

- Nance, J. P. (2017). Student surveillance, racial inequalities, and implicit racial bias. *Emory Law Journal*, 66(4), 765–837.
- Nanda, J. (2019). The construction and criminalization of disability in school incarceration. *Columbia Journal of Race and Law*, 9(2), 265–321.
- National Association of School Resource Officers. (n.d.). *Frequently asked questions*. <https://www.nasro.org/faq/>
- National Association of School Resource Officers. (2015, April 14). *Position statement on police involvement in school discipline*. <https://www.nasro.org/news/2015/04/14/news-releases/nasro-position-statement-on-police-involvement-in-student-discipline>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *Table 233.70b. Percentage of public schools with security staff present at least once a week, by type of security staff, school level, and selected characteristics: 2005–06, 2009–10, and 2015–16*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_233.70b.asp
- Nelson, S. L. (2018). Special education, overrepresentation, and end-running education federalism: Theorizing toward a federally protected right to education for black students. *Loyola Journal of Public Interest Law*, 20(2), 205–240.
- Raymond, B. (2010). *Assigning police officers to schools*. U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. https://rems.ed.gov/docs/DOJ_AssigningPoliceOfficers.pdf
- Redfield, S. E., & Nance, J. P. (2016). American Bar Association: Joint task force on reversing the school-to-prison pipeline. *University of Memphis Law Review*, 47(1), 1–180.
- Shaver, E. A., & Decker, J. R. (2017). Handcuffing a third grader? Interactions between school resource officers and students with disabilities. *Utah Law Review*, 2017(2), 229–282.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. (2018). *2015–2016 Civil rights data collection: School climate and safety*. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/school-climate-and-safety.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services. (n.d.). *About*. <https://cops.usdoj.gov>
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2018). *K–12 education: Discipline disparities for black students, boys, and students with disabilities*. <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-18-258>
- Vafa, Y., Ferrer, E., Kaleem, M., Hopkins, C., & Feldhake, E. (2018). *Beyond the walls: A look at girls in DC's juvenile justice system*. Rights4Girls & the Georgetown Juvenile Justice Initiative.
- Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, P.L. 103-322.
- Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs. (2020, June 16). *Testimony of the Washington lawyers' committee for civil rights and Urban Affairs Budget Oversight hearing of the Committee on Education and the Committee of the Whole of the Council of the District of Columbia*. <https://www.washlaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/WLC-Education-Budget-Testimony-June-2020.pdf>

Perfect or Mocha: Language Policing and Pathologization

Jennifer Phuong & María Cioè-Peña

The subject of policing, particularly the policing of bodies in schools, is prevalent in the minds of educators and parents (Mallett, 2017), yet there continues to be a form of policing that is situated in both the body and the mind that garners few critiques: language policing. Like other forms of regulation, the practices expounded in schools are reflective of larger systemic structures and trickle into the home. Language policing in schools manifests in many ways, such as teachers telling students to use certain words or prioritizing one language variety over another, typically regional standard English in the United States. Language policing is often depicted as care grounded in elevating students' linguistic practices, academic performance, and economic opportunities (Delpit & Dowdy, 2008). However, it is buoyed by the pathologization of language practices based on educational structures rooted in ableism and racism.

The introduction of Dis/ability Critical Race Theory (DisCrit) reframed discussions of disability and race. Integrating core principles from intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989), Critical Race Theory (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001), and disability studies (Danforth & Gabel, 2016), DisCrit brought forth an understanding of “why the location of being both a person of color and a person labeled with a dis/ability is qualitatively different for students of color than white students with a dis/ability” (Annamma et al., 2013, p. 5, emphasis in original). Despite naming language as an additional construction of difference, DisCrit did not explicitly explore how language is used both to pathologize minoritized communities and to celebrate the intellectual and cultural capacity of majoritized communities.

Similarly, when Flores and Rosa (2015) introduced the concept of raciolinguistic ideologies, they:

highlight[ed] the racializing language ideologies through which different racialized bodies come to be constructed as engaging in appropriately academic linguistic practices. Specifically, [they] argue[d] that the ideological construction

and value of standardized language practices are anchored in what [they] term[ed] raciolinguistic ideologies that conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices. That is, raciolinguistic ideologies produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects. (p. 150)

The framing of the co-construction of language and race to uphold values entrenched in white supremacy remains critical to this day. Yet, in focusing on the white gaze rather than the white normative gaze, Flores and Rosa missed an opportunity to explore how the focus on what is (and what is not) normal makes the categorization of deviant even possible.

In this chapter, we show how categorizations of students based on language are informed by ableism and racism, ultimately serving as a policing mechanism. Language thus becomes a color-evasive tool in so-called objectively assessing and labeling students, as well as surveilling and policing populations in schools, such as students from immigrant families. We examine language policing in educational policy and practice and how a mixed-status family navigates such language policing. In doing so, we present the need to use frameworks that explicitly address the intersection of race, disability, and language.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Cioè-Peña (2021) brings together central tenets of DisCrit with key components of a raciolinguistic perspective to propose a Critical Disabilities Raciolinguistic (CDR) perspective to address the particular needs of linguistically minoritized students of color with disabilities¹ and to counter the white normative gaze. Borrowing from DisCrit, a CDR perspective argues that people are not only racialized but also pathologized on account of their linguistic practices. Borrowing from raciolinguistic perspectives, a CDR perspective acknowledges that this pathologization happens not on the basis of an individual or community's language practices but instead on others' perceptions, who, regardless of their own identity, enforce the values and the perspectives under a white normative gaze. We especially draw attention to the fact that just as raciolinguistic perspectives need stronger theorization around disability, DisCrit needs stronger theorization around how languages and language practices are co-opted for the promotion and enforcement of ableism, particularly within immigrant communities. To extend Cioè-Peña's (2021) theoretical explorations, we focus on four DisCrit tenets that we believe are the most apt for reimagining.

Tenet one can be expanded to consider issues of not just language but also immigration status; this tenet "focuses on ways that the forces of racism

and ableism circulate interdependently, often in neutralized and invisible ways, to uphold notions of normalcy" (Annamma et al., 2013, p. 11). As mentioned, discussions about normalcy must also encompass ideals around language possession, language practice, and immigration status. While these ideals are encompassed by racism, it is important to parse out how language becomes a proxy for both race and ability, thus allowing policymakers and educators to make choices about a student's ability by perceiving a student's so-called deviant linguistic practice as a *racially neutral* assessment of ability. Thus, even when interlocutors share overlapping language practices, the racialization of the speaker mediates the assessment of the validity of their linguistic practices, the outcome of which is used to *neutrally* enforce a pathology. Therefore, the linguistic practices of emergent bilinguals labeled as disabled (EBLADs) are often discounted (e.g., bilingual education is often described as confusing for these students) regardless of their actual linguistic practices (Cioè-Peña, 2020). Similarly, ideas around normalcy are also tied to immigration status—enacting labels as ways to create in-group distinctions, establishing legitimacy by decreeing right and wrong ways of immigrating and right and wrong places to immigrate from. Thus, discussions about immigrants as public charges are not just about racism and ability but also classism and linguisticism—with linguistic practices and linguistic ability often being used as markers for citizenship and belongingness.

Considerations around language and immigration status also fit with tenet two: "DisCrit values multidimensional identities and troubles singular notions of identity such as race or dis/ability or class or gender or sexuality, and so on" (Annamma et al., 2013, p. 11). While this tenet is meant to be expansive, we believe the current nationalistic and monoglossic² political context demands that language and immigration status be explicitly named. Rather than these being categorizations possessed by the subject, they are imposed by structural systems that bolster the white normative gaze, like disability and race. As such, they triangulate into a multidimensional source of oppression in which each categorization works to uphold the other. Tenet four additionally demands the explicit naming of marginalization at the nexus of multiple axes of oppression to intentionally privilege the "voices of marginalized populations, traditionally not acknowledged within research" (Annamma et al., 2013, p. 11); this must then include those who are users of minoritized languages as well as those who are deemed to be (un)documented immigrants. These communities are often excluded from even the most niche narratives.

Finally, tenet five, which "considers legal and historical aspects of dis/ability and race and how both have been used separately and together to deny the rights of some citizens," could be expanded to reflect a more inclusive meaning of *citizen* (Annamma, et al., 2013, p. 11). While the neutral definition of citizen relates to an inhabitant or resident, given the resurgence of white nationalism around the world, most laypeople often associate

citizenship, alongside linguistic practice, with concepts of nativeness and belonging (Banks, 2017; Cioè-Peña, 2015). It is thus critical to make explicit how ableism and racism are used to deny citizens of rights and to deny citizenship and humanity to certain populations. Linguistically minoritized people of color with disabilities are often discounted as rightful citizens, placing parameters on the supports they have access to, thus reinforcing ideas of who belongs and who doesn't, alongside ideas of whose bodies and linguistic practices are valued.

We now turn to exploring how DisCrit can help to strengthen a raciolinguistic perspective, examining Rosa and Flores's (2017) conceptualization of a perceiving subject, as well as focusing on two components of a raciolinguistic perspective. Building on their previous conceptualization of a *white listening subject*, Rosa and Flores (2017) shift to "*racially hegemonic perceiving subjects* more broadly that are oriented to spoken language as well as other modes of communication and semiotic forms" (pp. 627–628, emphasis added). This perceiving subject includes "various nonspoken and nonlinguistic signs," as well as "literacy practices, physical features, bodily comportment, and sartorial style" (p. 629). Even though a *perceiving subject* can avoid audist orientations toward language by decentering listening, it dichotomizes spoken and unspoken language at the expense of signed languages. Stronger theorization of the perceiving subject vis-à-vis a producing rather than speaking subject should trouble assumptions of language production.

Both frameworks offer insights into using intersectionality as an analytical tool. In eschewing additive approaches to intersectionality, Rosa and Flores (2017) argue that "a raciolinguistic perspective can contribute to understandings of the ways that categories are intersectionally assembled and communicatively co-constituted" (p. 635). Therefore, rather than simply adding on disability or immigration status as an identity or social category for analysis, we attend to how ableism and racism simultaneously operate with, in, and through language and how this relates to the pathologization of undocumented immigrants in particular.

We thus need DisCrit for extending the third component of a raciolinguistic perspective: regimentation of racial and linguistic categories. Rosa and Flores (2017) highlight processes of *raciolinguistic enregisterment* that "involve asking how and why particular linguistic forms are construed as emblems of particular racial categories and vice versa, in what historical, political, and economic contexts, and with what institutional and interpersonal consequences" (p. 634). We need to understand ableism to understand the delegitimization of language practices of immigrants of color and the delegitimization of their personhood (Rosa, 2016). Even though sociolinguists have long theorized and promoted linguistic diversity, we must be more attuned to how language variation is often used as an indicator of disability. Not only has bilingualism been wrongly assumed to be detrimental

to the education of children who grow up in multilingual families (Yu, 2016), language variation within the boundaries of named languages also leads to classification of disability, particularly for students of color (Cioè-Peña, 2017). Students of color contend with their bilingualism being qualified as nonacademic, semilingual, and so forth and also see their language proficiency called into question, even for those who are positioned as monolingual English speakers (Flores, 2020).

We, therefore, need to consider the white *normative gaze* to understand and uncover the role of ableism as a mechanism of power. Only taking on a raciolinguistic perspective ignores how ableism operates, namely through the marginalization of students who deviate from the norm of a white, cisgender, male, statistically average ability, English-speaking child in school. Language thus becomes medicalized and pathologized in ways that undergird the oppression of EBLADs.

A CDR perspective offers a centralized focus on the experiences of linguistically minoritized people of color labeled as disabled. This perspective also acknowledges how the evaluation of linguistic practice functions as a flashpoint for both racism and ableism and as a process for reproducing and enforcing the white normative gaze. While DisCrit and raciolinguistic perspectives both aim to shed light on the subversive ways that evaluation, pathologization, and intervention function as tools of oppression, a CDR perspective centers that process on how language practices are manipulated to serve as indications of a disability, a response to a disability, and a barrier to inclusion through assimilation, regardless of whether a classification of disability is present or not (Cioè-Peña, 2020). As such, a CDR perspective extends DisCrit and raciolinguistic perspectives in an effort to adequately address the multiplicity of the aforementioned communities and foreground the unique nexus among race, language, and disability. It is also a way to ensure that both frameworks are as inclusive as their originators intended them to be without creating opportunities for subgroup othering or erasure. Thus, a CDR perspective is not a replacement but rather an explicit and necessary integration of the two theories. This theoretical and analytical move pushes us to adequately respond rather than further contribute to existing intersectional gaps (Cioè-Peña, 2017).

METHODS

We examine the *nexus* of the co-constitution of racism and ableism in and through language in educational policies and practices at two scales: language education policies that shape the pathologization of EBLADs and their language practices and an ethnographic case study of how an undocumented mother of EBLADs navigated those educational language policies. Examining this phenomenon along multiple scales allows us to understand

"the fluid and dynamic nature of relationships among discourse processes across dimensions of social organization" (Hult, 2010, p. 14).

We begin by taking a CDR perspective to explore categorizations of students and the basis for such categorizations to understand the policing and the pathologization of language practices through ableism and racism. More specifically, we examine how language is conceptualized through *specific learning disability*, the category of disability with the highest incidence in the United States; *Long Term English Language Learner (LTELL)*, a category of language learner that relies on enduring assumptions around ability and language proficiency; and the role of standardized assessment in these learner classifications. In doing so, we show how language is used to perpetuate normative and oppressive conceptualizations of ability, as well as monoglossic ideologies that prioritize English (Flores et al., 2015).

These insights serve as the context for a case study, which is part of a larger research project centered on the mothering experiences of Spanish-speaking mothers of EBLADs (Cioè-Peña, 2018). The study consisted of two phases. During the first phase, all 10 participants engaged in two face-to-face qualitative, narrative interviews. At the end of the first phase, three of the participants were invited to take part in ethnographic case studies based on their demographics, their children's educational placements, and their engagement and interests in phase one. These case studies were the basis of the second phase of the study. As part of the case studies, participants engaged in additional interviews and home observations and offered up artifacts relating to their or their children's experiences. The data shared here arose from the second phase during an interview that explored an undocumented mother's desires regarding one of her children's, an EBLAD, linguistic development. Data analysis consisted of narrative analysis of the mothers' *testimonios* using inductive codes (e.g., language, disability, school, and motherhood) as well as deductive codes that arose from the data (e.g., immigration, future, employment).

Exploring two different scales allows us to demonstrate the complex and fluctuating nature of ableism and racism in and through language, both with and without disability classifications present. Throughout, we demonstrate how using a CDR perspective can foreground the interconnectedness of race, language, disability, and immigration.

FINDINGS

We start with examining educational policy and practices to explore how racism and ableism contribute to language policing, namely through categorizations of students and the standardized testing that undergirds such categorizations. We then turn to a case study of how an undocumented mother of a child with a disability navigates language and education to demonstrate how one family negotiates such language policing.

Language Policing at School

Ties among language, race, and disability become cemented within educational structures. Disability classifications function to regiment and categorize both disability and linguistic practice, taking up linguistic practice as an indicator of normative versus deviant behavior. This can lead to disability categorizations and the reinforcement of those categorizations. Thus, linguistic practices are policed in order to cement ideas of normalcy. In this section, we examine language policing mechanisms in education, specifically (a) the *specific learning disability (SLD)* classification; (b) the *Long-Term English Language Learner (LTELL)* classification; and (c) standardized assessments.

In the 1960s, learning disability and cultural deprivation were two disability classifications used to describe students who supposedly struggled with abstract reasoning, object sorting assessments, and language deficiencies (Carrier, 1986). However, learning disability was the explanation given for behaviors of white, monolingual, English-speaking, middle-class, U.S.-born students who were considered the norm, and cultural deprivation was the explanation given for behaviors of students who deviated from those norms, such as students of color, students with a lower socioeconomic status, immigrant students, and rural students (Riessman, 1962; Snyder & Mitchell, 2006). Therefore, these categories of disability emerged to explain individual failure within educational institutions rather than examining the institutions.

Currently, cultural deprivation is no longer a disability classification, though its ideological underpinnings in situating educational problems within minoritized communities, rather than within educational structures, continues. Learning disability became Specific Learning Disability (SLD); however, the definition is embedded in color-evasive federal legislation that continues to perpetuate racism and ableism (Beratan, 2006). SLD is the category of disability with the highest incidence in public schools, with Black, Indigenous, and Latinx students overrepresented. Furthermore, these students are more likely to receive special education services in more restrictive settings, regardless of classification, than white students (Brantlinger, 2006). SLD is defined as

a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which disorder may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations (§§ 2657–2658)

Here, language is used to reinforce both white supremacy and ableism, necessitating the lens of the white normative gaze to unpack how imperfection is attributed to individuals' language practices. Phuong (2017) highlighted the ties between the individualization and the pathologization of disability

and language within special education structures as part of the white perceiving subject; the unspoken assumption is that so-called normal and able-bodied students use language *perfectly*. As Flores and Rosa (2015) rightly ask us to consider how we perceive the language practices of students of color, it is also important to consider how the white normative gaze evaluates language practices as (im)perfect, rather than solely as the white gaze.

The prioritization of English over other languages also contributes to the reification of monoglossic ideologies that pathologize imperfect language practices that deviate from some imagined norm. Monoglossic ideologies are intertwined with raciolinguistic ideologies that lead to normative ideas of fluency and language proficiency mediated by racism and ableism that converge to sort and categorize learners. Flores et al. (2015) argue that *idealized monolingualism* allows schooling systems to reify white monolingualism as an ideal, leading to the creation of labels like LTELL. In New York, LTELLs are students who are educated in the United States for at least 7 years and annually do not pass a battery of standardized assessments that purport to objectively measure a student's English language proficiency, thereby leaving them with the LTELL label. Flores et al. (2015) explain that this label relies on discourses of academic and linguistic partiality that positions LTELLs in a constant state of remediation, such that their linguistic practices in any language variety are seen as deficient. Such categorizations rely on both white supremacist and normative framings of language proficiency that cannot be separated from ableism. LTELLs and linguistically minoritized students of color, in general, are often positioned as languageless (Rosa, 2016). Parallel to SLD, this lack of language proficiency is situated in the student rather than considering how students' language practices are perceived.

The white normative gaze also mediates standardized testing and its impact on linguistically diverse students of color labeled as disabled. Language proficiency exams, state reading and math assessments, and psychological evaluations rely on normative ideas of language proficiency, intelligence, and behavior. Drawing from this tradition, eugenicists used intelligence testing as a mechanism to discover individuals who were considered defective or deviant (Snyder & Mitchell, 2006). Intelligence testing was central to education policies, allowing educators and researchers to view intelligence as "a fixed trait, passed on genetically, that clearly stamped certain groups as significantly more intelligent than others" (Osgood, 2000, p. 55), thus reifying the medical model of disability. Bilingualism was also historically seen as an indicator of disability, especially for immigrant populations (Valett, 1965). These types of testing relied on normative ideas of idealized monolingual language use. This way, through standardized testing, language, race, and disability are not socially constructed but naturalized facts.

Even though scholars have shown the multiplicity and hybridity of the language practices of students of color through a heteroglossic lens (García,

2011), standards-based reforms and testing rely on monoglossic ideologies that lead to deficit-oriented views of those same language practices. Monoglossic ideologies thus intertwine with ableism and racism to create particular categories of learners that deviate from some standard (Au, 2009), which is partially determined through assessment (Kibler & Valdés, 2016). This is reflective of the medicalization and the individualization of disability, race, and language, which converge as part of the language policing of undocumented immigrants. Ultimately, rigidity in conceptualizations of linguistic boundaries and proficiency reveal how monoglossic ideologies and deficit-oriented views of bilingualism contribute to constructions of disability. We use a case study to demonstrate how educational mechanisms of language policing manifest in home practices.

Language Policing at Home³

This case study highlights how these structural policies eventually filter into and through families, featuring the perspective of one mother to underscore the different ways that language can function in relation to disability, citizenship, and class within the same household. At the time, Paty's social positioning was that of an undocumented Mexican national living in the United States with two of her four children: Dan, a 5th-grader EBLAD in an English-only inclusive class, and Tanya, a 4th-grade emergent bilingual student in a dual-language class. To understand how language policing works, we first explore how each language is framed.

Language and Disability: Spanish as Disability Marker; English as Disability Remediation

When asked to explain why Dan was recommended for an evaluation, Paty first spoke about issues with communication:

Yo me sentía impotente porque no podía ayudar a mi hijo, él no podía hablar. Él no más pedía leche, "Mmhm, mmhm." Le decía, "Leche" y él me decía "Le." Algo así corto. [. . .] Y na' mas empezaba señas, o llorar, y eso era como una impotencia para mí.

I felt powerless because I couldn't help my son, he couldn't speak. He just asked for milk, "Mmhm, mmhm." I said, "milk," and he said, "me." Something like that, short. [. . .] And then he'd just start signaling, or cry, and that was like impotence for me.

In this brief vignette, oral language or a lack thereof was used to signal a problem and resulted in Paty feeling powerless as a mother. Simultaneously, other forms of communication like *signaling* or crying were not viewed as forms of communication, thus reinforcing our need to reinterpret language

as more than oral communication. Paty then continued to discuss how she first started to notice improvements:

Cuando él empezó a ir a la escuela, él empezó a hacer muchos cambios, tanto como aquí en la casa como en la escuela. Lógico que el todas las clases las daban en inglés. Pero él podía ya pronunciarme las cosas, Ya pués decía [inglés] "Milk, water mommy, juice mommy." Lógico, mochas⁴ todavía, pero ya podía.

When he started going to school, he began to make many changes, both here at home and at school. It was logical that all classes were taught in English. But he could already pronounce things for me. He was saying [English], "Milk, water mommy, juice mommy." Logical, still mangled, but he could [communicate].

In this retelling, Paty frames her child's growth around his ability to clearly communicate his needs in English. Despite the household being Spanish-dominant, Paty's son received English-only services. Here, Paty frames English differently from Spanish—while linguistic approximation was filtered through a lens of "corto" and by extension deficient, the brevity of Dan's English discourse was held to different standards. She discusses his changes and provides examples of his expanded vocabulary, framing his English development as growth despite concluding that the words were still *mocha*. Here, we see the beginnings of dichotomous positioning of each language: Spanish signaled a disability while English signaled growth and proximity to normal.

Language, Nationality, and Class: English for the Doctor, Spanish for the Maid

Although Dan's linguistic practices are evaluated through frames of normalcy, Tanya's linguistic practices yield common tropes that relate English to power and privilege and Spanish to inferiority and othering.

Paty: Yo le digo a Tanya, [. . .] "cuando tú seas grande y ya doctora, y sigas en este país, y no hay quien te limpie tu casa, y viene una señora, y te habla español, tú le puedes decir las cosas en español. Tú le puedes decir las cosas en español. Que no seas racista," le digo. "Porque tú eres mexicana. El título de que nada más porque naciste en este país, pero tú vienes de padres mexicanos." Porque Dan una vez me dijo—, bueno varias veces me dijo, "Pero yo no soy mexicano. Yo soy americano."

I say to Tanya, [. . .] "when you are big and a doctor, and you are still in this country, and there is no one to clean your house, and a lady comes and speaks Spanish to you, you can tell her things in Spanish. You can tell her things in Spanish. Don't be racist," I say. "Because you are Mexican. The title, that's just because you were born

in this country, but you come from Mexican parents." Because Dan once said to me—well, several times he said, "But I'm not Mexican. I'm American."

In this passage, Paty—who works as a cleaning lady for English-speaking employers—frames language around communication—not to communicate with her family or her patients but rather with *the lady* who cleans her house. As such, English is associated with a higher level of education, a profession, and superior status, while Spanish is associated with domestic work and subjugation. Additionally, Paty ends by saying "Don't be a racist," which reflects the idea that those who do not use a common language to communicate with others have a perspective that is inherently grounded in white supremacy.

Conversely, Paty uses language to reinforce her children's ethnic identities to them. Spanish, therefore, becomes synonymous with working-class Mexicans and English with elite, yet racist, Americans. This positioning of language is not representative of Paty's flaws as much as they are indicative of how the language ideologies of the perceiving subject are imposed upon, consumed, and adopted by the producing subject. Eventually, they become not only subject to but also enforce these ideologies.

From Policed to Policing

After numerous encounters positioning their home language as problematic at best, the children in the family then adopt the role of ideological enforcers. Here, Paty recounts a common exchange with Dan in which he both urges her to learn English and faults her for not being *fluent*:

Para mí difícil porque a veces a [Dan], más que a nadie con [Dan], me cuesta porque a veces él quiere que yo le hable más en inglés, a veces me cuesta porque yo no puedo pronunciar esas palabras, a veces le digo

"vuélvemela a repetir"

"pero es que tu no la estás diciendo bien, tu estás diciendo otra palabra,"

"okay entonces yo te la puedo contestar en español"

"si mamá pero tu también tienes que aprender inglés"

Él se enojaba al principio porque me decía "es que no es mi culpa que tu no hayas aprendido inglés, porque no aprendiste" [. . .] y yo le explicaba y le decía "hijo yo no nací en este país, yo vine grande a este país, siendo ya mamá de dos de tus hermanos," entonces a veces [responde] "pues vete a una escuela"

"hijo, es que no es tan fácil que uno que ya está más grande aprender el inglés como a ustedes que son pequeños que se les meten los idioma[s] más rápido."

A veces yo tengo que pensar luego digo "estoy aprendiendo." [Dan] se molestaba mucho porque me decía "es que me dejaron tarea y es tu culpa que yo no pueda porque tu no las dices bien y yo no las escribo bien."

For me, it's difficult because sometimes [Dan], more than anyone with [Dan], it's hard for me because sometimes he wants me to speak more to him in English, sometimes it's hard for me because I cannot pronounce those words, sometimes I tell him,

"Repeat it again."

"But you are not saying it well, you are saying another word."

"Okay, so I can answer it in Spanish."

"Yes, Mom, but you also have to learn English."

He was angry at first because he told me, "It is not my fault that you did not learn English because you did not learn" [. . .], and I explained to him and said, "Son, I was not born in this country, I came to this country, being a mother to two of your brothers," then sometimes [he responds], "Go to school."

"Son, it is not as easy for one who is older to learn English as it is for you who are children who get language[s] faster."

Sometimes I have to think, then I say, "I am learning." [Dan] was very upset because he said, "It's that I have homework, and it's your fault that I can't [do it] because you don't say them well and I don't write them well."

Here, we hear of how Dan chastises his mother for not learning English, critiquing her efforts to speak English, and holding her responsible for his inability to complete homework. Paty tries to reason with him, explaining her late introduction to English and restating her efforts to learn as an adult. In this retelling, we see how language policing evolves from systemic to interpersonal practice: blaming the producing subject without acknowledging systemic barriers; associating linguistic practice with age, ability, and birthplace; blaming the parent for their inability to engage rather than recognizing how monolingual services create a barrier; and extending the child's inability to perform to the parent. Racism and pathology thus become commonplace—it hides in the details and is enforced through relationships.

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, we used CDR to explore language policing in educational structures and how a mixed-status family that includes an EBLAD navigates those structures. Language policing occurs in schools through monoglossic and raciolinguistic ideologies that converge in normative schooling practices, such as standardized testing. Ultimately, categorizations of learners

and subsequent language and special education services in schools rely on normative understandings of bilingualism and language proficiency and lead to language policing. Languages other than English become pathologized for producing racialized subjects, and bilingualism becomes positioned as a problem for students of color labeled as disabled in developing language proficiency as measured through standardized testing (Chaparro, 2017).

School-based deficit perspectives of language permeate the home, extending individual pathologies to families, erasing their funds of knowledge (González et al., 2006), and restricting their ability to act agentively when navigating complex and oppressive educational structures. This was evident in Paty's experience; she was knowledgeable in her own right but regularly encountered structural barriers. A CDR perspective offers an understanding of how the perceiving subject's pathologizing of language is central to evaluating linguistic practice and measuring progression toward normalcy. Thus, in an effort to accelerate their children's qualification as normal across ability and nationality, parents like Paty inhabit the role of language police as a form of parental engagement, acting as good parents without understanding systemic structures that are being imposed on their family. The shift from language policed to language policing is critical to understanding how the racialization and pathologization that undocumented parents experience influence the educational policies and practices they support. In other words, to spare their children ongoing racism and ableism, parents seek to perfect their EBLADs' linguistic practices to accomplish racial and able-bodied passing.

Rather than subject their children to policing on the basis of race and immigration status, parents police their children's linguistic practices to cement their ability to pass as citizens. This desire to pass is not actually grounded in citizenship status, given that most of these children are, in fact, citizens but rather in an effort to deflect the ways in which non-English linguistic practice is used as a proxy for undocumented status. Unfortunately, this protective practice reinforces the very policing it aims to avoid. Furthermore, within one family, bilingualism can serve as an advantage for an able-bodied child, while being a potential risk for *outing* a disabled one. These dynamics reveal the complexity of discourses around immigration when considering the multitude of migrant categories, including refugees and asylum seekers, as compared to documented immigrants who arrive in the United States for work, marriage, school, and so forth; different categories evoke different treatment and policing practices (Crawley & Skleparis, 2018). Ultimately, a CDR perspective allows us to recognize how language can be perceived as a barrier to access while also serving as a "racialized signifier of cultural assimilation and immigrant worth" (Kibria & Becerra, 2021, p. 11), no matter the migrant status.

Language policing thus highlights the significance of the perceiving subject as the unit of analysis, not as a specific individual but rather the subject

positions they embody as they perceive language practices. For example, Flores et al. (2020) found that teachers tied deficit descriptions of students' language practices to institutional categorizations of learners (e.g., EL status, speech-language impairment) and schooling practices (e.g., performance on literacy assessments), thereby using the labels and supposedly objective testing to rationalize such descriptions. Language, therefore, becomes a color-evasive way for teachers to find disability and reify the pathologization of disabled students.

CONCLUSION

A CDR perspective allows researchers to foreground how the white normative gaze mediates the language policing of multiply marginalized students through schooling structures and policies that focus on sorting and categorizing students. In attending to the role of language in racism and ableism, we consider the particularities of how language-minoritized communities are marginalized, as well as how language is co-constructed with race, disability, and immigrant status. This analysis ultimately emphasizes the importance of avoiding trickle-down social justice (Crenshaw, 2019) and instead centering multiply marginalized groups to extend the possibilities of DisCrit.

NOTES

1. We use the term *linguistically minoritized students of color* to account for the fact that even students of color who identify as users of English have their linguistic practices discounted through dialectical categorizations often driven by anti-Blackness.

2. Within language education, monoglossic ideologies "treat . . . languages as separate and whole, and view . . . languages as bounded autonomous systems" (García, 2011, p. 7).

3. We choose to foreground the voices of the participants in this manuscript. In a nod to Mendoza-Denton (2008), the body of the text includes participants' narratives in the original language without the use of italics. English translations can be found immediately after in italics; in-text quotation translations are italicized.

4. The word *mocha* can be seen as an alternative to short or mangled. The translation of one definition is: "that it does not have the tip, termination, or finish that it would have to have due to its nature" (Oxford Dictionary, n.d.).

REFERENCES

Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 16*(1), 1-31.

- Au, W. W. (2009). High-stakes testing and discursive control: The triple bind for non-standard student identities. *Multicultural Perspectives, 11*(2), 65-71.
- Banks, A. M. (2017). Respectability & the quest for citizenship. *Brooklyn Law Review, 83*(1), 1-54.
- Beratan, G. D. (2006). Institutionalizing inequity: Ableism, racism and IDEA 2004. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 26*(2). <https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/682/859>
- Brantlinger, E. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Who benefits from special education? Remediating (fixing) other people's children*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Carrier, J. G. (1986). *Learning disability: Social class and the construction of inequality in American education* (Vol. 18). Praeger.
- Chaparro, S. E. (2017). *Language and the gentrifying city: An ethnographic study of a two-way immersion program in an urban public school* (Publication No. 2213) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania]. Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations.
- Cioè-Peña, M. (2015). Translanguaging within the monolingual special education classroom. *Theory, Research, and Action in Urban Education, 4*(1).
- Cioè-Peña, M. (2017). The intersectional gap: How bilingual students in the United States are excluded from inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 21*(9), 906-919.
- Cioè-Peña, M. (2018). "Yo soy su Mama:" *Latinx Mothers Raising Emergent Bilinguals Labeled as Dis/Abled*. City University of New York.
- Cioè-Peña, M. (2020). Planning inclusion: The need to formalize parental participation in individual education plans (and meetings). In *The educational forum* (Vol. 84, No. 4, pp. 377-390). Routledge.
- Cioè-Peña, M. (2021). 3 dual language and the erasure of emergent bilinguals labeled as disabled (EBLADs). In N. Flores & A. Tseng (Eds.), *Bilingualism for all? Raciolinguistic perspectives on dual language education* (pp. 63-87). Multilingual Matters.
- Crawley, H., & Skleparis, D. (2018). Refugees, migrants, neither, both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's "migration crisis." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 44*(1), 48-64.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139-167.
- Crenshaw, K. (2019). The marginalization of Harriet's daughters: Perpetual crisis, misdirected blame, and the enduring urgency of intersectionality. *Kalfou, 6*(1), 7-23.
- Danforth, S., & Gabel, S. L. (Eds.). (2016). *Vital questions facing disability studies in education* (2nd ed.). Peter Lang.
- Delpit, L., & Dowdy, J. K. (Eds.). (2008). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom* (2nd ed.). The New Press.
- Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory into Practice, 59*(1), 22-31. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665411>
- Flores, N., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (2015). Looking holistically in a climate of partiality: Identities of students labeled long-term English language learners. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 14*(2), 113-132. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2015.1019787>

- Flores, N., Phuong, J., & Venegas, K. M. (2020). "Technically an EL": The production of raciolinguistic categories in a dual language school. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(3), 629-651.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Garcia, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gonzales, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Routledge.
- Hult, F. M. (2010). Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2010(202), 7-24. <http://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2010.011>
- Kibler, A. K., & Valdes, G. (2016). Conceptualizing language learners: Socioinstitutional mechanisms and their consequences. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(51), 96-116.
- Kibria, N., & Becerra, W. S. (2021). Deserving immigrants and good advocate mothers: Immigrant mothers' negotiations of special education systems for children with disabilities. *Social Problems*, 68(3), 591-607.
- Mallett, C. A. (2017). The school-to-prison pipeline: Disproportionate impact on vulnerable children and adolescents. *Education and Urban Society*, 49(6), 563-592.
- Mendoza-Denton, N. (2008). *Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among Latina youth gangs*. Blackwell.
- Osgood, R. L. (2000). *For "children who vary from the normal type": Special education in Boston, 1838-1930*. Gallaudet University Press.
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.) Mocha. *Oxford English Dictionary*.
- Phuong, J. (2017). Disability and language ideologies in education policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 32(1), 47-66.
- Riessman, F. (1962). *The culturally deprived child*. Harper & Row.
- Rosa, J. D. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: Raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 26(2), 162-183.
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46(5), 621-647.
- Snyder, S. L., & Mitchell, D. T. (2006). *Cultural locations of disability*. University of Chicago Press.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(4), 471-495.
- Valett, R. E. (1965). A formula for providing psychological services. *Psychology in the Schools*, 2(4), 326-329.
- Yu, B. (2016). Bilingualism as conceptualized and bilingualism as lived: A critical examination of the monolingual socialization of a child with autism in a bilingual family. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46(2), 424-435.

MARGIN TO MARGIN