



Editorial introduction: a historical overview of the expanding critique(s) of the gentrification of dual language bilingual education

Garrett M. Delavan¹ · Juan A. Freire² · Kate Menken³

Received: 31 May 2021 / Accepted: 15 July 2021 / Published online: 21 August 2021
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature B.V. 2021

Introduction

This special issue of *Language Policy* is focused on inequitable trends in dual language bilingual education (DLBE) through the metaphor of gentrification, referring to privileged new residents taking over an urban space. DLBE in the U.S. refers to any program that delivers content in English and another language for a significant period of time: usually 50–100% of the school day is provided in the language other than English for at least 5 years in the primary grades or at least one content-based course per year at the secondary level. The goal of such programs is to develop bilingualism and biliteracy rather than transition students to the dominant language as the sole avenue for academic thinking and lifelong learning.¹ DLBE programs tend to foster socio-cultural competence (or similar concepts), yet ideally they would aim to explicitly foster students' critical/sociopolitical consciousness of social injustices (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Freire, 2014, 2020) and ecological responsibility (Delavan, 2020).

The vast majority of multilingual learners (MLLs, often referred to as English learners) in U.S. schools today are enrolled in programs where English is the sole medium of instruction, in large part due to language education policies that restrict or have never actively supported the use of students' home languages in school (Baker & Wright, 2017; García, 2009). By contrast, DLBE is a form of bilingual education that has increased in recent years, even though DLBE programs by definition disrupt English-only language education policies in U.S. schools. In the

¹ Dual language bilingual education has different terminology in the literature and in schools, such as dual immersion, dual language, or immersion programs. We do not equate the term *dual* with the more precise terminology of *two-way* later explained.

✉ Juan A. Freire
freire@byu.edu

¹ Georgia State University, Atlanta, USA

² Brigham Young University, Provo, USA

³ Queens College & Graduate Center, CUNY, New York, USA

literature and the field, DLBE programs are generally grouped into four categories (see Baker & Wright, 2017; de Jong, 2011; García, 2009 for detailed definitions):

- Programs for language revitalization, often in indigenous communities experiencing language shift to English and called “heritage” programs,
- One-way developmental/maintenance bilingual education programs for actively multilingual communities,
- One-way immersion programs (sometimes called world or foreign language immersion) for English speakers with no familial or ethnic connection to the partner language (in many cases, these programs will admit students designated as English learners), and
- Two-way programs that seek to balance speakers of the partner language with students from families interested in the partner language for other reasons.

These definitions have usually focused on program configuration and intended beneficiaries. However, we agree with the critiques by Valdés (1997) as well as Palmer et al. (2019) that equity, racial justice, and social justice should be centered in these definitions as well as in the development, aims, and implementation of these programs. As we argue in this special issue, the inattention to these matters has led us to normalize DLBE gentrification in many areas of the U.S. today.

In a 2018 article in *Language Policy*, Flores and Chaparro (2018) made a powerful call to broaden “what counts as language education policy to include a focus on the broader racial and economic policies that impact the lives of language-minoritized communities” (p. 365). This argument, combined with Cooper’s (1989) guiding question for language policy research, “Who plans what for whom and how?” (p. 31), grounds this special issue of *Language Policy*, which examines how DLBE programs are undergoing *gentrification*—some form of pushing out marginalized students amid the influx of more privileged students and parents in ways that have not received explicit attention from educators or policymakers (Valdez et al., 2016b). This has occurred in spite of the fact that DLBE programs were originally developed to serve MLLs through developmental bilingual education. In 1997, Guadalupe Valdés published a prescient “cautionary note” alerting educators to this possibility in DLBE, and more recently—as her concerns came to fruition—scholars began identifying and addressing how privileged students and families have increasingly come to benefit from DLBE, often in inequitable ways. With Valdez et al.’s (2016b) article, “The Gentrification of Dual Language Education,” the field found a provocative name to refer to the increasing presence of privileged populations in bilingual education spaces in ways that are frequently to the detriment of minoritized language students, their families, and their communities. An increasing number of scholars have taken up this term in their work, and extended it beyond the two original forms of gentrification examined in two-way DLBE programs: (a) inequitable attention paid by educators to racial/ethnic/linguistic groups and (b) unfair exchange of linguistic resources between ethnoracial groups (Valdés, 1997).

We introduce this special issue of *Language Policy* by offering a unique chronological literature review of DLBE scholarship in the U.S. prior to and since the emergence of the gentrification critique. The first section seeks to explain what led

scholars and educators to place such high hopes on two-way DLBE as a catalyst for raising the legitimacy of bilingual education in general in the U.S. mainstream and as a promising means of increasing racial integration in U.S. public schools. The second section offers the field the first comprehensive review of the body of literature on the gentrification of U.S. DLBE, highlighting inequities that together make the hopes and assertions of the initial period seem overzealous or even naïve. The results of our review reveal that findings and critiques around gentrification-like processes—and the accompanying phenomenon of anti-gentrifying resistance—are not only growing in number but also varying much more widely in their focus, such as the foci of attention in the classroom, linguistic exchange, program access and demographics, curriculum and instruction, neighborhood change and parent politics, available program models, as well as ideologies and discourse in policy, promotion, and media coverage. What this two-part literature review offers the field, therefore, is a kind of crowd-sourced definition of DLBE gentrification and its subtypes that has emerged from empirical evidence and collaborative interchange among scholars.

The unresolved history of race and integration in DLBE: growth of DLBE prior to gentrification critiques

1960s: The civil rights origins of bilingual education and “compensatory” approaches

It is important to put into context the gentrification of DLBE programs observed in schools today by first describing how these programs emerged and became popular. Current bilingual education programs in U.S. schools have their origins in the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, as bilingual education was part of broader struggles by immigrant and migrant communities, particularly Latinxs, for racial and social justice. The federal Bilingual Education Act of 1968, which was the official concession to activism in New York City and Miami (Blanton, 2004), favored transitional bilingual education (TBE) over longer-term bilingual program models (García, 2009). TBE programs were designed for MLLs who speak the same home language to receive schooling in their home language and in English, with the amount of English increasing each year and the goal that students quickly transition (or assimilate) to English-medium general education classrooms within a few years (Baker & Wright, 2017; García, 2009). The resulting bias in the availability of federal funding led to TBE programs becoming the preferred approach in the years after the law was passed.

From the outset, tensions arose between bilingual education and approaches to achieving racial justice. When the Bilingual Education Act became law in 1968, school integration was also being fought for by activists as a central component of the Civil Rights movement in the wake of the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) decision, which ruled unanimously that racial segregation of children in U.S. public schools was unconstitutional. However, because TBE programs at the time served students from the same racialized group, particularly Latinxs, these programs were positioned at odds with school integration policies. “Since *Brown v. Board*

of *Education* (1954), unusual efforts have been made to promote pupil integration. A program of bilingual instruction, however, tends to isolate the target population in separate classes, thereby raising the spectre of ethnic segregation” (Shaw, 1975, p. 110). As Shaw explained, bilingual (TBE) programs were seen as segregated at a time when activists for the rights of minoritized groups were fighting for school integration (Contreras & Valverde, 1994; Moran, 1988; Roos, 1978; Teitelbaum & Hiller, 1977; *The University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 1979; Zirkel, 1977).

In addition to the segregation critique, bilingual education was also portrayed as remedial or compensatory (Del Valle, 1998; Flores & García, 2017; Foster, 1976; González, 1980; Lyons, 1990; Moran, 1988; Rivera, 1980; Zirkel, 1977). As Brisk (1998) wrote, “The prevailing approach that has guided language minority students’ education is compensatory, the principal goal of which is to teach students English as quickly as possible... Bilingualism is considered a problem and the source of linguistic and academic failure” (p. 13). When the Bilingual Education Act was passed into law, TBE programs were presented as a form of remedial education for immigrant students to learn English quickly, with the rationale that segregation could be addressed “by stressing the importance of transitioning” multilingual learners “quickly from their specialised programme into the mainstream classroom” (de Jong & Howard, 2009, p. 83).

1970s: DLBE as the proposed solution to segregation and compensatory bilingual education

Beginning in the late 1970s, DLBE began to be offered as a better solution to the problem of segregation and the perception of TBE programs as remedial (González, 1980). As Moran (1988) wrote about the 1978 amendments to the Bilingual Education Act: “To prevent unnecessary segregation, the Act explicitly permitted English-speaking children to participate in bilingual education classes” (p. 1290). Lyons (1990) elaborated upon how DLBE programs (also known as two-way programs) were promoted as a way to address these concerns:

Although initially conceived as an enrichment program, the 1968 federal Bilingual Education Act had been recast into a compensatory education program by the time it was signed into law. Federal civil rights policies respecting language-minority students reinforced the compensatory character of bilingual education in the 1970s by focusing on the so-called deficiencies of language-minority students... In 1984, Congress expanded the Bilingual Education Act to authorize developmental bilingual-education programs—integrated, two-way programs that help language-minority and English-language-background students achieve bilingualism in English and a second language. (p. 62)

In addition to addressing concerns about racial segregation in TBE programs, DLBE programs provided a developmental form of bilingual education that, due to the presence of English monolingual children in the classroom, could be positioned as enrichment education rather than remedial, compensatory, or deficiency focused (Rivera, 1980).

1980s into the 1990s: anti-bilingual education attacks and DLBE to the rescue

During the 1980s, bilingual education in the U.S. came under direct attack. In 1981, then U.S. Senator Hayakawa introduced the earliest constitutional amendment to make English the sole official language of the United States; in 1983, he founded a political advocacy group called U.S. English with the same aims (Baker, 1988). Similarly, then President Reagan spoke against bilingual education before the National League of Cities in 1981 (see Baker, 1988; Baker & Wright, 2017; Crawford, 2008; Moore, 2021; Padilla et al., 1991). While the compensatory, remedial portrayal of TBE programs had been a central argument to justify passage of the Bilingual Education Act, by the 1980s criticism of this approach grew and TBE programs were increasingly scrutinized.

Transitional bilingual education programs, which provide only a limited period of native-language instruction and do not ensure English mastery, prevent immigrant children from attaining academic fluency in either their native language or in English. (Spener, 1988, p. 133)

Del Valle (1998) suggested that the deficit-focused arguments for TBE and its reputation as a remedial program for immigrant students made bilingual education particularly vulnerable to attack.

In that time period, two-way DLBE programs offered the general public a more politically palatable form of bilingual education that had been rebranded as enrichment education due to the inclusion of White,² English monolinguals (rather than only immigrant or migrant MLLs), and its developmental approach with sustained bilingualism and biliteracy support over time (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Morison, 1990). “Dual language” had also been discursively distanced from bilingual education by altogether erasing the word “bilingual” from its label, thereby avoiding its political contentiousness (Flores & García, 2017; García et al., 2018) (note that it is for this reason that in this editorial we make a point to refer to the programs as dual language *bilingual* education, following García et al., 2018). García (1984) described how policies of the 1980s called for bringing bilingual education and foreign language education together as a direct policy response to anti-bilingual education backlash when it was offered for immigrant students alone. For scholars and practitioners, these rebranded programs seemed the perfect solution.

Concerned scholars and educators hoped that “dual language” would provide a way for bilingual education to survive the 1990s, as attacks intensified with the passage of anti-bilingual education ballot measures in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts (Baker & Wright, 2017; Menken, 2013). National enrollment of multilingual learners in bilingual education programs decreased from 59 to 37% between 1992 and 2002 (Zehler et al., 2003) during this restrictive period of U.S. language education policy. By contrast, Howard et al. (2003) reported that the number of DLBE programs actually increased from 30 documented programs in the mid-1980s to 266 in 2002. While the growth of DLBE during this time period was insufficient

² We capitalize all races to emphasize their inventedness (Appiah, 2020).

to curtail an overall loss of bilingual education programs nationally, any expansion was noteworthy during such restrictive times.

In 1985, the U.S. Department of Education funded the Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR), which had partnerships with universities and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) in Washington, DC. Because the federal government perceived potential effectiveness in two-way DLBE programs, one of the CLEAR tasks contracted by the federal government was to identify two-way DLBE programs to which they would research and provide technical assistance and startup support (Lindholm-Leary, 2015). CAL began a directory of foreign language immersion programs in 1981 (CAL, 2021), introducing additional DLBE directories and promoting DLBE in those early stages. These efforts supported DLBE expansion, especially two-way DLBE as a more politically feasible option.

Throughout this foundational period in the establishment of DLBE programs in the U.S., much scholarship was generated focused on sharing evidence of their effectiveness (Cazabon & Lambert, 1993; Christian, 1994, 1996; Collier, 1992; Collier & Thomas, 2004; Dolson & Mayer, 1992; Genesee, 1985; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Ramírez et al., 1991). The following offers one example:

Emerging results of studies of two-way bilingual programs point to their effectiveness in educating nonnative-English-speaking students, their promise of expanding our nation's language resources by conserving the native language skills of minority students and developing second language skills in English-speaking students, and their hope of improving relationships between majority and minority groups by enhancing cross-cultural understanding and appreciation. (Christian, 1994, p. 6)

Research evidence for the academic effectiveness of DLBE was robust by the end of the 1990s, and this line of scholarship continued through the next decade. For instance, Collier and Thomas (2004) described the “astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all” (p. 1). During this period, resource books and guidelines for program implementation also emerged (Cloud et al., 2000; Howard et al., 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2000, 2001). While scholars and language activists were placed on the defensive in their efforts to protect bilingual education from political attacks by English-only advocates, critiques of DLBE were not welcomed in the predominant scholarship of the time period.

Integration continued to be considered a key characteristic of DLBE, as evident in this quotation: “Contact between members of different groups leads to increased liking and respect for members of an outgroup, including presumable reductions in stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination” (Genesee & Gándara, 1999, p. 670). Many believed that placing diverse students together would automatically lead to improved intergroup relations. However, while the DLBE guidance publications offered detailed information about features and principles of program design such as curriculum, assessment, instruction, and program structure (Howard et al., 2007), issues of race and racism—including how to repair the harms of segregation, how to build authentic integration, and how to mitigate privilege in the classroom—were overlooked. We suggest here that the lack of resolution to the historical tensions between bilingual education and school integration and the corresponding

inattention to equity and racial justice within DLBE in its evolution have exacerbated the gentrification present in these programs today.

In the remainder of this introduction, we situate the articles in the special issue by offering a similar review of the scholarly critiques that emerged to address the enthusiasm for two-way DLBE as a purportedly simple and automatic solution to a highly segregated school system. The concept of gentrification-like processes has allowed the field to embrace and support the growth of DLBE while still keeping track of inequities that arise from its broadening profile of participation and suggesting ways of ameliorating them.

The evolution and expansion of gentrification critiques

In this section, we trace chronologically how DLBE gentrification critiques emerged and evolved, noting multiple sub-types of gentrification and how they have played out in different bilingual education contexts.

1990s

What we identify as the gentrification debate dates back to at least the 1990s. The 1980s and 1990s saw a significant increase in critical academic scholarship in general, as well as in the fields of education and applied linguistics in particular (Kubota & Miller, 2017). Valdés (1997) noted that by mid-decade several scholars were calling out the field of bilingual education (a) for its “non-confrontational attitude,” (b) for maintaining an “appearance of neutrality,” (c) for not “carrying out critiques of the educational system,” and (d) for ultimately being “neither progressive nor empowering” (p. 418). Valdés cited several earlier critical voices, such as Freeman (1996), whose research showed how the English language was privileged within DLBE programs in multiple ways, and language-majoritized (typically White) parents were not expected to find the needs of the Latinx community compelling.

Valdés (1997) is credited amongst scholars of DLBE gentrification with providing the first broad, cohesive critique of how the presence of privileged monolingual students in two-way programs might have inequitable outcomes; as such, her groundbreaking “cautionary note” has proven to be extremely influential today, as her concerns were prescient. That said, within a language policy context in which bilingual education advocates felt on the defensive and typically only lavished praise on DLBE, the original response to her manuscript “was decidedly negative,” as she received “angry letters and other personal communications” and her concerns were altogether dismissed (Valdés, 2018, p. 391). Valdés (1997) voiced radical concerns—rather than minor critiques amidst mostly rosy praise—about whether dual language bilingual programs would be able to fully achieve their promises for minoritized students. What follows are what we read as the key elements of her critique during that time period:

- DLBE was seen as “saving” bilingual education amidst the backlash of the 1980s and 1990s because “the presence of anglophone children will ensure community support” (p. 393).
- DLBE could “save” public schools from White flight, and even very young students with privilege were aware of their power to grant or withdraw this “savior” presence.
- White English-dominant students tended to get far more attention and praise from teachers, administrators, and journalists.
- The language exchange was unequal, with Spanish being given “away casually to the children of the powerful” who could then exploit bilingualism and racialized Spanish-speakers even more (p. 393).
- DLBE professionals with world/foreign language training prioritized “the instrumental value” of bilingualism for “business, politics, law, etc.” (p. 413).
- Educational equity in DLBE was being oversimplified to language development, while silencing other factors (p. 396).
- Only critical consciousness development among DLBE educators and students with “sensitivity to the realities of intergroup relations” could change this status quo (p. 419).

This list of critiques by Valdés (1997) set the stage for other scholars to continue to examine and theorize these processes with empirical evidence, and we suggest that gentrification is the metaphor that best groups them all together.

Soon afterward, Delgado-Larocco (1998) documented asymmetrical relationships between English-speaking and Spanish-speaking parents with children in a DLBE program. English-speaking parents were dominant, holding teachers accountable for their children’s Spanish learning. This pressure (a) had effects of utilizing Spanish-speaking students as service providers for English-speaking students’ language learning and (b) had discursive and instructional implications in the classroom, leading teachers to focus on English-dominant students as an imperative for the DLBE program. These conditions were evident in patterns of teachers’ instruction and classroom discourse that centered English-speaking students, while ignoring the needs of Latinx MLLs. We read this as evidence in support of what we term the **inequitable attention and exchange critique** laid out by Valdés (1997) as the central problem of two-way DLBE.

2000s

Three themes related to gentrification in two-way DLBE developed in scholarship from 2000 to 2010: inequity of educators’ attention, inequities of demographics and access, and a policy drift toward neoliberal discourse. Carrying forward Delgado-Larocco’s (1998) line of work, **inequities in educators’ attention** within two-way programs was a central gentrification theme during the 2000s, with more detailed empirical studies that found evidence to support the critique. For example, Amrein and Peña (2000) discussed a two-way DLBE program in Arizona that focused more on students who spoke English, whether bilingual or not, than students who spoke only Spanish, finding asymmetries in pedagogical practices, resources, and

materials. MLL students were not literally pushed out of programs, but subtle gentrification occurred as educators invested more in English-dominant students' success and marginalized the needs of MLLs. Amrein and Peña (2000) found voluntary segregation based on MLLs' language proficiency, as English speakers associated with English speakers, bilingual or not, while Spanish-speaking MLLs were marginalized by peers.

Lewis (2003) offered a further example of the inequitable attention and exchange critique by examining a DLBE school in California with a larger proportion of White Spanish learners than Spanish-speaking students. Lewis documented how White parents and students successfully garnered more educator attention in a program committed to the needs of marginalized students. Despite discussions of social justice and concerted efforts by school staff, including a faculty meeting focused on reading and discussing Valdés' (1997) cautionary note, White parents and middle class students continued to drive the overall curriculum and teaching practices. A critical mass of White, English-dominant children felt more entitled to advocate for their own needs and interests, their voices amplified by White parents who entered the school daily to advocate for their interests.

Palmer's (2004, 2009) research was central during this time period as she documented attention gentrification in two-way DLBE programs and shared evidence of English-privileged students from affluent families dominating classroom talk time and more frequently demanding teacher attention. Palmer (2009) called attention to the "important debate ... raging below the surface in U.S. bilingual education research and practice" and specifically asked: "What roles do English-dominant middle-class children play in bilingual classrooms?" (p. 179–180). She called urgently on DLBE educators to acknowledge and ameliorate this dynamic of discursive racial privilege.

Research by de Jong and Howard (2009) deepened this inequitable attention and exchange critique by explicitly examining whether racial integration was truly occurring in two-way DLBE, surveying empirical research to question the field's "implicit assertion that the linguistic benefits of student integration will extend equally and naturally to both languages and both language groups, especially when the groups involved come from distinct ethnic backgrounds" (p. 86). These authors noted that "the TWI [two-way immersion] integration literature" heavily emphasizes the availability of language models or language experts as the most salient advantage of integration but "assumes that majority and minority speakers will carry out the role of language expert equally" (p. 91). They explicitly put empirical research evidence behind Valdés' seminal arguments and concluded that in a naïve approach to two-way DLBE "duelling rather than mutually reinforcing agendas" will tend to emerge, and "it is the language minority student who will lose out, linguistically and academically" (p. 93).

A second theme during this decade was the emergence of a set of critiques of **inequitable program access and demographics**, including empirical evidence, during the culmination of the attack on bilingual education by the English-only movement. The passage of three major anti-bilingual education laws beginning in 1998 with Proposition 227 in California, followed by Arizona (Proposition 203 in 2000), and Massachusetts (Question 2 in 2002), had the overall effect of authorizing

and legitimating the survival of bilingual programs if they included White, English-privileged students. As a result, enrollment of MLLs in various forms of bilingual education plummeted while enrollment of initially monolingual English speakers increased (Linton & Franklin, 2010; Wentworth et al., 2010). These enrollment trends made many educators and scholars wary of the problematic depiction of DLBE as the hope for saving bilingual education that had been promulgated in the previous decades.

Palmer's (2010) case study of a school in California with a Spanish–English two-way DLBE strand program was typical, with its overrepresentation of White, middle-class students in DLBE while students in the English-only program were mainly Latinx and African-American. Extending beyond race and language, Scanlan and Palmer (2009) documented gentrification at two schools where special education students were systematically pushed out of the two-way strand into the mainstream program.

A third theme in this period was the concern of many scholars that **a rise in neoliberal discourse** was occurring in language education planning and policies (Darder, 2002; Heller, 2003; Macedo et al., 2003; Ricento, 2005). Petrovic (2005) specifically referred to the steady takeover of bilingual education by the two-way DLBE model and the problematic ways that neoliberal framing was embraced both by those who wanted to save it on behalf of minoritized language communities and those who wanted to spark interest among more privileged parents. In this early version of the **discursive gentrification critique**, he warned that the combination of neoliberal and uncritical perspectives on DLBE could encourage privileged families to use minoritized families as commodities, raw materials, or even “live specimens of the second language” (p. 406), thus uniting this intensified attention to the neoliberal discourses of language policy with the inequitable exchange critique. Building similarly on Valdés' (1997) cautionary note, Varghese and Park (2010) issued an additional warning on the pitfalls of framing and promoting DLBE based on a global and neoliberal agenda. These scholars acknowledged the economic benefits provided by DLBE that are wanted and needed for MLLs, yet they contended that courting neoliberalism can overshadow the civil rights and legal battles for MLLs. They argued that a neoliberal logic can ultimately benefit privileged students more than others and gentrify the equity interests of MLLs.

2010–2015

From 2010 through 2015, the gentrification phenomenon and conversation deepened beyond the problematics of two-way DLBE classrooms to include (a) a deeper critique of inequitable parent dynamics in DLBE programs, (b) a deeper critique of the tensions between the world language and bilingual education fields, and (c) analyses of the Utah Model. The advent of Utah's novel state-level policy between 2006 and 2008 to quickly roll out new DLBE programs—as well as many similar district-level initiatives across the country—prompted increased scholarly attention in the 2010s on whether language-minoritized students were benefiting from DLBE expansion and the rebranding of nearly all programs away

from the term “bilingual” and toward the term “dual” (García & Kleifgen, 2010), as an aspect of discursive gentrification.

Dorner (2011) and Shannon (2011) widened the critique of two-way DLBE programs to study how parents and administrators interacted to reproduce inequities of attention and access based partly on the discursive framing they gave to DLBE. Dorner (2011) illustrated how English-privileged parents dominated a debate over the implementation of a new DLBE program in which the voices of immigrant parents were largely absent. Similarly, Shannon (2011) found two main groups of parents—the English dominant and the Spanish dominant (mostly immigrants)—with “converging and diverging interests,” but with different levels of power to sway administrators (p. 90). The critical incident at the heart of the analysis occurred when a White mother humiliated a Latina bilingual co-chair of the PTA for not being familiar with or following Robert’s Rules of Order. Tensions arose among parents after the incident, which the principal largely evaded, and the following year the principal refueled the tension and division “by targeting Latino parents and their sympathizers on her staff” (p. 95), and accusing a Latina first-grade teacher of not paying equal attention to White students in her classroom.

Meanwhile, Delavan and Freire (2010) presented their initial findings from a study of the Utah Model on the program types and demographics of schools where new DLBE programs were rapidly emerging. They termed the rapid growth of new programs in the U.S. “the DL boom,” answering the question “for whom is this boom?” with descriptive statistics of a rapidly decreasing share of participation in Utah DLBE by English-learner-designated and Latinx students. They also accused Utah educators of missing an opportunity to follow through on the promise of Navajo programs in the original Utah DL legislation and of failing to meet the needs of the large multilingual Pacific Islander population in the state.

The term and concept of DLBE “gentrification” were first presented in a paper at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in 2013 (Valdez et al., 2013). These researchers’ initial phase of research on Utah DLBE policy introduced in the AERA working paper emerged in final form in four peer-reviewed journals starting in 2014 as advanced online publications and culminating as final prints in 2016 and 2017 (Delavan et al., 2017; Freire et al., 2017; Valdez et al., 2016a, b). The seminal significance of this policy case was that Utah had the first truly standardized state-level language planning strategy with DLBE as its centerpiece. Two aspects new to the gentrification landscape were prominent:

- (a) one-way world/foreign language immersion programs designed only for English-speaking monolinguals were the most numerous programs in the model, and
- (b) world language scholars and practitioners drove the discursive framing of DLBE rather than bilingual education scholars and practitioners or their ideas (Delavan et al., 2017; Valdez et al., 2016a).

What Freire and Delavan (this issue) argue in hindsight is that these studies of the Utah Model (discussed subsequently) had been analyzing data on three main types of gentrification:

- *demographic gentrification*, longstanding issues of inequitable attention/exchange, as well as program access and demographics,
- *discursive gentrification*, following Petrovic (2005) and Ricento (2005) but expanded to apply to Utah's print media and promotional materials, and
- *programmatic gentrification*, inequities in program design policies and trends which Utah's boom additionally demonstrated the need to examine because of how it prioritized one-way world/foreign language immersion programs over two-way programs and excluded both one-way developmental/maintenance bilingual education programs (designed to serve only students already proficient in the partner language) and models other than 50:50 language allocation.

Yet with the passage of time even more subtypes of DLBE gentrification appear to be emerging and worth naming more specifically.

The gentrification critique was crucially expanded when Cervantes-Soon (2014) compiled various aspects of the two-way DLBE problematic in the specific geographic context of the increasing Latinx population in North Carolina. Building on the earlier neoliberalism and micro-scale inequitable and exchange critiques, her article also deepened the world language discipline critique raised by Valdés (1997) by tracing the rising world language education influence over the field in comparison to the influence of scholars and practitioners trained in the bilingual/bicultural tradition. We suggest this as a macro form of inequitable attention and exchange observed at the micro-level (program and classroom phenomena) in previous studies. Cervantes-Soon warned that in this world-language-field reframing of DLBE, the voices of minoritized parents tend to get lost and replaced by the voices of privileged parents.

2015–2021

In the second half of the 2010s, scholars encountering similar processes in other contexts reported several new perspectives on the gentrification issue, and the literature expanded in number and types of studies and inequities. The first **Utah Model** study published found discursive gentrification manifested in Utah print media, mainly promoting neoliberal discourses around the value of DLBE and marginalizing discussion of equity or heritage reasons for participation in such programs (Valdez et al., 2016b). These findings led the authors to propose clearly naming two discursive frameworks competing for attention in DLBE policymaking: *globalized human capital* arguments, which used neoliberal discourses around job skills and workforce development, versus *equity-heritage* arguments on behalf of MLL communities. This discursive gentrification was also evident in Utah promotional materials and other policy documents (Delavan et al., 2017; Freire et al., 2017). Lu and Catalano (2015) built on the distinction of the above frameworks for critical discourse analysis of DLBE media coverage, surveying news articles along with readers' online comments. Lu and Catalano found many readers still opposed to DLBE, usually because of being misinformed or associating it with undeserving immigrants. The authors called for more studies of discussion of DLBE in public spaces

and more effort by its promoters to balance majority-serving discourses with minority-serving discourses like equity and heritage.

A study by Morales and Rao (2015) extended documentation of inequitable program access and demographics via gentrifying program placement choices. Despite Illinois having strong bilingual education policy mandating at least transitional programs when enough MLLs arrived at any one school, the authors found that the emerging DLBE programs had tended to be located in White, English majority, middle-class neighborhoods, not where Latino MLLs resided in large numbers. Valdez et al., (2016a) showed similar school demographics gentrification in Utah, where DLBE programs had mainly served low-income MLLs until 2007 when the state passed legislation and implemented the Utah Model.

Another subcategory of gentrification critique examined micropolitics of **DLBE programs operating in literally gentrifying neighborhoods** (i.e. neighborhood gentrification; Chaparro, 2017; Garcia-Mateus, 2020; Heiman, 2017). Heiman and Murakami (2019) described a “dual gentrification” where both the neighborhood and its ideologies were gentrified. These authors referred to neighborhood gentrification as the result of the rise of property values and ideological gentrification as privileged parents’ desire to have their children participate in two-way DLBE programs.

This work contributed substantially to studies conducted in gentrifying neighborhoods and to those undertaken to fill out field assessments of ways the voices of teachers and administrators reflect and resist discursive gentrification. Heiman’s work portrays efforts of a two-way DLBE teacher in Texas resisting school demographic gentrification due to neighborhood and ideological gentrification (Heiman, 2021; Heiman & Yanes, 2018). Henderson (2019) documented teachers’ discourses in Texas and Utah schools gentrifying students perceived with low language skills and academic achievement, particularly language-minoritized students. This special issue includes several examples of this type of research, many offering hopeful resistance.

A new area of gentrification research emerged around recent **neoliberal dismantling of bilingual education bans**. Katznelson and Bernstein (2017) broadened the discursive gentrification critique by pointing to the disadvantages of the strategy of using neoliberal framing around global business benefits to garner public support for California’s Proposition 58 in 2016, which ended the partial ban on bilingual education passed by popular vote in 1998 (Prop. 227). These interest-convergence style choices (Burns, 2017; Freire et al., 2017; Morales & Maravilla, 2019; Shannon, 2011) by activists crafting the language of the ban echoed previous critiques of the problematic use of globalized human capital (neoliberal) discourse. Flores (2020) enhanced this critique of the Proposition 58 neoliberal strategy by situating it within a larger critique of the historic arc of language ideologies that served colonial nation states and now serve a more transnational system of racialized capitalism under logics of neoliberal globalization. Flores (2020) called on the field to accept that “bilingual education is not a panacea” for dismantling these larger injustices made to seem like common sense in the hegemonic “grid of intelligibility,” arguing that “if we want to truly affirm the language practices of Latinx and other racialized students, bilingual education

will never be enough” because language is not nearly as central to politics as is claimed by the various branches of language education (p. 63). Flores pushes us to accept that racialization and economic exploitation are where the fight truly rages.

These arguments are part of the gentrification critique that situates the DLBE boom in a **larger ideological critique and calls for societal transformation**: Burns (2017) builds on the work of Shannon (2011) and others in documenting the asymmetrical power of English-dominant White parents in two-way programs, but theorizes it further by connecting it to the Whiteness studies and critical race theory concepts of interest convergence and color-blind ideology to analyze how “Whiteness adapts, manipulates, and justifies its own supremacy” as part of “the co-opting of DL[BE] by dominant interests” (p. 349). Flores and Garcia (2017) narrate the gentrification process of DLBE through personal reflections, using the metaphor of a “move from basements to boutiques.”

[This] resonates with the tropes of pride and profit introduced by Duchêne and Heller (2013) in their discussion of language in late capitalism. These two ideologies—of pride and profit—operate dialectically and have been used differently to promote or restrict bilingual education from the mid-1960s to today. (p. 14)

These authors call for reconnecting bilingual programs with the radical social movements that emerged in the 1960s. Flores and Chaparro (2018) also argue for a view of language education and DLBE policy that is willing to consider much more than language development.

Bilingual education programs in low-income neighborhoods would be implemented as part of a comprehensive revitalization [of] these neighborhoods. Similarly, bilingual education programs in affluent and gentrifying neighborhoods would be implemented as part of a larger effort to create mixed income neighborhoods through the development of affordable housing within the catchment areas of these schools. (pp. 380-381)

They call for an ambitious anti-classist and anti-racist approach to DLBE that works in collaboration with neighborhood-based activism for equity in urban spaces.

Delavan et al. (2021) joined this conversation and argued that their research findings on the Utah Model epitomized U.S. raciolinguistic ideology and reminded readers to consider class and economics in raciolinguistic analyses. They theorized a structure or discourse of *propertied White aurality* that names how the languaging of those with greater economic or Whiteness capital is valued more, while the languaging of those without the same forms of capital is evaluated as inferior. The Utah Model was theorized as having enforced propertied White aurality through three processes—mass production, mass marketing, and mass displacement—that may also describe the gentrification of other contexts (Delavan et al., 2021). The idea of *mass production* referred to the rapid expansion of a one-size-fits-all, top-down DLBE model aimed at producing 100

programs in just a few years as was Utah's stated goal. *Mass marketing* named the concerted effort at promotion that assumed the existence of a homogenous audience of English monolinguals interested primarily in the economic benefits of multilingualism and multiculturalism. These two planning mechanisms had privileged communities centrally in mind and thus led to the *mass displacement* of both minoritized students from their original proportion of enrollment in DLBE programs and of the discourses of equity and heritage from media and policy documents.

Another recent perspective of study is the **evolution of the Utah Model and its influence on other states**. Freire et al. (2021b) conducted a nationwide study and found that Delaware, Georgia, and Wyoming emulated the Utah Model and engaged in discursive gentrification that benefited White English-privileged students. In a study of DLBE print media coverage in North Carolina and Georgia, Cervantes-Soon et al. (2020) found discursive gentrification patterns echoing Utah media coverage of the rollout of the Utah Model. Chestnut and Dimitrieska (2018) argued that educators from several of Indiana's DLBE programs had implemented the Utah Model based on their communication and visits to Utah programs, and Morita-Mullaney et al. (2020) described Indiana's Utah-like emphasis on fostering one-way programs for English monolinguals rather than two-way programs that would better serve MLLs. Another example of the spread of the gentrifying Utah Model has been the growing dominance of the 50:50 language allocation model, and the corresponding restriction of other models that provide more instructional time in the partner language in Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, as discussed by Freire and Delavan in this special issue. On an optimistic note in terms of language allocation policies, Freire et al. (2021a) traced how two DLBE charter schools running 90:10 programs in Utah resisted the state's 50:50 language allocation requirement for state support, a process which ultimately resulted in revision of the legislation.

Two areas where the gentrification critique has attracted attention are those that go **beyond elementary education** and/or **beyond the commonly studied languages**. Sun (2019) called on the field to produce more research on DLBE programs at the secondary education level, with attention to patterns of gentrification. Morita-Mullaney et al. (2020) found data cautioning that secondary DLBE programs can have the ironic "equity trap" effect of preventing marginalized students from accessing advanced coursework. Oliveira et al. (2020) applied the gentrification lens to Portuguese-English programs, finding that educators in one such program did not value Brazilian language varieties equally and that Brazilian immigrant students "did not enjoy the attention and support that their English-dominant peers experienced" (p. 572). Zheng (2021) critiqued neoliberal multilingualism operating in DLBE to explain the discourses of White parents in Chinese DLBE and to theorize making DLBE more welcoming to families who speak Chinese at home. Avni and Menken (2021) examined a middle school that opened new DLBE programs in Mandarin, Russian, Spanish, and Hebrew, focusing specifically on the Hebrew program that was opened to attract Jewish families. These scholars found that the program's myopic focus on language closed off possibilities for educators to address inequities in the classroom resulting from the religious identity and racialization of

the students. Kasun et al. (2021) used the gentrification lens to study for the first time a bilingual school teaching in a signed language.

As a final new direction to highlight, several scholars have explicitly made calls to **make critical consciousness a fourth goal** or pillar of DLBE (Alfaro, 2019; Heiman, 2021; Heiman & Yanes, 2018), as a way to address DLBE gentrification, in addition to the three goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural understandings traditionally set forth in the literature. This line of argument began with Freire and Valdez (2013), who applied Freire's (2014) dissertation research to propose this fourth pillar of DLBE at the annual conference of the American Association for Educational Research. Freire's (2014) dissertation and publications based on this work detailed the benefits of setting critical consciousness as a fourth goal (Freire, 2014, 2016, 2020; Freire & Feinauer, 2020), alongside similar formulations of other scholars (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Heiman, 2017; Palmer et al., 2019). Having presented an in-depth summary of the literature on the gentrification of DLBE to date, we now outline the contributions in this 2021 special issue of *Language Policy*.

This issue's contribution to a way forward

The early research on DLBE focused heavily on creating a body of research to fight against the English-Only Movement by conducting and publishing research that proved that well-designed bilingual education programs, especially DLBE, were highly effective for all students, especially MLLs and other marginalized students. This foundational work also showed that DLBE was beneficial for English-privileged students, which was key in preserving and spreading DLBE programs across the United States. However, a neoliberal reframing of DLBE and its exponential uptake by White families galvanized the rapid increase in programs over the last 20 years. The aggressive adoption of DLBE programs in states such as Utah, Delaware, and Georgia was clearly focused on gentrification (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2020; Freire et al., 2021b; Valdez et al., 2016a). While we agree that DLBE is still the best public schooling option for students to develop their multilingualism, especially marginalized students, Guadalupe Valdés' (1997) cautionary note and its inheritors have clearly communicated that we should not ignore the inequities that have accompanied its sudden popularity. Despite the emerging body of scholarship in this area, much work is still needed to ensure that DLBE realizes real integration rather than gentrification.

The articles in this special issue make a timely contribution to the field by addressing pertinent gaps in the DLBE equity conversation. We have ordered the articles from those that are national in focus to those that are most local. They explore gentrification from different angles and at different scales, including issues related to national media images; language allocation models; and administrator, teacher, and parent discourse. All include implications that suggest ways of redirecting gentrification toward true integration.

In "Picturing Dual Language and Gentrification: An Analysis of Visual Media and Their Connection to Language Policy," based on a study exploring 58 images from online news articles, Ted Hamann and Theresa Catalano analyzed five images

representing gentrification by joining the theoretical frame of Habermasian notions of the public sphere with a multimodal critical discourse analysis. This article contributes to the DLBE field by deepening understandings about how journalists' choices of visual images can contribute to DLBE gentrification. The authors invite the field to consider multimodality, social semiotics, and even semiotization as a bigger and fuller toolbox for DLBE equity research.

Juan A. Freire and M. Garrett Delavan, in "The Fiftyfication of Dual Language Education: One-Size-Fits-All Language Allocation's 'Equality' and 'Practicality' Eclipsing a History of Equity," critique what they call "fiftyfication" or "50:50 eclipse," referring to the privileging or takeover of the 50:50 balance of instructional time between program languages. Based on a study of states nationwide, they found that six states besides Utah revealed fiftyfication and language allocation contradictions in policy documents posted on their state department of education websites. This work introduces the idea of programmatic gentrification: any shift toward DLBE program designs that unfairly benefit privileged communities. The authors make a call to preserve space for more equitable language allocation policies in DLBE, referring to models with more instructional time in the partner language.

For "We Live in the Age of Choice': School Administrators, School Choice Policies, and the Shaping of Dual Language Bilingual," Katie A. Bernstein, Adriana Alvarez, Sofia Chaparro, and Kathryn I. Henderson conducted an interview-based study of 22 administrators from 14 school districts across Arizona, California, and Texas. They found administrators used DLBE as a marketing resource for student recruitment within a policy climate of school choice. The authors found ideological gentrification in administrators' discourses, even in settings where schoolwide demographic gentrification was absent. The authors argue that neoliberalism is the necessary point of critique for bringing equity to school choice policies and to gentrification of DLBE in general. This article offers the field a much needed focus on how school administrators must carefully reflect on their discourses if they are to help ensure true integration in DLBE.

Similarly, in "Now It's All Upper-Class Parents Who Are Checking Out Schools': Gentrification as Coloniality in the Enactment of Two-Way Bilingual Education Policies," Lisa M. Dorner, Claudia Cervantes-Soon, Daniel Heiman, and Deborah Palmer share ethnographic research of three school districts in three different states. They found common themes of gentrification in these programs, with traceable neoliberalism and coloniality, yet the programs were confronted with moments of resistance by stakeholders such as parents, educators, administrators, and community activists. This work discusses factors contributing to gentrification, including marketing of the programs for parents, hiring of international teachers, and transportation policies, as well as issues related to instructional language allocation policies. The authors offer the field a coloniality perspective needed to better understand how two-way programs are shaped for more or less equity across U.S. contexts.

Sofia Chaparro—in "Creating Fertile Grounds for Two-Way Immersion: Gentrification, Immigration, & Neoliberal School Reforms"—reports on an 18-month ethnographic study in which she was a participant observer and interviewer of eight stakeholders who helped in creating the program. Chaparro observed that the DLBE

program caused many to perceive the host school as having a higher status, thus contributing to the DLBE gentrification phenomenon by increasing enrollment and ultimately giving White parents the strongest voice at the school. Despite various unsuccessful efforts to include Latinx families and to reduce and avoid DLBE gentrification, the underlying logic that White middle- and upper-middle-class parents would bring more resources to the school was persistent. This article cautions the field that it must work to counteract the over-empowerment and over-recruitment of privileged parents in two-way programs.

In “A Black Mother’s Counterstory to the Brown-White Binary in Dual Language Education: Toward Disrupting Dual Language as White Property,” Andrea Blanton, G. Sue Kasun, James A. Gambrell, and Zurisaray Espinosa employ critical race theory to examine the experiences of a Black mother fighting to be read as the legitimate leader of the parent teacher association of a school with a Spanish–English two-way program. The gentrification this mother experienced is retold in three themes: Whiteness as a property right, racial battle fatigue, and resistance and self-care strategies. Ultimately, gentrification became less symbolic and more material when this parent finally withdrew her family from the school. This article highlights long neglected issues of marginalization lived by African American parents in DLBE schooling, inviting the field to break out of its traditional Brown-White binary in its equity analyses.

In their manuscript entitled “‘Research Shows That I Am Here for Them’: Acompañamiento as Language Policy Activism in Times of Two-Way DLBE Gentrification,” Dan Heiman and Mariela Nuñez-Janes propose *acompañamiento* as an approach to pedagogy and language policy activism intended to support language-minoritized students affected by DLBE gentrification. They position the *acompañamiento* strategy as one of the elements of the proposed fourth goal of critical consciousness in DLBE towards activism. This article describes how a DLBE classroom teacher enacted *acompañamiento* with fifth grade students and their families who were being pushed out of DLBE schooling due to literal and metaphorical gentrification processes in a Texas city. This article offers the field another impactful story of a teacher’s successful resistance to these inequitable trends.

The special issue closes with two generous and welcome commentaries by high-profile scholars in the field, Patricia Gándara and Guadalupe Valdés, that help summarize its implications for the field.

Acknowledgements We express our gratitude for the peer reviewers’ work, for their timely feedback, and excellent insights. Peer review in academia occurs behind the scenes and in anonymity. We thank them for their excellent and generous collaboration. We also appreciate the hard work of the authors of the articles for this special issue and the collegial cross-fertilization of transformational ideas their work contains.

References

- Alfaro, C. (2019). Preparing critically conscious dual-language teachers: Recognizing and interrupting dominant ideologies. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 194–203.
- Amrein, A., & Peña, R. A. (2000). Asymmetry in dual language practice: Assessing imbalance in a program promoting equality. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(8), 1–17.

- Appiah, K. A. (2020). The case for capitalizing the B in Black: Black and white are both historically created racial identities—and whatever rule applies to one should apply to the other. *The Atlantic*.
- Avni, S., & Menken, K. (2021). Hebrew dual language bilingual education: The intersection of race, language and religion. In N. Subtirelu, N. Flores, & A. Tseng (Eds.), *Bilingualism for all? Raciolinguistic perspectives on dual language education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (1988). *Key issues in bilingualism and bilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters.
- Blanton, C. K. (2004). *The strange career of bilingual education in Texas, 1836–1981*. Texas A&M University Press.
- Brisk, M. E. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Burns, M. (2017). “Compromises that we make”: Whiteness in the dual language context. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(4), 339–352.
- Cazabon, M., & Lambert, W. E. (1993). *Two-way bilingual education: A progress report on the Amigos program* (National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education R117G10022; pp. 1–37).
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2021). *Directory of foreign language immersion programs in U.S. schools*. <http://webapp.cal.org/Immersion/>.
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the new Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 64–82.
- Cervantes-Soon, C., 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., Gambrell, J. A., Kasun, G. S., Sun, W., Freire, J. A., & Dorner, L. M. (2020). “Everybody wants a choice” in dual language education of el Nuevo Sur: Whiteness as the gloss for everybody in media discourses of multilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1753201>
- Chaparro, S. (2017). *Language and the gentrifying city: An ethnographic study of a two-way immersion program in an urban public school*. Doctoral dissertation.
- Chestnut, C. E., & Dimitriiska, V. (2018). *Implementing Indiana's new dual language immersion programs: Educator perspectives*. Indiana University.
- Christian, D. (1994). *Two-way bilingual education: Students learning through two languages* (National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, pp. 1–27) [Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Department of Education].
- Christian, D. (1996). Two-way immersion education: Students learning through two languages. *Modern Language Journal*, 80(1), 66–76.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Collier, V. P. (1992). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1–2), 187–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1992.10162633>
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1–20.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Contreras, A. R., & Valverde, L. A. (1994). The impact of Brown on the education of Latinos. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 63(3), 470–481. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2967197>
- Crawford, J. (2008). *Advocating for English learners: Selected essays*. Multilingual Matters.
- Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*. Westview Press.
- de Jong, E. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Caslon.
- 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(1), 81–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802149531>
- Del Valle, S. (1998). Bilingual education for Puerto Ricans in New York City: From hope to compromise. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(2), 193–218.
- Delavan, M. G. (2020). Earth democracy as empowerment for TESOL students and educators: Though the crisis speaks English, englishes can become a commons language of sustainability. In J. Goulah

- & J. Katunich (Eds.), *TESOL and sustainability: New perspectives on English language teaching in the Anthropocene Era* (pp. 19–40). Bloomsbury Press.
- Delavan, G., & Freire, J. A. (2010). *Utah's dual language immersion boom: Is it listening to cultural differences or reinforcing differences in power?* [Paper presentation]. Annual meeting of the American Educational Studies Association (AESA). Denver, CO, United States.
- Delavan, M. G., Freire, J. A., & Valdez, V. E. (2021). The intersectionality of neoliberal classing with raciolinguistic marginalization in state dual language policy: A call for locally crafted programs. In N. Subtirelu, N. Flores, & A. Tseng (Eds.), *Bilingualism for all? Raciolinguistic perspectives on dual language education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Delavan, M. G., Valdez, V. E., & Freire, J. A. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1204890>
- Delgado-Larocco, E. L. (1998). *Classroom processes in a two-way immersion kindergarten classroom*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Davis. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations Publishing database.
- Dolson, D. P., & Mayer, J. (1992). Longitudinal study of three program models for language-minority students: A critical examination of reported findings. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1–2), 105–157.
- Dorner, L. M. (2011). Contested communities in a debate over dual-language education: The import of “public” values on public policies. *Educational Policy*, 25(4), 577–613.
- Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (2013). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. Routledge.
- Flores, N. (2020). Producing national and neoliberal subjects: Bilingual education and governmentality in the United States. In L. M. Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and neoliberal governmentality* (pp. 49–68). Routledge.
- Flores, N., & Chaparro, S. (2018). What counts as language education policy? Developing a materialist anti-racist approach to language activism. *Language Policy*, 17(3), 365–384.
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2017). A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From base-ments and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000162>
- Foster, W. P. (1976). Bilingual education: An educational and legal survey. *Journal of Law & Education*, 5, 149.
- Freeman, R. D. (1996). Dual-language planning at Oyster bilingual school: “It’s much more than language.” *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 557–582. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587698>
- Freire, J. A. (2014). *Spanish-English dual language teacher beliefs and practices on culturally relevant pedagogy in a collaborative action research process*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, Proquest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Freire, J. A. (2016). Nepantleras/os and their teachers in dual language education: Developing sociopolitical consciousness to contest language education policies. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal*, 10(1), 36–52.
- Freire, J. A. (2020). Promoting sociopolitical consciousness and bicultural goals of dual language education: The transformational dual language education framework. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 19(1), 56–71.
- Freire, J. A., Delavan, M. G., & Valdez, V. E. (2021). Grassroots resistance and activism to one-size-fits-all and separate-but-equal policies by 90: 10 dual language schools en comunidades latinas. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1874868>.
- Freire, J. A., & Feinauer, E. (2020). Vernacular Spanish as a promoter of critical consciousness in dual language bilingual education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1775778>
- Freire, J. A., Gambrell, J. A., Kasun, S. G., Dorner, L., & Cervantes-Soon, C. (2021b). The expropriation of dual language bilingual education: Deconstructing neoliberalism, whitestreaming, and English hegemony. *International Multilingual Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2021.1929762>
- Freire, J. A., & Valdez, V. E. (2013). *Going from "I" to "We": One school's dual immersion teachers' culturally relevant beliefs and practices* [Paper presentation]. Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). San Francisco, CA.
- Freire, J. A., Valdez, V. E., & Delavan, M. G. (2017). The (dis)inclusion of Latina/o interests from Utah’s dual language education boom. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 16(4), 276–289.

- Gándara, P. C., & Aldana, U. S. (2014). Who's segregated now? Latinos, language, and the future of integrated schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(5), 735–748.
- García, O. (1984). Bilingualism in the United States: Present attitudes in the light of past policies. In S. Greenbaum (Ed.), *The English language today: Public attitudes toward the English language* (pp. 147–158). Pergamon Press.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs and practices for English language learners*. Teachers College Press.
- García, O., Menken, K., Velasco, P., & Vogel, S. (2018). Dual language bilingual education in NYC: A potential unfulfilled. In M. B. Arias & M. Fee (Eds.), *Profiles of dual language education in the 21st century* (pp. 38–55). Center for Applied Linguistics.
- García-Mateus, S. (2020). Bilingual student perspectives about language expertise in a gentrifying two-way immersion program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1797627>
- Genesee, F. (1985). Second language learning through immersion: A review of U.S. programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(4), 541–561. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1170246>
- Genesee, F., & Gándara, P. (1999). Bilingual education programs: A cross-national perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 665–685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00141>
- González, J. (1980). Bilingual education: Issues for the '80s. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education* (pp. 1–7). Georgetown University Press.
- Heiman, D. (2021). “So, is gentrification good or bad?” One teacher’s implementation of the fourth goal in her TWBE classroom. *Anthropology & Education*, 52(1), 63–81.
- Heiman, D. B. (2017). *Two-way immersion, gentrification, and critical pedagogy: Teaching against the neoliberal logic* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin]. The University of Texas at Austin, Texas ScholarWorks. <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/61911>.
- 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.
- Heiman, D., & Murakami, E. (2019). “It was like a magnet to bring people in”: School administrators’ responses to the gentrification of a two-way bilingual education (TWBE) program in central Texas. *Journal of School Leadership*, 29(6), 454–472.
- Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 473–492.
- Henderson, L. M. (2019). The danger of the dual-language enrichment narrative: Educator discourses constructing exclusionary participation structures in bilingual education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 16(3), 155–177.
- Howard, E., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2003). *Trends in two-way immersion education: A review of the research* (Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education No. R117-D40005). Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk (CRESPAR), Johns Hopkins University.
- Howard, E., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education*. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Kasun, G. S., Scott, J., Kaneria, A. J., & Delavan, M. G. (2021). North American coloniality and decoloniality: Transnational tensions in a Mexican deaf bilingual school. *Bilingual Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2021.1877212>
- Katznelson, N., & Bernstein, K. (2017). Rebranding bilingualism: The shifting discourses of language education policy in California’s 2016 election. *Linguistics and Education*, 40, 11–26.
- Kubota, R., & Miller, E. R. (2017). Re-examining and re-envisioning criticality in language studies: Theories and praxis. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 14(2–3), 129–157.
- Lewis, A. E. (2003). *Race in the schoolyard: Negotiating the color line in classrooms and communities*. Rutgers University Press.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2000). *Biliteracy for a global society: An idea book on dual language education*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2015). *Two-way/dual language education: Then and now*. California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Linton, A., & Franklin, R. C. (2010). Bilingualism for the children: Dual-language programs under restrictive language policies. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language* (pp. 175–191). Teachers College Press.

- Lu, J., & Catalano, T. (2015). Let them learn English: Reader response to media discourse about dual language education. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 9(2), 1–26.
- Lyons, J. J. (1990). The past and future directions of federal bilingual-education policy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508(1), 66–80.
- Macedo, D., Dendrinos, B., & Gounari, P. (2003). *The hegemony of English*. Paradigm.
- Menken, K. (2013). Restrictive language education policies and emergent bilingual youth: A perfect storm with imperfect outcomes. *Theory into Practice*, 52(3), 160–168.
- Moore, S. C. K. (2021). *A history of bilingual education in the US: Examining the politics of language policymaking*. Multilingual Matters.
- Morales, P. Z., & Maravilla, J. V. (2019). The problems and possibilities of interest convergence in a dual language school. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 145–153.
- Morales, P. Z., & Rao, A. B. (2015). How ideology and cultural capital shape the distribution of Illinois' bilingual education programs. *Teachers College Record* (ID Number: 18139).
- Moran, R. F. (1988). The politics of discretion: Federal intervention in bilingual education. *California Law Review*, 76(6), 1249–1352. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3480675>
- Morison, S. H. (1990). A Spanish–English dual-language program in New York City. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508(1), 160–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716290508001013>
- Morita-Mullaney, T., Renn, J., & Chiu, M. M. (2020). Obscuring equity in dual language bilingual education: A longitudinal study of emergent bilingual achievement, course placements, and grades. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(3), 685–718.
- Oliveira, G., Lima Becker, M., & Chang-Bacon, C. K. (2020). “Eu sei, I know”: Equity and immigrant experience in a Portuguese-English dual language bilingual education program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(3), 572–598.
- Padilla, A. M., Lindholm, K. J., Chen, A., Hakuta, K., Lambert, W., & Tucker, G. R. (1991). The English-only movement: Myths, reality, and implications for psychology. *American Psychological Association*, 46(2), 1–11.
- Palmer, D. (2010). Race, power, and equity in a multiethnic urban elementary school with a dual-language “strand” program. *Anthropology & Education*, 41(1), 94–114.
- Palmer, D. K. (2004). *Educating for equity in a dual immersion classroom: “¡No interrumpas!”* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Palmer, D. K. (2009). Middle-class English speakers in a two-way immersion bilingual classroom: “Everybody should be listening to Jonathan right now.” *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 177–202.
- Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 121–133.
- Petrovic, J. E. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 4, 395–416.
- Ramírez, J. D., Yuen, S., & Ramey, D. (1991). *Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children* (United States Department of Education No. 00-87-0156). Aguirre International.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the “language-as-resource” discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 348–368.
- Rivera, C. (1980). *Bilingual education tradition in the U.S.: Transition vs. maintenance models* (U.S. Department of Education, National Institute of Education, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) No. ED221051, p. 28). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED221051>
- Roos, P. D. (1978). Bilingual education: The Hispanic response to unequal educational opportunity. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 42(4), 111–140.
- Scanlan, M., & Palmer, D. (2009). Race, power, and (in)equity within two-way immersion settings. *Urban Review*, 41, 391–415.
- Shannon, S. (2011). Bicultural parent engagement: Advocacy and empowerment. In E. Olivos, O. Jiménez-Castellanos, & A. M. Ochoa (Eds.), *Bicultural parent engagement: Advocacy and empowerment* (pp. 83–102). Teachers College Press.
- Shaw, F. (1975). Bilingual education: An idea whose time has come. *New York Affairs*, 3(1), 94–111.
- Spener, D. (1988). Transitional bilingual education and the socialization of immigrants. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(2), 133–154.

- Sun, W. (2019). From the editorial board: Multilingualism for all or tools for gentrification? Call for the examination of dual language programs in secondary education. *The High School Journal*, 102(4), 263–266.
- Teitelbaum, H., & Hiller, R. (1977). Bilingual education: The legal mandate. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47(2), 138–170.
- The University of Pennsylvania Law Review. (1979). Bilingual education and desegregation. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 127(6), 1564–1606. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3311629>
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3), 391–430.
- Valdés, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 388–412.
- Valdez, V. E., Delavan, G., & Freire, J. A. (2016b). The marketing of dual language education policy in Utah print media. *Educational Policy*, 30(6), 849–883. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089590481455-6750>
- Valdez, V. E., Freire, J. A., & Delavan, G. (2013). *For whom is the dual language immersion boom? The gentrification of strong forms of U.S. language education* [Paper presentation]. 2013 American Education Research Association Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA, United States.
- Valdez, V. E., Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2016a). The gentrification of dual language education. *Urban Review*, 48(4), 601–627.
- Varghese, M. M., & Park, C. (2010). Going global: Can dual-language programs save bilingual education? *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 9(1), 78–80.
- Wentworth, L., Pellegrin, N., Thompson, K., & Hakuta, K. (2010). Proposition 227 in California: A long-term appraisal of its impact on English learner student achievement. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 37–49). Teachers College Press.
- Zehler, A. M., Fleischman, H. L., Hopstock, P. J., Pendzick, M. L., & Stephenson, T. G. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities*. Office of English Language Acquisition, U.S. Department of Education Contract No. ED-00-CO-0089, p. 43). Development Associates/George Washington University.
- Zheng, B. (2021). Neoliberal multilingualism and “humanitarian connections”: Discourses around parents’ experiences with a Mandarin Chinese immersion school. *Language & Education*, 35(1), 78–95.
- Zirkel, P. A. (1977). Bilingual education and school desegregation: A case of uncoordinated remedies. *Bilingual Review/la Revista Bilingüe*, 4(3), 180–188.

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

M. Garrett Delavan is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Middle and Secondary Education at Georgia State University. He worked for 18 years as a public school teacher in language education. His research focus is language education planning that creates equitable access to program types and class curriculum by opposing evolving forms of racism and classism embedded within marketization trends in education. This includes studying ecjustice curriculum connections meant to allow language learners to access the empowering awareness it will take to transform society for the better.

Juan A. Freire is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Teacher Education at Brigham Young University. He worked for several years as an elementary school teacher, both in Spain and in a Spanish-English dual language bilingual education (DLBE) program in Utah. His research focuses on equity in DLBE in the areas of multicultural/bilingual teacher research and in the analysis of DLBE policy and planning.

Kate Menken is a Professor of Linguistics and Director of Linguistics and TESOL Programs at Queens College of the City University of New York (CUNY). She is also a Research Fellow at the Research Institute for the Study of Language in Urban Society at the CUNY Graduate Center. Her research interests include language education policy, bilingual education, and the education of bilingual children and youth in U.S. public schools. Further information can be found on her website: <http://katemenken.org>