

al., 2015; Wiley, 2002). In sum, the aim is to assess the evolution made in language education policy with respect to emergent bilingual learners and to see where we might go from here.

Late 19th Century-1960s

Until the end of the nineteenth century, bilingual education was widely authorized in a number of states. Locally operated bilingual education was provided throughout the United States in many non-English languages, including French, Norwegian, Italian, Swedish, Danish, Dutch, German, and Spanish (Kloss, 1977/1998). Although, during this period, immigrant groups managed to maintain their heritage language while participating in the civic life of the new nation, it is important to note that bilingual education in the 19th century was not intentionally for the promotion of bilingualism. Rather, many localities provided bilingual instruction without state sanction, and “a policy of linguistic assimilation without coercion” seemed to prevail (Ovando, 2003, p. 4). With the new wave of immigrants from Europe in the early twentieth century, the Americanization movement came into being as many native-born residents perceived the mass immigrants as a threat to society (Blanton, 2004). By educating foreigners in English and conveying “American values” in schools, the Americanization movement eventually became characterized by cultural and linguistic assimilation, political loyalty, as well as construction of national identity (Behdad, 2005). During the Americanization era, the use of languages other than English were prohibited by harsh restrictive language policies and bilingual programs were quickly replaced by English-only instructions.

The xenophobia of World War I caused the United States to push for monolingualism and curtail bilingual programs (Ramsey, 2010). In particular, German as a foreign language was eliminated in most schools and English-only instruction started proliferating during the post-World War I period. From the 1920–1960s, English immersion, or “sink or swim” policies became dominant methods of instruction for language minority children (Hakuta, 1986). For linguistically-minoritized students, there were few or no remedial services provided, and education was restrictedly dominated by monolingualism (Baker & Jones, 1998). Behind the “sink or swim” approach is the belief that language minority students themselves should be the ones responsible to assimilate into the U.S. society. Language policies, during this period, served as a practical tool to tame the conquered groups’ ideological principles, destroy minority cultures, and help the nation maintain colonial domination (Crawford, 1992).

1960s-1980s

With the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s and the 1964 Civil Rights Act, bilingual education advocates started engaging in transformative practices to acknowledge the plight of language minoritized students and endeavor to nurture linguistic diversities. The passage of Bilingual Education Act (BEA) (1968), Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, indicated a major shift of establishing and funding bilingual programs for emergent bilingual students. Specifically, the amendment provided financial assistance to local educational agencies and attempted to meet the special needs of students with “Limited English Proficiency” (LEP). However, the aim of BEA was ambiguous and controversial. Following the guidance of BEA, it was unclear whether the purpose of the Act was to help children become literate in two languages or to transition them into English at the earliest moment as possible (Crawford, 2004). As Crawford (2000) writes, “the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 passed Congress without a single voice raised in dissent. [But] Americans have spent the past 30 years debating what it was meant to accomplish” (p. 107). Despite the ambiguity of the law, BEA marked a significant step in moving away from

the “sink-or-swim” approach and provided the initial foundation for ensuring the legislative credibility of supporting students in bilingual instruction.

The next landmark in the evolution of language education policy for emergent bilinguals was the 1974 Supreme Court case *Lau v. Nichols* (414 U.S. 5637). In this Supreme Court case, approximately 1,800 non-English-speaking Chinese students alleged discrimination grounded on the lack of supplemental English classes in the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). Consequently, basing the unanimous decision on the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Court ruled public schools receiving federal funds must provide linguistically-minoritized students with supplemental language instructions to ensure their rights of receiving equal education. The *Lau* verdict had an enormous impact on the development of bilingual education in the U.S. and further led to the passage of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act in August 1974. With this Act, Congress affirmed the *Lau* decision and expanded its jurisdiction to apply to all public school districts, not just those receiving federal financial assistance (Teitelbaum & Hiller, 1977).

1980s-2002

After the previous 20-year period of opportunity, however, bilingual education was challenged and attacked by a new political perspective in the 1980s, which no longer cherished minority communities’ ethnic culture. For example, in 1981, newly elected President Reagan amplified his political standing with the following statement:

It is absolutely wrong and against American concepts to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so they can go out into the job market and participate. (R. Reagan, public speech, March 3rd, 1981)

Building on Reagan’s political agenda, by 1988 English-only programs were allowed to receive as much as 25% of Title I part A school program grants - a significant increase from four percent adopted in 1984. The increase in funds for English-only programs reflected the political strategies that intentionally eliminated languages other than English from the educational system.

At the state level, a clear consequence of language prejudice is reflected in the passage of Proposition 227 in California (1998), also known as the “English for Children” initiative. The endorsement of Proposition 227 in California came close to placing emergent bilingual students back onto the “sink-or-swim” approach. That is, students can now only receive a maximum one-year instruction in their home language before being placed in mainstream English classrooms (García & Curry-Rodríguez, 2000). Following the passage of Proposition 227, similar legislation was passed in Arizona (Proposition 203) in 2000 and Massachusetts (Question 2) in 2002. Simply put, these initiatives represent a trend of the modern English-only movement across the states that threw bilingual programs into turmoil.

2002-2015

After the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002, bilingualism as a resource and tool in the education of emergent bilinguals has been increasingly marginalized (Crawford, 2004). That is, under NCLB, education was envisioned as an activity that measures students’ success solely based on performance on English-only high-stakes tests (Menken, 2008). As part of this process, the term bilingual, which Crawford (2004) has called “the B-word”, was systematically been erased from the legislation and from the names of official bureaus and laws. García (2009)

documented how the progressive elimination of the term bilingual was represented at the federal level (see Figure 1). In short, the erasure of “the B-word” implies an intentional disarticulation of issues surrounding bilingualism.

Figure 1.

Elimination of the Term “Bilingual” from the Names of Official Bureaus and Laws

BEFORE	AFTER
Title VII of the ESEA, known as the <u>Bilingual</u> Education Act	Title III of NCLB, known as Language Instruction for <u>Limited English Proficient Students</u> .
The Office of <u>Bilingual</u> Education and Minority Languages Affairs	The Office of <u>English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement</u> for Limited English Proficiency Students
National Clearinghouse for <u>Bilingual</u> Education	National Clearinghouse for <u>English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction</u> Educational Program

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was reauthorized by President Barack Obama in 2015, as Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Under ESSA, states are required to hold schools accountable for the progress of English learners towards language proficiency and academic progress. While ESSA continues the goals of NCLB of ensuring high standards and accountability, it lessens federal oversight over education and decentralizes accountability decisions to state and local levels. By providing state and local education agencies the autonomy to establish standards and report on students’ progress, ESSA brought an era in which emergent bilinguals’ schooling experiences vary across states and are deeply associated with state immigrant policy contexts (Callahan et al., 2020). That means, emergent bilingual learners can end up being served with very different programs depending on state and local policies. In this sense, the diversity in approaches to educating bilingual learners are across different states offers valuable insights into the political discourse within specific contexts (Welton et al., 2023).

Contemporary Dilemmas in Bilingual Education in the U.S.

In recent years, the profile and demographics of English learners have changed tremendously. While emergent bilingual learners may typically be portrayed as students who recently arrived in the U.S. and primarily speak a language other than English, recent studies show that the majority of students identified as English learners (ELs) were born in the U.S. and likely have been exposed to English before entering school (Johnson, 2023). In response, the model of dual language education (DLE) or two-way immersion started to make inroads recently. Students in DLE programs are typically described as a combination of emergent bilingual learners and students who speak English as their primary language. The involvement of both groups of students signals a growing awareness of equity and language rights and offers an alternative to the pervasive English-only stance (de Jong et al., 2020). Instead of solely focusing on the English proficiency of emergent bilingual learners, the goals of DLE programs gear towards “developing bilingual skills, academic excellence, and positive cross-cultural and personal competency attitudes for both groups of students” (Lindholm-Leary, 2001, p. 30).

Despite the laudable goal, it is crucial to be aware of the power dynamics in the DLE classrooms. Specifically, DLE programs separate English and the partner language during class to provide uninterrupted instructions in each language. However, such strict language separation in DLE programs inadvertently overlooks the fluid bilingualism of many emergent bilingual learners and forces students to be categorized as speakers of either English or the other (paired language), thus causing language minoritized students to be alienated (de Jong, 2016; Howard et al., 2007). At the same time, DLE makes bilingual education a product whose consumers are not necessarily emergent bilingual learners (Petrovic, 2005). In this way, emergent bilingual learners' home-language proficiency becomes a commodity that is desired by white middle-class parents (Palmer, 2010) and for the profit of white middle-class children (Flores & Garcia, 2017).

Discussion and Conclusion

In this article, I reviewed the evolution of language education policy in the U.S. from the late nineteenth century until the early 2020s. The brief look at the historical profiles of policies in the field provides evidence of the continuing need for developing more equitable bilingual education programs as well as indicating the demand for more informed policymakers, well-prepared teachers, and critical researchers. As we have observed, language education policies have seen major waves and shifts in the value and models that either support or oppress the linguistic rights of language minoritized students. The lack of coherence on policy for emergent bilingual learners rests upon the complicated relations lying between politics, language, education and society. Thus, it is important to understand not just what language ideologies and value discourse are presently embedded in language education policies, but also how the ideologies and discourses have come to domination and for what reasons.

For example, on a positive note, it is within the context of the Civil Rights movement that bilingual education emerged, as part of a broader effort to dismantle white supremacy and instill cultural pride in Latinx and other minoritized communities (Flores & García, 2017). The massive policy shifts toward standardized testing and accountability in the 21st century reflect neoliberal consideration of the language skills of individuals and the nation; the recent movement leaning towards DLE programs represents a free-market interpretation of bilingual education that result in it being more accessed by privileged groups than language minoritized communities. Briefly, the programs, forms, and policies of language education for emergent bilingual learners in motion in the U.S., are not absolute and isolated changes but rather a correspondence of complex, enduring and evolving elements in relation to governance (Ball, 2016).

Overall, this review contributes to the contemporary field of language education policy related to ESOL programs in two ways. First, through tracing the evolution of U.S. language education policies as it pertains to K-12 emergent bilingual learners, this review enables us to have a more complex understanding of the relationship between politics, policy, and education. Second, situated in the ramped up xenophobic rhetoric and the recent anti-immigration socio-political context, this review provides critical implications for ESOL teachers and educators to engage in the dense policy work and create liberating and healing spaces for (im)migrant bilingual students. For critical teachers and educators who are committed to advocating for students' language rights, it is crucial to connect flows of politics, power, and language policy to acknowledge the value of students' home language, amplify the fluid bilingualism of bilingual students, revive a sense of agency, and fight for students' linguistic rights and educational equity (Bacon, 2020; Fu & Aubain, 2023).

References

- Anderson, T., & Boyer, M. (1970). *Bilingual schooling in the United States*. Southwest Education Development Laboratory.
- Anyon, J. (2005). What "counts" as educational policy? Notes toward a new paradigm. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(1), 65-88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118783188>
- Bacon, C. K. (2020). "It's not really my job": A mixed methods framework for language ideologies, monolingualism, and teaching emergent bilingual learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(2), 172-187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118783188>
- Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (Eds.). (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ball, S. J. (2016). Following policy: Networks, network ethnography and education policy mobilities. *Journal of education policy*, 31(5), 549-566. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2015.1122232>
- Behdad, A. (2005). *A forgetful nation: On immigration and cultural identity in the United States*. Duke University Press.
- Blanton, C. K. (2004). *The strange career of bilingual education in Texas, 1836-1981*. Texas A&M University Press.
- Brooks, M. D. (2015). "It's like a script": Long-term English learners' experiences with and ideas about academic reading. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 383-406. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24398712>
- Callahan, R., Gautsch, L., Hopkins, M., & Carmen Unda, M. D. (2020). Equity and state immigrant inclusivity: English learner education in ESSA. *Educational Policy*, 1-43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904820925819>
- Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of "English-only"*. Addison-Wesley.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Bilingual Educational Services.
- Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety*. Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom*. Bilingual Educational Services.
- de Jong, E. J. (2016). Two-way immersion for the next generation: Models, policies, and principles. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(1), 6-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1118667>
- de Jong, E. J., Coulter, Z., & Tsai, M. C. (2023). Two-way bilingual education programs and sense of belonging: Perspectives from middle school students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 26(1), 84-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1783635>
- de Jong, E. J., Yilmaz, T., & Marichal, N. (2020). Multilingualism-as-a-resource orientation in dual language education. In P. Ramírez & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Dual Language Education in the US* (pp. 53-71). Routledge.
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2017). A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 14-29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000162>

- Fu, S. (2021). Breaking the silence: A critical review of language policy and planning for long-term English learners. *GATESOL Journal*, 31(1), 17-35. <https://doi.org/10.52242/gatesol.125>
- Fu, S., & Aubain, Y. (2023). Navigating power in multilingual classrooms: teachers' engagement with language education policies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2270968>
- Gándara, P. C., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Harvard University Press.
- Gándara, P., & Escamilla, K. (2017). Bilingual education in the United States. *Bilingual and multilingual education*, 12, 439-452.
- García, E. E., & Curry-Rodríguez, J. E. (2000). The education of limited English proficient students in California schools: An assessment of the influence of Proposition 227 in selected districts and schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(1-2), 15-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2000.10162749>
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Mohanty, A. K. and Panda, M. (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140-158). Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2009). Emergent Bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 322-326. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00172.x>
- García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2017). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners*. Teachers College Press.
- García, O., & Lin, A. (2017). Extending understandings of bilingual and multilingual education. *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02324-3_1-1
- Gebhard, M., & Harman, R. (2011). Reconsidering genre theory in K-12 schools: A response to school reforms in the United States. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(1), 45-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.12.007>
- Hakuta, K. (1986). *The mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. Basic Books.
- Harklau, L., & Ford, M. K. (2022). English learner education and teacher preparation in the US: an interpretive language education policy analysis. *Language and Education*, 36(2), 137-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1981925>
- Harman, R. (2018). *Bilingual learners and social equity*. Cham Springer International Publishing.
- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education*. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Johnson, A. (2023). Achievement and growth for English learners. *Educational Policy*, 37(4), 1044-1069. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048211049419>
- Kim, Y. K., Hutchison, L. A., & Winsler, A. (2015). Bilingual education in the United States: An historical overview and examination of two-way immersion. *Educational Review*, 67(2), 236-252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.865593>
- Kloss, H. (1977/1998). *The American bilingual tradition*. Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind*. Multilingual Matters.

- Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2014). No child left bilingual: Accountability and the elimination of bilingual education programs in New York City schools. *Educational Policy*, 28(1), 96-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904812468228>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2021). *English learners in public schools*. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgf/english-learners>.
- Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162589>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1492.2010.01069.x>
- Petrovic, J. E. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 4(4), 395-416. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-005-2888-y>
- Ramsey, P. (2010). *Bilingual public schooling in the United States: A history of America's “polyglot Boardinghouse”*. Springer.
- Ricento, T. (1998). National language policy in the United States. In T.K. Ricento & B. Burnaby (Eds.). *Language and politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities* (pp. 85-112). Routledge.
- Teitelbaum, H., & Hiller, R. J. (1977). *Bilingual education: The legal mandate*. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 138–170. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.47.2.u762286x1221500k>
- Thompson, K. D. (2017). English learners’ time to reclassification: An analysis. *Educational Policy*, 31(3), 330-363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815598394>
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E., Kleyn, T., Morales-Rodríguez, S., & Han, A. (2005). Self-designated dual-language programs: Is there a gap between labeling and implementation? *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(2), 453-474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2005.10162844>
- Umansky, I. M., & Avelar, J. D. (2023). Canaried in the coal mine: What the experiences and outcomes of students considered long-term English learners teach us about pitfalls in English learner education... and what we can do about it. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 28(1), 122-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2022.2123326>
- Valenzuela, A. (2010). *Subtractive schooling: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. State University of New York Press.
- Wagenaar, H. (2011). *Meaning in action: interpretation and dialogue in policy analysis*. Sharpe.
- Welton, A., Diem, S., & Lent, S. (2023). Let’s face it, the racial politics are always there: A critical race approach to policy implementation in the wake of anti-CRT rhetoric. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 31(109), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.31.7694>
- Wiley, T. (2002). Accessing Language Rights in Education: A brief history on the U.S. context. In T.W. Tollefson (Ed.). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Lawrence.
- Wiley, T. G. (2001). On defining heritage languages and their speakers. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Blueprint for the future* (pp. 29-36). Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems