social sciences

MDPI

Article

Language Policies and Ideologies for Socialization and Identity-Building in U.S. Schools: The Case of Newcomer and Refugee Students in Arizona and New York

S. Garnett Russell *, Camille Fabo, Victoria Jones and Arnela Colic

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA; cef2183@tc.columbia.edu (C.F.); vhj2104@tc.columbia.edu (V.J.); ac4921@tc.columbia.edu (A.C.)
* Correspondence: sgrussell@tc.columbia.edu

Abstract: Although multilingualism is a major issue in educational policies, especially in states hosting a high number of newcomer immigrant students, there is limited research exploring the experiences of a multilingual group of newcomer students and how they use language in schools. This article draws on 112 interviews with students from an immigrant background across four high schools in Arizona and New York. We illuminate the role of language in shaping identity and inclusion. Through conceptualizing power and language ideology, we find that language ideologies and practices shape the perception of students' social interactions in school settings. Our findings also indicate that teachers' practices and school policies surrounding language(s) have the potential to affect how students view language in relation to their own identity and via social interactions. We contribute to an understanding of how language policies and ideologies shape the experiences and power dynamics of diverse, multilingual, immigrant-origin students.

Keywords: language policy; language ideologies; immigration/migration; newcomers; refugees

check for updates

Citation: Russell, S. Garnett, Camille Fabo, Victoria Jones, and Arnela Colic. 2024. Language Policies and Ideologies for Socialization and Identity-Building in U.S. Schools: The Case of Newcomer and Refugee Students in Arizona and New York. *Social Sciences* 13: 601. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13110601

Academic Editor: Jill Koyama

Received: 30 August 2024
Revised: 18 October 2024
Accepted: 30 October 2024
Published: 5 November 2024

Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The United States hosts the highest number of immigrants in the world (15%), including resettled refugees and asylum seekers (Kramer and Tong 2024)[1]. One in four students attending schools in the U.S. is either an immigrant or a child of immigrants (Sattin-Bajaj et al. 2020). In recent years, there has been an increase in newly arrived immigrant students due to ongoing political conflicts, climate change, and economic crises globally (Sugarman 2023). The rise in global migration and displacement in recent years has important consequences for the experiences of youth in schools due to interrupted formal schooling, as well as having to transition to a new system and new language of instruction.

More than ten percent of all public-school students in the U.S. are classified as English Language Learners (ELLs), or students who speak a language other than English at home and need additional support in learning English (National Center for Education Statistics 2018)[2]. About 15 percent of ELLs are recent immigrants, while others are immigrants who have lived in the country for longer or were born in the U.S. (Sugarman 2023). In 2021, 48 percent of newly arrived immigrant students reported speaking Spanish at home; other newcomer students speak Portuguese, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and Farsi, among other languages (Sugarman 2023). While school districts do not collect data on different immigrant categories such as refugees or undocumented students (FERPA 2024), schools generally use data on ELLs as a proxy for immigrant status since the majority of recently arrived immigrant students are generally classified as ELLs. In our study, we focus on the experience of multilingual students, the majority of whom are classified as ELLs, and who are also newcomers and resettled refugees.

While there is ample research on the experience of immigrant students in schools (for examples, see Portes and Fernández-Kelly 2008; Rumbaut 1997; Suárez-Orozco et al.

2008; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2009; Valenzuela 1999, etc.), and specifically the educational experiences of students from Spanish-speaking countries (for example see Cho and Reich 2008; García and Leiva 2014; Koyama and Bartlett 2011), limited studies have explored the experience of a diverse and multilingual group of newcomer immigrant students, including both Spanish and non-Spanish speakers, and their "languaging" practices in schools (for exceptions, see Bajaj et al. 2022; Koyama and Kasper 2022). Existing studies explore the experiences of refugee and newcomer students but have focused primarily on issues related to belonging, extra-curricular activities, and pedagogy rather than specifically on how language policies shape their identities and experiences as students in schools (Bajaj et al. 2017; Mendenhall et al. 2017; Roxas and Roy 2012; Russell and Mantilla-Blanco 2022). Other studies on refugees and language policy focus on contexts outside of the U.S. (Van Viegen 2020; Reddick and Dryden-Peterson 2021).

In this study, we draw on qualitative interview and observation data collected in four high schools in Arizona and New York with a diverse group of students from an immigrant background (primarily newcomer immigrants and resettled refugees) to understand how language shapes their experiences around identity and inclusion within the school setting. The cases of Arizona and New York represent two contextually different political climates with different language ideologies or beliefs about language that are shaped by their cultural and sociological contexts (Spolsky 2003). While New York is politically liberal and offers bilingual education programs, Arizona is historically politically conservative and remains the only state in the U.S. with an English-only medium of instruction policy in schools[3]. The data come from a larger mixed methods study focused on questions of civic identity and belonging; however, the issue of language emerged as a key finding, which we explore in this study. In this article, we draw on interviews conducted with 112 students, as well as more than 250 h of classroom observations to answer the following questions: How do language policies and ideologies, teachers, and school structures influence student academic and social experiences? How do students understand their identity and school environment based on their language background?

We argue that language functions as a part of identity that intersects with other salient characteristics, such as race/ethnicity, religion, gender, and time spent in the U.S. Drawing on theories related to power and language ideology (Bourdieu 1991; Norton 2010), we posit that the power dynamics between language groups in schools are related to students' sense of inclusion in the school community. In addition, we explore how school structure and recognition of their home languages also influence their experience.

2. Background: Immigrant Students and ELLs in Arizona and New York

In 2018, both Arizona and New York had high numbers of students classified as ELLs: 7% and 9%, respectively, with Spanish being the most common language spoken in both states (National Center for Education Statistics 2018). Students classified as ELLs have a lower graduation rate both nationally and in Arizona and New York: in 2018 only 34% of ELLs graduated in New York compared to 83% overall (NY State Education Department 2018); in Arizona 47.2% of ELLs graduated compared to 78.4% overall (Arizona Department of Education 2019). Hence, it is critical to better understand the social and academic experience of ELLs.

In the U.S., the right to language instruction in home languages comes from the *Civil Rights Act* of 1964, which forbids discrimination on the basis of "race, color, or national origin." The *Bilingual Education Act* of 1968 allowed for the provision of federal funding through competitive grants to school districts implementing bilingual education. In addition, the Supreme Court case of *Lau v Nicholas* (1974) required all school districts to meet the different language needs of their ELLs. However, the *Title III Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students* in 2002 moved the focus from bilingual education to English-only education to support ELLs (Hornberger 2006; Johnson and Johnson 2015). In addition, the passage of English-only propositions in California (1998), Arizona (2000), and Massachusetts (2002) eroded the right to bilingual education.[4]

In New York, bilingual education was codified in the *Aspira Consent Decree* of 1974, which guaranteed bilingual education as a legal right for non-English-speaking students in New York. In contrast, in Arizona, bilingual education programs were repealed in 2000 with Proposition 203, which required the use of English instruction only in schools. Arizona remains the only state in the U.S. to have an English-only law mandating that students learn English through the Structured English Immersion (SEI) or English Language Development (ELD) classes. ELD classes (known as English as a New Language—ENL in New York) focus on teaching English skills to enhance students' academic outcomes (Saunders et al. 2006). The SEI model in Arizona required students to attend four hours of English instruction focused on grammar, reading, writing, and conversation. Criticized for isolating students and causing them to fall behind in core subjects, Arizona introduced a "2-h block model" to reduce the time spent on English-only instruction (Kaveh et al. 2022). These recent policy changes passed under SB1014 in 2019 allow for a more flexible approach, a reduction to a two-hour block and access to bilingual education (Kaveh et al. 2022).

3. Literature Review

3.1. Language Policy and Ideology, Racialized Practices, and School Structures

In this section, we review previous research regarding language policy and ideology, standardization and raciolinguistics, and school structure and language learning. We argue that these various elements affect students' experiences and identities, both as recipients and actors of linguistic standards, and as agents of enacted language policies in schools. By exploring individual, school, and policy levels, we contribute to understanding how intersectional identities are formed through the reciprocal influences among these dimensions.

Studies on language policy consider how questions of mono- and multi-linguistic approaches to education are decided in policy and practice. These decisions have implications for the academic and social experiences of students of immigrant origin, who, individually and collectively, might not share the dominant language standards and practices. Research on the standardization of languages and raciolinguistics examines cases of language learning and linguistic communication where a hierarchy of ways of speaking is presented and a certain type of language use is expected. Finally, research on schools and language learning considers how language ideologies influence the teaching and learning environment in schools, specifically in the context of Arizona and New York, where this study's data were collected.

3.2. Language Policy and Ideology

The literature on language policy has explored how language policies shape and are shaped by how people perceive the role of language, and by *language ideologies* or representations that connect language with other social constructs and phenomena, including identities (such as race/ethnicity, gender, or nationality), ideas about appropriate behavior, intelligence, and morality, but also forging the definition of truth and universality (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994). Shaped by cultural and sociopolitical contexts, language ideologies are inherently influenced by cultural beliefs and values (Spolsky 2003) and are politically constructed, reflecting power relations between language and its speakers. This dynamic creates a hierarchy, as seen in the distinction between standard and non-standard forms of language, which has implications for students from immigrant backgrounds.

The literature explores the influence of ideology on language policy (Cushing 2021; Farr and Song 2011; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994), the perception of the purpose and use of language (Hult and Hornberger 2016; Ruíz 1984), concepts of monolingualism and multilingualism (McNelly 2015; Shapiro 2014), and the phenomenon of translanguaging (Blackledge and Creese 2017; García and Leiva 2014; García and Wei 2015; García and Lin 2017). In particular, the literature on language policy investigates approaches to language in education from both an ideological and practical perspective.

Several studies have applied concepts of language ideology to explore themes of standardization, control, and discipline. Farr and Song (2011) explore processes of stan-

dardization and monolingualism that permeate bilingual education programs in the United States. They find that such an approach results in tensions with multilingual students' language abilities and identity. Similarly, in an ethnographic study of a secondary school in London, Cushing (2021) reveals how the standardization of what is considered appropriate or suitable English is used as a mechanism to control and discipline students. Through a qualitative study based on document analysis of US laws in relation to their implications for language policies, McNelly (2015) argues that US language policies in schools fail to see language as a resource (Ruíz 1984). Similarly, the literature on "language deficit ideology" has investigated how educational systems focus on "fixing" the linguistic skills of non-native English speakers instead of drawing on their existing knowledge of other languages (Shapiro 2014; Menken and Kleyn 2010). To understand how such ideologies are received by students, Shapiro (2014) explores how English language learners in the U.S. are exposed to "deficit discourse" about their language abilities, and how high school students respond to such messaging, through an analysis of interviews and media footage.

In regard to practices which may support or challenge language policies, the phenomenon of translanguaging has been explored in language policy literature as a tool to value students' heritage language and identity. The term "translanguaging" derives from the Welsh word, trawsieithu, that the teacher Cen Williams used to describe the pedagogical practice used by his bilingual Welsh–English students (García and Lin 2017). The alternating of languages in both their productive and receptive use is integrated into the classroom as a purposeful practice. In particular, the concept of translanguaging has grown increasingly important in studies on language policy and practice (García and Lin 2017). It has been studied as an approach to integrating practices of bilingualism in schools (García and Wei 2015; García and Lin 2017), a supportive approach for working with mobile and displaced populations (Blackledge and Creese 2017; Van Viegen 2020), and as a tool for social justice (García and Leiva 2014). Focusing on social justice, García and Leiva (2014) explore how Leiva, an English language teacher, uses both Spanish and English in her classroom for newly arrived Latino students in a purposeful and systematic way to "resist" common monolingual approaches in the United States. Translanguaging is a classroom practice that celebrates and promotes students' first language, that being Spanish, as well as teaching English through dynamic bilingual activities (García and Leiva 2014).

3.3. Standardization and Linguistic Racism

Standardization and linguistic racism reflect language ideologies in their political and cultural dimensions, shaping the way people interact and perceive the world in which they live (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994). These ideologies have political and sociocultural roots and implications that manifest in the definition of standard versus non-standard language use (Lippi-Green 2011; Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1998), but also the social and racial stratification of language use, defining individuals and groups' identities and values (Flores and Rosa 2015; Rosa 2019). The related topics of standardization and raciolinguistics are cultural, political, and economic, and foster linguistic racism and discrimination (Baker-Bell 2020; Sung 2018).

Drawing on existing research, Lippi-Green (2011) focuses on how ideologies regarding variations in American English translate into educational policies and individual practices. Lippi-Green (2011) finds that variations are inherent to languages and that everyone has an accent. Lippi-Green posits that accent discrimination is based on a social construct oppressing non-dominant groups, and occurs when the judgment of the listener characterizes the speech and the speaker. These beliefs and attitudes toward accents particularly impact non-native American English speakers. Such discrimination is tied to raciolinguistics, and linguistic racism. Raciolinguistics explores how race is constructed through specific language practices and how these practices, in turn, shape language variation and use. Linguistic racism refers to the process and instrument of legitimation and reproduction of social inequalities and power imbalance based on linguistic differences between groups (Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1998). Baugh (2018) emphasizes how discrimination

operates in the stigmatization of some accents based on their social or racial connotations in processes also called "linguistic profiling".

Rosa (2019) draws on a two-year sociolinguistic ethnography to illuminate how Latin youth have been marginalized in school settings. Rosa (2019) emphasizes the burden they carry, as they constantly negotiate their identities between assimilation and multiculturalism—as manifested in multilingualism—in a Chicago public school. Flores and Rosa (2015) use the raciolinguistic framework combined with culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP) (Paris and Alim 2014), and a critical heteroglossic lens to explore the pervasive dimensions of "additive approaches" to language education, and how these approaches perpetuate appropriateness-based ideologies and stigmatization of linguistic practices associated with racially minoritized students. Their work expands on the existing literature and uses interviews of long-term ELLs to show that standardization and appropriateness-based approaches manifest in linguistic discrimination against non-standard English practices can be seen as deviant from the norms. The authors illuminate how racialized populations experience systemic and systematic stigmatization, and whether or not their linguistic practices meet the standards.

Sung (2018) analyzes interviews and class observations from 2003 to 2005 to explore student perceptions of their school's model change from a bilingual education program to tracking in a Northern California public school. The major finding shows that language needs are defined based on racist criteria, which serves to perpetuate raciolinguistic ideologies in a non-white dominant school. Drawing on linguistic racism and historical perspectives, Baker-Bell (2020) explores anti-black linguistics in education, drawing on observations of an ethnographic study conducted in an ELL class in Detroit, within a class where all students were Black and African American, communicating in "Black Language." The author focuses on pedagogy and the arts as a tool to address racist practices, providing teachers and students with tools to be more critical of their habits, language used, biases, potential, and agency.

3.4. Schools and Language Learning

Beyond student outcomes, language ideologies, which influence policies and practices in schools, have implications for the social, economic, and institutional benefits that accrue for individuals based on whether they speak the dominant language, which disadvantages non-dominant language speakers (Flores and Rosa 2015; Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1998). The literature on bilingual education policies and practices in Arizona and New York, the two states where our data were collected, is robust and established. Drawing on interviews with administrators, teachers, and school founders at a successful bilingual high school in New York, Koyama and Bartlett (2011) show how actors at the school and community level come together to create a bilingual school in the face of policies that constrain bilingual education practices by coalescing political power towards a practice of second language acquisition.

Through their interviews with school administrators and teachers, Menken and Solorza (2014) explore how increased testing requirements drove a number of New York City schools to abandon their bilingual programs in favor of English-only education with hopes of improving test scores. In addition, they find that the small schools movement led to greater disbursement of emergent bilingual students across schools, resulting in schools having insufficient numbers to require bilingual programs. Thus, implicit policy changes still contribute to a reduction in bilingual education despite not having explicit legal or legislative doctrines that mandate English-only education, such as in Arizona.

The largely qualitative empirical research on language policy and school structure in New York City focuses predominantly on administrators and teachers, a trend reflected in the empirical work on Arizona as well. Some notable exceptions include Johnson's (2012) three-year ethnographic study in Phoenix, following Arizona's change to English-only education, and Johnson and Johnson's (2015) article drawing on that same data and additional ethnographic work in Washington. In general, their ethnographic data reveal

how teachers and students shape their experiences to accommodate the reality of linguistic diversity and how their interactions generate an interpretation of state and federal policies at the local level (Johnson 2012; Johnson and Johnson 2015).

Despite promising local adaptation, scholars have found that Arizona's implementation of the four-hour English-only block was generally detrimental to ELLs academically, and often resulted in social segregation (Gándara and Orfield 2012; Koyama 2021; Rios-Aguilar et al. 2012b). A recent policy change to reduce the four-hour block to a two-hour block in Arizona has produced a slightly more flexible language policy context. Examining the education committee meetings on this legislative change, Kaveh et al.'s (2022) discourse analysis shows that the legislative change was advocated for on the basis of its benefit for parents, administrators, teachers, and ELLs. They argue that when appropriately contextualized at the local level, efforts to create and improve bilingual education can be successful even in challenging political climates (Kaveh and Lenz 2022). In general, the literature on language policies and practices across New York and Arizona is largely qualitative and with the exception of Koyama (2021), focuses on minority-language speakers more broadly, without a specific concentration on newcomers and refugees. In our study, we build on the existing literature to analyze the experiences of students from linguistically diverse backgrounds and explore how they navigate language policies and ideologies in different school systems. Our goal is to understand the role of language standards and policies in shaping students' perceptions of identity and socialization.

3.5. Theorizing Language, Power, and Identity

We conceptualize language and education as linked to power, ideologies, and identity. We draw on Bourdieu's (1991) work about language and power, as well as work on language and identity (Norton 1997, 2010), and the notion of intersectionality (Crenshaw 1991) to demonstrate how language intersects with other identity variables such as race/ethnicity to produce exclusionary and discriminatory practices (Flores and Rosa 2015; Paris and Alim 2014).

In his seminal work on language and power, Bourdieu (1991) characterizes language as an instrument of power used by the dominant group to legitimize their position of power by imposing a "legitimate" language. He notes linguistic exchanges represent "relations of symbolic power in which the power relations between speakers or their respective groups are actualized" (37). State-controlled institutions, such as schools and political institutions, play a fundamental role in creating unified linguistic practices and a standard language as part of a broader nation-building process (Anderson 1991; Bourdieu 1991). Schools create linguistic hierarchies and transmit "linguistic relations of power based on the unequal distribution of linguistic capital" (57). Thus, schools serve to reproduce the language and linguistic practices of the dominant class.

Building on the intricate connection between language and identity, Norton (2010) extends the work of Bourdieu (1977) to understand how speech is inextricably linked to the broader social world and becomes a social practice in and of itself. Norton (2010) reflects on the power of the act of speaking as a process of (re)negotiation with ourselves as we present to the outside world. Communication and identity-building intersect with gender, race/ethnicity, class, and sexual orientation as features shaping identity. In speaking, we shape our relationships with social others in a particular place and moment in time. In the classroom, language practices thus represent not only an exchange of words but also an act of "identity construction and negotiation" (Norton 1997, p. 410). By centering speech as an object of analysis in our study, we work to understand how it influences students' perceptions of themselves and others.

Through the lens of intersectionality (Crenshaw 1991), we analyze how language, as one facet of identity among newcomer students, intersects with other identity characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, and religion to shape their experiences in schools. We also draw on work about linguistic discrimination and raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores and Rosa 2015), which privilege monolingual language ideologies. Chang-Bacon (2020)

argues that "monolingual language ideologies continue to facilitate social, material, and institutional benefits for those whose language adheres to this ideal, while simultaneously disadvantaging those whose language use is constructed as aberrant in a given society" (3). Hence, this ideology fosters a deficit approach to understanding language as a problem rather than as a right or resource (Hult and Hornberger 2016; Ruíz 1984).

We apply these frameworks to understand the experiences of immigrant origin students (primarily newcomers and refugees) in high schools in the U.S. We argue that language ideologies in the school and classroom reflect a tension between the broader state and school approach to language, and the teacher's and student's use of languages in the classroom. In addition, we find instances of how language as identity shapes student experience both in terms of inclusion and exclusion in the school setting. We center the student voice as an object of analysis in our findings in order to determine how this mediates students' perceptions of themselves and others. We engage with the notion of intersectionality to understand how students' positionality and identity impacts the way in which they engage with language identities.

4. Data and Methods

We analyze qualitative interview and observation data from a larger mixed methods study conducted in four high schools in two states (Arizona and New York) during the 2018–2019 school year.[5] We focus on schools in Arizona and New York given that both states have a high number of immigrants (13% and 23%, respectively) and resettled refugees. At the time of the study, both states were ranked among the top six for refugee resettlement (Blizzard and Batalova 2019). In addition, the states differ in their social context and approach to immigrants and language policy. New York is politically liberal and historically welcoming towards immigrants (Foner 2014). As a border state, Arizona has traditionally been more conservative politically and hostile towards immigrants, as demonstrated by the passage of the SB 1070 "show me your papers bill" to question immigration status (Cabrera et al. 2013). In addition, Arizona proposition 203, passed in 2000, repealed bilingual education laws and required the use of only English in schools (Kaveh et al. 2022). Arizona is currently the only state in the U.S. to have an English-only law. In contrast, New York supports a range of English as a New Language courses and bilingual education programs. In addition, 16 schools in New York City are part of the International Network for Public Schools (INPS), which exclusively support newcomer immigrant students and ELLs.

4.1. Participating Schools

We purposely selected two public high schools with a high number of newcomer immigrant students in a city in Arizona and in New York City. The four schools in our study included three comprehensive high schools open to all students, and one school which is part of the Internationals Network for newcomer students who had arrived in the past four years (see Table 1). The schools in our sample had a majority of Hispanic/Latinx students (60–75% in the Arizona schools and 51–61% in New York schools) and other racial/ethnic groups including African American/Black (11–15% in Arizona and 8–16% in New York), and Asian (3–4% in Arizona and 4–35% in New York). In addition, the participating schools all had a high proportion of ELLs ranging from 10 to 24% in the comprehensive high schools to over 80% in the internationals school for newcomers. All of the four schools in the study served economically disadvantaged students: in Arizona, both schools received Title 1 funding for students, while in New York, the vast majority of students qualified for free lunch and public housing.

The schools in our study offered a range of different options to support ELLs. The two schools in Arizona (School A and B) offered a SEI/ELD approach, which included teaching English grammar classes in a two- or four-hour block. In addition, both schools also offered "sheltered" content courses, for example in global history, aimed at ELLs. School C in New York offered ENL classes, which served students who were new to learning English, as well as more advanced bridge courses known as "Commanding English." The school

also offered sheltered subject courses such as global history, where the subject content was taught predominantly in English with at-level support for ELL students. In addition, while School C offered bilingual Spanish–English track for certain subjects, we did not include these students in the study, due to lack of comparability across the four schools. School D in New York was part of the International Network of Public Schools (INPS) and served recently arrived newcomer students through a focus on both the linguistic and academic development through students' home languages through translanguaging (Sylvan 2013).

Table 1. Participating Schools.

School	State	Type of School	Language Approach	% ELLs	Main Languages Spoken
School A	Arizona	Comprehensive	SEI/ELD (2 or 4 h block); sheltered content courses	10%	Spanish, Arabic, Farsi/Dari, Swahili, Kirundi/Kinyarwanda
School B	Arizona	Comprehensive	SEI/ELD (2 or 4 h block); sheltered content courses	19%	Spanish, Arabic, French, Swahili, Kirundi/Kinyarwanda
School C	New York	Comprehensive	ENL; sheltered content courses; bilingual track	24%	Spanish, Arabic, Nepali, Bengali
School D	New York	Internationals	Incorporation of home languages (translanguaging, etc.)	81%	Spanish, French, Arabic, Bengali

4.2. Data Collection

A research team including the primary investigator (first author) and three doctoral research assistants conducted research in the four schools during the 2018–2019 school year. We obtained permission from the International Review Board (IRB) at Teachers College, Columbia University, as well as from the schools and districts. We also obtained consent from parents and consent/assent from students to participate in the study. We conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with 112 students in grades 9 to 12 across the four schools. The interview participants included a diverse sample of students from across the different grades, ages, gender, countries of origin, home languages, and immigration backgrounds. Students participating in the study came from 49 different countries and spoke 39 different languages, although the majority identified as Spanish speakers. Participants' ages ranged from 14 to 21 and included equal numbers of girls and boy students (see Russell et al. 2021 for more details). Students who participated in the study included resettled refugees, newcomer immigrants who have arrived in the past four years, asylum-seekers, undocumented and DACA students, as well as students who have been in the U.S. for longer and who identify as first or second-generation immigrants.

The interviews generally lasted 30 min to one hour and were conducted during lunch or breaks or after school. Interviews were conducted primarily in English, although some were conducted in Spanish by the primary investigator who is fluent in Spanish or by a research assistant who is a native Spanish speaker. While we posed questions about students' experiences at school related to belonging and civic identity, the theme of language emerged as a salient finding that shaped their experiences within the classrooms, school, and more broadly in the U.S.

To complement the interviews with students, the research team also conducted interviews with 19 teachers and 14 school administrators in the four schools. Teachers taught grades 9–12 in a variety of subjects including US government, US and world/global history, global citizenship and ethnic studies, English language arts, and English language courses (ENL, ELD, Commanding). The teachers participating in the study included both women (63%) and men (37%) from a range of racial/ethnic backgrounds. Some teachers

identified as immigrants themselves, spoke other languages besides English, or had lived in another country.

Moreover, we spent more than 250 h across the four schools observing classes and other school activities. The research team observed classes of the teachers who also participated in the study, including global history, US history, government, global studies, and English language courses. We also observed school events, such as multicultural days, poetry festivals, and other informal school activities and clubs.

4.3. Data Analysis

We analyzed the qualitative interview and observation data using NVivo software. All the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed; those in Spanish were translated into English. We then analyzed the data using both etic (external and deductive) codes from the literature and emic (internal and inductive) codes that emerged from the data, such as language and discrimination (Saldana 2011) (see Table 2). Throughout the research process, the team took notes of emerging themes and reflections; we engaged in regular self-reflective and critical discussion throughout the field work (Robertson 2002).

Table 2. Coding Description and Examples.

Category	Code	Description	Examples
Discrimination	Race	Student reports discrimination based on ethnicity, country of origin, or skin color by peers, teachers, or others.	"when they know I'm from Iraq, you see their face change."
	Language	Student reports discrimination based on mother tongue, language skills, or accent by peers, teachers, or others.	"Because I don't speak their language, they told me bad things."

4.4. Positionality

The research team consisted of students with diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, and immigration backgrounds. The three research assistants identified as first or second-generation immigrants, and also spoke common languages with some of the students (including Spanish and French), which might have helped build rapport with the students; the primary investigator is fluent in Spanish and French. To build trust and establish a relationship with the students, the research team visited the schools on a weekly basis and spent time in the classrooms and engaged in school activities with the students. While the research team engaged in self-reflective processes, our positionality coming from an elite university may have influenced the way in which students responded to our questions.

5. Findings

In our findings, we present evidence of how immigrant-origin students navigate language ideologies and practices through interactions with teachers, classmates, and the wider community. We contextualize these ideologies and practices in the broader policy structure, which provides insight into how students and educators respond to, reflect, and reshape dominant language ideologies and practices in their schools. We present findings on teachers' pedagogical practices around language as a cultural and academic resource; how language practices and ideologies influence student experiences; and how the school structure impacts language learning.

5.1. Pedagogical Practices of Language

Interviews and observations demonstrate several examples of pedagogical practices and approaches that view language both as a tool and a challenge. Students and teachers alike talked about their experiences of using non-English languages to enrich the academic, social, and cultural experience in the classroom. However, teachers and students also spoke about challenges faced by non-native English-speaking students, with interviews high-

lighting tensions and prejudice. In many cases, the practice of translanguaging was often described as a classroom phenomenon without using the term "translanguaging" directly.

5.1.1. Language as an Academic Tool

Through interviews, many teachers expressed they were working to applaud students on speaking their first language (L1), other languages, and skills of multilingualism and translanguaging. We argue that this approach directly challenges the "language deficit ideology" (Shapiro 2014) by valuing mother tongues other than English. In particular, many teachers expressed their positive impressions of multilingual newcomer students and how they hoped to instill a sense of pride in one's non-English language skills. Teachers described knowing languages outside of English as "crazy impressive" (Peter, School A), skills that "amaze" them (Marcia, School A), and as "leverage" for other language learning (Linda, School D). One teacher explained that part of their job of working with newcomer students was to encourage "them to understand how valuable the skills they already have are" (Sam, School B). Another teacher remarked on his own reflection on the students' skills, "when you pause for a second and think that they are translating it back into the language that they are familiar with, and then re-translating, coming up with an answer, and then translating it back into English is. . . it's amazing" (Dave, School A). In regard to the responsibilities of school educators, one school administrator remarked that teachers "always need to look at what students are bringing to the table in order to identify strengths as quickly as possible" (Linda, School D). Moreover, one teacher expressed that students who speak multiple languages should be put in positions of "authority" when class material relates to those languages (Sam, School B). They expressed that providing those opportunities to students in class would "increase student self-advocacy" (Sam, School B). According to multiple teachers, this position of authority took shape in tangible ways in many of the classrooms. For example, one teacher from School A mentioned that French-speaking students originally from African countries were encouraged to take Advanced Placement French to utilize their language skills in the classroom (Peter, School A).

In addition to multilingualism being seen as a point of pride and a position of authority in some classrooms, it was also used as a motivating factor to encourage students as they learned English. In interviews, teachers often expressed that such multilingual skills demonstrate students' capabilities to learn new languages. One administrator focused on behavior intervention explained that a group of newcomer students who each spoke five or more languages were commenting on the fact that they did not know English. The administrator said he expressed admiration for their immense multilingual skills and joked to the students, "How long is it gonna be before you add one more to that list?" (Greg, School B). Thus, interviews demonstrate how teachers and students leveraged language skills as a source of pride, position of authority, and a motivating factor in the academic setting. Many teachers and administrators pushed the idea of non-English languages as an academic tool that could aid students' experiences and performance in the classroom.

5.1.2. English as the Dominant Language

Despite valuing other languages, English remained the dominant language used in the classroom across the four schools. In addition, the data reveal several cases of negative commentary from teachers about students' language abilities as well as possible underlying prejudice. In particular, such comments emerged when teachers were asked about their academic expectations for students. One teacher remarked,

> ENL [English as a New Language] is not a learning disability, and I think that a lot of teachers don't know that. . . I had to, some brilliant kids last year that just didn't speak English, and their other teachers. . . didn't understand that. And so they were treating them like they were not as intelligent, and I've seen that when the kids transition out of ESL. That the English teachers will sometimes like, treat them like they don't know as much when it's just the language barrier, which I've seen before. (Pamela, School C)

Hence, this teacher's observations reveal a trend of underestimating and de-valuing newcomer students' intelligence based on their knowledge of English. This type of behavior denotes prejudiced opinions of teachers working with ELL students. Additionally, some teachers were not as open to translanguaging practices as other teachers. In particular, one teacher explained that "if you're in my classroom, it would be expected that they're speaking and communicating in English" (Brenda, School C). It is important to note that some of the teachers interviewed were monolingual, which may have influenced their classroom rules, expectations, and their beliefs about multilingualism and translanguaging practices as potential academic resources.

Perceptions and ideologies of multilingualism may differ between students and teachers. As depicted above, teachers often valued students' linguistic competencies. In contrast, the students' interviews emphasized a prevailing deficit ideology at various levels, where being an English learner was not simply perceived as a lacking skill but also as a barrier to learning, communicating, and socializing. Students more directly tied their language practices to aspects of identity. A deeper exploration of their experiences uncovers a more nuanced picture, highlighting feelings of inclusion, exclusion, and empowerment.

5.1.3. Language as a Social Skill

Both students and teachers saw speaking a non-English language as a useful social skill that helped build relationships with peers in the classroom. In interviews, teachers mentioned seating students who had been at the school for a longer time with new students of their same L1, in order to foster an easier transition for the newer student. One student, Benjamin, a newcomer from Mexico (School A), mentioned that despite school challenges, "the good part is that there is always someone who can help me, a student who speaks Spanish." Patrick, a resettled refugee from the Central African Republic, remembered his first days at school, saying, "It was also kinda easy 'cause um. . . there was this one girl that I remember, she spoke French. So like, when I came the teacher, she already know like that I spoke French, so like she would sit by me, she would be like interpret" (School B). In this context, speaking French was considered a social skill that the student who had been in that school for a longer period was able to utilize to help other newcomer students.

However, teachers and students expressed that sometimes one's L1 could be a social challenge: both in situations where no other students spoke the same L1, or too many students spoke the same L1. While sharing the same non-English L1 created social communities for L1 speakers of the same language, primarily Spanish, it was a common challenge to socializing from other newcomer students who did not speak Spanish as an L1. For example, some students expressed feelings of isolation without a shared language as their peers. In particular, a non-Spanish-speaking student explained his experience:

> the kids were a bit tough to, like, accept someone to their group, who didn't speak—especially the ELD kids, 'cause they spoke Spanish mostly. Most of the kids. And they like couldn't talk to someone who doesn't speak that language. We were kind of outsiders. (Omar, School A)

Thus, differing levels of inclusion and communication for ELD kids depended on if their L1 was widely spoken by the student body.

Some teachers and students shared that many students with the same L1 stuck together and did not practice English with their classmates. Teachers recognized the practice of widely speaking Spanish, noting that:

> I think sometimes that can make it tougher for the Spanish speaking student, because it's easier for them to turn to somebody and start speaking Spanish to them, whereas somebody um, somebody speaking uh, Nepalese isn't going to be able to turn to somebody next to them. (Dave, School A)

Additionally, one student mentioned that she hoped to learn Spanish in order to socialize more with the L1 Spanish speakers at her school:

> Devna: I don't know, it's just something. But I have many friend[s] from, friends from Africa. And they [are] cool. I become friends with them. But. . . those people who speak Spanish, it's hard to be friends with them. (School A)

Although English is viewed as a common language among these multilingual students, Spanish was the main "minority" language across the four schools. Interviews demonstrate the importance of Spanish for social interactions and to build friendships in contexts where the majority of students are native Spanish-speakers. ELL students expressed that differing L1 backgrounds created subgroups based on mother tongues.

5.2. Bullying and Exclusion

Despite generally positive views on multilingualism among teachers and students, students also shared experiences of bullying, teasing, and discrimination based on their identity, specifically around the languages spoken and their accents, as well as racialized incidents.

5.2.1. Language and Accents

Students generally viewed Standardized American English as the norm, and consequently students often felt discriminated against for not fitting these standards. Within classrooms and in school more broadly, they experienced teasing. Numerous students across the schools shared experiences of bullying based on their accent in English. Miranda (School A), a DACA student originally from Mexico shared that "Sometimes I get made fun of because I have an accent when I speak. Which I don't really know if I do or not". While Nadia, a resettled refugee from Iraq noted that "there has been a lot [of discrimination], made fun of my accent" (School A). For instance, Malik, a resettled refugee from Iraq (School B), believed he should not be considered an ELL since he already spoke English with a perfect accent: "No accent. And then they still put me in ELD". This belief underscores the importance of accent and validates accent discrimination by focusing not on the language itself but on American-English pronunciation standards (Lippi-Green 2011). Hierarchizing accents reflect internalized socio-cultural discriminatory practices, positing that some variations are validated while others are not, which leads to exclusion, discrimination, and bullying as described by Asad, a newcomer student from Cote d'Ivoire: "a lot of other people, they say they get bullying in school, stuff like that [. . .] because their accent, people laugh at them" (School C). As such, some accents are perceived through the lens of the speaker's skin color, origin, or race, with discriminatory views from the listener's internalized biases regardless of the speech itself.

Other students particularly stressed the importance of accent, such as Linda who said that "sometimes [she] just want to get rid of [her] accent" (School A). This quote exemplifies how accent is lived as a burden in the intersectional identity of newcomer students, as well as how negatively students perceive accents. This also illuminates the internalized self-depreciation as the consequence of discrimination and monoglossic ideologies spread among students in schools. Indeed, discrimination of accents often occurs alongside bullying and teasing around identity. Asad, for example, explained that students were bullied because of their race but "also because of their accent, people laugh at them" (School C).

Other students mentioned how newcomer immigrant students were sometimes excluded or discriminated against for not speaking English. Mercy (School B), a second-generation immigrant whose father was from Jamaica, suggested that others might look down and exclude students for being "just like, umm. . . immigrants. I feel like other people just like, "Oh they're. . . the immigrants, they're kids that can't speak English, you know?" Such perception stigmatizes non-English native speakers and immigrants in a "language deficit ideology" that fuels discrimination and bullying, since schools attempt to make newcomers fit the existing standards and practices with no regards to their individual strengths and values (Menken and Kleyn 2010; Shapiro 2014).

Not speaking English makes students feel and look different and excluded. Silvia, a newcomer student from the Dominican Republic, differentiated racism and language

exclusion, and the fact that not speaking English represented a barrier to inclusion and led to teasing and humiliation:

> And for me, what's difficult in this for me speak English, they have a problem for [with] me, because it's not racist, but I have felt, like, in middle school the people that speak English, they treat me like I was different from—a different girl. Because I don't speak their language, they told me bad things. (School D)

The picture arising from these excerpts reveals that discrimination is multi-faceted and manifests not only in teasing for having an accent, but also as a way to exclude immigrants, and tell them "bad things".

As such, discrimination and self-exclusion go hand in hand, where some students said they were afraid of participating in class discussion, activities, or clubs. The majority of students shared their fears of being bullied, like Samara (School B), a resettled refugee from Iraq, who felt "shy when I talk[ed] because I didn't speak English. Like I get afraid like they [are] going to laugh at me or this stuff but that was like the most problem." This example from Samara illustrates how fears related to language standards can also affect confidence and participation of students in class.

5.2.2. Intersectional Discrimination and Linguistic Racism

Language discrimination often intersects with other forms of discrimination, based on religion, gender, race, or ethnicity. A teacher Leah, for example, expressed the fact that: "a lot of students will talk about discrimination that they faced in America. Maybe based on skin color, maybe based on the accent, maybe based on religion" (School D). Students shared that they were teased because of their accent, but that the "intensity" and perception of this discrimination would vary depending on their country of origin or the color of their skin. Miranda (School A) for example, said that "I will be told, because of my skin color, they say I'm too white to be Mexican". This shows how people associate being Mexican with a certain skin color that cannot be white and shows how they even resist the idea that a white person could identify as Mexican. In the same vein, Nadia (School A) shared how her skin color let people assume her European origins: "honestly, I think. . . I have like advantage because I'm white." As such, whiteness is perceived as an asset or a privilege, and some students might assume that being white contrasts with the idea of being an immigrant.

However, Nadia (School A) also mentioned how people shift their views: "when they know I'm from Iraq, you see their face change". As such, Linda further shows not only how whiteness can tone down discrimination based on language, but also how she feels her origins are being perceived as problematic. Coming from Iraq was seen negatively, which increased the complexity of the discrimination faced by newcomer students who have intersectional identities. As such, identifying as Arab, Muslim, or speaking Arabic was often conflated and stigmatized. As an example, Javier, a newcomer from Honduras shared: "Let's say there's a group of Hondurans, and he not. We speak Spanish, and then an Arabic guy pass by, and we said, "Ah el Arabe" Or something like that" (School D). Language and religions are associated and discriminated against, and students may face difficulties advocating for themselves, and feel limited in terms of their ability to use English properly to defend themselves and their religion. For example, Amira, a resettled refugee from Syria shared her experience in dealing with discrimination:

> I just explain to him. And like, even the explain in the beginning, was difficult for me because I don't like, speak English very well. So, yeah. I, I. . . was trying to explain to them, and like, make sure, and like, I try to act with him so nice, so kind, to. . . to let them know, like, even if you wear the hijab you are like normal person. (School A)

Amira also expressed her impression that language, religion, and identity are intertwined, and that some ideologies about Arabic and Islam were often associated and led to rejection. The language barrier made it even more challenging for Amira to advocate for

herself and for her origins, to express to her classmates and peers that being Muslim and wearing hijab did not make her less of a human being.

5.2.3. The Shift of Spanish from a Minoritized to a Dominant Minority Language

Unexpectedly, we found that Spanish could be perceived by other non-Spanish speakers not as a minoritized language but conversely as a dominant minority language of exclusion. The shift of Spanish from a minoritized to a dominant minority language illustrates complex dynamics of diversity, inclusion, exclusion, and power. Empowering Spanish-speaking students fosters confidence, learning, and community, yet it also faces challenges from monolingual pressures and perceptions of exclusion. "Non-Spanish speakers" sometimes accused Spanish speakers of not making an effort to speak English in class, as Jimena, a newcomer from Colombia (School C), explained: "Once, I was talking to a guy who was born here. . . So he always says things like, 'Why don't you speak English?'"

Furthermore, within minoritized groups, using Spanish sometimes replicated the typical power dynamics of dominant languages, reinforcing monolingual and exclusionary ideologies. Paradoxically, Spanish was viewed as a dominant and exclusionary language by some students. For instance, Ibrahim (School D), who was born in the U.S. but lived in Guinea before returning to the U.S., shared that he felt excluded and minoritized amongst Latinx students because he did not understand and speak the language, and felt excluded from conversations with peers: "most of the time if I sit with the Hispanic people, they only speak like kind of Spanish. I feel bad about it and when I try to be involved in their speaking". (School D). Another student, Fatou from Senegal, shared the challenges she encountered in making friends with Spanish-speakers in her majority Spanish-speaking school: "It's because, usually—you know I don't speak Spanish, so I wouldn't sit—I wouldn't be friends with someone who, like, I wouldn't be friends with them, but like the problem is I feel more comfortable being around those who speak the same language as I do". (School D). These quotes reveal how not speaking Spanish can be perceived as different and create divisions between Latinx and non-Latinx students, who might feel excluded.

5.3. State Policies and Educational Experiences of ELLs

In addition to language policies and ideologies, school structures also influence student experience regarding language. Across the two states, the student discussion of classes and experience as ELLs differed visibly. In Arizona, where ELLs were at the time mandated to a two- or four-hour block of English, students generally held a positive view of the ELD program, though their experiences in non-ELD ("regular") courses was much more varied. In general, the vast majority of ELL students in our Arizona sample found ELD to be a space where they could be open, talkative, and positive. When asked how she felt about her ELD classes and community, Amira in Arizona, shared:

> So. . . like beautiful. Because. . . all the students you work with is [are] like from [a] different country. . . I learn from a lot of things, like from the country, from like religion thing, like different community and like we are so close together, like all the ELD students, like family. We help us to-, we help together like too much [a lot], we have fun together (School A)

Her assertion that the ELD classes are a safe community with students who share similar backgrounds and experiences was echoed by other students in Arizona schools. The implication of community extends often to ELD teachers as well, who students feel play a large role in crafting a safe, informative, and comfortable learning environment. At times, in comparing regular classes to ELD, students noted how they preferred the ELD classes, primarily because of the support and community offered. When asked about how she felt about ELD classes compared to regular classes, Devna in Arizona, spoke favorably about her ELD classes and the support of her teachers:

> 'Cause I have Ms. Smith. And like, she's like, holding us. Like we do [an] essay, she tells us how to do it. In normal classes, I heard people say like, 'This is the essay you have to do, and due on this day'. And you have to do it, even if you don't understand. (School A)

In general, the ELD block in Arizona was discussed positively by students in terms of community and learning, particularly for newly arrived ELLs, and the extra support provided by the teachers. However, several students mention that the two- or four-hour block in Arizona required a lot of time, making it challenging for them to earn enough credits to graduate on time. In addition to the heavy time requirement, a few students described the ELD classes as monotonous, repetitive, or too isolated from the general student population. When asked about whether he preferred ELD or regular class, Jim, an Arizona refugee student from Tanzania explained, "I prefer the.... mainstream ones. 'Cause, like, I already been in the ELD classes. So like I'm going there to see other, different things". When asked what he would change at school to better support newcomer and refugee students he shared "this ELD program... it kind of like slows down, how, like, the time to graduate. (...) [You] have to take the classes in ELD. Not the classes that you need to graduate" (School A).

ELL students from Arizona were generally appreciative of the community, care, and learning they found in the ELD community at school, despite some of the drawbacks of a separate ELD program, including difficulty graduating on time and feeling separated from the rest of the student population. Students noted the divisions between their experiences in ELD and in regular classes, often referring to regular classes as ones with "American students." Rania, a senior refugee from Iraq in Arizona shared that it is "really hard" for her to be in ELD "because everyday [she] see[s] the same students" (School B). Ricardo, an Arizona sophomore from Mexico prefers regular classes to ELD because "You get to meet more people... here, there are the same ones every day" (School B). In addition, some students commented on how ELL students were separated from the regular students and often were not friends. For instance, Omar, as resettled refugee in School A explained that there is limited interaction between ELLs and regular students due to the language barrier: "I think some of it has to do with the language barrier. They don't speak the same language, they are also a different culture".

In addition to students, staff members openly commented on the visible separation of ELL students from the rest of the student population, in part through the extensive English language block required in Arizona, and in part because of physical separation of students in the school buildings themselves. An ELD teacher from Arizona commented on the distance between ELD classrooms and the regular classrooms, "When I first started teaching here, all the ELD classes, we were in that building there. Like almost off campus... And again, I... I hated that". While the separation of ELL students in Arizona has generated opportunities for community building, it has also curbed larger school and community integration. Findings therefore suggest that state language policies in Arizona have implications for both de facto and de jure separation of students.

In New York, the data reveal a slightly different pattern, with ELL students being less likely to discuss segregation from the non-ELL student population, reflecting the influence of a more integrated approach to ELD programming in a school environment that is exceptionally diverse. Without the constraints of an English-only language of instruction, classroom observations from schools in New York revealed much more translanguaging and bilingualism in the classroom, both from the teachers and the students. For example, one teacher at the Internationals school in New York provided PowerPoints with instructions in English, Spanish, French, and Arabic (Observations, Chris, School D). In addition to multilingual practices in schools, students perceived less of a difference between ELLs and non-ELLs. For instance, in the internationals school (School D), the majority of students were categorized as ELLs; in the other school (School C), many of the students were ELLs or former ELLs. For instance, Maya (School C), a student at School C originally from Puerto

Rico, talked about how the boundaries were blurred between the groups and how students did not distinguish between ELL and non-ELL students as much:

> They don't really say anything that much 'cause like, everyone in school isn't just like, it's not just one race. It's like, more people than, like, people at here, they're mixed. So like, people know Spanish and English, too. So it's like, we're all pretty much bilingual.

However, some students and teachers noted the physical separation within and among schools of ELLs. For example, Oscar, a newcomer from the Dominican Republic in the internationals school (School D) commented "Well, I still feel like—like it's kind of a segregation between the schools for people who are born here, you know, they know the language, and for us, that we don't know it". Despite the lack of de jure separation of ELLs in New York schools, there remains a degree of de facto separation of students that is fueled in part by language.

Together, the findings suggest that the school approach to categorizing, organizing, and teaching ELL students has implications for the student experience, both academically and socially. In Arizona, students praise the community and safety they feel in the ELD program, which is largely a result of the extensive amount of time that ELL students spend in ELD classrooms together given Arizona's SEI/ELD policy. At the same time, students note the downsides of spending a disproportionate amount of time in ELD classrooms and away from the rest of the school population, namely difficulty meeting graduation requirements and feeling segregated from the non-ELL student population. In New York, where bilingual education and translanguaging in the classroom is sanctioned and encouraged, students express less attachment and identification with the ENL/ELD program and see their whole school community as a multilingual and multicultural space.

6. Discussion and Conclusions

We explored how beliefs and social constructs surrounding language ideologies manifest in the experiences of students from immigrant backgrounds, focusing on newcomers and resettled refugees, examining how their intersectional identities and associated language practices might be perceived as either an asset or a barrier. We found that the wider social context, the structure of school, the approach to teaching English, teachers' roles in supporting multilingualism in the classroom, and the multi-linguistic background of students in the school play a role in the experience of newcomer students. Depending on the wider state context, school structure, and school population, we find that language takes on different uses and meanings in terms of identity and how it is used in practice. We show how language practices and policies can be used to form interpersonal relationships but also can foster exclusionary practices. Our findings point to a broader tension between the intent of schools in assimilating students into an English-only environment and the desire to recognize multilingualism and value diversity.

Our findings are aligned with other work that posits language as a resource, right, and problem (Hult and Hornberger 2016; Ruíz 1984). Speaking a non-English language and learning English in US schools are linguistic experiences that contribute to nuanced academic and social experiences. We find that within the school context, both teachers and students perceive that language can be used as a resource but also represents a challenge within academic and social contexts.

In many instances, teachers and staff challenged a "language deficit ideology" (Shapiro 2014). They emphasized the value of speaking multiple languages and how this connects to students' cultures and personal experiences, portraying multilingualism and language diversity as assets for both individuals and the broader school community (Koyama 2021). In addition, speaking multiple languages was generally viewed by teachers and students as a social resource (Ruíz 1984), which allowed them to connect with each other socially, especially for recently arrived students who did not speak much English. Teachers and students could be agentic actors in their academic experiences and in enhancing the self-confidence of ELL students, aligning with Koyama's (2021) call for an "asset-based learning

environment" that leverages the linguistic and cultural strengths of students from immigrant backgrounds.

However, some teachers and students who had been in the U.S. for longer were critical of newcomer immigrant students and expressed strong monolingual ideologies opposing the use of languages other than English in the classroom, which does not benefit multilingual students' learning (Flores and Rosa 2015; Kaveh and Lenz 2022). Some teachers assumed that students' lack of fluency in English was related to academic weaknesses; this deficit approach also manifested in interactions with peers. These deficit ideologies create negative consequences for students' personal, social, and academic experiences (Shapiro 2014; Menken and Kleyn 2010). Future research could investigate how to counter deficit ideologies around language and how to support ELLs, particularly recently arrived students.

In addition to the existence of complex language ideologies, we also find that these ideologies promote acts of exclusion and discrimination, especially based on accent and language spoken, which echoes existing research (Lippi-Green 2011; Flores and Rosa 2015). However, different from existing research, our study also finds that non-Spanish speakers often felt excluded in their majority Spanish-speaking schools and communities. Hence, even though Spanish is a non-dominant language more generally, within the school context, its relative dominance as a second language carries implications for students' social and academic experiences. In addition, we find that language intersects with other salient identities such as race/ethnicity and religion, pointing to the importance of understanding language ideologies as a vector shaping intersectional identities rather than viewing them in isolation (Crenshaw 1991). Indeed, we observed how language practices are racialized, with listeners often discriminating against the speakers and their accents based on their preconceived expectations. This reshapes the value of speech, as well as interpersonal and intergroup relationships (Flores and Rosa 2015). Accents exacerbate social hierarchies, using judgments about language practices as a mirror of racial and ethnic prejudices (Lippi-Green 2011).

Our findings also highlight the importance of broader language policies and school structures in shaping language ideologies and experiences of students in schools. While we generally find that students, particularly in the Arizona schools, appreciate their ELD courses and the community, some students also referred to the de facto segregation of ELLs in schools. Beyond separation, students commented on other challenges that arose from the additional language requirements, such as difficulty in completing requirements for graduation. In line with Gándara and Orfield (2010), students felt the social separation institutionalized through the four-hour block. While the extant literature adequately notes the lack of data supporting Arizona's model as effective English language learning (Rios-Aguilar et al. 2012a), students' feelings towards segregated English classes are mixed, as evidenced.

While language policies and ideologies matter, the way in which these policies are enacted within schools matters more for students' lived experiences. Our data also indicate the importance of teachers and students as agentic actors in how they engage with language policies and ideologies. We find that the way in which teachers and students respond to policies and language ideologies varies depending on power hierarchies (Bourdieu 1991), and how they are situated within the school and state context, as well as due to their own background and identity (Crenshaw 1991). For instance, teachers with immigrant backgrounds or who speak other languages besides English may be more supportive of different languages. The ability of teachers to shape positive experiences for ELLs adds to findings from Koyama and Bartlett (2011) in New York and Johnson (2012) in Arizona on the power that local community actors like teachers and students have in crafting the lived experiences of education policies.

We contribute to discussions about language policies and ideologies and how these shape the experience of diverse, multilingual immigrant-origin students across two different contexts. Future research could attend to how language ideologies manifest across different types of schools, for example in specialized schools or in charter schools. Additionally,

future research should investigate the newcomer experience in schools with different linguistic profiles, comparing schools with students from multiple, diverse L1 backgrounds with schools where there is one dominant L1 speaker group. Such research could shed light on the differing social environments in schools for newcomer students.

Author Contributions: Writing—original draft, S.G.R., C.F., V.J. and A.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by Spencer Foundation, Small Civics Grant, grant number #201900058.

Institutional Review Board Statement: This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Teachers College Institutional Review 19-046 on 18 October 2018.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article, and further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Notes

1 Resettled refugees have been transferred from a country of first asylum to a host country, such as the U.S., that will grant them residency; asylum seekers are those who travel to the U.S. and apply for asylum upon arrival (US DHS 2016).

2 ELLs are defined as students who are either foreign-born, whose native language is not English, or are students with difficulties in speaking, reading, and writing English (ESSA 2016).

3 We identify New York as a politically liberal state, given its support for a Democratic President in every election from 1992 to 2020, and Arizona as a politically conservative state given its support for a Republican President in every election from 1992 to 2020 (with the exception of 1996 and 2020).

4 California and Massachusetts repealed their policies in 2016 and 2017, respectively, and have since provided more support for bilingual programs (Kaveh et al. 2022).

5 For the mixed methods study, we also conducted a survey with students (see Russell et al. 2021).

References

Anderson, Benedict Richard O'Gorman. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Arizona Department of Education. 2019. Arizona Department of Education, Accountability and Research. Available online: https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/data (accessed on 30 October 2024).

Bajaj, Monisha, Amy Argenal, and Melissa Canlas. 2017. Socio-Politically Relevant Pedagogy for Immigrant and Refugee Youth. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 50: 258–74. [CrossRef]

Bajaj, Monisha, Daniel Walsh, Lesley Bartlett, and Gabriela Martínez. 2022. *Humanizing Education for Immigrant and Refugee Youth: 20 Strategies for the Classroom and Beyond*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Baker-Bell, April. 2020. Dismantling Anti-Black Linguistic Racism in English Language Arts Classrooms: Toward an Anti-Racist Black Language Pedagogy. *Theory into Practice* 59: 8–21. [CrossRef]

Baugh, John. 2018. *Linguistics in Pursuit of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [CrossRef]

Blackledge, Adrian, and Angela Creese. 2017. Translanguaging and the Body. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14: 250–68. [CrossRef]

Blizzard, Brittany, and Jeanne Batalova. 2019. Refugees and Asylees in the United States. *Migration Policy Institute.* Available online: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/refugees-and-asylees-united-states-2018 (accessed on 30 October 2024).

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge Studies in Social, and Cultural Anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [CrossRef]

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cabrera, Nolan L., Elisa L. Meza, Andrea J. Romero, and Roberto Cintli Rodríguez. 2013. 'If There Is No Struggle, There Is No Progress': Transformative Youth Activism and the School of Ethnic Studies. *The Urban Review* 45: 7–22. [CrossRef]

Chang-Bacon, Chris K. 2020. 'It's Not Really My Job': A Mixed Methods Framework for Language Ideologies, Monolingualism, and Teaching Emergent Bilingual Learners. *Journal of Teacher Education* 71: 172–87. [CrossRef]

Cho, Seonhee, and Gabriel A. Reich. 2008. New Immigrants, New Challenges: High School Social Studies Teachers and English Language Learner Instruction. *The Social Studies* 99: 235–42. [CrossRef]

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. Race, Gender, and Sexual Harassment. *Southern California Law Review* 65: 1467. Available online: https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3872&context=faculty_scholarship (accessed on 30 October 2024).

Cushing, Ian. 2021. Language, Discipline and 'Teaching like a Champion'. *British Educational Research Journal* 47: 23–41. [CrossRef]

ESSA. 2016. Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education. U.S. Department of Education. Available online: https://www.ed.gov/laws-and-policy/laws-preschool-grade-12-education/every-student-succeeds-act (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Farr, Marcia, and Juyoung Song. 2011. Language Ideologies and Policies: Multilingualism and Education. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5: 650–65. [CrossRef]
FERPA. 2024. Protecting Student Privacy. Available online: https://studentprivacy.ed.gov/ferpa (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Flores, Nelson, and Jonathan Rosa. 2015. Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education. *Harvard Educational Review* 85: 149–71. [CrossRef]
Foner, Nancy. 2014. Immigration History and the Remaking of New York. In *New York and Amsterdam: Immigration and the New Urban Landscape*. Edited by Nancy Foner, Jan Rath, Jan Willem Duyvendak and Rogier van Reekum. New York: New York University Press, pp. 29–51. [CrossRef]
Gándara, Patricia, and Gary Orfield. 2010. A Return to the "Mexican Room": The Segregation of Arizona's English Learners. Available online: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7m67q3b9 (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Gándara, Patricia, and Gary Orfield. 2012. Segregating Arizona's English Learners: A Return to the 'Mexican Room'? *Teachers College Record* 114: 1–27. [CrossRef]
García, Ofelia, and Angel M. Y. Lin. 2017. Translanguaging in Bilingual Education. In *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Edited by Ofelia García, Angel M. Y. Lin and Stephen May. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 117–30. [CrossRef]
García, Ofelia, and Camila Leiva. 2014. Theorizing and Enacting Translanguaging for Social Justice. In *Educational Linguistics*. Edited by Adrian Blackledge and Angela Creese. Dordrecht: Springer, vol. 20, pp. 199–216. [CrossRef]
García, Ofelia, and Li Wei. 2015. Translanguaging, Bilingualism, and Bilingual Education. In *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., pp. 223–40. [CrossRef]
Hornberger, Nancy H. 2006. Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and Planning. In *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 24–41.
Hult, Francis M., and Nancy H. Hornberger. 2016. Revisiting Orientations in Language Planning: Problem, Right, and Resource as an Analytical Heuristic. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe* 33. Available online: https://www.bilingualreviewjournal.org/index.php/br/article/view/269 (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Johnson, David Cassels, and Eric J. Johnson. 2015. Power and Agency in Language Policy Appropriation. *Language Policy* 14: 221–43. [CrossRef]
Johnson, Eric J. 2012. Arbitrating Repression: Language Policy and Education in Arizona. *Language and Education* 26: 53–76. [CrossRef]
Kaveh, Yalda M., and 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* 45: 2683–700. [CrossRef]
Kaveh, Yalda M., Katie A. Bernstein, Claudia Cervantes-Soon, Sara Rodriguez-Martinez, and Saida Mohamed. 2022. Moving Away from the 4-Hour Block: Arizona's Distinctive Path to Reversing Its Restrictive Language Policies. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 16: 113–35. [CrossRef]
Koyama, Jill P., and Lesley Bartlett. 2011. Bilingual Education Policy as Political Spectacle: Educating Latino Immigrant Youth in New York City. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14: 171–85. [CrossRef]
Koyama, Jill, and Julie Kasper. 2022. Transworlding and Translanguaging: Negotiating and Resisting Monoglossic Language Ideologies, Policies, and Pedagogies. *Linguistics and Education* 70: 101010. [CrossRef]
Koyama, Jill. 2021. Sovereignty, Citizenship and Educating Refugees in the United States. *European Educational Research Journal* 20: 311–28. [CrossRef]
Kramer, Stephanie, and Yunping Tong. 2024. How the Migrant Population of Each Region Differs. *Pew Research Center.* Available online: https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2024/08/19/migrants-living-in-each-region/ (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Lippi-Green, Rosina. 2011. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge. [CrossRef]
McNelly, Carla A. 2015. Language Learning Policy through the Lens of Language as a Problem, as a Right, and as a Resource. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice* 6: 5–26. [CrossRef]
Mendenhall, Mary, Lesley Bartlett, and Ameena Ghaffar-Kucher. 2017. 'If You Need Help, They Are Always There for Us': Education for Refugees in an International High School in NYC. *The Urban Review* 49: 1–25. [CrossRef]
Menken, Kate, and Cristian Solorza. 2014. No Child Left Bilingual: Accountability and the Elimination of Bilingual Education Programs in New York City Schools. *Educational Policy* 28: 96–125. [CrossRef]
Menken, Kate, and Tatyana Kleyn. 2010. The Long-Term Impact of Subtractive Schooling in the Educational Experiences of Secondary English Language Learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 13: 399–417. [CrossRef]
National Center for Education Statistics. 2018. English Learners in Public Schools. Condition of Education. US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences Washington. Available online: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20_204.20.asp (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Norton, Bonny. 1997. Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 31: 409–29. [CrossRef]
Norton, Bonny. 2010. Language and Identity. In *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 349–69. [CrossRef]

NY State Education Department. 2018. 2018 | NY STATE—Graduation Rate Data | NYSED Data Site. NYSED Data Site. Available online: https://data.nysed.gov/gradrate.php?year=2018&state=yes (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Paris, Django, and H. Samy Alim. 2014. What Are We Seeking to Sustain through Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy? A Loving Critique Forward. *Harvard Educational Review* 84: 85–100. [CrossRef]
Portes, Alejandro, and Patricia Fernández-Kelly. 2008. No Margin for Error: Educational and Occupational Achievement among Disadvantaged Children of Immigrants. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 620: 12–36. [CrossRef]
Reddick, Celia, and Sarah Dryden-Peterson. 2021. Refugee Education and Medium of Instruction: Tensions in Theory, Policy, and Practice. In *Language Issues in Comparative Education II*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 208–33. Available online: https://brill.com/downloadpdf/edcollbook/title/59714.pdf#page=224 (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Rios-Aguilar, Cecilia, Manuel S. Gonzalez Canche, and Luis C. Moll. 2012a. A Study of Arizona's Teachers of English Language Learners. *Teachers College Record* 114: 1–33. [CrossRef]
Rios-Aguilar, Cecilia, Manuel S. González Canché, and Shirin Sabetghadam. 2012b. Evaluating the Impact of Restrictive Language Policies: The Arizona 4-Hour English Language Development Block. *Language Policy* 11: 47–80. [CrossRef]
Robertson, Jennifer. 2002. Reflexivity Redux: A Pithy Polemic on 'Positionality'. *Anthropological Quarterly* 75: 785–92. [CrossRef]
Rosa, Jonathan. 2019. *Looking Like a Language, Sounding Like a Race*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Roxas, Kevin, and Laura Roy. 2012. 'That's How We Roll': A Case Study of a Recently Arrived Refugee Student in an Urban High School. *The Urban Review* 44: 468–86. [CrossRef]
Ruíz, Richard. 1984. Orientations in Language Planning. *NABE Journal* 8: 15–34. [CrossRef]
Rumbaut, Rubén G. 1997. Paradoxes (and Orthodoxies) of Assimilation. *Sociological Perspectives* 40: 483–511. [CrossRef]
Russell, S. Garnett, and Paula Mantilla-Blanco. 2022. Belonging and not belonging: The case of newcomers in diverse US schools. *American Journal of Education* 128: 617–45. [CrossRef]
Russell, S. Garnett, Amlata Persaud, Paula Liliana Mantilla Blanco, Katrina Webster, and Maya Elliott. 2021. *Fostering Belonging and Civic Identity: Perspectives from Newcomer and Refugee Students in Arizona and New York*. New York: Columbia University.
Saldana, Johnny. 2011. *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research*. Understanding Qualitative Research. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Sattin-Bajaj, Carolyn, Veronica Boix-Mansilla, and Adam Strom. 2020. Supports for Students in Immigrant Families. Brief No. 9. EdResearch for Recovery Project. Available online: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED607732 (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Saunders, William M., Barbara R. Foorman, and Coleen D. Carlson. 2006. Is a Separate Block of Time for Oral English Language Development in Programs for English Learners Needed? *The Elementary School Journal* 107: 181–98. [CrossRef]
Shapiro, Shawna. 2014. 'Words That You Said Got Bigger': English Language Learners' Lived Experiences of Deficit Discourse. *Research in the Teaching of English* 48: 386–406. [CrossRef]
Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, and Robert Phillipson. 1998. Language in Human Rights. *Gazette* 60: 27–46. [CrossRef]
Spolsky, Bernard. 2003. Reassessing Māori Regeneration. *Language in Society* 32: 553–78. [CrossRef]
Suárez-Orozco, Carola, and Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco. 2009. *Children of Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Available online: https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=PmypbDvvyA8C&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=info:CmFD74NauTsJ:scholar.google.com&ots=t2LC_sW4lS&sig=ORekeXGlRsDv1Ze7gy8Q2jiyaNU (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Suárez-Orozco, Carola, Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, and Irina Todorova. 2008. *Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Available online: https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=_80qEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP6&dq=info:IUm47t07OTAJ:scholar.google.com&ots=uuxuQE8eVV&sig=Z0p0IAJ9Bu592OpYkf0-icX61x8 (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Sugarman, Julie. 2023. Recent Immigrant Children: A Profile of New Arrivals to U.S. Schools. Migration Policy Institute. Available online: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/recent-immigrant-children (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Sung, Kenzo K. 2018. Raciolinguistic Ideology of Antiblackness: Bilingual Education, Tracking, and the Multiracial Imaginary in Urban Schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 31: 667–83. [CrossRef]
Sylvan, Claire. 2013. Newcomer High School Students as an Asset: The Internationals Approach. *Voices in Urban Education* 19–24. Available online: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1046132 (accessed on 30 October 2024).
US DHS. 2016. Refugees and Asylees | OHSS—Office of Homeland Security Statistics. Available online: https://ohss.dhs.gov/topics/immigration/refugees-and-asylees (accessed on 30 October 2024).
Valenzuela, Angela. 1999. 'Checkin' up on My Guy': Chicanas, Social Capital, and the Culture of Romance. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 20: 60–79. [CrossRef]
Van Viegen, Saskia. 2020. Translanguaging for and as Learning with Youth from Refugee Backgrounds. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3: 60–76. [CrossRef]
Woolard, Kathryn A., and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55–82. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.