



Researching Latinxs, racism, and white supremacy in bilingual education: A literature review

Laura C. Chávez-Moreno

To cite this article: Laura C. Chávez-Moreno (2020) Researching Latinxs, racism, and white supremacy in bilingual education: A literature review, *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 17:2, 101-120, DOI: [10.1080/15427587.2019.1624966](https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2019.1624966)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2019.1624966>



Published online: 11 Jun 2019.



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



Article views: 928



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 6 View citing articles [↗](#)



Researching Latinxs, racism, and white supremacy in bilingual education: A literature review

Laura C. Chávez-Moreno 

University of California, Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

This article reviews literature on U.S. bilingual education that addresses white supremacy and racism, specifically pertaining to Latinx youth and their teachers. To illustrate the wide range of the research, the author categorizes the reviewed articles into three lines of inquiry: documenting language education policies, negotiating identity, and addressing pedagogical or programmatic problems in bilingual education. She discusses connections across the literature with regard to the researchers' social practices and the trends, implications, contributions, and gaps in the scholarship as a whole. The author finds that research examining white supremacy and racism mostly takes place in language-restrictive or dual-language contexts, and is overwhelmingly conducted by language and bilingual education scholars, not race scholars. To diversify the questions and perspectives used to study this topic, the author calls for more exploration of white supremacy in bilingual education contexts with a majority of Latinx students, where Latinxs can still suffer from racism and learn hegemonic epistemologies. She also recommends expanding the variety of race theories employed, and for future studies that conceptualize bilingual education as engaging in the racial formation of Latinxs. Having more diverse research areas and methodologies to investigate these issues may aid in developing curricular and pedagogical practices that counter white supremacy.

KEYWORDS

Bilingual Education;
Language Policy; Latino;
Racism; Critical Race Studies

Despite the historical presence and current growth of the Latinx¹ student population, which contributes to the racial and linguistic diversity of the P-12 student population in the United States, schools have not affirmed the cultural capital (Yosso, 2005) or funds of knowledge that Chicanxs and Latinxs bring to schools (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). This is not surprising, considering that the U.S. schooling system was founded on white supremacist and settler colonial ideologies (e.g., San Miguel, 1987; Spring, 2016) which establish a cultural, economic, and political structure where Whites overwhelmingly control material resources and power, including the power to validate certain epistemologies over others. This system spreads ideas of white entitlement and superiority as common sense and reinforces racial hierarchies across institutions and society.

As a counter to oppressive schooling, bilingual/biliteracy education models are imagined to affirm and develop Latinx and Chicanx students' linguistic and cultural ways of being (Flores, 2015; Macías, de Macías, de La Torre, & Vásquez, 1975). Beginning in the early 1980s, however, the English-only movement began to roll back some of the advancements and implementation of bilingual education (Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Wiley, 2007). The current state of bilingual education varies by state, with some such as Arizona having what some scholars call legalized linguistic apartheid (Combs, DaSilva Iddings, & Moll, 2014), and others such as Utah (Delavan, Valdez, & Freire, 2017) and Wisconsin (Lowenhaupt, 2015) making legal strides in encouraging bilingual education. Despite its re-emergence for some Latinx students, scholars have called into question whether some of the most popular bilingual interventions, such as dual-language programs, ultimately serve the Latinx community (e.g., Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Chávez-Moreno, 2018; García, 2009a; Valdés, 1997).

Twenty years ago, Guadalupe Valdés (1997) reported that when race was mentioned in bilingual education literature about minority student failure in school, race was conflated with culture. Valdés also asserts that race matters in bilingual programs, that dual-language programs do not solve the racial diversity challenges in classrooms, and that participating families from dominant groups are likely to influence bilingual education in potentially damaging ways. Since Valdés' article questioning whether dual-language programs could have equitable outcomes, work about racism in bilingual education and other language education programs has proliferated (e.g., Amos, 2018; Burns, 2017; Kubota & Lin, 2009; Liggett, 2014; Marx, 2006; Mitchell, 2013; Motha, 2014; Urrieta, 2010). For example, scholars are now exposing how bilingual education operates based on middleclass, white norms (Hadi-Tabassum, 2006) and is racialized as a dangerous affront to the integrity of the all-English nation-state (García, 2009b).

Keeping in mind that the study of racism and white supremacy in bilingual education is an emerging area of inquiry, this literature review asks: *What questions are being investigated and/or discussed in inquiries about racism, white supremacy, and Latinxs in bilingual education?* Though the legacies of white supremacy affect everyone in the U.S., in order to provide specificity to the Latinx condition, I concentrate on how white supremacy affects bi/multilingual Latinx youth and their teachers. I focus on Latinxs because of their large representation in bilingual education and because white supremacy has historically and legally used different tools to target distinct groups of color.

This review of the literature is organized into three parts. First, I provide a brief description of the methods used to select and analyze the scholarship. In the second section, I present what I see as the three main lines of research as distinguished by their construction of the research problem, and

I highlight some studies' theoretical frameworks and findings. I offer a descriptive analysis of the questions scholars have explored regarding issues of racism and white supremacy in the bilingual education of Latinx youth and in the role of their teachers. Scholars have emphasized that researchers should consider what kinds of questions are being asked in the field and what is left unasked (Cochran-Smith et al., 2013; Orellana & Bowman, 2003). Examining questions makes visible how the field is situating the work within larger ideological contexts. By tracking what questions researchers are investigating, scholars can understand how they are constructing the issues found at the intersection of bilingual schooling, white supremacy, race, racism, and Latinxs. Thus, I present each line's construction of the research problem by using a question to represent it.

In the third part, I discuss the trends, implications, contributions, and gaps in the scholarship as a whole. I also critique how the research studies and/or discusses these issues, and suggest questions and research problems that could be further explored.

On reviewing, the reviewer, and the review

This literature review is guided by Lather's (1999) conceptualization that a review both "polices and produces" (p. 3) the field while being a situated, partial, and perspectival analysis of the literature by the scholar. Like other reviews, this one is constructed based on the purpose and assumptions of the author, and thus cannot objectively mirror the extant research.

My purpose is to synthesize and show the different lines of inquiry in bilingual education that have addressed white supremacy and racism, and see how they illuminate the specific experience of Latinxs in bilingual education. This article—like all scholarship—is shaped by the researcher's background experiences, positionality, and identity. I briefly note that as a Mexican (im)migrant growing up in Arizona, my formal educative institutions did not support non-dominant epistemologies or my bilingualism. My critical perspectives on schooling, language, and literacy have cemented my commitment to changing this practice. As a Chicana and critical race/ethnic studies theorist, I take it as *a priori* truth that U.S. schooling has white normativity at its core and thus schooling defaults to providing an inequitable education to students from marginalized groups, even with efforts like bilingual education that intend to make schooling more just.

In order to locate the literature, I conducted a targeted search on electronic databases (ERIC, Education Research Complete) using the descriptor "bilingual education," because these databases index "dual-language immersion," "language maintenance," and "two-way immersion" under that term. I looked for literature published from 2002 to 2017 in peer-reviewed journals to ensure the relevance and quality of the research, and I selected the time

frame because the 2002 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act changed the context of bilingual education policy and implementation. The search yielded over 800 works. Of these, I reviewed the titles, abstracts, and journal names for their (1) reference to bilingual education, (2) examination of race, racism, and/or white supremacy, and (3) focus on the implications for Latinxs.

I further limited to literature that examined and/or had strong allusions to race, racism, and white supremacy and/or their affects in U.S. P-12 bilingual schooling. I included articles situated in an English-only context if they commented on how policies and practices impacted bilingual education and Latinxs. To further specify white supremacy's impact on Latinxs, I searched for articles that identified the race of participants to be Latinx, Hispanic, Chicanx, and/or other specific groups (e.g., Mexican-American), and/or made implications for this population. Finally, I included articles that investigated matters affecting youth, teachers, and/or prospective teachers. Following the criteria detailed above, I was left with 42 articles for this review.

One limitation of this literature review is that the use of euphemisms like diversity, ethnicity, culture, and nationality as a proxy for race made an exhaustive search for bilingual education literature that framed discrimination within white supremacy challenging, thus increasing the likelihood of excluding germane work. A similar issue occurred in regards to the use of "language minority," "English learner," or other language-based terms when referring to Latinx/Chicanx populations. Despite these limitations, this literature review strengthens the field's understanding of how the research examines questions about how scholars study bilingual education, racism, and Latinx issues, and how policies and practices reify and/or challenge racial inequities. Before my electronic search, I anticipated there being more literature for this review. However, in my search, I found that although there are many works on bilingual education that reference Latinxs, many did not examine racism, race, and/or white supremacy. In other words, just because the research population was Latinx did not mean there was an examination of race by the researcher. In other cases, articles focused on race/racism, but did not attend to the Latinx condition. Thus, I did not include these because they did not meet the criteria. Ultimately, this literature review shows there is less literature that is explicitly about Latinxs and race, and it helps to dispel the impression that inquiries into race, racism, white supremacy (especially inquiries that unambiguously deal with these topics), *and* Latinx issues are more explored than they actually are in bilingual education research.

I adopted the approach of "research as historically situated social practice" (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2014) to code and analyze the 42 articles. This approach helped to survey the field by looking at the social practices in which researchers engaged—that is, what questions the researchers asked, what

frameworks and methods they used, and what their findings were. With this approach, I noted how race, racism, and white supremacy were addressed in the studies, and which critical theories of race researchers used to frame their studies.

Research on bilingual education, Latinxs, and race/racism

In preparing this literature review, I looked for commonalities in the topics in order to identify how the central themes and problems were framed, as well as to see the range and variation in research questions. The literature I examined documented and/or addressed the racial marginalization that bi/multilingual Latinxs face. I analyzed the studies to see how the research constructed the issues it examined, what problems were emphasized, and how white supremacy, racism, and race were addressed. As a result, I identified three lines of inquiry that I synthesized into these overarching questions: (1) *What are the implications of language education policies and laws on bi/multilingual Latinxs and their teachers?* (2) *How do Latinx students and their teachers negotiate their identities within the particular context that pervades language education policy and practice?* and (3) *How do pedagogical and programmatic efforts counter or deal with the effects of their particular language policy context?*

In presenting these three lines of inquiry, I cite all included studies. However, I do not describe all of them. Instead, I expand on articles that I judge to be especially pertinent for the purposes of this review or illustrate certain points I make in the discussion.

Line 1: Context of policies and laws

This line of inquiry grapples with how policies and laws, at the micro or macro level, impact a local or national context (Bondy, 2011; Bratt, 2007; Cashman, 2006; Cline, Necochea, & Rios, 2004; Davila & de Bradley, 2010; Diaz Soto & Kharem, 2006; DuBord, 2010; Flores, 2013; Freire, Valdez, & Delavan, 2017; Galindo, 2011; Marx & Saavedra, 2014; Mitchell, 2005; Olivos & Quintana de Valladolid, 2005; Sung, 2017; Thompson, 2013). Works in this line ask: *What are the implications of language education policies and laws on linguistically diverse Latinxs and their teachers?* The 15 articles that fall under this first line are analytical or conceptual pieces (few collected field data as empirical studies) that provide historical descriptions and/or discussions of language policy and focus on deconstructing policies that affect linguistically marginalized Latinx students. Much of the analysis in this line focuses on changes to language education policies and laws that have been detrimental to linguistically diverse students and their teachers in the U.S. Most works examine contexts that have severe and infamous language restrictive policies (e.g., the states of Arizona,

California, and Massachusetts) or situate the work in the larger atmosphere of anti-bilingualism in the U.S. As a whole, the articles in this line of research identified restrictive language policies as stemming from racist, nativist, and colonialist discourses and ideologies.

Several pieces look at the legacy of racism and white supremacy in educational language policy (DuBord, 2010; Galindo, 2011; Mitchell, 2005). For example, DuBord (2010) shows how bilingual schooling has been used by Mexican elites to promote their children's bilingualism/biliteracy as a means of separating themselves from people of color of lower status. Mitchell (2005), in a historical case study of Massachusetts from 1968 to 1974, examines how an inner-city community transitioned from English-only to bilingual education. Mitchell's research makes connections to the current reinstatement of English-only legislation and institutional racism, and argues that English-only maintained Latinos as an "academic underclass" (p. 269). Galindo (2011) also focuses on the early 1900s to identify the legacy of nativism in our current anti-immigrant climate. Galindo points out that anti-immigrant sentiments are usually labeled as racism, yet nativism is also present in anti-bilingual education discourse and serves to racialize Mexican students "as an inferior race with limited intellectual abilities and as aliens and foreigners to the nation" (p. 327). Although racism and nativism are linked, Galindo urges readers to remember their distinctions, especially in light of institutional discrimination:

Because the legacy of the Civil Rights era has not prevented the implementation of discriminatory policies directed at immigrants, discrimination fueled by nativism and specific to the immigrant experience needs to be regarded as harmful as discrimination fueled by racism. (Galindo, 2011, p. 344)

Galindo continues to state that "discrimination against immigrants is not well understood within a history of societal discrimination narrowly conceived in terms of Black and White issues" (p. 344). For Galindo, this "racial duality" blurs the specificity of Latino/a and the histories affecting immigrant communities. Both Mitchell's and Galindo's articles provide a specificity to the Latinx condition in terms of language policies.

Most authors focus on the implications of banning bilingual education for bi/multilingual Latinxs and linked racism and white supremacy to these restrictive policies (Bratt, 2007; Marx & Saavedra, 2014; Olivos & Quintana de Valladolid, 2005). In an analytic piece on the state of U.S. bilingual education broadly, Diaz Soto and Kharem (2006) frame the push against bilingual education in terms of white supremacy and colonial terrorism. They argue that teacher education programs must pay more attention to the beliefs teachers may have towards bilingual/bicultural children. Bondy (2011) analyzes the current opposition to bilingual

education using Foucault's concept of normalization and concludes that English language learner students' differences are emphasized when compared to White, English-speaking students, and their difference is then used to marginalize them.

Two other authors (Flores, 2013; Thompson, 2013) explore how systemic inequality moderates the effects of proposed solutions to educational disparities. Using bilingual education as a case study, Flores (2013) argues that the extent to which language-minoritized groups can use the nation-state/colonial governmentality logic to advocate for their language rights is significantly limited. Flores concludes that re-appropriation of this logic does not fundamentally impact the ideologies it intends to critique (i.e., colonialism and racism).

In this first line of inquiry, two works use Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) as frameworks (Davila & de Bradley, 2010; Freire et al., 2017). These works show that extant bilingual education programs often predominantly serve the interests of the White, English-dominant majority. Situating institutional racism at the center and viewing racism as ordinary and endemic to society, Davila and de Bradley (2010) analyze data from Chicago Public Schools and other sources to examine Latinas/os' experiences with education policy and connect language to class and race issues youth face. They find that policies work to benefit a few while disenfranchising the rest; for example, Latinas/os had fewer opportunities to enroll in advanced placement, honors, or gifted classes. Similarly, Freire et al. (2017) examine Utah policy and promotional documents for dual language to find that Latina/o's interests were marginalized compared to that of the White, English-dominant majority.

As a whole, the articles in this line of research argue that restrictive language policies stem from racist, nativist, and colonialist discourses and ideologies. Some even frame these policies in terms of white supremacy (Davila & de Bradley, 2010; Diaz Soto & Kharem, 2006). Research in the other two lines of inquiry examines how these and other more equitable policies mediate the experiences of Latinx students and their teachers.

Line 2: Identity and experience

The studies in this line of inquiry generally ask: *How do Latinx students and their teachers negotiate their identities within the particular context that pervades language education policy and practice?* Unlike the first line of inquiry, the seven studies in this section use qualitative methodologies to center issues of identity (Amos, 2016; Arreguín-Anderson & Ruiz-Escalante, 2014; Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Juárez, 2008; Michael-Luna, 2008; Pimentel, 2011; Schreffler, 2007). They present how Latinx students and their teachers are ascribed racial identities and how they negotiate their

identities in the context of language education policy and practice. Some of the studies situate the identity construction and experiences of the participants within institutional racism or white supremacy. Others report encounters with racism without linking the incidents or their implications to these larger discourses or ideologies. However, as a whole, the studies in this line of inquiry demonstrate that the identity negotiation of Latinx students and their teachers is fraught with tensions because of the context of white normativity and racism that pervades language education policy and practice.

One way these studies address the issues intersecting bilingual education, racism, and Latinxs is by examining how policies enforce white normativity and inhibit linguistic expression, thus affecting the identity of the individual (Arreguín-Anderson & Ruiz-Escalante, 2014; Schreffler, 2007). Other studies consider how dimensions of identity (race, class, gender, etc.) affect the identity construction of bi/multilingual Latinxs and their education experiences (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Michael-Luna, 2008; Pimentel, 2011). Cahnmann and Varghese (2005), for example, present a cross-case analysis of two ethnographic studies on the identity-related challenges faced by two bilingual Latina teachers. The teachers' advocacy for bilingual education came at a great cost: they eventually left teaching because they felt constantly challenged professionally and isolated from their colleagues, and were even victims of threats—one teacher received racist hate mail. The authors argue that issues of language are connected to class, socioeconomic status, and race, and thus ultimately to larger political dimensions of a teacher's work. Similarly, Amos (2016) shows how two Latina bilingual teachers were overworked because of their language skills and identity, exploited by their schools. Amos describes the adverse effects they experienced, including feeling marginalized from colleagues.

Other studies explore how schooling affects the racial identities of students. Michael-Luna (2008) uses CRT and critical discourse analysis to examine how first-grade Mexican-origin bilingual students in a Midwestern dual-language classroom chose to identify as either White or Black. During a literacy event on Martin Luther King, Jr., the students self-identified as White because they did not want to identify as Black since they associated this identity with being powerless and excluded. In another example, Pimentel (2011) explores how a “deficit identity” was ascribed to her own son who had all the characteristics of academic readiness but who was treated as an “at-risk” student because the remedial program saw his Spanish language as a barrier. Once the child was moved to an enriched two-way dual-language program, the author reports her son's perceived racial and deficit identity changed and he was labeled as gifted instead. She explains that “the racialization of the Spanish language signifies Spanish as a deficiency in one context and then as a commodity in another context” (p. 351), consequently shaping Latinas/os' schooling experiences.

In another study, Juárez (2008) uses a poststructuralist framework to examine the relationship between teachers' practices and students' identities. Juárez argues that for the Mexican-origin language minority students who make up half of a dual-language program, the "English learner" label emerges as "a racialized and political category of representation or identity ascribed to language minority students" (p. 243). According to Juárez, a racial logic based on whiteness caused contradictions and tensions in the program's mission of fostering educational equity.

Line 3: Addressing the problem

Twenty articles fall into the third line of inquiry (Arce, 2004; Arreguín-Anderson & Kennedy, 2013; Bratt & Cain, 2013; Cammarota & Aguilera, 2012; DeNicolo & Fránquiz, 2006; Faltis & Arias, 2007; Fránquiz, Salazar, & DeNicolo, 2011; Johnson, 2012; Lapayese, 2007; López, 2008; Malsbary, 2014; Meshulam & Apple, 2014; Pacheco, 2010; Palmer, 2007, 2010; Revilla & Asato, 2002; Rodriguez, 2011; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009; Smith & Rodriguez, 2011; Wade, Fauske, & Thompson, 2008). These works explore how people and entities navigate and/or counteract white normativity, deficit views, and racism by asking: *How do pedagogical and programmatic efforts counter or deal with the effects of their particular language policy context?* As with the previous sections, I note the aspects of the studies where the authors frame their research question(s) (i.e., how they construct the problem). Because this is the largest line of research, I sorted the studies into one of three general groupings: (a) pedagogy, (b) negotiating white supremacist language policies, and (c) designing programs.

Pedagogy

Seven studies focus on learning, teaching, and learning to teach in ways that work against dominant narratives concerning linguistically diverse Latinxs, while also accounting for language, race, power, and/or culture (Arce, 2004; DeNicolo & Fránquiz, 2006; Fránquiz et al., 2011; López, 2008; Rodriguez, 2011; Smith & Rodriguez, 2011; Wade et al., 2008). These studies take up this project from the position of the bi/multilingual youth, their teachers, or both. Across the studies, authors report the challenges to providing antiracist and critical pedagogy, and to addressing race and power in classroom conversations and teaching. For example, scholars explore how students understood critical incidents concerning race sparked by multicultural literature (DeNicolo & Fránquiz, 2006), and how teacher educators fostered critically reflective dialogues regarding intersecting identities (Wade et al., 2008) and encouraged teacher candidates to deconstruct deficit views (Fránquiz et al., 2011).

In an example focusing on what the teacher learned from a teacher education course, Rodriguez (2011) provides a narrative study of a novice Latina bilingual resource teacher, Patricia, trying to enact social justice ideals in her teaching. Patricia provides a model for encouraging students to engage in their community through participatory democratic means by, for example, presenting their student-centered research projects to policy makers. Informed by LatCrit, the author offers her research as a form of counter-storytelling that contributes to dispelling deficit assumptions about teachers and youth of color, and “positions bilingual Latino/a immigrant youth as academically talented and gifted rather than language deficient” (p. 250). Though the scholarship suggests that some bilingual education teachers are taking up the challenge of implementing an emancipatory pedagogy that deals with race and racism, the research also shows that bilingual teachers face many difficulties in these efforts.

Negotiating white supremacist language policies

Seven studies investigate how Latinx students (Cammarota & Aguilera, 2012), their teachers (Bratt & Cain, 2013; Johnson, 2012; Lapayese, 2007; Pacheco, 2010; Revilla & Asato, 2002), or both (Malsbary, 2014) negotiate and/or confront white supremacist policies and laws, especially those regulating language and/or affecting language education.

The studies that center teachers’ negotiation of language policies and their effects on Latinx students find that restrictive language practices, reforms, and policies reinforce white supremacy (e.g., Malsbary, 2014), exacerbate a teacher’s deficit-oriented ideologies of Latinx English learners and their families (Pacheco, 2010), place English and white culture as superior to others and as the dominant norm (e.g., Cammarota & Aguilera, 2012; Lapayese, 2007), reify class exploitation, control teaching methods to the detriment of Mexican immigrant and Latinx students, and obligate critically conscious teachers to engage in furtive pedagogical practices (Bratt & Cain, 2013). In an interview-based phenomenological study, Bratt and Cain (2013) investigate how teachers who identified as Mexican/Mexican-American exercised their professional judgment in the Mexico-U.S. border, where teachers used “back-door methods” to promote biliteracy in schools where the use of languages other than English is restricted by legislation. By concealing these efforts, they suffered from anxiety and self-censorship. Bratt and Cain emphasize “Arizona’s linguistic discrimination [affected] English language learners and children who would most benefit from dual language instruction” (p. 153), although the authors leave it for the reader to infer based on the context that these would be Mexican/Latinx students.

In the only youth participatory action research project in this review, Cammarota and Aguilera (2012) describe how high school youth document

their educational experiences in Arizona in the face of particularly high anti-Latinx, anti-immigrant, English-only politics and public sentiment. The student-researchers find that the anti-Latinx discourse negatively impacted how students were viewed. For example, speaking Spanish was framed as a disadvantage at school. Importantly, like the other authors in this section, the authors mark the racism under investigation as a function or part of white supremacy.

Designing programs

Six studies examine responses to contexts where white normativity operates (Arreguín-Anderson & Kennedy, 2013; Faltis & Arias, 2007; Meshulam & Apple, 2014; Palmer, 2007, 2010; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009). These studies generally looked at how pedagogical and programmatic efforts deal with or counter the effects of its particular language policy context. Ultimately, behind many of these articles was the assumption that by documenting and/or examining a program, educators can learn how to improve programs for linguistically diverse students of color. Many of the studies in my review overall were situated within restrictive language policy contexts, but those in this line of inquiry included less restrictive environments. The articles vary on whether they explicitly mention and/or describe the language policies in terms of white supremacy.

These studies focus on efforts to design, at the program level, a more culturally and linguistically relevant experience for participants and/or on how an institutional context can mediate positive programmatic efforts. For example, Meshulam and Apple (2014) find that even in a bilingual elementary school in the Midwest with an antiracist multiculturalist mission that serves African Americans, Latinxs, and Whites, there was limited success in the implementation of a critical multicultural approach that equalized racial power structures. The program fell short because of neoliberal policies that restricted resources, stressed testing, and pushed for equality rather than equity, thus disregarding the unique needs of its communities of color. The authors emphasize that a transformative education for Latino/a and White students was “at the expense of African-American students” (p. 665), thus reproducing social, material, and racial inequalities.

In another study assessing an equity mission, Palmer (2007) ethnographically investigates how an elementary school’s English-dominant context affected its two-way dual-immersion bilingual strand program. Like Meshulam and Apple (2014), Palmer accounts for racism in terms of the racial and class segregation created by the strand program and the resulting tensions in carrying out its mission. Palmer notes that the program had a disproportionately higher number of White, middle-class students compared to the school’s overall racial makeup, resulting in African-American students being mostly designated to the English-only program

and left out of the opportunity to access bilingual education. Similarly, Palmer (2010), who draws from both colorblind racism and CRT's interest convergence for the theoretical framework, finds that the move from a transitional bilingual (serving Spanish speakers) to a dual-immersion model (serving both Spanish and English speakers) reduced the number of Latino children able to receive educational services that would support their bilingualism and biliteracy. By disregarding Latinos' needs and catering to White families, she notes that the program gives Whites a "virtual monopoly" on the spaces in the highly competitive lottery, while African American students are framed by some school personnel as inferior language learners and as "behavior problems," thus not able to benefit from the enriched program.

Now that I have presented the range of questions asked in articles that address racism, white supremacy, and Latinxs in bilingual education, I next move on to discuss how the reviewed studies deploy race frameworks, interrogate white supremacy in bilingual education, and provide specificity to Latinx issues in education.

Discussing racism, white supremacy, and Latinxs in bilingual education

Across the lines of research, the articles I have reviewed document the many challenges that bilingual programs and schools face in addressing racial injustices and meeting the needs of Latinxs. In this section, I discuss trends in the reviewed literature by addressing which contexts were studied, who engaged in the research, and what types of inquiries and perspectives are yet to be explored. I also suggest new directions for future research to explore.

In terms of which contexts were more represented, more than half of the reviewed studies (24 out of the 42)² were set in contexts with language restrictive policies, including states and schools that had moved from bilingual education to language restrictive programs or implemented a full ban on bilingual education for language-minoritized youth. This literature does the important work of documenting how white supremacist anti-bilingual education policies and practices (such as NCLB, English-only, and/or ESL policies) harm the identity, education, and biliteracy development of bi/multilingual Latinxs, as well as the practice of their teachers.

In the eight research studies that take place in dual-language programs (Freire et al., 2017; Juárez, 2008; Meshulam & Apple, 2014; Michael-Luna, 2008; Palmer, 2007, 2010; Pimentel, 2011; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009), scholars clearly center issues of white supremacy, racism, race, and/or their implications for Latinxs. These studies shed light on white supremacy's significant impact on dual-language programs, mostly considered "liberal" education contexts, with policies that promote bilingualism/biliteracy for a racially diverse population, which usually include White students.

While the literature on language-restrictive and dual-language contexts tends to study racism and white supremacy issues candidly, the other studies vary in how their purpose and analysis directly center race, racism, and white supremacy (Amos, 2016; Arce, 2004; Arreguín-Anderson & Kennedy, 2013; Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; DeNicolo & Fránquiz, 2006; Fránquiz et al., 2011; López, 2008; Rodriguez, 2011; Smith & Rodriguez, 2011; Wade et al., 2008). In other words, most of the reviewed research that spotlights white supremacy does so in contexts that are openly white supremacist (e.g., moving from bilingual education programs to assimilationist ESL programs) or have Whites present, such as in racially diverse dual-language programs. This suggests that the literature constructs “the problem of white supremacy” as a phenomenon that manifests in overt ways, for example as English-only policies and/or as racial dynamics with Whites in bilingual programs. For scholars who believe racism is not abnormal but inherent in U.S. institutions, it is unsurprising that white supremacy affects language restrictive contexts *and* bilingual educational settings, such as racially diverse dual-language and even all-Latinx programs. Thus, while research on bilingual education, Latinxs, and race that examines blatant white supremacy is essential, also needed is an analysis that names and focuses on white supremacy’s subtler effects and processes. For example, due to existing in a white supremacist society, bilingual education programs serving an all-Latinx population may still espouse white supremacist logics in its curricula and pedagogy, and consequently teach hegemonic epistemologies. Studying how these bilingual education spaces address anti-Latinx racism and white supremacy could offer different insights into the challenges they face and lessons they may offer other contexts. Future research also should explore how racism and white supremacy operate in various settings, how they affect the ability of schools to provide Latinx youth with an equitable education, and how to design antiracist bilingual education programs.

Nonetheless, the field of bilingual education has begun exploring issues of racism, unlike the field of race studies, which has yet to lend its analytic perspective of how racism and white supremacy function in bilingual education. Whereas many of the articles’ authors described themselves as past bilingual and/or language educators and scholars, none of those researching bilingual education contexts positioned themselves as Critical Race Theorists or scholars of critical race and ethnic studies. Indeed, when the popular framework of Critical Race Theory was used in the reviewed studies, it was mostly by scholars who identified as language/bilingual education scholars. Critical race scholars have mostly overlooked bilingual education as a research inquiry. Perhaps this results from the bifurcation of the fields, and bilingual education being imagined as a linguistic intervention rather than one attempting to ameliorate racial inequities. Race scholars could contribute by employing theories and different questions that would add specificity to

how Latinxs experience racism in various contexts, and to how white supremacy is conceptualized.

Since the article by Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) that “launched a thousand publications” (Leonardo, 2013, p. 4), Critical Race Theory (which emerged from legal scholarship, and falls under the more general critical race theories/studies) has laid a foundation for the education field to discuss racism and has provided the language with which to do so. Several studies from this review use critical race frameworks, such as CRT and LatCrit, with some researchers employing CRT and LatCrit in conjunction, stating that LatCrit allowed them to account for intersectionality, such as seeing language as an important part of the racial experience of Latinxs. Some scholars also mention other concepts and/or tenets from CRT, with most focusing on the principle that the voices and stories of the marginalized should count as evidence, with a few presenting their own experiences and knowledge as educators as evidence to inform their arguments. Scholars argue these voices are important to hear and consider, especially in discussions about anti-bilingual and language education policy and implementation. They document and expose both the experiences of marginalized groups and how the restrictive policies negatively impacted teaching practices with the assumption that making these effects public would engender necessary changes. In the reviewed research, LatCrit was the most commonly used CRT tradition.

The trend of using LatCrit shows another gap in the literature. In studies that use CRT, few mention using the legal constructs and foundations of CRT or employing an analysis based on legal literature like that advocated for by some Critical Race Theorists (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1998, 2011; Tate, 1997). While the traditions that do not use the legal literature in their analysis can provide insightful contributions to understanding racism and white supremacy, using a CRT framework analytically based on CRT’s legal tradition would add new insights into the bilingual education field by facilitating different questions and perspectives on the issues. Additionally, given the popularity of using CRT/LatCrit as a framework in the reviewed studies, this article reveals the need for bilingual education research to examine race and white supremacy using other counterhegemonic race frameworks, such as postcolonial, Chicana feminist, post-structural, and Indigenous frameworks. Using different frameworks will offer analyses that combat the dominant epistemologies that have governed how Latinx and bilingual populations are racialized, studied, and conceptualized (Demas & Saavedra, 2004).

Questions about race and racial formation (i.e., racialization) are also largely absent. From the beginning of my inquiry, I looked for how scholars were addressing race and found, as Leonardo (2013) has noted is the case with critical race studies in education, that the reviewed studies did not

examine *race*. While researchers documented how the Spanish language is negatively racialized thereby affecting Latinxs, with a few exceptions (Juárez, 2008; Michael-Luna, 2008; Pimentel, 2011), much of the research did not theorize how, like all schooling (Lewis, 2011; Omi & Winant, 2015), *bilingual education racializes youth*.

More often, the reviewed literature studies racism by concentrating on language policies that discriminate against Latinx students in order to highlight the youth's experiences with racism; however, these studies did not necessarily theorize or make racialization a focus of their study. Instead researchers spoke about language policies targeting and effecting Latinxs—that is, language was used as a proxy for race to talk about discrimination with racially biased outcomes. Perhaps this points to the research working from the premise that linguisticism is a tool of white supremacy or an equivalent to racism. Indeed, several authors compared discrimination based on race to that based on immigrant status (nativism) and/or language minority status (linguicism). Still, studying racialization in bilingual education from different lenses would provide helpful insights. The lack of examinations on racialization results in the literature not providing specificity about the Latinx experience in terms of understanding how race is constructed for Latinxs in bilingual education. For example, one could wonder if, for Latinxs, racism in bilingual education spaces consists mostly of issues about language access and representation.

Additionally, future studies could examine how bilingual education programs attempt to offer a counterhegemonic education that exposes students to marginalized epistemologies. Such a shift would require new and different research questions. Research also could contribute to the field of bilingual education by analyzing the dominant racial and raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015) being taught to youth and relate this to white supremacy. Inquiries into the ideologies and epistemologies being taught in the classroom would complement the call by other researchers to include a component of critical consciousness in dual-language schooling (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Freire, 2016) by showing whether and/or how bilingual programs engage in enhancing youths' critical consciousness.

In conclusion, the reviewed research provides information about how bilingual education programs are marginalizing and/or addressing the needs of Latinx students in order to inform educational policy-making, program design, and teacher preparation. With a focus on white supremacy and racism, my analysis of the bilingual education literature pushes the field to rethink how to model language programs and prepare teachers by focusing not just on the more common questions of language separation and allocation in programs, but on racial dynamics. Considering that this is a nascent area of inquiry, bilingual education can look forward to researchers continuing to provide insights into these important issues using a wide range of critical race and non-

dominant epistemological frameworks to examine white supremacy, racism, and race.

Notes

1. I employ an *-x* at the end of *Chicanx* and *Latinx* in order to include gender-nonconforming Latinxs/Chicanxs and to contribute to a political project that upsets gender binaries. When referring to other authors' work, I defer to the terms they use.
2. The 24 studies include 14 articles in Line 1 (all of Line 1 except Freire et al., 2017) and 10 studies from other lines: Arreguín-Anderson and Ruiz-Escalante (2014); Bratt and Cain (2013); Cammarota and Aguilera (2012); Faltis and Arias (2007); Johnson (2012); Lapayese (2007); Malsbary (2014); Pacheco (2010); Revilla and Asato (2002); and Schreffler (2007).

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Mariana Pacheco for providing insightful comments on an early version of this manuscript, and to thank the anonymous reviewers who volunteered to offer feedback on this article. Their comments and suggestions greatly improved the article.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

ORCID

Laura C. Chávez-Moreno  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6804-4961>

References

- Amos, Y. T. (2016). Wanted and used: Latina bilingual education teachers at public schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 49(1), 41–56. doi:10.1080/10665684.2015.1122557
- Amos, Y. T. (2018). *Latina bilingual education teachers: Examining structural racism in schools*. NY: Routledge.
- Arce, J. (2004). Latino bilingual teachers: The struggle to sustain an emancipatory pedagogy in public schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(2), 227–246. doi:10.1080/09518390310001653880
- Arreguín-Anderson, M. G., & Kennedy, K. D. (2013). Deliberate language planning in environmental education: A CRT/LatCrit perspective. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 44(1), 1–15. doi:10.1080/00958964.2012.665098
- Arreguín-Anderson, M. G., & Ruiz-Escalante, J. A. (2014). Una perspectiva crítica racial de la opresión lingüística desde el lente de voces chicanas. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, 13(1), 54–61. doi:10.1080/15348431.2013.800814
- Bondy, J. M. (2011). Normalizing English language learner students: A Foucauldian analysis of opposition to bilingual education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 14(3), 387–398. doi:10.1080/13613324.2010.543392

- Bratt, K. R. (2007). Violence in the curriculum: Compulsory linguistic discrimination in the Arizona-Sonora borderlands. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 5(1), 209–224.
- Bratt, K. R., & Cain, A. A. (2013). A delicate balance: The clandestine work of bilingual teachers of bilingual children in English-only borderlands classrooms. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 10(2), 150–184. doi:10.1080/15427587.2013.788380
- Burns, M. (2017). “Compromises that we make”: Whiteness in the dual-language context. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(4), 339–352. doi:10.1080/15235882.2017.1388303
- Cahnmann, M., & Varghese, M. M. (2005). Critical advocacy and bilingual education in the United States. *Linguistics and Education*, 16(1), 59–73. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2005.10.002
- Cammarota, J., & Aguilera, M. (2012). ‘By the time I get to Arizona’: Race, language, and education in America’s racist state. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 15(4), 485–500. doi:10.1080/13613324.2012.674025
- Cashman, H. R. (2006). Who wins in research on bilingualism in an anti-bilingual state? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(1), 42–60. doi:10.1080/17447140608668537
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual-language immersion in the new Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 64–82. doi:10.1080/15235882.2014.893267
- 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. doi:10.3102/0091732X17690120
- Chávez-Moreno, L. C. (2018). *A critical race ethnography examining dual-language education in the new Latinx diaspora: Reinforcing and resisting bilingual education’s racial roots* (PhD Dissertation). University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Cline, Z., Necochea, J., & Rios, F. (2004). The tyranny of democracy: Deconstructing the passage of racist propositions. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 3(2), 67–85. doi:10.1207/s1532771xjle0302_2
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Villegas, A. M. (2014). Framing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field, part 1. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(1), 7–20. doi:10.1177/0022487114549072
- Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chávez-Moreno, L. C., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2013). Research on teacher preparation: Charting the landscape of a sprawling field. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 439–547). Washington, DC: AERA.
- Combs, M. C., DaSilva Iddings, A. C., & Moll, L. C. (2014). 21st century linguistic apartheid: English language learners in Arizona public schools. In P. Orelus (Ed.), *Affirming language diversity in schools and society: Beyond linguistic apartheid* (pp. 23–34). NY: Routledge.
- Davila, E. R., & de Bradley, A. A. (2010). Examining education for Latinas/os in Chicago: A CRT/LatCrit approach. *Educational Foundations*, 24(1–2), 39–58.
- 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. doi:10.1080/19313152.2016.1204890
- Demas, E., & Saavedra, C. M. (2004). (Re)conceptualizing language advocacy: Weaving a postmodern mestizaje image of language. In K. Mutua & B. B. Swadener (Eds.), *Decolonizing research in cross-cultural contexts: Critical personal narratives* (pp. 215–234).
- DeNicolò, C. P., & Fránquiz, M. E. (2006). “Do I have to say it?”: Critical encounters with multicultural children’s literature. *Language Arts*, 84(2), 157–170. doi:10.2307/41962177
- Diaz Soto, L., & Kharem, H. (2006). A post-monolingual education. *International Journal of Educational Policy, Research, and Practice*, 7(1), 21–34.

- Dixon, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 7–27. doi:10.1080/1361332052000340971
- DuBord, E. M. (2010). Language policy and the drawing of social boundaries: Public and private schools in territorial Tucson. *Spanish in Context*, 7(1), 25–45. doi:10.1075/sic.7.1.02dub
- Faltis, C., & Arias, B. (2007). Coming out of the ESL ghetto: Promising practices for Latino immigrant students and English learners in hypersegregated secondary schools. *Journal of Border Educational Research*, 6(2), 19–35.
- Flores, N. (2013). Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual education in the United States. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 10(4), 263–287. doi:10.1080/15427587.2013.846210
- Flores, N. (2015). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 13–38. doi:10.1177/0895904815616482
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. doi:10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149
- Fránquiz, M. E., Salazar, M. C., & DeNicolo, C. P. (2011). Challenging majoritarian tales: Portraits of bilingual teachers deconstructing deficit views of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34(3), 279–300. doi:10.1080/15235882.2011.625884
- 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., Valdez, V. E., & Delavan, M. G. (2017). The (dis)inclusion of Latina/o interests from Utah's dual-language education boom. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, 16(4), 276–289. doi:10.1080/15348431.2016.1229617
- Galindo, R. (2011). The nativistic legacy of the Americanization era in the education of Mexican immigrant students. *Educational Studies*, 47, 323–346. doi:10.1080/00131946.2011.589308
- Gándara, P. C., & Hopkins, M. (2010). *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2009b). Racializing the language practices of U.S. Latinos: Impact on their education. In J. A. Cobas, J. Duany, & J. R. Feagin (Eds.), *How the United States racializes Latinos: White hegemony and its consequences* (pp. 101–115). Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing education practice in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hadi-Tabassum, S. (2006). *Language, space and power: A critical look at bilingual education*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Johnson, E. J. (2012). Arbitrating repression: Language policy and education in Arizona. *Language and Education*, 26(1), 53–76. doi:10.1080/09500782.2011.615936
- Juárez, B. G. (2008). The politics of race in two languages: An empirical qualitative study. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(3), 231–249. doi:10.1080/13613320802291132
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2009). Preface. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. viii–x). NY: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7–24. doi:10.1080/095183998236863
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2011). Race ... to the Top, again: Comments on the genealogy of critical race theory. *Connecticut Law Review*, 43(5), 1439–1457.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47–68.

- Lapayese, Y. V. (2007). Understanding and undermining the racio-economic agenda of No Child Left Behind: Using critical race methodology to investigate the labor of bilingual teachers. *Race Ethnicity & Education*, 10(3), 309–321. doi:10.1080/13613320701503306
- Lather, P. (1999). To be of use: The work of reviewing. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(1), 2–7. doi:10.3102/00346543069001002
- Leonardo, Z. (2013). *Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory of racism and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lewis, A. E. (2011). *Race in the schoolyard: Negotiating the color line in classrooms and communities*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Liggett, T. (2014). The mapping of a framework: Critical race theory and TESOL. *The Urban Review*, 46(1), 112–124. doi:10.1007/s11256-013-0254-5
- López, N. (2008). Antiracist pedagogy and empowerment in a bilingual classroom in the U.S., circa 2006. *Theory Into Practice*, 47(1), 43–50. doi:10.1080/00405840701764755
- Lowenhaupt, R. (2015). Bilingual education policy in Wisconsin's New Latino Diaspora. In E. T. Hamann, S. Wortham, & E. G. Murillo (Eds.), *Revisiting education in the New Latino Diaspora* (pp. 245–262). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Macías, R. F., de Macías, C. W., de La Torre, W., & Vásquez, M. (1975). *Educación alternativa: On the development of Chicano bilingual schools*. Hayward, CA: Southwest Network.
- Malsbary, C. (2014). “Will this hell never end?”: Substantiating and resisting race-language policies in a multilingual high school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 45(4), 373–390. doi:10.1111/aeq.12076
- Marx, S. (2006). *Revealing the invisible: Confronting passive racism in teacher education*. New York: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203961537
- Marx, S., & Saavedra, C. M. (2014). Understanding the epistemological divide in ESL education: What we learned from a failed university-school district collaboration. *Urban Education*, 49(4), 418–439. doi:10.1177/0042085913478624
- Meshulam, A., & Apple, M. W. (2014). Interrupting the interruption: Neoliberalism and the challenges of an antiracist school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(5), 650–669. doi:10.1080/01425692.2014.919847
- Michael-Luna, S. (2008). “Todos somos blancos”/we are all White: Constructing racial identities through texts. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 7(3–4), 272–293. doi:10.1080/15348450802237913
- Mitchell, C. (2005). English Only: The creation and maintenance of an academic underclass. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, 4(4), 253–270. doi:10.1207/s1532771xjle0404_4
- Mitchell, K. (2013). Race, difference, meritocracy, and English: Majoritarian stories in the education of secondary multilingual learners. *Race Ethnicity & Education*, 16(3), 339–364. doi:10.1080/13613324.2011.645569
- Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Olivos, E. M., & Quintana de Valladolid, C. E. (2005). Entre la espada y la pared: Critical educators, bilingual education, and education reform. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, 4(4), 283–293. doi:10.1207/s1532771xjle0404_6
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2015). *Racial formation in the United States* (3rd ed.). NY: Routledge.
- Orellana, M. F., & Bowman, P. (2003). Cultural diversity research on learning and development: Conceptual, methodological, and strategic considerations. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 26–32. doi:10.3102/0013189X032005026
- Pacheco, M. (2010). Performativity in the bilingual classroom: The plight of English learners in the current reform context. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 75–93. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1492.2010.01068.x

- 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 & Bilingualism*, 10(6), 752–768. doi:10.2167/beb397.0
- Palmer, D. (2010). Race, power, and equity in a multiethnic urban elementary school with a dual-language “strand” program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 94–114. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1492.2010.01069.x
- Pimentel, C. (2011). The color of language: The racialized educational trajectory of an emerging bilingual student. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 10(4), 335–353. doi:10.1080/15348431.2011.605686
- Revilla, A. T., & Asato, J. (2002). The implementation of Proposition 227 in California schools: A critical analysis of the effect on teacher beliefs and classroom practices. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 108–118. doi:10.1080/713845279
- Rodriguez, T. L. (2011). Stories of self, stories of practice: Enacting a vision of socially just pedagogy for Latino youth. *Teaching Education*, 22(3), 239–254. doi:10.1080/10476210.2011.593165
- San Miguel, G. (1987). The status of historical research on Chicano education. *Review of Educational Research*, 57(4), 467–480. doi:10.3102/00346543057004467
- Scanlan, M., & Palmer, D. (2009). Race, power, and (in)equity within two-way immersion settings. *The Urban Review*, 41(5), 391–415. doi:10.1007/s11256-008-0111-0
- Schreffler, S. B. (2007). Hispanic heritage language speakers in the United States: Linguistic exclusion in education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 4(1), 25–34. doi:10.1080/15427580701340683
- Smith, M. D., & Rodriguez, A. (2011). A critical foundation for bilingual education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 9(2), 186–198.
- Spring, J. (2016). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States* (8th ed.). NY: Routledge.
- Sung, K. K. (2017). “Accentuate the positive; eliminate the negative”: Hegemonic interest convergence, racialization of Latino poverty, and the 1968 Bilingual Education Act. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 92(3), 302–321. doi:10.1080/0161956X.2017.1324657
- Tate, W. F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, 22, 195–247. doi:10.2307/1167376
- Thompson, K. D. (2013). Is separate always unequal? A philosophical examination of ideas of equality in key cases regarding racial and linguistic minorities in education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(6), 1249–1278. doi:10.3102/0002831213502519
- Urrieta, L. (2010). Whitestreaming: Why some Latinas/os fear bilingual education. *Counterpoints*, 371, 47–55.
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 10, 391–429. doi:10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948
- Wade, S. E., Fauske, J. R., & Thompson, A. (2008). Prospective teachers’ problem solving in online peer-led dialogues. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(2), 398–442. doi:10.3102/0002831207308224
- Wiley, T. G. (2007). Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the US context. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism: an Introductory Reader*, 61, 89–107.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69–91. doi:10.1080/1361332052000341006