Foreword: Toward a Post-Gentrification Future in Bilingual Education Research, Policy and Practice

Nelson Flores

One day I was visiting a dual language class at a school that I will call Washington Elementary School located in a racially and linguistically diverse working-class though rapidly gentrifying neighborhood. It was a hot day toward the end of the school year and I noticed that the room was one of the few in the school with air-conditioning. When I asked the teacher about this, she told me that some of the affluent white parents with children in the program had done a fundraiser to purchase the air conditioner for the classroom. On the one hand, she welcomed this support especially on such a hot day and acknowledged the advantages to having such well-resourced and politically savvy parents supporting the program. On the other hand, she worried about the expectations that often came with this involvement, with some of these parents expecting special treatment because of the resources they were able to bring to the program. She also worried about the resentment this created among non-dual language teachers at the school who were forced to endure the heat because they did not have well-resourced parents who could advocate for them in this way. Indeed, the air conditioner was the latest in a long list of complaints that other teachers had made to the principal about the special privileges received by the dual language teachers – a sentiment this teacher adamantly rejected based on the massive amounts of work she had to do to manage the expectations of the very involved affluent white parents while ensuring that the needs of the low-income Latinx students and families were also addressed.

Another day I was visiting a dual language class at a school that I will call Hamilton Elementary School located in a high poverty and highly segregated predominantly Latinx neighborhood. That day I was joined by a central office administrator charged with overseeing the expansion of dual language education in the city. Her original goal was to replicate the success of Washington Elementary School in attracting affluent white families into the dual language program as a way of fostering school integration

that would bring much needed resources to Hamilton. I expressed skepticism that the school would be able to attract affluent white families because of its location in what some refer to as the 'Badlands', an area of the city that has experienced institutional neglect resulting in multiple generations of racialized poverty and the resulting violence typically associated with such poverty. She initially pushed back on my suggestion, insisting that if the program were strong enough affluent white parents who were clamoring for more options for their children would flock to it. After visiting the school with me that day, she conceded the point that the massive poverty of the surrounding neighborhood would make it impossible to market the school in the ways that she had envisioned and that it made sense to focus on making it more effective for the existing student population. Yet, none of the resources she had available to her were designed to develop a strong dual language program within a long-standing bilingual community rather than an even balance of 'native English' and 'native Spanish' speakers and she and I both struggled with how best to support the school in strengthening its program as part of our ongoing collaboration with the school.

Most advocates see the promotion of dual language education as part of broader efforts to promote racial equity. Yet, as both anecdotes above show, this is easier said than done in a society plagued by stark and long-standing racial inequities. At schools like Washington Elementary School, a major challenge is to balance the needs of the very outspoken and often fickle affluent white parents with the needs of the low-income Latinx students also served in the program, as well as the predominantly low-income students of color served by the rest of the school. At schools like Hamilton Elementary School, the major challenge is how to create a high-quality dual language program that doesn't presuppose the need for the presence of affluent white families while also confronting the effects of multiple generations of racialized poverty. *Overcoming the Gentrification of Dual Language, Bilingual and Immersion Education* offers a cohesive framework for understanding these challenges as related, rather than separate from one another. It does so by framing gentrification as an analytic tool not simply for understanding the fraught nature of racial dynamics within actual gentrifying neighborhoods but also for analyzing the ways that dual language education has increasingly centered the needs of affluent white students over the needs of racialized bilingual students regardless of where they are located. In this way, the gentrification of dual language education can be understood both as the physical displacement of racialized bilingual students from these programs and the normative assumptions of language development built around theories developed within contexts of elite bi/multilingualism that have been universalized in ways that marginalize language development within contexts of racialized bilingualism.

Adopting the more comprehensive framing of gentrification of *Overcoming the Gentrification of Dual Language, Bilingual and Immersion*

Education allows us to reinterpret the history of bilingual education in ways that see that this gentrification was present from the time that bilingual education became institutionalized in the United States in the late 1960s. The common narrative surrounding the gentrification of bilingual education is that it marks a break with the earlier goal of bilingual education that was focused primarily on building on and extending the existing cultural and linguistic practices of racialized bilingual students. Yet, if we look closer at the historical developments of the field, it quickly becomes apparent that bilingual education in its institutionalized forms has never actually sought to achieve this goal and has, instead, always reproduced normative assumptions of language development that framed racialized bilingualism as a barrier to learning. Of note was the fact that the supposed cognitive benefits of bilingualism within a Canadian context of elite bilingualism (Peal & Lambert, 1962) were not found by educational psychologists within the US context of racialized bilingualism. Building on the culture of poverty theory that was the dominant approach to social science research and policymaking in the 1960s and 1970s (Goldstein, 2012), the argument that would emerge to explain this apparent discrepancy was that racialized bilingualism prevented students from developing native capacities in any language (Cummins, 1976). This would eventually morph into the argument that these students had basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) but not cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) in either language and that bilingual education would be able to address this deficit by providing them with a strong foundation in their first language (L1) that they could transfer to English (Cummins, 1980). This was a reconfiguration of long-standing raciolinguistic ideologies that framed the language practices of racialized communities as deficient and in need of remediation (Rosa & Flores, 2017) and illustrates the ways that theories of bilingual education were gentrified far before the programs were.

It is this gentrifying of the theories of bilingual education that would pave the way for the physical gentrification addressed by the chapters in *Overcoming the Gentrification of Dual Language, Bilingual and Immersion Education*. By reifying the hegemonic modes of perception of the white listening subject (Rosa & Flores, 2017), bilingual education's reemergence in the United States after the 1960s became reframed as a remedial intervention that was designed to fix the supposed cultural and linguistic pathologies of racialized bilingual students (Flores, 2016). Considering the raciolinguistic ideologies that have shaped dominant theories in bilingual education, it should come as no surprise that the shift away from a remedial orientation to an enrichment orientation would do little to address the root of the issue and would even raise questions as to whether racialized bilingual students who supposedly lacked a strong foundation in any language should even be allowed to access such enrichment programs. This astute observation was prophetically made by Guadalupe Valdés in 1997 just as

advocates for bilingual education were beginning to move toward dual language education as a counterattack to the political assaults on remedially oriented transitional bilingual education programs. Situating her argument within the generations of deficit perspectives that have shaped societal and social science researcher representations of Mexican American communities, Valdés' argument provides an important foundation to the raciolinguistic perspective that has emerged in recent years that points to the limits of linguistic solutions in countering generations of racial oppressions and the danger that reliance on linguistic solutions will reinscribe the racial hierarchies that they purport to combat. *Overcoming the Gentrification of Dual Language, Bilingual and Immersion Education* brings together critical scholars and activists to continue these conversations with the goal of situating dual language education within broader struggles for racial equity.

While some readers may see the arguments being articulated throughout *Overcoming the Gentrification of Dual Language, Bilingual and Immersion Education* as pessimistic, I see each chapter and the entire volume as optimistic in their belief that bilingual education can play an integral role in the construction of a post-gentrification world. The chapter authors dare to imagine policies designed to dismantle gentrification that include inclusive housing policies and efforts to eradicate poverty. They work to develop post-gentrification research in bilingual education by unapologetically decentering whiteness and recentering the cultural and linguistic knowledge of racialized communities. They collaborate with educators and communities in developing post-gentrification approaches to bilingual education that no longer make their primary goal to attract the right number of students that fit into preselected demographic categories such as 'native English speaker' and 'native Spanish speaker' but rather to build culturally and linguistically responsive policies and practices that center the resistance and resiliency of racialized bilingual communities. Rejecting the gentrification of bilingual education theories is an important first step that bilingual education scholars and activists can take in our research and collaborations with schools and educators. Anybody looking for ways of doing this have a treasure trove in *Overcoming the Gentrification of Dual Language, Bilingual and Immersion Education*.

References

Cummins, J. (1976) The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: A synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, no. 9.

Cummins, J. (1980) The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. *NABE Journal* 4, 25–59.

Flores, N. (2016) A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy* 30, 13–38.

Goldstein, A. (2012) *Poverty in Common: The Politics of Community Action during the American Century*. Duke University Press.

Peal, E. and Lambert, W. (1962) The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs* 76, 1–23.
Rosa, J. and Flores, N. (2017) Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society* 46, 621–647.
Valdés, G. (1997) Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review* 67, 391–429.