towards their languages. While all but one of the children indicated a loss of proficiency in their heritage language after beginning school, they maintained positive emotions towards their heritage language(s) and demonstrated acts of agency to preserve the language(s). Nevertheless, children's agentive acts are not without their consequences. Our study shows that using the heritage language in monolingual English settings where bi/multilingualism is not actively encouraged leads to negative emotions, such as fear and shame towards minoritized languages and bi/multilingualism.

Although this study represents a small sample of bi/multilingual children, their reports of increasing patterns of language loss and expressions of insecurity towards bi/multilingualism were concerning. The explicit consciousness of some of these 10-year-olds of the harmful effects of monolingual schooling practices on their heritage languages is particularly alarming. One could argue that these bi/multilingual children attending monolingual schools witnessed a silent and gradual linguistic genocide. Although this may sound extreme, Skutnabb-Kangas (2006) warned us against assimilationist subtractive education as one of the most critical and direct agents in linguistic and cultural genocide. Yet, she also proposed organising an education committed to linguistic human rights as the solution.

Several of the children did not favour their teachers using their languages. This finding highlights that teachers who work in monolingual schools, and particularly those who do not share their students' linguistic and cultural background(s), need to invest in building a foundation of trust for students whose languages have been historically minoritized. Despite showing signs of internalised

hegemonic ideologies, most of the children in this study expressed close affinities with their heritage and wished for more pluralistic environments in their schools. Resisting monoglossic approaches to education and working towards humanising language rights is a significant challenge for schools that have been historically designed to promote linguistic assimilation. A fundamental step towards this change is to plan curriculum and instruction centred on languages, cultures, and lived experiences of children *currently* represented in schools. By creating space for children to optimise all their linguistic and cultural resources for learning, English-medium classrooms can legitimize dynamic bi/multilingualism and foster linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of schooling for positive social transformation (Paris and Alim 2017).

As with any empirical study, there are several limitations regarding this research. First, this study was exploratory; thus, the findings cannot be generalised to children in other contexts. Furthermore, our use of interviews to elicit beliefs and emotions about language may not reveal the participants' unconscious attitudes, as they may base their responses on the researcher's expectations (Brabant, Watson, and Gallois 2007). Despite these limitations, our study has implications for research with bi/multilingual children. As the powerful voices of the children in this study suggest, young children have valuable insight to contribute to studies of bi/multilingualism. Future research in this area should further explore issues related to bi/multilingual children's identity, agentive language practices while navigating different contexts, and their emotional and linguistic development from children's own perspectives, rather than making assumptions based on outcome-oriented measures.

Note

1. Sample questions included: What languages do you speak at home? (Probe for parents, your parents to you, you and your sibling); Do you use the language(s) for different things or activities? Do you have 'language rule' at home? What language(s) do you use at school? What was a time when you felt proud of your language? What was a time when you felt embarrassed/ashamed/scared to speak your language? Have you found knowing heritage language to be useful? Why? How important do you think learning English is for kids like you who speak two or more language at home?

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Yalda M. Kaveh  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5425-3818>

Ashley Lenz  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3383-1997>

References

- Achugar, M. 2008. "Counter-hegemonic Language Practices and Ideologies." *Spanish in Context* 5 (1): 1–19.
- Ahearn, L. M. 2001. "Language and Agency." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30 (1): 109–137.
- Alstad, G. T., and P. Sapanen. 2021. "Language Orientations in Early Childhood Education Policy in Finland and Norway." *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy* 7 (1): 30–43.
- Antoon, S. 2016, April 19. "Why speaking Arabic in America feels like a crime." *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/apr/19/why-speaking-arabic-america-feels-like-crime>.
- Armstrong, T. C. 2014. "Naturalism and Ideological Work: How is Family Language Policy Renegotiated as Both Parents and Children Learn a Threatened Minority Language?" *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 17 (5): 570–585.
- Arnold, J. 2011. "Attention to Affect in Language Learning." *Anglistik. International Journal of English Studies* 22 (1): 11–22.
- Babino, A., and M. A. Stewart. 2017. "'I Like English Better': Latino Dual Language Students' Investment in Spanish, English, and Bilingualism." *Journal of Latinos and Education* 16 (1): 18–29.

- Baker, C. 1992. *Attitudes and Language* (Vol. 83). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. 2011. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bergroth, M., and Å Palviainen. 2017. "Bilingual Children as Policy Agents: Language Policy and Education Policy in Minority Language Medium Early Childhood Education and Care." *Multilingua* 36 (4): 375–399.
- Bernstein, K. A., N. Katznelson, A. Amezcua, S. Mohamed, and S. L. Alvarado. 2020. "Equity/Social Justice, Instrumentalism/Neoliberalism: Dueling Discourses of Dual Language in Principals' Talk About Their Programs." *TESOL Quarterly* 54 (3): 652–684.
- Blackledge, A., and A. Pavlenko. 2002. "Ideologies of Language in Multilingual Contexts." *Multilingua* 21 (2/3): 121–326.
- Block, N., and L. Vidaurre. 2019. "Comparing Attitudes of First-Grade Dual Language Immersion Versus Mainstream English Students." *Bilingual Research Journal* 42 (2): 129–149.
- Brabant, M., B. Watson, and C. Gallois. 2007. "Handbook of Intercultural Communication." *Handbook of Intercultural Communication* 7: 55–76.
- Braun, A. 2012. "Language Maintenance in Trilingual Families – a Focus on Grandparents." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 9 (4): 423–436.
- Braun, V., and V. Clarke. 2006. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3 (2): 77–101.
- Calkins, S. D., and M. A. E. Bell. 2010. *Child Development at the Intersection of Emotion and Cognition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Chaparro, S. E. 2019. "But mom! I'm not a Spanish boy: Raciolinguistic Socialization in a two-way Immersion Bilingual Program." *Linguistics and Education* 50: 1–12.
- Cho, G., F. Shin, and S. Krashen. 2004. "What Do We Know About Heritage Languages? What Do We Need to Know About Them?" *Multicultural Education* 11 (4): 23–26.
- Choi, J. 2021. "Navigating Tensions and Leveraging Identities: A Young Trilingual Child's Emerging Language Ideologies." *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 1–14. doi:10.1080/15348458.2021.1964366.
- Creese, A., and A. Blackledge. 2015. "Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 35: 20–35.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. 2018. "Family Language Policy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, edited by J. W. Tollefson, and M. Pérez- Milans, 420–441. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- De Houwer, A. 2009. *Bilingual First Language Acquisition*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- De Houwer, A. 2020. "Harmonious Bilingualism: Well-being for Families in Bilingual Settings." In *Handbook of Home Language Maintenance and Development*, edited by S. Eisenchlas and A. Schalley, 63–83. De Gruyter Mouton.
- de Jong, E. J., Z. Coulter, and M. C. Tsai. 2020. "Two-way Bilingual Education Programs and Sense of Belonging: Perspectives from Middle School Students." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–13. doi:10.1080/13670050.2020.1783635.
- Dewaele, J.-M., and P. D. MacIntyre. 2016. "The two Faces of Janus? Anxiety and Enjoyment in the Foreign Language Classroom." *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 4 (2): 237–274.
- Dragojevic, M. 2017. "Language attitudes." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*.
- Eksner, H. J., and M. F. Orellana. 2012. "Shifting in the Zone: Latina/o Child Language Brokers and the Co-Construction of Knowledge." *Ethos (berkeley, Calif)* 40 (2): 196–220.
- Farr, M., and J. Song. 2011. "Language Ideologies and Policies: Multilingualism and Education." *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5 (9): 650–665.
- Flores, N. 2013. "Silencing the Subaltern: Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and Bilingual Education in the United States." *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 10 (4): 263–287.
- Flores, N. 2014. "Creating Republican Machines: Language Governmentality in the United States." *Linguistics and Education* 25: 1–11.
- Fogle, L. W. 2012. *Second Language Socialization and Learner Agency*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fuller, J. 2015. "Multilingual Education." In *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging*, edited by J. Cenoz and D. Gorter, 137–158. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gal, S. 2006. "Migration, Minorities and Multilingualism: Language Ideologies in Europe." In *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices*, edited by C. Mar-Molinero and P. Stevenson, 13–27. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O. 2011. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- García, O., C. Makar, M. Starcevic, and A. Terry. 2011. "Studies in Bilingualism." *Bilingual Youth: Spanish in English-Speaking Societies* 42: 33–55.
- García, O., and R. Torres-Guevara. 2009. "Monoglossic Ideologies and Language Policies in the Education of U.S. Latinas/os." In *Handbook of Latinos and Education*, edited by E. G. Mutillo, S. A. Villena, R. T. Galván, J. S. Muñoz, C. Martínez, and M. Machado-Casas, 208–219. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gerena, L. 2010. "Student Attitudes Toward Bilingualism in a Dual Immersion Program." *Reading* 10 (1): 55–78.
- Gregersen, T., P. D. Macintyre, and M. Meza. 2014. "The Motion of Emotion." *Modern Language Journal* 98: 574–588.

- Guardado, M. 2018. *Discourse, Ideology and Heritage Language Socialization*. Boston, MA: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Henderson, M. H. 2016. "Prescriptive Language Attitudes in a Dual Language Elementary School." *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 1: 1–1.
- Howard, E. R., J. Sugarman, and D. Christian. 2003. "Trends in two-way immersion education." A review of the research.
- Imai, Y. 2010. "Emotions in SLA: New Insights from Collaborative Learning for an EFL Classroom." *The Modern Language Journal* 94 (2): 278–292.
- Johnson, D. C. 2010. "Implementational and Ideological Spaces in Bilingual Education Language Policy." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 13 (1): 61–79.
- Kaveh, Y. M. 2020. "Unspoken Dialogues between Educational and Family Language Policies: Language Policy Beyond Legislations." *Linguistics and Education* 60: 100876.
- Kaveh, Y. M., and J. Sandoval. 2020. "'No! I'm Going to School, I Need to Speak English!': Who Makes Family Language Policies." *Bilingual Research Journal* 43 (4): 362–383.
- Kheirkhah, M. 2016. "From family language practices to family language policies: Children as socializing agents." (Doctoral dissertation, Linköping University Electronic Press).
- King, K. A. 2016. "Language Policy, Multilingual Encounters, and Transnational Families." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37 (7): 726–733.
- Krogstad, J. M., R. Stepler, and M. H. Lopez. 2015. *English Proficiency on the Rise among Latinos*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Kroskrity, P. V. 2004. "Language Ideologies." *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* 496: 517.
- Lee, T. S. 2009. "Language, Identity, and Power: Navajo and Pueblo Young Adults' Perspectives and Experiences with Competing Language Ideologies." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 8 (5): 307–320.
- Leeman, J. 2012. "Investigating Language Ideologies in Spanish as a Heritage Language." In *Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States: The State of the Field*, edited by S. Beaudrie, and M. Fairclough, 43–59. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lippi-Green, R. 1997. "What we Talk About When we Talk About Ebonics: Why Definitions Matter." *The Black Scholar* 27 (2): 7–11.
- MacIntyre, P. D., T. Gregersen, and S. Mercer. 2019. "Setting an Agenda for Positive Psychology in SLA: Theory, Practice, and Research." *The Modern Language Journal* 103 (1): 262–274.
- Maguire, M. H. 2005. "What if you Talked to me? I Could be Interesting! Ethical Research Considerations in Engaging with Bilingual/Multilingual Child Participants in Human Inquiry." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 6 (1). doi:10.17169/fqs-6.1.530.
- Malloy, C. 2021. "English Expressive Narrative Skill Matters for Sociodramatic Play in Classrooms with Multiple Home Languages Represented." *Early Education and Development* 32 (7): 1016–1032.
- Martínez-Roldán, C. M., and G. Malavé. 2004. "Language Ideologies Mediating Literacy and Identity in Bilingual Contexts." *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 4 (2): 155–180.
- McGroarty, M. E. 2010. "1. Language and Ideologies." In *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*, 3–39. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Merriam, S. B. 1998. *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Milroy, J. 2001. "Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5 (4): 530–555. Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Niedt, G. 2011. "Arabic Accent and Perception in the USA." (Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University).
- Oller, D. K., and R. E. Eilers, eds. 2002. *Language and Literacy in Bilingual Children (Vol. 2)*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Orellana, M. F., L. Ek, and A. Hernandez. 1999. "Bilingual Education in an Immigrant Community: Proposition 227 in California." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 2 (2): 114–130. Routledge.
- Pagán, X. E. R. 2021. How Educational Language Policy Orientations and Ideologies Relate to English Learner Outcomes: A Mixed-Methods Analysis." (Doctoral dissertation, Notre Dame of Maryland University).
- Paris, D., and H. S. Alim, eds. 2017. *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pavlenko, A. 2012. "Affective Processing in Bilingual Speakers: Disembodied Cognition?" *International Journal of Psychology* 47 (6): 405–428. Psychology Press.
- Potowski, K. 2007. *Language and Identity in a Dual Immersion School*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ricklefs, M. A. 2021. "Functions of Language use and Raciolinguistic Ideologies in Students' Interactions." *Bilingual Research Journal* 44 (1): 90–107. Routledge.
- Rosa, J. D. 2016. "Standardization, Racialization, Languagelessness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies Across Communicative Contexts." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 26 (2): 162–183.
- Rosa, J., and N. Flores. 2017. "Unsettling Race and Language: Toward a Raciolinguistic Perspective." *Language in Society* 46 (5): 621–647. Cambridge University Press.
- Ruiz, R. 1984. "Orientations in Language Planning." *NABE Journal* 8 (2): 15–34.

- Sampasivam, S., and R. Clément. 2014. "3. The Dynamics of Second Language Confidence: Contact and Interaction." In *Multiple Perspectives on the Self in SLA*, edited by S. Mercer and M. Williams, 23–40. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Schwartz, M. 2018. "Preschool Bilingual Education: Agency in Interactions Between Children, Teachers, and Parents." In *Preschool Bilingual Education*, edited by M. Schwartz, 1–24. Cham: Springer.
- Sevinç, Y. 2016. "Language Maintenance and Shift Under Pressure: Three Generations of the Turkish Immigrant Community in the Netherlands." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2016 (242): 81–117.
- Sevinç, Y. 2020. "Anxiety as a Negative Emotion in Home Language Maintenance and Development." In *Handbook of Home Language Maintenance and Development*, edited by A. C. Schalley, and S. A. Eisenclas, 84–108. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Sevinç, Y., and A. Backus. 2017. "Anxiety, Language use and Linguistic Competence in an Immigrant Context: A Vicious Circle?" *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22 (6): 1–19.
- Sevinç, Y., and J. M. Dewaele. 2018. "Heritage Language Anxiety and Majority Language Anxiety among Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 22 (2): 159–179. Sage.
- Silverstein, M. 1979. "Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology." In *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, edited by R. Cline, W. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2006. "Language Policy and Linguistic Human Rights." In *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, edited by T. Ricento, 273–291. Malden: John Wiley & Sons.
- Slavkov, N. 2017. "Family Language Policy and School Language Choice: Pathways to Bilingualism and Multilingualism in a Canadian Context." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14 (4): 378–400. Routledge.
- Smith-Christmas, C. 2020. "Child Agency and Home Language Maintenance." In *Handbook of Home Language Maintenance and Development*, edited by A. C. Schalley and S. A. Eisenclas, 218–235. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Smith-Christmas, C. 2021. "Using a Family Language Policy Lens to Explore the Dynamic and Relational Nature of Child Agency." *Children & Society* 36 (3): 354–368.
- Snyder, C. R., S. J. Lopez, and J. T. Pedrotti. 2011. *Positive Psychology: The Scientific and Practical Explorations of Human Strengths*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Tannenbaum, M. 2012. "Family Language Policy as a Form of Coping or Defence Mechanism." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33 (1): 57–66.
- Tse, L. 1998. "Seeing Themselves through Borrowed Eyes: Asian Americans in Ethnic Ambivalence/Evasion." *Multicultural Review* 7 (2): 28–34.
- Valdés, G. 2004. "Between Support and Marginalisation: The Development of Academic Language in Linguistic Minority Children." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7 (2-3): 102–132. Routledge.
- Wagner, C. J. 2018. "Being Bilingual, Being a Reader: Prekindergarten Dual Language Learners' Reading Identities." *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 18 (1): 5–37. Sage.
- Wiley, T. G. 2000. "Continuity and Change in the Function of Language Ideologies in the United States." In *Ideology, Politics, and Language Policies: Focus on English*, edited by T. Ricento, 67–85. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wilson, S. 2020. "Family Language Policy Through the Eyes of Bilingual Children: The Case of French Heritage Speakers in the UK." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 41 (2): 121–139.
- Wong, P. T. P. 2011. "Positive Psychology 2.0: Towards a Balanced Interactive Model of the Good Life." *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne* 52: 69–81.
- Yazan, B., and I. Ali. 2018. "Family Language Policies in a Libyan Immigrant Family in the U.S." *Heritage Language Journal* 15 (3): 369–387.
- Zúñiga, C. E. 2016. "Between Language as Problem and Resource: Examining Teachers' Language Orientations in Dual-Language Programs." *Bilingual Research Journal* 39 (3-4): 339–353.