

## **Race, Social Justice, and Power Equity in Dual Language Education**

Claudia G. Cervantes-Soon

Dual language education (DLE) in the United States is situated in important ways within a long history of colonial legacies, racial tensions, asymmetrical power relations, and struggles for educational equity for marginalized groups. It could be said that any language education program is far from neutral, but for Latinxs, language is of particular significance given its role in the colonial, imperialist, racializing, and segregation processes that have shaped their community's prospects in this country. This report synthesizes current literature, both empirical and theoretical, to offer an analysis of power dynamics in DLE within its historical, economic, and sociopolitical contexts. The analysis examines how power is exercised between Latinx children from immigrant and LM backgrounds and English speakers and their parents, the existing tensions between racial groups in DLE, and the strength of the current research on social justice, equity, and inclusiveness in DLE. Ultimately, the goal is to offer an analysis that may help DLE researchers identify potential ways to address inequities and increase the potential to promote social justice for historically marginalized communities through DLE education.

To this end, I will first locate DLE within the evolution of contemporary bilingual education in the United States and the various ideological trends that have given way to its current material and discursive framings. With this backdrop, I will locate the social justice goals that have been articulated by DLE advocates as well as the stumbling blocks that have materialized along the way. I will then examine how different contexts create the conditions for inequities in DLE and will shed light on some of the student groups that tend to be erased in assumptions of equal benefits. Finally, I will offer a limited assessment of the current empirical work on DLE in relation to social justice and equity, including the methods and outcomes of

current research, its strength and usefulness, as well as some of the gaps and areas of growth that remain. I will conclude with implications and recommendations to reorient the path of DLE toward the empowerment of historically marginalized communities.

The most recent publication of the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education defines dual language as "any program that provides literacy and content instruction to all students through two languages and that promotes bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement, and sociocultural competence—a term encompassing identity development, cross-cultural competence, and multicultural appreciation—for all students" (Howard, et. al, 2018, p. 3). Howard and colleagues also identify program variations in DLE according to the linguistic groups of students they serve. While two-way DLE integrates English dominant students with students dominant in the partner language, one-way DLE programs serve more linguistically homogenous groups. One-way programs are further differentiated as *developmental bilingual* programs which serve students proficient in the partner language, but not English at the time of enrollment, and *"foreign"/world language immersion* programs which teach a partner language to English dominant students. It should be noted that there are many nuances and variations within each model depending on the context where they are implemented that significantly shape the programs' orientation, race relations and power struggles. This report will use the term DLE to refer generally to two-way immersion programs, unless otherwise specified. Finally, DLE programs exist in a variety of partner languages to English, such as Spanish, Mandarin, Korean, French, as well as in a number of Indigenous languages. While this list of languages is not exhaustive and there are also nuances in implementation for each that deserve attention, for the sake of brevity and attention to the prospects of Latinx students, I will narrow this analysis to Spanish as the focus partner language of this report.

## **Rebirthing Bilingual Education as Dual Language: Histories, Power Struggles, and Visions**

It has been over 20 years since Guadalupe Valdés (1997) issued a cautionary note calling attention to the potential pitfalls of DLE in their potential to exacerbate power asymmetries by giving children from the dominant group -- namely white middle-class, English speakers -- access to Spanish mastery, and in so doing, increasing and perpetuating their domination over Latinxs. Since then, researchers have continued to voice important concerns about issues of power and inequities that can persist and even exacerbate in DLE programs (Carrigo 2002; Cervantes-Soon, et. al., 2017; Cloud, et al. 2000; De Jong & Howard 2009; Delgado-Larocco, 1998; Edelsky 1996; Freeman 1995; McCollum, 1999; Palmer, 2009, 2010; Pierce 2000; Potowski, 2007; Varghese & Park, 2010). Scholars have also expressed increasing concern over the ways in which neoliberal policies, global economic interests, and emphasis on developing human capital have become the moral compass guiding these programs (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Martínez, 2017; Petrovic, 2005; Valdez, Delavan & Freire, 2014). These challenges, however, should be understood as part of a long legacy of racial/linguistic tensions in the United States generated by its colonial/imperialistic history, and therefore any future planning in DLE should consider the sociopolitical background that continues to shape current conditions for educational initiatives.

While bilingual education is mostly perceived as an immigrant education issue, and as something affecting every language minoritized (LM) immigrant community in somewhat generalized ways, it is important to note its unique significance to the Latinx community. Historically, for many Latinxs, particularly Chicanxs/Mexican-Americans in the Southwest and Puerto Ricans, language has been a tool of power, with English dominance reflecting the

material conditions of U.S imperialism, settler colonialism, and land invasion (Santa Ana, 2004). Needless to say, for these communities, bilingual education is inherently a highly politicized issue, and a central one that emerged during the Civil Rights movements of the 1960s. Scholars have noted the radical vision that Latinx Civil Rights activists had in mind in their initial conception of bilingual education. For example, Trujillo's (2014) ethnography documents the emergence of bilingual/bicultural education as part of the Chicano movement in Crystal City, Texas, when the marginalized Mexican-American majority community and the *Raza Unida Party* fought against the white minority's political dominance and control of power. Trujillo notes that, with the vision of *El Plan de Aztlán*, Chicano Crystal City activists were not looking for integration or access to white hegemony, but rather for self-reliance and decolonization in which the goal of bilingual/bicultural education was to cultivate "radical ethnic consciousness through schooling" and an ethic of insurrection (p. 6). In a similar vein, Flores' (2016) account of the Young Lords' vision for bilingual education, a U.S. based, Puerto Rican nationalist organization, reveals its revolutionary and decolonizing aims. The Young Lords viewed dominant education programs as the indoctrination of white supremacist ideologies that resulted in self-hate and white hegemony. To them, then, bilingual education, along with the teaching of Puerto Rican history, constituted a decolonizing means to combat psychological imperialism and reclaim dignity and pride in the Puerto Rican Spanish language and Indio-Afro heritage.

These two examples illustrate what Flores (2016) denominates the race radical goals that Civil Rights activists envisioned for bilingual education, which highly contrast with the vision of accommodation that has characterized its post-Civil Rights institutionalization. The accommodation approach has entailed, even if unintendedly or strategically so, a continuous effort to depoliticize bilingual education and merge it with the ideologies of hegemonic

Whiteness in order to gain acceptance, resources, and access to the dominant structures -- precisely the approach that guides the implementation of many dual language programs today. These ideologies can be recognized in the intellectual/scientific frameworks, purposes, language views, methods, and curriculum used in bilingual education in the past 40 years.

For example, the institution of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 came largely as a result of accommodating bilingual education into the education policies and initiatives generated by the war on poverty and the discourse of cultural deficits about minoritized communities (San Miguel, 2004). Rather than establishing bilingual education as a way to restore the linguistic heritage of Latinx students or offer a culturally sustaining education in its own right and in the communities' own terms, bilingual education had to be justified in ways that aligned with the ideologies and rationale of the dominant group. Therefore, the transitional model, which usually provided home language instruction only for one to three years and which aimed to push students into the mainstream classroom as soon as possible, is the bilingual program that became most prominent (Flores & García, 2017; Grinberg & Saavedra, 2000).

Grinberg and Saavedra's (2000) genealogical analysis also sheds light on how the pursuit to establish bilingual education as a legitimate disciplinary field, opened the doors to the hegemony of psycholinguistics as way to measure the scientific validity of bilingual education. Its validity was in turn only determined by the programs' ability to assimilate Latinx children into the English language as opposed to their bilingualism and biculturalism and identification with their communities. As such, bilingual education has been predominantly interpreted, studied, and applied from an instrumentalist perspective, generally relying on monolingual paradigms of second language acquisition theory to examine its effectiveness and design curriculum and instruction (May, 2013; Ortega, 2014). Questions of effectiveness also took over the scholarly

discourse in ways that largely erased questions concerning the race radical perspectives in the construction of the field.

This is not to say that bilingual education has not played an active role in the affective, economic, or political domains of LM children and communities. Even within a transitional model, bilingual education has served to some extent to create spaces where Latinx students could nurture their ways of being; develop pride in their language, culture, and heritage; and use their unique language skills for economic uplift (Flores & García, 2017). Yet the accommodation approach has also succumbed such pride to hegemonic Whiteness and colonial settler privilege. For example, in the case of New Mexico, Grinberg and Saavedra (2000) point to the fallacy of claiming a Spanish heritage or "Hispanidad" as the source of pride, and divorcing bilingual education from Chicano Civil Rights movements. Claiming a link to Spain might have been perceived as the means to achieve a higher status in a hierarchy of hegemonic Whiteness, but it also capitalized on settler colonialism, effectively erasing centuries of mestizaje and Indigenous ancestry, and hence impeding any decolonizing possibilities.

Even outside of New Mexico, such colonial ideologies are evident in the dominance of the standardized variety of Spanish as the legitimate partner language in DLE and in the insistence to maintain language separation practices. Within such perspective, there is an urgency to ensure that the standardized Spanish language is not corrupted by Anglicism, translanguaging, or Indigenous influences, which in turn stigmatizes the authentic and dynamic language practices of bilingual Latinx students from working-class communities, and reifies them as semilingual learners (García, 2014). In other instances, DLE might not be directly connected to Spain, but still is framed as a global and internationally oriented program, positioning Spanish as a "foreign" language, rather than the second most spoken language in the United States. Through

these positionings DLE is framed as a global education program to prepare students for international affairs, rather than to recognize how cultural diversity shapes their everyday lives in their local context. Finally, while building a higher self-esteem and pride in one's culture may have been a significant advantage in the intimacy of traditional bilingual classrooms where all students were Latinxs and had similar socioeconomic backgrounds, two-way dual language programs today present challenges to such spaces as Latinxs from low-income communities are viewed in constant reference to their white English-dominant, usually more affluent -- and now also bilingual -- peers in a context of increased competition and accountability.

The accommodation approach in bilingual education may be most visible, however, in efforts to depoliticize the field through embracing an assets approach, or language-as-resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984), which is the very foundation of the re-emergence of bilingual education as DL, and which paradoxically has brought about the very issues of inequality that are so pervasive today. Such orientation positions minoritized languages as desirable assets for economic development and national defense, which was viewed as a way to increase the status of minoritized languages, reduce divisiveness and opposition to bilingual education, and counter deficit thinking about LM children and the remedial connotation in bilingual education. This perspective gave way to the formulation of two-way DLE programs precisely during a time of increased hostility against bilingual education, the rise of restrictive language policies, and a strong discourse of transitional bilingual education as a failing program. The two-way dual language model was also welcomed by foreign language educators whose field was struggling to survive declining public interest and funding allocations (Osborn, 2006; Valdés, 1997), as well as by English-speaking mainstream families motivated by increased research on the cognitive advantages of bilingualism. However, a number of scholars have revealed how embracing that

orientation a bit too precipitously and uncritically, has actually led to the commodification of minoritized languages and the cooptation of bilingual education, largely for the benefit of the dominant group and without any commitment to social transformation (Ricento, 2005; Varghese & Park, 2010).

As it will be evident in this report, the desired outcomes that bilingual education advocates had in mind as they embraced an assets orientation have been largely unfulfilled in ways that transform the material conditions and bring substantial empowerment to Latinx bilingual students, mainly due to its inability to disrupt the hegemonic Whiteness and its structures of power in schools and in society. Instead, the language-as-resource perspective has merged with neoliberal ideologies and the language of capitalism, and has fed into U.S. imperialism by positioning DLE education and bilingualism as a tool to increase U.S. economic and military domination over the world (Petrovic, 2005). In light of this historical and socio-political background, I now turn to identify the equity goals that have been articulated in DLE in order to examine the possibilities and difficulties to attain them as well as new challenges regarding race and power that have emerged in a variety of DLE contexts.

### **The Equity Promise of DLE**

Within the general goals of grade-level academic achievement, bilingualism and biliteracy, and sociocultural competence, specific social justice and equity goals pertaining the education of LM learners have been articulated in the literature. These goals have many overlaps as they build on each other, and have been described in different ways, but they can be summed up in the following five:

#### ***1. Increasing English learners' (EL) grade level achievement and closing achievement gaps***

While English language acquisition has been the main objective of the transitional model, DLE programs emphasize high academic achievement in both languages. Increasing ELs' achievement has been an imperative goal in order to build the necessary academic foundation for long-term academic success and for higher education. Closing achievement gaps between students from minoritized communities and middle-class white anglophone children is one of the most commonly invoked equity rationales for establishing DLE programs. Yet because DLE is branded as an enrichment and rigorous program, such goals cannot be articulated through remedial language. Instead, DLE programs are framed as promoting ELs' achievement by maintaining high expectations grounded on standards that meet or exceed them in both languages. In addition to the assets orientation previously discussed, the potential of academic equity in DLE has been supported by research that demonstrates that students in DLE have higher test scores (Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Pérez, 2004; Steele, et al., 2013; Steele, et al., 2017; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 2012) and higher high-school graduation and college enrollment rates (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001) than peers from the same demographic group in mainstream programs.

## ***2. Eliminating the segregation of LM students***

Because two-way DLE programs integrate English dominant children and speakers of a partner language with the goal of fostering bilingualism and biliteracy for all children, one of the most important aspects lays in its ability to combat the pervasive segregation of English learners on the basis of English proficiency which has historically plagued the education of Latinx youth with inferior schooling conditions and lack of opportunities. Furthermore, DLE brings teachers', parents', and school leaders' attention to linguistic and cultural diversity and to support

intergroup relationships by breaking down stereotypes and promoting positive attitudes toward minoritized languages and their speakers (de Jong & Howard, 2009; Palmer, 2010; Potowski, 2007). Gándara and Orfield (2012) attribute the assumption of successful integration in DLE to Gordon Allport (1958) and Elizabeth Cohen's (1995, with Lotan) empirical and theoretical work, which postulate that "children will learn to respect each other if they are exposed to learning situations in which they have sustained contact of a basically positive nature and their social status is equalized" (Gándara & Orfield, 2012, p.21). The premise of equalized status, to which I will return later, is not a given and deserves further consideration. Suffice it to say for now that while the inferior conditions of schooling for LM students and students of color generated by segregation was a fundamental concern during the Civil Rights Movement, equity is not simply achieved merely by integrating students and providing them with the same teachers, schools, resources, academic expectations, and curriculum, while linguistic access, benefits and advantages as well as power and status remain unbalanced. de Jong and Howard (2009) then remind us that "the successful outcomes of integration in [DLE] programmes are by no means guaranteed, and that the subject warrants closer examination in order to avoid inequities in instructional practices and programme outcomes" (p.82).

### ***3. Promoting additive bilingualism***

Dual language programs specifically support bilingualism and biliteracy rather than aiming to push LM students into mainstream English instruction as soon as possible (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). Therefore, they offer instruction in the home language for at least five years. The equity rationale is that ELs do not have to sacrifice their opportunity to learn cognitively demanding academic material due to lack of English proficiency because they can access challenging material in their home language. This approach is based on research that links

additive programs to bilingual proficiency and content area achievement (e.g., Genesee et al., 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Steele, et al., 2017).

Simultaneously, DLE programs offer a context for more effective English acquisition process (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Quintanar-Sarellana, 2004) due to increased daily opportunities to interact with English speakers in authentic ways.

#### ***4. Equalizing the status of diverse students and fostering a healthy bilingual/bicultural identity***

The language-as-resource orientation and the integration of English speakers wishing to learn Spanish in DLE aims to send a message to Spanish speaking students that they possess important linguistic knowledge that is desirable to others and of which they should feel proud to continue to develop. The DLE context is also supposed to offer ELs an advantageous position during Spanish instruction. It then follows that if the status of the minoritized language is raised, and its speakers are positioned as language experts, their status will be elevated too, and this may not only counter deficit thinking about ELs, but may also foster confidence in their potential as bilinguals and as equal to their English-speaking peers – after all, all the students in the classroom are language learners. For these reasons, DLE programs are believed to promote ethnic pride, a strong sense of bicultural and academic identities, and a higher self-esteem among Latinx students (de Jong & Bearse, 2011; Izquierdo, 2011; Palmer, 2009; Potowski, 2007).

#### ***5. Promoting higher levels of family and community engagement in the education of their children from minoritized groups.***

The long-term nature of bilingual instruction in DLE offers the possibilities for families to develop greater positive engagement among LM families, not only because parents can access bilingual teachers who can better relate to the minoritized cultures represented in their classrooms throughout their children's participation in the program, but also because dual

language schools seek to establish an environment that reflects a value on bilingualism and inclusion by providing resources, activities, and a welcoming atmosphere for all families (Thomas & Collier, 2002).

### **Challenges to Social Justice and Equity in DLE**

A growing body of work has documented the pervasive challenges of power and status that remain in DLE (see Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, Palmer, Heiman, Schwerdtfeger & Choi, 2017 for a recent review) despite its equity goals, revealing DLE programs' difficulties to truly equalize the status of English speakers and LM students. Evidence of persistent inequities behooves us to reconsider the extent to which a social justice agenda can be realistically followed when hegemonic Whiteness and neoliberal ideologies remain foundational to DLE. For example, besides the theoretically and empirically found benefits of integration previously discussed, there is an underlying assumption that through cross-cultural interaction, students from minoritized groups will acquire the cultural capital of the dominant group – that is, the aspirations, attitudes, and ways of being and speaking of the powerful. Such assumption implicitly positions the dominant culture as the norm and as the standard measure of worthiness, which is reinscribed and perpetuated in the classroom by curriculum, assessment, language practices, and interactions as well as by policies, decision making, and cultural practices at the school community levels. Below I describe some of the ways in which hegemonic Whiteness and neoliberal ideologies structure inequities for LM students and communities in DLE.

### **Hegemonic Whiteness as the Corner Stone of DLE**

Situating its origins within the rise of nation-states and colonization, the spread of global capitalism, and the discursive production of a hegemonic White subject in the construction of the racialized Others, Flores (2016) defines hegemonic Whiteness as the representation "of the idealized White subject—what the ideal White person should be and act like in terms of his or her look, demeanor, sexual behaviors, gender identity, language practices, and so on" (p.3). Such an inherently white supremacist and settler colonialist notion of the idealized subject constitutes the normative frame of reference to which all subjects should aspire, all while perpetually positioning the racialized Other in direct opposition. Flores (2016) posits that in a society with hierarchies structured by hegemonic Whiteness, the language-as-resource orientation and the idea of "bilingualism for all" that are foundational to DLE, are likely to benefit those who most closely fit this normative frame—namely, White affluent families. There are two salient ways in which hegemonic Whiteness materializes in DLE: linguistic domination and interest convergence.

### *Hegemonic Whiteness through linguistic domination*

Despite the framing of DLE as language maintenance programs for LM students, English hegemony and the devaluation of LM students' linguistic practices is perhaps the most obvious example of hegemonic Whiteness. Standardized English almost always receives priority in accountability measures (Fitts, 2006; Freeman, 2000; McCollum, 1999; Warhol & Mayer, 2012), toward course credit (Freeman, 2000) or toward the purchasing of resources (López & Fránquiz, 2009), and therefore, instruction in the partner language is often significantly reduced (Bears & de Jong, 2008; Freeman, 2000; Palmer, Henderson, Wall, Zúñiga, & Berthelsen, 2015; Torres-Guzmán, Kleyn, Morales- Rodríguez, & Han, 2005; Warhol & Mayer, 2012) particularly as

students move up in grades (Bears & de Jong, 2008). English also tends to be the language that dominates in the wider school community such as by teachers of special subjects, librarians, or administrators (Fitts, 2006; Palmer, 2009), making English a non-negotiable language and suggesting that while English speakers' bilingualism is to be celebrated as an exceptional accomplishment, bilingualism for LM students is to be anticipated (Valdés, 1997; Muro, 2016).

It is important to note that it is hegemonic Whiteness, and not solely English that structures linguistic hierarchies. Even when increased, the use of Spanish is not enough to equalize the status of the languages and their speakers as in many cases, only the standardized variety of Spanish (another face of hegemonic Whiteness) is valued and the authentic language practices of working-class, simultaneous Latinx dual-language learners are still implicitly framed as deficient (Fitts, 2006; García-Mateus, 2016; McCollum, 1999). Such emphasis on the standardized variety also has implications for black students who may speak Ebonics. In this way, the home language is again positioned as a source of shame, further perpetuating (White) standardized English hegemony.

There is then no surprise that as time goes by, LM students tend to use and favor English in social interactions with peers (Delgado-Larocco, 1998; de Palma, 2010; Lucero, 2015; McCollum, 1999; Palmer, 2007; Potowsky, 2007) as well as for academic purposes (Palmer, 2009). Hegemonic whiteness through the dominance of standardized English as the the most valuable form of academic and social language, can be detrimental for Latinx students (de Jong & Howard, 2009), and its impact has been captured by ethnographic and qualitative studies revealing LM students' decreased confidence in their Spanish proficiency, and the internalization of English as a marker of success and higher social status (Dorner, 2010; Freeman, 2000; McCollum, 1999).

Inequities also occur as the pervasive dominance of English gives greater opportunities to anglophones to demand attention to their needs, assert authority, and dominate classroom discourse, while silencing and marginalizing LM students even in the bilingual classroom (Amerein & Peña, 2000; Palmer, 2008; 2009). In turn, such attitudes can influence teachers' perceptions and expectations, positioning English speakers as more participative and thus as more invested, more confident, more academically competent, and even more bilingually proficient (Cervantes-Soon & Turner, 2017; García-Mateus, 2016; Henderson, 2018; Pimentel, et al., 2006). In this way, deficit thinking about LM students is reproduced to the detriment of their academic identities (Palmer, 2008) and to their opportunities to access rigorous and additive bilingual instruction (Henderson, 2018).

The inability to elevate the status of LM students poses important challenges to the potential benefits of integration, hindering the possibilities for fruitful cross-cultural relationships. Amerein & Peña's (2000) qualitative study of a DLE program developed in Phoenix, AZ to promote social justice revealed that bringing two linguistic groups together in the classroom did not alter social hierarchies, but rather resulted in the students' voluntary separation into language cliques along racial/ethnic and class lines. Students who could serve as language brokers tended to form their own elite group based on their high bilingual/biliterate proficiency, and preferred to join English monolingual groups than interact with monolingual Spanish speakers. The researchers concluded that in agreement with Peña's (1997) research on cultural differences, "success in school came more readily for those willing to understate, separate from or deny their Mexican culture" (p. 1997, p.13).

### *Hegemonic whiteness through interest convergence and symbolic integration*

The theory of interest convergence posits that policy changes for racial integration and equity are not motivated by moral obligations, but by the degree to which the dominant group perceives that such policies will benefit them (Bell, 1980). Through this lens, integration in DLE offers LM students access to additive bilingual education, but only insofar as it advances the interests of the white middle-class-community (Palmer, 2010). This leaves DLE in a difficult position to pursue social justice and address inequities, as the interests of the dominant group are prioritized in order to maintain the viability of the program. For example, the DL program in Paciotto and Delany-Barmann (2011) reduced the amount of Spanish used to appease English families' ambivalences and fears, resulting in even less access to Spanish instruction for LM students than what they formerly had in their transitional bilingual program.

With interest convergence as the point of departure for the establishment of new DLE programs, even when communities are consulted, the voices most likely to receive attention and the needs and interests to take priority are those of the middle-class white community (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Dorner, 2011b; Paciotto & Delany-Barmann, 2011; López, 2013; Peña, 1997). For example, Gerena's qualitative (2011) study of a DLE program established in an urban community of Southern California to intentionally promote equity, showed that after two years, even when anglophone parents had developed more positive attitudes and empathy toward Latinx parents and students, little was done to address the needs of the LM community – such as providing bilingual office staff. In this case, Latinx parents had to organize and campaign to promote the program among English-speaking families, while simultaneously advocating at the school district level for more support for their needs. Dorner (2011b) found that in the public debates about the development of a DLE program in the Midwest, not only did English-speaking parents' voices dominate, but the districts' final decisions ultimately privileged the desires of the

white dominant group over those of the immigrant communities. Even when administrators may deliberately work against the domination of white parents, Burns (2017) found that structural factors like lack of funding create the conditions that perpetuate white parents' influence.

The ways in which LM communities are disadvantaged within the interest convergence dynamic has also been evident in the inequitable ways in which districts promote and offer information to parents about the DLE program (Dorner, 2011a) and in recruitment and enrollment processes. Palmer's (2010) study of a magnet DLE strand found that both blacks and Latinxs in the surrounding neighborhood had serious difficulties gaining admission to the program due to sanctioned admissions and administrative policies as well as to color-blind racism which created the conditions for internal school segregation. Therefore, despite the school's almost evenly split student body between African Americans, Latinxs, and whites, the DLE English-speaking population was almost entirely white. In other cases, promoting DL programs as "enrichment" to gain acceptance by families from the dominant group may generate an "elite connotation," often attracting and selecting top-scoring or "gifted" and economically more affluent English-speaking children and positioning LM students at a disadvantage (Pimentel, et al., 2006), excluding them from rigorous and additive bilingual instruction (Henderson, 2018), and undermining Spanish-speaking parents' views of the program to build their children's Mexican roots in the development of personal and academic identities (López, 2013).

In sum, the different faces of hegemonic Whiteness in DLE pose difficulties for social justice agendas, which manifest in the classroom through social interactions and through the sanctioned whitestream and hidden curricula, as well as by the voices that are privileged to shape policies and practices. Countering hegemonic Whiteness risks the very possibility of DLE

programs because it is the underlying ideology used to draw support. It can then be deduced that to foreground social justice goals, the underlying orientations will have to be altered and sources of support and sustenance reimagined.

### **Contexts of Exacerbated Inequity and Erased Communities**

Three specific contexts where DLE is being increasingly embraced grant further consideration because of the stark power asymmetries between linguistic groups. These contexts include: a) historically segregated communities in paths of gentrification, b) regions with a relatively recent surge in the Latinx population but without a long-standing presence of bilingual education, and c) places with restrictive language policies. While some communities may fall in more than one of these categories, it is important to recognize how these contexts exacerbate challenges to social justice and equity, as well as to locate possibilities for agency.

Recent research has offered insight about ways in which gentrification processes and DLE merge (Chaparro, 2017; Flores & Chaparro, 2017; García-Mateus, 2016; Heiman, 2017; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Muro, 2016). In these contexts, the participation of white affluent families may be discursively framed as the way to save "failing" schools characterized by pervasive segregation, and increasing Latinx population, and declining test scores, (Pearson, Wolgemuth, & Colomer, 2015). Meanwhile DLE programs fit the 'choice' discourse alongside vouchers and charter schools, and are a way to rebrand schools as urban amenities (Cucchiara, 2013). Because stark socioeconomic disparities are almost always present in these settings, vulnerabilities to hegemonic Whiteness are exacerbated. For example, Muro's (2016) study of the parental involvement at a DLE school in Los Angeles shed light on how social inequalities in the larger society were reproduced in the school, with white affluent parents leading the PTA and

organizing events, while Latina immigrant mothers prepared and served food. A white parent even expressed appreciation of the DL program because it would prepare their child to communicate in the future with his workers. And while white affluent parents viewed socioeconomic diversity as fun, Latina mothers actually expressed apprehension about how their lack of resources limited their children. The danger then lies with confusing symbolic integration -- that is, the friendly and polite interactions that remain superficial and render power asymmetries unaltered if not intensified (Muro, 2016), with the actual establishment of meaningful and transformative cross-cultural relationships.

Regions with a relatively recent surge in the Latinx population, but without a long-standing presence of bilingual education, like the U.S. South, the Midwest, and in states like Utah where DLE has boomed pose similar risks (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Freire, Valdez, & Delavan; 2017). Some of the additional challenges include the lack of locally grown Latinx bilingual teachers with the necessary sensitivity to issues of power and race/class tensions, as well as the states' lack of experience in general with cultural and linguistic diversity outside of the black/white binary and with bilingual education. Most concerning is the intentional positioning of English speakers as the main beneficiaries of DLE (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Freire, Valdez & Delavan, 2017). Because many of the DLE programs in these settings are created under the umbrella of world language education, equity and social justice goals can be easily relegated to the margins. Thus, for example in North Carolina, one-way DL programs, which often explicitly exclude English learners, are the most popular model. In contrast, developmental bilingual education is typically discouraged and almost non-existent. This phenomenon is the materialization of what Valdez, Freire, and Delavan (2016) have referred to as the gentrification

of DLE, in which LM students are actually pushed out of the program while the participation of English speakers in bilingual education expands.

This is also the case in DLE programs operating under restrictive language policies. Although California and Massachusetts have recently seen a reversal in these policies, Arizona remains largely an English-only state for LM students despite the growing number of DLE programs. While severely constricting, the law does not ban bilingual education completely, but the ways in which State education officials interpret its waiver system has gradually increased restrictions and systematically excluded the English learners who would benefit most from DLE (Combs, Evans, Fletcher, Parra & Jiménez, 2005). In this case, DLE may more closely resemble one-way programs that at best admit only LM students who have acquired “a working level” of English. Even the introduction of bill SB 1242 to expand bilingual education excludes English learners and rather emphasizes economic benefits and national security – proof of the interest convergence and neoliberal logic at work (Kelly, 2018). As such, DLE within the implementation of restrictive language policies contributes to the continuous segregation of LM students (Gándara & Orfield, 2012; Lillie, Markos, Arias, & Wiley, 2011). Studies have shown that there is space for strategic agency to negotiate these spaces and increase access from LM students to DLE (e.g. Jimenez-Silva, Garvey, & Gomez, 2015; Newcomer & Puzio, 2016), yet the general lack of a clear understanding of the law and support from those implementing the program tend to hinder logistical possibilities to equalize access (Gomez Gonzalez, 2016) effectively erasing a large population of Latinx English learners in DLE. Simultaneously, the lack of teacher input into state policymaking restricts their agency and creates ambivalence about their beliefs and abilities on how best to advocate for LM students (Morehouse, 2017).

In addition to the erasure of Latinx English learners from many DLE programs, Black students and Indigenous students from Mexico and other parts of Latin America tend to be made invisible in dominant conceptions of DLE. As is the case with many Chicanx students and other Latinxs who are simultaneous bilinguals and thus do not fit the "native English speaker" or "native Spanish speaker" boxes, these two groups often present linguistic variations from English and Spanish respectively that tend to be either ignored or perceived as unfit for DLE programs. In addition, their cultural heritage, histories and values tend to be ignored or minimized in whitestream curriculum. The presence of these students complicates notions of cross-cultural awareness and social justice, particularly when color-blindness (Palmer, 2010) and notions of "we are all bilingual" in DLE serve to conceal or undermine the institutional racism and settler colonialist privilege that persists in U.S. society and schools. Erasing these students from DLE discourse perpetuates unequal treatment and expectations based on racial stereotypes, as well as the tacit anti-blackness and anti-indigenous attitudes that are deeply rooted in Latin America and that often extend to the U.S. Latinx community.

Native students from Mexico and Latin America are a growing population in the United States. The passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994 had a significant negative impact on the Indigenous and rural populations in Mexico, forcing thousands out of their lands (Popke, 2011), and changing the profile of Mexican migration to the United States. In the U.S. South, for example, Mexican immigrants in the past few decades have come from areas that were not previously involved in waves of migration, such as Southern and Southeastern Mexico, and who are also Indigenous, poorer, and with lower levels of formal education (Perreira, 2011). This population tends to be ignored in U.S. society and schools (Machado-Casas, 2009; Martínez, 2017; Urrieta, 2013). By categorizing them as "Latinos" their indigeneity

is erased, and their cultural and linguistic backgrounds positioned in ambivalent ways in DLE, where their linguistic repertoire is at best only partially supported (Martínez, 2017) and at worse stigmatized.

Similarly, there has been as serious lack of attention to black students in DLE (Valdés, 2002). The fact that English speakers are almost always assumed to be white and that there is little information about black students' experiences and linguistic trajectories in DLE literature serve to erase these students from conceptions of DLE, academic outcome reports, the preparation of bilingual teachers, and curriculum and instruction design (Valdés, 2002). Considering the historical exclusion of African-Americans from foreign language education in the U.S. (Hubbard, 1980), deficit views about their everyday language practices (Kubota, Austin, & Saito-Abbott, 2003; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009), and the interest convergence that guides the establishment and implementation of DLE, equity for this student population should be of great concern among DLE advocates. For example, the tendency to establish DLE programs in areas that mostly benefit white-middle class families, to disseminate information, and create enrollment procedures (Dorner, 2011) that disadvantage low SES families of color, there is a danger of excluding low SES black students from DLE altogether and further segregating school communities along racial and linguistic lines, as demonstrated in Palmer's 2010 and Scanlan and Palmer (2009)'s studies.

While Nicoladis, Taylor, Lambert and Cazabon, (1998) have noted the possibility of Spanish acquisition to serve as an equalizer between black and white English speakers, emphasis on a perceived need of English literacy remediation can hamper black children's access to Spanish literacy instruction (Wiese, 2004). Krause (1999) also found higher attrition rates in DL among African American students and lower literacy levels in a program that explicitly

attempted to include African American heritage in the curriculum, suggest that literacy achievement issues might have been caused by linguistic differences. Parchia's (2000) study of African American families in a DLE noted that despite an overall satisfaction with the program due to positive relationships with peers, a less segregated environment, and academic qualities, black parents still lamented a lack of culturally relevant curriculum for their children, even when multiculturalism was one of the program's stated goals. They were concerned that the school gave priority to Latino culture and academic needs more than to their own.

Furthermore, despite the fact that low SES Latinx and African American students often share neighborhoods and schools and are forced to compete for the same scant resources, researchers and practitioners have avoided unpacking the tensions that can emerge between Latinx immigrants and African American students in low SES schools (Valdés, 2002), as well as between teachers and students. As an exception, Bender's (2000) study examined teachers' attitudes toward language use and intergroup relations in a DL program serving low-income students who were entirely African American or Puerto Rican speakers of nonstandard varieties of English and/or Spanish. Her study sheds light on the detrimental role of teachers' deficit views about students from minoritized groups, as well as lack of preparation and understanding of content-based language learning and pedagogy. In this regard, the question of whether DLE can serve the needs and deliver the promise of multi/bilingualism, high academic achievement, and cross-cultural understanding to at least two different linguistic groups who have been subjected to educational malpractice for generations has yet to be fully explored (Valdés, 2002), and will continue to be unless there is a fundamental shift in conceptions of who these programs should be designed to serve.

### **Implications for Research in DLE**

Needless to say, in light of the research here presented, measuring achievement outcomes through standardized assessments is not enough to recognize inequities in DLE. Before envisioning changes of practice, we must assess the kind of research and questions that have been guiding the implementation and promotion of DLE. Much of the scholarly support for DLE is based on quantitative studies that report students' performance on academic and linguistic assessments that reflect and reinforce the very ideologies and structures of power previously discussed. This is understandable given that the larger discourses around education policy and funding competitions primarily revolve around measurable outcomes, which are always in reference to the hegemonic Whiteness norm (Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2017). While such outcomes have been generally positive in DLE, these kinds of studies are unable to shed insight on important nuances that shape the complex experiences of LM students and other marginalized communities in these programs because they conceal the day to day social interactions and power dynamics that these students confront and that are subject to fluctuations and continuous negotiations. In other words, these studies do not ask the questions nor employ the necessary approaches that would reveal issues of inequity or ways to advance social justice goals. For example, across the fields of language education, researchers compare groups, based on binary categorizations of English/Spanish speakers, language majority/minority groups, or L1/L2, even when remarks about the unsuitability of such terms to account for individuals' complex sociolinguistic realities (Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2017; Cook, 2002; de Jong, 2016; Hopewell & Escamilla, 2014). Such studies then erase the complex experiences and negotiated movements of those who do not fit neatly into these categories. Comparisons in cross-sectional models also often neglect selection bias (Steele, Slater, Li, Zamarro, & Miller, 2013), and large-scale experimental studies aiming to prove causation tend to be done in relatively well-implemented

programs that obscure the very challenges of those that divert from such frames and that are perhaps more common than we may anticipate.

This is not to say that outcomes-based quantitative analyses are not useful in other ways, and that naturalistic research approaches do not exist -- much of the evidence used in this report to illustrate the presence of inequities in DL is based on such work. Yet the latter are rarely used to guide the establishment or design of programs.

Another example of the ways in which such outcomes-based studies dominate the field of DLE and obscure inequities is the lack of research attention to the third goal of developing sociocultural or cross-cultural awareness in DL. In part this has to do with the complexity of this area and the continuous evolution of how these concepts are defined in the field. Nonetheless, lack of attention to this goal relative to achievement and biliteracy also reveals its lack of priority in the literature and program development. In particular, Reyes and Vallone (2007) point to identity construction as a fundamental aspect of the cross-cultural goal in DLE, and this in the context of power relations. They also lament the unfortunate lack of research in this area, considering its relevance to students from minoritized groups and its potential impact on students from the dominant group.

Finally, whatever approach to research is used, there is a need for an intersectional lens all while maintaining the centrality of race and coloniality as necessary frameworks for analysis in DLE. Some studies have revealed how factors beyond language, and traditional conceptions of ethnicity, such as social-class, gender, and immigration/citizenship status and multiracial/ethnic identities, also play a role in the reproduction and complex configuration of power asymmetries (e.g. Chaparro, 2017; García-Mateus, 2016; Flores & Chaparro, 2017). Along these lines, further research is also necessary in DLE contexts where all participants are members of minoritized

groups, such as those that integrate entirely black and Latinx children, as well as those that integrate English and Spanish speaking Latinx children (and a range of language proficiencies in between), such as those in U.S.-Mexico border communities, which tend to be excluded from language immersion research that centers the English speaker as the target learner, and which is increasingly shaping conceptions of DLE.

### **Implications for Forging a Social Justice Path in DLE**

Attempting to fix programmatic issues and idiosyncrasies without altering the very foundation of hegemonic Whiteness and neoliberalism undergirding these programs -- that is the vision and theoretical framing of bilingual education -- is likely to yield little results. At the same time, in recognizing that these ideologies are unlikely to be eradicated in society at large in the near future, and that they will continue to frame the prospects for youth and families from marginalized communities, DLE programs are still responsible for serving students from minoritized groups in ways that will support their academic and economic advancement, promote their dignity, give them the tools to navigate current power structures, and foster empowered identities as agents of change. That is, changes for social justice in DLE should encompass considerations of current realities, while striving to transform them. This is indeed a formidable challenge that will require great caution, new approaches to research, ongoing collaborative efforts, and the boldness to engage in continuous reflection, self-critique, and willingness to change the course of action. Some of these efforts are already underway, and I present here recommendations from some of this work in hopes to elicit further dialogue to reimagine the possibilities in DLE without losing sight of the historical, ideological, discursive, theoretical, and empirical background I have provided.

Colleagues and I have proposed the addition of *critical consciousness* as the fourth pillar in the conceptualization of DLE (Cervantes-Soon, et al., 2017; Heiman & Yanes, 2018; Palmer, Cervantes-Soon, Heiman & Dorner, forthcoming). We draw from critical theory and critical pedagogies to define critical consciousness as the process of overcoming pervasive myths through a deep understanding of the role of power in the formation of oppressive conditions (P. Freire, 2007). The addition of critical consciousness as a fourth pillar in DLE implies that all stakeholders, including teachers, parents, administrators, and children are responsible for engaging in the growing awareness of the structural oppression in society and a readiness to take action to correct it. It also involves specific elements, such as interrogating power, critical listening, historicizing schools and communities, and embracing discomfort (Palmer, et al., forthcoming). We posit that the centering of critical consciousness has the potential to radicalize all other pillars, bringing attention through each one of them to issues of equity, status, and power in the policies and decision making, the curriculum and pedagogies, and all the interactions that occur in all contexts of the program. For example, in connection with Reyes and Vallones (2007) conceptualization of identity exploration as essential in the development of cross-cultural competences, a focus on critical consciousness may help avoid essentialist impositions of ethnic identity, superficial parallels between students from different groups, and an overemphasis on self-esteem, which may unintendedly situate identity as a psychological phenomenon separate from the larger social structures of power. Instead deep critical consciousness work would promote an understanding of self as part of a larger historical, economic, political, and racialized project, allowing individuals to for example recognize white privilege or reflect on their position in settler colonialism, and about the meanings of these social locations in the day to day life. With such understandings, cross-cultural dialogue about

possibilities to engage in transformative work would take deeper meaning, more conducive to blurring boundaries between communities (Dorner, 2017) without easily falling into cultural appropriation. While research is necessary to determine how to do this in age appropriate ways with children, such work is only becoming more urgent in today's era of growing hostility against immigrants and violence against black and brown bodies, and it can certainly begin with the adults in the program.

Based on the material turn in the field of applied linguistics which seeks to bring attention to the links between language and the political and economic conditions of colonialism and global capitalism/neoliberalism (Pennycook, 2015), Flores and Chaparro (2017) argue for a new materialist anti-racist paradigm in language policy activism. This approach would demand explicit connections between language education and other efforts that seek to address societal inequities caused by multiple factors, such as poverty, racism, and xenophobia. To illustrate this point, this kind of activism would involve, for example, enacting bilingual education programs in affluent and gentrifying neighborhoods as part of a number of initiatives with the larger goal of creating economic integration, such as the development of affordable housing in the surrounding neighborhoods. Such efforts are already taking place in some communities. For example, Beloved Community, a grassroots organization in St. Louis Missouri that started a dual language program, works exclusively on comprehensive, sustainable solutions for economic equity, sustainability, and equitable population distribution through strategies that focus on building equity in schools, at work, and at home.

Finally, efforts to undo colonialist and neoliberal orientations in DLE necessitates new radical theoretical visions and epistemic sources for the curriculum and pedagogical practices, particularly in the preparation of bilingual teachers. Such visions must expose not only the very

colonial legacies that continue to shape power configurations and material realities, and which make hegemonic Whiteness so pervasive. This shift should draw from and build the imaginaries, ingenuity, and epistemic resources of the very communities that have been excluded in conceptions of valid knowledge. For example, I have proposed elsewhere that using an anticolonial Xicana feminist framework in the preparation of Latinx bilingual teachers may help build such vision and path (Cervantes-Soon, 2018). And like the materialist approach to language policy activism proposed by Flores and Chaparro (2017), this vision should consider collective forms of agency by thoughtfully exploring potential connections to other anticolonial agendas and grassroots efforts in education, such as the recent movements for ethnic studies (e.g. Valenzuela, Zamora & Rubio, 2015).

These recommendations converge in the realization that conceiving DLE in purely linguistic and academic terms is not enough to address the pervasive marginalization of LM students and other youth of color. Ambitious visions and agendas that address the roots of and power asymmetries and the everyday realities that they generate are necessary to enact substantive change.

## References

- Allport, G. (1958). *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Amrein, A., & Peña, R. A. (2000). Asymmetry in dual language practice: Assessing imbalance in a program promoting equality. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 8.
- Bearse, C., & de Jong, E. J. (2008). Cultural and linguistic investment: Adolescents in a secondary two-way immersion program. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41, 325–340.
- Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest convergence principle. *Harvard Law Review*, 93, 518–533.
- Bender, L. A. (2000) *Language Planning and Language Policy in an Urban, Public School: The Interpretation and Implementation of a Dual Language Program*. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Burns, M. (2017). “Compromises that we make”: Whiteness in the dual language context. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(4), 339-352.
- Carrigo, D. (2000). *Just how much English are they using? Teacher and student language distribution patterns, between Spanish and English, in upper-grade, two-way immersion Spanish classes* (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the New Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37, 64–82.
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2018). Using a Xicana feminist framework in bilingual teacher preparation: Toward an anticolonial path. *The Urban Review*, 1-32. doi: 10.1007/s11256-018-0478-5

- Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education, 41*(1), 403-427.
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G., & Turner, A. M. (2017). Countering silence and reconstructing identities in a Spanish/English two-way immersion program: Latina mothers' pedagogies in El Nuevo Sur. In X. Rong, & J. Hilburn (Eds.), *Immigration and education in North Carolina: The challenges and responses in a new gateway state*. Boston, MA: Sense.
- Chaparro, S. (2017). Language and the gentrifying city: An ethnographic study of a two-way immersion program in an urban public school. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cohen, E. & Lotan, R. "Producing Equal-Status Interaction in the Heterogeneous Classroom." *American Educational Research Journal 32* (1995): 99–120.
- Combs, M. C., Evans, C., Fletcher, T., Parra, E., & Jiménez, A. (2005). Bilingualism for the children: Implementing a dual-language program in an English-only state. *Educational Policy, 19*(5), 701-728.
- Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cucchiara, M. (2013). *Marketing schools, marketing cities: Who wins and loses when schools become urban amenities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- de Jong, E. J. (2016). Two-way immersion for the next generation: Models, policies, and principles. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 10*, 6–16.

- de Jong, E. J., & Bearer, C. I. (2011). The same outcomes for all? High school students reflect on their two-way immersion program experiences. *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities*, 104-122.
- de Jong, E. J., & Howard, E. (2009). Integration in two-way immersion education: Equalising linguistic benefits for all students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12, 81–99.
- de Palma, R. (2010). *Language use in the two-way classroom: Lessons from a Spanish-English bilingual kindergarten*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Delgado-Larocco, E. L. (1998). *Classroom processes in a two-way immersion kindergarten classroom*. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Dorner, L. M. (2010). English and Spanish “para un futuro”—or just English? Immigrant family perspectives on two-way immersion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13, 303–323 doi:10.1080/13670050903229851
- Dorner, L. M. (2011a). US immigrants and two-way immersion policies: The mismatch between district designs and family experiences. In T. W. Fortune, D. Christian, & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 231–250). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Dorner, L. M. (2011b). Contested communities in a debate over dual language education: The import of “public” values on public policies. *Educational Policy*, 25, 577–613.
- Dorner, L. M., Crawford, E. R., Jennings, J., Sandoval, J. O., & Hager, E. (2017). I Think Immigrants “Kind of Fall Into Two Camps”: Boundary Work by US-Born Community Members in St. Louis, Missouri. *Educational Policy*, 31(6), 921-947.

- Edelsky, C. (1996). *With justice and literacy for all: Rethinking the social in language and education*. London, England: Taylor & Francis.
- Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30, 337–365.
- Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, 30, 13–38.
- Flores, N., & Chaparro, S. (2017). What counts as language education policy? Developing a materialist Anti-racist approach to language activism. *Language Policy*, 1-20.
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2017). A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 14-29.
- Freeman, R. D. (1995). Equal educational opportunity for language minority students: From policy to practice at Oyster Bilingual School. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 39–63.
- Freeman, R. D. (2000). Contextual challenges to dual-language education: A case study of a developing middle school program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 31, 202–229.
- Freire, P. (2007). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, J. A; Valdez, V. E., & Delavan, M. G. (2017). Language as whose resource?: When global economics usurp the local equity potentials of dual language education. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 11(2), 86-100.
- Gándara, P., & Orfield, G. (2012). Segregating Arizona's English Learners: A Return to the "Mexican Room"? *Teachers College Record*, 114(9)9, 1-27.
- García, O. (2014). US Spanish and education global and local intersections. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 58–80.

- García-Mateus, S. (2016). "She was born speaking English and Spanish!" Co-constructing identities and exploring children's bilingual language practices in a two-way immersion program in central Texas. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from Texas ScholarWorks.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerena, L. (2011). Parental voice and involvement in cultural context: Understanding rationales, values, and motivational constructs in a dual immersion setting. *Urban Education*, 46(3), 342-370.
- Gomez Gonzalez, L. M. (2016). *Dual Language Programs (DLPs): Questions of Access to DLPs in the State of Arizona*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Arizona State University Dissertation/Thesis Database.
- Grinberg, J., & Saavedra, R. (2000). The constitution of bilingual/ESL education as a disciplinary practice: Genealogical explorations. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 419-441.
- Hamayan, E. V., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction from A to Z : Practical guidance for teachers and administrators*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Heiman, D. (2017). Two-way immersion, gentrification, and critical pedagogy: Teaching against the neoliberal logic (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Texas ScholarWorks.
- Heiman, D., & Yanes, M. (2018). Centering the Fourth Pillar in Times of TWBE Gentrification: "Spanish, Love, Content, Not in That Order". *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 12(3), 173-187.

- Henderson, K. I. (2018). The danger of the dual-language enrichment narrative: Educator discourses constructing exclusionary participation structures in bilingual education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1-23.
- Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2014). Struggling reader or emerging biliterate student? Reevaluating the criteria for labeling emerging bilingual students as low achieving. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 46, 68–89.
- Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., & Rogers, D. (2018). Guiding principles for dual language education (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2003). *Trends in two-way immersion education: A review of the research*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.
- Hubbard, L. J. (1980). The minority student in foreign languages. *Modern Language Journal*, 64, 75–80.
- Izquierdo, E. (2011). Two way dual language education. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *Chicano school failure and success: Past, present, and future* (Third Edition) (pp. 160–172). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Jimenez-Silva, M., Garvy, M., & Gomez, L. (2015, April). *Supporting teachers of English learners through meaningful professional development: Teachers of language learners learning community (TL3C)*. Paper presented at meeting of the American Education Research Association. Chicago, IL.
- Kelly, L. B. (2018). Interest convergence and hegemony in dual language: Bilingual education, but for whom and why? *Language Policy*, 17(1), 1-21.

- Krause, E. M. (1999). Two-Way Bilingual Education: Analysis of an Inner-City Program. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Kubota, R., Austin, T., & Saito-Abbott, Y. (2003). Diversity and inclusion of sociopolitical issues in foreign language classrooms: An exploratory survey. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36, 12–24.
- Lillie, K., Markos, A. Estrella, A., Nguyen, T., Peer, K., Perez, K., . . . Wiley, T. (2010). *Policy in Practice: The Implementation of Structured English Immersion in Arizona*. Los Angeles: Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education* (Vol. 28). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Borsato, G. (2001). Impact of two-way bilingual elementary programs on students' attitudes toward school and college. Berkeley, CA: UC Berkeley Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2010). Alternative educational programs for English learners. In California Department of Education, *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches*, (pp. 323-367). Sacramento, CA: CDE Press.
- López, M. M. (2013). Mothers choose: Reasons for enrolling their children in a two-way immersion program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36, 208–227.
- López, M. M., & Fránquiz, M. E. (2009). “We teach reading this way because it is the model we’ve adopted”: Asymmetries in language and literacy policies in a Two-Way Immersion programme. *Research Papers in Education*, 24, 175–200.
- Lucero, A. (2015). Cross-linguistic lexical, grammatical, and discourse performance on oral narrative retells among young Spanish speakers. *Child Development*, 86, 1419–1433.

- Machado-Casas, M. (2009). The politics of organic phylogeny: The art of parenting and surviving as transnational multilingual Latino indigenous immigrants in the U.S. *The High School Journal*, 92(4), 82–99.
- Martínez, R. A. (2017). Dual language education and the erasure of Chicanx, Latinx, and indigenous Mexican children: A call to re-imagine (and imagine beyond) bilingualism. *Texas Education Review*, 5(1), 81-92.
- May, S. (2013). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McCollum, P. (1999). Learning to value English: Cultural capital in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 23, 113–134.
- Morehouse, D. (2017). *Teacher Perceptions of Dual-Immersion in Arizona's English-Only Language Environment*. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Muro, J. A. (2016). “Oil and water”? Latino-white relations and symbolic integration in a changing California. *Sociology of Race & Ethnicity*, 2.
- Newcomer, S. N., & Puzio, K. (2016). Cultivando confianza: A bilingual community of practice negotiates restrictive language policies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(4), 347-369.
- Nicoladis, E., Taylor, D., Lambert, W. & Cazabon, M. (1998) What two-way bilingual programmes reveal about the controversy surrounding race and intelligence. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 1(2):134–148.
- Ortega, L. (2014). *Understanding second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.

- Osborn, T. (2006). *Teaching world languages for social justice: A sourcebook of principles and practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Paciotto, C., & Delany-Barmann, G. (2011). Planning micro-level language education reform in new diaspora sites: Two-way immersion education in the rural Midwest. *Language Policy*, 10, 221–243.
- Palmer, D. (2007). A dual immersion strand programme in California: Carrying out the promise of dual language education in an English-dominant context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(6), 752-768.
- Palmer, D. (2008). Building and destroying students’ “academic identities:” The power of discourse in a two-way immersion classroom. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 21(6), 1–24.
- Palmer, D. (2009). Middle-class English speakers in a two-way immersion bilingual classroom: “Everybody should be listening to Jonathan right now . . .” *TESOL Quarterly*, 43, 177–202.
- Palmer, D. (2010). Race, power, and equity in a multiethnic urban elementary school with a dual-language “strand” program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 41, 94–114.
- Palmer, D., Cervantes-Soon, Heiman & Dorner (forthcoming). Bilingualism, Biliteracy, Biculturalism and Critical Consciousness for All: Proposing a Fourth Fundamental Goal for Two-Way Dual Language Education. *Theory into Practice*.
- Palmer, D., Henderson, K., Wall, D., Zúñiga, C. E., & Berthelsen, S. (2015). Team teaching among mixed messages: Implementing two-way dual language bilingual education at third grade in Texas. *Language Policy*, 15, 393–413.

- Parchia, C. T. (2000) Preparing for the Future: Experiences and Perceptions of African Americans in Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Pearson, T., Wolgemuth, J. R., & Colomer, S. E. (2015). Spiral of decline or “beacon of hope:” Stories of school choice in a dual language school. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1524/1559>
- Pennycook, A. (2015). Class is out: Erasing social class in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(2), 1–9.
- Peña, R. A. (1998). A case study of parental involvement in a conversion from transitional to dual language instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22, 237–259.
- Pérez, B. (2004). *Becoming biliterate: A study of two-way bilingual immersion education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Perreira, K. M. (2011). Mexican families in North Carolina: The socio-historical contexts of exit and settlement. *Southeastern Geographer*, 51(2), 260–286.
- Petrovic, J. E. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 4, 395–416.
- Pimentel, C., Diaz Soto, L., Pimentel, O., & Urrieta, L. (2008). The dual language dualism: ¿Quiénes ganan? *Texas Association for Bilingual Education Journal*, 10, 200–223.
- Pierce, M. S. (2000). Native/non-native speaker collaboration in a two-way bilingual education class. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Popke, J. (2011). Latino migration and neoliberalism in the U.S. South: Notes toward a rural cosmopolitanism. *Southeastern Geographer*, 51(2), 242–259.

- Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school* (Vol. 63). Multilingual Matters.
- Quintanar-Sarellana, R. (2004). ¡Si se puede! Academic excellence and bilingual competency in a K–8 two-way dual immersion program. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 3(2), 87–102.
- Reyes, S. A., & Vallone, T. L. (2007). Toward an expanded understanding of two-way bilingual immersion education: Constructing identity through a critical, additive bilingual/bicultural pedagogy. *Multicultural perspectives*, 9(3), 3-11.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the “language-as-resource” discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the USA. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 348–368.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 7, 15–34.
- San Miguel, G. (2004). *Contested policy: The rise and fall of federal bilingual education in the United States, 1960-2001*(Vol. 1). University of North Texas Press.
- Santa Ana, O. (2004). Chronology of events, court decisions, and legislation affecting language minority children in American public education. *Tongue-tied: The lives of multilingual children in public education*, 86-105.
- Scanlan, M., & Palmer, D. (2009). Race, power, and (in) equity within two-way immersion settings. *The Urban Review*, 41(5), 391.
- Steele, J. L., Slater, R., Li, J., Zamarro, G., & Miller, T. (2013, September). The effect of dual-language immersion on student achievement in math, science, and English language arts. Paper presented at the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness conference, Washington, DC.

- Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. (2017). Effects of dual-language immersion programs on student achievement: Evidence from lottery data. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*, 282-306.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E., Kleyn, T., Morales-Rodríguez, S., & Han, A. (2005). Self-designated dual-language programs: Is there a gap between labeling and implementation? *Bilingual Research Journal*, *29*, 453–474.
- Trujillo, A. L. (2014). *Chicano empowerment and bilingual education: Movimiento politics in Crystal City, Texas*. New York: Routledge.
- Urrieta, L. (2013). Familia and comunidad-based saberes: Learning in an Indigenous heritage community. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *44*(3), 320–335
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67*, 391–429.
- Valdés, G. (2002). Enlarging the pie: Another look at bilingualism and schooling in the US. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *155*(156), 187–195.
- Valdez, V. E., Delavan, G., & Freire, J. A. (2014). The marketing of dual language education policy in Utah print media. *Educational Policy*. Advance online publication.
- Valdez, V. E., Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2016). The gentrification of dual language education. *The Urban Review*, *48*(4), 601-627.

- Valenzuela, A., Zamora, E., & Rubio, B. (2015). Academia Cuauhtli and the Eagle:" Danza Mexica" and the Epistemology of the Circle. *Voices in Urban Education*, 41, 46-56
- Varghese, M. M., & Park, C. (2010). Going global: Can dual-language programs save bilingual education? *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 9, 72–80.
- Warhol, L., & Mayer, A. (2012). Misinterpreting school reform: The dissolution of a dual immersion bilingual program in an Urban New England elementary school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35, 145–163.
- Wiese, A.-M. (2004). Bilingualism and biliteracy for all? Unpacking two-way immersion at second grade. *Language and Education*, 18(1), 69–92.