Boston College Lynch School of Education and Human Development

Department of Teaching, Curriculum, and Society

Curriculum and Instruction Doctoral Program

WHAT COUNTS AS FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS? RACED, CLASSED, AND LINGUICIZED RELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILIES AND A TWO-WAY DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL PROGRAM

Dissertation by

JASMINE NATHALY ALVARADO

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

August 2022

Abstract

What Counts as Family Engagement in Schools? Raced, Classed, and Linguicized Relations Between Families and a Two-Way Dual Language Bilingual Program

Jasmine Nathaly Alvarado, Author

Dr. C. Patrick Proctor, Chair

Dominant conceptualizations for family-school relations across U.S. educational research, policy, and practice continue to privilege the behaviors, experiences, and practices of white, upper- and middle-class families, while failing to address the race and class power-relations that permeate educational institutions and their neighborhoods. In the field of bilingual education, there is an emergent body of research that examines issues of language, race, and class within the experiences of families in two-way dual language bilingual education, where children from multiple racial, cultural, and economic groups are educated together with the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy. However, this scholarship has not related the experiences and relations in bilingual programs to the broader issue regarding the dominant and deficit discourse of family-school relations in the U.S. In response, this dissertation situates families' experiences in a two-way dual language bilingual program within the broader ideological, political, and historical dimensions of U.S. family-school relations. A theoretical orientation informed by Critical Race Theory, Critical Poststructuralist Sociolinguistics, and Feminist Poststructuralist frameworks was used to highlight how racialized positionalities of families in schools reverberate beyond individuals' identity construction, connecting to discourses about families at other societal scales. This study utilized participant observations, semi-structured interviews, and artifact generation. Data was analyzed using discursive and textual analytical approaches.

Findings include (a) an investigation of how the legal and institutional contexts related to family-bilingual school relations contribute to the racialization of people and their languaging; (b) an analysis of how raciolinguistic ideologies are deployed to naturalize the designation of linguistic and ethnoracial labels upon families; and (c) a generation of portraits highlighting how families ruptured deficit positionings by reporting on systems of oppression, their dynamic language practices, and their expansive relations across groups of people, places, and temporal scales. Ultimately, this dissertation argues that despite individual efforts of stakeholders in bilingual programs to foster the wellbeing and development of families, the racist and classist foundations of schooling will ensure the reification of oppressive educational experiences for multiply minoritized families. At the same time, these families will continue to find ways to survive, resist their subjugation, and reimagine more liberatory worlds.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

I was able to finish this dissertation because of the love, support, and care from my family, teachers, students, mentors, school partners, and friends. Querida familia, Ustedes siempre serán mi inspiración para todo lo que hago y logro hacer. Mami y tío-gracias por todos los sacrificios que han hecho para que mí y mi hermana pudiéramos tener más oportunidades y recursos para vivir una vida más saludable. Ustedes me han dado la fuerza, apoyo, y tiempo para seguir adelante persiguiendo mis sueños. Siempre me han mostrado la importancia de ser humilde y tener orgullo de mis raíces. Ustedes siempre serán mis héroes. Cindy (Pong)-Our sisterhood is one of the most cherished relationships I have. I am grateful to have such a beautiful, strong, independent, and confident woman as my best friend, who I can call to vent, brainstorm, and be silly. Deepening our bond over these past couple of years has been one of my greatest joys and sources of pride.

My dear chair, Dr. Patrick Proctor-I am blessed to have you as a mentor, friend, and colleague who has been a constant support throughout these past six years. You have been there for me when you understood and/or couldn't really understand an issue/event/circumstance. Thank you for making me feel safe to express my ideas, whether they were aligned with yours or not, vent about interactions/institutions/actors/systems etc., and disclose personal circumstances that were impacting my professional trajectory. You have allowed me to get to know you not only as a scholar/advisor/chair, but also, as a father and husband who is constantly juggling errands, dog walks, homework time, and college applications. I will always be grateful for getting to know the Goddard-Proctor crew!

To Dr. Leigh Patel, Dr. Nelson Flores, and Dr. Mariela Páez, thank you for agreeing to be members of my dissertation committee, and for your guidance, feedback, and encouragement

throughout this learning trajectory. Querida Dra. Patel-I am grateful to be in the presence of a beautiful learner, educator, builder, and scholar with a fierce commitment toward liberation and self-determination. Thank you for all the learning I have been able to engage in due to our texts, chats, and my reading and listening to your scholarship. You were definitely right about what you said when I first talked to you when I was admitted to the program-that this journey was going to be one arduous battle-one that I would have to fight through without losing my sense of self. Dr. Flores-you always made the time to listen and brainstorm with me about my research despite your multiple commitments and roles as part of your broader efforts in trying to change the world. Our check-ins pushed me to listen more, study harder, build with others, and focus on precision. Your insight and questions continue to influence how I envision my research agenda as part of larger efforts to ensure societal transformation. Dra. Páez-I am grateful for the kind and affirming remarks about my research focus and questions. Thank you for believing in this work and for encouraging me to think about how to situate this work across various conversations and spaces. It has been a blessing to learn from you and Dr. Annie Homza as part of the Bilingual Certificate Program.

My scholar sisters-although most of you do not live in Boston anymore, you have been a constant support system throughout this doctoral journey, especially this past year. My success is much due to our creative moments of joy and expression. Thank you lovelies! Nicholl-I was able to finish this dissertation because I knew you and I were in this journey together. Knowing that you were a call away and right there with me helped me continue to type and think. Thanks for our texts and chats that reassured me that we are not crazy and that it is not us but them. Yalda and Renata-thanks for being the most stunning, brilliant, and kind bridesmaids and supportive scholar sisters! Yalda-even though you have been on the tenure-track hustle for several years

now, you always position me as an equal knowledge builder and confidant. Our friendship is one of the greatest outcomes of this doctoral experience. I know I can call you for anything and you will be there regardless of the countless roles and responsibilities you have. Renata-along with being a brilliant knowledge builder, you exemplify how to be a supportive and loyal friend. Regardless of how much is going on in your life, you make the time to be there for others no matter what. I miss our trips around Boston and have missed you during these past 2 years as I ventured around Boston.

Shaneé, Rocío, Raquel, and Marcela-I am in awe of how you engaged in community-centered and humanizing scholarship as you navigated the ups and downs of life. You all inspired me to push through and believe in myself when I doubted my abilities and skills! Rocío-I am in awe of your advocacy efforts in Boston, and I am so glad that I am able to share that love for this neighborhood with you. Mirjana-reconnecting with you this year has been one of the best, unexpected outcomes of this academic year. Thank you for being there for me during some of the most important days of my life. I am excited to continue to be there for one another.

To my friends-Charlie, Eunhye, Josie, Stefanie, Brenda, Rajeev and Melissa, Paul X, Chris, Trevor, Mari, Casandra, and Diana-thank you for checking in on me, sending me encouraging messages, and making sure that I rested and pursued non-academic related activities. I will always be grateful for your advice, availability, and care! Thank you for making this journey more bearable, fun, and filled with laughter. Building friendships in Boston with many of you have been one of the best parts of living here! I am so fortunate to have met you all!

To the schools where I have worked, volunteered, and taught-I am grateful to have learned so much about teaching, relating, and caring from your members. The members (e.g. teachers, school aides, administrators, parents) of these schools have been some of my most

inspiring teachers. What I write is basically what I have witnessed, experienced, and learned from you all. A special thanks to Rochelle, Keyla, María V., Jany, Veronica, Rosa, María G., Brenda, Beverly, Carmen, and Laura-for your trust, transparency, care, and feedback/insight.

To my teachers and mentors-Drs. María Estela Brisk, Sarah Hesson, Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Beth Warren, Roberto Gonzales, Guadalupe Valdés, Yolanda-Sealey Ruíz, and Mildred Boveda-thank you for believing in my ideas, skills and abilities, supporting me beyond scholarly endeavors, and encouraging me to focus on my purpose and commitments with fortitude and confidence. Dra. Brisk-you are the grandmother I never had. The way I organize my schedule is greatly influenced by my witnessing your work ethic. Beyond teaching me how to write proposals and book chapters, you have made it clear that you are there for me if I need support in other facets of my life. You have celebrated my marriage, driven me to and back from meetings, and celebrated my birthday. ¡Gracias por cuidarme profesora linda! Dr. Alex Freidus-you believed in this work in its early stages and without knowing me too well. Your optimism about what I could do and contribute to educational research and broader efforts toward ameliorating societal inequities greatly influenced my last two years of the doctoral program. Thank you for believing in me during a time when I felt alone and was doubting myself. Dr. Sarah Hesson-I would not have known what the heck a doctoral program is without learning and talking with you about your experiences as a doctoral student. Thank you for presenting the doctoral program as a future possibility in my educational and professional trajectory. I am grateful to have a brilliant and kind friend/mentor who has witnessed my development and growth since my first year of teaching. Also, thank you for reminding me to pause and celebrate as we go through life!

To my husband, David-we did this together. We finished this doctoral program while navigating the job market and getting married during a pandemic. We did this even when no one

really had much good advice to give us about trying to pursue our passions and trying to live together in the same city after we finished the doctoral program. Being your partner makes me feel like I can do anything because you are right there with me. I feel brave enough to face life's challenges with you by my side. Thank you for all the big, little things that helped me finish this dissertation-snuggling and hugging me when I am stressed and anxious, listening to me rant about my ideas, people, and experiences, making sure I ate a meal, doing the laundry, driving me to and from appointments, providing words of inspiration and affirmation, and so much more. Every time I started to regret enrolling in our doctoral program, thinking about how I met you because of this experience helped me push those thoughts away and focus. I look forward to the many experiences and adventures with you, amor. Te quiero, te amo, y estoy enamorada de ti.

List of Tables

Transcription Conventions

word.	Falling intonation
word,	Continuing intonation
word?	Rising intonation
word!	Excited intonation
wor:d	Elongated syllable
word	Stressed syllable/word
=word=	Attached speech
wor–	Cut-off speech
[word]	Overlapping communication
( )	Inaudible speech
(word)	Presumed speech
↑↓	Especially high or low pitch change
(.)	Micro-pause (less than 0.2 seconds)
(#.#)	Timed pause
˚word˚	Quiet speech
((word))	Transcriber's note/Non-verbal communication

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

When I was an elementary school student, I dreaded attending parent-teacher conferences. By the time we would reach my classroom door to meet with my classroom teacher, my mother would have been asked multiple times by other families and staff in the school hallways about my father's whereabouts. In a mix of Spanish and English, she would briefly respond that my father was working. Often, my father's whereabouts was the topic of the first question or remark that my classroom teacher made when she met my mother. My mother would specify to my classroom teacher that my father was unable to attend school events because of his irregular schedule as a janitor. At best, there was a moment of silence. At worst, there were eye rolls from my classroom teacher. Instead of being nervous about my report card grades, I was more concerned with my teacher's assessment of my family meeting the expectations and norms that my school had for families. My concerns grew out of the messages that I received during the school day and the pattern of conversation topics during parent-teacher conferences. Aside from my father's whereabouts and professional occupational status, the rest of the conversation between my mother and teacher during parent-teacher conferences was usually spent on reprimanding my mother for not correctly signing forms written in English; discouraging my use of Spanish during school or class activities; and my family's lack of participation in school-wide events.

Even though my family and I were available to attend some of the school-wide events held during weekday evenings or weekends, I never insisted to my parents that I wanted to attend these activities. Most of these activities were organized by parents from white, middle-, and/or upper-class backgrounds and were conducted in English. Additionally, the topics felt very out of touch with my experiences, histories, and practices that resonated with my identity as a New

Yorker, Ecuadorian, of Quechua descent, bilingual Latina. My belief that my family and I were not welcomed in school events and activities was reaffirmed by the comments, assumptions, and actions from school staff members and students during the school day. For example, teachers would label the parents who volunteered for field trips, participated in school events, and attended classroom events or activities as caring, attentive, and/or involved parents. I remember one paraprofessional telling my classmates in fourth grade that these were the parents you could count on. However, I noticed that there was even a hierarchy within the group labeled as involved parents. Parents who were non-white, viewed as not proficient in English, and available to participate in school-related events were relegated to specific roles or tasks such as making food for events, passing out flyers, and ordering library books. Although these tasks are important to the functioning of a school, I noticed that these parents were excluded from key-decision making processes and official leadership positions of the school. As such, even if my parents followed the norms, roles, and expectations demanded by my school, they would never be considered good enough because there would always be some aspect about them that would be positioned as less than.

When I became a teacher of a one-way dual language bilingual program in Queens, New York, I promised myself that I would do my best to sustain the languages and cultural histories of my students and their families.[1] I thought it would be easier to keep this commitment in a public school that was led by a principal of Dominican descent and whose leadership team was primarily composed of people with Latin American ancestry. However, I was very wrong. Before I met with my students and their families, I was introduced anecdotally to them by

[1] I define *one-way dual language bilingual education* as an educational program model that fosters the bilingualism and biliteracy of one group of bilingual students, usually language minoritized students. Students receive content and language instruction in English and a minoritized language (García & Kleifgen, 2018).

teachers and staff members who worked with them in previous grades. I was told which families were the ones who would not be responsive or did not care and those who I could count on for anything or were attentive. Also, administrators informed me that I should let them know about the parents who signed up to volunteer or participate in the school and classroom. Based on their language capacities and skill sets, the administrators would designate them into specific roles or tasks. They revealed that even though most of these parents spoke Spanish, few of them knew how to read or write well in their heritage language. Parents who were able to speak in English and Spanish, and had a job viewed as the status of working professional or middle-class were positioned by my supervisors and staff members as having appropriate attributes for roles that entailed key decision-making processes for school-related initiatives. As for parents who did not sign up to volunteer in school, those who were viewed as light-skinned and/or as having important occupations were viewed in school as caring parents who had legitimate reasons for not being present during the school day.

Despite my efforts to navigate the politics, policies, and structures of the school and provide an educational experience that fulfilled what I imagined bilingual education could look like, I was bound to the same norms, rules, and expectations that constrained what my family's relationship with school could be like. As such, I became an enforcer of the same practices and structures, and their associated ideologies, that positioned my family as inferior when I was an elementary school student. Still, the categories for families that I had been introduced by my colleagues contrasted with my experiences and relations with families as a teacher. I learned that my families consistently communicated with me through letters, texts, and phone calls. They utilized their dynamic linguistic repertoires to express their concerns, wonderings, and insights. Also, they understood most of what the school had written in Spanish and English. Further,

families answered my phone calls or promptly responded to my messages through letters, texts, and calls. Many demonstrated their care for my wellbeing through unexpected gestures and acts. Sometimes I would receive snacks and/or lunch sent with students from their parents. When students presented me with these kind gestures, they informed me about the meal's affiliation with a Latin American country and their specific family practices and traditions. Notably, I realized that some parents were members of the largest community-based organization that was five blocks away from the school, Make the Road New York. I noticed these parents' affiliation with Make the Road when I started attending Make the Road's meetings to understand relevant and key issues of the neighborhood and how to get involved with initiatives that would ameliorate these problems. These meetings were delivered bilingually in English and Spanish. Members regularly talked about their experiences and displayed their cultural practices when reflecting on issues such as immigration, housing, and school overcrowding. Although the specific group of families from my classroom came to these forums to design reforms for their communities, they were not invited to be a part of decision-making processes or given official leadership roles in my school. The insidious entwinement of race, language, and class within a seemingly indisputable standard of an *idealized white family* was upheld by my school and the process of schooling.

The stories I tell, and the topics and questions that are the foundations of my dissertation are rooted in my personal and professional experiences as a bilingual, Ecuadorian with Quechua roots, New Yorker, Latina in U.S. public schools. This dissertation centers race, class, and language discourses to understand how educational stakeholders (e.g. educators, administrators, school staff, families, community affiliates) position the social groups and language practices of families in a two-way dual language bilingual program in the Greater Boston Area. My

dissertation explores how families negotiate, reify, and resist such positionalities and their material effects. Further, it situates the practices, narratives, and framings that inform families' relations and experiences in a two-way dual language bilingual program within the broader ideological, political, and historical dimensions of family-school relations in a globalized U.S. racist-capitalist society. As I build relationships with educational stakeholders at the two-way dual language bilingual program that is the site of my dissertation research, I intend to learn with and from them about other possibilities for the relationships between families and schools/schooling. As such, this study seeks to dispute static and dichotomized approaches used to describe families and family-school relations.

This chapter continues with a brief review of the literature on the topic of family-school relations in the U.S. while also building a rationale for the study. After, the purpose and research questions are presented along with key terms for the study. I conclude this chapter with my reflection and explanation of my relationality with the research topic, participants, and place.

Background and Rationale

Family-school relations in the U.S. have been labeled, defined, and discussed by researchers, policymakers, and educators in a variety of ways. Terms such as *parent involvement* (Baquedano-López et al., 2013; Epstein, 1986; Gordon & Nocon, 2008; López, 2001), *home-school relations* (Graue, 2005; Graue & Oen, 2009; Graue & Sherfinski, 2011), *home-school-community partnerships* (Epstein, 1995, 2006), and *family engagement* (Mapp, 2012; Olivos et al., 2011; Weiss et al., 2011), among others, have been used to label and describe the critical relationship between families, communities, and schools. These ways of talking about how parents should interact with schools are rooted in studies, policies, and practices, and constitute the family-school relation discourse.

However, the discourse on family-school relations is much more than the act of talking about how parents should interact with schools. As Nakagawa (2000) states,

> the discourse of parent involvement in schools has created particular definitions and understandings of legitimate parent involvement, as well as commonsensical notions of a good parent. This discourse structures how various educational stakeholders approach family-school relationship prior to any interactions at the school level. (p. 445)

Kainz and Aikens (2007) concur with Nakagawa (2000) by stating that the dominant notions of family-school relations in policy, research, and practice have the power to produce actions or behaviors, and establish seemingly legitimate categories for families that serve to maintain the interests of dominant groups and reproduce societal inequities. Specifically, this discourse creates representations of an idealized family and restricts the possibilities that can be envisioned for how families and schools interact with each other (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2004). These representations of family engagement in U.S. schools continue to privilege the behaviors, experiences, and practices of white, upper- and middle-class families, while failing to explicitly address the race and class power-relations and processes that permeate educational institutions and their surrounding neighborhoods (Baquedano-López et al., 2013). As a result, racially minoritized families, especially those from low-income backgrounds, are often mispositioned as under-engaged, apathetic about education, or as subjects of dire intervention who need to be indoctrinated into narrow roles and responsibilities demanded by schools (Baquedano-López et al., 2013; Doucet, 2011; López, 2001).

Regardless of the scholarship from multiple disciplines and educational scales that highlight the narrow and deficit framings of family relations in U.S. schools, official governmental policies continue to position family-school relations as remedies for broader

societal issues and inequities. For example, the 2001 reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, known as *No Child Left Behind*, suggested that schools were not doing enough outreach to engage parents from culturally and linguistically minoritized groups. A core position of this policy was that the engagement of families in their children's education can affect academic achievement beyond any other type of education reform. Although the policy attempts to expand the view of the family's role in education, it shifts the lens away from societal inequities affecting minoritized groups to the perception that the involvement of parents in schools can guarantee enriching educational experiences for their children (Nakagawa, 2000). Within this frame, the problem for why racially minoritized families do not acquire wealth and resources and achieve educational success lies within their inferior capacities, behaviors, beliefs, and attributes of these families. More recently, due to the climate of college-and-career readiness standards and preparing students for the 21st century, policymakers, politicians, and researchers have argued for more systematic models of family engagement policies (e.g. *Every Student Succeeds Act* of 2015, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department Education policy statements of 2016) to support students as they work toward mastery of rigid learning demands outlined in standards such as the Common Core State Standards (Caspe et al., 2011; Johnson, 2012). In addition, organizations like the Family, School, and Community Engagement Group (2010) have urged the federal government to invest in rigorous family engagement initiatives to compile core family engagement practices, and specifically, those that align with major educational reform initiatives, such as college-and career readiness standards. As such, these seemingly neutral family-school practices ignore race-class power relations in society and how they shape and are shaped by the experiences, practices, and histories of racially minoritized families.

In response to these dominant approaches and definitions for family-school relations in policy, research, and practice, there is an increasing number of studies that emphasize the salience of race and racialization for racially minoritized parents as they engage with U.S. schools and children's schooling experiences (McCarthy Foubert, 2019; Posey-Maddox, 2017). In particular, several sociological studies have engaged with critical race frameworks to show the multiple ways in which families described as Black promote the educational success of their children in and out of school (Cooper, 2009; Posey-Maddox, 2014, 2017). For example, Reynolds (2010, 2014, 2015) reported on experiences of families described as Black middle-class in a primarily white suburban school district she calls Coolwater. She noted how they help their children understand their experiences with racial microaggressions at school. Reynolds (2010) also explained that families described as Black middle-class engaged in *impression management*, "a process whereby [they] try to control the impressions others form about them" (p. 154). In her mixed-methods study of the involvement of families described as Black/African-American in schools, Thompson (2003) reported on how some participants viewed their involvement in school as necessary in order to protect their children from experiencing racism. For example, one mother met with teachers and principals in order to ensure that her daughter was challenged academically because the school had low expectations for Black children. Intense advocacy was the only way her daughter could experience rigorous curricula, gain entrance into gifted and talented programs, and enroll in honors classes.

In the field of bilingual education, there is an emergent body of research that examines issues of language, race, and class within the relations and experiences of families in two-way dual language bilingual education, where children from multiple racial, cultural, and economic backgrounds are educated together with the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy (e.g. Burns,

2017; Chaparro, 2019; Muro, 2016; Shannon, 2011). These studies take up Valdés's concerns from her 1997 seminal piece that cautions educational stakeholders to carefully examine issues of language and power, and intergroup relations present in two-way dual language bilingual programs. With multiple reports and studies about bilingualism's cognitive and economic value in a globalized racist-capitalist society, two-way dual language bilingual programs have been branded as boutique programs where students designated as white, English-speaking children could learn another language (Flores & García, 2017). Using critical race frameworks such as interest convergence and whiteness as property, Shannon (2011) and Burns (2017) report how parents labeled as white, English speaking occupied leadership positions in school organizations, including parent-teacher associations, and were invited by administrators to be part of decision-making processes for reforms and initiatives at the two-way bilingual dual language programs.

Specifically examining the race relations and integration of parents classified as white and families marked as Latinx, Muro (2016) notes that these parents engaged in "symbolic integration, the polite, surface-level interactions that are enjoyable, voluntary and additive" (p. 2), while racial prejudice and stratification remained entrenched. Muro (2016) reports that families classified as white were commended for their bilingualism and attempts to learn about the cultural practices of families classified as Latinx.[2] However, families classified as Latinx did not mention being praised for their bilingualism, rather, they cited their pride in their children's bilingualism. Similarly, Chaparro (2019) notes different reasons among parents designated as white and Latinx for valuing bilingualism. For families classified as white, bilingualism meant the opportunity to learn another language and communicate with other culturally and

[2] I use the terms, Latinx, Latino/a, Hispanic, based on their direct citation in studies and by scholars and participants. Latinx is used as a gender-expansive term for people of Latin American descent in contestation to gender binaries.

linguistically diverse groups. For families classified as Latinx, bilingualism was a marker of cultural pride and a resource that could help them achieve economic security and more professional opportunities. Chaparro (2019) suggests that differences in "background experiences, migration trajectories, and access to resources" (p. 2) between families designated as Latinx and those marked as white led to different kinds of pressures, needs, and demands on the two-way dual language bilingual program and its teachers.

Shannon (2011) argues that while the asymmetry in the social and language status of white and racially minoritized families in two-way dual language bilingual programs have been noted in several contexts, more research is needed to address "the magnitude of the problem and how it creates disparate parental relations and student outcomes" (p. 83). For example, the aforementioned studies have demonstrated the race-class inequities and power relations in two-way dual language bilingual programs in their efforts to demand for more just and humanizing schooling experiences for minoritized groups. However, this body of scholarship has not related the experiences and relations in bilingual programs like two-way dual language bilingual immersion to the broader issue regarding the dominant and deficit discourse of family-school relations in the U.S. Various fields like sociology of education (Cooper 2009; Nopper, 2011) and educational policy studies (Nakagawa, 2000; Wilinski & Vellanki, 2020), have argued for the importance of understanding the historical, ideological, and material dimensions regarding the dominant rhetoric of family-school relations. Accordingly, an analysis of the historical, ideological, and material processes of family-school relations in bilingual educational settings like two-way dual language bilingual programs can help begin to unpack enduring images, practices, and structures that seek to regulate the experiences, backgrounds, and practices of racialized minoritized families in these spaces.

Research Questions and Design

Rather than focusing on gaps of the aforementioned studies to justify the focus of this research, this study builds on the existing research literature that unpack, complexify, and contest the punishing mechanisms of coloniality, racist-capitalism, and white supremacy in the schooling experiences of racially minoritized youth and their families. Accordingly, this dissertation builds on the growing body of literature that seeks to denaturalize deficit and dominant framings of family-school relations in the U.S. With regard to bilingual education, this study extends research that has highlighted the racialization of families and language practices in two-way dual language bilingual programs. It attempts to move from an uncritical acceptance of dominant conceptualizations of what family-school relations can be in bilingual educational settings, and showcases the ongoing struggle among educational stakeholders' efforts to foster relations with families. Specifically, this dissertation examines how family-school relations are conceptualized in policy text and appropriation in regards to a two-way dual language bilingual program in the Greater Boston Area. I demonstrate how these conceptualizations of family-school relations produce and restrict particular subjectivities, and present material effects for racially minoritized families. Lastly, I report how focal families, families institutionally classified as Hispanic, at the two-way dual language bilingual program make sense of these racialized positionalities and their material effects.

In short, this dissertation examines the conceptualizations of family-school relations within family engagement policy text and appropriation of a two-way dual language bilingual program and its affiliated community partners in the Greater Boston Area. This dissertation explores the following research questions:

- How are family-school relations conceptualized by educational stakeholders (i.e. teachers, administrators, parents, children, community-affiliates) and in related texts of a two-way dual language bilingual program in the Greater Boston Area?
    - How are race, class, and language implicated in these conceptualizations?
- How do two-way dual language bilingual families institutionally classified as Hispanic expand, reify, and/or resist these conceptualizations?

These research questions are examined through a theoretical orientation informed by Critical Race Theory, Critical Poststructuralist Sociolinguistics, and Feminist Poststructuralist frameworks. I use these lenses to showcase how racialized positionalities of families in bilingual educational programs reverberate beyond individuals' identity construction, connecting to discourses about families at other social scales in a globalized U.S. racist-capitalist society. Further, these research questions are answered using qualitative data from a two-way dual language bilingual program and its community affiliates in the Greater Boston Area. The data for this study include observational field notes, interviews with participants, and artifacts from participants, school, and community spaces. Participants for this study include families (at least one guardian/caretaker/parent and their children), teachers, administrators, and community members affiliated with the two-way dual language bilingual program. Analyses of these data are informed by Levinson et al.'s (2009) definition of policy as a social practice of governing-what can and should be done about a specific aspect of society.

Definitions of Key Terms

Several key terms and choice of words permeate the study. Below is a list of definitions for these terms as a reference for subsequent chapters and further clarification of concepts, contexts, and methods related to this dissertation.

- **Bilingual**: A person or group that uses two or more languages and/or dialects. I use *bilingual* because of its explicit ties to sociopolitical processes that surrounded the Civil Rights Era and the institutionalization of bilingual education in the U.S. (García & Kleifgen, 2018; Grosjean, 2010).
- **Discourse**: Refers to spoken and written language use. Discourse is a group of statements that provides a way of representing ideas at a particular moment (Foucault, 1972). Discourses shift in significance and meaning depending on their historical and cultural specification (Foucault, 1972). They not only shape our understanding of reality, but also, they shape our relationships to this reality. This includes our sense of self (our subjectivity) and our relationship to that which is constituted as the norm.
- **Ethnoracial**: I use this term when referring to a category that defines a group of people as a phenotypically heterogeneous group that is understood ethnically (e.g. defined nationally or culturally) and a racially homogeneous group (e.g. stereotypically defined physically)" (e.g. Latinx/o/a, Asian-American, Black) (Fergus et al., 2010; Rosa, 2019).
- **Family-school relations or family engagement**-The nature of relationships that families have with schools and the process of schooling. I use this broad definition to limit my prescription of forms and approaches for family relations with schools for this study's school, community, and participants. However, I acknowledge that many terms have been used for *family-school relations*. These terms will be discussed in chapter 2, review of the literature. Also, I consider *family* as a group with one or more guardians/caretakers/parents and their children.
- **Language-majoritized and minoritized**-Language minoritized refers to a group or person whose language practices undergo processes of being relegated as less than when

compared to groups rendered as having legitimate language practices, but they may not be necessarily marked as a racialized Other in the globalized nation-state. However, I do consider the specific group, *racially minoritized bilinguals*, as part of this broader group (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Language majoritized refers to a group or person whose language practices are indicative of possessing an idealized and standardized language of a globalized nation-state.

- **Policy appropriation**-"The process through which policy actors creatively interpret policy; through their interpretations, these actors make new policy in situated locales and communities of practice" (Levinson et al., 2009, p. 768). This term follows the conceptualization of *policy* as an ongoing social practice of power that establishes what can and should be done about a specific aspect of society (Levinson et al., 2009).
- **Racialization**-The process of constructing racial meaning, including the creation of racial categories and the signification of these categories in relation to phenotype, language practices, objects, and ideas. Racialization occurs in a myriad of societal levels and can take multiple forms over time (DuBois, 1935; Omi & Winant, 1994). Racial categories for groups of people who are marked as dominant norms based on the notions of whiteness and European exceptionalism are described as *racially majoritized* and those who are marked as foreign and minority are *racially minoritized*. Further, racialization has consequential and unequal social and economic outcomes for people who are minoritized as a racial Other in opposition to whiteness.
- **Subjectivity and subject position**-"Subjectivity, an individual's sense of self, is understood to be constituted through discourse. Subject positions, or the ways of being an individual, are constructed, with or without that individual's input, through

discourse. Our sense of self or subjectivity can be considered in flux as we assume complementary and competing subject positions at the same time" (Allan, 2008, p.8). Further, forms of knowledge and practices, that are rendered as dominant or inferior by settler nation-states, permeate this process of making sense of ourselves.

- **Two-way dual language bilingual education**-An educational program model that attempts to have a balanced number of language minoritized students and language majoritized students educated together with the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy. Students receive content and language instruction in English and a minoritized language (García & Kleifgen, 2018).

Conclusion and Organization

In *Decolonizing Educational Research: From Ownership to Answerability,* Patel (2016) asks researchers to pause and consider where a research question comes from by taking the time to pause and begin to ask the questions: Why me?; Why this?; Why now?; and Why here? As I conclude this chapter, I use these questions as guides for further explaining my relationality with my research topic, participants, and place. I began the introduction of this chapter by addressing the first question, Why me?. Now, I will discuss how my educational and personal experiences influenced the formation of the research questions, concepts, and methodologies that inform this study. Then, I will reflect on how I became introduced to this dissertation's focal neighborhood, Mills City, and two-way dual language bilingual school, the Mills City Dual Language School. More reflections of my relationality and accountability with place and participants will be discussed in chapter 4.

Why this?

My experiences as a student, teacher, and member of a community-based organization catalyzed my desire to learn more about how societal issues and structures create the schooling conditions and experiences for students and their families in the U.S. I wanted to be in a role and place where I would have the time, energy, and opportunities to deeply engage with large and complex issues that permeated my life and the lives of racially minoritized groups. After conversations with my former graduate school instructors who just finished their doctoral studies in Urban Education at the CUNY Graduate Center, I decided that enrolling as a doctoral student at a higher educational institution would present more time, opportunities, and resources to explore the questions I had about bilingual education, societal issues, and the role of families in schools and schooling. Still, I was nervous about the prospect of having less financial stability and the possibility of not consistently working with members of schools throughout my time in a doctoral program.

I began my doctoral studies during academic year 2016-2017, the time when Donald Trump was elected and began his term as president of the United States. Although I already wanted to take a course on Critical Race Theory due to my initial research interests and experiences, I now sought out to enroll in this course as a source for healing, learning, and community building with my peers and instructors due to the results of the U.S. presidential elections. With Dr. Leigh Patel's recommendation, I enrolled in a Critical Race Theory class taught at Tufts University by an amazing instructor and scholar. I still remember feeling a mixture of relief, amazement, nervousness, and excitement from the comments made during the first day of class such as, "Donald Trump is a motherfucker. And Obama, he ain't that great either. Expect to read lots and cite from the texts." I learned from multiple types of sources such

as videos, case law, and research studies about different concepts in Critical Race Theory and its related branches (e.g. TribalCrit; DisCrit; LatCrit). I read ethnographic studies that used Critical Race Theory to understand the entrenchment of white supremacy in public school systems, and how racially minoritized communities navigated and demanded expansive educational opportunities in their neighborhoods (e.g. Stovall, 2016; Vaught, 2011). Further, I was presented with opportunities to utilize frameworks, specifically interest convergence, whiteness as property, and expansive and restrictive equality, to analyze state policy texts related to bilingual education in Massachusetts and New York. These assignments left me wondering about how different educational stakeholders made sense of policies and how race, class, and language contributed to these interpretations.

During my time in the Critical Race Theory class, I began to read more literature that explicitly focused on the salience of racism, race, and racialization in bilingual education. I was surprised to realize that there were not many scholars who explicitly focused on race, racism, and racialization in bilingual educational settings as part of their research agendas. I remember listening to conversations among my peers whose research interests were in bilingualism and bilingual education about the scholarship of Dr. H. Samy Alim, Dr. Nelson Flores, and Dr. Jonathan Rosa. Around that time, the book, *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes Our Ideas About Race*, was published, and my colleagues were very excited to read the book. They recommended that I read the scholarship from the authors of the book. Reading the scholarship from these scholars provided historical background into how fixed categories of race and language have continuously been vectors of multiple systems of domination such as coloniality, white supremacy, imperialism, and racist-capitalism. They also illustrated the ways in which language practices of racially minoritized groups were sites of deep transformation and

contestation of normalized oppressive, colonial logics. Consequently, my engagement with literature focused on race, class, and language led me to specific questions about families in bilingual education and societal processes. As such, I view this dissertation as an opportunity to explore these questions in conversation with frameworks and approaches that I have learned during my doctoral studies, and in and outside higher educational settings. Further, I regard this dissertation writing journey as a way to grapple and interrogate the affordances and limitations of theoretical and methodological approaches used in this dissertation.

Why here and Why now?

Before my formal introduction to the focal site of my dissertation, the Dual Language School, I often visited and interacted with members of its Greater Boston neighborhood, Mills City. I regarded Mills City as a place where I could enjoy my then fiancé's company (now husband), as we developed relationships with other residents who shared similar ethno-racial and class backgrounds with me. Throughout my time in engaging with different places and members of Mills City, I became aware of some of Mills City's pressing issues. For example, in my conversations with Mills City residents from low-income backgrounds, I was informed that rent prices and the number of people living in apartments and multiple-unit houses were increasing. I noticed that there was a sudden rise in the amount of luxury apartments being constructed around Mills City's main commercial streets. Additionally, I realized that many official leadership positions in Mills City were mostly occupied by people marked as white and/or from Italian, Irish, middle- and/or upper-class backgrounds. Meanwhile, I became aware of the Dual Language School. My fiancé informed me of its existence after we walked by the school, which sits on one of Mills City's main commercial streets. Before the dissertation development phase,

my fiancé suggested that the Dual Language School could be a potential dissertation site given my interests, background, and familiarity with Mills City.

As I finished my pre-dissertation requirements, I started to think about the location and participants for the dissertation. Due to my working relationship with teachers of a two-way dual language bilingual program in Boston Public Schools, I thought that my dissertation would take place there, especially since the teachers and school staff were supportive of my presence in the school and my research topic. However, it was really hard to contact administrators of the district's institutional review board and get accurate information about their dissertation approval process. Additionally, I knew that there was hesitation among official leaders of the school district about having many research studies in their district due to the history of researchers' exploitation and experimentation on minoritized groups. As such, I was unable to receive approval to conduct my dissertation study from Boston Public Schools.

When two faculty members at Boston College became aware of my difficulty in gaining official approval from Boston Public Schools to conduct my dissertation study, they introduced me to the assistant superintendent of Mills City Public Schools and the principal of the Mills City Dual Language School. They explained that this school district did not have an institutional review board (IRB), which could make the approval process of the dissertation a more manageable process when compared to large school districts like Boston Public Schools. In my conversations with the school district assistant superintendent and Dual Language School principal, I explained my research topic, experiences that led me to my interest in this topic, and asked for their permission to conduct my research at the Mills City Dual Language School. The Mills City school leaders were interested in learning more about parents' perspectives on the policies and structures of the Dual Language School and overall school district. They thought

that the study's findings could inform future initiatives aimed to improve community-family-school relations. Notably, the principal at the Mills City Dual Language School thought that I could help the school with their immediate needs since they were understaffed, under-resourced, and relatively a new school. I agreed to volunteer at the Dual Language School as I developed relations and understanding of the program for my study. It was also convenient that the neighborhood and school site were less than a 25-minute car ride from my graduate school and apartment. In sum, the evolving relationship with Mills City, Mills City's changing demographics and history, the priorities of the school district and school, and the financial and administrative feasibility all contributed to the selection of the focal site and neighborhood for this dissertation.

Organization

Within this introductory chapter, I discussed the experiences that led me to pursue the topic of family-school relations situated within a two-way dual language bilingual context. Then, I presented an overview of the growing body of literature that discusses the dominant framings of family-school relations in the U.S., and studies that center race, racialization, and racism in the experiences of families in U.S schools. After, I explained the ways in which this study expands the current research on family-school relations in the U.S., especially with regard to bilingual education programs. I shared the focus and purpose of the study with a brief description of the research design and methodology. I presented and defined key terms used throughout the study, and discussed educational and professional experiences that influenced the concepts and approaches that inform this study. Lastly, I explained how I became introduced and developed relationships with the focal site, the Dual Language School, and its neighborhood, Mills City.

This dissertation is organized into seven additional chapters. The next chapter, chapter two, is a review of the literature that examines the various ways in which family-school relations in the U.S., with a specific focus on bilingual programs, have been described, studied, and understood. Chapter three presents the theoretical approach and relevant literature that inform my research on family engagement policy text and appropriation with the Mills City Dual Language School, a two-way dual language bilingual program, and its community partners. To address various sociocultural and material dimensions within family-school relations in two-way dual language bilingual programs, three overarching frames inform the theoretical orientation: (1) Critical Race Theory, with its attention to the intersection of race and property (Harris, 1993; Vaught, 2011); (2) raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017), as shaped by critical sociolinguistic claims; and (3) feminist poststructuralist perspectives towards identity construction (Butler, 1993; Weedon, 1987). In chapter four, I elaborate on the research design, instruments, neighborhood, school, and participants of this study. Considering policy as a social practice of power, I utilize a combination of qualitative methods, including participant observations, semi-structured interviews, and artifacts. Further, data analysis applies discursive and textual analytical approaches.

Chapters five through seven present findings based on data analysis. Chapter five examines how legal and institutional contexts related to family-school relations in two-way dual language bilingual education contribute to the racialization of people and language practices. I first discuss the legal contexts of family-school relations and bilingual education and report on several dominant, racialized discourses about families' social positionings that permeate these contexts. Then, I highlight how ways of thinking about groups of people are woven within the discourses and associated structures and practices within the local, contemporary context of the

Mills City Dual Language School. Chapter six reports on how raciolinguistic ideologies permeate how the dual language program leverages different labels to govern types of relations that families marked as Hispanic can have with the school. The remainder of this chapter presents narrative portraits, influenced by Park's narrative snapshots (2012) and Lawrence-Lightfoot's portraiture (1997), of how families marked as Hispanic negotiated different linguistic labels (e.g. Spanish speaker, English speaker, English Learner). Chapter seven employs Lawrence-Lightfoot's and Davis's (1997) portraiture to highlight the complex and multidimensional interactions and experiences of one family as they grapple with discourses about themselves, other families, and their relations with school(ing). The focal moments occur inside and outside the dual language school, demonstrating that families' negotiation of relations with school(ing) is not physically bounded to one place.

In the eighth and final chapter, I revisit this study's research questions and highlight key findings for each question. I tie practices, structures, and routines within the local, contemporary context of a two-way dual language bilingual program to broader race-class inequities and processes in society. Then, I discuss this study's empirical contributions and recommendations for future research. Specifically, I note how it contributes to research studies on family engagement policies and the lived experiences of families in bilingual programs, and discuss this study's affordances and constraints in trying to examine multiple matrices of oppression. In closing, I offer possible trajectories of collective mobilization, learning, and decision-making for Mills City and reflect on future directions and commitments as a member of this society.

CHAPTER TWO: Review of the Literature

The review of the literature for this dissertation is composed of three bodies of research: (1) literature that presents models or frameworks for family-school relations; (2) research on family engagement policy; and (3) research on families in bilingual education programs. The chapter begins with an overview of renowned definitions and frameworks for family-school relations from research and official government policies. The overview also describes how notable empirical studies have directly responded to the popular frameworks for family-school relations in the U.S. The following sections in this review present the other two bodies of research through a specific systematic approach. Within each group of literature, research of family engagement policy and research on families in bilingual education programs, I highlight the following features of each research study: the research topic, research problem, methodology, and findings. This approach enabled me to present characteristics of individual studies as well as commonalities and differences across the groups of literature. Further, I describe these findings with the terms the scholars use to refer to family-school relations (e.g. families, parents, engagement, involvement, partnership). Lastly, the end of each section and conclusion for this chapter show connections between the bodies of literature and my dissertation, and discuss how my dissertation's research agenda contributes to the existing approaches, purposes, and/or issues presented within previous research studies. In sum, this section presents how research studies, as forms of policy, have established particular forms of thought, and ways of being when referring to family-school relations in the U.S., and how my research study engages with these bodies of literature.

Family-School Relations Definitions and Frameworks

Defining Involvement, Engagement, and Partnership

There are many terms used to refer to the relationships that families and their communities have with schools and the process of schooling. Specifically, the terms, *involvement, engagement, partnership*, are often used interchangeably. However, these terms have distinct meanings with the two latter two being more closely aligned to each other. Researchers present *parent involvement* as: (1) school-based behaviors such as parents' communication with school officials and participation or attendance in school activities and events such as parent-teacher conferences, parent-teacher association meetings, fundraisers, etc.; and (2) behaviors outside of the school building such as supporting the learning at home and engaging children in conversations about educational expectations at home (Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Lareau & Horvat, 1999; Shumow & Miller, 2001). More recently, researchers (e.g. Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Ishimaru & Takahashi, 2017; Luet, 2017) have used *engagement* to conceptualize the relationship among families, schools, and communities in efforts of moving away from the concept of *involvement*, which they say implies a partial, subservient role that families have in their children's education and school structures in particular. This preference for engagement was advanced by Dennis Shirley (1997) in the context of community organizing for school reform. According to Shirley (1997),

> parent involvement-as practiced in most schools and reflected in research literature-avoids issues of power and assigns parents a passive role in the maintenance of school culture. Parental engagement designated parents as citizens in the fullest sense-change agents who can transform urban schools and neighborhoods. (p.74)

In conversation with Shirley's (1997) distinctions between engagement and involvement, Ishimaru (2019) presents *traditional parent involvement* as a "deficit-based approach that privileges specific behaviors in schools presented as the norm" and *family engagement* "as efforts to reach out and better integrate nondominant parents and families into existing systems and structures" (p. 3). As such, Ishimaru (2019) presents *parent engagement* as a slightly improved model from that of parent involvement in that there are more efforts to have relationships with families but with the same goal of indoctrinating families into preexisting models or scripts that promote dominant behaviors aimed to sustain white supremacy.

Shirley's (1997) conception of *engagement* is similar to the dominant framings for *partnership* in educational research. A *partnership* is defined as a cooperative relationship in which families, community members, and school employees have shared roles, responsibilities, and mutual benefits (Auerbach, 2012; Caracciolo, 2008). Expanding on the importance of partnership in comparison to dominant forms of involvement, Ngai and Koehn (2016) assert that presenting parents with opportunities to volunteer, chaperone in field trips, or participate in school fundraising events are not sufficient practices for having parents be part of the school community. They argue that families and community members must be part of "equal partnerships" that are beneficial to these groups (Ngai & Koehn, 2016, p.27). These types of partnerships are fostered by opportunities to converse and deliberate about relevant and important issues to both the staff and families of the school (Ngai & Koehn, 2016). According to Freeman (2010), partnerships among families, schools, and communities are authentic and effective when they can improve cross-cultural understanding and deeper social relations. Notably, Freeman (2010) does not discuss the access to material resources for minoritized groups in these partnerships as an important factor for these partnerships.

Defining Families and Parents in Federal Policies

The deemphasis of the inequitable distribution of wealth and resources in the U.S. within the aforementioned definitions for family-school relations are not anew. In fact, during the Civil Rights Era, often viewed as a pivotal moment of social progress, federal policies and reports continued to focus on the practices and behaviors of individual families and schools as explanations for poverty and racial discrimination across U.S. communities. For example, in 1965, U.S. Assistant Secretary of Labor, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, published a report named *The Negro Family: The Case For National Action,* best known as the *Moynihan Report* (Stephens & Zhang, 2020). The report suggested that material inequities and racism faced by what Moynihan refers as *Negro Americans* stemmed from the "deterioration of the Negro family structure in the urban ghettos" (Moynihan, 1965, p.3) Some characteristics that the report presents as indicators of the deterioration are “female-headed households, welfare dependency, and antisocial behavior" (Moynihan, 1965, p.30). According to Moynihan (1965), the U.S. needed to position "the establishment of a Stable Negro Family Structure" as a major initiative to "ending discrimination, poverty, and injustice" (p.5).

The fixation on racialized Others instead of the ongoing and collective processes of Othering is also apparent in the institutionalization of Community Action Programs during that time. As part of the *Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,* Community Action Programs were responsible for providing "services, assistance, and other activities to give progress toward the elimination of poverty or causes of poverty" (p. 1). A controversial feature of the Act was the requirement for "maximum feasible participation" of people directly affected in decision-making about how federal funds would be spend on them and their community (Economic Opportunity Act, 1964, p.2). The law's allowance of people from minoritized groups to contribute to the

process of determining how resources and funds aimed to improve their lives caused major anger, frustration, and opposition among the nation's power establishment, especially local political regimes and corporate elites (Abrams, 1987). By the late 1960s, congress required that the community action programs be run by the state or local government, or an agency designated by the state or local government. Witnessing how political activists and neighborhood groups aimed to disrupt power structures and relations through *Community Action Programs*, several politicians and lawmakers (e.g. Senator Robert Kennedy and William Cannon, chief of the Federal Budget Bureau's Division of Education) believed that school districts were partially responsible for the failure for children eventually becoming academically successful and later on acquiring wealth, and needed external agencies and evaluation and reporting mechanisms in place to pressure local schools to improve the educational outcomes and socioeconomic stability of students (Abrams, 1987).

The orientation of schools as potential panaceas for maldistribution of wealth and racial discrimination for minoritized groups, specifically Black/African American families, by politicians, policymakers, and federal reforms during the Civil Rights Era led to subsequent federal education policies designating, surveilling, and stratifying the nature of family-school relations. Concerning the 1965 *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), which gave the federal government a major role in American schooling, did not use the following terms, *parent*, *mother*, and *father*. Instead, it made references to *families*, and especially, *low-income families* (Baquedano López et al., 2013). In ESEA, *families* referred to parents and children, who were the rights-bearing groups of concern in the law. However, the reauthorization of ESEA through the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) in 2001 framed *parents* as critical partners entrusted with carrying the goals of the policy that benefited children, who became the sole

group of concern in the law (Baquedano-López et al., 2013). A core position of NCLB is that the engagement of parents in their children's education has the potential to affect students' academic achievement beyond educational reforms. For example, schools were ineligible to receive Title I funding set aside for students of low-income and racially minoritized groups without a written agreement to encourage the involvement of parents in schools (Baquedano-López et al., 2013). This policy required a parent involvement contract, also referred to as a *compact* (National Coalition of Parent Involvement in Education, 2005), through which schools, in consultation with parents, outlined the involvement practices for parents that will support academic and school outcomes (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). School outcomes supported by parent involvement included student test performance, promotion, attendance, social skills, and graduation (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

In 2013, the U.S Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Education promoted the widespread use of the term, *families* instead of *parents*. The return to the usage of *families* instead of *parents* recognized the role that siblings, extended family members, and multi-generational caregivers have on children's lives (Mapp & Kuttner, 2014). Specifically, the U.S. Department of Education *Family Engagement Framework* centered on building "a dual capacity of families and educators in supporting student learning through an authentic partnership" (Ishimaru & Takahashi, 2017, p. 5). And yet, the framework continues to position family involvement as a necessary condition for the academic success of students in schools. As Ishimaru and Takahashi (2017) state, the U.S. Department of Education *Family Engagement Framework* does not "explicitly commit to systemic and institutional changes to ameliorate inequities in U.S. schools, and address the power of race, class, language, and citizenship status in school-based forms of engagement" (p.5). Therefore, the major problem that the framework

and its related federal policies (e.g. *Every Student Succeeds Act* of 2015, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Education policy statements of 2016) aim to address does not reside in the structures or dynamics that are in and beyond schools, but rather, it focuses on the extent and ways that parents fulfill their responsibilities to educate their children.

Frameworks for Family-School Relations

Joyce Epstein is a well-known researcher in the field of family, school, and community scholarship. Specifically, she is known and widely cited for her model of parental involvement. Epstein's (1995) model presents six types of *parental involvement*: Parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community. Epstein's model has been criticized for promoting restricted visions of partnership that are centered on the agenda of a few school stakeholders, mostly administrators, educators, and parents from white and/or middle- and upper-class backgrounds (Jeynes, 2011; Warren et al., 2009). Several scholars (e.g. Auerbach, 2007; Barton et al., 2004; Fine, 1993) have critiqued the model for its inability to address race and class inequities, and asymmetrical power relations among parents and other stakeholders (e.g. teachers, parents, administrators) that influence the experiences of families from minoritized groups. For example, Fine (1993) notes that parents with low-income and wealth status are focused on immediate day-to-day human needs such as access to material resources and securing stable and safe living space to an extent that makes participation in school activities difficult. Posey-Maddox (2017) examines the experiences of parents referred as African-American/Black in a primarily white suburban neighborhood she calls Forest Glen. Posey-Maddox (2017) describes how parents regard schools as places that mirror or compound the racism they experience in their broader community. Similar to other studies on the relations of families regarded as Black and/or African-Americans (e.g. Cooper,

2009; Lareau & Horvat, 1999, Reynolds, 2015), parents in Posey-Maddox's (2017) study describe instances in which their input was ignored and/or their advocacy efforts were rebuffed by teachers, administrators, and leaders of parent-teacher associations.

While Epstein's framework attempts to present supposedly value-neutral and narrow categories for family relations with schools, Auerbach (2012) and Henderson et al. (2007) present a *continuum of engagement* or *partnership models* that range from *closed-door policies* in which schools are presented as panaceas for troubled communities buffering students from bad influences, to *authentic partnerships* in which families can vote and present their opinions on school decisions that influence student learning. Auerbach (2012) and Henderson et al. (2007) present *authentic partnerships* as respectful alliances among educators, families, and community groups that value relationship building, dialogue across difference, and sharing power in pursuit of a common purpose in socially just, democratic schools. Auerbach's (2012) and Henderson et al.'s (2007) partnerships include four categories of partnership in a hierarchical and linear fashion. Auerbach's (2012) *partnership-leadership continuum* includes: (1) leadership for preventing partnerships, which highlights beliefs and practices that justify the separation of schools from communities; (2) leadership for nominal partnerships, which entails limited outreach and activities conducted through the school's terms and goals; (3) leadership for traditional partnerships, which encompasses more extensive outreach from the previous category with a focus on two-way communication; and (4) leadership for authentic partnerships. Similarly, Henderson et al. (2007) present family-school partnerships as four types of schools with increasing levels of *partnership*: (1) fortress schools; (2) come-if-we-call schools; (3) open-door schools; and (4) partnership schools.

Auerbach (2012) and Henderson et al. (2007) assert that most of the literature on family, school, and community relations focuses on school contexts that are considered *fortress schools*, or *come-if-we-call you schools*. Fennimore (2017) describes such approaches as "deficit-based and school-controlled, biased toward the practices and experiences of white and/or upper- and middle-class families, and dismissive of the practices and experiences of nondominant families" (p. 160). As Weaver and Reising (2007) state, minoritized families have to negotiate institutional practices and structures that operate to disenfranchise them from the outset. As such, the dominant discourse for family-school relations

> favors arrangements in which schools may value parents as supporters of student learning at home, but parents do not have opportunities for meaningful partnerships with educators to improve the teaching and learning in the school. (p.13)

The ways in which the funds of knowledge theoretical and pedagogical approach are practiced and referenced in schools is an example of how good intentions from schools to build relations with minoritized families may ultimately result in excluding and alienating these families. Moll et al.'s (1992) *funds of knowledge* began as a participatory pedagogy project that partnered teachers with a local university to understand the practices and knowledge forms of primarily Mexican-working class households in efforts to counter deficit perspectives of families and low expectations of their children. The project's premise rested on the importance of studying the sociopolitical, historical, and economic context of households to contest static representations of children and families in schools (Moll et al., 1992). As a consequence, the knowledge forms present in homes could be leveraged as part of curricular experiences of students in classrooms. Unfortunately, the extent to which the funds of knowledge of families and children are valued and engaged within classrooms may have limited purposes dependent on

school initiatives, curriculum, and individual goals from administrators, teachers, and other staff members. Further, Mangual-Figueroa (2011) asserts the importance of presenting students' funds of knowledge that may not be familiar or are viewed as difficult/complex by educators because such knowledge can be sources for dialogue and critical examination of what students' experiences in the communities might bring to their learning and development.

Community organizing has been framed as a promising approach to challenge narrow and deficit-based notions of family-school relations and foster educational equity (Delgado-Gaitán, 2001; Ishimaru, 2014; Warren et al., 2009). *Community organizing* seeks to actively engage parents and other community members in advocating for themselves as the primary means of influencing decision-makers in the institutions that affect their lives (Warren et al., 2009). It aims to strengthen their capacity to exercise power and leadership in creating more equitable learning environments (Mediratta et al., 2009; Warren et al., 2009). These organized efforts frame students, families, and communities as collaborators in the hard work of improving educational institutions and learning experiences in these places. A growing number of community organizing groups such as the Logan Square Neighborhood Association in Illinois; Oakland Community Organizations from California, and the Alliance Schools of Texas Industrial Areas Foundation are using community organizing approaches to ameliorate and transform the relationship between educators and parents/caretakers/guardians (Ishimaru et al., 2014). Despite the promising efforts and possibilities in community organizing, families in organizing initiatives may be condemned, censored, or silenced as they negotiate expectations and norms in the community organizations or general leadership structures (Dyrness, 2011; Fennimore, 2017).

Connections to the Dissertation

Most of the aforementioned definitions, approaches, and models for family relations with schools operate under the assumption that improving schools and educational experiences of children is an apolitical process, one that avoids societal issues and power relations, in this case, pertaining to race, class, and language. Parents' acquisition of expected practices, roles, and responsibilities from educational institutions and official policies is viewed as the remedy for solving social and material inequities in the U.S. educational system. Parents' practices, behaviors, and experiences that do not align with the expectations and demands from schools, including from staff members and leadership groups, are ignored or devalued. The definitions, approaches, and models for family relations with schools presented in this section are not intended to serve as a conceptual lens for this dissertation study, nor are they intended to usurp how the research participants make sense of what counts as family-school relations in this dissertation. Rather, the existing definitions and approaches serve as points of reference for how participants and the dynamics of the dissertation site, the two-way dual language bilingual program may challenge and/or supplant them. The next two sections review the research on family engagement policy and research on families in bilingual education programs. Within each section, I highlight key features of each research study and discuss how this dissertation contributes to the existing approaches, purposes, and/or issues.

Research on Family Engagement Policy

This review of the literature on family engagement policy focuses on a specific context, time, and aspect. For example, it highlights empirical research in the U.S. and that has been published since 2001. The year 2001 is significant because ESEA was reauthorized through the *No Child Left Behind Act*, which shifted the role of parents from beneficiaries and groups of

concern in the policy to critical partners in carrying out the goals of the policy for children. Since the focus is the relationships between families and schools, this research synthesis does not report on the practices of families outside of school, specifically, at home, or on families engaged in community organizing. Further, the literature reveals how there are multiple terms used interchangeably with *families* and *engagement* (e.g. parents, caretakers, guardians, involvement, partnership). Often, research studies use these terms synonymously without defining them. Also, studies that did not exactly use the term, *policy*, but that were published in journals that focus on education policy are included in this review.

My analysis of 12 studies about family engagement policy revealed two major groupings based on the research studies' topics: 1) experiences of families in schools; and (2) conceptions of family-school relations. The studies were conducted in the following states: Illinois, Michigan, New York, Tennessee, Utah, and undisclosed Midwestern, Southwestern, and Southeastern states. The majority of studies, 11 studies, are qualitative. One study used a mixed-method approach. Below, I present the results of my analysis organized by the two groupings of the literature and then offer connections between this literature and the research agenda for my dissertation study.

Experiences of Families in Schools

Four studies of the twelve studies in this group examined the experiences of families, in particular, of parents who had children in schools (i.e., Jefferson, 2014; Oliva & Alemán Jr., 2019; Shiffman, 2013; Shuffelton, 2020). Both Oliva and Alemán Jr. (2019) and Shuffleton (2020) focused on how federal and/or official local educational policies influenced how racially minoritized families (i.e. families described as Latina, African-American, and/or Vietnamese) interacted with members of the school. In contrast to these studies, Jefferson (2014) reported on

the experiences of family members described as Black and Latino in schools that were labeled turnaround schools. While Shiffman (2013) also reported on the experiences of parents described as Black and Latino, she was focused on highlighting how the limit on welfare benefits influenced parents' ways of supporting their children's education. In regards to the construction of the problem or issue in their studies, Jefferson (2014) and Oliva and Alemán Jr. (2019) asserted that the perspectives and experiences of families from racially minoritized groups continue to be ignored in schools, and yet, families are crucial partners who can help reimagine the purpose and functioning of schools. For example, Jefferson (2014) argued that research, policy, and practice have primarily justified the role of families in schools because of their potential to promote student academic achievement. Due to this narrow rationale for family engagement in schools, Oliva and Alemán Jr. (2019) claimed that other educational stakeholders miss out on the opportunities to learn from families' creative ways in which they promote the learning of students and relations among groups. Two studies (Shiffman, 2013; Shuffelton, 2020) were concerned with conflicting messages from official federal and state policies about the parents' responsibilities in the educational experiences of children. They wanted to understand how racially minoritized families navigated resource constraints, participation in the workforce, and parent participation in schools.

Overall, these four studies used qualitative research designs with observations and semi-structured interviews as central instruments for data generation. Only Shiffman (2013) incorporated artifacts and documents as part of her research design. Jefferson (2014) and Shiffman (2013) conducted interviews and participant observations with a range of educational stakeholders (e.g. members of community groups, parents, educators, social service professionals). On the other hand, Oliva and Alemán Jr. (2019) and Shuffelton (2020) focused

their interviews and observations on parents, particularly, racially minoritized mothers who had children in schools. Notably, Oliva and Alemán Jr. (2019) referred to their semi-structured interviews as forms of "pláticas -conversations that allow us to self-discover who we are in relationship to others within Latino culture" (De la Torre, 2008, p. 4). Along with Jefferson (2014), Oliva and Alemán Jr. (2019) noted that policies and practices aimed to encourage parent participation in school initiatives served as barriers that restricted the racially minoritized family members' access to school spaces and information. To access resources and physical spaces in the school, racially minoritized family members had to conform to school-sanctioned behaviors. Jefferson (2014) reported that members of families labeled as Black and Latino were given penalties for failing to access school spaces in the specific ways listed in school policy texts.

With regard to official state and city educational policies, Shuffelton (2020) described how racially minoritized families became excluded from formal school leadership positions and opportunities to be members of parent leadership groups in their new schools. Within the context of the closing of many Chicago neighborhood schools in 2012-2013, Shuffelton (2020) noted how mothers described as African-American or of Vietnamese descent navigated the lottery-based magnet schools where their children were newly enrolled. Although these mothers were active and had formal roles in parent organizing groups outside of school, they felt that they were ignored when they inquired about academics or initiatives to school administrators and parent leaders of the new school. Despite the constraints placed by schools and concerns about economic stability, Oliva and Alemán Jr. and Shiffman (2013) presented the multiple and creative ways in which racially minoritized mothers supported the education of their children. For example, Shiffman (2013) described how mothers who were receiving welfare benefits were not able to secure job opportunities close to their neighborhoods and children's schools due to

geographic and transportation barriers. And yet, these mothers attempted to build work-based networks and sought advice about parenting and academic resources for their children.

Conceptions of Family-School Relations

Along with the above studies focused on the experiences of families in schools, eight studies of twelve studies examined the conceptions of family-school relations among various educational stakeholders (e.g. educators, mid-level administrators, parents, community leaders, legislators). Four studies (Casto et al., 2016; Ishimaru et al., 2016; Wilinski & Morley, 2019; Wilinski & Vellanki, 2020) examined how teachers, mid-level administrators, and school officials made sense of official state policies that allocate specific roles to families in schools and the education of their children. Three other studies (Kainz & Aikens, 2007; Nakagawa, 2001; Prins & Toso, 2008) examined policy texts and empirical studies related to families and their roles in schools and their children's education. One study (Luet, 2017) reported on the perspectives of parents, local officials, teachers, students, and school administrators about the barriers and opportunities for parental involvement in schooling. With regard to the construction of the research problem, Luet (2017) along with Nakagawa (2001) and Kainz and Aikens (2007), argued that the dominant ways of talking about parental involvement devalue families' particular forms of participation, and even, particular social groups. Notably, Nakagawa (2001) considered official government policies such as *No Child Left Behind* and school-related texts as powerful vectors for limiting the possibilities of building close family-school relationships.

On the other hand, Wilinski and Morley (2020) and Wilinski and Vellanki (2020) asserted the importance of understanding expectations for family roles and responsibilities in the education of PreK students because most state Pre-K programs require mandates that foster family engagement. Additionally, Casto et al. (2016) and Prins and Toso (2008) justified their

research focus by claiming that there is limited research that examines how local community and state initiatives partner with schools to promote families' engagement with their children's educational experiences in schools. Different from the aforementioned approaches toward constructing the problem regarding the conceptions of family-school relations, Ishimaru et al. (2016) noted that individuals who serve as cultural brokers can play a critical role in bridging the racial, cultural, and linguistic power divides between schools and minoritized families. And yet, they also warn that cultural brokers may inadvertently attempt to assimilate parents into dominant norms, expectations, and behaviors, thereby reinscribing asymmetrical power relations and constraining parental expression in schools.

Most studies focused on the conceptions of family-school relations are qualitative studies. Specifically, four studies (Ishimaru et al., 2016; Luet, 2017; Wilinski & Morley, 2019; Wilinski & Vellanki, 2020) out of the seven qualitative studies generated data through participant observation and semi-structured interviews. Notably, within this group of four studies, only Ishimaru et al. (2016) and Luet (2017) included parents and children as research participants. Three studies (Kainz & Toso, 2007; Nakagawa, 2001; Prins & Toso, 2008) conducted critical discourse analysis on official state policies, mandates, and/or research studies that discussed the expected behaviors, roles, and responsibilities of parents in their children's academic success in schools. The only mixed-method study in this group of studies on the conceptions of family-school relations, Casto et al. (2016), used surveys from the New York State Department of Education and the Office of Children and Family Services as well as interview transcriptions of 73 participants, which included community officials, school administrators, and non-profit organizational leaders.

As a whole group, the findings of the eight studies in this group of research revealed two themes related to how family-school relationships are conceptualized in official policy texts and by educational stakeholders. First, definitions and approaches for family engagement invited parents to participate in schools in ways that met the goals listed in school and state-wide initiatives. This finding appeared in four studies (Ishimaru et al., 2017; Luet, 2017; Wilinski & Morley, 2019; Wilinski & Vellanki, 2020). Mid-level administrators from state educational departments described in Wilinski and Morley's (2019) study wanted to have parents involved in decision-making processes focused on activities and events of preK programs. And yet, as Wilinski and Morley (2019) suggested, these state department leaders do not consider reaching out to the PreK families for their suggestions about forms of involvement that parents may value but that are not currently reflected in state preK mandates. Further, Luet (2017) noted how superintendents made increasing parental involvement in schools as one of their key reform efforts, creating initiatives that tracked and held parents accountable to these reforms.

In response, teachers negotiated expectations from state mandates, school leaders, and department leaders for parent involvement with their perceptions of what parents needed and valued (Wilinski & Vellanki, 2020). For example, Wilinski and Vellanki (2020) reported that teachers emphasized less the role of parents as active decision-makers of preK program-wide initiatives and events and focused more on responding to parents' expectations of their involvement in school. For example, a teacher worked with one parent who was not able to attend required monthly program events by relaying the information and resources discussed in these meetings during the teacher's lunchtime or through virtual conferences (Wilinski & Vellanki, 2020). Although some school districts assign staff to serve as cultural brokers between families and schools, Ishimaru et al. (2016) explained that these people ultimately attempt to fit

parents' visions of education or issues with schools within already established school-wide agendas. For example, Ishimaru et. al (2016) noted how one family liaison or cultural broker described how one parent's concern with food security and the expensive price of healthy food led to the parent-teacher association creating an event to help donate canned goods to a local food bank. While the liaison attempted to provide the parent with informational resources that may help alleviate the lack of food security at home, the issue of food insecurity in the neighborhood was not acknowledged as a focus in other aspects of the school such as curriculum and partnerships with community organizations.

Further, the second main finding among this group of 8 studies was that policy, research, and practice have historically bounded and constructed notions of an idealized parent (Nakagawa, 2001). Through her analysis of state educational policy texts, Nakagawa (2001) argued that parents are placed with competing roles and responsibilities. For example, Nakagawa (2001) stated that parents are framed within the state policy texts as crucial decision-makers because they need to protect their children's interests. Alternatively, Nakagawa (2001) argued that parents are also viewed as a problem with inferior practices. Under this frame of the parent as a problem, parents do not do enough and need to be involved in ways that the school dictates, or else they will continue to be a problem. However, if these parents choose to protect their children's interests, they will still be viewed as a problem because they are overly involved, and are unable to ensure the academic success and financial stability for the entire school.

Similar to Nakagawa's (2001)'s construction of parents as a problem, Prins and Toso's (2008) analysis of parenting education profile (PEP) texts encourages parents to learn and embrace prescribed parenting behaviors and literacy practices. Notably, the texts suggest that parents should strive to "overcome discomfort resulting from their cultural beliefs and abide by

the recommendations so that their children can be successful in schools" (Prins & Toso, 2008 p. 586). Further, the texts do not encourage parents to question certain practices, or work with educators and other community members to identify other ways to support the educational success of their children (Prins & Toso, 2008). Relatedly, Kainz and Aikens (2007) analyses of studies, media texts, and official policies explain that the contemporary emphasis on educational interventions to minimize supposed negative educational outcomes for children living in homes with limited resources is just a continuation of what has been said about families and schools throughout U.S. history. For example, these scholars noted that policymakers and researchers in the 1960s claimed that parents' behaviors at home were tied to children's learning, which was ultimately linked to school academic achievement (Kainz & Aikens, 2007). Kainz and Aikens (2007) suggested that this framing of family and school relations was fueled by the national concern over the failure of U.S. schools to produce scientists capable of creating innovations for space exploration that would be better than those from Russia (Kainz & Aikens, 2007).

Connections to the Dissertation

The synthesis of the 12 studies within the literature on family engagement policy offered several insights into the perceptions and experiences of families, particularly families in U.S. schools. My review of this research revealed three considerations for my study, particularly as it related to the rationale, framework, and data generation.

First, the majority of the research studies in this group of literature sought to address one of the following two issues: (1) multiple and conflicting parent roles in schools within policies; (2) the experiences and perspectives of parents, specifically those from minoritized groups, that are ignored and devalued in schools. However, one study, Kainz and Aikens, (2007) asserted that the current representations and experiences of parents in the U.S. are enduring constructions that

have ideological and historical underpinnings. These constructions of parents are meant to limit the possibilities for humanizing family-school relationships. As such, Kainz and Aikens (2007) aimed to relate the contemporary asymmetrical relations between families and educational institutions with broader sociopolitical and historical processes. In response to Kainz and Aikens's (2007) research focus, my study argues that these longstanding constructions of what family relations can be with schools and the process of schooling are racialized and linguicized representations-enduring effects of white supremacy, coloniality, and racist-capitalism.

Similar to Kainz and Aikens (2007), this dissertation incorporates forms of data that are beyond texts from government or educational institutions and agencies. Following the lead of these scholars, this dissertation aims to expand notions of what is considered policy through my theoretical orientation and the participation of families, which are the focus of the conversations in this body of literature. Shiffman (2013) and Oliva and Alemán Jr. (2019) described the multiple ways in which parents engage in the education of their children that are beyond prescribed forms forced upon them by their children's schools. Despite the asymmetrical relations in schools and broader societal inequities, the parents in Shiffman's (2013) and Oliva and Alemán Jr.'s (2019) studies continued to seek out resources, opportunities, and social spaces for their learning and development. As such, one purpose of this dissertation is to report on the ways in which parents and their children reimagine the relationships that they have with the functioning and learning that occurs in schools.

Lastly, most studies were qualitative studies, many of which had a variety of data sources (e.g. interviews, observations, documents). Few studies like Ishimaru et al. (2016) and Luet (2017) had a range of participants (e.g. administrators, community leaders, staff, parents). And yet, children rarely were invited to be research participants in these studies. Although Ishimaru et

al. (2016) included children as participants for their study, their perspectives were minimally presented within their findings. The exclusion of the perspectives of children about what they think their parents' and overall family's relationship should be and currently is in schools may lead to the mistaken notion that the research topic of family-school relations is about parents/caretakers/guardians only. Accordingly, this dissertation considers the perspectives and experiences of families, including those from children and at least one of their caretakers/guardians/parents.

Research on Families in K-12 Bilingual Education Programs

Due to this research study being situated in one bilingual education program model, two-way dual language bilingual immersion, it is important to learn about other studies that have focused on families in bilingual education programs. I focused on studies that centered families who already had children participating in the program instead of just recently enrolling their children in the program. As such, this synthesis does not include research of bilingual families in other educational models, community organizations, or their homes. Like the previous group of studies, this review presents empirical research in the U.S. and that has been published since 2001, the reauthorization of ESEA through the *No Child Left Behind Act*. Also, I included studies that have used other terms that are often used interchangeably with *families*, *engagement,* and/or *relations* (e.g. parents, caretakers, guardians, involvement, partnerships). Like the previous body of literature, these terms are used synonymously and are not always defined.

My analysis of 20 studies about families in bilingual education programs led me to organize these studies into three groups based on their research study topic: (1) perceptions of program goals and characteristics; (2) relations among families; and (3) negotiation of expected roles and responsibilities in programs. These studies were conducted in the following states:

Arizona, California, Illinois, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, and undisclosed Southeastern and Southwestern states. The majority of the studies, 13 studies, are qualitative studies. Three studies used mixed-method approaches while four studies used quantitative methods. The subsections that follow present the results of my analysis, organized by the three groupings of the research, and connections to the research agenda of my dissertation study.

Perceptions of Program Goals and Characteristics

Ten of the 20 studies reviewed in this group analyzed the perceptions that families had on the goals and characteristics of the bilingual education programs where their children were currently enrolled. The majority of these studies (Aguayo & Dorner, 2017; Dorner, 2010; Olivos & Lucero, 2020; Parkes & Ruth, 2011; Ramos, 2007; Sung, 2020) focused on parents' satisfaction with the features of dual language bilingual programs and their children's learning in these programs. Along with these studies, three studies (Ee, 2018; Gerena, 2011; Wesely & Baig, 2012) analyzed parents' rationales for valuing dual language bilingual programs and continuing to enroll their children in the program. In contrast to the other 9 studies, Ee (2017) investigated the relationship between parental involvement and parent demographic characteristics (i.e. neighborhood, income, race/ethnicity).

There were three overarching research problems within this group of 10 studies. First, five studies (Ee, 2017; Gerena, 2011; Parkes & Ruth, 2011; Sung, 2020; Wesely & Baig, 2012) insisted that parental involvement was an important and influential factor for dual language bilingual program effectiveness and quality. Specifically, these studies noted that parent involvement could help improve student academic performance and students' attitudes toward language learning. As such, there needed to be more research that examined how parents viewed the functioning and programming of two-way dual language bilingual programs. Second, two

studies (Ee, 2018; Ramos, 2007) asserted that it was important to understand parents' perceptions on two-way dual language bilingual immersion programs because of the program model's drastic growth over the last two decades in an increasingly diverse U.S. society. Notably, Ee (2018) pointed out that there is a need for understanding the perspectives of parents in Korean-English two-way dual language immersion programs due to 1) the majority of bilingual education research focusing on Spanish-English programs; (2) this type of program starting in the mid-1995 and with now 20 programs of its kind across the U.S; and (3) the increase of Korean immigration to the U.S. Lastly, the third main research problem found in three studies (Aguayo & Dorner, 2017; Dorner, 2017; Olivos & Lucero, 2020) centered on the tenuous, power-laden, and complex nature of the relationships that families have with other members of the school as well as with specific program features and expectations. For example, Olivos and Lucero (2020) noted that it was important to understand the parents' perceptions about the two-way dual language bilingual program to delineate which aspects of the program they preferred and felt welcomed or excluded.

There was a range of research designs within this group of 10 studies. Three studies (Dorner, 2010; Ee, 2018; Gerena, 2011) were qualitative studies, which primarily used participant observations and interviews. Gerena (2011)'s two-year ethnographic study consisted of school-wide observations and focus group interviews with 15 parents, who were described as English-only, Spanish-only, or bilingual. Ee's (2018) study consisted of school-wide observations and semi-structured interviews with 6 parents labeled as Korean and 6 parents labeled as non-Korean. Ee (2018) also conducted interviews with the school principal and teachers. Notably, Dorner's (2010) case study consisted of participant observation and semi-

structured interviews with Mexican immigrant families. She met with families, including parents/caretakers and their children, at home and in school.

Additionally, four out of the 10 studies (Ee, 2017; Parkes & Ruth, 2011; Sung, 2020; Wesely & Baig, 2012) were quantitative studies. Although all of these four studies reported that they administered surveys to parents in two-way dual language bilingual programs, only Ee (2017) specified the format of his survey. Ee (2017) explained that his survey questions were based on four Likert-scales ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 4 (very satisfied). Parkes and Ruth (2011) collected surveys from 724 parents, who were described as 56% Spanish dominant, 38% English dominant, and 4% bilingual in English and Spanish. Wesely and Baig (2012) collected surveys from 358 parents who were described as belonging to Spanish-English one-way dual language immersion programs. Focused on Mandarin Chinese two-way dual language bilingual programs, Sung (2020) described the 580 participants as "89% white, 23% Asian or Asian-American, and 7% other ethnicities including African-American, Latinx, Native American, Pacific Islander, and mixed ethnicities (not white or Asian)" (p. 389).

Three studies (Aguayo & Dorner, 2017; Olivos & Lucero, 2020; Ramos, 2007) out of the ten studies employed a mixed-methods approach. Both Aguayo and Dorner (2017) and Ramos (2007) administered surveys to their participants that consisted of questions based on a 5-point Likert-scale and open-ended questions. The participants in Ramos's (2017) study consisted of 326 parents of children enrolled in English-Spanish two-way dual language bilingual programs. According to Ramos (2017), 94% of the participants described themselves as Hispanic-Latino, 2.2% as Caucasian, 1.4% as Asian-American, .8% as African-American, and .3% as American-Indian/Alaskan Native. As for Aguayo and Dorner (2017), they did not specify the total number of participants in their study, but instead, explained that they centered their analysis on mothers

who were Spanish-speaking. Out of this group of mixed-methods studies, Olivos and Lucero (2020) was the only study that incorporated interviews along with their surveys with Likert-scaled questions. These scholars explained that while 363 parents completed the survey, they focused on 12 parents described as Latino and Spanish-speaking whom they were able to conduct interviews.

Concerning the findings from this group of 10 studies, there were three themes related to the perceptions of bilingual program goals and characteristics. First, parents had concerns about the language and literacy development of their children and about the school's communication with them. For example, Parkes and Ruth (2011) noted that parents described as Spanish-dominant were concerned about whether their children were learning English at an appropriate grade-level pace. Some of these parents wished that the school would have more content instruction in English, especially in mathematics. Sometimes Spanish-speaking parental concerns about the degree of English language use in a two-way dual language bilingual classroom escalated when they attempted to recruit other parents, mainly parents described as Latino (Dorner, 2010). Additionally, Parkes and Ruth (2011) mentioned that the Spanish-dominant parents were concerned about whether there were sufficient resources and staff that would help them understand the initiatives and changes in their two-way dual language bilingual school. Similarly, parents in Olivos and Lucero (2020) and Ee (2017) disclosed that they wished that school staff would communicate more consistently and clearly about the instructional goals that are supposed to foster children's learning and language development. For example, the parents described as Latinos in Olivos and Lucero (2020) revealed that the parent-teacher organization meetings were only conducted in English.

Along with parental concerns about language and communication, two studies (Aguayo & Dorner, 2017; Olivos & Lucero, 2020) in this group suggested that parents blamed themselves for their perceived lack of language ability and knowledge about the process of schooling, and were nervous about being physically present in spaces of dual language bilingual schools. Parents in Aguayo and Dorner (2017) mentioned that they felt very nervous when they had to walk by the entrances of the school due to the bullying that they witnessed in these spaces. These parents wished that they felt comfortable in explaining this concern to staff members and attributed their lack of communication with educators and staff to their perceived lack of English and inadequate use of Spanish. Ee (2018) brought an intriguing perspective about the safety concerns because he suggested that some parents did not feel safe and comfortable in programs because of the presence of other ethnoracial groups. Ee (2018) explained that families described as Korean or Korean-American implied that they did not feel comfortable interacting with *Latino or other people of color* because of the considerable differences between them (Ee, 2018, p. 703). However, these parents did not specify the differences they were referring to in the interviews. Further, Olivos and Lucero (2020) reported how schools communicated with Latino families through bilingual flyers and newsletters, and called them to join committees. And yet, parents described as Latino in this study disclosed that they did not understand how they were supposed to respond to these forms of communication. Some of these families attributed their lack of schooling in their home countries as part of the reason why they did not fully comprehend the policies and expectations from their children's schools (Olivos & Lucero, 2020).

Besides parents' concerns about their practices and histories, six studies (Dorner, 2010; Gerena, 2011; Ramos, 2007; Sung, 2020; Wesely & Baig, 2012) discussed how parents viewed dual language bilingual programs as spaces that promoted the practice of their heritage languages

and cultures. By students being able to practice and learn more about their heritage languages and cultures, they would be able to connect with distant and older family members (Dorner, 2010; Gerena, 2011; Sung, 2020; Wesely & Baig, 2012). Parents explained that they enjoyed reading with their children in their heritage language because it was a way to discuss important issues that were relevant to their neighborhoods and cultures (Ramos, 2007). Ramos (2007) reported that parents facilitated their children's meet-ups with their friends to practice their heritage language outside of home and school. However, many of these studies noted that the desire to maintain the heritage culture and language as a reason to be a part of a dual language immersion program pertained to families who were not marked as white. For instance, Dorner (2010) and Gerena (2011) explained that parents classified as white were the parents who were more concerned with job opportunities and connectedness on a global scale. These scholars noted that parents classified as white were pleased that their children were becoming more knowledgeable of cultures in the school for the ultimate goal of them being able to connect with more social groups and opportunities outside the U.S.

Relations among Families

In addition to the previous studies focused on program characteristics and goals, six studies (Burns, 2017; Chaparro, 2019; Muro, 2016; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009; Shannon, 2011: Turner, 2016) examined the relations and experiences among families in bilingual programs. Three studies (Chaparro, 2019; Muro, 2016; Turner, 2016) described the experiences and forms of interactions among Latino and white parents in two-way dual language bilingual programs. Similarly, Shannon (2011) and Burns (2017) investigated the practices, structures, and relations that were viewed as indicators of parental involvement in two-way dual language bilingual programs. In contrast to the above studies, Scanlan and Palmer (2009) investigated how race,

ethnicity, and class influenced the retention and recruitment of families in two-way dual language immersion programs. Along with Burns (2017), Scanlan and Palmer (2009) justified the importance of their study by framing bilingual education as a civil rights issue. They noted that although bilingual programs were intended to serve the interests of language minoritized groups, the continual enrollment of white and upper- and middle-class groups in dual language bilingual programs raise questions about whose interests are addressed in these programs.

Relatedly, three studies (Chaparro, 2019; Muro, 2016; Shannon, 2011) framed their research problems on societal demographic shifts and inequities. For example, Chaparro (2019) explained that there were vast differences in the migration trajectories, socioeconomic and ethnoracial backgrounds, and access to resources that influenced how families experienced and perceived two-way dual language immersion programs. Muro (2016) noted that neighborhood demographic changes have the potential to exacerbate tensions and inequities among ethnoracial groups in public institutions like schools. Focusing on demographic changes at a national level, Shannon (2011) argued that there is a persistent tense relationship between Latino/Spanish minority groups and white/English majority groups in the U.S. According to Shannon (2011), Latinos have been positioned in the U.S. as a group composed of people with questionable citizenship status and who do not have a right to the same rights as white people. In contrast to the rest of the studies in this group, Turner (2016) claimed that there is not enough research on the intergroup relations of families that attend parent language classes in bilingual programs.

The six studies in this group of research are qualitative studies that primarily conduct participant observation and interviews. Only Turner (2016) incorporated open-ended surveys as part of her research design. Three studies (Chaparro, 2019; Muro; 2016; Turner, 2016) focused their interviews and observations on parents described as Latinx or Latino and white in two-way

dual language immersion programs. Although data generation in Burns (2017) was focused on parents, she mostly observed and interviewed parents from white and middle- and upper-class backgrounds. Unlike the other five studies, Scanlan and Palmer (2009) observed and interviewed various educational stakeholders such as administrators, teachers, parents, and caregivers.

In terms of findings, the studies in this group presented the complex and consequential nature of the relationships among families in two-way dual language immersion programs. Specifically, the collective group of findings argued that the presence of minoritized and majoritized groups in schools did not guarantee that their practices and histories would be viewed of similar importance, and that they would have equal access to resources and opportunities in the programs. For instance, four studies (Burns, 2017; Chaparro, 2019; Muro, 2016; Shannon, 2011) described how parents marked as white viewed their bilingualism as an added resource that would expand their entire family's professional opportunities and social networks from local to global scales. Although these parents valued bilingualism for their children, they were not convinced of the heritage language maintenance for language minoritized children (Shannon, 2011). Further, Muro (2016) noted that parents described as white appreciated being exposed to cultural practices from Latinx groups because this exposure "made them feel special relative to other white people" (p. 526).

In contrast to the relations that families described as white had with bilingualism, Chaparro (2019) and Muro (2016) explained that several families labeled as Latinx, particularly from low-income backgrounds, regarded the presence of white and middle- and upper-class families in the program as reminders of their low-socioeconomic and racialized position in the U.S. For the families labeled as Latinx and with low-socioeconomic status, their children's bilingualism meant more opportunities for academic achievement and socioeconomic mobility

when compared to those from their homelands (Chaparro, 2019; Muro, 2016). Also, bilingualism for these families was another mode for effectively communicating with family members, especially with members who could talk about the histories and traditions of their homelands. Despite the sociopolitical and historical disparate nature of Latinx and white families' connections with language and culture, Chaparro (2019) noted that these families were labeled under static language labels, *English speakers* for people marked as white and *Spanish speakers* for people marked as Latinx and from low-income backgrounds. Further, Scanlan and Palmer (2009) suggested that these Spanish-English two-way dual language immersion programs may reinforce a Latino/Anglo dualism. They explained that promotional materials presented the school as an institution that aimed "to honor Latino and Anglo cultures equally" (Scanlan & Palmer, 2009, p. 409). Additionally, no participant in their study mentioned dimensions of race and ethnicity that extended beyond classifications of Anglo or Latino (Scanlan & Palmer, 2009).

Further, families had different opportunities to be part of key decision-making processes and leadership groups in two-way dual language bilingual programs. Three studies (Burns, 2017; Chaparro, 2019; Muro, 2016) explained how white and middle- and upper-class families were presented with school leadership roles and invited to decision making processes for important school reforms and policies. Under this leadership demographic makeup, school initiatives often served the interests of white and middle-and upper-class groups. For example, Burns (2017) noted how a parent-teacher organization, primarily composed of parents from white and middle- and upper-class backgrounds, hosted a silent auction fundraiser at a local restaurant. The parent group explained that they wanted to sell art that did not reflect "too much of a particular heritage because art needed to be appropriate for the home of a family with a generic aesthetic" (Burns, 2017, p. 346). In contrast to white and middle- and upper-class families, families classified as

Latinx and from low-income backgrounds held supportive roles such as translators, preparers and servers of food during events, and disseminators of school newsletters or flyers. Additionally, Turner (2016) suggested that mothers described as Spanish-dominant and Latina were heavily encouraged to participate in parent language classes so that they could serve cultural and linguistic supports for parents from white and middle- and upper-class backgrounds. This high level of encouragement and active communication was not apparent within other initiatives and groups at the school (Turner, 2016).

Negotiation of Expected Roles and Responsibilities

Lastly, four studies (Chaparro, 2020; Chung, 2020; Hernández, 2013; Newcomer & Puzio, 2016) of the twenty studies in this group reported on how parents negotiated prescribed roles and responsibilities in schools. Both Hernández (2013) and Newcomer and Puzio (2016) examined how parents, described as Latino or of Mexican origins, made sense of official state and school-based policies. With regard to their construction of the research problem, Hernández (2013) and Newcomer and Puzio (2016) asserted that official educational policies from the local to the national level heavily influence the schooling experiences of families. Specifically, they claim that educational policies shape how educational stakeholders' interpretations and enactment of programs and practices. The other studies, Chaparro (2020) and Chung (2020) described how a select group of parents from two-way dual language bilingual programs negotiated the expectations and practices from educators and administrators. For Chaparro (2020), it was important to understand the experiences and backgrounds of racially minoritized parents, in this case, Latinx parents from low-income backgrounds, so that educators can foster humanizing learning experiences instead of solely prioritizing language learning. Relatedly, Chung (2020) insisted that it was crucial to examine the dynamic and sociopolitical nature within

how parents of non-Chinese descent relate with aspects of the minoritized language and its related ethnoracial group, in this case, Chinese culture and the Mandarin language.

All four studies engaged in qualitative methods. Three studies (Chaparro, 2020; Hernández, 2013; Newcomer & Puzio, 2016) conducted participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and generated artifacts. However, one study (Chung, 2020) conducted interviews with participants, which were 21 parents who were described as of non-Chinese descent. Hernández (2013) and Chaparro (2020) also invited two-way dual language bilingual parents as participants for their studies. However, these families were described as Latinx or of Mexican descent. Unlike the above studies, Newcomer and Puzio (2016) generated data from a range of educational stakeholders such as educators, principals, parents, students, and community members. Newcomer and Puzio (2016) argued that language was an important part of the identities of children and their families. For example, one Latina mother stated that she did not want her children to lose their ability to practice Spanish because Spanish was part of their culture (Newcomer & Puzio, 2016). Additionally, Latina mothers explained that they were proud of their bilingualism and hoped that their children viewed their bilingualism as a source of pride and resource for socioeconomic and educational mobility.

In contrast to these relations between language and identity, Chung (2020) revealed that parents, in this case, those described as of non-Chinese descent, were concerned about their relations with Chinese culture and the Mandarin language. Notably, these parents were interviewed during the start of the COVID-19 pandemic at the start of 2020. The parents described the perpetuation of deficit-based rhetoric in the U.S. during the pandemic toward Chinese culture, with the Mandarin language being viewed as an indicator of the culture (Chung, 2020). They argued that before the pandemic Mandarin was viewed as a vector for more

academic opportunities and networks, including ones in China. Now, these parents wanted their children to continue to learn Mandarin but instead, more for the purpose of academic and material opportunities than having direct relations with China and Chinese culture.

With regard to official state and school policies, Hernández (2013) explained how a Latina parent who had a leadership position was expected to continuously use language from institutional policies in her interactions with educators and administrators. The parent explained how administrators would interrupt her or call her attention to her use of *bilingual* over *English learner* to describe students who were placed in English as Second Language classes or those who did not yet pass English as a Second Language proficiency tests. Hernández (2013) noted that the parent consistently followed this educational label to describe the students in her interviews. As such, Hernández (2013) suggested that even when parents from racially minoritized groups are invited to assume leadership roles in the school, they are often expected to conform to specific language forms and conventions promoted in official educational policies. Similarly, Chaparro (2020) reported how Latina mothers also experienced isolation and confusion due to the lack of staff members who speak Spanish and are available to help them with technological concerns.

Connections to the Dissertation

The review of 20 studies on families in K-12 bilingual education settings suggested that the experiences and relationships that families have with bilingual programs are complex, multifaceted, and can look differently based on place and time. This group of literature presented three implications for my study, particularly as it related to the rationale and theoretical orientation.

To begin, various studies (e.g. Ee, 2017; Parkes & Ruth, 2011; Sung, 2020) justified the importance of their research on families in bilingual programs by claiming that the academic achievement of students was related to parent involvement. Specifically, they claimed that there was a measurable level of parent participation that favorably impacted children's motivation to learn in bilingual programs. As such, it is important to learn more about what parents thought about the school and its members so that this information could be a resource for encouraging parents to participate through the approaches demanded by the school.

In opposition to this rationale for research on families in bilingual programs, other studies (e.g. Dorner, 2013; Olivos & Lucero, 2020; Ramos, 2007) argue that families, specifically, families from racially minoritized groups, considered themselves as actively engaged in the education of their children, and have deep connections with the purpose and goals of their children's schools. For these studies, it was crucial to examine the different considerations and definitions that multiple educational stakeholders had for parental engagement/ involvement/relations, etc. with bilingual programs. They claimed that certain definitions and practices for the relationships between bilingual programs and families privileged white and middle- and upper-class families, and excluded racially minoritized families, particularly those labeled as Latinx/o/a. In response, this dissertation argues that the issue is not whether or not families care or participate in bilingual programs, but, rather, it is the narrow, depoliticized, and ahistorical constructions of family-school relations that hinder the learning and prosperity of racially minoritized families. In this way, this research study already assumes that parents do care and participate in their children's schools and learning.

Other studies (e.g. Hernández, 2013; Newcomer & Puzio, 2016) reported on how families of bilingual programs negotiated official government and school policies. They claim that the

policies are authoritative forces that shape the conditions around public education, and consequently, the family-school relationship. Although these policies have an enduring social and material impact on schools and their stakeholders, this study argues that these texts are one form of policy, specifically, one form that states what should be said or done about something, in this case, family-school relations. This definition of policy informs the theoretical orientation and allows for other forms of data to be viewed as policies.

Conclusion

In sum, this review of the literature suggested that prescribed definitions and approaches for family-school relations continue to be relegated as idealized standards for how families and schools should interact with each other. Accordingly, various researchers, policymakers, and practitioners asserted that the extent to which families can conform to these bounded constructions for family-school relations greatly influences the educational outcomes of students. Meanwhile, others claimed that these narrow conceptions privilege families described as white and middle- or upper-class, while excluding and delegitimizing the experiences and contributions of racially minoritized groups. And yet, as forms of policy, these studies mostly presented this issue as a school-based matter rather than one that is historical and sociopolitical in nature, and one that transcends beyond the school as an institution. Further, these debates and conversations do not highlight the perspectives of children about their parents', caretakers', and/or guardians' relations with schools and schooling. Combined, the splits, divisions, and tensions reflected in this review suggested that more investigation about family-school relations in bilingual programs, and more, broadly, in U.S. schools, is needed. As such, my study on family-school relations of a two-way dual language bilingual program presented the opportunity to do just that.

The following chapter presents the theoretical orientation for this dissertation that aims to contribute to the existing debates described in this review.

CHAPTER THREE: Theoretical Orientation

The review of the literature suggested that the dominant and contemporary framings of family-school relations in the U.S are enduring constructions that have ideological, political, and historical underpinnings. In response, this chapter presents my theoretical orientation to examine the dominant representations that characterize family-school relations in policy text and appropriation from a two-way dual language bilingual program. Three overarching frames inform this orientation for engaging in this analysis of family engagement policy text and appropriation: (1) Critical Race Theory (CRT) (Harris, 1993; Vaught, 2011) with its attention to the intersection of race and property; (2) raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017), as shaped by critical poststructuralist sociolinguistic claims; and (3) feminist poststructuralist perspectives towards identity construction (Butler, 1993; Weedon, 1987). Together, these frames address various sociocultural and material dimensions within the construct of family-school relations in two-way dual language bilingual programs. This orientation highlights the ways in which race, class, and language discourses interact to position two-way dual language bilingual families and their language practices. Further, it seeks to highlight and interrogate the rationalities, and tangible and intangible benefits that are associated with these subject positions. Lastly, the approach illustrates how these subject positions, and their material effects are not merely imposed on families, but instead, are recognized, contested, and/or altered within and through the language practices of families. This orientation provides a robust theoretical base for understanding the appropriation of family engagement policies within two-way dual language bilingual programs.

Critical Race Theory and the Centrality of White Subjects in U.S. Education Policy

Critical Race Theory began in the field of Critical Legal Studies as both as an intellectual movement and a theory (Crenshaw, 2002; Stefancic & Delgado, 2000). Specifically, it began as a critique of Critical Legal Studies for failing to theorize race and racism (Stefancic & Delgado, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2010). After their experiences at Critical Legal Studies conferences, collectively writing together legal and research literature, and more importantly, engaging in an "ongoing institutional struggle over race, pedagogy, and affirmative action at Harvard" (Crenshaw, 2011, p.1264), several law students and professors, many of whom were from racially minoritized groups, founded Critical Race Theory at a seminar held in the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1989.[3] Recognizing the limited progress from the Civil Rights Era, CRT scholars extended forms of activism by critiquing Civil Rights legislation as largely symbolic and revealed how white supremacy continues to be upheld by the law (Crenshaw, 1988; Harris, 1993). In other words, Civil Rights legislation was symbolic because these laws did not ensure material and social equality for Black and African-Americans and other racially minoritized groups. Notably, Crenshaw (2011) clarifies that while legal studies was the first discipline to examine race and racism, CRT took off due to claims about the relationship between law and racial progress and issues with legal liberalism. Despite the current attempts from the media, institutions, and entities to delegitimize this theory, CRT continues to maintain a robust presence in legal studies and many other disciplines such as political science, psychology, philosophy, and education (Crenshaw, 2011).

Critical Race Theory challenges and examines the multiple ways in which race, racialization, and racism impact institutional structures, practices, and discourses. Under this

[3] Founding scholars include Derrick Bell, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Richard Delgado, Neil Gotanda, Linda Green, and Lani Guinier, Mari Matsuda, and Patricia Williams.

framework, race is a permanent, malleable, and entangled feature of a globalized racist-capitalist society. The idea of *race* includes the socially constructed belief that humans can be divided into biologically discrete and exclusive groups based on physical and cultural traits (Golash-Boza, 2016).[4] In fact, racial subjugation and stratification are globally centuried practices that are not exclusive to the slave trade and slavery of African peoples. In fact, the formation of racist-capitalism can be traced to the social organization of human grouping in Western Europe during the rise of capitalism, many of whose descendants might have become positioned as white (Gilmore, 2002). As such, the selection of particular human features for purposes of racial signification is always and necessarily a globalized, social, and historical process. One example is the ways in which race is enmeshed with nationality and ethnicity.

In this contemporary globalized racist-capitalist context, CRT scholars assert that society is not post-racial by reporting on the existing structures, practices, and policies that mark racially minoritized students as deficient and deprived (Rousseau & Dixon, 2006). These markers of deficiency and invalidity extend to ways of knowing, being, and relating with one another. According to Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), CRT in education helps explain that racial disparities in schools are a "logical and predictable result of a racist society in which discussions of race and racism continue to be muted and marginalized" (p. 47).[5] In evaluating the social and material effects of race, racialization, and racism in education, CRT challenges constructs of neutrality, objectivity, colorblindness, and meritocracy embedded in educational structures, discourses, and practices. Further, CRT aims to rethink and transform unjust practices and

[4] There is no biological basis for distinguishing among human groups along the lines of race.

[5] Black intellectuals like W.E.B. Du Bois and Carter G. Woodson theorized issues related to racism, whiteness, education in early 20th century (Du Bois, 1935; Woodson, 1933), but there was a collective emergence of scholarship theorizing race in the field of education around the time Ladson-Billings and Tate started to apply CRT in educational research in the 1990's.

structures in efforts of expanding material and social benefits for racially minoritized groups (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Race-Based Inequality in Education post-Civil Rights Era

Despite legislation during the Civil Rights Era that opposed legal segregation, CRT scholars in education (e.g. Aggarwal, 2016; Dumas, 2014; Harris, 1995) assert that race-based inequality in education continues to persist through the ideological construction of an embodied inferiority within Blackness as opposed to hegemonic whiteness, and the complete dismissal of the lack of redistribution of wealth and resources as a factor. In other words, educational policies, structures, and practices continue to perpetuate the notion that racially minoritized groups, especially Black and African-American groups, do not academically excel in schools "due to their psyche, capacities, and culture (e.g. values, behaviors, attitudes) that dwell in their individual physical bodies" (Aggarwal, 2016, p.2). From this perspective, language is a capacity and marker that indicates racialized inferiority or superiority rather than a practice in which people engage. Through schooling, the language practices of racially minoritized students and their families are marked as inferior and foreign traits. In this manner, schooling and educational institutions position racially minoritized families' language practices as potential explanations for their unfavorable educational outcomes and socioeconomic immobility (Aggarwal, 2016; Stefancic & Delgado, 2001). By foregrounding the concept of capacities, in this case, language, as a site of intervention, educational institutions and policies render invisible the material effects of social inequality, and thus, ensure that the uneven distribution of resources and wealth that produce inequalities remain intact in a globalized racist-capitalist U.S. state.

The notion of an embodied inferiority within Blackness as opposed to whiteness became a basis for excluding racially minoritized families from the right to expect or receive intangible

and tangible benefits. According to Harris (1993), these benefits meet the following functional criteria of property: *the rights of possession, exclusivity, reputation, and disposition*. Harris (1993) argues that some property is non-transferrable, and therefore, rights and property cannot be read as mutually exclusive. Vaught (2011) explains how whiteness may appear alienable to white people imposing and withdrawing whiteness at will. For example, the model minority stereotype demonstrates how whiteness can be partially leased to Asian Americans and Latinxs, whereas the designation of some groups of white people as "white trash" demonstrates how whiteness can be used to shame white people with less generational wealth or income, which leads to the perception of their racial privilege being under threat. However, these exiled people can reclaim their racial privileges, whereas racially minoritized groups cannot claim to be a part of whiteness as a social group and protected form of property. Additionally, *the right to use and enjoyment* refers to use of privileges based on whiteness as a sociocultural recognized entity (Harris, 1993). These privileges entail access to social networks, freedoms, and economies, as well as legal protections. Linked to the property rights of use and enjoyment is *reputation and status*, which frames whiteness as a reputation that yields value. Lastly, *the right of exclusivity* is based on the premise of what one owns, one has the right to enjoy without obligation to share the enjoyment with others (Harris, 1993). As such, possessors of whiteness are granted the legal right to exclude others from privileges inhering in whiteness. One key manifestation of such exclusion is the ability of policies, institutions, and practices to define racially minoritized groups.

Application for this Dissertation

In relation to the above claims about race-based inequities in education, this dissertation proposes that the ideological architecture of embodied inferiority of racially minoritized groups

permeates policies, structures, and institutions across and within all levels of society.[6] I refer to Harris's (1993) property functions of whiteness to showcase how the racialization of language practices and groups of people in educational policies relates to the maldistribution of intangible and tangible benefits among families in a two-way dual language bilingual program.

In this dissertation, I argue that the right to use and enjoyment manifests in how policy text and appropriation allows families, who are marked as white, the rights to claim membership, participation, and ownership in two-way dual language bilingual spaces and material resources (e.g. classrooms, parent leadership councils, dissemination of school updates), and right to languaging without denial of material resources and social stigmatization. Closely related, I examine how these benefits, social group status, and ways to language yield value or reputation that is linked to whiteness. Throughout this study, I highlight how the imposed whitening of language practices and behaviors of families through policy appropriation and text marks a tactical deployment of partial and unpropertied whiteness. In reference to the right to exclude, I analyze definitions as they relate to two-way dual language bilingual families, particularly in relation to their language practices and ethnoracial groups. These definitions are not merely labels. They shape the nature of relationships that families have with other educational stakeholders affiliated with the two-way dual language bilingual program and partner organizations of the broader community. They also influence the ways in which families define their approaches for supporting the education of their children attending a two-way dual language bilingual program. Rather than using whiteness as property for an analytical frame to suggest that racially minoritized families are passive victims of race as constructed by whiteness,

[6] Aggarwal (2016) notes that an ideological architecture is creating a discursive terrain that facilitates certain ways of posing and resolving questions.

I use Harris's frame to understand how institutional structures, actors, practices are mechanisms of hegemonic whiteness (Gillborn, 2005; Vaught, 2011). As I will elaborate later, although racially minoritized communities often resist and reject the practices, routines, and structures from educational institutions, "the overwhelming power of whiteness is necessarily explained through a framework that captures the punishing mechanisms of white supremacy" (Vaught, 2011, p. 41).

Hegemonic Whiteness in the Institutionalization of Bilingual Education

Since its inception, bilingual education has emblematized a continuous battleground of conflicting orientations towards the language and culture of racially minoritized communities. According to Flores and García (2017), various proponents, which include Latinx political organizations such as the Brown Berets and Young Lords, framed bilingual education as a part of broader efforts to dismantle white supremacist relations of power.[7] Part of this group of advocates consisted of high school Latinx/Chicanx students who organized walkouts in Los Angeles from their classrooms to voice their recommendations for Ethnic Studies curricula, bilingual education, and the hiring of more Latinx/Chicanx educators (Muñoz, 1989). For this group of proponents, bilingual education was never simply a program to educate their children bilingually, but rather it was a vector to realize political and economic development in Latinx communities. In other words, bilingual education was meant to be a form of political education, a space to study the history of struggles for social, political, geographic, and economic power with the explicit purpose of strengthening and mobilizing collectives for social change and the liberation of racially minoritized groups (Herzing, 2021).

[7] This brief overview of the legalization of bilingual education focuses on Latinx groups, particularly Chicanx and Puerto Rican communities, the largest Latinx groups in the U.S. at the time of the passage of the Bilingual Education Act. This is an incomplete account about the history of language education in the U.S, which includes Indigenous groups' right for language education.

Other proponents of bilingual education followed the logic of embodied inferiority among racially minoritized groups that permeated the *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision. The *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision focused on psychological damages of Black children that were caused by segregation in ways that decentered the focus on legal and historical material inequalities in their lives (Flores & García, 2017). It promoted the notion that the solution to address inequities in education is fixing inherent deficiencies within the practices of Black and other racially minoritized children (Flores & García, 2017). Subsequently, some proponents of bilingual education viewed bilingual programs as educational models that could fix the linguistic and cultural practices of Latinx students. In this manner, these practices among Latinx communities were framed as explanations for political and economic inequities in broader communities (Sung, 2017). Despite divergent interests, Latinx activist groups and community organizations joined policymakers in endorsing the 1968 *Bilingual Education Act* (BEA) based on the hope of increasing educational and employment opportunities for racially minoritized communities. However, the hopes of Latinx activists would go largely unmet. As bilingual education became institutionalized in the U.S, it became divorced from broader socio-political struggles and became reincorporated into hegemonic whiteness.

As Flores and García (2017) assert, two major goals for bilingual education emerged in the post-Civil Rights era, both of which were disentangled from broader efforts to dismantle white supremacist relations of power. One goal was for the programs to improve the self-esteem of racially minoritized communities by instilling pride of their cultural and linguistic practices to prepare them to engage with mainstream English classrooms and broader society. The other goal was for bilingual programs to allow students to utilize their first language only for the purpose of developing standardized American English. These goals were co-constructed on one another

such that it led to the discursive positioning of bilingual education as a way to instill cultural pride in Latinx and other racially minoritized groups in ways that would fix their linguistic deficiencies (Flores & García, 2017). Flores (2016) refers this racializing process found in bilingual education as *monolingual hegemonic whiteness*, "the positioning of a monolingual speaker of the standardized national language as the ideal national subject" (Flores, 2016, p. 25).

Regardless of attempts to frame bilingual education as a solution to assimilate racially minoritized students into language practices and social norms associated with whiteness, subsequent federal policies (e.g. reauthorization of BEA in 1984, *No Child Left Behind* in 2002, and *Every Student Succeeds Act* in 2015) increased support towards English-only programs and required funding for bilingual programs to depend on English language assessment outcomes of racially minoritized youth. The emphasis of standardized assessments and stringent criteria for the identification of English Language Learners in these policies emerged in response to the publication of *A Nation at Risk* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983 (Lagemann, 2000). *A Nation at Risk's* central argument was that the U.S. education system was not reaching the standards of excellence and rigor necessary to compete with other nations and have a flourishing economy (Lagemann, 2000). Its impact on U.S. governmental reforms continued well into the 1990s as indicated by the creation of standardized academic content in curricula and high-stakes testing.

Notwithstanding, and almost simultaneously, theories and research on the cognitive benefits of bilingualism for white middle- and upper-class Canadian students in contrast to language minoritized students in the U.S. (e.g. Cummins, 1979, 2001), and the rapid economic globalization at the turn of the 21st century led to the proficiency in language other than English to emerge as a desired resource in the U.S. Mainstream English-dominant families developed

interest in language immersion education, which provided content-based instruction in English and another language (Dorner, 2011). Advocates of bilingual education who were interested in ensuring that Latinx and other racially minoritized students could use their heritage languages in their schooling saw promise in language immersion models, specifically two-way dual language bilingual programs. Dual language bilingual or two-way dual language bilingual programs teach two languages through pedagogy and curriculum that strictly separate these languages. When teaching two languages is the goal, the bilingualism and language practices of racially minoritized communities is still framed as a barrier to instruction that seeks to police their practices under standardized language forms (García, 2009). Flores (2017) refers to this orientation as *bilingual hegemonic whiteness*,

> a hierarchy of bilingualism, with families coming from white upper- and middle-class backgrounds deemed more aligned with an idealized bilingualism that produces cognitive benefits and the racialized Others seen as cognitively deficient in ways that have prevented them from mastering either of their two languages. (p. 25)

In a globalized racist-capitalist society, this hierarchy of bilingualism embedded within two-way dual language bilingual models benefits families who are positioned to fit closely to the ideals of hegemonic whiteness. In 1997, Guadalupe Valdés issued a cautionary note that highlighted how attention to the needs of children marked as white and middle- or upper-class being taught in Spanish would supersede teaching bilingualism to Latinx students. In sum, the language practices, subjectivities, and experiences of families marked as white and middle- or upper-class continue to be centered as neutral and objective foundations for the institutionalization of various forms of bilingual education, including those models labeled as asset-based program models like two-way dual language bilingual programs. Unfortunately, racially minoritized families continue

to engage in bilingual educational settings, where the goal is to mold their language practices, subjectivities, and relationality with groups of people into the ideals of hegemonic whiteness.

Along with Flores (2016a, 2016b), several scholars (e.g. Kelly, 2016; Sung 2017; Snyder, 2020) in the field of bilingual education have examined how governmental educational policies continue to uphold hegemonic whiteness and position racially minoritized families under a deficit lens. Examining the sociopolitical and economic context during the passage of the 1968 *Bilingual Education Act*, Sung (2017) highlights how policymakers' positions on bilingual education often framed the minoritization of racially minoritized families as resulting from cultural deficits rather than larger societal processes. Sung (2017) warns that although bilingual education continues to be justified as a program that addresses the cultural deficits of racially minoritized families, oppression and social control can take different forms across communities, and can change with broader social and economic shifts. Kelly (2016) demonstrates the malleability of hegemonic whiteness in two recent state policies in California and Arizona, both of which previously had strict English-only policies. These bills reveal that the discourse on bilingual education in these states moved from offering bilingual education to support racially minoritized students as they learn a standardized version of English to showcasing the economic and national security benefits of bilingualism. Kelly (2016) claims that the shifting rhetoric in educational policies aimed to promote bilingualism and expand bilingual programs, specifically, two-way dual language bilingual programs, continues to exacerbate inequities experienced by racially minoritized families in schools and communities.

Although governmental reforms in states with previous restrictionist language policies (e.g. Arizona, California, and Massachusetts) have encouraged the expansion of bilingual programs, they continue to disentangle schools and schooling from broader societal processes

and struggles, and do not guarantee that racially minoritized families will be recognized under humanizing lenses or have access to these programs. Even in states like Washington that have been historically open to bilingual education (Johnson & Johnson, 2015), their state policies do not explicitly foreground, racialization, racism, and other societal inequities. Further, racially minoritized families and their language practices are not acknowledged, and are framed under deficit and homogeneous categories marked as non-white or non-European (Snyder, 2020). Analyses of state and federal bilingual education policies highlight how state educational policy texts and planning serve critical roles in determining the experiences and allocation of resources for racially minoritized families in local schools and communities.

Application for this Dissertation

Although these analyses offer critical insights about the racialized discourses and allocation of resources for families in bilingual educational programs, they are grounded solely in educational policy texts generated at the state and federal governmental levels. The analyses of policies that are officially authorized by enforcement mechanisms of government is just one aspect and approach to the study of educational policy. It is also important to understand how stakeholders from local educational institutions and their partner organizations make sense of and take up "ideas, norms, and values," that are found in other societal contexts, entities, and actors (Levinson et al., 2009). Since racialization, racism, and white supremacy are embedded in the fabric of U.S. society, Gillborn and Ladson-Billings (2010), assert the importance of educational stakeholders recognizing how systemic racism manifests in schools and their local neighborhoods through structures, actors, and practices that may seem routine and mundane (e.g. curriculum, assessments, digital resources, teacher and administrator hiring practices, parent engagement strategies). Accordingly, this dissertation views parent engagement policies, its

associated structures, actors, and practices, in local schools and by community partners as forms of policy.

This dissertation uses an expansive definition of policy as an ongoing practice of cultural expression, in written or unwritten form, that makes governing statements about what can or should be done in society (Levinson et al., 2009). In short, policy, is an expression about specific ways and forms of governing. It defines reality, orders behaviors, and often has material consequences. Officially authorized policies by government or institutional structures is one form of policy. Other forms of policy include practices found outside these structures or agencies and from groups that are not specifically charged with making official policies, as well as nonhuman entities. In such a way, policies extent beyond spoken language, it extends to modes of communication and semiotic forms from individuals or social groups to nonhuman forms like digital technologies, assessments, research studies, and institutions as governing actors (Rosa & Flores, 2017). "Therefore, policy may be documented and codified, or it may exist in unwritten form through memory and practice" (Levinson et al., 2009, p.770). As such, educational stakeholders appropriate or "creatively interpret and take in elements of policy, thereby incorporating these discursive resources into their own schemes of interest, motivation, and action" (Levinson et al, 2009, p. 779). The negotiation of meaning about policy, is discourse accompanied by subject positions and material effects. A critical poststructuralist stance, and a raciolinguistic ideology framework in particular, considers the ways in which local policies, its associated structures, practices, and appropriators (e.g. teachers, parents, students, administrators), are produced and producers of broader racialized discourses, systems, and relations in society. It offers an expansive examination of the subjectivities, accompanied

knowledge forms and practices, available to racially minoritized families in regards to the nature of their relations with schools and schooling.

Racialization of Language Through Critical Post-Structuralist Sociolinguistics

Language and Power Relations

As previously mentioned, the oppression of racially minoritized families in educational institutions and communities is partly realized within and through language. A critical poststructuralist sociolinguistic stance aims to denaturalize and interrogate the power relationships that influence this oppression.[8] This stance adopted in this dissertation, through the employment of raciolinguistic ideologies, builds on Foucault's (1978) theory of power. According to Foucault (1978), power is not concentrated in a single place, but is ubiquitous and operates within social relations in which some members are positioned to have more value than others. The omnipresent nature of power and its influence on everyday life is strong. It "reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes, and everyday lives" (García et al., 2016, p. 4). Power, through the production of what is deemed to be "true" (discourse), makes subject positions and related knowledge forms individuals utilize to understand themselves, their behaviors, and relations (García et al., 2016, p. 4). This critical poststructuralist sociolinguistic stance informs how raciolinguistic ideologies are employed in this dissertation, and provides a framework of subject formation that assists in understanding the subject positions available to racially minoritized families from a two-way dual language bilingual program. The production of subject positions and accompanied forms of knowledge and practices through discourse does not

[8] "Critical poststructuralist sociolinguistics builds on insights from poststructuralist framings of power and seeks to apply these insights to the study of language and society. It specifically builds on Foucault's microphysics of power" (García et al., 2016, p4).

mean that racially minoritized families are passive groups who merely accept subject positions, relations, and dominant knowledge forms made available to them in policies, institutions, actors, and practices. Racially minoritized families may challenge and expand on subject positions and accompanied knowledge forms and relations through their construction of their subjectivities. The dynamic nature of subjectivities of families will be discussed in the final section of this framework.

Raciolinguistic Ideologies in the Purpose and Approaches for Bilingual Education

In their definition and expansion of the theory of raciolinguistic ideologies, Rosa and Flores (2017), highlight broader societal processes that position racially minoritized groups' language practices as markers of embodied inferiority in accordance with hegemonic whiteness. Flores and Rosa (2015) refuse to center analyses on approaches that document empirical linguistic practices of racially minoritized groups, and instead aim to interrogate the interpretative and categorizing practices of white perceiving subjects or entities. They state that white perceiving subjects or entities can include people, institutions, tools, or policies. Rosa and Flores (2017) illustrate how white perceiving subjects/entities mark the language practices of racially minoritized groups as deficient characteristics of inferior groups. Shifting the focus from the language practices of racially minoritized groups to hegemonic white perceiving subjects/entities disrupts the logic that racially minoritized groups need to engage with idealized language practices related to hegemonic whiteness so that they can transcend race and class oppression. Accordingly, this study aims to understand how racial and class hierarchies permeate into "what" counts as family engagement/family-school relations by educational stakeholders and texts affiliated with a two-way dual language bilingual program. It aims to situate family-school(ing) relationships within a broader analysis that seeks to understand how these relations

reinforce, extend, and/or challenge broader racial and class inequities that lie at the core of the marginalization of racially minoritized communities.

Racially minoritized families are expected to adhere to standardized language forms imbued with dominant language ideologies even though white perceiving subjects continue to rely on raciolinguistic ideologies that perceive racially minoritized families as engaging in deficient practices. Using a poststructuralist sociolinguistic stance, Flores (2016b) examines how dominant framings of bilingual education, from the past to present, continue to uphold language ideologies that serve nation-state/colonial governmentality-the formation of governable national and colonial subjects that fit the political and economic needs of modern society (Foucault, 1978). Racial hierarchies that emerged alongside the rise of nation-states and colonization shaped language ideologies that represented language as a bounded, homogeneous construct that could be possessed by white and upper-class elites. This imposition of a bounded language that is understood as an entity that can be removed from the actual lived experience of people was also reified through scientific studies of language (Bauman & Briggs, 2000). These processes and shifts in scientific thinking allowed for what Flores (2016b) and García (2009) refer as *monoglossic language ideologies* that position monolingualism as the norm to which all citizens should aspire to have. The objectification of this idealized monolingualism occurred through the standardization of languages in European and colonial contexts. These nationalist/colonial ideologies led to the production of *mono-languaged subjects* of the standardized national/colonial language (Flores, 2016b). As opposed to monolingual, Flores (2016b) uses *mono-languaged* to emphasize that the formation of a monolingual subject is produced through discursive practices that circulate through institutions (e.g. schools, workplaces, government agencies). Flores (2016b) states:

> mono-languaged subjects were produced in two different ways in colonial contexts like the U.S: one was to impose the colonial language on colonial subjects, and the other was to impose a codified version of Indigenous languages that were seen as preserving static cultures and ensuring their subordination. (p. 533)

Monoglossic language ideologies permeated the early development and framing of bilingual education programs in U.S. Even though early programs were transitional bilingual programs where students were allowed to use their non-English heritage languages, they were expected to use these languages as tools for developing proficiency of an idealized standardized English language as quickly as possible. As such, this program was classified as a subtractive bilingual program where the assumption is that language minoritized students must become mono-languaged in the standardized national language and give up their heritage language (Flores, 2016b; García, 2009). Whereas subtractive bilingual programs produce mono-languaged subjects, additive bilingual programs like two-way dual language bilingual produce *bi-languaged subjects* who are proficient in two standardized national languages and acquire them in a linear fashion (Flores, 2016). However, the construction of bi-languaged subjects continues to uphold nation-state/colonial governmentality by dividing students into native speakers of the majoritized language and native speakers of the minoritized language (García, 2009; Flores, 2016b). This binary may serve to delegitimize the bilingualism of language minoritized students, and position them as not native of the dominant language, in this case, English (Fitts, 2006). The promotion of a bi-language subject in additive programs may be in stark contrast to the everyday experiences of language-minoritized students who grow up in a context of where language forms are not strictly separated (García, 2009). As for racially minoritized students, they may not compartmentalize their language practices into discrete standardized national languages and may

appropriate languages in ways that form new subjectivities, which are delegitimized by nation-state/colonial governmentality. To rationalize students' nonconformity towards separating their language practices in rigid, bounded ways, additive bilingual programs often leverage ideologies of languagelessness, which suggest that racially minoritized students lack proficiency in any language (Rosa, 2016; Flores et al., 2020). In sum, the language practices of racially minoritized students do not neatly fit into the ideals exposed by additive language programs, and therefore, this lack of fit, along with the disconnection with established race-class hierarchies, turn these additive programs into vectors of oppression.

Heteroglossic orientations of language have challenged the ideologies that uphold the aforementioned bilingual educational models. Under a heteroglossic perspective, languages are dynamic, complex, and fluid practices of multilingual communities. This framing promotes the development of new approaches to bilingual education that would sustain fluid linguistic practices of students and develop students' ethnolinguistic identities (García, 2009). One example is García's (2009) framework of translanguaging, which challenges static language constructs that privilege monolingualism and argues for use of dynamic language practices of students from minoritized groups. While heteroglossic approaches in bilingual education have challenged monoglossic ideologies, they have not explicitly challenged the power dynamics embedded in neoliberalism that continue to maintain racial and linguistic hierarchies of a globalized racist-capitalist society. Flores (2016b) explains that

> while monoglossic language ideologies were an integral part of nation/state colonial governmentality, it seems that heteroglossic language ideologies are at best compatible with, and at worse integral to, neoliberal subject formation through the production of

> dynamic-languaged subjects-subjects whose language practices are harnessed into competencies that maximize corporate profits. (p. 535)

As such, schooling in a globalized racist-capitalist state has encouraged the production of *dynamic-languaged subjects* who are expected to be proficient in several different languages in ways that fit its political and economic needs. In bilingual educational settings, the promotion of a dynamically-languaged subject as an idealized aspiration for language-minoritized students, specifically, racially minoritized students and their families, continues to uphold neoliberal logics that maintain racial and class inequities of broader communities. Without interrogating the processes and relations that promote a dynamically-languaged subject in bilingual educational settings, language-majoritized families may be granted opportunities or resources through their deployment of language and cultural practices that advance the political and economic needs of the globalized racist-capitalist state. As such, racially minoritized families who lack material resources and social networks may not be given the same privileges as language-majoritized families, those families whose first language is marked as English.

However, Canagarajah (2005) and Flores (2016b) suggest that bilingual educational programs can be spaces where educational stakeholders engage in continual resistance towards oppressive grand narratives that uphold racial-class power structures and processes. Specifically, Flores (2016b) refers to Gloría Anzaldúa and her work (1987) as an example of a *resistant languaging subject*. Through her theory of the borderlands, Anzaldúa interrogates language ideologies that enforce linguistic borders and racial ideologies that place boundaries on race and ethnicity (Flores, 2016b). Aligned with a heteroglossic perspective, Anzaldúa critiques monoglossic ideologies, but she goes beyond this orientation by drawing on works of Indigenous and racially minoritized groups to develop her theorization of the borderlands (Flores, 2016b).

Extending Anzaldúa's work, Lu (1992) emphasizes the importance of challenging deficit discourses, its associated practices and subject positions, that constantly shape the lives of language-minoritized students at the center of language education. In regards to racially minoritized families and their relation with bilingual educational settings, various educational stakeholders, including families, would consistently interrogate and work through dichotomous framings of language that perpetuate deficit perspectives while situating this framing of language within broader political and economic processes that lie at the root of the oppression of racially minoritized communities. This process of generative conflict and struggle allows for the emergence of resistant languaging practices that go beyond seemingly static languages and social identities. Educational stakeholders would consistently struggle and work through conflicting framings of "what" gets to be considered as family-school relations, and how these considerations have material effects, create subject positions, and are connected to broader historical and political processes.

Application for this Dissertation

Informed by a critical poststructuralist stance, and a raciolinguistic ideology framework in particular, this dissertation does not presuppose what family engagement should be in a bilingual program, in this case, a two-way dual language bilingual program. Instead, it exposes narratives, understandings, and practices that inform the relations and knowledge generation that families are expected to have with one type of bilingual program and its community affiliates, and situates these framings within broader racialized ideologies, power relations, and structures of a globalized racist-capitalist U.S. society. Part of this analysis includes the examination of languaged subject positions that are available to families and their relations with schools and community affiliates. It showcases how these languaged subject positions may serve as proxies

for race and are intertwined with discourses about family engagement. In this dissertation, I refer to the entanglement between languaged and racialized subject positions as raciolinguicized subject positions of two-way dual language bilingual families in policy appropriation and text. In short, the production, negotiation, and contestation of raciolinguicized subject positions and their material effects by stakeholders, especially focal families, of a two-way dual language bilingual program is a major object of inquiry.

As mentioned in previous sections, the racialized and raciolinguicized subject positions of families produced by discourses of family engagement within policy appropriation and text does not mean that families acknowledge or merely accept these subject positions and expected knowledge forms and relations. Through their construction of individual subjectivities, "one's sense of self constituted through discourses" (Allan, 2008, p. 8), families may attempt to challenge and expand on these subject positions and accompanied relations and forms of thought. A feminist poststructuralist orientation of identity construction allows us to consider the ways in which families, with and through language, continuously make sense of their relations with school(ing) through discourses made available through policy appropriation, and how they define themselves with language and ethnoracial groups (e.g. Black, Hispanic, Latino/a/x, African-American). This orientation aims to highlight the partially shifting, multiple, and complex nature of the racialized and raciolinguicized subjectivities (Daniels & Varghese, 2019) of families in a two-way dual language bilingual program. Further, this process may promote the emergence of alternate subjectivities that challenge dominant ways of understanding and being in the world.

Racialized Subjectivities as Sites of Conflict, Refusal, and Possibilities

Negotiation of Fluid and Power-laden Sense of Self

The poststructuralist concept of subjectivity exposes how individuals are produced by and producers of various discourses in the world (Weedon, 1999). Individuals are constantly trying to understand themselves and ways of being each other through the dyadic relationship with discourses regularly produced by institutions, individual behaviors, and social relations. However, these discourses do not create stable and coherent subject positions, beingness, and ways of learning. With and through language, these discourses and their subject positions are "constantly being negotiated as individuals are making sense of themselves and their relations to the world" (Weedon, 1999, p. 41). This sense of self is "precarious, can be contradictory, and is constantly being reconstituted through discourse each time individuals speak or think" (Weedon, 1987, p. 33). The repetition of discourse, embedded within race-class power relations and processes, privileges certain subjects and populations who can conform most closely to white idealized subjects.

Critical race theorists whose work is underpinned by poststructuralist understandings of identity demonstrate how such an approach allows us to complicate and unpack the ways in which identities, relations, and forms of thought are produced by power. For example, Ringrose's (2002) work on whiteness shows that a fluid notion of identities does not preclude an understanding of identities that are perceived as essential, rather it theorizes how and why these are produced, constrained, and experienced in different times, contexts, and interactions. She argues that this notion of identity may enable educational stakeholders to understand the dynamic and historical relations among racial and other identity categories and knowledge projects. Additionally, Carbado and Gulati (2003) explore the way race is negotiated, presented,

and projected in the workplace on a daily basis, and the ways in which individuals perform a racial identity can influence the extent to which they/she/he suffers discrimination. They note that particular institutional arrangements in a workplace exacerbate the discrimination and oppression of racially minoritized groups. However, workplace cultures are not static, but instead, they evolve. Carbado and Gulati (2003) claim that the discourses that constrain the ways in which individuals perform racially minoritized identities in the workplace are historically and broadly constituted by racialized power asymmetries in society at large.

Further, Bhattacharyya et al. (2002) assert that national and global ethnoracial categories shift, changing the limited ways in which people of different phenotypes are positioned and can position themselves. Specifically, they note how whiteness shifts over time and place, and attribute racialization as an important aspect of globalization. These studies that are in conversation with poststructuralist understandings of identity and Critical Race Theory demonstrate the perpetual and everyday presence of white supremacy that attempts to fix race onto bodies, and how groups and individuals negotiate the accompanied raced relations, forms of thought, and experiences within the limits of their/his/her racialized subjection. As such, these scholars do not presuppose that an individual or group has sovereign agency within a globalized racist-capitalist society, but instead, they showcase how individuals or groups may challenge and present other ways of being, knowing, and valuing as they negotiate the racialized subject positions and effects presented to them in society.

Application for this Dissertation

For this study, I do not presuppose that families have total agency in contesting the social and material effects from broader and historicized raced-classed structures, processes, and institutions. Instead, I examine how families negotiate the racialized and raciolinguicized

discourses and subject positions that permeate institutions, actors, and relations, and how through their negotiation of their subjectivities, they may contest raced-class oppression by presenting other ways of having relations with schools and schooling. I intend to highlight the negotiation of subjectivities of focal families institutionally classified as Hispanic in a two-way dual language bilingual program in efforts of learning with and from these families about other possibilities for relationships with schools that are beyond narrow, and often, dichotomized framings of family non/engagement/ involvement/participation.

Interpellation and Performativity in the Negotiation of Subject Positions

As racially minoritized families are confronted with multiple discourses that permeate policy text and appropriation in regards to their relations with bilingual schools and schooling, they are hailed or interpolated into certain subject positions (Butler, 1993). According to Butler (1993), the process of interpellation, a linguistic act of hailing, or calling an individual initiates him/her/them into a subjected status and therefore a certain order of social existence. This hailing (or "hey you!) is an act of forming the subject to comply with and obey the expected ways of being in society. In her theory of performativity, Butler (1993) asserts that interpellation can function without an individual's acknowledgment; that is, the linguistic constitution of the individual can happen without their/his/her knowing. For example, if someone does not notice or respond to the "hey you," this lack of acknowledgement does not negate the existence of the subject position and its discourse. Butler (1993) notes that even when an individual names the structures and processes that hailed them/him/her into certain norms, these recitations may reproduce, and at times, contest these norms. The repetitions of norms or performances are not always identical in calling groups and individuals into expected order of social existence; sometimes they may produce another form of being in the world, an alternate subjectivity. In her

argument for performance framings of gender, Butler (1993) notes that while a drag show can be an opportunity to subvert heterosexual gender norms and frame gendering as fluid, it can also potentially reinforce such norms if the subversion is ignored, misunderstood, or locally stigmatized. As such, the extent to which an individual performance may be regarded as a resistant act is very dependent on the extent to which it is socially recognized as one. In regards to race, while there is an instability in the ways discourses attempt to racialize individuals and groups, the everyday and perpetual exercise of white supremacy through different institutions, policies, and interactions constrain the ways in which racially minoritized groups resist racialization and its material effects. While Butler's (2010) work focuses on how race becomes perceived as fixed onto bodies, race and racialization also exert material consequences in the form of oppression to racially minoritized groups.

Youdell (2006) is an example of a study that uses Butler's theory of performativity and critical race and whiteness studies to report on how students respond and endure consequences of racialized discourses and subject positions presented at their school. Specifically, she investigates how Lebanese and Turkish students at an Australian school are racialized as good and bad Arabic students through discourses of orientalism and terrorism that permeate their schooling contexts. Youdell (2006) describes how a high school invited its students to sell food and items that resonated with their heritage and culture during a multicultural fair. Further, the school encouraged students to advertise the event to friends, family, and neighbors. Youdell (2006) notes how Turkish and Lebanese students' food and artifacts were placed under a stand labeled as Arabic. Despite the imposed label, the Turkish and Lebanese students agreed to sell their items in the stand that marked them as Arab. When they started to set up their stand, the students changed the sign to read *Lebs Rule* and *Turks Rule*. During the multicultural fair, one

senior administrator regularly stood in front of the stand watching them. Later, the administrator used his walkie talkie to call other school staff to support the expulsion of attendees who were standing by the Lebs Rule and Turks Rule stand, and who were invited by the students from the stand. The Turkish and Lebanese students were called upon to be good minority student subjects if they conformed to accepting a racialized subject position, in this case, Arab. However, their attempts to present themselves as Lebanese or Turkish and claim any sort of legitimacy is denied through hegemonic whiteness that permeates schooling. Forms of material and social effects on these students include the delegitimization of a supportive collective and being positioned as troublesome minority students that threaten what counts as *studenthood* in broader society. Accordingly, Youdell (2006) demonstrates that the strength, and social and material impact of racial oppression cannot be underestimated in the examination of how racialized discourses and subjectivities emerge within particular school contexts and acts. Due to the material and social impact of race and racialization, a poststructuralist analysis of how people are constituted and identified through racialized discourses found within a particular context must also be informed by Critical Race scholarship.

Application for this Dissertation

The racialized and raciolinguicized subjectivities of families in relation to school(ing) can be performative under the constraints of their extent of intelligibility across and within policies, structures, and relations in a globalized racist-capitalist society. Through the discourses about family-school relations produced through different interactions with texts, individuals, and groups, certain norms for families' roles, knowledge generation, and practices in relation to school(ing) are placed upon families. These norms racialize and linguicize families through this hailing. In addition, families continue to call these norms into existence even when they cite the

racialized and raciolinguistic ideologies, structures, actors, and processes that attempt to hail them into these norms. Within their performances, racially minoritized families may also contest and/or create subjectivities for themselves. Further, they may call upon other families into specific ways of relating with schools and schooling through their interactions with others and with multimodal sources (e.g. official policy texts, being interviewed, writing notes). As such, racially minoritized families' interactions and relations with individuals, groups, and sources can contribute to the promotion and unsettling of discourses that impact their lives, as well as that of other racially minoritized families. The degree to which these performances are read as a contestation and/or reification of subjectivities, subject positions, and discourses are dependent on their social recognition and codification. Although racially minoritized families may attempt to hail themselves under subjectivities, knowledge forms, and practices linked to whiteness, this hailing is often not recognized by other stakeholders, institutions, and policies. Therefore, racially minoritized families are denied tangible and intangible benefits linked to whiteness in schools, which perpetuates unfavorable educational outcomes and socioeconomic immobility for these families.

For this dissertation, I report how discourses that emerge from policy texts and educational stakeholders' (e.g. families, administrators, educators, community leaders) policy appropriation hail families into racialized and raciolinguicized subject positions, and ultimately, how focal families of a two-way dual language bilingual program negotiate these subject positions as they make sense of their individual subjectivities. In reference to educational stakeholders' appropriation of policies regarding family relations with the two-way dual language bilingual program, I highlight what they state about families' expected knowledge forms, practices, and responsibilities with the two-way dual language bilingual program, and

procedures, events, and routines that pertain to family-school relations. Further, I examine how specific experiences and interactions related to families' policy appropriation may undermine dominant race and language ideologies, moving towards new ways of framing language practices, accompanied forms of learning, and groups of people.

Conclusion

This theoretical base is informed by Critical Race Theory, Critical Poststructuralist Sociolinguistics, and Feminist Poststructuralist theories, to examine the racialization of families and their language practices in a two-way dual language bilingual program. As such, the theoretical base for this study works at the boundary of critical race and poststructuralist theories. It explores how these theories together layer understandings of race and racialization in schools and through schooling, while not denying the tensions and incompatibilities within each theory. Further, it theorizes how negotiations of racialized positionalities of families reverberate beyond individuals' identity construction, relating to racialized and linguicized discourses about families at other social scales as well as the broader production of racialized and raciolinguicized subjectivities/subject positions in a globalized U.S. racist-capitalist state.

The following chapter presents the methodology and protocols that are used in this dissertation. The chapter also discusses the place and participants of this study.

CHAPTER FOUR: Methods

This chapter reports on the design, instruments, place, and participants of the dissertation study. I first introduce methodological implications for this study's theoretical orientation. Second, I provide an overview of the research questions. Third, I describe the focal neighborhood, school, and participants, and discuss my relationality and accountability with participants and places. Lastly, I describe data generation and analyses.

Research Design and Rationale

To understand what is considered family relations with schools/schooling, I use a theoretical orientation informed by Critical Race Theory, Critical Poststructuralist Sociolinguistics, and Feminist Poststructuralist Theories to examine the dominant representations that characterize family-school relations in policy text and appropriation in regards to a two-way dual language bilingual program. In particular, I report on how families institutionally classified as Hispanic make sense of their relation with schooling through discourses made available through policy appropriation and text, how they define themselves with social groups, and manage material and social effects.

Within this study's theoretical orientation, policy is not a collection of official institutional and governmental texts, but rather it is a discursive process that operates across multiple scales, appropriators, contexts, and entities (Ball, 2015; Pennycook, 2006). In other words, policy refers to how order is maintained through politics, understood as the heterogeneous strategic relations that shape lives and worlds. Simultaneously, policy itself is a discourse that rationalizes why schools privilege the behaviors, practices, and experiences that are markers of whiteness. The discourses shaping and shaped by policy are grounded in an epistemological debate that shape the social and material realities that families experience with

schools and schooling. Educational stakeholders make sense of and take up ideas, norms, and values that permeate these discourses. These discourses refer to written and spoken language use, and should be understood as "language-in-use"—meaningful symbolic behavior with a dynamic, flexible meaning negotiated among participants and with regard to their relationship to a social context and nonhuman entities (e.g. institutions, digital technologies, research studies, assessments) (Blommaert, 2005; Hanks, 1996).

As such, different forms of data informed each other, each providing different insights into the discourses and processes that produce what is considered family-school relations in relation to a two-way dual language bilingual context. Accordingly, I utilized a combination of qualitative methods, including participant observations, semi-structured interviews, and artifact generation. The sources and approaches for this dissertation do not aim to search for universal truths, but instead, seek to present multiple realities. My relations, experiences, and histories influenced the interpretations of the data that addressed this research study's questions. The description of this study's approaches and sources as well as how they contributed to answering the research questions are presented after my discussion of the focal community, school, and participants.

Research Questions

This study explores the following research questions:

- How are family-school relations conceptualized by educational stakeholders (i.e. teachers, administrators, parents, children, community-affiliates) and in related texts of a two-way dual language bilingual program in the Greater Boston Area?
    - How are race, class, and language implicated in these conceptualizations?

- How do two-way dual language bilingual families institutionally classified as Hispanic expand, reify, and/or resist these conceptualizations?

Research Location and Participants

Place in Educational Research

Within a given place of a settler-colonial racist-capitalist state, there are localized asymmetries of power and privilege, for example, in who can walk or travel in particular places based on identifications of race, class, ethnicity, and other social markers, who has access or ownership of property, and who is affected by environmental issues of water or air pollution (Lipitz, 2011; Robinson, 1983). Place is not value-neutral. Dominant groups impose their definitions of what place is and is not. As such, educational policies operate through place to establish and reinforce race, class, and language inequities (Grande, 2004; Massey, 1991). Citing Tuck and McKenzie (2015), Patel (2015) argues that research is connected to place in geographic, chronological (though not linear), and spatial ways, and that attending to place, is "one of the strongest ways that educational researchers can interrupt coloniality" and "its thirst for universal truths" (p. 61). As such, I provide a brief overview of the place of this research study and its participants as a means of recognizing the importance of place, and specifically, as it pertains to participants in this study and myself as a researcher and family member. [9]

Neighborhood

What is now the state of Massachusetts, was, is, and always will be the land of Indigenous peoples. The names used for the inhabitants and settlements of this land have changed over the last 12,000 years, but thousands of Indigenous people from the Massachusett,

[9] This overview is meant to acknowledge the importance of land and relationships to land. Since this study does not analyze the historical and relational underpinnings of land, this study is very limited in addressing the impact of settler-colonialism.

Nipmuc, Nipmuck, Pocumtuc, Wampanoag, and Nauset tribes continue to live in this place (Woods, 2019). With regard to the neighborhood now named Mills City (a pseudonym), its original inhabitants were the Massachusett people, who continue to live and practice their culture on the same land. [10] The name, Massachusett, is taken from Algonquian, which is a term meaning *at the great hill*, referring to the land that is now named the Blue Hills Reservation (citation withheld). Notably, two tribes of the Massachusett, the Pequossette and the Nonantum, had settlements on the banks of the well-known Quinobequin/Charles River (citation withheld). Around 1634, several decades after the arrival and permanent settlement of Pilgrims, a group of English colonists settled in Mills City.

With the arrival of the missionary, John Eliot, in mid 17th century, the majority of the Massachusett were forced to convert to Christianity (Lomawaima, 1999). Through John Eliot's leadership, churches and schools were established in various towns in New England, including Mills City, with the intent to civilize Indigenous peoples through their conversion into Christianity and assimilation into English cultural practices (Vuilleuimer, 1970). These towns, including what is now named as Mills City, became known as praying towns, towns for Native converts to Christianity. In praying towns, Indigenous peoples had to submit to English laws and adopt administrative practices of the English town in their governance. According to Lomawaima (1999), Native peoples were and continue to be perceived as having mental, moral, physical, and cultural deficiencies. Pedagogical methods for Indigenous students included "a military model of mass regimentation, authoritarian discipline, strict gender segregation, an emphasis on manual labor, rote memorization, and drill in desired physical and emotional habits" (Lomawaima, 1999, p. 19). In addition to local schools in praying towns, Massachusett children,

[10] All names of people, places, and organizations are pseudonyms-unless otherwise indicated.

along with other Indigenous children in the U.S., were forced to attend boarding schools, including the Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania, which was founded by Richard Henry Pratt, the person who coined the phrase, "kill the Indian and save the man" in 1892 (Weinstein-Farson, 1989).

Since the 17th century, sustained contact with Europeans resulted in catastrophic population loss for Indigenous peoples, particularly for Native men. Disease, enslavement, dangerous physical employment (whaling), and warfare were major causes of Indigenous loss of life. Population loss of Indigenous peoples meant less resistance and barriers for English settlers to make land into property (Woods, 2019). When land is recast as property, a place becomes ahistorical and a source of capital for white groups considered human. The remaking of land into property is accompanied by the remaking of Native peoples as savages, unhumans, and eventually ghosts. Also, Africans/Black slaves brought by force to colonies are recast as property (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Further, European colonists continued to politically dismantle Native communities, whether they were categorized as plantations, districts, reserves, leading to more outmigration of Native groups to other lands in and out of Massachusetts (Woods, 2019). As of today, the structure of settler thirst has reduced relationships to land as relationships to property, making property an essential vector for legal rights in the U.S. Native communities continue to engage in ongoing battles with the federal government for federal recognition and ancestral lands (Marcelo & Fonseca, 2018; Mizes-Tan, 2018). In regards to the Massachusett, its descendants continue to live across the Greater Boston Area, many of which recognize themselves as part of four tribes, the Mattakeeset, Natick, Ponkapoag, and Namasket (Woods, 2019).

Since the 19th century, the town currently called Mills City (a pseudonym), is a form of property and has experienced significant changes. In the early 19th century, the town was known

as *mill city* due to the establishment of the Boston Manufacturing Company-the first integrated textile mill in the U.S. (citations withheld).[11] The city contains several dams that stretch along the Charles River. Accessibility to dams was crucial to power textile mills and other endeavors related to initial mass industrial production in the U.S. The town was also known for its watch and automobile industry during the 19th century. Notably, the first production of the motorcycle in the U.S. was built in a Mills City automobile manufacturing company (citations withheld). In the 20th century, Mills City became an early hub for computer and electronics companies, a site of the first invention of microwaves and lasers (citation withheld).

The city remains a hub for the technology industry in Massachusetts and is known for its downtown area with wide variety of businesses and restaurants that represent its diverse population of residents (citations withheld). Over the past 30 years, there has been a steady increase in the population of diverse cultural groups and a decrease in the population classified as white (U.S. Census, 2020). In 1990, 24% of Mills City residents were designated as born outside of the U.S. (U.S. Census, 1990). The ethnoracial makeup of Mills City was classified in 1990 as 83% white, 8.5% Hispanic/Latino, 4.4% Black/African-American, 7.3% Asian, 3.2% Mixed-Race, and .16% American Indian and Alaska Native (U.S. Census, 1990). As of 2020, 28% of Mills City residents are designated as born outside of the U.S. (citation withheld). The top 10 countries of origin for residents born outside of Mills City are the following: Guatemala, China, India, Haiti, Canada, Uganda, Mexico, Bangladesh, Italy, and Brazil (citation withheld). The members of Mills City are described as 72.3% white, 13.5% Hispanic/ Latino, 11.4% Asian, 7.7% Black/African-American, 3.3% Mixed-Race, and .3% American Indian and Alaska Native

[11] To protect the anonymity of the neighborhood and participants, I do not cite references that I used to describe the neighborhood.

(U.S. Census, 2020). For residents who are above 5 years old, 33.6% of this group is classified as speaking another language other than English (U.S. Census, 2020).

Despite the increasingly diverse population of Mills City, economic inequality and issues affecting the quality of life for its residents continue to increase. The percentage of residents living in poverty has increased from 7% in 1990 to 11% in 2020 (citation withheld). The median rent went from $1,050 in 1990 to $1,700 in 2020 (citation withheld). In regards to home ownership, the median home price rose from $292,000 to $425,000 (citation withheld). According to criteria from the Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University (2020), Mills City can be considered a gentrifying neighborhood because these aforementioned statistics reveal that the socioeconomic changes exceed the changes of the median house prices, rents, and incomes in the city of Boston. Due to increasing rents and home prices, low-income families are sharing living spaces, and extended families and non-related individuals are sharing apartments in Mills City (citation withheld). News sources and observations, both my own and those of my participants, indicate a growth in new and re-modeled luxury apartments in the area, especially around the main commercial streets. Rivera (2019) estimates that there will be a significant drop in the population of racially minoritized and low-income groups in Mills City because they will migrate to other towns in the Greater Boston Area that have lower home and rent prices within the next 5 years.

Although the residential population has diversified in Mills City over the past 30 years, racially minoritized groups are excluded within Mills City government leadership groups (citation withheld). For example, Eric Jocol the founder of a Guatemalan focused non-profit organization, is the only Mills City resident from a racially minoritized group to be a part of Mills City's Chamber of Commerce (citation withheld). Currently, the City Council is composed

of 13 members who are classified as white and two members who are described as Hispanic/Latino (citation withheld). Notably, all members of the Mills City Public Schools Committee are white and have at least a bachelor's degree (citation withheld). In response to the asymmetrical race-class structures in city government, Eric and several Mills City non-profit leaders (2020) argue that Mills City policymakers and politicians must reconfigure leadership structures to acknowledge the grassroots efforts of community leaders from minoritized groups fighting for reforms that ameliorate racial discrimination and economic inequality in the town.

The Dual Language School

The Dual Language School is one of 10 public schools in the Mills City School District and the only two-way dual language bilingual program in the district. The school is located at the edge of a commercial and residential area. The school is located in a brick building that sits along the main commercial street of Mills City. The building houses various public recreational programs along with the Dual Language School. The Dual Language School uses mostly classrooms in the second and third floors of the building. There are tiny plots of grass in front of the building, and bright blue entrance doors on the side that contrast with its red bricks. The back of the school is a vast concrete space. Half of it is used as a playground, and the other half is used as a faculty and staff parking lot. In front of the school are businesses and restaurants of the main commercial street, but towards the back of the school are residential units and houses. Notably, some of these residential units are large, new-unit, modern single-family homes. Two short blocks behind the school is a big public playground where students play during recess.

The program is a 90:10 model, in which the amount of heritage language instruction (Spanish) decreases yearly as teaching in English increases, until there is a 50:50 balance of the languages in grades four through five. In school year 2019-2020, there were 146 students

enrolled. For each grade (K-4), there are two classroom teachers. The student population is classified by Massachusetts Department of Education as 70% Hispanic, 20% white, 4% African-American, 3% Multi-Race, and 3% Asian (citation withheld). Sixty percent of students are designated as economically disadvantaged (citation withheld). Sixty-three percent of students are classified as the English language not being their first language (citation withheld). According to the Mills City Public Schools Committee guidelines (2020), school bus transportation is provided for students who live more than one and half-miles from the Dual Language School.

The Dual language School was formed in 2015 with two kindergarten cohorts having 40 students in total. Each subsequent year, a new grade level was added with 2 classrooms until it became a K-5 program. Notably, the program began during a time when bilingual education was prohibited in Massachusetts. Although Massachusetts was the first state in the U.S. to legalize bilingual education in 1971, it was one of three states, as part of the *English for Children Initiative*, to prohibit bilingual education and render bilingual teacher education as obsolete in 2002. Under the English Language Education in Public Schools Act (Chapter 71A), all children in Massachusetts public schools were taught exclusively in English, and students marked as English language learners were placed in sheltered English immersion or other English-mediated classrooms. Two-way dual language bilingual programs that were already established before Chapter 71A were unaffected.

Kay Dorner, a former Mills City middle school teacher, was a major advocate for the creation of the Dual Language School as part of the Mills City School Committee (citation withheld). During graduate school, Kay studied curricula and program models, and regarded the two-way dual language bilingual model as a pathway to increase equity and equal access to educational opportunities for minoritized groups (citation withheld). With the help of the director

of the Mills City Public Schools English Language Learner programs and the Mills City Public Schools superintendent, Kay formed the two-year year planning committee that would help implement the two-way dual language bilingual model (citation withheld). Since the program's inception, each kindergarten cohort of 40-50 students is chosen by a lottery in early August before the school year starts for the new cohort. Lotteries are conducted separately by assigned language dominance, English or Spanish dominance. A student's dominant language is determined by using parents'/guardians' answer to the following question on the home language survey, "what language did your child first understand and speak?" Parents interested in the program attend open houses held in the Spring prior to the lottery in August.

Now, the Dual Language School is in its sixth year of programming with a new established fifth grade cohort. It operates in a current state language policy context that has officially reinstated bilingual education since fall 2017 through the Language Opportunities for Our Kids (LOOK) Act. According to Mills City Public Schools Committee (2020), it is likely that the Dual Language School will move to another building in the coming years once the school includes sixth grade classes and expands classes per grade level. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the school implemented hybrid and remote instruction for grades K-4. However, starting in Fall 2021, as mandated by state department mandates, the school reverted back to in-person instruction for all grades. However, parent meetings and events continue to be conducted online.

Participants

In total, there are 32 participants in this study: 8 families (each one with at least one student and one parent/caretaker/guardian), 4 classroom teachers, 7 school and school district members (e.g. teachers, paraprofessional, librarian, principal, assistant superintendent), and 3

community affiliates (e.g. after-school program director and directors of grassroots organizations). With regard to ethnoracial identification of the 8 parents, three self-identified as Guatemalan (one also identified as Hispana), one as Salvadorian, one as Puerto Rican, two as white and from Italian descent, and one as white and from multiple European origins. The 10 children self-identified ethnoracial identification are as follows: three as Guatemalan (one also identified as Hispana/Hispana Americana), two as Salvadorian, three as Italian, one as white from multiple European countries, and one as Puerto Rican/Black/African-American. Five of the eight families are part of the same grade cohort, the 2020-2021 third grade cohort. Within the eight families, two families had children who are in the second-grade cohort. Two of these families had formal roles as part of the parent groups at the school. I spoke to seven parents out of the eight families in English and Spanish. I have spoken only in English with one family.

Among school teachers, staff, and administrators, four identified as Dominican American (one of them also identified as Black Latina), one as Colombian, one as Guatemalan, one as Guatemalan American, one as Argentine, and three as white and from early European descent. In regards to community affiliates, one identified as Guatemalan American and Latino, and the other two directors presented themselves as white and with origins from various European nations. With the exception of one school district administrator and two program directors, I have spoken with the rest of the school teachers, staff, and affiliates in English and Spanish.

There are more layered descriptions about the backgrounds, experiences, and practices of the focal families than the other participants in the findings chapters due to the nature of the research topics and theoretical base for this study. Throughout the findings chapters, I consistently use pseudonyms to refer to focal family members. In order to emphasize the collective reification of norms, values, and behaviors within the institution of schooling, I usually

refer to stakeholders, who are non-focal family members, as one of the following actors: teacher, administrator, community affiliate, and school member. Thus, I minimally use pseudonyms and specify the exact role of other stakeholders throughout the findings chapters. However, there are instances within the findings and conclusion chapters that I use a pseudonym for a non-focal family stakeholder to highlight how a specific interaction or event with him/her/them influenced the content or structure of the chapters.

Table 1 and 2 provide a snapshot of all participants, their self-ethnic/racial classification, occupation, place of residence, and children's grade levels, based on observations, conversations, and field notes from fall 2019 to the end of fall 2021. The demographic information in these charts and above paragraphs should be read as an overview of how participants chose to present themselves as of the last interview and interaction that I had with them for data generation. It is very likely that many of the participants' ethnoracial self- identifications have changed since then.

Table 1

Two-Way Dual Language Bilingual Families

Name	Relationship to child and family	Ethnic/Racial Identification	Professional Occupation	Children's/youth's names and grade levels
Flor	Mother, married	Salvadorian	Small business owner	Samuel-Third grade Melanie-Second grade
Mariana	Mother, single/divorced	Guatemalan/Hispana	Waitress	Monica-Third grade
Beatrice	Mother, married	Guatemalan	Caretaker of elderly residents	Brendon-Third grade

Marina	Mother, married	Guatemalan	Food preparer at a sandwich shop	Alejandra-Third grade Pedro-Tenth grade
Veronica	Mother, married	Puerto Rican	Office secretary	Michael-Fourth grade
Claire	Mother, married	Italian/white	Office secretary	Carly-Second grade
Carrie	Mother, married	Italian/white	Assistant professor of media studies	Sam-Fourth grade
Christa	Mother, married	white/multiple European origins	Associate of a financial firm	Hayden-Third grade

Table 2

Two-Way Dual Language Bilingual Staff and Affiliates

Name	Ethnic/Racial Identification	Professional Occupation	Relation with Mills City
Juliana	Dominican/Black Latina	Dual language teacher	Works in Mills City
Myra	Dominican American	Dual language teacher	Works in Mills City
Victoria	Argentine	Dual language literacy coach/teacher	Works in Mills City
Kiara	Dominican American	Dual language teacher	Works and lives in Mills City
Rosario	Dominican American/Afro-Latina	Dual language principal	Works in Mills City
Sara	Colombian	Dual language teacher	Works and lives in Mills City
Yessica	Guatemalan American	Dual language teacher	Works and lives in Mills City

Claudia	Guatemalan	Dual language family liaison/former secretary	Works and lives in Mills City
Felicity	white/multiple European origins	Dual language teacher	Works in Mills City
Margaret	white/multiple European origins	Dual language librarian/technology support	Works and lives in Mills City
Elisa	white/multiple European origins	District assistant superintendent	Works in Mills City
Diana	white/multiple European origins	After-school program director	Works in Mills City
Eric	Guatemalan American	Director of non-profit organization	Works and lives in Mills City
Kay	white/European origins	Director of non-profit organization	Works and lives in Mills City

Participant Recruitment and Selection

Overview

Purposive, convenience, and snowball sampling were used to recruit families, teachers, administrators, and community affiliates of the school site and school district. Convenience sampling refers to selecting a sample based on time, resources, location, and availability of respondents (Merriam, 1998). The neighborhood and school site were in a convenient location because they were less than a 25-minute car ride from my apartment and graduate school. The short commute helped me to have more flexibility in my work schedule and not overspend my monthly travel budget. Further, the school district of the neighborhood did not have its own institutional review board (IRB), which made the approval of the research study a quicker process compared to studies that have to be approved by IRB committees of large school districts

and higher educational institutions. Once the superintendent and principal of the Dual Language School approved my study and gave me consent to participate in their school/school district, they wrote letters of approval for me to submit with my IRB application mandated by my graduate school. The participants for the study were chosen through purposive and snowball measures. Participants invited for this study fit at least one of the following descriptions:

1. Are parents/guardians/caretakers with children in Mills City Dual Language School
2. Are district or school administrators, teachers, or staff
3. Are members of groups or organizations affiliated with the Mills City Dual Language School that could discuss the relations the school/district has with residents and issues related to Mills City

Most participants were identified during my time as a participant observer in the Mills City Dual Language School in academic year 2019-2020. Many of them recommended each other as potential participants for the study.

Fostering Relations and Relationships through Informed Consent

I have been very fortunate to have fostered and maintained relationships with the school district, school, and participants since the initial stages of this study. Negotiating entry into the school district and school community was not a daunting or time-consuming process as I imagined and was warned about from other faculty members and colleagues.

In the process of preparing for this research study and looking for a bilingual educational context, Mills City Public Schools, specifically, the Mills City Dual Language School, was recommended by two Boston College professors in my doctoral program who knew the assistant superintendent of the school district and the principal of the Mills City Dual Language School. One of these professors introduced me to Elisa, the assistant superintendent, via email, and

shortly after, we had a conversation through Facetime. I shared with her a research summary prior to our conversation. In this conversation with Elisa, I explained my research topic, experiences that led to my interest in this topic, and asked for her permission to proceed with the approval process. Elisa said that she was interested in the perspectives and feedback from families, especially families from low-income and racially minoritized backgrounds, and thought that my experience as a former dual language teacher and bilingualism in English and Spanish could be an asset to the Dual Language School. She gave me her consent with the condition that I needed to get approval from the principal of the Dual Language School for complete approval.

After Elisa and my dissertation advisor connected me with the principal of the Dual Language School, Rosario, through email, I was invited by Rosario to meet with her and Kiara, a second-grade teacher. In our meeting, Rosario informed me that she was interested in knowing more about what parents, specifically, parents from low-income and racially minoritized backgrounds, thought about the policies and structures of the school and school district that are aimed at promoting relations with the school(ing). However, as noted in chapter one, she thought that I could support the immediate functioning of the school since they were understaffed, under-resourced, and relatively new to the district. Rosario introduced me to Kiara and said that the second-grade cohort could use support in their classrooms, specifically with the female students. More than two-thirds of the second grade were classified as boys. Kiara also revealed that she was relatively new to teaching in a two-way dual language bilingual context and would love support from an experienced teacher like myself. I accepted their invite to volunteer at the school two-three full school days per week. Rosario and Kiara informed me that they would refer and think about potential participants for the study during my time at the school.

After, Rosario and Elisa wrote letters of support for my research study to submit to the Boston College IRB office. Throughout this past academic year, Rosario and Kiara have been strong supporters of my research and have welcomed me to their school community. I am very grateful to have them, as well as Elisa and Boston College faculty, to vouch for me (e.g. my character, experience, and purpose) at the start and throughout this study. Within the first two weeks of volunteering at the Dual Language School, Rosario requested that the school district give me an email so that I could have access to school district leadership and school staff/team emails. Further, she and Kiara introduced me to school members (e.g. school leadership team members, secretaries, teachers, janitors, parents) and invited me to staff and school event meetings. Notably, when Rosario introduced me to other educational stakeholders, she informed them that she supported the research study and was looking forward to the dissemination of its findings. Volunteering for most of the academic year allowed me to develop relationships with different educational stakeholders and for them to develop familiarity with me. Due to my bilingualism (in English and Spanish), I was able to communicate in a language that they felt comfortable using with me. On many occasions, especially in conversations with people from racially minoritized groups, I was asked about my ethnicity and race. For participants whose families are from Mexico, Central or South America, they informed me that I could pass as one of them. Further, I often introduced myself and was introduced as "Jasmine, a doctoral researcher who was a dual language teacher in New York City" when first meeting a school member, but as time passed, participants still continued to ask me "what" I am.

In regards to the participation of school members and community affiliates, they often recommended each other or alerted each other that I would reach out to ask them to participate in my study. I suspect that many of these participants who recommended and connected me to

others also vouched for me because they all said yes. Only one participant declined because she moved to California in the middle of the school year. Moreover, with the help of Kiara, I met the second-grade families during parent-teacher conferences or parent events to verbally inform and invite them to the study. After, I talked to students about the purpose of the study and invited them to ask questions about the study. I informed the children that they were not obligated to participate in the study. Then, after my conversations and consent from students, Kiara and I sent the consent forms in the students' homework folders for signatures and declines from parents. As for families with formal roles in school groups or committees, Rosario introduced them to me and my research study when I attended their events and meetings.

I answered questions about the study through different modes such as telephone calls, notes, and chats during dismissal time or in the school hallways. Participants were informed that though every effort would be made to ensure their anonymity is preserved, it is not guaranteed, especially if they have a very well-known role in the neighborhood or school district. The consent forms revealed that the study would use pseudonyms for their names, neighborhood, and school. Non-family participants gave consent for interviews and collection of artifacts. For families, they had the option to have them, and their children interviewed, observed, and submit artifacts, or be interviewed and submit artifacts. Nine families gave me their full consent (e.g. interview, observation, artifact collection for students and parents) out of 26 families. I have chosen five families as focal families whose experiences, practices, and backgrounds will be discussed within the findings of the study. One of the nine families moved, and the rest of the families remained as participants who contributed to the presentation of the discourses of school-family relations with regard to the two-way dual language bilingual program.

Relationality and Accountability with Place and Participants

I present myself as Ecuadorian, of Quechua descent, New Yorker, Latina, and bilingual. My life experiences shaped my outlook on the topics that I examine in this dissertation. As alluded in chapter 1, my schooling, professional, and personal experiences have influenced my commitment to addressing broader societal issues that influence the schooling experiences of minoritized youth and their families. Despite these commitments and experiences, I recognize that being a PhD student and researcher could have potentially discouraged educational stakeholders and community members from saying yes to my request for their participation in my research study due to the history of extraction and exploitation of minoritized groups by researchers and higher-educational institutions. At the same time, I recognize that my role as a volunteer, former elementary dual language teacher, and bilingual Latina, helped me gain consent, build rapport, and earn credibility with several members of the school, school district, and neighborhood. Additionally, my gender and class affected the ways in which others saw me, whom I could interact with, and who felt comfortable with me. I developed different relationships with different participants, and my roles and responsibilities varied in each place. In turn, different people perceived me in different ways. The following sections provide a brief overview of how my relationships with place and participants have evolved.

Mills City

Before initiating my research study, I often visited Mills City because my then fiancé (now husband) lived there and I enjoyed walking around the neighborhood, especially in the parts where there are sidewalks. I viewed Mills City as a place where I could be with a loved one and be around people from similar ethnic, racial, and class backgrounds. I enjoy walking around Mills City because I am able to witness many cultures and languages that remind me of home,

Queens, New York. As a daughter of immigrants who worked different types of service jobs and for small businesses, I gravitate towards getting to know people in these occupations because they remind me of my former neighbors, family members, and friends from New York. When I got permission to conduct research in Mills City, I looked forward to the possibility of forming relationships with its residents since I did not have many personal or professional relationships with Mills City residents. Through connections with families, educators, and staff members of the Dual Language School, I am able to greet some employees and owners of small businesses in main commercial streets by their first names. Before COVID-19, residents invited me to attend community events to help out with translating, learn about key issues and reforms, and connect me with other residents. Now, with the distribution of COVID-19 vaccines, I am slowly starting to attend these events and meetings with other residents again in-person.

Unexpectedly, Mills City has also become a part of home. In December 2020, I moved to Mills City. Financial constraints led us to move into my husband's apartment, which he was temporarily renting before the pandemic. Since our move, my husband and I have learned more about the neighborhood together and have built relationships with other members of Mills City, including some participants of this study. During summer 2021, we got married at the Mills City Hall. Now, I live a 7-minute drive from the dual language program. Living closer to the school has made it more manageable to volunteer, attend meetings and events at the school, and have conversations with families after dismissal.

Families

Although I was introduced to families in this study as a doctoral student and researcher who is a former two-way dual language bilingual teacher, I had different relationships and positionings with different families. The majority of families in the study who identified

themselves as being from a Central American country perceived me as a fellow member of this group. After a couple of conversations since my initial interaction with them, they would ask what country I was from, and even sometimes, directly ask if I was from a specific country like El Salvador or Mexico. Notably, several parents, like Flor and Beatrice, reached out via email or phone with a question about school curriculum or policies when they were unable to reach the secretary or their children's teachers. The frequency of calls from these families has increased since the COVID-19 pandemic. Topics of conversation included technology help, website(s) access, and information about food pantries in Mills City. Although families of Latin American descent associated me as a school aide or assistant teacher, I was able to visit their homes to answer questions about school policies/structures, and provide support on technology and content or literacy curriculum. For example, before COVID-19, I would read with Flor's children during weekends because Flor confided in me that she was unable to read in English. In regards to Beatrice's family, I was able to form a close relationship with her because I work with her younger son, Brendon, at the Dual Language School, and my husband directs the afterschool and summer camp that her older son, Oscar, attended. Through my relationship with Flor and Beatrice, I was able to form a relationship with another focal participant, Mariana. I occasionally reminded these parents about my research agenda and affiliation with a higher education institution when I felt that they might have forgotten that I was going to conduct and record interviews with them. Despite the COVID-19 pandemic limiting in-person interactions, I was fortunate to not have difficulty in maintaining active communication through phone (including Facetime), text, or email with these families.

The way I interacted with families that are institutionally marked as white is different-it was more on a as needed basis for my study. They saw my role as a volunteer as part of the work

I am doing for my dissertation. They understood my role as a researcher, and not really as a teacher or part of the school. In fact, they actively invited me to attend parent meetings or school events to generate data for my study. These parents were members of the parent and school leadership committees of the school. They expressed their flexibility in their schedules when I arranged times to conduct interviews with them in the coming months. Due to my affiliation with Boston College, they asked about its master's and doctoral programs to recommend to other family members or friends. Although I did not have many in-person interactions with them due to COVID-19, these families classified as white were responsive to phone calls and emails. They were willing to schedule meetings with me through Zoom or Facetime. Despite the availability and participation in events or meetings over the past two years, I am still nervous about social or material repercussions from this group of families after the dissemination of this study's findings.

Students

The place where students saw and interacted with me heavily influenced my relationships with them. In the classroom, the students saw me as a school aide, who has some but not complete authority as their classroom teacher. For example, students knew they could ask me for permission to go to the bathroom, to get a drink of water, or use an iPad if they finished with work and there was extra time before the end of the lesson. However, students knew that the classroom teacher was the person deciding the schedule for the day and makes curricular decisions. Nonetheless, they greeted me as "Ms. Jasmine," and many got excited when I was there, virtually and in-person. With the class, I was a teacher aide/researcher. I listened (took notes) during whole group lessons, and in general, supported students in centers or through small group or individual work. At times, I volunteered to read aloud with students or looked after

students when the teacher was individually assessing students. Some children asked for my help-they wanted assistance in reading or writing, or in resolving conflicts among peers. Students who are in my dissertation study have tended to be the children who asked me more about other aspects of my life such as hobbies, previous teaching experiences, and places that I have visited outside of Mills City and Boston. Sometimes, the children participants informed other children and school members that I have visited their homes and have talked with their parents.

School Members

During academic year 2019-2020, I developed closer relationships with several teachers and staff of the school while the rest of school team did not know my name. Some members who did not know my role as a researcher or graduate student thought I was a student teacher doing my practicum at the site. I spent the majority of my time with the second-grade cohort and its teachers, one of them being Kiara. Besides the second-grade group, I worked closely with Victoria (the literacy coach), Margarita (former secretary/current family liaison), Margaret (librarian), and Rosario (principal). In particular, I have developed a caring and friendly relationship with Kiara and Rosario. They were the first members of the school that I met and have consistently checked with me about the ways in which they could support my project and recruit participants. During the entire year, Kiara asked me for advice about curriculum, instruction, and work/life harmony. Also, Kiara and Rosario grew up in Boston, and I connected with them by talking about our upbringing in a Northeast city with diverse cultures and groups, and being from low-income immigrant households.

Over time, my status in the school changed because my relations with the school and its members have changed over academic year 2020-2021. I learned from school district emails about budget cuts, staff shortages, and lack of resources for online instruction due to the COVID-

19 pandemic. When Rosario asked me if I was returning to volunteer and research at the school during these past two school years, I asked if she would like for me to be a substitute teacher exclusively for the school. Although Rosario consistently gives me credit for helping her school survive during these tumultuous years, I often felt not useful enough. Nonetheless, I was honored that Rosario vocalized her support of my research agenda, allowed me to engage with the school community, and trusted me enough to support her teachers and students. I have substitute taught (in-person or virtually) students from grades K-5. As such, I interacted with teachers and staff that support all grade levels at the school. When I greeted everyone at the office and hallway, I was greeted back and called by my first name. However, I was often asked "what are you?" when interacting with multiple stakeholders. They commented that they understood that I was there for research, but that they saw me with families, teachers, and staff, and did not know where to place or what to call me.

Community Affiliates

As for the three community affiliates for the study, I met each of them through different circumstances. In regards to Diana, the after-school program director, I met her when we were using the same office table to work in the dual language program during the fall of academic year 2020-2021. We introduced ourselves to each other when I helped her fix an issue that she was having with the school office copy machine. We bonded over common challenges and issues when directing afterschool programs since I previously directed an afterschool program in a bilingual school in New York City. She invited me to visit her after-school classes and contact her to set up meetings with her for future interviews. In regards to Eric and Kay, directors of other non-profit organizations, I met them through emails from Rosario and a Boston College faculty member who is a resident of Mills City. I have invited them for a drink or meal to get to

know them, their affiliation, and their work in their organization. Although these affiliates were accessible through email or phone, I did not interact with them on a frequent basis. However, they would often send me information about events held by Mills City public officials or organizations for my research study.

These relations and experiences reaffirmed my commitment to being accountable to participants in this study by involving them in identifying ways in which this research would benefit their communities. As I wrote my findings chapters, I talked with participants to answer questions and get feedback and clarification. As discussed with Elisa, the district assistant superintendent, and Rosario, the principal of the Dual Language School, I will submit an executive summary and present my findings to the Dual Language School leadership team and staff meeting, and the Mills City Schools Committee. Additionally, I recognize that my experiences are not universal, and that different people have different experiences and/or may experience the same events differently. Throughout the data analysis process, I interrogated my assumptions and experiential knowledge through the writing of reflective memos along with member checking with participants (Miles et al., 2013).

Data Generation

Given this qualitative study's focus on the conceptualizations and experiences of families in schools, a combination of sources was used to generate data over academic year 2020-2021. The study includes the following data generation methods: semi-structured interviews, state, school and school district official documents, student and parent artifacts, unstructured participant conversations, participant observations, and secondary sources that relate to the school, school district, or neighborhood. At the end of this section, Table 3 depicts the data

sources and generation methods that were used to answer the research questions for this dissertation.

Observations

Throughout October 2019-June 2021, I consistently engaged in participant observation two to three times per week at the Dual Language School, which excluded the one to two days I covered classes as a substitute teacher. I spent the majority of my time with two focal third-grade classes and school-related events and activities (e.g. parent-teacher conferences, parent-teacher association meetings, weekly staff meetings). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, I participated and interacted with students, families, educators, and staff through online and in-person mediums. The extent of my participation during a meeting was dependent on its people, place, and purpose. For example, I took an active role in assisting the classroom teacher, with her permission, in class activities, and helping students complete their classwork. In contrast, I was mostly quiet and observed during parent-teacher conferences and staff meetings, unless I was directly invited to give my perspective on an issue.

At the Dual Language School, I took jottings and elaborated these jottings into field notes after school. With regard to school events or meetings that were after school hours, I took notes during or immediately after the event to note what happened, the conversations among participants, and my involvement and impressions about the meeting or event. These jottings included instances that I found significant or unexpected in relation to the topics of study, and to what participants reacted to as significant or important. At the beginning of my time at the Dual Language School, I engaged in many unstructured conversations with members of the school and jotted notes about these conversations of people who were interested in the study and who named others as potential participants for the study. Jottings also included verbatim phrases from

participants, and descriptions of location, time, artifacts used by participants, and whether participants were present or absent. With permission and when appropriate, I took pictures and audio- or video-record interactions, presentations, and/or student work after I received signed consent forms. I mostly used my phone, audio recorder, and computer to audio/video record or take pictures when I visited the school. Further, I gathered and saved documents and brochures that were distributed during meetings and events.

Participant observation at the Dual Language School served multiple purposes for this study. First, I described the evolving nature of the relationships that I have with different members of the school, as well as the relationships these members have with each other. For this purpose, I noted my interactions with these members and the interactions they had with each other, especially if they involved families and/or they are intended for facilitating interactions between staff and families and other community members. Second, I reported how and when educational stakeholders (e.g. school staff, educators, students, families, administrators) and community affiliates made sense of official school, district, and state policies that mention family relations with schools, in particular, with bilingual programs like two-way dual language immersion. I noted material and/or social benefits or effects placed on children and their families based on their negotiation of these policies. Third, the observations of focal families (caretakers, guardians, or parents and children) reported on how they understood their relations with other school and community affiliates, and themselves as families of the Dual Language School. Within their negotiation of expected family-school relations, I noted how focal families negotiated material or social effects/benefits that are accompanied with these expectations. Fourth, observations provided an interpretative context for artifacts and interview data generated. These observations were points of reference for interviews with participants.

Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with family members, children, administrators, educators, staff members, and community affiliates during the second semester of academic year 2020-2021 and summer 2021. These interviews presented educational stakeholders' understandings of family-school relations and associated material or social effects/benefits. These understandings highlighted how educational stakeholders made sense of official and unofficial policies that pertained to families through their backgrounds, and interactions and experiences with people and texts. Further, the interviews of the focal families presented how parents, guardians, and/or caretakers and their children constantly made sense of their relations with school(ing), and how they defined their relationship with ethnoracial groups and language practices. The interviews with families also reported their language, professional, and schooling backgrounds, as well specific experiences and practices they mentioned as they described their language use and relation to ethnoracial groups. However, these interviews were flexible to discuss concerns related to specific school or classroom-related events, current pandemic, neighborhood issues, and comments made from other educational or community stakeholders. Further, I discussed with participants about moments from observations that I found significant or unexpected in relation to the topics of study.

The interviews were mostly conducted through online, digital mediums like Zoom or Facetime and/or phone calls. With five focal families, I conducted interviews in-person, socially distanced, and in open public space. All interviews were conducted during non-school hours and at a time that worked for the participants. During the interviews, I disclosed to participants that they could skip and not answer questions and ask for me to stop audio-recording at any time. I briefly reintroduced the research agenda, how I gained permission to participate in the program,

and personal and professional experiences that led me to this study. With permission from participants, I audio-recorded the interviews for analyses. I conducted 1-2 interviews for every participant in this study. For focal families (5 families with at least one guardian/parent/caretaker and student), I conducted 2 interviews, and for school staff and administrators, I conducted one interview. For community affiliates, I conducted one interview with each of them. Given the COVID-19 pandemic and multiple conversations with families during the past year, I wanted to be extra careful in not overwhelming participants with the process of scheduling and participating in interviews during these tumultuous times.

After conducting each interview, I wrote field notes and reflective memos. Within these notes and memos, I wrote down impressions, salient themes, any interruptions or unexpected events, and the general interview milieu. I looked over these notes as I transcribed the interviews to provide context and additional insights during transcription and analysis. As I transcribed interviews, I added additional notes of questions that I thought would be useful to discuss in later conversations or subsequent interviews. The interviews definitely layered and provided unexpected information about the school, its members, and neighborhood.

Artifacts

During my time at the Dual Language School, I collected the following documents: a) school-family handbooks; b) Every Student Succeeds Act Titles II-1V (which focus on family engagement in public schools); c) local and national newspapers about the Dual Language School and Mills City school district; and c) agendas and notes from Mills City Public School Committee and Dual Language School leadership team meetings. These documents helped me understand how official school, district, and federal policy texts presented family-school relations, specifically as they relate to bilingual education programs, and associated material and

social benefits. However, I focused on the official governmental, institutional, and local school policies that were mentioned by the participants in this study, especially the focal families, during data generation.

As previously mentioned, I collected copies of artifacts from school events and meetings to augment my study of how educational stakeholders understood the roles, practices, and expectations for family relationships with the Dual Language School. I made copies of focal student and parent artifacts (e.g. texts, pictures, curricular materials) that were helpful in understanding their ideas about their language use, relation with language, relation with ethnoracial groups, school, and neighborhood. Further, these artifacts helped contextualize events, interactions, and responses from educational stakeholders during analyses of interviews and field notes.

Table 3

Research Question and Topic Alignment with Data

Research Question	**Topic/Data Source**
1. How are family-school relations conceptualized by educational stakeholders (i.e. teachers, administrators, parents, children, community-affiliates) and in related texts of a two-way dual language bilingual program in the Greater Boston Area? a) How are race, class, and language implicated in these conceptualizations?	*Official school, district, and federal text presentation of family-school relations and benefits/effects:* -school handbooks -school district handbooks -Every Student Succeeds Act Titles II-IV *Educational stakeholders' understandings of family-school relations and benefits/effects:* -audio/video recordings of interviews with families, school leaders, educators, and community affiliates -copies of artifacts from meetings and school events -audio/video recordings and field notes of observations in classrooms and school events

2. How do two-way dual language bilingual families institutionally classified as Hispanic families expand, reify, and/or resist these conceptualizations?	*Families' relations with school(ing), ethnoracial groups, and language practices:* -audio/video recordings of interviews with parents and students -audio recordings and field notes of observations in classrooms and school events -copies of student and parent artifacts from school events *Families' negotiation of benefits/effects of family-school relations:* -audio/video recordings of interviews with parents and students -copies of student and parent artifacts from school events -audio recordings and field notes of observations in classrooms and school events

Data Analysis

Overview

Data analysis occurred in a recursive manner (Miles et al., 2013). This process included deductive and inductive coding, reflective memo writing, and theory/perspective triangulation (Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002).[12] Using an Excel spreadsheet, I organized the data by type, date generated, brief description, and keywords. I highlighted recordings that I wanted to analyze carefully later, specifically the interactions among participants and individual interviews. Data analysis entailed discursive and textual analytical approaches. Since discourse is socially situated, Marshall (1992) argues that discourse must be interpreted with regard to other

[12] According to Patton (2002), *theory/perspective* triangulation is employed in an effort for the researcher to continuously challenge his/her/theirs own biases, as well as consider and place the theories that undergird the study under suspicion throughout this process.

discourses to understand systems of meaning, knowledge, and belief that are rendered intelligible. Thus, discourses become a system of statements that interact in complex ways to produce and reproduce particular points of view (Mills, 1997). Discourses reflect "ideologies, values, beliefs, and social practices" (Hicks, 1995, p. 53).

Throughout the process of data analysis, discourse is viewed as "actively shaping and producing subject positionings and material realities in which we find ourselves in" (Hicks, 1995, p. 52). The various forms of data complemented each other to form nuanced understandings about the racialized, classed, and linguicized discourses and processes related to family-school relations within the contemporary context of a two-way dual language bilingual program. The purpose of their analysis was to understand how institutional and official policy discourses shaped and reflected particular experiences, roles, and relationships for families, as well as how individuals reinvented and resisted such subjectivities. Therefore, the primary focus for data analysis was on the relationships between people and institutions and systems of power. My attunement of this focus of inquiry was influenced by Tuck's and Yang's (2014) stance on "settler colonial knowledge and production for the academy...disguised as objective knowledge for the public." Tuck's and Yang's (2014) claims about social science research in a settler-colonial society naturalizing knowledge extraction and governance of minoritized groups influenced my decision to limit over-relying on and disclosing mechanistic coding schemes. In turn, my process of writing memos as I engaged with data and codes helped me crystalize meaning to answer the research questions for this study (Kinloch & San Pedro, 2014). Throughout all stages of the analytical process, I wrote memos where I described patterns, tensions, and disjunctures emerging from the data, my evolving relationships with participants and Mills City, and connections from theories, research, readings, and interactions (Jackson &

Mazzei, 2011). Part of this work was reflecting on how specific excerpts and incidents reflected matrices of oppression and the agency of participants in grappling with the material and social effects from oppressive structures.

The process of writing was especially important in the creation of narrative portraits (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 1983; 2005; Park, 2012) that reported on how families institutionally classified as Hispanic made sense of their relation with schooling and how they defined their relationship with ethnoracial groups and language practices. The portraits were built from interviews, artifacts, and excerpts from observations during school and classroom events. My experiences, relationships, and perspectives influenced the ways I composed the portraits. Most of these portraits are somewhere between the narrative snapshots of Park (2012) and portraiture (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 1983, 2005). They weave participants' multiple experiences and reflections into a more robust narrative than Park's comparative discrete snapshots fragmented into thematic sections. Further, portraiture "intends to merge the systematic and careful description of good ethnography with the evocative resonance of fine literature" (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2005, p. 6). Unlike portraiture, most of the narrative portraits in this study were constructed with a particular analytical focus-of how families negotiated, reified, and resisted raciolinguicized subject positions found within a contemporary two-way dual language bilingual program. However, I utilized portraiture to present a deeper description of one family's ways of knowing, being, and negotiation of dominant discourses about family-school relations. In the following section, I end my discussion of data analysis for this study by presenting an overview of the coding approaches for texts and interviews that illuminated certain patterns of meaning.

Analysis of Texts

Textual analysis was informed by Allan's (2008) policy discourse analysis, which focuses on the "shaping of policy problems, solutions, and images" (p. 8). I extended Allan's (2008) approach to artifacts and observational notes that do not explicitly mention official governmental or institutional policies because a policy-focused lens exposes hidden assumptions of social practices, notes the ways in which they form subject positions and produce material effects, and may present alternatives to the status quo.[13] First, I read and reread all materials to look for policy patterns and exceptions. Then, I employed inductive and deductive coding by using MAXQDA qualitative data analysis software. As part of deductive coding, I developed etic and provisional codes for core constructs of my research questions (Miles et al., 2013). These core constructs included race, language, and class, which required further specification of codes (e.g. for language, nature of languaging, language varieties, language labels, language teaching, language as proxy for race). Beyond theoretical codes, other deductive codes were linked to context, responses to interview questions, and topics within the literature review of family-school relations. Then, inductive coding was used to conceptualize emergent patterns. For instance, within the a priori code for language labels, emerged categorizations of English Learner, Spanish speaker, English speaker, and Spanglish. As I coded data, I read and reread documents to identify key concepts within and across texts to make connections among them (Allan, 2008). This reading provided insights into the individual interactions and conversations among stakeholders from observational and interview data.

[13] I use the term, text, to include various written and multimedia resources (e.g. handouts, notes, websites) in an increasingly digital world as indicated by new literacy studies (New London Group, 1996).

Analysis of Interviews

The analysis of interviews was informed by Briggs (1986) and Bacchi's and Goodwin's (2016) poststructuralist interview analysis. Briggs (1986) helped account for various components of the interview situation to contextualize meanings of utterances; while Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) focus on the production, questioning, and disruptions of subject positions produced within interview events. After each interview, I wrote brief memos to reflect on various components of the interview situation (e.g. setting, participants, time/day/date, interactional goals, and social/relevant events). Then, I reviewed and transcribed the interviews and attached my memo to the transcription. Next to the memo, I wrote a layered description of the structure of the interview, which included more components of Briggs's (1986) interview approach (e.g. activities, shifts in focus, arrival or departure of other actors, changes in tone or gesture).

After, I coded the interviews inductively based on recurring themes, connections, and ideas that emerged from a holistic review, using MAXQDA qualitative data analysis software (Miles et al., 2013). However, they were loosely structured in response to the focal research questions of this dissertation. For instance, codes included: characteristics of family-school relations; reference to ethnoracial groups; reference to language groupings; family structures; and verbs that encoded what speakers were doing with language. Lastly, I interrogated assumptions within text segments by asking myself the following questions: What assumptions about families and school(ing) support in this text segment? What relationships between families and school(ing) are implicated in this text segment? How do they contribute to particular discourses regarding family-school relations? What might be some material consequences of these relationships?

Conclusion

This chapter opened with a description of the research design and a rationale for the research approach that was used in this dissertation. Next, I gave an overview of the neighborhood, school, and participants. Then, I discussed my relationality, accountability, and recruitment of participants. Lastly, I described data generation and analytical methods for this dissertation. Findings from this analysis will be the focus of the following chapters.

CHAPTER FIVE: Legal and Institutional Contexts of Family-School Relations for Two-Way Dual Language Bilingual Education

Right after dismissal, I was making copies of graphic organizers for third-grade classes in the school's main office. As the papers were churning out from the copy machine, I overheard Beatrice ask the school secretary, Annie, about the whereabouts of her son, Brendon, since she was late for pick up. I turned around and enthusiastically walked over to Beatrice. After greeting each other and Annie calling Myra, a third-grade teacher, to have Brendon walk over to the main office, Beatrice asked me about my husband, doctoral studies, and wedding planning. "Estamos bien. Tomando las cosas poco a poco y tratando de estar calmados durante el proceso. ¡Que gusto de verte, siento que no nos hemos visto en algún tiempo!," I replied (FN20200226). Beatrice shook her head, sighed, and started to look at the floor. I became nervous that I had said something to offend or upset her. I was afraid that she interpreted my remark of not seeing her in a while as me judging her actions instead of noticing that I missed her presence and our conversations. I quickly tried to address these fears by telling Beatrice that I missed her company, our conversations, and learning about where to shop and eat in Mills City. Beatrice looked up, smiled, and said, "Siempre puedes mandarme un text para conversar o vernos cuando estoy libre" (FN20200226).

By then, Brendon had arrived at the main office, informing Beatrice that he had all his belongings and was ready to head home. As they headed out of the office, Beatrice asked me if I could go with her downstairs to the school's main entrance. In front of Beatrice and me, Brendon made swift jumps as he went down the school staircase. In contrast, Beatrice slowly walked down, and I followed her pace. In a soft tone, she commented,

> Ms. Jasmine, no he estado en muchos eventos como antes en la escuela porque estoy cansada de estar corriendo de un lado al otro. De mi trabajo o appointments a reuniones

donde no tengo nada que hacer allí. Claudia quiere que yo sea la voz de Guatemala pero yo no quiero. (FN20200226)

We stopped by the main door, turned, and looked at each other. I nodded and asked Beatrice what she thought Claudia, a staff member, meant by calling her "la voz de Guatemala." She explained that Claudia wanted her to present the perspectives of families from Guatemala during events and parent meetings that discussed school programming and curricular expectations. Beatrice further explained that because she was one of the few Guatemalan caretakers/parents, who represent the majority of families of Latin American descent, to attend those meetings and events, Claudia encouraged her to be a representative for this group. However, Beatrice disclosed that she does not want to be labeled as "the voice of this group" of families and be pressured to meet associated expectations by other school members under this label (FN20200226). Her comment highlighted how the expectations for cultivating relations and being in decision-making spaces with other members of the school conflicted with her professional and personal commitments. Beatrice reminded me that she was willing to cultivate interconnectedness, relations, and understandings with members of the school by reiterating that she was available through text or phone call to connect and find a time and place that was convenient for both of us. It seemed that Beatrice refused to submit to the pressures of abiding by narrow, inflexible norms and expectations placed upon her as a family member from the Mills City Dual Language School.

Although the focus of this chapter does not intend to present an overview of Beatrice's and her family's experience at the Mills City Dual Language School, my memories of interactions with Beatrice and her son, Brendon, have been starting points when trying to connect and peel the layers within the racialized and linguicized discourses, accompanied structures and

practices, about family-school relations that permeate the school. Specifically, I think about these questions: Why does one person have to be the voice of all Guatemalans? What narratives, structures, and practices at the school reinforce this expectation? How does this issue extend beyond this school context? This chapter examines how legal and institutional contexts related to family-school relations in two-way dual language bilingual education contribute to the racialization of people and language practices in broader efforts to maintain white supremacy and racist-capitalism.

Referring to chapter 2 (literature review), I start with briefly discussing the legal contexts of family-school relations and bilingual education during the U.S. Civil Rights Era and reporting on the dominant, racialized discourses that permeate these contexts about families' social positioning and language practices. Next, I highlight how these intelligible ways of thinking about groups of people and languaging connected to family-school relations are woven within the discourses, and associated structures and practices in the contemporary context of the Mills City Dual Language School. Throughout this discussion of the Mills City Dual Language School, I weave the comments of various educational stakeholders (e.g. administrators, educators, parents/caretakers/guardians, and staff members) who, as institutional policy actors, made sense of dominant discourses about family-school relations. As such, the focus is how historical, problematic logics about family-school relations shaped how different actors made sense of groups of people and their language practices within a bilingual program. In my closing comments, I leverage this discursive tracing of family-school relations and examination of material effects related to the contemporary context of the Mills City Dual Language School to augment my understanding of Beatrice's negotiation of her racialized positioning of being the "voice of Guatemala" at the school.

Defining Families of Bilingual Programs in Federal Educational Policy

Informed by Levinson et al.'s (2009) definition of *policy* and *policy appropriation*, I provide an overview of the socio-political conditions and actions in the federal arena during the Civil Rights Era to form governing statements about what should be considered family-school relations in the U.S. Although legislation did oppose legal racial segregation during the Civil Rights Era, a time often viewed as a pivotal moment of social progress, federal educational reforms have continued to perpetuate what Aggarwal (2016) refers to as *the ideological architecture of whiteness as property*. Aggarwal (2016) argues that educational policies, institutions, and actors promote the notion that racially minoritized groups, especially Black/African Americans, do not academically excel in schools because of their "psyche, capacities, and cultures (e.g. values, behaviors, attitudes) that dwell in their individual bodies" (p. 2). Thus, educational policies, institutions, and actors have rendered the histories, practices, and knowledge forms of racially minoritized groups as explanations for their unfavorable educational outcomes and socioeconomic immobility. By attributing social inequities to supposed inferior traits inherent in racially minoritized groups, educational policies, institutions, and actors ignore the material and structural nature of social inequities and exacerbate the uneven distribution of wealth and resources that maintain these inequities intact in a globalized racist-capitalist state. Consequently, federal policies in the U.S. related to family-school relations and bilingual education have reified the individualization of educational inequities and racist outcomes in the schooling experiences of racially minoritized families.

During the Civil Rights Era, there were several reports and legislation that claimed to promote the wellbeing and educational success of racially minoritized groups but ultimately positioned these groups as inferior beings who needed to be fixed, surveilled, and confined by

actors and collectives of mostly white- and middle-and upper-class backgrounds and who had immense legal, social, and material privileges. For example, in 1965, U.S. Assistant Secretary of Labor, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, published a report named *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, best known as the *Moynihan Report* (Stephens & Zhang, 2020). In the *Moynihan Report,* he suggested that the U.S. must address the inherent deficiencies within what he calls "Negro families" as a major initiative to end discrimination, poverty, and injustice in the U.S. (Moynihan, 1965). Towards the end of the 1960s, there was a movement among politicians and lawmakers, such as Senator Robert Kennedy and William Cannon, chief of the Federal Budget Bureau's Division of Education, for federally-funded community action programs to be run by state or local government agencies. These efforts were the result of political regimes' and corporate elites' concerns about their political and economic power being threatened due to activists' and neighborhood groups' leveraging these agencies to disrupt power structures and relations in their local communities (Abrams, 1987). Moreover, the aforementioned collective of politicians and lawmakers believed that schools must adhere to the metrics and evaluations from external federal agencies so that schools could fix and address inherent deficiencies within racially minoritized children and families, which were the supposed causes of their lack of educational success and socioeconomic mobility (Abrams, 1987).

More recent federal educational policies continue to position schools as panaceas for societal inequities through their efforts to address supposed deficit characteristics within the knowledge forms and practices of racially minoritized children and their families. The extent and approach that a school takes to address these perceived deficiencies continues to be monitored and regulated through the standardization of curricula, testing, instruction, and accountability measures (Au, 2016). For instance, the *Every Student Succeeds Act* of 2015 and its predecessor,

the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2002, focus on the extent and ways that parents/caretakers/guardians can fulfill expectations from their schools to promote the academic success of their children. In other words, children's academic success is framed as highly dependent on the degree to which parents/caretakers can fulfill the expected norms and behaviors demanded by the institution of schooling. For instance, schools with more than 40% of students classified as from low-socioeconomic backgrounds are expected to have written agreements that encourage the involvement of parents/caretakers/guardians to support school outcomes in order to receive Title I funds (Ishimaru & Takahashi, 2017). School outcomes center on test performance, attendance, and graduation (Baquedano-López et al., 2013; Ishimaru & Takahashi, 2017). Ultimately, federal educational policies that intend to build relations with families and communities continue to exacerbate societal and educational inequities by not explicitly committing to systemic and institutional changes, and positioning the behaviors and practices of families, specifically, those from low-income and racially minoritized backgrounds, as explanations for their lack of educational success and socioeconomic wellbeing.

In terms of bilingual education, lawmakers and politicians have positioned these programs as remedies for the supposed cultural and linguistic behaviors of racially minoritized groups, especially for Latinx/Chicanx groups during the Civil Rights Era (Sung, 2017). They framed language practices of racially minoritized groups as deficient behaviors that were explanations for racially minoritized groups' lack of academic success and economic prosperity. Although Latinx activists and grassroots organizations viewed bilingual education as a potential catalyst for emancipatory education and liberation, the goals for these programs that emerged during its institutionalization in 1968 were disentangled from efforts to dismantle institutions, practices, logics, and norms that maintained white supremacy and racist-capitalism (Flores &

García, 2017). At best, bilingual programs were created with the goal of improving the self-esteem of racially minoritized groups by instilling pride in their cultural and linguistic practices while learning to engage in mainstream English classrooms and maintain the privileged societal status of English (Flores & García, 2017). At worst, they became educational spaces that solely assimilated racially minoritized students into language practices, knowledge forms, and social norms associated with whiteness. Regardless of these conflicting orientations for bilingual education during the post-Civil Rights Era, subsequent federal policies (e.g. reauthorization of the *Bilingual Education Act* in 1984, *No Child Left Behind* in 2002, and *Every Student Succeeds Act* in 2015) have increased support for English-only programs and required funding for bilingual programs to depend on student performance of English language assessments.

Concurrently, mainstream English-dominant families developed an interest in language immersion education because they viewed proficiency in a language other than English as a desired resource (Dorner, 2011). This surge of interest in language immersion education can be attributed to the research on the cognitive benefits of bilingualism for white middle- and upper-class Canadian students (e.g. Cummins, 1979, 2001) and the rapid economic globalization at the turn of the 21st century (Dorner, 2011). Advocates of bilingual education who were interested in ensuring that Latinx and other racially minoritized groups could use their heritage languages in their schools saw promise in language immersion models, specifically two-way dual language programs. However, various scholars (e.g. García, 2009; Johnson & Johnson, 2015; Sung, 2017; Valdés, 1997, 2018) have continuously pointed out that when teaching two languages is the goal of bilingual programs, the dynamic language practices of racially minoritized groups are still framed as barriers to instruction that aim to uphold standardized language forms (García, 2007). Ultimately, these scholars argue that the language practices, knowledge forms, and subjectivities

of families marked as white and middle- or upper-class continue to be centered as neutral and objective foundations for the institutionalization of bilingual education in state educational policies, including models positioned as asset-based programs like two-way dual language education. In sum, families from racially minoritized groups continue to engage in bilingual programs that: (1) frame their language practices, ways of being, and knowledge forms as explanations for unfavorable educational outcomes and socioeconomic immobility; (2) mold their language practices, knowledge forms, and ways of being into ideals of hegemonic whiteness, specifically into an idealized white family (Leonardo, 2012); and (3) ignore the material and social effects of white supremacy, globalization, and racist-capitalism.

As witnessed above, federal educational policies focused on family-school relations and bilingual education claim to advance the educational success and socioeconomic wellbeing of racially minoritized groups but actually individualize educational inequities and disentangle these inequities from the uneven distribution of resources and wealth that are cemented in a globalized racist-capitalist state. Specifically, these policies and related agencies do not sufficiently address the social and material conditions of local communities, which are naturalized circumstances of a globalized racist-capitalist state. Instead, institutions, in this case, schools, are pressured to frame societal inequities as pertaining to individual families, with behaviors, knowledge practices, and relations that are in dire need of erasure and remediation. Educational institutions are expected to comply with these dominant norms, values, and ideas that dictate what families' relations should be with schooling and learning of their children as part of greater efforts to maintain white supremacy and globalized racist-capitalism. In other words, the *ideological architecture of whiteness as property in educational policy* (Aggarwal, 2016) has resulted in the complex and contradictory ways that schools, in this case, bilingual

programs, and their stakeholders (e.g. educators, families, staff members, administrators) take up hegemonic, racialized norms, values, and ideas about family-school relations.

The following section is informed by the *property functions of whiteness* (Harris, 1993) and the orientation of educational stakeholders as *institutional policy actors* who make sense of dominant ideas, norms, and values (discourses) in their locales (Levinson et al., 2009). I examine how various educational stakeholders make sense of the racialized and linguicized discourses that permeate a two-way bilingual dual language program, the Mills City Dual Language School, about family-school relations. Within this analysis, I report on how these stakeholders reify, resist, and reimagine the norms, values, and behaviors of families that are rendered intelligible in their school. Moreover, I relate these discourses to specific practices and structures present at the school that perpetuate the maldistribution of intangible and tangible benefits among families. In sum, I argue that the racialized and linguicized discourses and accompanied material practices about family-school relations within the Mills City Dual Language School reify notions of embodied inferiority within racially minoritized groups, individualistic orientations towards educational inequities, and their disentanglement from societal issues to cement white supremacy and globalized racist-capitalism.

Dominant Discourses, Structures, and Practices within Family-Bilingual School Relations

This section examines how discourses, and their related practices and structures, about family-school relations present in the Mills City Dual Language School naturalize and promote the aforementioned logics that form the *ideological architecture of whiteness as property in educational policy* (Aggarwal, 2016). Within this analysis, I highlight how various educational stakeholders (e.g. parents/caretakers/guardians, educators, administrators, community affiliates) at the dual language school make sense, struggle with, and contest these discourses, practices,

and structures related to family-school relations. In such a way, these stakeholders' complex ways of making sense of the intelligible forms of family-school relations demonstrate that race-based educational inequities are not necessarily the result of individual so-called bad educators, leaders, or family members, but rather, it is the naturalized, problematic relations, logics, and structures within and beyond schools that cement family-school relations as another vector for maintaining the oppression of racially minoritized groups in a globalized racist-capitalist society. Further, my understandings of the dominant discourses at the dual language school were influenced by the following question that informs Levinson et al.'s (2009) framework for *policy appropriation*, "who plans what for whom and how?" As I discuss how educational stakeholders grapple with these discourses, I refer to Harris's (1993) *property functions of whiteness* (see chapter 3, pg. 62 for in-depth definition) to note how seemingly mundane and routine practices and structures relate to the maldistribution of intangible and tangible benefits among families based on whiteness. As mentioned in chapter 3 (theoretical orientation), the following benefits of whiteness meet the functional criteria of property: *the rights of possession, exclusivity, reputation, and disposition*.

White, English-Speaking Families Dominate

When I asked questions that started with *who* and *for whom* regarding family-school relations to multiple stakeholders (parents/caretakers/guardians, educators, community affiliates, staff members, administrators), they emphasized that the dual language school created opportunities, structures, and initiatives that prioritized the experiences, perspectives, and needs of white families. Often, these stakeholders interchangeably used the following verbs to describe how white families influenced the programming and structure of the school: *dictate, lead, dominate, control* (FN20200216; FN20210520). Notably, *dominate* was the verb that was most

frequently used when stakeholders described the material and social privileges ascribed to whiteness and those marked as white families (FN20200216; FN20210917). One administrator reported that "those white families want to dominate what goes on in the school. Those English speakers want to make sure that whatever we do that it meets their goals for what they want for their kids." (INT20210426). Like many participants, this administrator interchangeably used *English-speaking* to describe families positioned as white (FN20210426; FN20210513).

However, various staff members and educators pointed out that families described as Asian or Black/African American are grouped as *English-speaking* within school documents and procedures. For instance, one educator disclosed that "the options for language designation of families was English and Spanish so we marked Asian and African American families as English in our spreadsheets and folders. But you know, we all knew that when we used English speaking we really meant white people" (INT20210416). Indeed, other educators and staff members reported that when they talked about families and used English speaking, it was usually in reference to white families. One staff member stated, "It is troublesome to group people under English or Spanish when they come knowing multiple languages, especially our Asian and Black families who we put in as English. But we know when the staff talks to each other that we mean white families are English speakers." (INT20210513). As such, the English language was ascribed by members of the school as a social practice that ultimately belonged to whiteness and those who were positioned as white. Families marked as Asian and Black/African American were prohibited from being speakers of other languages beyond English (FN20210928).

According to various participants, the interests of white families became the foundation for the structure, purpose, and programming of the dual language school once the school district planning committee gained material and social support to create the school from families

described as Latino/a. One staff member reported that "las familias Latinas fueron que el comité trataron persuadir que la escuela era un beneficio para la comunidad. Pero después que ya el comité tuvo el ok del distrito, ellos comenzaron a asegurarse que había muchos blanquitos en la escuela" (INT20210414). The participant's comment explains how the district school committee garnered support from families described as Latino/a for the dual language school by asking them to sign petitions. She notes how recruitment efforts shifted towards attracting more white families after the committee used the petitions to show the school district committee that families marked as Latino/a wanted the bilingual program in their neighborhood (FN20210414).

A community affiliate, who was part of the school district planning committee, expressed how the committee relied on her to convince families described as Latina/o to sign petitions for the school,

> Si supiera que mis colegas iban a...a usar esas peticiones para después solo atraer a blanquitos, no hubiera tratado con tanta fuerza hablar con las familias Latinas. Porque no había muchos Latinos en el comité querían que yo conectara con esas familias para conseguir lo que ellos querían. Estaba bien con eso con tal que el enfoque era las familias Latinas. No había gente de otra raza más que Latinos y blanquitos. (INT20210313)

This affiliate's comment revealed that there were few members positioned as Latino/a within the committee. In the rest of our interview, she further described the rest of the members of the school district planning committee as white (FN20210313). Another administrator confirmed the composition of the school district planning committee. She reported, "Yes, it was a lot of white people unfortunately. We had some Latino/a parents and community members but not many. We should have done better to have other members from other backgrounds to reflect a better representation of the neighborhood" (FN20210315). The community affiliate's and

administrator's remarks indicate how the planning committee was mostly made up of members positioned as white, who were conferred with decision-making power to determine the structure and programming of neighborhood schools and the recruitment of its members.

Another community affiliate mentioned that the school district planning "committee's efforts to recruit white families and enroll their children into the school lottery for the first kindergarten cohort at the dual language program was evident in how that they carried out and planned informational sessions" about the program (INT20210315). Specifically, the school district planning committee held informational sessions during the 9 am-5 pm block, on weekdays, and primarily in English. The majority of families in attendance were positioned as white, and most of the questions were asked in English (INT20210315; INT20210518). Further, several parents and staff members described how these meetings were centered on informing these families about the benefits of bilingualism and bilingual education for personal and professional development. For instance, an educator remarked,

> These meetings would talk a lot about how children would learn about other cultures by being in the program. But we really knew that meant how white people would learn. They kept focusing on how they would learn about Latin America and how they were learning from other children's customs. It would help them learn more about the world for their future relationships and career goals. (INT20210518)

This educator's comment suggests how the learning of cultures, specifically for white children, would benefit their acquisition of social and material benefits such as leveraging understandings of cultural practices from Latin American countries to access social networks for professional advancement. In agreement with this educator's remarks, a parent explained, "these meetings suggested that by being around children and families who spoke Spanish, then white people

would learn about more Latin America, which would be good for us. In a way, I was left thinking about how this program would be good for Latino people?" (INT20210418). Thus, the parent points out how there was a lack of attention in these meetings to the needs and priorities of families described as Latino/a.

Later, the parent indicated how the recruitment meetings emphasized bilingualism as being beneficial for the cognitive development of children. Several other participants concurred with the premise of highlighting the cognitive benefits of bilingualism to gain favor from families. One staff member explained that "all the brain research shows that bilinguals are just better problem solvers and are able to adapt quicker to sudden situations" (INT20210612). Another educator further commented that "the district talked a lot about the merits of the bilingual brain and the impact of being bilingual would help alleviate the student achievement gap of Latino students and other students of color" (INT20210523). However, she also expressed her confusion about how cognitive benefits to all groups would necessarily alleviate educational inequities, "Well I know bilingualism is beneficial to anyone so I am not sure then how it will target the disparities and injustices Latino children and other kids of color face. Like how it's supposed to help them catch up?" (INT20210523). This educator wondered how the lack of academic success of children positioned as Latino/a would be remedied by bilingualism fostering their brain development. The educator suggests that the district educated families about bilingualism benefitting all groups of people but did not specify how it would address the educational inequities of children positioned as Latino/a.

Various participants acknowledged that white or English-speaking parents/caretakers/guardians determine the purpose, structure, and languaging of events and initiatives for families at the dual language school. For example, a parent described how she

stopped going to parent-teacher association meetings because "the meetings were led by representatives that were white, English speaking, or have money. These parents keep being elected every year despite the group being aware that there is a lack of minority families" (INT20210324). The parent reported how the leadership team of parent-teacher groups was consistently made up of people described as white, English-speaking, and wealthy, regardless of the group's awareness of the absence of families from racially minoritized groups in key decision-making processes. Additionally, a staff member discussed how she was uncomfortable attending those meetings due to the ethnoracial, linguistic, and socioeconomic makeup of the parent leadership structure (FN20210108). She explained,

> Yo ni podía hablar en español en esas reuniones porque ellos, casi todos blanquitos, les gustan hablar en solo inglés. También estas familias tratan de forzar sus ideas y lo que quieren en otras reuniones como el comité de liderazgo de la escuela y te excluyen de otras reuniones de planificación para otras incitativas. (INT20210108)

This staff member's comments point to how parents/caretakers/guardians positioned as white and English-speaking claimed the right to determine language use, in this case, English, in meetings and events at the school. She notes how members marked as white imposed their ideas about the programming and structure beyond parent-teacher meetings to spaces such as the school leadership team meetings, school staff meetings, and small event planning committees (INT20210108; FN20210916).

The staff member further explained that there were other groups and spaces allocated to discussing societal and educational inequities and where families described as Latino/a could participate and share their ideas about schooling and learning (FN20210916). She presented Mills City's English Learners Parent Advisory Council as an example. According to Mills City

Public Schools (2021), the council is made up of parents/guardians/caretakers with children who are identified as English Learners. The goal of this council is to "promote a network of parents of multilingual children, provide a forum to share information and advise the school district on the development of programs, policies, and budget related to English language learning" (citation withheld). Notably, the council was formed by the Office of English Learners of the Mills City School District, whose leadership team is composed of white women. A parent revealed that she attended these meetings, but over time, she became disillusioned with the structure and dynamics of the committee. She reported,

> La representante de las familias de nuestra escuela me invitó ir con ella en estas reuniones para representar la escuela y más familias Latinas como no van a las reuniones de padres en la escuela. Fui porque vi la oportunidad de...you know conocer más familias around the district y poner mi opinión para más fondos para los programas bilingües. Las primeras veces fue nice conocer a más familias Latinas aunque era raro para mí que no había otras porque este grupo es para cualquier padre that has un niño EL. Después vi que era para socializar sin ver ningún cambio o consideración de nuestras ideas para las escuelas. (INT20210328)

The parent's comments reveal several tensions regarding the positioning and functioning of the group. First, the council's meetings focused on just one of its goals, of fostering relations among families with children described as English Learners, instead of creating opportunities for families to be actively involved in the planning and development of programs for these children. Second, the parent's confusion about her witnessing only families she described as Latino/a in a school district space meant for families with children labeled as English Learners highlights how the schooling structures reify the racialization of the label, English Learner, as a marker that

corresponds to the language practices, in this case, the lack of English proficiency, of Latinx people. In relation to the previous claim, staff members' positioning of Latinx people as automatic members of groups for those marked as English Learners indicate the deep entrenchment of raciolinguistic ideologies in family-school relations, and that this reification is not limited to individuals who explicitly aim to minoritize and exclude racially minoritized groups. Even members who are advocates in schools may simultaneously reify and resist the relations of power in society. In sum, the functioning of Mills City's English Learners Parent Advisory Council suggests that school-related groups that aim to address societal inequities and encourage the leadership of families, specifically Latinx families, ultimately deny them the right to influence the nature of schooling and learning under the guise of allocated space for more socialization and expression.

Since the planning of the Mills City Dual Language School, the experiences, perspectives, and priorities of white, English-speaking families have influenced the program, relations, and structure. These families can claim ownership of making decisions for committees, initiatives, and events at the school. In relation, families marked as Latino/a were excluded from having the right to claim ownership or participation in these spaces. Further, they were relegated to groups designed for families with children labeled as English Learners, groups that strictly regulate the nature of relations that these families can have with schooling and learning.

Informing about Curriculum, Programming, and Resources

In their comments about the legitimacy of white families in the dual language program, members and affiliates of the school made remarks about *what* these families considered the goals and purposes of family relations with the school. Specifically, they reported that what white families considered as valid indicators of family relations with the school was the standard

and norm upheld in the program (FN20210928). In other words, the goals and purposes for family-school relations were those that would maintain the status and reputation of whiteness as a superior racial identity and group. Two discourses about the goals and purposes of family relations at the dual language school were consistently present in my conversations with participants. One was that family relations at the dual language school is focused on informing families about the school curriculum and programming as well as resources in the Mills City community. Although *inform* was the verb that was most frequently used by stakeholders to describe the goal of family-school relations, stakeholders used other verbs interchangeably and in place of *inform.* Notably, a director of a non-profit organization mentioned that *inform* in this case really meant "white families like dictate or declare to those families who did not have a say about what they should do if they want to be considered as engaged at the school" (INT20210612). When I asked him what he meant by "those families," the director clarified, "you know, families who are not white and are poor, they are told what they should know about the school's academics, programs, and services to be considered actively participating" (INT20210612). Thus, the director suggests that families marked as white established a certain understanding of curricula, programs, and resources as a prerequisite for minoritized families to be, at least temporarily, marked as engaged or actively participating families.

In fact, several participants emphasized the importance of families being informed about changes in curriculum and school initiatives to ameliorate an "achievement gap" (FN20210408; FN20211015). Across these interviews, I witnessed how stakeholders discussed the importance for all families to be informed of curriculum and initiatives at the school, but then, as the conversation went on, they specifically referred to racially and linguistically minoritized groups (FN20211015). For instance, an administrator specified that she thought that "families of color

and Spanish-speaking ones need to be regularly tuned into the expectations of different subjects, especially those with children in grades three and on when testing starts" (INT20210426). She went on to say that these families "can use this information to inform how they can encourage their children's English language that will help them pass tests. This will help their children be successful academically and hopefully have a good job in the future" (INT20210426). A second-grade teacher confirmed in her interview that there is an expectation to focus on families of students marked as Spanish speakers or designated as English Learners, "Yeah. Like I feel like I have to ensure that my Spanish speaking families, especially those who are designated EL know what is going on so that they can support their English because of testing will come after second grade" (INT20210427). This teacher later on discussed how she does not like having standardized testing dictate her relationship with these families but she "wants to ensure that they do not underperform in these tests as they are expected to and make sure dual language is for them too" (INT20210427).

The second-grade teacher's and administrator's comments reveal how the goal of informing families about curriculum changes and school initiatives is related to standardized testing pressures within the broader neoliberal accountability system that has pervaded education (Au, 2016). Various scholars (e.g. Annamma et al., 2017; Au, 2015; Schissel, 2019) have argued how this era of neoliberal accountability and testing functions in support of white supremacy through its ahistorical, race evasive, and meritocratic nature. The administrator's comments augment these scholars' concerns about positioning the success of language and racially minoritized groups in standardized exams as pathways to educational success and socioeconomic mobility. In other words, if these families support their children's development of norms, ideas, and practices in school, then their children have the potential to be relegated, at least temporarily,

some material and social benefits (e.g. being positioned as smart, on grade level, or English proficient). Further, the second-grade teacher's comment is reminiscent of other stakeholders' sentiments, of being aware of how standardized exams position racially and language minoritized groups under deficit lenses but still supporting families' compliance to these tests because their academic success would uphold the value and reputation of the school. That is, the value and reputation of the dual language school being an institution that symbolically integrates families marked as white and as racially minoritized (Muro, 2016).

Several educators and community affiliates reported on how school events and initiatives were decentered from social inequities and neighborhood issues that impacted families. For example, a third-grade teacher mentioned in a conversation during our lunch break that school events "just focus on doing the talk and doing school activities instead of reall:y doing something. Some actions that would help address issues that families have to deal with" (FN20210312). Later, in our conversation, the teacher specified that her comments were referencing "families of color" and "those who are low-income" (FN2021312). She explained that some of these families, specifically those within her class, have informed her of how the following issues influenced their educational and schooling experiences: immigration status, affordable housing, residential displacement, and job security (FN20210312). One community affiliate mentioned that she "wanted to help make some of the game nights and parties as fundraising efforts for a non-profit that the parents decide they care about" (INT20210316). She went on to explain how "the parent group wanted to make it very school-based. Like just about what happens inside the school." (INT20210316). Indeed, the websites of the dual language program and its parent-group only highlight activities that are very school-based. They mention

the following activities: dance parties, game nights, clothing drives, field trips, holiday concerts, and staff appreciation events (citation withheld).

Various school staff members and administrators reported on their efforts to disseminate information about community resources to families of low socioeconomic status and/or are marked as racialized Others (FN20210108; FN20210916; FN20211015). For example, an administrator and staff member both noted how they help families fill out applications to receive funding from non-profit organizations in Mills City (FN20210108; FN20210408). They also refer families to organizations that maintain food pantries, clothing drives, and free internet access (FN20210108; FN20210408). At the same time, the administrator and staff member argued that the school district should have a system of networks composed of various community groups to address the wellbeing and stability of families in a more sustainable fashion (FN20210108; FN20210408). The administrator acknowledged that "there are not systems in place to effectively address the broader issues that our families face. We try to support, but it's time-consuming and so overwhelming when you do it alone without a network of support from the district" (FN20210408). Agreeing with the administrator's remarks, the staff member stated, " Although we try to help each family one by one, it is really taxing on our time and workload. I wish the district had some routines or supports that could help our efforts be more efficient and collaborative with other people. I fear that our efforts are unsustainable" (FN20210108). Here, the administrator and staff member point out how the lack of structures, systems, and routines across the district leads to individual school members trying to support families' acquisition of social and material benefits that would alleviate societal inequities.

Acknowledging Multiple Cultures and Languages

The individualization and disregard for societal inequities are also displayed in the second goal of family-school relations that permeated my conversations with various stakeholders of the dual language school, which is to acknowledge multiple cultures and languages. Notably, this goal is part of the school's mission statement (citation withheld). However, under the demands of the state and federal department of education, the school's demographic data places families into one of the following labels described as *race/ethnicity: African American/Black, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, White, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander,* and *Multi-Race* (citation withheld). Further, the school's demographic profile omits information about the languages spoken by its members. Instead, it mentions the percentage of children who are classified as *English Learners* (citation withheld). Although this information is on a website regulated by state agencies, the school continues to utilize these labels to categorize families in their handbooks and pamphlets (FN20201118; FN20210916). In fact, one parent, who regularly participates in the parent-teacher group at the school, mentioned that "seeing the different race/ethnicity makeup that the school has on the handouts helps me focus on promoting diversity and embracing all types of heritages at the school, like that is the main goal for the group" (INT20210512). When I asked this parent what she meant by "diversity and embracing types of heritages," she said, "like celebrating different food, learning songs and dances, and types of books from other countries that families represent. We can embrace our differences." In such a way, this parent leverages the ethnoracial demographic data provided by the school and district to augment her view about the parent-teacher group primarily focusing on the promotion of heritage practices of families. Notably, heritage practices are reduced to a minute and temporarily-bounded set of experiences.

One initiative, described by several participants, highlights the problematic nature of centering diversity as a focal goal of family-school relations. For instance, two parents described how a group of parents who are part of the school leadership team advocated changing the school's name because it did not reflect the multicultural goal of the school (FN20210328). One parent mentioned that she "did not think the name was a big deal because the name of the neighborhood is there and that's cool to have" (INT20210326). Another parent explained that "fue importante para ellos ver una persona Latina en el nombre porque es una escuela de culturas pero para mí no vi la importancia. Creo que muchas de las familias que yo conozco no es algo importante. Cosas de la comunidad es más importante." (INT20210328). The parent later commented that an administrator informed this group of parents to design a voting process where the choices of the school names and the final vote would guarantee majority input from families (FN20210328). When I asked the administrator about this issue in naming the school, she smirked and replied,

> Those parents were insisting that the name was a big deal for people! So I told them to go ahead and show me a way that would show that, but I knew they couldn't and they didn't because that's not important for families of color or con bajos recursos. Like these families care more about making sure they are living well and are financially ok. (FN20200213)

The administrator later remarked that "those parents just wanted to make themselves feel good like they were doing something good for the community" (FN20200213). The administrator's and parents' descriptions of the school naming initiative provide an example of how the mere celebration of diversity can be leveraged to uphold the interests of whiteness. In this case, what was framed as a priority for the majority of families was just a priority for a few people, who

were already institutionally positioned as having the right to determine what was important for families in the school. Specifically, the above participants suggest that the school naming initiative was a way for these parents/caretakers/guardians to promote themselves as advocates of multiculturalism without explicitly addressing competing interests, perspectives, and issues among different groups of families.

Various participants from racially minoritized groups disclosed in their conversations and interviews with me that their issue was not with having moments to celebrate being a member of these groups, but instead, it was that the sole celebration masked the multiplicity of issues, histories, and relations within social groups. Two educators noted that people who identify in one group can still have different experiences with other countries and identify as members of other social groups (FN20201218; FN20210123). One of them disclosed that "although many of my families can be considered Latino and so am I. We are different too. I am Dominican and also consider myself Afro-descent and Black. Also, the way I think about my culture and background is different from my mom's too" (FN20210123). The other teacher later added,

> There are issues based on our relationships with different countries that are more important to some than others. It's good to find common ground on ones we share but also see how we can help each other. Isn't that also the good part of being part of a group? (FN20210123)

In their remarks, the teachers point out several dimensions within the process of understanding and leveraging ethnoracial categories. First, they note that people can be members of multiple ethnoracial groups and have different relations with nation-states. Second, these educators clarify that within families, members from different generations can have divergent experiences and identifications with social groups and places. Third, they claim that being part of

ethnoracial groups can be foundations for exploring different and similar experiences and relationships that are grounded in relations with societal processes and places across social scales. Both of these possibilities are necessary for humanizing ways of relating to one another, caring for one another, and building healthier lives together. In sum, these educators, similar to other affiliates' and parents' comments, note the multiple ways in which the strict adherence to ethnoracial categories excludes the histories and relations of people. Rather than masking these divergent trajectories and relations under the guise of diversity, they present difference and unity as not mutually exclusive, but instead, they can be foundations for countering the punishing mechanisms of white supremacy.

These last two sections demonstrate how enduring discourses about the goals and purposes of family-school relations at the Mills City Dual Language School reified the status and reputation of whiteness and justified the exclusion and minoritization of families positioned as racialized Others. The first goal, of informing families about curriculum and school changes, was related to pressuring language and racially minoritized groups to conform to norms and expectations of standardized exams as solutions for ameliorating educational and socioeconomic inequities. Additionally, initiatives were ahistorical, school-based, and decentered from enduring issues that minoritized families faced in the Mills City community. With regard to the second goal, acknowledging multiple cultures and languages, it served as a guise for masking the complex and historical relations that groups of people have with various social categories within and across national borders. Further, it reified white people's and the institution of schooling's claim to define and bound people’s identification with themselves and others.

Communicating through Internet-based and Digital Technologies

The goals and purposes of family-school relations deemed valuable in the dual language program were maintained through the two main legible ways of communicating with members of the school. These forms of communication were also mechanisms for white people's continual claim to ownership, membership, and participation in the programming and structures of the dual language program. One legible way of communicating for families at the school was through digital and internet-based technologies.

Although monthly school newsletters were available in printed formats, their information was less-detailed, and their dissemination was slower than their digital counterparts (FN20191128; FN20200215; FN20210906). For example, the digital monthly school newsletters contained embedded links to learning materials, class websites, and community resources. However, the printed version did not list the links or contain printed versions of the webpages. The pictures and text in the digital versions were colorful, layering the meaning and significance of the message in the newsletters' pages. Further, the monthly school newsletters were first emailed to families with email addresses. Usually, the printed versions of the newsletters were disseminated to students within 1-2 days after the digital distribution. On one occasion, when I witnessed the distribution of the printed version of the newsletters, I asked a third-grade teacher about how the school assures that everyone receives the information from the newsletters (FN20210912). She replied, "There is really not a system, more like each teacher should hold extras for absent kids. When we were fully remote teaching, I am told that they were mailed too" (FN20210912). The third-grade teacher's comment reveals the lack of structured protocols at the school for ensuring that all families receive a version of the newsletter. Even if families receive printed versions of the newsletters because of their lack of internet access and/or digital

technologies, they will obtain less information from the school due to the missing information from linked webpages and features.

When I asked how the dual language school ensures that time-sensitive and extremely important information about the school is communicated to families, one administrator assured me that they reach all families by making sure that a staff member individually calls families who qualified for free and reduced lunch (INT20210426). She said that "those who do not take action based on the information from the newsletters and calls are careless or too dependent on the school to hand guide them through every little thing" (INT20210426). After these conversations with the administrator, I conversed with the staff member who made the individual calls to caretakers/parents/guardians about important or time-sensitive school matters. In one of our conversations, she stated "Puede ser muy apurado y estresante. Algunas veces solo dejo recados porque no están en casa la hora que llamo. También algunos reciben los mensajes muy tarde, después de un deadline" (FN20210521). The administrator's and staff member's comments reveal how the current protocols in place for communicating with families do not ensure that all families can access important information about the school in a timely fashion. The staff member's comments highlight the lack of personnel, conflicting schedules, and time constraints involved in the process of calling families, in particular, those of low-socioeconomic status. Regardless of institutional limitations and families' low-socioeconomic status and wealth, the administrator, like other staff members and educators, expect all families to be knowledgeable of current events and new changes at the school. Families who are unable to comply with these demands are viewed as not being responsible and are blamed for their situation.

Several parents informed me during their interviews that they are able to communicate with various teachers at the school through a text messaging application. One parent explained

that information about the application is sent to each caretaker's/parent's/guardian's phone number and student email addresses (INT20210320). However, she warned that "aunque tienes un teléfono tienes que saber cómo download la cosa y seguir las instrucciones. No es tan obvio si tú no tienes experiencia con las apps del teléfono" (INT20210320). In fact, the parent elaborated that a staff member would ask for her help in helping other parents/caretakers/guardians who had a cellphone but needed guidance in downloading the application (INT20210320). She reported, "Se que tuve la oportunidad de saber cómo trabajar con computadora pero muchas familias de bajos recursos no tienen la oportunidad. Pero me hace raro que la escuela usa esto en vez de otras maneras como Facebook que padres usan" (INT20210320). Another parent explained, "Bueno el Facebook las personas saben usar más que el app que nos mandan usar. Y ese ni es tan fácil para gente y no siempre usan tecnología. Deben preguntarnos cuál es más fácil." (INT20210420). In such a way, this parent suggests that the dual language program ask families about the forms of technology that are most accessible for them to use rather than continuing to use an application that is not informed by their preferences and experiences. Until then, and as suggested by one parent, families with limited access to technologies and internet access will continue to build social networks as they navigate dominant modes of communication demanded by their school so that they can receive information about their children's education and schooling, and possibly be considered as informed and responsible caretakers/parents/guardians.

Communicating in One, Correct form of Language

The other related dominant form of communication aimed at maintaining the naturalized goals and purposes of family-school relations was expressing in one, correct form of language. The separation, hierarchy, and boundedness of languages were promoted across the school's committees, groups, and forums that involved families. For instance, meetings for the parent-

teacher group, sub-group committees, and school leadership team were conducted primarily in English when they were held in person (FN20200109). When these meetings were held virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic, they were mostly held in English, except for the ones held at the beginning of the school year (FN20210915). A parent who often led parent-teacher group meetings informed me "that there was always at least one Spanish language translator for those who needed that extra support and careful attention. Also, the materials given out are also in Spanish." (INT20200109). This parent's framing of caretakers /guardians/parents who desired the information in these meetings in Spanish needing extra support and attention suggests that those who preferred Spanish language use in these spaces are positioned as people deviant from the norm.

Although there was at least one person who translated in Spanish for parents/guardians/caretakers when I attended several parent-teacher-meetings in person, the translator and the small group of parents who preferred Spanish language use sat in the back of the room, isolated from the other members (FN20191213; FN20200109). Also, after one of these parent-teacher meetings, the Spanish language translator disclosed his uncertainty about the accuracy of his translation, "I am not sure sometimes if I translated the right thing because sometimes, they talk in segments or too low to hear" (FN20200109). A staff member confirmed that it was too hard to understand for those who wanted to communicate in Spanish during the meeting and sat with the translator. The vague and confusing communication led her to stop attending these meetings (FN20200226). She shared that "esas reuniones me dejaron confundida de lo que pasa donde yo trabajo! Paré de ir! No podía oír lo que decían. Prefería obtener la información antes para tratar de a los que hablan en español en otras maneras" (FN20200226). In her remarks, the staff member also disclosed that she tries to find out in advance the topics and

content discussed during parent-teacher meetings so that she can try to relay this information to families who prefer to communicate in Spanish. Together, the experiences of the staff member and translator demonstrate how even personnel, who are institutionally tasked with cultivating relations and interactions among families and school staff members, are pressured to conform and navigate the hierarchy of English and the minoritization of Spanish. In their attempts to contest dominant forms of languaging, these stakeholders attempt to find other approaches for disseminating information to families who prefer to learn and communicate in Spanish.

As suggested in previous sections, texts, whether digital or paper-versions, were restrictive in the nature of communicating information to families. In regards to languaging, the placement of text in these resources promoted the hierarchy, separation, and boundedness of languages. First, the webpages that pertained to the dual language program or the entire Mills City school district displayed English versions of information or messages on the top or right side of the webpages (citation withheld). At worst, some of these webpages are entirely in English, disregarding other heritage languages primarily used by the Mills City community. For instance, the webpage for the dual language program's parent-teacher group is entirely in English (citation withheld). Although there is an option to change the language of the webpage to Spanish, the link to click and change to the Spanish version of this webpage is at the very bottom of the webpage. Second, the newsletters or pamphlets about the dual language program or the entire Mills City school district are primarily presented in English, with options of obtaining these resources in other languages (citation withheld). According to a staff member, "Muchas veces hay versión de español atrás de los recursos pero si no, tienes que hablar con la oficina de la escuela para que te den en otro idioma." (INT20210328). In this excerpt, the staff member suggests that families who prefer informational resources in a language other than English often

have to actively self-advocate for their preferences by reaching out to staff members who work in a school or district main office. Along with the translation services in the preceding paragraph, the sporadic availability of resources in Spanish in the dual language program reifies the erasure of other languages that are not marked as Spanish or English.

Along with these dominant expectations for languaging, several parents noted how the standardization of languages was promoted through the exclusion of varieties within languages. One parent shared that she uses some words in Spanish "que son de Guatemala" and gets confused when other words are used in place of them at meetings in school (INT20210320). She also mentioned that "es raro que no están presente maneras de hablar Guatemalteco porque ya mayoría de nosotros Latinos aquí somos de Guatemala" (INT20210320). In her remark, this parent points out how the varieties of Spanish are connected to the different experiences that people have with nation-states, and their heritage and national identification. In this case, the parent notes that there are specific words in Spanish that resonate with what she describes as Guatemalan culture but are not leveraged in school meetings regardless of the demographic makeup within the Latinx community at the school. Further, another parent explained that the exclusion of other forms of language manifests in what she described as "school language" (FN20210512). She explained, "It's like they expect you to know the lingo of school like what PTA stands for or like PD. Even if I prefer communicating in English, I don't even know how to respond to what the school wants." (FN20210512). In such a way, this parent reveals the varieties of languages by connecting ways of languaging to specific knowledge forms from disciplinary fields, in this case, education. She also highlights how the institution of schooling expects families to communicate in this form of languaging, one that has historically privileged

and is influenced by the practices of families marked as white and from high- socioeconomic status.

In sum, the two legible ways of communicating for families to interact with other members of the dual language program exacerbated white people's ownership of the functioning and programming of the school as well as perpetuated the value and prestige that comes with the status of whiteness. Under these dominant forms of communication, families from racially minoritized status and low-socioeconomic status have less access to information related to the learning and development of their children at the school. Their ways of communicating are erased, restricted, or grouped together, relegating histories and knowledge forms as objects that the institution of schooling can mold to benefit whiteness. Families who do not conform to the legible ways of communication that privilege whiteness are blamed for their absence in school initiatives and events and are positioned as requiring exceptional support.

Discussion

The discourses, accompanied structures and practices, related to family-school relations at the Mills City Dual Language School upheld norms, values, and logics that form the *ideological architecture of whiteness as property in educational policy* (Aggarwal 2016). Specifically, the discourses, accompanied structures and practices, about family-school relations at the Mills City Dual Language School reified (1) notions of embodied inferiority within racially minoritized groups, (2) individualistic orientations toward educational inequities, and (3) their disentanglement from societal issues to cement white supremacy. By asking myself Levinson et al.'s (2009) question, "who plans what for whom and how?," I noticed how the following five discourses regulated family-school relations in the dual language program: (1) white, English-speaking families dominate, (2) informing about curriculum, programming, and

resources, (3) acknowledging multiple cultures and languages, (4) communicating through internet-based and digital technologies, and (5) communicating through one, correct form of language. Through these discourses at the bilingual program, I witnessed how multiple practices, narratives, and structures followed the property function of whiteness, to exacerbate or exclude benefits to people based on their racialized positioning.

Since its initial development stages, the dual language program centered on the preferences, practices, and experiences of families marked as white, English-dominant. To garner support from these families, the Mills City school district emphasized the psychological and economic benefits of bilingualism and multiculturalism (Callahan & Gándara, 2014). In such a way, the language practices, experiences, and knowledge forms of racially minoritized groups became for the use and enjoyment of white people. They could leverage the learning and experiences in the bilingual program to encourage further social and economic advancement in a globalized racist-capitalist society. Extending Chávez-Moreno's (2021a) claims, stemming from Ruíz (1984) about language-as-white-resource, I suggest that it is also about entire heritage and cultural groups becoming white resources, because of the knowledge forms and ways of being that intersect with the ways that languaging is commodified. Further, the presence of white people maintained the status and reputation of the program as a renowned program, in contrast to the deficit and historical positioning of bilingual programs (e.g. transitional bilingual education) with predominantly racially minoritized families (Flores & García, 2017). Notably, there are no other bilingual programs in Mills City School District, which further marks the program as a valuable enrichment program (Valdez et al., 2016) and highlights the denial of racially minoritized groups having the right to learn in other bilingual program models.

The goals and purposes of family-school relations that were framed by educational stakeholders reified whiteness as the superior racial group by presenting white people's practices, experiences, and priorities as indicative of responsible, informed, and attentive attributes. This positioning of families resonates with Leonardo's and Broderick's (2011) claims about schooling as an institution maintaining the status of white people as the smartest, most capable beings. Additionally, families were expected to support ahistorical, individualized school initiatives. School events and programs involving families ignored the societal inequities experienced by families and prevalent issues in the Mills City community. In relation, families were expected to have access to technology, internet, and language in standardized ways. Throughout all these above practices and structures, the dynamicism, historicity, and relational aspects of racially minoritized groups' languaging, social positioning, and membership to social groups were bounded and ignored (Chaparro, 2020; García et al., 2021; García & Solorza, 2020). Consequently, racially minoritized families who did not conform to the idealized behaviors and norms expected in the dual language program were relegated under deficit labels and blamed for their lack of educational success and social mobility (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Chávez-Moreno, 2021b). Building on Donnor's (2013) claims about the entire U.S. public education system being white property, Chávez-Moreno (2021a) reports on how a high school dual language bilingual program in a U.S. Midwestern state served as white property. In relation to Donnor's (2013) and Chávez-Moreno's (2021a) arguments, the dominant discourses about family-school relations that permeate governmental educational policies and the contemporary context of the Mills City Dual Language School normalize family-U.S. school relations as white property.

Throughout the negotiation and navigation of the dominant discourses, associated structures and practices, related to family relations with the Mills City Dual Language School, educational stakeholders (e.g. families, staff members, and administrators) attempted to contest the minoritization of families. Parents created social networks to obtain information about the education and schooling of their children despite the inaccessible and exclusive forms of communication at the bilingual program. Staff members and administrators reached out to caretakers/parents/guardians about resources in the Mills City community that can support their wellbeing and socioeconomic stability. Notably, parents reallocated their time and energy to other personal and professional matters when they discontinued and refused to attend school-related initiatives that bounded their forms of expression and roles as members of the program. Their experiences suggest that the refusal to engage in particular acts, groups, or physical spaces can be modes of self-preservation and survival in order to continue to navigate hegemonic white institutions. Ultimately, the individual ways that educational stakeholders contest while they reify logics and practices perpetuating white supremacy show that educational inequities are not due to the failings of any particular person. Rather, the problem stems from the collective workings of institutions, policies, and practices across society that uphold norms, values, and behaviors to cement white supremacy and racist-capitalism (Aggarwal, 2016; Harris, 1993).

Although bilingual educational programs are often relegated as programs that sustain the cultural and linguistic practices of minoritized youth as they achieve educational success, the institution of schooling itself, even in a place that tries to promote expansive forms of learning, will ensure the reification of racist, classist, and linguicized practices and structures. Even though individual staff members such as educators, administrators, and community affiliates may care about the development and wellbeing of families, they are often confined to seemingly

permanent schooling structures, like the ones mentioned in this chapter. One starting point for what Harris (1993) refers to as "dismantling the actual and expected privilege that has attended to white skin" (p.1779) can be for schools, especially its members marked as white and from high-socioeconomic status, to situate themselves with collectives, who are part of neighborhoods and who are actively committed to addressing material conditions impeding the wellbeing and success of fellow neighbors. Part of this work with collectives would also entail those marked as white encouraging the redistribution of their material, legal, and social benefits. At large, the complete dismantling and reimagining of the purpose and nature of schooling must occur, one in which institutions and deficit, oppressive forms of knowledge and practices are positioned as issues instead of individual bodies as problems.

Conclusion

Instead of reiterating the points I've made about the institutional and legal contexts of family relations with two-way dual language bilingual education, I use this section to refer back to the particular interaction with Beatrice from the first page of this chapter, which has been a catalyst to the questions and wonderings that inspired this chapter. In doing so, I try to honor my commitment to leveraging writing as a form of learning and building future trajectories of learning. My analysis of the practices, structures, and logics that permeated the Mills City Dual Language School helped me understand the enormity and complexity behind the process in which institutions, policies, and actors across different scales work together to form the raciolinguicized positioning of Beatrice as "the voice of Guatemala." As I wrote about the idealized practices and structures linked to the discourses about family relations at the dual language program, I remembered Beatrice's attendance at several school events and groups. I recalled her rushing into meetings in her medical uniform and equipment, later informing me that

she was coming from work. At the end of the meetings, she would help other caretakers and families who did not know how to download certain phone applications or access email. I was reminded of how another parent informed me that Beatrice helped her set up a Zoom link through her work account. And now that the low number of parents marked as a racialized Others has dwindled in meetings, events, and initiatives at the school, I realize that Beatrice stood out even more after these changes in participation structures. It seems that the raciolinguicized marker that the institution of schooling relegated to Beatrice was a way to tag her as a racially minoritized parent/caretaker/guardian who was exceptional and unique to justify the exclusion and minoritization of other families from ownership or membership in school spaces and material resources. In a way, I think Beatrice's refusal to continue to conform to expectations and behaviors marked by this label was a way to acknowledge and commit to issues, practices, and experiences of various groups to which she belongs. Further, it seems that her refusal signifies her commitment to issues that are directly related to herself and as a member of her family.

I do not use this dissertation as an opportunity to deeply express my experiences and interactions with Beatrice because I am still ruminating on how to weave those moments into a narrative that will not ultimately perpetuate stories of just pain and trauma (Tuck & Yang, 2014). Due to this decision to pause my process of solely writing about Beatrice and wanting to somehow show my learning still from my interactions with her, I wove some interactions with her in ways that would highlight the main argument of the chapter. Although I do not unpack the raciolinguicized label of "the voice of Guatemala" in this dissertation, the next chapter unpacks the raciolinguicized labels of *English speakers* and *Spanish speakers*, which strongly permeated the experiences and relations that families had with the Mills City Dual Language School. In the

next chapter, I examine how these labels were consistently leveraged by various educational stakeholders, specifically staff members, educators, and administrators, to describe families, specifically those classified as Hispanic, at the Mills City Dual Language School. Through these stakeholders' and families' negotiation, I report on how they reify, contest, and reimagine forms of languaging, knowledge forms, and being associated with these labels.

CHAPTER SIX: Negotiating Raciolinguicized Labels within Family-School Relations for Two-Way Dual Language Bilingual Education

The previous chapter reported how discourses about family-school relations at a two-way dual language bilingual program upheld enduring, dominant logics that justify educational inequities and the maldistribution of wealth and resources in a globalized, racist-capitalist society. As I witnessed how various educational stakeholders made sense of these discourses, they continuously used two raciolinguicized labels to describe families, *English speaking* and *Spanish speaking* families. Stakeholders used these labels interchangeably to refer to families marked as white and as Latino/a or of Latin American descent. Further, they used them to refer to families as using one standardized national/colonial form of language, either in English or Spanish. Given my previous schooling and teaching experiences, as well as my reading of studies in bilingual education from various scholars (e.g. Chaparro, 2019; Hernández, 2017; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009), I was expecting to witness the presence of these dominant categories within the institution of schooling. However, after a couple of months of participating at the school, I realized that I mistakenly assumed that stakeholders' interchangeable use of the above linguistic categories to refer to families marked as white or Latino/a/x would directly match how these families were described within institutional documents, routines, and procedures.

Toward the end of the Fall of 2019, an administrator of the Mills City Dual Language School gave me access to a folder shared among school staff, where official school documents about students and families were stored. She welcomed me to look over the documents for my research and to use them as a reference when I was substitute teaching or making phone calls to families as a volunteer. After quickly skimming through the various subfolders, I decided to deeply examine the folders that were labeled as class lists and grade levels. There, I noticed how multiple labels were attached to families and their contact information. This form of

categorization was startling to me because I was not accustomed to seeing families, as entire units, being categorized under ethnoracial and linguistic labels, among many others (e.g. disability, free and reduced lunch, gender). In the official school documents at the dual language school, families marked as white were classified as English speaking, which was aligned to how stakeholders described these families during conversations, events, and meetings. However, the documents placed families marked as Hispanic, who were usually described as Latino/a or of Latin American descent by stakeholders, under a variety of linguistic labels. Along with the Hispanic label, these families were classified as *English speaking, Spanish speaking, or Spanish speaking EL*. When I asked administrators, along with other educators, whether they were aware that the families they were generally referring as Spanish speaking or as Latino/a were described differently in institutional documents, they admitted that they knew of these multiple classifications for families marked as Hispanic and expressed that they were consistently struggling to make sense of them in their everyday experiences. In short, families marked as white were consistently relegated as English speaking, while there were variations in the linguistic classifications for families marked as Hispanic.

Although a dominant expectation within the two-way dual language immersion model is to have an equal number of families marked as speakers of the majoritized language and as speakers of the heritage language and whose classifications would be linked neatly to ethnoracial groups, this was not the case at the school, nor do I think it is really the case across many schools in general. As many studies have reported (e.g. de Jong & Bearse, 2014; Freire & Delavan, 2021; Morita-Mullaney et al., 2020), students who enroll in two-way dual language bilingual education tend to communicate across many language varieties and regard themselves beyond or in contrast to ethnoracial labels. Such studies have pointed out that in their efforts to balance the

number of majoritized and minoritized language speakers, two-way dual language bilingual programs often focus on the recruitment of children marked as white and/or English speaking (de Jong & Bearse, 2014; Freire & Delavan, 2021; Morita-Mullaney et al., 2020).Therefore, the multiplicity of raciolinguicized labels at the Mills City Dual Language School do not just reflect the power relations and practices of the local school and neighborhood, but also, they are related to historical, sociopolitical processes that have produced these labels. Specifically, these categories are connected to broader constructions of race, language use, and personhood used to mark racially minoritized groups as having no legibility within a globalized racist-capitalist state.

This form of racialization is heavily organized by raciolinguistic ideologies, such as the relationship between monoglossic ideologies and ideologies of languagelessness (Rosa, 2016; Flores et al., 2020). Monoglossic language ideologies idealize the sole use of a standardized language variety, while ideologies of languagelessness mark racially minoritized people as possessing no language (Rosa; 2016; Flores et al., 2020). As suggested by my essentialization of ethnoracial and linguistic labels for families in the dual language program on the first page of this chapter, multiple linguistic codes linked to the ethnoracial marker of Hispanic can be naturalized by schools and its members, further cementing ethnoracial and linguistic classifications of white/Latino/a/Hispanic and English/Spanish as rigid norms. Accordingly, this chapter aims to examine and interrogate the various raciolinguicized subject positions that are designated to families marked as Hispanic at the Mills City Dual Language School. I regard the labels (Spanish-speaking, English-speaking, EL) as subject positions to highlight their political and historical nature, and I consider them as mechanisms used by a nation-state to govern individuals and groups.

Within this chapter, I first briefly describe the different legal and institutional processes that have produced the raciolinguicized subject positions related to the ethnoracial group, Hispanic. I use this historical overview as an entry point for historicizing how raciolinguistic ideologies, in particular, monoglossic language ideologies and ideologies of languagelessness, inform contemporary depictions of the language practices and the relations that families marked as Hispanic have with bilingual programs.[14] Following this overview, I report on how these ideologies permeate how a dual language program, as a hegemonic perceiving entity, leverages the various raciolinguicized subject positions to govern the types of relations that families marked as Hispanic can have with the school and its members. After, I present portraits of families marked as Hispanic but with a different linguistic designation (e.g. Spanish speaker, English speaker, English Learner) to discuss how these families negotiated and contested these categorizations imposed by the institution of schooling. Ultimately, these portraits demonstrate how, irrespective of linguistic designation, families' language practices, knowledge forms, relations, and sense of selves are positioned by structures, policies, and practices in deficit ways to justify and reinforce educational inequities. At the same time, these portraits highlight how families present expansive ways of connecting and learning from people across social groups and places, and framing language practices and subjectivities beyond dominant notions of family-school relations.

[14] I use Hispanic to refer to families' ethnoracial designation by the institution of schooling and to align with the nature of classification of linguistic codes imposed on these families by the same institution. I use Latino/a/x in comments from participants, cited scholars, and language within specific documents/research studies/literature. Therefore, this chapter presents a limited discussion about the terms used for this ethnoracial group since it does not discuss the latest ongoing debate about the usage of Latine, a gender-neutral form of Latina/o and that is consistent with the gender-neutral Spanish letter, “e.”

Racializing Hispanic, Spanish Language, and Spanish/English Bilingualism

As reported in chapter 2 (literature review), racial hierarchies emerged alongside the formation of nation-states and colonization to socially group people and mark them as inferior or superior beings based on European exceptionalism and whiteness. This process also relegated language as a bounded feature that can be used to justify, cement, and designate the superiority or inferiority of individuals and groups of people (Flores, 2014). Focusing on the U.S., governmental institutions have classified groups of people to designate them as white, or as racialized Others. Mora's (2014) overview of the ethnoracial category, Hispanic, reports on how government officials, media, and activists, each representing different interests, negotiated to legalize the label. She notes how these stakeholders agreed to bound the category around ambiguous similarities in culture and values, an ambiguity that did help expand the pan-ethnic composition. For activists, there was hesitation about directly linking this category to the Spanish language. Indeed, Mora (2014) explains how politicians, census officials, and media groups continue to use *Spanish-speaking* interchangeably with *Hispanic*. As an example, Mora (2014) describes how in 1969, under the Nixon administration, the *Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American-Affairs* was renamed the *Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People,* to "ensure that federal government programs reach Spanish-speaking Americans and to recommend the creation of new programs to respond to the needs of Hispanic Americans" (p. 110).[15] Notably, various scholars (e.g. Darder, 2004; Haney-López, 2003; Pérez-Torres, 2000) have reported how the Spanish language is used to racialize and racially discriminate people

[15] The term, Latino/a, emerged nearly as a nearly synonymous term meant to reject elevating Spanish ancestry, but this term is also significantly marked and bounded by the Spanish-language (Chávez-Moreno, 2021c; Mora, 2014).

designated as Hispanic.[16] Specifically, monoglossic language ideologies that privilege a standardized form of English linked to Americanness and whiteness have been used to justify the maldistribution of rights and resources to people due to their use of Spanish.

The U.S. educational system has leveraged monoglossic language ideologies to justify the educational inequities of racially minoritized youth. In particular, the education system often marks students described as Hispanic under labels of English Learner or Limited English Proficient as an indication of not being proficient in an idealized standardized English language and needing to separate or completely give up the Spanish language. These labels began to be heavily enforced in the late 1960s as part of the high-stakes and neoliberal accountability movement in education, a system aimed to track and bound racially minoritized students' educational trajectories (Flores & García, 2017; Lissovoy, 2013). This movement also influenced the development and functioning of bilingual programs. In bilingual education, monoglossic language ideologies were leveraged in various, insidious ways. One way was to justify the use of the heritage language, in this case, Spanish, of children described as Hispanic as a mere tool for developing proficiency in an idealized standardized English language variety and thus become a mono-languaged subject (Flores, 2016b). The other way was to enforce children's bounded and separate use of two standardized colonial/national languages, Spanish and English, in additive programs like two-way dual language immersion. In additive programs, children are expected to become bi-languaged subjects, proficient in two standardized national/colonial languages (Flores, 2016b). Simultaneously, ideologies of languagelessness (Rosa, 2016) are utilized in these programs to delegitimize the dynamic bilingualism of students designated as Hispanic and

[16] Although the focus of this historical review is to report on how U.S. has racialized and discriminated people marked as Hispanic through and with language, people have formed relations, collectiveness, and ways of survival under these terms and forms of communication.

enforce upon them the expectation that they must compartmentalize their language practices into specific standardized language varieties of English and Spanish. In other words, ideologies of languagelessness suggest that students classified as Hispanic do not possess proficiency in any language, and therefore, additive bilingual programs will aid them in becoming proficient in two standardized colonial/national languages and acquiring them in a linear fashion (; 2016; Flores et al., 2020).

Monoglossic language ideologies and ideologies of languagelessness permeate the positioning and experiences of families of two-way dual language bilingual programs. They have reinforced dualisms concerning language, culture, and identity. Scanlan and Palmer (2009) and Chaparro (2019) discuss how dimensions of race, ethnicity, and language do not extend beyond *Latinx/white or Latino/Anglo* classifications in two-way dual language bilingual programs. These scholars claim that these bounded classifications fail to capture the complexity of families' language practices and lived experiences. In particular, they note how families positioned as white are presented as possessors of idealized standardized English and capable of becoming bi-languaged subjects, while families described as Latinx/Latino are users of an inferior version of the Spanish language. Similarly, Chávez-Moreno (2021b) describes how educators questioned the intelligence and educational background of families presented as Latinx due to their Spanish language. In her efforts to contest bounded, deficit-notions of language and identity in two-way dual language bilingual education, Chaparro (2019) examines how children described as white, or Latinx were positioned by parents and teachers to argue that evaluations of children's competence and linguistic ability were influenced by raced and classed positionings.

Extending the claims from the above scholars, the following section seeks to unravel the dimensions of race, class, ethnicity, and language that are embedded in the various

raciolinguicized subject positions (English Learner, Spanish speaker, English speaker) that govern the types of relations that families marked as Hispanic can have with a two-way dual language bilingual program. Specifically, I highlight how ideologies of languagelessness and monoglossic language ideologies influence the imposition of these raciolinguicized subject positions on families described as Hispanic. As Aparicio (2007) explains, the ethnoracial group of Hispanic is "made up of people from various Latin American countries with multiple languages, socioeconomic classes, immigrant statuses, phenotypes, and cultural practices" (p.39). In such a way, the following sections focus on families institutionally classified as Hispanic because these members inherently showcase the complexity of race, ethnicity, language, and identity within this social group, thereby countering binary orientations toward ethnoracial categories. Further, in the following sections, I present families as groups (Nightingale, 2011, 2013; Morales & Harris, 2014), and describe how each family, as a collective and as members of a collective, negotiates and resists the following categorizations, English Learner, Spanish speaker, English speaker. What immediately follows is an overview of how the Mills City Dual Language program, as a hegemonic perceiving entity, uses the above raciolinguicized subject positions, grounded in ideologies of languagelessness and monoglossic language ideologies, to govern the educational and schooling experiences of families.

Designations of Families as Hispanic, Spanish Speaker, English Speaker, or Spanish EL

As part of the neoliberal high-stakes accountability era in education, federal and state regulations mandate schools to track and classify their members under many categories, some of which pertain to ethnoracial and language groupings (Au, 2015; Schissel, 2019). At the Mills City Dual Language School, the classification of families begins when parents/caretakers/guardians enroll their children at the school, as a result of being picked

through the kindergarten lottery or from a waiting list of families interested in enrolling their children at the school. According to a school administrator, "families fill out an enrollment form and language survey that talks about their backgrounds and languages" (INT20200210). In the form, in compliance with the state department of education classifications, families are supposed to select only one of the following choices under race: African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, White, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, and Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic (FN20200115). The above administrator commented, "there are no other opportunities for families during their time with us to change how they describe themselves in ethnic-racial lines" (FN20200115).

The language survey asks parents/caretakers/guardians to respond to the following question, "what language did your child first understand and speak?" (FN20200115). A staff member clarified that the choices are narrowed down to "English o Spanish. Si el niño habla cualquier otro idioma ponemos que hablan el inglés" (INT20200612). A child is coded as a Spanish speaker and potentially an English Learner to later take a state-adopted language screener (FN20200115). The student's score on the screener determines if she/he/they obtain the label, English Learner. Regardless of the English Learner label, children and their families retain the label of English and Spanish speaker throughout their time in the program. The above staff member acknowledged that this "proceso resulta en que los Hispanos son los que están marcados como ELs o que hablan español y el resto de los niños son los que hablan el inglés" (INT20200612).

As demonstrated by the student enrollment process at the dual language school, families navigate routines and practices, influenced by racialized and raciolinguistic ideologies that bound their sense of selves, language practices, and social relations. Families can't identify under

multiple ethnoracial categories or decline from placing themselves under any of these labels. Further, they have to conform to an English and Spanish binary. Families who speak another language other than English or Spanish do not have the choice to present themselves as speakers of other languages and are positioned as English speakers. The identification of Spanish speakers is officially designated as a matter that pertains to families marked as Hispanic. In such a way, languages are attached, denied, and/or available to specific ethnoracial groups. The information that is collected by staff members and administrators is then used to form profiles of children and their families that are grouped by grade level. Under these profiles, for their entire time as members of the dual language program, families are marked as English or Spanish speakers and remain in their originally selected ethnoracial category.

Divergent Considerations of Who is an English Learner

If a child is classified as an English Learner, this label is attached to the Spanish speaker label within the student and family profile, until he/she/they reach a passing score on a language standardized test, the ACCESS exam. Despite the continual tracking of English Learners within school documents, school staff members' and educators' descriptions of who should be considered an English Learner or non-English Learner varied widely, and were temporally and contextually dependent.

For instance, various teachers described how they had students classified as English speakers, but they would consider these students as unofficial English Learners due to their perceived lack of appropriate language in English (FN20200213; INT20200612; INT20210313). A second-grade teacher commented how she "and other teachers make small literacy groups with students who are officially classified as English Learners and those who needed support in academic English but were English speakers" (FN20210313; INT20210313). A third-grade

teacher and staff member described how students who are officially designated as Spanish speakers but are not determined to be English Learners through the language screeners are included in small literacy groups composed of students labeled as English Learners (INT20210416; INT20210514). The staff member noted that the reasoning for this grouping was "usually because these students speak a lot of Spanish at home and their parents speak mostly in Spanish so their English really needs to be reinforced." (INT20210416). Other educators and staff members explained that some students officially designated as English Learners are placed in small literacy groups with students classified as English speakers (FN20201108; FN20210216; INT20210514). One fourth-grade teacher reported that "there are many students who have not passed the language test to exit the EL label, but they perform better in English reading exams in school than the Spanish ones, so they end up being grouped with English speakers for reading groups" (INT20210514). When I probed about why these students remained ELs, this teacher posited that "these students probably are just still not there yet in grade level and maybe other languages are affecting their literacy skills" (INT20210514). Another teacher speculated that "these students probably are just not on grade level in both so that affects them exiting as EL you know" (INT20210516).

The multiple and divergent evaluations among educators, administrators, and staff members at the dual language program about the languages, literacies, and groupings of students labeled as English Learners were heavily dependent on discourses of languagelessness. Stakeholders' justifications for perceiving students classified as Hispanic labeled as English speakers as lacking academic English are reinforced by the discourse of languagelessness. Despite their designation as English speakers, students were marked as not being competent in a perceived standardized variety of English, along with not being competent in a minoritized

language. In such a way, discourses of languagelessness reified educators' decisions to place these students in literacy groups with students labeled as English Learners. These discourses also influenced how students, who are labeled as English Learners but receive higher scores on English literacy exams than Spanish literacy exams, are allowed to participate in small literacy groups with students classified as English speakers. Overall, my conversations with various educators and staff members of the school suggested that although they did not believe that the English Learner label accurately reflected students' language and literacy practices, they still relied on this label for their instructional decisions and compliance with government mandates.

Regimenting Routines and Structures for Families

The terms, English speakers and Spanish speakers, were dominant raciolinguicized subject positions present within routines, structures, and procedures related to families of the dual language school. Specifically, they helped structure family-school communicative procedures, school and district-wide events, and the composition of each class. In terms of family-school communication, the approaches for sending school documents and calling families were structured around the English speaker and Spanish speaker categories. Two staff members disclosed how they had to group newsletters, flyers, and letters under two piles, one for Spanish speakers and the other for English speakers (INT20210521; INT20210613). In fact, they had to make sure that the pile for Spanish speakers had Spanish translations of English documents and the pile for English speakers had English versions of documents before distributing these documents to each class.

Although many documents had messages with English and Spanish translations, the above staff members disclosed that they were not expected to ensure that families had access to documents in both languages. One of them justified this lack of expectation by stating that "it

might be too much for families to receive information in two languages" (INT20210613). Similarly, family call lists to relay school-wide information were separated under English and Spanish speaker categories (INT20210521; INT20210613). The other staff member revealed that she was the one responsible for "haciendo las llamadas para las familias que hablan el español y la secretaria era la que hacía para los de inglés" (INT20210521). In sum, the dual language program distributed information and communicated with families in ways that were bounded to a standardized language variety. Attempting to make sense of this communicative regimentation, staff members referred to monoglossic language ideologies to suggest that families lacked the competence to understand multiple standardized language varieties and dynamic forms of languaging.

The dominance of the raciolinguicized terms, English speakers and Spanish speakers, and related ideologies, regulated the participation and composition of the classroom, school, and district events. Teachers across grade levels informed me that class lists for the subsequent grade level are heavily influenced by families' language designation (FN20200213; FN20201119; FN20210415). For instance, a first-grade teacher commented that "teachers meet at the end of the school year with the principal and coaches to determine how many types of families can be in each new class setting" (INT20210514). When I asked this teacher to explain what she meant by types of families, she clarified that "that it means how many of each language label and also disability marker can be in each class, especially language. We don't want one teacher having too many of one over the other" (INT20210514). Later on, the first-grade teacher explained that the rationale was "mainly because we do not want some teachers having too many Spanish speakers and then having so much stress of supporting these kids who need support in both languages" (INT20210514). Concurring with the separation of families by English and Spanish speaker

categories at the school, a third-grade teacher stated, "It helps to separate the families for virtual online parent-teacher events to make sure that the Spanish speakers get extra support to really understand what is happening here since usually many can't really read or write " (INT20210416). Additionally, a second-grade teacher remarked that "it gives us time to make sure that Spanish speakers know what is going on because their language tends to be limited" (INT20210416). The change to virtual parent-teacher conferences occurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the school district office mandating that the dual language program conduct virtual parent-teacher events in English and Spanish (FN20201006). In summary, the monoglossic configuration of classroom and school-related groups reinforced discourses of languagelessness that justified Spanish speaking families needing support in academics, language learning, and understanding the nuances of schooling.

Within the larger neoliberal accountability system in the U.S., the institution of schooling regulates the educational experiences and relations of families in schools. Accordingly, the contemporary context of the Mills City Dual Language School, its structures, practices, and procedures bound, surveil, and classify families to subject positions, heavily grounded in racialized and raciolinguistic ideologies like ideologies of languagelessness and monoglossic language ideologies. These classifications influence perceptions of families' language practices, knowledge forms, and access to physical and social spaces. Following this section, I report how families classified as Hispanic negotiated the above subject positions and how racialized and raciolinguistic ideologies interacted with their experiences and relations.

Portraits of Families classified as Hispanic, English Speaker, Spanish Speaker EL

Through families' construction of their subjectivities, they negotiate, challenge, and expand relations, forms of thought, and practices connected to raciolinguicized and racialized

ideologies and subject positions that permeate schools. Drawing on a feminist poststructuralist orientation of identity construction (Butler, 1993; Weedon, 1999), complemented with the notion of collective subjectivity (Nightingale, 2011; Morales & Harris, 2014), families, as collectives and as members of these collectives, at the Mills City Dual Language School negotiated, reified, and contested dominant norms about their roles, knowledge forms, and practices related to the raciolinguicized subject positions, *English Learner, Spanish speaker, and English speaker*, heavily anchored by ideologies of languagelessness and monoglossic language ideologies. Through narrative portraits, influenced by Park's narrative snapshots (2012) and Lawrence-Lightfoot's and Davis's portraiture (1997), I report on how three families institutionally classified as Hispanic negotiate these subject positions, related practices, and discourses as they make sense of their relations with school(ing) and define themselves with language and ethnoracial groups.

These narrative portraits, primarily informed by two interview transcripts, field notes, and memos, highlight how families collectively negotiated race-class power relations and how this process presents divergent trajectories, relations, and experiences among individual members of these collectives. Further, I regard these portraits as composed of broad and very light, expressive strokes, given the analytical focus of this chapter, my limited, referenced interactions, and page constraints (see chapter 7 for a portrait, which is more aligned with Lawrence-Lightfoot's & Davis's portraiture (1997), of a family). According to school documents, each family is institutionally classified as Hispanic but has a different linguistic designation. Overall, their experiences demonstrate that regardless of linguistic label, the institution of schooling marks their language practices, knowledge forms, relations, and sense of selves, as deficient based on their racialized positioning. At the same time, their experiences present other

possibilities for framing language practices, forms of learning and relationality, and groups of people beyond dominant notions of family-school relations.

Monica and Mariana

I met Monica when she started second grade, and I volunteered for two days out of the week in her classroom. Monica introduced me to her mother, Mariana, after I volunteered to walk with Monica to her house and wait for her mother, who was running late to pick her up from school. Monica lives one block away from the dual language program. In our first conversation, Mariana disclosed that she is a single mother and has an inconsistent work schedule. In a later conversation, Mariana clarified that she works as a waitress in a restaurant located on one of the main commercial streets in Mills City. Since our initial introduction, I have built relations with and learned from Mariana and Monica through phone calls, text messages, and house visits to assist with technology and internet set-up at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. During one of these visits, I asked Mariana and Monica for their permission to be participants of this study and conduct interviews with them as part of the process.

During my conversations and interactions with Monica in classroom activities and lunch and recess, we discussed how we see ourselves in relation to our heritage and social groups. Monica referred to herself as "having parents from Guatemala" and "from Mills City." In fact, she elaborated that she "usually says she is from Mills City because that is home to me, really." It was only when I asked her in an interview that Monica explicitly identified as being "Hispana Americana" and "from Guatemala." In a separate conversation, she said, "Sometimes I say Hispana Americana. Sometimes I say Hispana. Like I know I am from here and from Guatemala." In such a way, Monica seems to see herself as a member of her neighborhood, Mills City, the U.S., and traces her heritage and family roots to Guatemala. She shows her dynamic

sense of self, beyond the sole marker of American, one that has often been leveraged to evoke a national identity grounded in whiteness and European exceptionalism, and thus, exclude the heterogeneity of cultures, backgrounds, histories, and experiences (Nieto, 2002).

Like Monica, Mariana identified herself as "de Guatemala" and "Hispana" in her interviews. However, she specified that "lo que digo cuando digo de Guatemala es que nací y viví en Guatemala antes de venir a los Estados Unidos" and "para mi soy Hispana porque ese es el término que usan para identificar la gente de que vienen en países Latino Americanos aquí en los Estados Unidos." Even though Mariana refers to herself as "from Guatemala" in the United States, she presented herself differently when she lived in Guatemala. When she lived in Guatemala, Mariana would identify herself as from a particular region linked to a specific terrain, for example, she said, "cuando digo que soy de la cierra, la gente sabe de cuál región soy." Mariana disclosed that she highlights regionality and terrain of where she grew up when she interacts with people who grew up in Guatemala and live in Mills City or in the Greater Boston Area. Through her comments, Mariana associates herself as part of the nation-state where she was born and raised, Guatemala. And yet, she also acknowledges being positioned by the U.S. as Hispana and notes that this marker aims to group people like her whose homelands are Latin American nations. Thus, she points out how a globalized racist-capitalist nation-state groups people from different places and trajectories under labels. Additionally, Mariana layers her identification as Guatemalan by describing the various regions in her homeland and affiliating herself more closely with a specific terrain. Mariana's selective disclosure about her regional- and terrain-specific roots in Guatemala suggests that she shares certain aspects about herself with those she feels she can connect with, a form of refusal of ideologies that naturalize the complete extraction of knowledges, practices, and relations from racialized Others.

To Mariana, Monica is "Hispana Americana porque ella creció aquí en Mills City pero también es de Guatemala porque sus raíces son de allí." She disclosed that she does not want her daughter to call herself "solo Americana" because "necesita retener sus raíces y saber su cultura más de lo genérico aquí en los Estados Unidos." In fact, right after this comment, Monica walked into the kitchen, where I was interviewing Mariana, to grab a snack. Mariana embraced Monica in a hug and informed me that Monica often has to defend being "no solo Americana pero también de Guatemala y Hispana Americana." In a separate conversation, Monica elaborated how she has to clarify that she is not only "Americana but also from Guatemala when she and her friends are talking about food." Monica described one experience when she explained that she liked "fast food like McDonald's and pizza" and her friends from school said, "that means you are American." She expressed that she was bothered by being seen "as only American" and had to tell friends that she is "also from Guatemala too and likes food that my (Monica's) mom makes like arroz, pupusas."

In their remarks, Monica and Mariana refuse to be bounded under the category of American. For Mariana, the identity label, American, represents an ahistorical, static construct that attempts to disconnect them from their transnational relations, and cultural and heritage practices associated with Guatemala. Still, Mariana may also not regard herself as American due to racist, nationalist, and xenophobic ideologies that exclude her being, practices, and knowledge forms from those rendered as legible signs of Americanness (Nieto, 2002). Mariana and Monica similarly extend the American label to be a hyphenated identity for Monica, representing transnational and intergroup relations and experiences that are part of Monica's sense of self. Notably, Monica highlights the racialization of cultural emblems and how they are utilized within the institution of schooling to bound youth's sense of selves and relations within the

confines of idealized American exceptionalism. At the same time, Monica points out several heritage practices to resist the acculturation of norms, values, and routines that legitimize white supremacy, racist-capitalism, xenophobia, and nationalism.

Throughout my conversations with Monica and Mariana, they mentioned that their family speaks English and Spanish inside and outside their homes. However, they also disclosed that their family prefers to communicate in Spanish when together. When I asked Mariana about this preference for Spanish, she mentioned that "es una manera de preservar nuestra cultura como somos de Guatemala y no olvidarnos de donde somos." Following these remarks, Mariana acknowledged that she "espera que nosotras hablemos en español en la casa." In such a way, Monica's family's preference for communicating is heavily influenced by Mariana regarding the Spanish language as a practice linked to her Guatemalan roots. Further, Mariana's perspective indicates conflicting processes that have influenced her relationship with language, place, and culture. She relies on monoglossic discourses tied to standardized language forms that are linked to a nation-state. On the other hand, Mariana utilizes language as a way for her and her daughter to retain practices linked to their Guatemalan roots, thereby resisting the extermination of their family and heritage knowledge forms and practices (Tienda & Mitchell, 2006).

In our final interview, Mariana confided that another reason for preferring Spanish use at home was her perceived lack of English proficiency. During this revelation, she explained that "no uso bien el inglés pero sí sé cómo leer y escribir un poco en el español porque fui a la secundaria en Guatemala. Uso palabras en inglés aquí pero siento que la gente me mira raro entonces me siento raro usar." In her comments, Mariana highlights that her monoglossic orientation is political, interactional, and ideological by noting how she is judged by other people when she communicates in English. Further, Mariana's minimizing of her Spanish literacies and

presenting herself as lacking proficiency in English are reified by discourses of languagelessness, thereby, suggesting that she is not fully proficient in any language. Although Mariana reported how her family communicates in English and Spanish, she does not relate this practice as indicative of bilingualism. For instance, Mariana argued that Monica "es bilingüe porque ella domina los dos idiomas pero yo no me presento como bilingüe porque sé el español, bueno un poco." It seems that Mariana utilizes her monoglossic orientation and relies on discourses of languagelessness to claim that there is an idealized level for communicating in two languages that she has yet to achieve and that corresponds to individuals like her daughter, who she positions as bilingual.

Although Mariana regards Monica as bilingual, Monica mentioned in one of her interviews that she "knows how to read and write in Spanish and English too but needs some help in both." When I asked Monica what she meant by "needing help in both," she explained that "teachers pick her up a lot to read and practice English and Spanish." Indeed, during the school day, I have witnessed Monica being removed from her classroom to participate in English and Spanish literacy small groups taught by literacy coaches. Monica further explained that she likes to communicate in English and Spanish "for different reasons even though I do feel like I am supposed to like Spanish more based on what my teachers say." According to Monica, her classroom teacher and literacy coaches have remarked that she is "stronger in Spanish than English even though she needs work on both." Therefore, Monica points out discourses of languagelessness that reinforce her positioning as not quite proficient in any language. She highlights how these discourses permeate schooling structures and practices when she describes being pulled out of her classroom to participate in literacy groups with coaches. She describes how teachers expect her to have a stronger relationship with one language over the other. This

pressure stems from raciolinguistic ideologies that assume people classified as Hispanic communicate and have a strong relationship with the Spanish language. At the same time, Monica refuses to place herself under rigid forms of language and identity when she expresses how she likes both languages for different reasons.

Even though Monica explained that she talks with Mariana about her education, Mariana remarked that she often feels uninformed about Monica's learning and programming at the dual language school. She described the irony of feeling uninformed "porque la escuela es solo un bloque de donde vivo! También es una escuela donde la gente habla español." Thus, she challenges the racialized belief that physical proximity to an educational institution is indicative of a member having a strong affiliation or relation with the place (Lipitz, 2011). In her comment, Mariana also denaturalizes the belief that sharing a common language with members of an educational institution will ensure deep relations and avenues of communication among them (Cortéz & Gutiérrez, 2019). Although the school sends monthly newsletters, Mariana revealed that she receives no newsletters or calls from staff members about school updates. Besides trying to attend parent-teacher conferences, she explained, "Si quiero saber algo específico sobre mi hija llamo a la escuela y hablo con un personal de la escuela o hablo con las mamás de su clase." She clarified that she calls "otros padres que son de Guatemala o nuestros países" to ask questions about school curriculum and scheduling of events. In such a way, Mariana attempts to refuse her positioning as a parent/caretaker/guardian entirely dependent on resources and procedures from an educational institution by cultivating social networks to understand the nature of learning and schooling at the dual language program.

After these remarks, Mariana confided that she wants to know from staff members and educators how to support her daughter with her learning despite her " tiempo en la escuela

limitada en Guatemala y estar más cómoda en el español." She expressed how she thinks that "los maestros de Monica creen que soy dejada porque siempre estoy corriendo de un lado a otro pero necesito trabajar para tener un lugar estable para mi hija." Indeed, Monica reaffirmed that her mother works multiple jobs with inconsistent schedules to support their health, wellbeing, and stability. She gave an example of how her mother's employment enables them to access experiences that support their living, "Por el trabajo de mi mamá podemos ir a parque y comprar un helado. También en el fin de semana caminamos para tomar aire, ver cosas o animales o en el bicycle." Thus, although Mariana leverages discourses that mark her education and languaging in deficit and bounded forms, she resists being positioned as a parent/caretaker/guardian that does not care or support the learning of her daughter. Through her emphasis on needing to work to ensure a stable home for Monica, Mariana connects the importance of accessing financial and material resources to the globalized, neoliberal structures of a racist-capitalist society. Despite the positioning of Mariana as careless or unsupportive of Monica's education, Monica reaffirms her mother's efforts to support her wellbeing by describing the various activities they do together.

According to official school documents at the dual language program, Monica and Mariana are linguistically and ethnoracially classified as a Hispanic and Spanish speaking, EL family. In contrast, they don't present themselves under these classifications. Instead, they point to their collective positioning as "Hispana" and "de Guatemala." They also point out their divergent trajectories and relations to their neighborhood, nation-states, and regions/terrains. At the same time that Monica and Mariana point out monoglossic orientations and discourses of languagelessness that position their dynamic language practices in deficit ways, they also contest dominant expectations by the institution of schooling of having to conform under standardized, national/colonial language varieties. As part of this contestation, they highlight how Mariana

wants to learn about the dynamics and functioning of the dual language program and how she is supporting the wellbeing and development of Monica. Mariana and Monica also note societal structures and inequities that influence Mariana's physical presence at the school.

Alejandra and Marina

During the summer before I started to volunteer at the dual language program, I was introduced to Marina by her son, Pedro, who was a camp counselor of a middle school program where my then fiancé was the program coordinator. On the final day of the program, Marina brought her daughter, Alejandra, so that Alejandra could learn about the projects that Pedro facilitated for middle school students. In one of my conversations on that day, Marina informed me that Alejandra was a student at the Mills City Dual Language School, which prompted me to disclose my research interests and possible future work with the program. By coincidence, during the coming school year, the principal of the dual language program expressed her preference for me to volunteer for the second-grade cohort, which included Alejandra. After several talks with Marina during school dismissal, she and I exchanged our email addresses and phone numbers. Through these forms of communication and chats at Marina's workplace, which is one of my favorite sandwich shops in Mills City, I informed Marina about my dissertation and asked for her and Alejandra's permission to be part of the study.

One day, at the sandwich shop, as we were determining a time and date to conduct her interview, Marina asked me if I was going to a racial literacy event that was being promoted by the dual language program. She explained that an event about racial literacy seemed interesting and that it would take place at the neighborhood library. Although I was not aware of the event during our conversation, I did end up attending the event, which was held during the week and in the evening. I remember that the participants at the event were mostly young adults, and mid-age

adults who were phenotypically white. When I met with Marina to conduct my interview with her, she asked me about what was discussed during the event and that she "quería ir pero el tiempo no era bueno para mí. Trabajo en las tardes hasta la noche." She elaborated how she works,

> desde las 4pm hasta las 11pm. Llego a casa cansada y me duermo rápido para levantarme y preparar desayuno para Alejandra. Quisiera que eventos no eran siempre en la tarde porque los temas son interesantes algunas veces los que sé por la escuela.

In such a way, Marina expresses her interest in learning more about the issues of race with members of her neighborhood, but she points out how her work schedule, an outcome of a neoliberal, globalized capitalist order of a racist society, constrains her opportunities to engage in this potentially transformative collective work. Despite her night schedule and exhaustion, Marina demonstrates her commitment to supporting the wellbeing and learning of her daughter, Alejandra, by ensuring that she provides her with breakfast.

Following her comment regarding attending public forums, Marina explained that she "quisiera que nos piden nuestra opinión sobre el horario para cosas públicas, especialmente en la escuela. Eso es la razón porque ya no voy a las sesiones de language exchange." Marina described how the dual language school has an initiative named Language Exchange. Under this initiative, parents/caretakers/guardians meet on Friday late afternoons at the school to learn how to communicate in English or Spanish. A teacher facilitates this exchange through her planning of activities. In Marina's comments about scheduling public forums and school events, she points out how public institutions fail to institute protocols and procedures that would generate feedback and insight from its members. She seems to suggest how current structures and

practices of public institutions contribute to the exclusion of members from racially minoritized and low-socioeconomic status.

Marina went on to discuss the multiple reasons why she stopped attending the Language Exchange initiative. She disclosed how during these sessions "sentía que no estaba aprendiendo el inglés pero los padres °blanquitos° que saben el inglés si estaban aprendiendo el español de mí. ¡El enfoque de la sesiones eran para ellos!" In short, even when racially minoritized people attempt to acquire language practices anchored in monoglossic language orientations, their rights to learn language varieties are less important when they lessen the potential for white people to acquire language forms that will provide more tangible and intangible benefits for them. Marina wanted to learn a form of languaging, a standardized English variety, to strategically navigate and acquire networks, resources, and opportunities. However, Marina stopped attending the sessions once she realized that the sessions were designed to privilege the interests of white people and position her as a language and cultural object for extraction.

Marina further mentioned that she was uncomfortable with having to separate from Alejandra. She did not understand "porque la Alejandra no puede estar conmigo y también que haya something para ella hacer o aprender." Parents/caretakers/guardians can bring their children with them to the school when they are there for the sessions. However, once they arrive at the school, the parents/caretakers/guardians go to one room for the Language Exchange session while the children are grouped together in another room where a staff member supervises them. In her interview, Alejandra specified that she felt "lonely and bored" when she was "in the room with the other kids waiting for parents." She "talked with the teacher or used my mother's (Marina's) phone to play games or something" and "didn't know the other kids there." Marina's and Alejandra's comments indicate how programs that are linked to school-family relations

ultimately separate family members, positioning children as not critical members who foster learning and relations among families in schools. This separation among families, especially those of minoritized groups, is a centuried practice used by educational institutions to assimilate families under norms, practices, and values linked to whiteness (Agbo, 2007; Grande, 2004). Rather than conforming to this deficit positioning of being a submissive family, Alejandra and Marina describe their discomfort with the separation and stratification of their roles in the Language Exchange program. Notably, Marina and her daughter denaturalize their positioning in the program through their critiques and presentation of an alternative arrangement for their sessions.

In their interviews, Alejandra and Marina mentioned that their family is "de Guatemala" and "viven en Mills City." Marina added that she is "de la capital de Guatemala. Soy de la ciudad." Like Mariana, Marina stressed the importance of specifying the region of Guatemala because "hay diferentes oportunidades dependiendo de donde eres. Por ejemplo, yo pude ir a la escuela hasta la secundaria pero los del campo muchas veces no tienen accesso." Similar to Mariana, Marina positions herself as part of the nation-state where she was born and raised, Guatemala. Like Mariana, she also notes the different regions and terrains within Guatemala, refuting racist and nationalist ideologies that aim to essentialize people as having the same experiences and relations with places and terrains (Lipitz, 2007; Massey, 1991). Marina further refutes this essentialization by suggesting that people have divergent and inequitable access to educational opportunities in Guatemala based on where they live.

As Marina finished her comment about educational inequities in Guatemala, Alejandra peeked her eyes into the kitchen, where we were conducting the interview. Marina exclaimed, "¡No cierto que eres de Mills City y de Guatemala, Alejandra! (Alejandra nods) ¿Alejandra de

dónde más eres?" Alejandra slowly entered the kitchen and responded, "...I don't know?" "Eres de Massachusetts and de los Estados Unidos!," stated Marina. In subsequent conversations and interviews with Alejandra, she does not describe herself in relation with the U.S. or in Massachusetts. Like Monica, Alejandra seems to position herself as a member of her neighborhood, Mills City, and recognizes her family's and heritage roots linked to Guatemala. However, her hesitation in positioning herself as part of the U.S. and the state of Massachusetts suggests that her mother expects her to assume this identity label. Marina's expectation for her daughter's sense of self to be connected with these places is heavily reinforced by ideologies that naturalize people's legibility as connected to their location within boundaries of colonial and national place formations (Molina, 2014; Tuck & McKenzie, 2014).

Throughout my conversations with Marina and Alejandra, they informed me that they communicate in English and Spanish. They highlighted the connection between their languaging and transnational relations. For instance, Alejandra described how she talks in both languages because these forms of communication allow her "to talk with familia en Guatemala, con tías y primas allá cuando mi mami (Marina) llama ellos." In her interview, Marina argued that "es importante tener raíces con familia y país donde venimos y el hablar el español nos ayuda. Quería que Alejandra practicara el español y por eso le puse en dual language." In their comments, Marina and Alejandra position Spanish as a conduit for deepening their connection to their family and heritage roots. Notably, Marina frames the dual language program as a place where Alejandra can maintain her Spanish language use to continue to foster the aforementioned relations. Alejandra augments the dynamicism of languaging as a catalyst for communicating with people from different places across various scales when she stated that "speaking English allows me (Alejandra) to talk to people in Mills City too." Rather than strictly adhering to

raciolinguistic ideologies that regard language as static entities for possession, Alejandra and Marina connect languaging to their sense of selves and their relations with families, heritages, and places across and within colonial/national boundaries.

Although Marina and Alejandra highlighted their use of English and Spanish, Marina clarified that "Alejandra is bilingual and I (Marina) am sort of bilingual." Following this remark, Marina disclosed that she enrolled in adult English Language classes during the first two years of living in the U.S., but she stopped attending the classes because of financial constraints. She accepted a new job that would help pay for her monthly expenses and build a savings account. However, her new work schedule conflicted with the schedule of the adult English language classes. That is, while monoglossic language ideologies that shape the U.S expected Marina to acquire a standardized variety of the English language, the neoliberal, globalized capitalistic structure created a situation where Marina had to sacrifice the opportunity to become comfortable in communicating in this dominant language variety in order to pursue the possibility of financial stability and wellbeing. This sacrifice likely influenced Marina's perspective about not being fully bilingual. Despite deficit positionings on her language practices, Marina leverages dynamic language practices within her experiences as a friend and member of her neighborhood. In the same conversation, Marina explained how she sends texts, makes phone calls, and drafts emails to the dual language school and Mills City community members. She explained, "uso ambos idiomas cuando tengo que comunicar con la escuela o con otros aquí en Mills City como amigos o hacer diligencias."

With regard to Alejandra's sense of self and languaging, she presented herself as "alguien que usa el inglés y español muchas veces, todos los días, en la escuela y afuera." Even though she highlighted her dynamic language use inside and outside of school, Alejandra also described

how she was in different literacy small groups throughout the day at the dual language program. She said, "I read a lot of books in English with a teacher in another room and read a lot of books in Spanish there too." Indeed, Alejandra was regularly pulled out of her classroom for small literacy group work with designated Spanish and English literacy coaches. The English literacy groups were composed of students designated as English Learners and students who were not classified as English Learner but were marked by the dual language program educators and staff as "needing more practice in English to improve their literacy." The Spanish literacy groups were composed of students who were marked by staff members and educators as "needing more reinforcement in Spanish to keep up" despite English or Spanish speaker classification. Alejandra recalled that "teachers say I go back and forth too much in English and Spanish. Going to read with them is supposed to help me not do that too much." When I asked her for clarification about what she meant by "too much," Alejandra replied "Like talk mixed Spanish and English. Not really English or Spanish."

In her descriptions of the dual language program, Alejandra points out several structures, practices, and actors that are anchored in monoglossic orientations and discourses of languagelessness. She points out the monoglossic configuration of literacy groups by explaining how they are labeled by focal language and have the purpose of teaching a standardized national/colonial variety of language to students. Alejandra highlights how teachers rely on discourses of languagelessness when she notes that her teachers regard her as not proficient in either English or Spanish. Still, Alejandra continues to assert her dynamic use of language forms inside and outside of school.

Based on official school documents at the dual language program, Alejandra and Marina are linguistically and ethnoracially classified as a Hispanic and Spanish speaking family.

However, they don't use these labels to describe themselves. Instead, they collectively position themselves as from Guatemala and living in Mills City. Along with these collective positionings, they describe divergent experiences and relationships with their neighborhoods, nation-states, and regions. For example, while Marina positions Alejandra as being from the United States and Massachusetts, Alejandra does not see herself as part of these national/colonial place formations. Although monoglossic language ideologies and ideologies of languagelessness have attempted to bound and render Marina's and Alejandra's languaging as unintelligible within and outside of the dual language program, they have leveraged their dynamic language forms to maintain transnational connections, deepen family ties, and create social networks with neighborhood residents. As part of this contestation, they have argued for the reconfiguration of structures and protocols in public forums and initiatives, and note societal inequities that have influenced their forms of languaging and participation in dominant forms of family participation in schools.

Veronica and Michael

I was introduced to Veronica by another parent who had already agreed to be a participant in this dissertation study. During our interviews, this parent disclosed that she did not have close relationships with families she regarded as Latino. However, she mentioned that she was closest to Veronica because her "English was pretty good and we can communicate through it." After this parent introduced me to Veronica over email, Veronica and I agreed to meet through Zoom. During the start of our first conversation, I reiterated the parent's comment about her regarding Veronica as someone she had a close relationship. Veronica quickly corrected my assumption by stating that "We are not too close. Just because I can speak English doesn't mean I think she is a close friend or anything. Get along, yes, but close, not really." In such a way, Veronica resisted the discourses leveraged by the parent and me to essentialize her English

language use as a direct indication of her relationships with others. In our initial conversation, I realized that I have already worked with her son, Michael, through my substitute teaching of his fourth-grade class. After this initial conversation, Veronica and I interacted and learned more about each other during school dismissals. During these dismissal conversations, I talked with Veronica and Michael about the topics and goals of this dissertation study. Over another conversation through Zoom, Veronica and Michael accepted to be participants for this study.

During their interviews, Veronica and Michael identified as being "from Mills City and having family members from Puerto Rico." Veronica specified that even though she is "from Mills City. I (Veronica) have moved around a lot. Growing up I lived in Framingham too." She also disclosed, "Even though I sometimes say I am Puerto Rican. I mean that's my heritage but like I was not born there unlike my parents who later moved here to Mills City." Thus, Veronica presents her relationships with various neighborhoods and her heritage roots stemming from Puerto Rico, defying ideologies that aim to locate her under just one location within a nation-state (Tuck & McKenzie, 2014). In such a way, her connection with different neighborhoods and her homeland of Puerto Rico highlights the dynamicism of her heritage practices and membership in different social groups. Veronica's specification of her parents being born in Puerto Rico reveals contradictory but coalescent ideologies. At the same time that Veronica relies on discourses that promote birthright claims to place relations, she also suggests the divergent experiences that her family members have with the Caribbean Island based on their upbringing.

To Veronica, Michael is "Puerto Rican and Black American because of my (Veronica's) family being from Puerto Rico and his dad's side be many generations Black American." Veronica wants to make sure that Michael does not call himself "only Puerto Rican because he

comes from generations of Black people who have been through a lot here (U.S.) and have continued to resist many things from it." Indeed, Michael acknowledged his ethnoracial relations and heritage roots throughout his interviews and conversations. Michael stated, "my family is from Puerto Rico and Black" and "my father's side is African American who have been here for a long time already." He also presented himself as "from Mills City." Veronica's and Michael's comments show the multiple localized, inter- and intra-group, and diasporic relations within Michael's identity. Veronica seems to encourage the socialization of Michael as Puerto Rican and Black American as a way of him honoring the histories, practices, and knowledge forms from groups of people who are marked as racialized Others and who have faced constant denial of legal and material rights (Delale-O'Connor et al., 2020; Matias, 2016). Similar to Monica and Alejandra, Michael positions himself as part of a local neighborhood, Mills City, rather than present himself as a member of the nation-state, U.S. Michael's remarks about his father's identity as Black, African American also shows Michael's resistance to considering himself as solely American, which has a dominant association with a white/European national identity.

With regard to their languaging, Michael and Veronica explained that they communicate in English and Spanish. However, in an interview, Veronica presented herself as " 'Spanlingual,' someone who uses broken Spanish and speaks more English at home." When I asked her why she considered her Spanish languaging as "broken," Veronica discussed her educational experiences in high school, specifically her time taking Spanish classes to fulfill her foreign language credit for graduation. She explained that her time in Spanish as foreign language classes made her feel "like her Spanish was not good enough because it was not European Spanish." Later in the conversation, Veronica referred to Spanish from Spain as European Spanish. She went on to describe a memory of being a student in the Spanish as a foreign

language class. According to Veronica, "my Latino friends and I would see other students who speak English would get higher grades in Spanish exams than us, which was weird for us to see." Such experiences as a student in a Spanish as a foreign language classroom made Veronica feel "like the Spanish learned from home, from my parents was not good enough."

Veronica presents herself through a monoglossic orientation when she describes herself as Spanlingual, as someone who languages in an inferior form of Spanish. However, she points out how the institution of schooling, its structures (Spanish as a foreign language classroom), practices (assessments), and its actors (teachers) have leveraged these discourses to mark her Spanish language use as less than those varieties from Europe and from people whose language practices were viewed as aligned with these varieties. These discourses reified educational inequities, such as Veronica receiving a lower grade in her class and not being allowed to leverage her heritage and linguistic practices as integral sources for her learning. Further, Veronica relies on raciolinguistic ideologies that link the Spanish language to the ethnoracial group, Latino/a/x, and her Puerto Rican heritage. Concurrently, she maintains a sense of connectedness through the Spanish language with people who position themselves as members of shared ethnoracial and heritage groups as well as those of her family unit.

Even though Veronica mentioned her preference for languaging in English at the start of one interview, she also reported how she did not feel comfortable expressing herself in English or Spanish with parents/guardians/caretakers at the dual language program. Eventually, Veronica stopped attending initiatives and participation spaces that were designated for parents/caretakers/guardians of the dual language program. Before describing particular moments in the dual language program, Veronica reiterated that she is "generally very social and loves to converse with people" but "shuts down when she feels alienated or uncomfortable."

Following these remarks, she explained how the dual language program "wants me to know school language" and "expect you to know the lingo of school like what PTA stands for or like PD. Even if I prefer communicating in English, I don't even know how to respond." Additionally, she noted that most initiatives "mostly have English dominant parents, you know people who are white. But their English is school-language." Indeed, Veronica resisted the framing of her behavior, in this case her personality and languaging, as the cause for her uncomfortable interactions at the school. Rather, she attempts to show how the institution of schooling expects her to conform to language practices connected to a specific discipline, education, a field that has continued to reify knowledge forms connected to European exceptionalism and whiteness (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Leonardo, 2009). Further, raciolinguistic ideologies uphold the notion that the language practices of a white person are directly reflective of the idealized practices and knowledge within the institution of schooling.

Veronica's comments highlighted how the dual language school's programming for families presented bilingualism as the communication in two separate languages, thereby reifying monoglossic language ideologies. She explained that "events for parents can be separated for English parents and Spanish parents," which was a routine practice during academic year 2020-2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. According to Veronica, "the program held events through Youtube or Google Meet but had one time for English speaking parents and another time for Spanish speaking parents." After, she reiterated the above reasons for not joining the sessions labeled as for English speaking parents and confided how she "did not belong in the ones for Spanish speakers because I (Veronica) did not speak <u>that</u> type of Spanish." After I asked her what she meant by "that type of Spanish," Veronica commented,

> the Spanish used much in the program's events and letters are very Guatemalan based. I (Veronica) am not surprised because there's many Guatemalans here in Waltham. However, I don't speak that way and I am not from Central America so I feel those events are not for me.

As she concluded her comments about the programming for families at the dual language program, Veronica disclosed that she would like to "get to know more Latino families from the program even though we are different like many grew up in Central America."

Veronica's above experiences in schools, as a former K-12 student and parent of the dual language program, point out how the institution of schooling has leveraged raciolinguistic ideologies to ultimately position her as someone who is not proficient in any language, as languageless. For instance, Veronica's Spanish language use was positioned as inferior when compared to a European-based variety in her high school classroom, heavily grounded in raciolinguistic ideologies that naturalize European-based Spanish varieties as idealized Spanish (Valdés, 1997, 2018). Specifically, events and programs for families at the dual language program reified monoglossic language ideologies that frame bilingualism as double monolingualism, which expect people to compartmentalize their fluid forms of languaging into two standardized language varieties. These schooling structures and practices also reified raciolinguistic ideologies that essentialize the Spanish language practices and groups of people marked as Hispanic/Latino/a/x under one language variety. In opposition to these forms of essentialization, Veronica notes the divergent linguistic practices and transnational relations and trajectories among families marked as Hispanic/Latino/a/x but does not regard them as impediments to building relations with them. She hopes to learn and get to know them.

Veronica enrolled Michael into the dual language program to ensure that Michael could "practice Spanish and be able to communicate with her Puerto Rican family, especially when we (Veronica and Michael) go visit them." During his interview, Michael confirmed that his enrollment in the dual language program was due to Veronica's desire to maintain communication with his family from Puerto Rico. Michael noted how he "likes to be able to talk in Spanish with mi abuelita y abuelito because I (Michael) am close to them and they live close to us." Veronica and Michael position Spanish as a vector for sustaining relations with their family, heritage roots, and Caribbean homeland. They regard the dual language program as a place that helps Michael maintain a form of communication that enhances his family and diasporic connections. Later in his interview, Michael described the dynamicism of his language practices when he interacts with different people and across different places. He stated that he "often prefers to use Spanish with my (Michael's) mom's family and at school and I use English with my dad's side and friends. Basically I like both!" As such, Michael does not adhere to the raciolinguicized expectation of languages as bounded and hierarchical entities. Instead, he leverages his dynamic language practices to connect with multiple members of different social groups and places.

Despite pointing out his dynamic language use, Michael explained that he was "still learning how to use them well in school" and that his "teachers were working on some things to help me (Michael) do that." According to Michael, teachers group him in literacy groups with "Spanish speaking kids to make sure I (Michael) can learn from them." Indeed, the classroom teacher and Spanish literacy coach disclosed in previous conversations that Michael would benefit from communicating in Spanish with those framed as “Spanish speaking so that he be better about sorting out the differences in languages especially since he is in a testing grade."

With regard to English literacy groups, Michael highlighted specific language forms that were framed as issues that were limiting his use of English. Michael stated,

> teachers have said that there are some things we are working on in English. Like to them I say be a lot or pronounce words that begin with th like if they started in ds! But honestly that's how I talk, and I like to talk like that.

From Michael's discussion about his literacy groupings at the dual language program, it is apparent that they are grounded in monoglossic configurations, discourses of languagelessness, and anti-Blackness. Teachers expect Michael to separate his dynamic language forms into two standardized languages as part of the more extensive efforts to prepare him for standardized exams. These pressures are connected to the current neoliberal accountability system that ties standardized assessments to students' educational trajectories, teacher evaluations, and school funding and social standing (Au, 2016; Au & Ferrare, 2015). In both literacy groupings, Michael's language skills are framed as not quite good enough, referring to discourses of languagelessness, of racially minoritized students not being able to communicate in any language. In such ways, these schooling structures, practices, and actors encourage Michael's positioning himself as not quite proficient in any language. And yet, Michael points out and embraces several features of his expansive linguistic repertoire and identity. He notes language features connected to Black Language. Although words in Black Language appear similar to standardized white English, the context and linguistic purpose of usage differ (Alim & Smitherman, 2012). For example, Rickford (1999) and Smitherman (1977) report on how a distinctive feature of Black Language is the habitual use of "be" to demonstrate a reoccurring event or condition. Along with monoglossic language ideologies and ideologies of languagelessness, anti-Blackness permeates the dual language program to render Black

Language as a nonexistent language and people racialized as Black as having no language. Michael's likeness of his languaging is one way in which he advocates for the legitimacy of his linguistic dexterity and Black Language's ability to facilitate meaning-making. With and through Black Language, Michael asserts his Black, African-American identity.

Following his discussion about literacy groups, Michael presented several recommendations to address issues regarding how the dual language program encourages parents'/guardians'/caretakers' participation in children's schooling and learning experiences. He argued how the school "should have different ways to make sure that they ask all parents about what they want the school to do and what they can do." He explained how Veronica "doesn't get asked what should be changed at the school like what we learn and how we learn it." This shows Michael contesting racist ideologies, structures, and practices that deny his mother a right to be part of decision-making processes and participation spaces that determine the curricula and pedagogy at the school. Michael specified the types of learning experiences he'd like to have at the dual language school. For instance, he mentioned that there should be "more project-based learning that allow us (students) to make ideas together with our parents and do them in the languages we want. Everyone learns differently and likes different things." Through his recommendation of project-based learning experiences, Michael aims to expand the forms of knowledge, groups of people, and experiences that can be considered as valid informants and levers of learning and development. Overall, Michael positions himself as a rightful school member who has recommendations for families' participation in children's learning and schooling, thereby opposing ideologies, structures, and actors that do not recognize children as active catalysts toward humanizing family-school relations (Ishimaru et al., 2016).

Informed by school documents at the dual language program, Michael and Veronica are linguistically and ethnoracially classified as a Hispanic and English-speaking family. However, they don't explicitly present themselves under these labels. Rather, they collectively position themselves as being from "Mills City" and having "family members from Puerto Rico." And yet, they point out their distinct trajectories, relations, and experiences within and across different places, people, social groups, and languages. For instance, Michael describes his connection with his father's family, whom he describes as Black American. Although monoglossic language ideologies, ideologies of languagelessness, and anti-Blackness permeate the institution of schooling, they take pride in their dynamic language repertoires to sustain their diasporic, local, and family connections. Notably, Michael shows his dexterity in Black Language, and in turn, his connection with Blackness and African-American heritage. Lastly, they contest these raciolinguistic and racist ideologies about their sense of selves and relation with school(ing) by pointing out the essentialization of social groups, forms of communication, and languaging in naturalized approaches for family engagement in the dual language program.

Discussion

The formation of the U.S. nation-state has naturalized the social groupings of people as inferior and superior beings and language as a form of property/marker of superiority, all grounded in European exceptionalism and whiteness. Accordingly, governmental and other public institutions have continued to perpetuate the classification of groups of people and language practices to maintain white supremacy, globalized racist-capitalism, coloniality, and multiple colonialisms, among many other vectors of oppression. The federal government's designation of people with ancestry or connections to Latin American nations as Hispanic or as Spanish speaker, and the public education system's labeling of children as English Learner or

Limited English Proficient are outcomes of the above hegemonic processes (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Mora, 2014). Despite advocates' and proponents' efforts to ensure that bilingual programs are spaces that promote the dynamicism of languages, cultures, and identities, the high stakes accountability educational system demands that schools comply with nation-state classification systems as a way for the nation-state to regulate and monitor children's educational trajectories (Au, 2016; Au & Ferrare, 2015).

Raciolinguistic ideologies are one of the many processes of racialization that rationalize the grouping of people as inferior and superior beings. Specifically, monoglossic language ideologies are leveraged within and across schools to establish that racially minoritized students and families lack idealized standardized English, which is the reason behind their educational and socioeconomic inequities (Flores, 2016). Often, ideologies of languagelessness accompany monoglossic language ideologies to insist that racially minoritized groups do not have any language (Rosa, 2016). As such, the varied ways in which institutional actors from the contemporary context of the Mills City Dual Language Program leveraged the raciolinguicized subject positions of English speaker, Spanish speaker, and English Learner, and related discourses to position families and allocate material and social benefits are heavily connected to the long-standing histories, systems, and practices that maintain the oppression of those racialized as Other. In short, the enduring reach and effect of these subject positions are beyond an individual actor.

In fact, the raciolinguicized subject positions of English speakers, Spanish speakers, and English Learners, permeated the routines, structures, and procedures related to families in the dual language program. They structured family profiles, communicative procedures and modes, and composition of classes. For example, approaches for sending school documents and calling

families were structured around the English speaker and Spanish speaker category. Additionally, these subject positions influenced the functioning of school and district events. One such school event was online parent-teacher events divided into Spanish speaker and English speaker sections. Further, these subject positions were heavily related to a family's ethnoracial designation. As a result of the student enrollment process at the dual language program, the identification of Spanish speaker is officially designated as an issue that pertains to families marked as Hispanic. Families who speak another language other than English or Spanish are classified as English speakers. With regard to the English Learner label, this label is attached to families marked as Hispanic, Spanish speaker until the child has received a passing score on a standardized language test. Although educators and staff members were often skeptical about these categories accurately reflecting the language and literacy practices of students and families, they still relied on these categories for their instructional and programming decisions as well as compliance with government mandates (Flores et al., 2020; Phuong, 2021). As such, the raciolinguicized subject positions and ideologies that permeated schooling structures constrained families' sense of selves, forms of communication and learning, and types of experiences with school members. In short, these subject positions not only pertain to students as individuals, but also are bound to their entire families' experiences with school(ing) and learning.

However, focal families refused to bound and present themselves under these dominant categories. None of them used English Learner, Spanish speaker, or English speaker. Instead, they pointed out their individual and collective identifications and experiences related to various ethnoracial groups, places within and across nation/state lines, forms of languaging, and family members. For instance, school documents classified Michael and Veronica as English speakers and Hispanic. And yet, they did not mention these labels to describe themselves or talk about

their experiences. Veronica and Michael identified as being from Mills City, having family members from Puerto Rico, and communicating in English and Spanish. Along with these shared subjectivities, they disclosed their divergent realities and relations across multiple categories, places, and groups of people. Veronica discussed how she also lived in Framingham, which is in contrast to her parents growing up in Puerto Rico. However, Michael reported that his mother's family is from Puerto Rico and that his father's side is Black/African-American. In fact, Veronica asserted the importance of Michael embracing his Black/African-American identity as part of him maintaining cultural and family pride, and preparing to face deficit positionings and material consequences.

Veronica's and Michael's experiences and comments show that it is not mutually exclusive for individuals or collectives to share social categories while embracing each other's different realities and trajectories. They refute how assertions of difference directly indicate refusal of shared identity (Bukhari, 2010; Patel, 2022). Through these differences, people can take informed actions to uplift each other's experiences and contest the effects of societal inequities. Perhaps, they can recognize how previous efforts that have promoted shared and bounded identities have required the subjugation of people from other groups. These actions apply beyond an individual or group and entail understanding how the usage of standardized national/colonial languages contributes to the restriction of people under one social category and delegitimization of connections with other social groups. One such example is Veronica's desire to learn and get to know families classified as Hispanic despite knowing that these families have distinct ties with Latin American countries and communicate in other Spanish language varieties. With regard to ethnoracial groups like Hispanic/Latinx/o/a, people's openness and welcoming to

difference while being positioned or relating with shared realities as part of this category may expand forms of resistance to anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity.

As part of considering connected yet distinct realities, individuals and groups, especially those who share or are bounded in a social category, can be attuned to unique and varied experiences with different forms of oppression (Crenshaw, 1991). For example, Crenshaw's (1991) landmark intersectional analyses of legal studies demonstrated the importance of drawing on matrices of oppression, racialization, patriarchy, heteronormativity, and economic stratification, to understand the experiences of women racialized as Black. Building on Crenshaw's scholarship, various scholars (Chávez-Moreno, 2021c; Gómez; 2018; Hurtado, 2019) have argued for drawing attention to the differing histories and trajectories that have resulted from multiple colonialisms within people positioned as Hispanic/Latina/o/x (e.g. imperialism, settler-colonialism, and connections to anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity). As an example, the focal families in this chapter highlighted how societal inequities have influenced their ethnoracial identification, languaging, and school(ing) and learning experiences. Mariana reported how the U.S. nation-state positioned her as Hispana and noted how this marker is used to group people whose homelands are Latin American nations. Further, Marina described how processes related to the globalized neoliberal, capitalistic market and immigration have limited her opportunities to acquire dominant forms of language expected in the U.S. Marina, along with Alejandra, pointed out the centuried practice of stratification and separation of minoritized family members within dominant participation structures in schools (Agbo, 2001; Grande, 2015). And yet, the routines, structures, and procedures within the dual language program, and the institution of schooling at large, continue to ignore the durability and power of systems of oppression. They perpetuate essentialized ideas of culture, language, and identity that permeate raciolinguicized subject

positions. Therefore, seemingly expansive, liberatory, and heterogenic approaches to family-school relations, regardless of individual good intentions, will continue to reify the oppression of its members by ignoring members' lived experiences and material effects of socio-political, historical processes, and power relations (Baquedano-López et al., 2013; Ishimaru & Takahashi, 2017).

A feminist poststructuralist orientation of language and identity augmented the reporting of how various educational stakeholders, with and through language, made sense of racialized and raciolinguicized subject positions that permeate discourses about family-school relations. Notably, families negotiate these categories as they make sense of their identities as families and as individual members. With and through language, focal families promoted and/or unsettled discourses that impact their lives, as well as that of other families. For example, they altered their language practices to align or deviate from norms regarding their roles, knowledge, and practices in relation to school(ing) and learning. Alejandra described the monoglossic configuration of literacy groups at the dual language program and how she is expected to bound her language forms under standardized national/colonial forms. At the same time, Alejandra leveraged her dynamic language practices to explain how she uses English and Spanish inside and outside of school every day. When Michael discussed his experiences with the monoglossic configuration of literacy groups, he pointed out several of his linguistic features connected to Black Language. As he took pride in his expansive forms of languaging, Michael also reified his Black, African-American identity. Further, through his languaging, he positioned himself as a catalyst for expansive forms of family-school relations. In such ways, Michael and Alejandra demonstrate the importance of recognizing, naming, and valuing language varieties as integral to their identity construction (Valdés, 1997, 2018). Further, they hail themselves as resistant languaging

subjects (Flores, 2016b), who challenge dichotomous framings of language that perpetuate perspectives about themselves and their families.

Conclusion

This chapter interrogated the various raciolinguicized subject positions, English Learner, Spanish speaker, and English speaker, that are designated to families marked as Hispanic within the contemporary context of the Mills City Dual Language School. They are connected to broader constructions and processes related to race, language, class, and personhood that perpetuate the unintelligible positioning of minoritized groups in a globalized racist-capitalist society. These subject positions and accompanied racialized and raciolinguistic ideologies influenced the deficit positioning of focal families' language practices, relations to other members and places, and inequitable access to material resources and social/physical spaces inside and outside the dual language program. According to school documents at the dual language program, focal families were all institutionally classified as Hispanic but had a different linguistic designation. Despite the institution of schooling's positioning of these families, their portraits showcase how they ruptured social categories by highlighting their dynamic language practices, expansive relations across people, places, and temporal scales, and the role of systems of oppression in their schooling, learning, and relations.

My interactions and experiences with focal families helped me grapple with my role in perpetuating the above bounded labels and taking active measures in pausing to study, question, and rupture the naturalization and hierarchization of social categories. These families showcased the transformative potential of embracing and attuning to divergent realities within shared social groupings. In fact, their actions demonstrated how the strict adherence to broad labels negates the centering of lived experiences as levers for liberatory forms of learning and connectedness

among and within collectives. In relation, when I was deciding on the goals and structures of this dissertation's findings chapters, I had an uncomfortable feeling when thinking about the possibility of writing all of these chapters in a format where the discussion of grand power structures and narratives would be featured in the first sections followed by the lived experiences of participants. I realized that I wanted a part of this dissertation to highlight the beauty, struggle, and justice-oriented potential of centering the lived experiences of families as focal points for future inquiring, studying, and reimagining dominant ways of understanding and being in the world. The following chapter, Chapter 7, is an attempt to do so, as I employ portraiture (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997) to describe how one focal family, Flor, Samuel, and Melanie, challenge, resist, and reimagine discourses of family-school(ing) relations that permeate their experiences within and outside the dual language program.

CHAPTER SEVEN: Protecting, Learning, and Connecting: A Portrait of Flor, Melanie, and Samuel

It is lunchtime for the second-grade cohort at the dual language school. During this time, I usually grab a chair in the corner of the school's main office and have a meal as I reply to text messages and/or emails. However, today, my inbox is empty, and there are no new message notifications. Closing my laptop, I realize that I have the time, energy, and accessibility to enjoy lunch with the second-grade students in the school cafeteria. I have the affordance of not being a classroom teacher who is often swamped with grading, lesson planning, or trying to catch a moment to handle personal matters during lunch hour. I leave my bag and coat under one of the main office chairs, pick up my water bottle and plastic container filled with leftovers from last night's dinner, and head over to the cafeteria. Before stepping into the cafeteria, I hear multiple voices of children engaging in conversations that represent a limitless range of topics, from the characters in the Roblox video game to color schemes of bicycles. Walking into the cafeteria, I see children eating their school or home lunch together on round, white tables, and cafeteria staff members wiping food trays by the serving table area. Two other adults are standing parallel to this area. I feel some children's faces looking up at me and hear "Ms. Jasmine is here," murmured around their tables. I wave my hand and try to give a quick "hello" to the children in my vicinity as a way of trying to limit my interrupting their flow of conversations.

I notice that there are multiple open seats on the round, white table where Alejandra, Monica, and Samuel are sitting. "Hi! Is there anyone sitting in these seats?," I ask. Samuel informs me that the seats are indeed empty and asks if I am going to eat with them. I share with Samuel and the other two children that I wanted to know more about the structure of lunch and recess hour and the activities that they engaged in during this time. "Also, ya'll always talk about loving lunchtime so much so would like to know more why!," I exclaim. They give a quick

giggle as they pick up their forks from their styrofoam lunch trays. Meanwhile, my hands are raised and shaped in a y-shaped form. I notice Monica's piercing, chestnut-colored eyes staring at my hands. She tells me, "I like your bracelets Ms. Jasmine." Staring at my silver and rose quartz bracelets on my right hand, I disclose to Monica, Alejandra, and Samuel my fondness for bracelets that stem from my Ecuadorian family's history of making jewelry using various metals and stones. Alejandra jumps in and states, "Ah. I think my mom has jewelry like that too, and I think I have some too at home."

In the middle of Alejandra's remarks, one of the two adults who was standing by the lunch serving area walks over to our table and sits next to Samuel. While drinking his juice box, Samuel leans on her shoulder."Yo también hago joyas así en la casa a lado de las otros trabajos que tengo," she smiles and then glances at the rest of us. After offering to make me jewelry, she presents herself as "Flor, la mamá de Samuel y de Melanie." I find out from Flor and Samuel that Melanie is in first-grade at the dual language program. As I finish eating my leftover spaghetti, Flor talks about her schedule and official role at the dual language program. She acts as a school aide for a couple of days out of the week, with a focus on second and first grade, the grade levels of which her children are currently members of. "Quería estar más informada y ver cómo están mis hijos entonces como tengo un poco de flexibilidad pregunté a Claudia si había puestos y ahora aquí estoy," Flor discloses while wiping Samuel's purple juice mark off his lip with her finger. Along with her efforts of being informed about Samuel's and Melanie's learning and development, Flor tells me that she periodically gives reports about Alejandra's and Monica's experiences in the dual language program to their parents over phone calls or during dismissal. Alejandra and Monica nod in agreement with Flor's remarks as they get up to throw out their lunch. Samuel chimes in and says, "We all live close to each and around here, by the school."

Flor starts to ask me about my role in the school and the specific Ecuadorian regions where my family is from. "Oh she works with us, mom like a teacher," Samuel clarifies. I nod sideways and give a brief overview of my roles at the school, "Sí, soy una voluntaria y voy a sustituir. Fui maestra pero ahora estoy otra vez en la escuela y haciendo un proyecto sobre la escuela para mi certificado del doctorado." I present myself as "teniendo familia de la costa y de la cierra, orgullosa de estar afiliada con diferentes regiones."

Outside our table, the cafeteria staff is wiping tables and throwing out lingering napkins and plastic wrappers into a garbage container being wheeled around by students. Noticing that the garbage can is now next to our table, Flor quickly throws out our scattered and empty plates and trays. As she gets up from her seat, Flor pats Samuel's shoulder and tells me, "Bueno pues, tengo que ayudar antes que el otro grado venga. ¡Gusto de conversar!" "¡Igualmente Flor!," I exclaim while gulping down some water from my water bottle and starting to get up from my seat. I thank Alejandra, Samuel, and Monica for allowing me to sit with them for lunch and remind them that I would see them later after their time at the gym for recess. Walking out of the cafeteria, I wave at the rest of the second-grade students lining up by the cafeteria door, getting ready to head to the gym, located on the basement level of the school building.

Since this initial conversation with Flor, she and I have continued to learn more about each other's personal and professional backgrounds through our conversations during recess and dismissal. At the same time, I was learning more about Samuel and Melanie throughout my participation in classroom and school-wide activities. After realizing that I was a former teacher of a dual language program, Flor asked me if I could read in English and Spanish with her children, Samuel and Melanie, once a week. We came to an arrangement after several turns of Flor offering financial compensation and me trying to politely refuse her generous offers. She

agreed to connect me with other staff members and families of the school and arranged a time for me to visit her house to discuss and present my study's topics and design to her family. Towards the end of this conversation at Flor's house, I asked for Flor's, Samuel's, and Melanie's consent to participate in my study. In this chapter, I present a portrait of some of my experiences and interactions with this family-what I learned with and from them throughout these moments. This narrative specifically highlights how Flor, Samuel, and Melanie, as a family and members of this family, make sense of their relations with school(ing) and how they define themselves with social groups, with particular focus on those related to ethnoracial and language groups. Leveraging Butler's (1993) theory of performativity, the portrait of Flor, Melanie, and Samuel exposes how they attempt to challenge, resist, and reimagine other forms of being, relating, and learning, as they negotiate dominant discourses about family-school(ing) relations that permeate their experiences within and outside the dual language program.

Utilizing Portraiture to Tell *a* Story

It is intentional that I frame this chapter as *a* story instead of *the* story. Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) describe how through portraiture, an incompleteness is made apparent, noting that although researchers have insights, they are not the only knowers. Thus, portraiture allows for deep listening, observing, and learning with and alongside participating, honoring the specificity of people's experiences, insights, and personhood.[17] It "combines empirical description and aesthetic expression to create a narrative that captures the complexity and multidimensionality of human experience and organizational life" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 15). Engaging in portraiture helped me reconcile how to write in a way where I

[17] Portraiture is part of a broad group of methods and approaches conceptualized by members of minoritized groups (e.g. Brayboy, 2006; Ross, 2003; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) that engage in witnessing and storytelling as levers for teaching, learning, and collectivity, part of larger efforts for survivance and self-determination.

could express my interpretations of how families made sense of themselves and worked through complicated, often harmful narratives and material effects, while limiting as best as I could to present myself as *the* source of a bounded, all-knowing truth. In doing so, I tried to follow's Lightfoot's and Davis's (1997) stance on searching for goodness, assuming that there are challenges, contradictions, and setbacks in how Flor, Samuel, and Melanie attempt to reimagine and contest dominant discourses about themselves, other families, and their relations with school(ing). As Lightfoot and Davis establish (1997), "the portraitist assumes that the qualities of strength, health, and productivity will always be imbued with flaws, weaknesses, and inconsistencies" (p. 142).

Indeed, this story is about one family and does not intend to make assumptions about all families in bilingual programs or U.S. schools, in general. Instead, I hope that the subtlety of detail in the portrait elicits further understandings, reflections, and connections that challenge logics, practices, and systems aimed to relegate certain individuals and groups of people as inferior beings in schools, and more broadly, in society. Following Lawrence-Lightfoot's (2005) comparison of portraiture's aesthetic wholeness to that of a tapestry, I describe focal moments and interactions with Flor, Samuel, and Melanie over the past two and half years by carefully selecting and weaving together field notes, transcripts, and memos. Consistent with the nature of portraiture, I do not include citations for these levers of knowledge generation. Lastly, the subsequent interactions and experiences in this portrait occur within and outside the Mills City Dual Language School, demonstrating that families' negotiation of their relations with school(ing) is a process that is not physically bounded to one place.

Recess Time

I turn around to close the playground gates. Behind me, I hear Kiara, a second-grade teacher yell, "Alright guys. Go play!" The children in the second-grade cohort scatter, some throwing their lunch boxes by the bench closest to the playground gates. This playground is a public neighborhood playground. Children in kindergarten and first grade use the small playground that is on the left side of the brick building where the dual language program is housed. The rest of the children at the school, in grades 2-5, have recess in the community playground that is three blocks away from the dual language school. At least three adults accompany students to the playground for recess. Usually, this group of adults consists of one teacher, the school security guard, Marco, and a school aide. On the days when she is at the school as an aide, Flor accompanies the first and second-grade cohorts, the grade levels of Samuel and Melanie, to the park. In a previous conversation, she mentioned, "¡Me gusta poder ver que mis hijos están sanos y felices durante recreo!"

After closing the gates, I turn and look around the playground. I notice students are in small and large groups in various areas of the park. A multitude of sounds saturates the space. I hear laughing, shouting, jingling of melodies, quick exclamatory remarks, and commands. Pairs of children take turns pushing each other on the swings. Others are hanging on monkey bars while their peers observe them from below. Next to the monkey bars, there are two slides where several students are trying to go down the slides as some of their classmates try to go up these same slides. I walk over to the slides where I hear Kiara, raising her voice to encourage the children to go down the slides in one direction to avoid injuries. She then covers her mouth with her hands and blows into them. While we start to talk about her newborn daughter's health and the cost of childcare, we look over the basketball area and notice that Flor, Marco, and a cluster

of students are standing by the edges of the court. Kiara asks, "Hey can you go check that out? Call me if there is a big issue." "Sure! No problem," I respond and try to quickly walk over to the basketball court.

As I scurry in high heel boots toward the basketball courts, I see Marco walking towards me, dressed in a black suit and wearing his trademark sunglasses. When we approach each other, Marco tells me "It's all good now, Jasmine. Flor talked to the men that were playing basketball." As I am about to ask him for more details about the situation, he asks me if I could accompany Flor and supervise the children by the basketball courts because he has to rush to the police precinct for required training. I accept his request, but I am still confused about what was going on in the basketball area. Once I get there, I notice that there is a line of young adult men sitting by the concrete steps leading into the basketball court. They are talking to each other while looking at the court filled with second-grade students. Dressed in a dark, long red coat, Flor is quietly standing next to them. Her eyes are laser-focused on the children running and kicking a soccer ball. Beneath each basketball hoop, there are white portable futsal nets. One child is acting as a goalie for each net. Four children are on each side of the court, aiming to score a goal on the opposing side.

One of the children playing is Samuel, Flor's son, who has disclosed in prior conversations about his love for futsal. In fact, he is a member of a children's futsal team that represents the Mills City community for a larger youth league. For Samuel, futsal is a sport that connects him with a multitude of loved ones and members of various communities. "It's awesome being able to play something you really like to do and be able to hang out with other people like my friends. Also, it's cool I can do that for Mills City." Samuel, later on, clarifies that what he means by "that for Mills City" is "being able to do something for Mills City." He sees

his membership and participation in the youth futsal league as a way to foster the wellbeing and relationships among Mills City members. "There are not a lot of sports for kids to join and I like to show people what we know about soccer. I like for people to come see us and enjoy watching us play." Although Samuel does not know everyone from Mills City who attends the games, he often sees these members when he walks with his family around the main commercial streets. "I feel like I know more of Mills City because of these games because I see people who come to the games, but I do not know them well when I go to walk with my mom and sister around Franklin Street." Along with Mills City residents, Samuel meets other children who are around his age range and from surrounding neighborhoods. Sometimes, he "gets to hang out with them after the games, like have snacks or go have pizza close to where we (they) played."

Samuel shares his father's great interest in futsal. "My dad loves futsal! When he has the time and energy, we play together. It's definitely when he has energy because he works hard." Samuel's father, Miguel's, job occupation is in construction, particularly building and renovating houses and apartments. His sporadic and lengthy work schedule often conflicts with Samuel's routine. When their schedules are compatible, Miguel invites Samuel to go practice futsal drills in their backyard or at the nearby public playground. Notably, Samuel recalls a moment with Miguel that heavily impacted his decision to consistently play futsal during recess,

> One day, I think a Saturday. My dad and I were doing some drills. He explained that I was getting better at me using both my feet to kick the ball. He told me that even when he is not there with me that I should practice and to remember that he is there with me. So I try to practice in recess because I want to show my dad what I learned and make him proud. I think about him a lot as I play in recess. It's like he is there with me.

Samuel views recess as an opportunity "to practice his futsal skills" as part of greater efforts to develop his abilities as a futsal player and deepen his bond with Miguel. Specifically, he aims to show his father how he carefully listens and follows his advice on their shared hobby. Futsal also seems to be an experience where he feels close to his father, regardless of physical location. While Samuel follows the structured time and space for recess, his engagement with futsal exposes the multiplicity of relations that he has with friends, loved ones, and members within and across neighborhoods. In particular, Samuel's thoughts about his father when he plays futsal during the school day demonstrate how he sustains his bond with his father, which challenges the dominant expectation of children conforming to a complete separation from their families as part of being students during the school day. Like Samuel explains, "I like that I see my mom, but I also like to think about my dad even if he's not at school."

"¡Vamos Samuel! Trata de pasar la bola a Jonathan," shouts Flor as I approach and stand next to her. She nods at me and says, "Ay Ms. Jasmine, por fin están jugando los niños. ¡Estaba muy preocupada que los niños no iban a tener tiempo para jugar!" Flor explains how the young adult men who are sitting by the concrete steps next to the basketball court/futsal area were playing basketball when she and the children arrived there. They continued to play basketball as the children were lined up outside the courts, waiting for their turn to play. Flor discloses that she had to grab the young adults' attention to ask them if the children could use the basketball courts for a brief period. "Tenía que llamarles la atención porque no era justo para los niños. Les dije que si podían darnos el espacio por unos 15 minutos porque nosotros no tenemos la flexibilidad de tiempo como ellos. ¡Que bueno que ellos no se opusieron y estuvieron calmados!" Students usually have 20 minutes in the playground and basketball court/futsal area because it usually takes 10 minutes to walk with students to and from the dual language program. There are no

explicit rules or procedures for sharing the playground area, and thus, people are expected to negotiate the usage of the public space. Flor views the 20 minutes that students have to play at the playground as a crucial part of the day. "Ellos necesitan tiempo para relajarse. Ser niños. Eso ayuda a mantener su salud. Es necesario que nosotros también protegemos este tiempo para ellos. No solo ver no más cómo la escuela espera." During these remarks, I notice Flor's stern face and one of her hands shaking up and down. It seems important to her that adult members of the school actively ensure children have some time during the day where they have autonomy in the activities that they engage in with their peers. She defies the dominant expectation of being a staff or family member who only surveilles students by actively reconfiguring a public space to ensure the development and wellbeing of children.

Flor's stance about protecting the time and space allotted for recess reminds me of her descriptions about her K-12 schooling experiences in El Salvador. Flor grew up in "el campo donde hay muchas montañas. Tenía que caminar como casi una hora y media ida y vuelta." When Flor was a young girl, government policies were not enforced by public officials or agents to ensure that children regularly attended K-12 schools. Flor regarded her free time as a student during the school day as precious time. "Estaba tan cansada de caminar todos los días que siempre usaba el recreo para descansar y tomar aire. Porque cuando llegaba a casa tenía que ayudar con el dueño de nuestra casa a lado." After school, Flor, with her father, would visit her next-door neighbor, who owned the house they resided. They helped the owner of their home plant crops outside their houses as a way to cover their monthly rent. Although Flor initially liked going to school, she stopped attending due to the various effects of being bullied by her peers. "Paré de ir porque había unas niñas que me molestaban mucho porque aprendía más lentamente las cosas. Ya recreo no era tiempo para descanso sino un tiempo de estrés. Estaba tan

cansada todos los días." As such, one consequence of bullying was recess becoming a time of stress and exhaustion for Flor. No longer was recess a time for relaxation or refuge. She exclaimed how "los adultos en la escuela no fueron atentos en la escuela y por eso es importante los adultos sean bien atentos a lo que pasa con los niños." After leaving K-12 schooling, Flor focused on helping her family grow crops and care for the animals in the farms around her neighboring homes.

Flor often thinks about her K-12 schooling experiences in El Salvador when she works in the dual language program. She leverages these memories as reminders of ensuring that children feel supported and safe at the school. "Quiero que los niños, todos no solos los míos, se sientan bien en lenguaje dual. Que nosotros queremos que ellos estén felicidades y pueden explorar los que ellos quieran. Algo que no tuve la oportunidad en El Salvador." When she was a student in El Salvador, Flor did not feel she could actively choose the topics or activities that she wanted to further explore at school. She hopes to help expand opportunities for children at the dual language school to pursue questions or goals during their structured daily schedule. It seems that Flor tries to contest being positioned as a gatekeeper or regulator of children's learning and development. "No es solo académico que debe importar en las escuelas. Hay mucho más que ayuda al niño a florecer a una buena persona que ayuda a los demás." To Flor, children's schooling experiences should help them become "buenas personas," those who want to help others in their communities.

Flor reiterates "no es solo académico que debe importar en las escuela" from the above previous conversation as we continue to stand and watch the children play futsal. She then looks down at her boots for a moment and sighs. Despite Flor adhering to school procedures and routines that expect her to be an aide who primarily watches over students, she points out that

she tries to protect the few opportunities that children have during the school day to choose their activities. She clarifies how she wants to have other responsibilities and roles at the school. "Trato de darles más libertad cuando puedo proteger el tiempo de ellos. Pero muchas veces durante el día escolar tengo que seguir donde la escuela quiera que haga como cuidadora. Muchas veces estoy parada allí viendo y quisiera hacer más." I wonder if she has shared these sentiments with other members of the school and then ask her about it. Flor slowly looks at me and then up at the sky. She expresses her doubts that her opinions would be taken seriously given the constrained roles placed upon her by the school. "No quiero molestar con las opiniones, especialmente porque esperan que cumplo con el rol y horario que me dan. No quiero meterme en problemas." Hearing Flor's remarks, I am concerned that someone like her, a parent/caretaker/family member, who is also an official staff member of the school suspects that she will endure material or social consequences for voicing her perspectives and concerns about students' lack of autonomy in their educational experiences.

I gently nod and press my lips, trying to affirm her sentiments and express my discontent with this situation. Flor touches my shoulder and tilts her head. "Vamos a enfocarnos en cosas buenas Ms. Jasmine. ¡Miremos cómo va el juego!" She asks Jonathan, one of the children playing futsal, about the score of the game. He explains that there is a tie, 2-2 and that the children are going to move forward with their "sudden death," which means that each team will have one of their players try to score a goal to win. The rest of the players come toward Flor and me to stand by us and watch their teammates try to score for the win. After two tries, one of the players scores for their team, the team of which Samuel is a member. I notice Flor throw her hands up in excitement, but then, she tells all of the children, "¡Buen trabajo chicos! ¡Que partido!" She looks backward toward the playground area and realizes that the other second

graders are lining up. She tells the children to quickly gather their belongings and start to walk toward the playground area.

As we make our way toward the other second-grade students and Kiara, I hear Flor ask Samuel "¿si tuviste un buen tiempo?" I notice Samuel's beaming face as he talks to his mother, which I am unable to hear due to the other multiple conversations occurring among the other children. Still, I think about how Flor and Samuel are confined by dominant expectations of how they should act and present themselves as members of the dual language program during recess. Within their compliance to the policies, structures, and routines embedded within the recess period, Flor and Samuel expand the ways they understand themselves, beyond student and staff member, such as being a soccer player, a son, a protector, a former student, a member of Mills City and El Salvador. They also unpack histories, relationships, and experiences, behind their behaviors and practices during recess. Through this unraveling, Flor and Samuel point out how recess can be a time to honor and leverage relationships with loved ones, experiences with members of multiple communities, understandings from previous schooling experiences, and focused goals for their activities and interests.

Cafecito, Pan, y Lectura

I lean my head on the yellow wall, trying to hide my sleepiness from spending too much time watching Netflix last night. However, I know my efforts are futile because Flor immediately offered me "cafecito para tomar pan con queso" when I arrived. I could not say no, especially since I did not have my regular morning cup of coffee to boost my energy levels. Flor giggles as she notices me yawning while seated at her brown, wooden kitchen table. Embarrassed, I reply, "Ay Flor. ¡Estaba viendo la televisión hasta tarde y fue por gusto! No había nada bueno." Strong smells of hazelnut permeate the kitchen. Lots of vapor is coming out of the black coffee pot that

is on the kitchen stove. Flor turns off the stove. She then grabs a clay cup hanging from a hook above the kitchen sink and pours the hazelnut coffee. Opening one of her pantry cabinets, she tells me "que no me preocupe, aquí estamos para ayudarnos y no juzgar. Pero sí da risa sus bostezos." I tell her that my family also makes fun of my loud yawns, specifically how my fiancé says they are "whale yawns" even though we have never seen or heard any whales. Placing the cup of coffee and plate of pan de queso in front of me, she says with a laugh "Sí muchas veces el humor ayuda para manejar el estrés de la vida."

I thank Flor for her generosity and start to sip on the cup of hazelnut coffee. She tells me "es un placer," and then grabs a wooden chair to sit across from me. As she sits down, she explains that she bought the pan con queso from a nearby Guatemalan bakery, where she usually sees and interacts with other families from the dual language program. "Hago conversación con las familias si los reconozco. Como si sus caras son familiares porque los he visto en la escuela. Algunas veces me hacen preguntas de la escuela como soy una aide." After I inquire about the types of questions that the families ask her, Flor discloses how families "muchas veces las familias quieren saber más sobre las cosas que los niños aprenden en cada materia y preguntan sobre recursos académicos de la comunidad. La información que nos mandan no es clara." She goes on to argue that the school's wording and presentation of information is limiting for "las familias que prefieren hablar el español." I nod as I think about how the school's communicative approaches limit families beyond those whose heritage languages are connected to English and Spanish. Currently, the school's messages and newsletters for families uphold a rigid separation between standardized versions of English and Spanish and are very internet- and technologically-dependent.

Flor notes how the dual language program favors a specific variety of Spanish in their communicative approaches with families. "Mira Ms. Jasmine aunque muchas materias son en el español es un tipo que ellos no entienden ni yo tampoco. Muchos de nosotros somos de Centro América y usamos otras palabras." I quickly gulp a piece of bread as I feel my chest starting to tighten. Her comments make me reflect upon the countless times I have witnessed staff members click on translation tabs or word processing links for Spanish "Spain version" when drafting messages or letters to families. Even though Claudia, the family-school liaison, regards herself as speaking Spanish in ways that resonate with her Guatemalan roots, information and messages sent to families are often sent by administrators and educators without Claudia looking at them beforehand. Additionally, staff members rarely approach families for their feedback about the forms, content, and language of the school's communicative tools. The extremity of how families from linguistically and racially minoritized backgrounds are positioned to be compliant receivers and followers of information and expectations communicated by the school is exemplified in how Flor, an official staff member, is not presented with opportunities to make decisions about the dual language school's communicative approaches.

I suddenly notice that there is a Salvadorian flag taped above us on the yellow kitchen wall. Flor stares at the flag as she releases a sigh. Looking up at the flag, I ask her how she tries to inform herself about the curriculum and programming across grade levels, beyond those of which her children are a part of. Flor presents me with a comprehensive approach for obtaining information related to curricular and instructional approaches as well as the events and programming at the school,

> Bueno pues trato de preguntar a las maestras durante recreo y salida. También mando mensajes por text a Claudia sobre cosas. Si no puedo hablar con estas personas porque

unas veces están ocupados o no me respondan entonces conozco a otros padres de los otros grados y pregunto a ellos para tener la información.

Following these remarks, Flor emphasizes how regardless being "una ayudante para la escuela por unos días, siento que es mi deber saber lo que pasa la escuela." I hear a sense of responsibility and commitment from Flor in rupturing norms, structures, and practices that justify the separation of schools and communities and inconsistent one-way communication. This contestation of schools positioned as enclosed fortresses also occurs within the interactions that families have with Flor in the Guatemalan bakery. Further, Flor contests the dominant understanding that the family-school communication pertains only to a few staff members when she insists that it is her responsibility to be knowledgeable about multiple aspects, members, and dynamics of the dual language school.

Flor glances at me and then starts to look down at the kitchen table. She begins to talk about the nature of languaging and its connection to her approach to being informed about the dual language school. "Buen pues, trato lo que puedo para estar informada, aunque no se bien el inglés o español. Uso todo lo que tengo para comunicarme." After I ask her for clarification about what she means by "todo lo que tengo," Flor explains that she leverages her dynamic linguistic repertoire and knowledge of digital literacies. "Bueno todas las palabras que sé en ambas idiomas y también como sé usar varios apps en el teléfono, trato de usar lo que me ayuda." I am reminded of our previous conversations where she disclosed the impact that her limited time in El Salvador's schools had on the nature of her literacy and language. After leaving K-12 schooling, Flor did not read with anyone around her household because her "papás no sabían leer y mis hermanos vivían en la ciudad. No podía esforzarme en la lectura para conocer más palabras y tuve que concéntrame en trabajar para mantenerme y a mis papás." Even

though she cites the dominant belief of minoritized people lacking language and reports on the impact of her schooling experiences to position herself as lacking language and literacy, Flor strategically employs her dynamic languaging and literacies to ensure that she fosters relations and disseminates knowledge across other minoritized members of the dual language program.

"¿Vas a la reunión sobre escogiendo el nombre de la escuela?," she asks while squinting her eyes at me. I realize that I was probably gazing aimlessly, which may have been interpreted by Flor as me not listening to her. "Perdón, Flor. Estaba pensando. ¡Ud. sí sabe comunicar en muchas maneras y usa eso para unir a las personas! Eh no sé. ¿Cuándo es?" She tells me that the meeting is to choose a new name for the school. There are two meetings on separate days for this issue. One is supposed to be held in English and the other one in Spanish. The Spanish version is going to be held next Wednesday. Elected leaders of the parent-teacher group along with teacher representatives are hosting these events. The elected leaders of the parent-teacher group, mostly composed of people from white and middle-class backgrounds, have argued for the name of the Mills City Dual Language School to be changed into one that incorporates the name of a renowned Latinx person. In turn, the principal, Rosario, heavily insisted that the group needs to get a count of votes that represents the majority, more than 50%, of families that compose the school. One of the leaders of the parent-teacher group reached out to Flor to persuade her to attend the meeting to vote on a new school name.

When I ask about her participation in other events or meetings held at the school for families, Flor presents multiple reasons related to the scheduling of these initiatives as well as her professional and personal endeavors behind her limited attendance,

> Bueno pues muchas veces tienen la planificación de los eventos durante tiempos que no son bueno para mí. Me han preguntado de asistir a planear pero prefiero contribuir a mi

manera, a mi tiempo. Ud. sabe, tener control de mi horario. Los días cuando no trabajo en lenguaje dual estoy concentrada en mi negocio de pupusas que me va muy bien.

I am struck by Flor's use of her phrase "control de mi horario," and think about how the scheduling of events and programs intended for families are created by just a few members of the school. Resisting the dominant positionings of minoritized parents/caretakers/guardians being irresponsive or nonengaged family members, Flor notes how the boundness and inflexible scheduling of the school events and initiatives conflicts with her managing multiple roles and responsibilities, like being an owner of a thriving business. Given her comments about scheduling, I am curious if Flor's regard toward the family-school initiatives would be different if she were in a formal leadership role and had power to make decisions about the nature of these events. She says, "Honestamente no he pensado así de eso. Sí tuviera un rol donde puedo influenciar el horario entonces sí creo que estuviera más atraída de esos grupos."

Finishing my cup of coffee, I think about how and what would family-school events and groups look like if parents/caretakers/guardians from racially and linguistically minoritized backgrounds like Flor could exercise power and leadership in these spaces. Suddenly, I hear quick footsteps behind me. "Mom! Can I have some juice y pan? Oh hi Ms. Jasmine!," Melanie shouts as she tugs Flor's shirt. Samuel is next to Melanie, seemingly to also want a snack. "Hi you two! Melanie, today we are going start with you first!," I exclaim. Today, it's Melanie's turn to go first to read books and practice some sight words. Every week when I visit their house, Melanie and Samuel take turns in the order they read with me. We read books given to them from their teachers and of their choice based on a pile of books from the library or from those I bring with me. Usually, Flor gives them a snack before we engage in literacy work.

She takes out juice boxes from the refrigerator and places them on the kitchen table. Samuel and Melanie quickly grab their boxes and start to sip on them. They grab the two seats in between Flor and me and sit. Using one of the dinner knives already on the table, Flor cuts two pieces from a large loaf of pan con queso and places them on two separate plastic plates, one for Samuel and the other for Melanie. Samuel takes the straw out of his mouth and says, "Gracias mommy. Voy a regresar arriba para jugar." He then grabs his plate and heads upstairs to his room. Meanwhile, Melanie starts to eat her piece of bread between her sipping some grape juice. As she eats, she shakes her head from side to side and starts to sing a melody. Flor has previously described Melanie as “una niña con mucha energía y le gusta decir lo que piensa a cualquier persona." Indeed, I have witnessed Melanie be very direct and transparent in her interactions with various members of the school. I have also noticed her hum a melody when she engages in academic and recreational activities.

As Flor touches her daughter's cheeks and gives her a slight smile, she asks, "Melanie tenemos que escoger un nombre para cambiar el nombre de la escuela. Tiene que ser alguien que es importante y Hispano. ¿Quién crees que debe ser?" Melanie takes a quick sip of her grape juice box and looks up at the ceiling. She then places her juice box down and responds, "Well...I think it should be Sonia Sotomayor or Malala. They have done amazing things. They are very brave! That would be so cool mommy!" During the past couple of weeks, Melanie has been reading and watching videos about famous women and their contributions as part of the biography literacy unit in her class. She has previously mentioned that she "admires Sonia because she had to place needles so young and that hurts!" and that "Sonia still went to school and defends people, like when they don't have much." With regard to Malala, Melanie has disclosed how she "loves how kind she is to many people" and "had to fight to go to school

because where she lives don't allow it." During this time when the biography unit is being taught in her class, Melanie has asked me during our time together at her home about the people discussed in class and if we could read more books about them, especially books about Malala Yousafzai and Sonia Sotomayor.

Even though Melanie reads and speaks across English and Spanish varieties at home, she is often positioned by educators and administrators as someone "who is low reader in both languages" or "not on grade level in reading in both languages." Indeed, she has told me in previous conversations that she learns in "Spanish and English but is still getting better at both." During meetings among educators, I have noticed educators utilized Melanie's standardized language and literacy scores and associated labels to make inferences about her engagement with literacy. Such inferences include Melanie "not reading enough at home," "not having a good literacy environment at home," and "not liking reading books in general." Regardless of these deficit positionings about her literacies, languages, and family's knowledge forms, Melanie has consistently asked Flor and me to select books in Spanish and English that pertain to topics covered in her class. Additionally, she has asked me to bring pictures and videos about these topics to watch together. In other words, despite Melanie's positioning as someone who does not like to read or speak well in both languages, she consistently engages in multiple practices of meaning-making and interpretation, which extend beyond language to include other representational modes. Her family member's encouragement and engagement with multiple forms of literacies also disrupt normalized, deficit understandings about racially minoritized families as not interested in acquiring dominant forms of literacies expected in schools and not engaging in complex and contextually-informed literacies.

After listening to Melanie's suggestions for the new name of the dual language program, Flor lifts her right index finger and starts to tap her right cheek. There is a brief moment of silence before Flor stares at Melanie. "Bueno Melanie creo que la escuela quiere nombrar una persona Hispana que es famosa y ha hecho cosas importante como Sonia." After Melanie asks her "what is Hispana," Flor explains that "Hispana es una persona que es descendiente de países Latino Americanos como nosotros. Nosotros somos Hispanos o Latinos." Melanie nods and then inquires, "But I thought we were from El Salvador?" I am not surprised by Melanie's questions. Her remarks relate to previous conversations about her cultural and heritage backgrounds. In one interview, she stated that she "is from Mills City" and "has family in El Salvador." She has expressed her desire to travel to El Salvador. "I would like to go! I have family there and I do not know them. Like I have talked with them over the phone, but I want to see them. Like where they live. My mom says it is pretty too!" Although Melanie has not been to El Salvador, she wants to learn about and visit this country, especially due to her having cousins and aunts living there. She also wants to learn more about her parents' upbringing in El Salvador. "My mother and dad are from there. I want to know how they were like when they were my age! Like where they went to school!"

Upon hearing Melanie's questions, I notice Flor roll her eyes and seem a bit frustrated. "Ay Melanie sí somos de El Salvador pero también somos Hispanos porque aquí en los Estados Unidos nos llaman eso porque somos de países latinoamericanos." I start to try to think back to when I started to refer myself as Latina/Hispana. Influenced by my inability to remember when exactly I started to use this ethnoracial identification, I tell Flor, "Bueno pues tal vez Melanie necesita más tiempo para reflejar sobre el significado y uso de Hispana. ¿Ud. dijo que comenzó a referirse así cuando llego acá no?" There is a moment of silence. I start to get nervous that I

upset Flor with my remarks or came off as pretentious. Flor turns to Melanie and uses her left hand to touch Melanie's right shoulder. She moves her chair closer to Melanie. Melanie lifts up her left hand to touch her mother.

Flor then lifts her right hand to caress Melanie's small hairs at the start of her hair line and says, "Bueno amor con el tiempo creo que vas a ver el uso de Hispano/Latino más como en las escuelas y otros lados. Eso va a ayudar entender el significado y porque personas lo usan." Melanie nods and replies, "Ok mom...Doesn't the person have to have helped people? And do good things for them. Like Malala and Sonia?" Melanie's comments make me reflect upon the sociopolitical, activist, and community-driven origins of bilingual education. Specifically, her phrase "person have to have helped people" reminds me of how activists and leaders of community groups positioned bilingual education during the Civil Rights Era as a form of political education instead of this program being regarded as only a place of cultural pride. Melanie's question to Flor seems to be a way in which she pushes adult, voting members, like her mother, to consider other factors beyond name recognition and ethnoracial identification, when selecting a person's name to represent a school. In particular, she pushes for the name, thereby, the school to be framed as a catalyst for improving the lives of its members and others in the broader Mills City community. Although Melanie, like the rest of the students at the dual language school, is not given the right to vote on the school naming process, she resists herself being marked as a student who is disinterested in the school's programming and goals by pointing out her nuanced rationale behind potential school names.

While scratching the right side of her head, Flor affirms Melanie's question, "Bueno eso es un buen punto. Debe ser una persona que no es solo famosa pero también quiere ayudar a las comunidades con bajos recursos. ¿Quieres ir conmigo a la reunión?" Melanie seems a bit taken

back by Flor's question. She changes her posture from being very close to the edge of the wooden table to leaning on her chair. "Not really. I think those things are kind of boring mom. Samuel and me don't do anything there. We just sit there," Melanie responds, as she starts to get up from her seat and head over to the living room. Her frank and insightful response makes me giggle. Indeed, I can imagine why those meetings would be boring for children. Meetings for the parent-teacher group or event planning related to the dual language school are adult-centered. Sometimes, childcare is provided in the room next to the room where these meetings are held. However, it is often the case that children who come with their parents/caretakers/guardians sit in the meetings without opportunities to express their opinions about the ideas and issues discussed among adults. They are relegated as listeners or bystanders in the deliberations instead of them being recognized as key decision-makers in their learning and development.

As Melanie comes back to the kitchen with her books and sight words, Flor and I quietly nod. Flor then replies, "Bueno la Melanie tiene razón puede ser aburrido para los niños. ¡Si yo me aburro imagínate a ellos!" Indeed, Melanie's comments highlight several issues about the family participation structures and practices at the dual language program. Although her and other students' experiences and knowledge forms do not inform the topics and relations of family-school initiatives, Melanie resists not being recognized as someone interested in generative dialogue and practices that advance the wellbeing and development of members of her school. Sorting out the sight word cards with Melanie on the kitchen table, I start to think about liberatory possibilities that could result if it were an expected norm within family-school relations to have students like Melanie positioned as key decision-makers, with beautiful complex, and powerful practices, histories, and lived experiences. Once the materials are organized, Melanie refocuses my attention. "Alright Ms. Jasmine, the cards are ready."

Snack Time

Juliana, the third-grade teacher, types into her laptop, which is connected to a projector. She puts twenty minutes into an online classroom timer. As she is setting up the timer, students are taking out their lunch boxes, which are usually under their seats. Multiple voices and conversations among the children saturate the classroom space. "Alright everyone, you have twenty minutes for snack. Raise your hand and Ms. Jasmine will give you today's snack. Today we have grapes! Who wants them?" After classroom teachers take attendance, around 8:50 am, one of the cafeteria staff members walks to each class to leave fruits or vegetables for students to have during their snack time. Snack time is embedded within each class's schedule at the dual language program. School administrators and instructional coaches expect snack time to occur within a 15-to-20-minute time frame. Before this time frame, students are expected to sanitize or wash their hands. However, teachers have autonomy in choosing the time for snack that they think is most appropriate based on their class schedule. For instance, some classes have lunch at a very early time, around 10:30 am, and therefore, teachers from these classes try to embed snack in the early afternoon. In contrast, other classes have lunch in the early afternoon, and thus, their teachers schedule snack time for the mid-morning. The later schedule applies to this third-grade classroom. Today's snack time started at 10:45 am.

I walk over to the front of the classroom, where there is a small wooden table next to the door. I grab the grapes that the cafeteria member left on the table earlier this morning. I turn around and see hands raised in different ways. Some children have their arms fully extended, while others have their hands raised right at their head level. Students are seated at wooden desks that are laid out in rows across the classroom. Desks are between three to four feet apart. Those students who have started to eat have their face masks in paper bags that are placed inside their

desks or on the floor. I walk by each desk of a student with a hand raised and place a bag of grapes on the side of the desks as they continue to talk to their friends around them. According to the school's safety policy during the COVID-19 pandemic, students are not allowed to walk around their classroom and can only talk to their friends who are seated directly in their vicinity. They are supposed only to take their masks off to eat, but often, they end up eating and talking with their masks off. Juliana often reminds them with a stern look and serious tone to keep their masks on when talking with peers. However, after several attempts to enforce the mask policy, Juliana usually stops giving reminders. In previous conversations with Juliana, she has acknowledged that the mask policy "is like a losing battle. One can't blame them. I mean they are seated mostly the whole day with those things and constrained of who they can talk to."

After dispersing the bags of grapes to students who had their hands raised, I shout, "Last call! ¿Nadie más quiere uvas?" Scanning the room, I see that there are no other hands raised. However, I notice something strange. Samuel is not talking to anyone, and his head is looking downward as he is eating his bag of chips. During snack time, he usually likes to interact with other students and eats his meal with a radiant gaze. I quickly place the remaining bag of grapes on the table next to the classroom door and walk over to Samuel. His desk is located on the right backside of the classroom, right before the small group table, which is in the corner of the room. I grab one of the dark blue chairs from the small group table and sit next to Samuel. I notice him briefly look up at me as I push my chair next to his desk.

"¿Cómo estás hoy día Samuel?" Samuel stops crunching his chips and takes a sip of his juice box. He turns toward me and responds, "No tan bien. No me siento bien que no quiero estar aquí hoy día. Ni quiero hablar con nadie." He then goes back to stare at the ground and continues to sip his juice box. After asking him about his health, he explains that "no tengo ánimo para

continuar de participar en clase." He shrugs and stares at me. At that moment, I am not sure what to say to a child who often explicitly vocalizes that he likes to come to school and usually has a beaming smile when he enters and exits the classroom. Referring back to previous times when stepping out of a physical space helped my wellbeing, I ask Samuel if he wants to take a walk and perhaps refill his water bottle. He immediately nods and requests my permission to throw out his empty juice box and potato chip bag. I tell him, "Claro después de tirar la basura, empaca tus cosas y traiga tu botella de agua. Esperarme por la puerta." As Samuel is throwing away his items and zipping up his lunch box, I walk over to Juliana and give her an update on Samuel. "Ms. Pacheco (Juliana) voy acompañar a Samuel a tomar agua y caminar un poco por la escuela. Tal vez vamos a venir después de Snack. Creo que tal vez le va a mejorar su ánimo." She deeply sighs. "Yeah a walk may help because he has been kind of different today and not very talkative."

I thank Juliana and head over to the front door. I look at Samuel and say, "Ready?" After he gives me a thumbs-up, we walk toward the main office of the school, where the closest water fountain is located. Samuel and I are silent as we walk in the hallway. Upon reaching the water fountain, he takes out his blue water bottle and places it near the head of the fountain. Once Samuel fills his bottle, he leans on the white school wall and takes a quick sip from his bottle. "Ok let's walk around and take a breather," I tell him as I glance at the school hallway. Right now, we are at the front of the hallway, next to the main office and entrance of the school. As we start to make our way toward the other side of the hallway, I hear chants, conversations, and commands coming from the kindergarten and first-grade classrooms. As one first-grader passes us, he says, "Hi Samuel!" Samuel gives the first-grader a quick hi and then goes back to look down at the floor as he continues to walk with me. I stop and ask, "Samuel, lo siento que no estás

sintiéndote bien. ¿Hay algo más que podemos hacer para relajarte un poco?" His eyes start to become watery. "I miss my family. Can we see Melanie?," he asks with a high-pitched voice. I realize that today is a day when Flor is not scheduled to come to the school as an aide. Upon hearing Samuel's remarks, I am compelled to give him a light tap on his shoulder but stop myself due to COVID-19 policies about socially distancing. So, I gently nod and say, "Vamos pues."

Walking over to Melanie's classroom, I am a bit concerned that the second-grade teacher, Cara, will be annoyed at us for interrupting a planned activity or lesson. During previous class observations and interactions with this teacher, I have noticed her uncomfortableness in adapting to sudden changes to the grade and school-wide schedule. However, I also start to reflect upon Samuel's rights, specifically, his right to see his sister during the school day, and how school norms, structures, and routines do not recognize Samuel's right to see his sister as a legitimate right that he has as a student. I think about how the uncertainty of Samuel being able to see his sister during the school day connects to the role of a school as a fortress where children, especially those from minoritized groups, are forced to abide by routines, norms, and knowledge forms not of their choosing. Part of this conformity entails children being expected to navigate physical spaces in ways that are demanded by adult, institutional actors. Often, adults, like myself, act as surveillants and gatekeepers of how children use physical spaces at schools. For instance, it is a naturalized expectation in the dual language program for a student to be accompanied by an adult if they want to go on an extended walk around the school. Still, though Samuel is expected to act as a submissive member of an institution, he also asserts his desire to see Melanie during the school day.

When Samuel and I arrive at the second-grade classroom, I quickly step inside and walk toward Cara. As I get closer to Cara, I realize that the classroom is pretty quiet. Students are

reading books or drawing and writing on white, lined paper. Cara is at her desk, looking over her small group conference notes. She looks up at me and says, "Ms. Jasmine. Nice to see you. How can I help you?" After I tell her that Samuel would like to check-in with Melanie, she points out to me that Samuel is still outside the classroom, by the door. I glance over and engage in a hand gesture to ask him to come inside. Samuel cautiously walks in as if he were trying to minimize any noise coming from him. As Samuel walks in, Melanie notices and whispers, "Samuel!" I then realize that Samuel was probably waiting for an adult figure to approve his use of the second-grade classroom space and am saddened by the dominant expectation placed upon children that they must seek approval from adults on how and when to use school spaces.

"Ms. Olson (Cara) nos dijo que Melanie y el resto de los estudiantes están leyendo independientemente. Ella está ok con tomando tiempo para chequear con Melanie," I whisper to Samuel. "Ok. Ms. Jasmine," Samuel whispers back and then quickly walks over to Melanie's desk. Some students look up from their books and writing pieces and stare at Samuel. Since some of them are seated at the front of the classroom, they look back to see where and to whom Samuel is going toward. Meanwhile, Melanie is waving her head from side to side as she looks inside her book about pandas. Like she does at home, Melanie is humming a tune while reading her picture book. However, once she notices that Samuel is walking over to her, she says, "Yay! Samuel is here!" Samuel grabs a chair from an empty desk next to Melanie and sits down. Once I see Samuel settled, I go over to a seat that is located right next to the classroom door and watch them from my angle.

Melanie places her book on top of her desk and hugs her brother. Their eyes are glistening and cheeks are compressing, which makes me think that they are smiling behind their face masks. After Samuel thanks Melanie for the hug, he asks her "what are you doing in class

today?" Melanie looks around the classroom walls and starts to tell Samuel what she has done during the school day so far.

> We counted numbers. We used seeds to count, and I counted with Hailey. We also had snack time. Mommy me puso unos cereal bars and strawberries. Yum. So good! Oh then Ms. Olson read to us about habitats. Like there are many of them. We got to choose our own animals and need to know about them. I'm happy I got pandas!

I am unable to hear the rest of Melanie's comments, but I see her pointing to her panda book and then taking out books from her blue book bag that is attached to her seat. She places all the books on top of the desk and says loudly, "Pick for us Samuel!" Samuel picks up each book one by one. He looks at the front and back covers and then skims the pages of each book. He leaves two books on top of Melanie's desk and places the rest of the books back in Melanie's blue book bag. Melanie tries to push her seat closer to Samuel as he picks up one of the two books. This one is called "Food for Pandas."

Looking at Samuel read with Melanie, I reflect on our previous conversations where Samuel presented himself as "using English and Spanish a lot every day." Samuel mentioned that he is "more comfortable in using English with teachers and friends." In fact, Samuel received higher scores on standardized English language literacy assessments than those focused on standardized Spanish literacy. However, various staff members tried to make sense of this apparent discrepancy in assessment scores by referring to the supposed lack of support from his parents to cultivate the literacies demanded at the school. For instance, one teacher claimed that "Samuel is probably lazier at home and does not practice reading at home. He has no one there to push him to read and get better in Spanish. That will help his English too to be bilingual." At the same time that structures, actors, and policies at the dual language program position Samuel and

his family as illiterate, lacking language, and possessing inferior behaviors (e.g. being lazy or not caring), they continue to display their engagement in multiple language and social practices of meaning and interpretation. For instance, when I read books with Samuel at his home, Flor asks questions about the meaning and sounds of words in the texts. Now, in the second-grade classroom, specifically within bounded expectations and roles placed upon him about his student role, literacies, and languaging, Samuel facilitates meaning-making with his sister and shows interest in her educational and schooling experiences.

As Samuel reads each page, Melanie often points to features in the pictures and texts. She continuously turns to him and makes remarks before he turns each page. I am unable to hear her comments as they continue to read the book about food for pandas. A few minutes later, as I look around the rest of the classroom, I hear my name. "Ms. Jasmine, I am ready to go now." I realize it's Samuel and give him thumbs up before getting up from my seat. I look at Cara, who is piling some worksheets together, and thank her for her support. I hear Melanie say "Bye Samuel! Come back again!" Samuel, who is already by the classroom door, waves back at Melanie. Walking out of the classroom, I ask him, "How do you feel?" Samuel exhales deeply and looks up at me. "Better. Much better."

Since Samuel's initial walk to Melanie's classroom during snack time, he has recommended various changes to the practices, routines, and structures of the dual language program. Referring back to the dominant expectation of adults regulating how children use places in schools, Samuel has demanded that he "and other students be able to go to the bathroom when we want to not have accidents." He tried to support his stance by stating that "each kid is different, and our bodies are different. Like it's not good to think all of us will have to go at the same time." Notably, he critiqued that his school "needs to think more about how we

are doing" instead of "just making sure we if learned or not stuff." In such a way, Samuel names the routines and practices that position him and other children as compliant, submissive members, yet his comments also contest these norms by exposing how they are harmful, uninformed, and unnecessary. Thanks to my walks and conversations with Samuel, I have been more attuned to the creative and multiple ways children, particularly those who are family members, care for one another in places within the dual language program where there is no official expectation for these acts to occur. Some of these instances occur outside of bathrooms, cubby areas, and classroom doors. Regardless of the attempts from various actors, structures, and processes that bound children into a certain order of social existence, they will continue to act in ways that undermine the subjugation of knowledge, groups of people, and forms of communicating within and across schools.

Reflections

When drafting this portrait of Samuel, Melanie, and Flor, I had no clue about what the title of this chapter would be. The process of writing the stories woven in this portrait, as well as watching and hearing conversations among scholars from racially minoritized groups helped me come up with a title. Specifically, two videos heavily influenced other texts and sources of knowledge cited in this section. One is a discussion hosted by the Stanford Graduate School of Education, where Drs. Subini Annamma, Kari Kokka, Maxine McKinney de Royston, Jonathan Rosa, and David Stovall converse about their definitions and examples of the relation between education and abolition. The other video is a discussion hosted by the Harvard Graduate School of Education, where Drs. Eve Ewing and Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot share their perspectives about diverse forms of expression for different purposes and different audiences, beyond dominant norms and expectations of higher education, as part of commitments to liberation, self-

determination, and transformation. Guided by the aforementioned experiences, interactions, and forms of knowledge, I realized that the following actions resonated with the multiple ways in which families negotiated, resisted, and reimagined forms of relating with school(ing): connecting, protecting, and learning. These actions are aligned with what Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) refer to as guiding metaphors and resonances. Accordingly, these resonances of connecting, protecting, and learning permeate the below reflections about the stories that compose this portrait.

Dominant approaches and definitions for family-school relations are often tied to apolitical, school-based, and decontextualized practices as part of larger efforts for perpetuating the enduring effects of white supremacy, coloniality, multiple colonialisms, and racist-capitalism along with other forms of oppression (Baquedano-López et al., 2013; Washington, 2021). They are linked to an idealized white identity, its behaviors, practices, and knowledge forms (Leonardo & Zembylas, 2013). In turn, families' practices, behaviors, and experiences that do not align with these expectations and demands within schooling are relegated as less than and deviant. Ishimaru and Takahashi (2017) argue that families from racially minoritized groups are often positioned as passive, uncaring, or hard to reach. They explain how families marked as Latinx are often positioned as hard to reach or uncaring, as evidenced by their absence in school-based activities or lack of response to communicative approaches from the school (Ishimaru & Takahashi, 2017). Although Flor is positioned as passive and uncaring by the naturalized approaches and definitions for family-school relations that permeate the dual language program, she demonstrates her refusal of these norms by protecting her use of time, labor, and energy utilized for maintaining her family's financial wellbeing and stability, and leveraging social networks to nurture the learning of her children and those of other minoritized families. Notably,

she critiques the bounded participation structures and roles for adults and children in family-school events and in the ways that children are expected to navigate school spaces. Additionally, Melanie refuses the dominant expectation of children, especially children from racially minoritized groups, of being submissive, compliant members within parent-school participation spaces by not wanting to attend these spaces and pointing out that children are not invited to engage in decision-making. What is read as not engaging/relating/involving with schooling by dominant discourses about minoritized families is often these families' refusal to compromise their personhood, relationality, and knowledge for possible recognition and acquisition of tangible or intangible benefits connected to whiteness.

One assumption that permeates dominant approaches and definitions for family-school relations is the idea that if a parent/caretaker/guardian is actively and physically present at a school then he/she/they will be presented with opportunities and leadership roles to make decisions that influence the functioning and programming of a school. Flor's experience in the dual language program problematizes this assumption. She is not only consistently present every week at the school, but also, she is an official school staff member at the dual language program. And yet, school administrators, educators, and other staff members have not allocated her with decision-making power and leadership roles to improve the learning and teaching at the school. Additionally, official leaders of parent-teacher groups have not positioned Flor with the power to impact the nature and purpose of this group. Instead, when assessing the literacies and languages of Samuel and Melanie, educators and administrators at the dual language program have positioned Flor's languages, literacies, and behaviors as problematic explanations for Samuel's and Melanie's institutional language and literacy labels. Flor's experience in the dual language program supports Hernández's (2013)'s claim that even when families marked as Latino/a are

invited to assume official roles at the school, they are expected to conform to specific forms and conventions promoted in policies and structures of schooling. Therefore, even when family members conform in some ways to dominant norms, practices, and structures in schools, it is not guaranteed that they will reap any social or material benefits tied to whiteness because there will be another aspect about them that will be marked as problematic and as an explanation for their subjugation.

As an outcome of dominant approaches and definitions of family-school relations being very adult-centered, children are rarely positioned as decision-makers, informants, or even as participants in educational research, policy, or practice related to family-school relations (Ishimaru et al., 2016; Luet, 2017). At the dual language program, official groups and leaders who coordinate groups and initiatives for families did not recognize the perspectives and experiences of students as legitimate forms of knowledges that can influence the purpose and structure of these spaces. Further, there were no structures or routines that promoted children's interactions with other family members present during the school day. Despite the nonrecognition of children being family members within the norms, structures, and practices at the dual language program, Samuel and Melanie consistently critiqued initiatives from the official family-school groups and presented possible reforms for current school structures, routines, and goals. For example, Melanie asserted that parents/guardians/caretakers should consider a person's advocacy efforts toward the acquisition of rights and resources for minoritized groups as a major factor when selecting the person, whose name will present the dual language program. This priority contrasts the selection of a name based on sole ethnoracial grouping, thereby reifying the positioning of a bilingual program as just a source of cultural pride. With regard to the purpose and goal of the entire school, Samuel recommended that the

school make explicit efforts to care for its students' health and wellbeing by decentering decontextualized and rigid forms of learning as the primary goal of the school. In such ways, Samuel's and Melanie's remarks resonate with the community advancement and political education goals that civil rights leaders had for bilingual education. They show how children have nuanced perspectives and important experiences that can help the school sustain the wellbeing of its members and address issues that impact members as well as those in the broader Mills City neighborhood.

Within the portrait of Samuel, Melanie, and Flor, I referred to the dual language school as a *fortress*, which was informed by Auerbach's (2012) and Henderson's (2007) argument that most of the literature on family-school relations focuses on school contexts that are *fortress schools* or *come-if-we call you schools*. Building on various scholarship focused on carceral logics and emancipatory education (e.g. Annamma, 2018; Shedd, 2011; Winn, 2021), I would argue that dominant, naturalized forms of family-school relations help frame schools as *carceles*. According to Meiners's definition (2017), the U.S. is a carceral state, one that has "multiple and intersecting agencies, institutions, and organizations that have policing and punishing functions" (p. 140). Within the carceral state, Annamma (2018) and Shedd (2011) argue that institutions, like schools, deploy logics, practices, and ideas, that normalize the policing, removal, and punishing of bodies, behaviors, and knowledge forms to maintain social control. Fueled by vectors of oppression such as racism, linguicism, classism, and ableism, carceral logics position some members in schools as inherently valuable and others as deviant, thereby enacting harm onto minoritized peoples, especially children. In relation, the structures, practices, and routines within family-dual language school relations are manifestations of carceral logics. Some examples from the above portrait include Samuel having to ask a teacher for permission to see

his sister; Samuel having to ask if he could come into a classroom; Flor being nervous of consequences if she asserts her opinions about students having more autonomy in their learning and schooling; labeling Flor, Samuel, and Melanie under rigid and deficit language/literacy labels; and a Guatemalan bakery not being recognized as a catalyst of family-school relations. In short, dominant family-school relations that permeate the dual language program justify the punishment of minoritized peoples as a normal aspect of society.

Despite the carceral nature of schooling, its minoritized members will continue to find ways to survive and resist their subjugation and reimagine alternative, more liberatory worlds. Possible worlds are already here and have been here because they have historically been born out of necessity among groups of people in order to continue to exist. In turn, various scholars (e.g. Annamma, 2018; Brayboy, 2005; Patel, 2016) have noted that people must become attuned to the possibilities for better living, caring, and relating with one another that historically have not been collectively supported or cultivated. In the portrait of Samuel, Flor, and Melanie, they have reconfigured the purpose and relational dynamics of various spaces within and outside of schools as forms of survival. During the bounded time and structure of recess, Samuel played futsal as a conduit for sustaining a practice shared by his father and membership with a neighborhood group, which allows him to meet members of other communities. At a Mills City Guatemalan bakery, not officially connected to the dual language program, Flor provides insight and clarifies questions regarding curriculum, teaching, and programming to families who are denied access to this knowledge by the school's forms of communication. At home, Flor leverages her social networks and resources to learn and acquire standardized forms of language and literacies. Further, Samuel and Melanie utilize the structured classroom space and snack time to leverage their dynamic literacies to learn about pandas and take care of each other's wellbeing. As a

whole, the experiences, interactions, and practices of Flor, Samuel, and Melanie exemplify the importance of people attuning to forms of survival that already occur in schools and leveraging them as catalysts for abolitionist education (Critical Resistance, 2022; Love, 2019).

In their conversation at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Dr. Ewing and Dr. Lawrence-Lightfoot (2021) discussed their efforts toward writing and researching with love and beauty as a priority. With regard to love, Ewing and Lawrence-Lightfoot (2021) pointed out the need to care, respect, and show the humanity of the individuals, places, and groups that we write about. They also consider being cognizant and responsive to the social and material consequences that researching and writing have on people, including the writer/researcher. In terms of beauty, Ewing and Lawrence-Lightfoot (2021) reported on the insular and opaque modes of communication that dominate higher education and research, and asserted that it is crucial to generate knowledge in ways that are precise, subtle, and nuanced so that communities beyond higher education can engage, struggle, and learn with it. Inspired by them and following the footsteps of many other change agents, I tried to write the above portrait with love and beauty in mind. I had to write about very complex, messy issues and experiences in the portrait without alienating and disengaging people who are not explicitly linked to higher education. That meant a constant dance between describing, interpreting, and putting myself in the portrait. One outcome was leaving academic citations for the reflection section about the portrait. As part of this process, I had to come to terms with my mistakes and imperfections as I reflected and wrote about the experiences of people I care about and who have helped me survive while trying to finish a doctoral program during a pandemic. Specifically, I had to recognize my complicity in being part of state governance and punishment as an adult and member of an educational institution. However, this example is not to say that transparency and vulnerability are not

liberating. It definitely felt exhilarating trying to contest this socialized pressure of being a "perfect, all-knowing" researcher through this writing by showing that yes, I am sleepy at times, and I do not always have the right things to say or do in front of people. In fact, I think I learned more from them than they did from me. Part of this learning was remembering many beautiful and funny moments with my sister in elementary school and my parents rushing with me on the 1 train to bring me to an educational institution or opportunity. For this, I will always be grateful for Flor, Samuel, and Melanie, as well as the other participants in this study. The following chapter is meant to cultivate future trajectories of learning, collectivity, and responsiveness to the communities and people I wrote about in these last three chapters while explicitly reflecting on how these chapters answered my guiding questions for this dissertation.

CHAPTER EIGHT: Conclusion

I turn up the volume and quickly look back at the computer screen. I notice Eric's eyes are looking downward, away from his screen. Thinking he is ready to end our interview, I thank Eric for his insight on his non-profit organization's different initiatives and local government structures in Mills City. He looks up at me and replies, "Jasmine, let me know if anything comes from this study. You know my family and I have done tons of interviews and nothing has really come from it. Although now I am back and forth between Mills City and Austin, keep me posted, ok?" After assuring Eric that I would update him about this dissertation's implications, he discloses, "You know although I have my daughter now living in Texas, Mills City will always be home for me and if there is anything I can do to help, I will do it." Following these remarks, Eric tells me that he has to run to another meeting and invites me to connect at another time when he is back in the Mills City area.

After my conversation with Eric, I immediately knew that I would revisit the above comments when the time came to figure out the structure and goals of the conclusion chapter for this dissertation. His comments encouraged me to think about how the understandings and experiences expressed in this dissertation would further promote the wellbeing, learning, and development of the people who I learned with and from, as well as of the broader Mills City neighborhood. Although I have periodically shared what I was writing about in my findings chapters to participants, I wanted a part of this chapter to be a space where I can brainstorm future trajectories of studying, learning, and mobilization that advance the goals and priorities of the communities and people I wrote and care about. Therefore, I organized this chapter in the following manner: revisiting research questions; recommendations for future research; studying,

having difficult conversations, and mobilizing in Mills City; and complications, future directions, and commitments.

Revisiting Research Questions

Using discourse analytic methods informed by the conceptualization of policy as a social practice of governing, this study examined how various educational stakeholders (educators, administrators, families, community affiliates) positioned the social groups and language practices of families in a two-way dual language bilingual program in a Greater Boston neighborhood, Mills City. As a major part of this study, this dissertation explored how families negotiated, reified, and resisted such positionalities and their material effects. Through a theoretical orientation informed by Critical Race Theory, Critical Poststructuralist Sociolinguistics, and Feminist Poststructuralist perspectives, I focused on the intersection of race, class, and language discourses that permeated the dominant constructions of family-school relations within the institution of schooling and the experiences of individual members. In this section, I re-introduce my research questions and key findings from the previous three chapters.

RQ1. *How are family-school relations conceptualized by educational stakeholders and related texts of a two-way dual language bilingual program in the Greater Boston Area? How do race, class, and language inform these conceptualizations?* Building on Aggarwal's (2016) *ideological architecture of whiteness as property in educational policy*, I examined how discourses and accompanied structures and practices of family-school relations in a dual language program reified broader, enduring understandings about the roles, behaviors, and expectations of families in schools. Specifically, the discourses, practices, and structures about family-school relations in the bilingual program reified (1) notions of embodied inferiority within racially minoritized groups, (2) individualistic orientations towards educational inequities,

and (3) educational inequities' disentanglement from societal inequities and broader processes. There were five dominant discourses that regulated family-school relations in the program: (1) white, English-speaking families dominate, (2) informing about curriculum, programming, and resources, (3) acknowledging multiple cultures and languages, (4) communicating through internet-based and digital technologies, and (5) communicating through one, correct form of language.

Through these discourses within the dual language program, I witnessed how multiple practices and structures followed the property functions of whiteness to exacerbate or exclude families' access to material and social benefits based on their racialized positioning. For example, the dual language program centered on the preferences, practices, and experiences of families marked as white, English dominant. To garner these families' support to create the program, Mills City school district officials emphasized the psychological and economic benefits of bilingualism and multiculturalism. Specifically, they claimed that by being around children whose heritage language was Spanish and ancestral roots were connected to Latin American nations, families marked as white, English dominant would learn more about other cultures and languages of other parts of the world. In such a way, families marked as white, English dominant could leverage their learning from interactions with linguistically and racially minoritized people to further exacerbate their social and economic advancement in a globalized-racist-capitalist society. Along with school district officials, various families and community affiliates reported how the presence of white, English dominant people maintained the status and reputation of the program, as their presence meant that the program was one where children who were deemed English proficient could learn another language but still be able to interact with those who had similar ethnoracial and class backgrounds and experiences. The positioning of the dual language

program stands in contrast to the deficit orientations toward other bilingual programs, like transitional dual language education, where its members are predominantly from racially minoritized groups (García & Solorza, 2020).

Further, the two legible ways of communicating for families exacerbated people's, who are marked as white, English dominant, ownership of the functioning and programming of the school. One legible way of communicating for families at the school was through digital and internet-based technologies. For instance, printed versions of monthly school newsletters were slower and less detailed than their digital counterparts. The digital newsletters were first emailed to families with email addresses. Teachers reported that there was a lack of protocols that ensured that all families received at least one version of the newsletter. The features and distribution of the newsletters lessened the likelihood that families who did not have internet access and/or digital technologies would receive the same information as those families who did have these resources. The other legible form of communication in the dual language program is related to the separated and hierarchical forms of languages promoted through various school groups and initiatives. For example, meetings for the parent-teacher group, sub-group committees, and school leadership team were conducted primarily in English when held in person. Although some parents noted that there was often a Spanish language translator in parent-teacher group meetings, the translator and the small group of parents who preferred to communicate in the Spanish language normally sat in the back of the room where these meetings were held. One of the translator volunteers disclosed how he had a hard time accurately translating the comments of the facilitators from the parent-teacher groups, given his seating position and facilitators' low voices.

In their reporting of family relations with the bilingual programs, educational stakeholders frequently used the terms, Spanish speaker and English speaker, to refer to families marked as Latino/a or of Latin American descent and as white. These raciolinguistic labels in the contemporary context of the Mills City Dual Language Program stem from racial hierarchies that emerged along with nation-state/colonial formations to group people as inferior or superior beings based on whiteness and European exceptionalism (Flores, 2014). Part of this process entailed framing language as a feature that indicated the superiority or inferiority of people. Contemporary federal and state regulations reinforce the classification of families under ethnoracial and language labels in schools.

At the Mills City Dual Language School, the classification of families begins when parents/caretakers/guardians enroll their children at the school. Families must choose one ethnoracial category and determine a primary language. Children are coded as English speakers if their families reported that they speak English or a non-Spanish language. Children are coded as Spanish speakers and potentially as English Learners who will later take a state-adopted screener. A student's score on the screener determines if he/she/they maintain the label, English Learner. Therefore, along with Spanish speaker and English speaker, English Learner is a category placed upon children through the dual language program's documents and procedures. The enrollment process results in framing the labeling of Spanish speakers as a matter that only pertains to families marked as Hispanic, placing families whose heritage languages are not English or Spanish as English speakers, and bounding each family under one ethnoracial category. These ethnoracial and language categories placed upon families are then used by staff members to form family profiles that will remain with them until they leave the program. Administrators, teachers, and other staff members used these profiles for communicative

procedures and to determine class composition. They relied on monoglossic language ideologies and ideologies of languagelessness to justify how the raciolinguistic terms influenced the procedures and routines at the school. One example is how administrators and teachers explicitly focused on making sure that the students who were labeled as Spanish speakers were evenly spread out in each class per grade level. Having too many children labeled as Spanish speakers was regarded as an extra source of stress because this group of students was viewed as needing support in both English and Spanish.

Through their negotiation of dominant discourses, material practices, and labels, members and affiliates of the dual language program also attempted to contest the minoritization of families. Administrators and staff members actively presented families with resources from non-profit organizations and public forums that could potentially help families sustain their wellbeing, development, and socioeconomic stability. Teachers and staff members were skeptical about how language categories of Spanish speaker, English speaker, and English Learner were accurately reflective of the language and literacy practices of families. Therefore, the individual ways in which educational stakeholders contested while they reified problematic logics and practices about individual families, languages, and social groups show that societal and educational inequities are not due to the failings of a particular person. Although individual members of the dual language program may care about the development and wellbeing of families, they are often confined to enduring and malleable norms and structures within the institution of schooling. Therefore, the problem stems from the collective workings of structures, systems, and relations in society that justify and normalize the flourishing of some people dependent on the suffering of many others.

RQ2. *How do two-way dual language bilingual families institutionally classified as Hispanic expand, reify, and/or resist these conceptualizations?* To avoid sounding repetitive from the previous section, I will focus on highlighting how families resisted the aforementioned conceptualizations and associated practices and structures from research question one.

Focal families institutionally classified as Hispanic were often relegated as unresponsive or unengaged members of the dual language program due to their lack of attendance in events, groups, and initiatives at the school. However, some of these families did initially attend these spaces and collectives. They stopped attending school-related initiatives because the structures and relational dynamics of these initiatives constrained their roles, decision-making powers, and forms of expression. For instance, Marina reported on the limited opportunities that she and other parents/caretakers/guardians had for presenting their ideas and perspectives about the nature of planning and development of bilingual programs within the English Learners Parent Advisory Council meetings. These meetings, as well as those for school leadership committees and the parent-teacher association, were primarily led by administrators or families marked as white and from middle/upper-class backgrounds. Additionally, the priorities and schedules of school programs and groups did not align with those of the focal families. Beatrice explained that white parent leaders' focus on changing the name of the school to one that represented a renowned Latinx person was not very important to her as a member of the school. Flor pointed out how the times and dates of events and group meetings at the school conflicted with her work schedule. When the focal families stopped attending the events and groups related to the dual language program, they reallocated their time and energy to other personal and professional matters that would advance the wellbeing, financial stability, and development of their families. What was recognized as being inattentive/unengaged with schooling was often the focal families' refusal to

continue to conform to roles, norms, and routines that contributed to their continued degradation and denial of material and social resources in society.

Despite the Mills City Dual Language Program's classification of families under ethnoracial and linguistic labels, focal families pointed out their experiences and relationships with various social groups, places, and forms of languaging. For instance, although school documents classified Veronica and Michael as Hispanic, English speakers, Michael and Veronica did not mention these labels when they described themselves. They identified as being from Mills City, having family members from Puerto Rico, and communicating in English and Spanish. Along with these shared identifications, they also disclosed their different experiences and relations with multiple categories, places, and groups of people. Veronica discussed how she lived in Framingham, which was different from her parent's upbringing in Puerto Rico. Michael explained that his father's family is Black/African-American. He further reified his Black/African-American identity as he pointed out several of his linguistic features connected to Black Language. Along with the other focal families, Veronica's and Michael's experiences refuted the notion of assertions of difference directly indicating refusal of shared identity (Patel, 2022). For instance, Veronica explicitly expressed her desire to get to know other Latinx families who had distinct ties with Latin American countries and communicated in multiple Spanish language varieties.

As families described their relations and experiences, they pointed out how different vectors of oppression influenced their ethnoracial identification, languaging, and schooling and learning experiences. For instance, Mariana pointed out how the U.S. positioned her as Hispana and noted how this marker is used to group people whose homelands are Latin American nations. She pointed out how she did not want her daughter, Monica, to be marked as "just American,"

because it was important to Mariana that her daughter sustained transnational relations and heritage practices. Additionally, Monica highlighted the racialization of cultural emblems and how they are utilized within schooling to bound youth's identification and relations within the confines of idealized American exceptionalism. Specifically, she noted how her friends positioned her as American because she disclosed that she liked fast food. However, Monica was bothered by being seen as "only American" and told her friends about being from Guatemala and liking types of food connected to her family and heritage. With regard to languaging, Mariana highlighted how people's deficit orientations toward her English language use affected her level of comfort in using English. Similarly, Monica pointed out how her language use is bounded and framed by her teachers. She noted how teachers describe her bilingualism as indicative of needing help and expect her to have a stronger connection with one language over the other based on standardized assessments. Notably, efforts of focal families, like Monica's and Mariana's, to point out vectors of oppression in their everyday experiences stand in great tension with one of the dominant discourses present in the dual language program, of solely focusing on acknowledging cultures and languages.

Even though families of the dual language program were expected to communicate in standardized language varieties within institutionally designated spaces, focal families reconfigured the purposes and interactional dynamics of spaces within and outside the school to support their educational and schooling experiences. Parents/caretakers/guardians created social networks to obtain information about their children's instructional program and school initiatives. For example, Flor explained how she would meet other families at a Guatemalan bakery, where they would discuss the content and skills across multiple disciplines and inquire about neighborhood resources for academic support. Flor and Marina disclosed that they would call

other families to obtain more information about their children's homework and class social dynamics. Overall, the focal parents/caretakers/guardians explained that they resorted to their social networks because they thought that the informational materials sent to families from the dual language program were presented in rigid formats and language varieties. Part of this reimagining of spaces and forms of family-school relations came from children. For instance, Michael explained that there should be more opportunities to engage in project-based learning experiences that allow students to generate ideas with their parents/guardians/caretakers with and through expansive forms of languaging. Additionally, Samuel and Melanie utilized the classroom space and snack time to learn together about pandas and take care of each other's wellbeing. Even though the institution of schooling aims to control, dismiss, and relegate families from minoritized groups as deviant, these focal families demonstrate that they will continue to find ways to survive and resist their subjugation by reimagining other forms of caring, relating, and living in the world.

Recommendations for Future Research

By framing policy as an expression of governing in society, this study addressed how seemingly mundane and commonsense practices, understandings, and structures related to families in contemporary bilingual programs serve to maintain the interests of whiteness and reproduce material inequities for people marked as an Other. Specifically, I situated these naturalized forms of knowledge, behaviors, and relations at the nexus of official policies, research studies, and frameworks related to families in bilingual programs, and more broadly, in U.S. schools. This work was heavily inspired by Kainz's and Aikens's (2007) analyses of different knowledge forms (e.g. research studies, media texts, and official government policies) to explain how the contemporary emphasis on educational interventions as an approach for

minimizing negative educational outcomes for children living in homes with limited resources is a continuation of what has been normalized throughout U.S. history. Kainz's and Aikens's (2007) study and my dissertation presented the Civil Rights Era as a pivotal period where family-school relations was reconfigured in ways that maintained the oppression and essentialization of people marked as Other regardless of de-jure racial desegregation in schools. However, many of the enduring understandings, practices, and relations about people have deep lineages across societal scales. For example, this dissertation reported how it was an unmarked norm within family programming and structures of the dual language program to separate family members from each other. The practice of schools separating family members reminds me of how Indigenous children were removed from their families to be indoctrinated into Christianity in the mid-17th century here in what is now called the United States (Lomawaima, 1999). As such, future studies may conduct analyses to examine how contemporary family-school relations are globalized and longstanding knowledge projects produced by nation-states to normalize and validate the hierarchies of being and land as property. Along with these analyses, studies that leverage coloniality as a theoretical lens may help point out how family-school relations are knowledge projects connected to long-standing patterns of power that are beyond the limits of governmental institutions (Wynter, 2003; Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

With regard to patterns of power, this study focused on the intersections of race, class, and language in dominant conceptualizations and experiences of families in a two-way dual language bilingual program. Together, three overarching frames, Critical Race Theory (Harris, 1993; Vaught, 2011), raciolinguistic ideologies as shaped by critical poststructuralist sociolinguistic claims (Flores, 2016a; Flores & Rosa, 2015), and feminist poststructuralist perspectives toward identity construction (Butler, 1993; Weedon, 1987) addressed various

sociocultural, historical, and material dimensions within the representations that characterize family-school relations in a two-way dual language bilingual program. As part of this work, I highlighted the collective workings of institutions, actors, and practices in upholding racialized and linguicized discourses about language practices, individuals, and groups of people. At the same time, I reported on how, through their negotiation of deficit-based logics and categories, participants of this study, especially the focal families, expanded possibilities for framing language practices, forms of learning, and group relations. In a way, this was a constant tension of this study, of having to examine historical, ideological, and structural mechanisms that produce problematic logics and categories, while also carefully reporting on the lived experiences of focal families in ways that do not position them as mere victims. However, I argue that this tension is a part of the contribution of this dissertation and indicative of the complex, messy entangled relationship among multiple forms of oppression. Specifically, this study contributes to the research that addresses the social and material effects of race and linguicism in family engagement policies (e.g. Hernández, 2017; Wilinski & Vellanki, 2019), as well as in the lived experiences of families in bilingual programs (e.g. Chaparro, 2019; 2020; Muro, 2016; Nuñez, 2021).

Still, there are many social positionings and subjectivities related to families in the two-way dual language bilingual program that I did not address in this study. For example, I dedicated one chapter to examining the racialization of Hispanic, Spanish Language, and Spanish/English bilingualism, but there were de-facto labels that educational stakeholders used such as "regular" and "nonresponsive" to refer to families based on their ethnoracial and linguistic positioning. Future studies may want to examine the discursive construction of such labels and their material effects on families' educational and schooling trajectories. Part of this

work would include situating these labels within broader sociopolitical, legal, and historical contexts and examining how families' negotiation and contestation of these labels intersect with their "background experiences, migration trajectories, and access to material resources" (Chaparro, 2019, p.2). Further, this dissertation discussed and presented the emergent and fluid nature of subjectivity that is constituted through discourse and in social relations. Therefore, how participants saw themselves and other members in this study has most likely changed and evolved since the conclusion of data generation. Inspired by Chaparro's (2017) use of trajectories of raciolinguistic socialization to examine how race, class, and language influenced individual children's educational trajectories in a two-way dual language bilingual program, I suggest more study of how raced, classed, and linguicized subjectivities of different families in bilingual programs unfold and change over longer periods of time.

Additionally, there were other prominent social categories and vectors of oppression that were not carefully studied in this dissertation. Specifically, many other social locations and processes interacted with discourses about family-school relations and how participants saw themselves and their relations with others. Some of these social categories and forms of domination not explicitly highlighted in this study are gender, sexual identity, ability, heteropatriarchy, binary socialization, and ableism. For instance, the discourses, structures, and practices about family relations with the dual language program promoted the surveillance, confinement, and stratification of bodies. Some examples include the structuring of family events under linguistic labels; the documentation of families under linguistic and ethnoracial labels; and the monitoring of children navigating different school spaces. In chapter 7, I referred to Annamma's (2016) and Shedd's (2011) work on the nexus of public schooling and the carceral state to suggest that dominant conceptualizations and practices connected to family-school

relations reify carceral logics. More analyses informed by frameworks like disability critical race theory and critical race spatiality could have further highlighted how the roles, norms, and expectations placed upon families in schools, in particular bilingual programs, pathologize families. Thus, more studies can deepen the analyses of family-school relations in bilingual programs by addressing how other forms of oppression coalesce in the experiences and interactions of families in bilingual programs.

Studying, Having Conversations, and Mobilizing in Mills City

Part of this dissertation reported on the raced, classed, and linguicized conceptualizations for family-school relations within several governmental reforms and legislation post-Civil Rights Era. Indeed, further investigations could extend a similar analysis to other governmental policies in other states and organizations. However, as this dissertation along with many other studies (e.g. Baquedano-López et al., 2013; Kainz & Aikens, 2007; Nakagawa, 2000), have pointed out, simply creating new legislation does little to disrupt and address broader societal issues and inequities. Instead, collective mobilization, learning, and decision-making across and within societal scales could catalyze systemic changes. Frankly, living in a society where its government structure continuously naturalizes the suffering of many for the prosperity of a few makes me have little faith in politicians and policymakers cultivating societal transformation and liberation. However, I do have faith in what people can do together, and I dedicate this section to brainstorming how I can leverage my learning documented in this dissertation to develop future trajectories that advance the goals of the people and communities I wrote about. Further, Mills City has become a home for me during these past three years, a place where my family and I cultivate relationships and engage in experiences that help us survive in a global pandemic. I use this section also to reconcile the tension of having to physically leave Mills City for a job

opportunity in another state while still being committed to the flourishing of this community, like Eric on page one of this chapter.

As I was writing the findings chapters of this dissertation, I learned about new policies and structures related to families in Massachusetts schools. These policies and structures were in development and were not discussed by my participants at the time of data generation. For example, the reinstatement of bilingual education in Massachusetts through the LOOK Act in 2017 presented several provisions about families of students classified as English Learners. Along with the establishment of English parent advisory councils, the provisions about families in the LOOK Act expanded parents'/caretakers'/guardians' rights to request the creation of programs for children marked as English Learners and enroll their children marked as English Learners in any of these programs offered by their local school districts.

Further, there is now a state family engagement framework posted online with the contact information of two state department of education administrators overseeing initiatives related to this framework. After spending a brief time reading over the framework and searching the state department of education website, I was left with three takeaways: (1) the state definition for family engagement is based on the federal family engagement framework; (2) the framework was created by members from 11 state agencies; and (3) there is an initial rollout of trainings on family engagement for a select group of school districts. As such, I intend to learn more about the content, structure, and actors involved in the programming and events related to the development of the state family engagement framework. Further, I would like to ask the state department administrators, who oversee the state family engagement initiatives, about how they communicate and solicit feedback from school districts in Massachusetts. Currently, I wonder about the rationale behind why state agency members were the only members directly involved

in the drafting of the family engagement framework, and how school districts are selected to be involved in the new family engagement trainings. As I learn more from the state department of education and read more about the framework, I will definitely have more questions and wonderings that will possibly inform future work.

Along with reading about the new development of the family engagement framework, I have been discussing each chapter's findings with participants. I have been talking with focal families about my crafting of their portraits and have been engaging in conversations with staff members about my enduring understandings on the dominant conceptualizations of family-school relations with regard to the dual language program. As I continue to engage in these conversations with participants, I will be disseminating a one-to-two-page summary of my overall findings from this dissertation. I hope to receive feedback from participants about possible recommendations before I present the summary of the findings to school and district administrative groups. Specifically, I want to check in with focal families to gauge if there are any relevant recommendations they proposed in previous conversations that I have left out in my summary. Additionally, I hope to brainstorm with them about ways in which the findings can be useful to their goals, relations, and priorities. For example, some educators who were participants in this study are supposed to conduct family engagement projects as part of their acquisition of additional professional development credits to hold the official district roles of teacher leaders. They have already expressed their interest in leveraging the summary of my findings and engaging in conversations as starting points for their projects. Also, Rosario, the principal of the dual language program, would like to think about strategies for lessening the isolation of the dual language program from the Mills City community. I hope to re-introduce Rosario to Eric, who is the director of a non-profit organization, and Paula, who was a former community organizer and

current family-school liaison at another Mills City school, after having separate conversations with them about their individual goals and schedules. Perhaps they can start to build social networks and events that can expand families' access to material and financial resources.

When I received approval from the Mills City school district and dual language program to conduct my dissertation in their community, I agreed to submit a one-two page summary of my study's findings and recommendations to then present in front of district and leadership committees. Although my recommendations mostly focus on trajectories of study and dialogue, many of them are centered on the reconfiguration of current groups and events. For instance, this dissertation reported on how current family participation structures and initiatives in the dual language program and larger school district are ahistorical and do not address the societal issues faced by many families. At the same time, different stakeholders have (1) divergent understandings about the goals, purposes, and members of family-school relations; (2) regard themselves as members of the Mills City community; and (3) have divergent understandings of linguicized and racialized labels. Therefore, I will ask leadership committees to consider reconstructing groups and events aimed at fostering relations with Mills City families in ways where people can converse about (1) their understandings of the role and purpose of family-school relations; (2) the meaning and usage of institutional labels placed upon families; (3) enduring inequities in Mills City, particularly regarding affordable housing, immigration status, and unemployment. Some possible questions used as conversation starters could be: What does it mean for families to engage in a school? What are some assumptions about people that we make when using a certain label? What groups, experiences, and histories are left out/dominant? Part of this dialogue would entail the study of different sources of knowledge that focus on the above topics and trace their historical origins.

There are various resources that could help Mills City members' process of reconfiguring structures and events aimed at collective study and dialogue for taking informed action to cultivate expansive and humanizing family-school relations. One resource is the Data Inquiry User Guide from the Equitable Parent-School Collaboration Project in Seattle Public Schools, led by Ann Ishimaru and Joe Lott (2015). Referencing one of their partner schools as an example, Ishimaru and Lott (2015) delineate a collaborative process for families and staff members to identify, study, and resolve a relevant organizational issue or problem of practice. As part of this process, Ishimaru and Lott (2015) encourage different forms of knowledge to inform potential solutions and expand leadership roles to families. Another resource could be the different approaches listed by Tuck and McKenzie (2015) for engaging in critical place inquiry. In such ways, members can learn about demographic, political, and geographic aspects and changes in Mills City. With regard to geography, people could learn more about the contributions and roles of non-human inhabitants in the Mills City community. Additionally, resources and members from organizations that focus on political education and community organizing may guide Mills City members' efforts to generate learning, dialogue, and mobilization that support the wellbeing and development of families in Mills City. The Center for Political Education, Critical Resistance, and the Abolitionist Teaching Network could be some of the organizations for reference and guidance.

The above topics of focus and resources are some possibilities that I have thought about for the Mills City community. My conversations with members and leadership groups in Mills City will likely lead to different goals and initiatives. Also, Mills City members and collectives may view some of my recommendations as misaligned with their goals, needs, and experiences. Indeed, these decisions tend to be outcomes of generative and collaborative dialogue. Although

my husband and I are fortunate to have secured job opportunities where we can live in the same city and that are aligned with some of our interests, I am not necessarily happy with having to physically leave Mills City. I have loved living in Mills City and attribute much of my time in Mills City as one of the main reasons for being able to finish this dissertation and hopefully graduate from my doctoral program. Regardless of living in a new place, I intend to continue to engage in conversations with Mills City members, ones where we can discuss complicated, messy topics and issues, and hopefully, with time, build consensus or at the very least, understanding. The pandemic has encouraged the Mills City school district to hold events and meetings in hybrid formats. Further, with the help of mentors, I have negotiated generous financial support from my future place of employment to be able to travel to Mills City for professional development and research purposes. Even though I will be living somewhere else, I aim to keep building and maintaining relationships with Mills City, and hopefully, continue to engage in difficult conversations that result in mobilization.

Complications, Commitments, and Future Directions

Despite my attempts to revise and edit this dissertation to make it sound more cohesive, I know that my efforts are ultimately futile. I changed throughout this process. This past summer, after finishing interviewing participants for this study, I devoted an extended amount of time to thinking about my purpose and priorities at this point in my life. Specifically, I kept asking myself these questions: Who am I ? What do I want? Why am I here? What do I stand for? What am I truly afraid of? It was important to me to think how my actions during the upcoming academic year, my final year in the doctoral program, would be responsive or aligned to the answers that I was coming up with during this moment of deep introspection. Through this work, I realized that I wanted my dissertation to be an expression of my learning and of myself. By "of

myself," I mean that I yearned to highlight other parts of me that were displayed during my experiences and interactions with participants in this study as well as through the process of writing. At the same time, I recognized that I was cautiously trying to write my first four chapters, trying to fit into a mold of what I thought my higher education institution wanted my dissertation to be like. Still, I was more afraid of writing a 200-plus page document and feeling like I betrayed myself to fit into a prescribed mold.

During this process, I read a letter that W.E.B. DuBois wrote to his daughter, Yolande, as she was about to start boarding school in England (1914). In the letter, he said, "Study, do your work. Be honest, frank and fearless, and get some grasp of the real values of life." (DuBois, 1914, para. 4). His words reminded me of what my mother has told me in previous conversations, "I gave you a life so you can live it." Their inspiring words reaffirmed my intent to strive for connection with my readers as I expressed what I learned from and with participants in Mills City. For me, connection also entailed having the courage to be vulnerable by showing my wonderings, mistakes, and conflicting thoughts as I wrote about messy, complicated issues. I wanted to create a form of expression that would allow my readers and me to share moments, where they could imagine me experiencing fierceness yet kindness, anger yet hopefulness, toughness yet tenderness. This meant trying to not fully repress my written expression by explicitly bounding myself to what I was socialized to think a dissertation at my higher education institution was supposed to be like. The result was going back from first person to third person, embedding conversations not translated into English, incorporating the comments from participants as much as it made sense for a section, writing very long sentences to very short ones, and engaging in creative writing.

My writing is not completely accessible to everyone. But then again, was writing solely in English, and incorporating what I had internalized from my higher education institution that a dissertation should look like really that accessible? Before enrolling in my final doctoral course, dissertation seminar, I already felt like a complete weirdo within my doctoral cohort in wanting my research to be in conversation with frameworks that directly grappled with matrices of oppression and multiple social locations. During my time in the dissertation seminar, it became evident to me that there was a specific formula that I should follow in order to graduate. I thought I should follow this formula to manage one fewer obstacle in my journey. After being presented with several sample dissertation proposals during the seminar, I understood that the dissertation proposal was supposed to be the first set of chapters of the dissertation, usually having the following components: an introduction with a problem statement and a claim of significance, theoretical framework, literature review, and methodology section. All of these sections must be written in third person and in English. Any words in other languages had to have an English translation. If I wanted to include myself, I could only do so in the positionality statement of the methodology section. And so, I tried to follow this formula for my dissertation proposal, mostly. I had four chapters written, 120 pages. The following findings chapters would be solely on what I witnessed in the contemporary bilingual program, followed with a conclusion chapter where I am supposed to analyze all of the previous findings sections and talk about my limitations.

After learning with and from participants and through moments of deep self-reflection during the past summer, I realized that I could no longer strictly follow the above formula. I wanted the dissertation to be an expression of my learning, connections, and self. I was confused and nervous about what to do. Time was running out. More like, money was running out, and my

institution was surveilling my graduation timeline. Specifically, I managed to acquire external funding from a renowned educational organization and used the prestige of this funding source to negotiate for my higher education institution to fund my completion of a second master's degree. I was costing the institution extra money. Therefore, I decided to try to leverage most of the original theoretical framework from my proposal as best as I could, and tweak the methods section based on how the data generation went and how the findings sections were taking shape. Some of the work from the literature review section was incorporated into the findings sections because having the literature review siloed from the findings seemed contradictory to my overall argument about how contemporary schooling is indeed political, historical, and connected to broader structures, practices, and systems. Additionally, I had to review more literature to situate better historically one of the findings chapters. Lastly, I incorporated discussion sections within the findings chapters instead of leaving them to the very last chapter. However, no matter how much I tweaked my first four chapters' languaging and tone, they would not seamlessly complement the following four. How could they? The way I was thinking about how I was supposed to situate myself in my dissertation was different at that time, in contrast to how I was thinking about myself in relation to the work when writing the remaining half.

I do not regret my shift in how I saw myself in relation to my dissertation and my attunement of commitments. But I do wish that I would have tried to be bolder, braver, and more honest much earlier in the process. I wish I was more honest with myself around the time of developing my dissertation, and then maybe I could have pushed beyond what I thought I should be and written courageously, with learning and connection at center. If I were to go through this process again, I would have loved to write in the format of a book. One where I could dedicate a chapter per family and continue a back and forth between the historical and contemporary. One

where I was writing in a way that was welcoming of forms of language that naturally permeated my thought process and interactions. I would have tried to see how frameworks from other scholars of minoritized groups, in particular knowledge systems (e.g. Asian American Feminisms; Black Feminist Thought; Xicana/Latina Feminist Perspectives) that Player (2021) has grouped as Women of Color Feminisms (e.g. Anzaldúa, 1983; Collins, 2000; Hong, 2018; hooks, 1990; Wynter, 2003), would have helped weave the relational, emotional, embodied, and experiential aspects of knowledges more seamlessly and cohesively within my writing. Still, I hope these above wishes and regrets serve as catalysts for new, messy trajectories of learning, building, and dismantling. Even though there may be rough patches, disconnections, and misunderstandings within this dissertation's finalized version, I can at least proudly walk away from it, knowing that I did not purposely try to hide parts of me that the institution of schooling has made me believe I could not show within my expression of learning. I can view this experience as momentum for continuing to see beauty and value in showing up as myself as I continue to study, create, break, and build with others.

References

Abrams, D. M. (1987). Political competition and cooperation between public and higher education agencies of state government. *Journal of Education Finance*, *12*(3), 369-390.

Agbo, S. A. (2007). Addressing school-community relations in a cross-cultural context: A collaborative action to bridge the gap between First Nations and the school. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, *22*(8), 1-14.

Aggarwal, U. (2016). The ideological architecture of whiteness as property in educational policy. *Educational Policy*, *30*(1), 128-152.

Aguayo, D., & Dorner, L. M. (2017). Assessing Spanish-speaking immigrant parents' perceptions of climate at a New Language Immersion School: A critical analysis using "Thinking with Theory". *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *25*, 112.

Allan, E. J. (2008). *Policy discourses, gender, and education: Constructing women's status*. Routledge.

Alim, H. S., & Smitherman, G. (2012). *Articulate while Black: Barack Obama, language, and race in the US*. Oxford University Press.

Annamma, S. A. (2018). Mapping consequential geographies in the carceral state: Education journey mapping as a qualitative method with girls of color with dis/abilities. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *24*(1), 20-34.

Anzaldúa, G. (1983). Speaking in tongues: A letter to Third World women writers. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of Color* (2nd ed., pp. 165-174). New York, NY: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new mestiza*. Ann Lute Books.

Aparicio, F. R. (2007). (Re)constructing *Latinidad*: The challenge of Latina/o Studies. In J. Flores & R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *A companion to Latina/o studies* (pp. 39-48). Blackwell.

Au, W. (2016). Meritocracy 2.0: High-stakes, standardized testing as a racial project of neoliberal multiculturalism. *Educational Policy*, *30*(1), 39-62.

Au, W., & Ferrare, J. J. (Eds.). (2015). *Mapping corporate education reform: Power and policy networks in the neoliberal state*. Routledge.

Auerbach, S. (2007). From moral supporters to struggling advocates: Reconceptualizing parent roles in education through the experience of working-class families of color. *Urban Education*, 42(3), 250-283.

Auerbach, S. (Ed.). (2012). *School leadership for authentic family and community partnerships: Research perspectives for transforming practice*. Routledge.

Bacchi, C., & Goodwin, S. (2016). *Poststructural policy analysis: A guide to practice*. Springer.

Ball, S. J. (2015). What is policy? 21 years later: Reflections on the possibilities of policy research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *36*(3), 306-313.

Baquedano-López, P., Alexander, R. A., & Hernández, S. J. (2013). Equity issues in parental and community involvement in schools: What teacher educators need to know. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 149-182.

Barton, A. C., Drake, C., Perez, J. G., St. Louis, K., & George, M. (2004). Ecologies of parental engagement in urban education. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(4), 3-12.

Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. (2000). Language philosophy as language ideology: John Locke and Johann Gottfried Herder. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identity* (pp. 139-204). School of American Research Press.

Bhattacharyya, G., Gabriel, J., & Small, S. (2002). *Race and power: Global racism in the twenty-first century*. Routledge.
Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, *37*(5), 425-446.
Briggs, C. L. (1986). *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*. Cambridge University Press.
Bukhari, S. (2010). *The war before: The true-life story of becoming a Black Panther, keeping the faith in prison, and fighting for those left behind*. Feminist Press at CUNY.
Burns, M. (2017). "Compromises that we make": Whiteness in the dual language context. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *40*(4), 339-352.
Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex*." Routledge.
Butler, J. (2010). *Frames of war*. Verso.
Callahan, R. M., & Gándara, P. C. (Eds.). (2014). *The bilingual advantage: Language, literacy and the US labor market* (Vol. 99). Multilingual Matters.
Canagarajah, S. (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
Caracciolo, D. (2008). Addressing anti-Indianism in the mainstream curriculum. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *10*(4), 224-228.
Carbado, D. W., & Gulati, M. (2003). What Exactly is Racial Diversity? *California Law Review*, *91*(4), 1149-1165.
Caspe, M., Lopez, M. E., Chu, A., & Weiss, H. B. (2011). *Teaching the teachers: Preparing educators to engage families for student achievement*. Harvard Family Research Project.
Casto, H. G., Sipple, J. W., & McCabe, L. A. (2016). A typology of school–community relationships: Partnering and Universal Prekindergarten policy. *Educational Policy*, *30*(5), 659-687.
Chaparro, S. (2017). *Language and the gentrifying city: An ethnographic study of a two-way immersion program in an urban public school* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania].
Chaparro, S. (2019). School, parents, and communities: leading parallel lives in a two-way immersion program. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *14*(1), 41-57.
Chaparro, S. (2020). Pero aquí se habla inglés: Latina immigrant mothers' experiences of discrimination, resistance, and pride through antropoesía. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(3), 599-628.
Chávez-Moreno, L. C. (2021a). Dual language as white property: Examining a secondary bilingual education program and Latinx equity. *American Educational Research Journal, 58*(6), 1107-1141.
Chávez-Moreno, L. C. (2021b). Racist and raciolinguistic teacher ideologies: When bilingual education is "inherently culturally relevant" for Latinxs. *The Urban Review*.
Chávez-Moreno, L. C. (2021c). Toward recognizing multiple colonialisms in the racialization of Latinidad. In E. G. Murillo Jr., et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Latinos and education* (2nd ed., pp. 164-180). Routledge.
Chung, M. F. (2020). "I call them my little Chinese kids": Parents' identities and language ideologies in a Mandarin-English dual language immersion school. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, *3*(2), 179-195.
Clair, M., & Denis, J. S. (2015). Sociology of racism. *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *19*, 857-863.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* Routledge

Cooper, C. W. (2009). Parent involvement, African American mothers, and the politics of educational care. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *42*(2), 379-394.

Córtez, A., & Gutiérrez, K. D. (2019). Socio-spatial repertoires as tools for resistance and expansive literacies. *Transforming schooling for second language learners: Theoretical insights, policies, pedagogies, and practices*, 123-142.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241-1299

Crenshaw, K. (2002). Background paper for the expert meeting on the gender-related aspects of race discrimination. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, *10*(1), 171-188.

Crenshaw, K. W. (2011). From private violence to mass incarceration: Thinking intersectionally about women, race, and social control. *UCLA Law Review*, *59*, 1420-1472.

Critical Resistance. (2022). https://criticalresistance.org/

Cummins, J. (1979 [2001]). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. In C. Baker and N. Hornberger (eds.), *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins* (pp. 63-95). Multilingual Matters.

Daniels, J. R., & Varghese, M. (2020). Troubling practice: Exploring the relationship between Whiteness and practice-based teacher education in considering a raciolinguicized teacher subjectivity. *Educational Researcher*, *49*(1), 56-63.

Darder, A. (2004). The politics of language: An introduction. *Latino Studies, 2*(2), 231-236.

de Jong, E. J., & Bearse, C. I. (2014). Dual language programs as a strand within a secondary school: Dilemmas of school organization and the TWI mission. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *17*(1), 15-31.

Delale-O'Connor, L., Huguley, J. P., Parr, A., & Wang, M.-T. (2020). Racialized compensatory cultivation: Centering race in parental educational engagement and enrichment. *American Educational Research Journal*, *57*(5), 1912-1953.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York University Press.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (2001). *The power of community: Mobilizing for family and schooling*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2006). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory ineducation ten years later. In A. D. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 31-56). Routledge.

Donnor, J. (2013). Education as the property of whites: African Americans continued quest for good schools. In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education*. Routledge.

Dorner, L. M. (2010). English and Spanish 'para un futuro'–or just English? Immigrant family perspectives on two-way immersion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(3), 303-323.

Dorner, L. M. (2011). US immigrants and two-way immersion policies: The mismatch between district designs and family experiences. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. W. Fortune (Ed.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 231-250). Multilingual Matters.

Doucet, F. (2011). Parent involvement as ritualized practice. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *42*(4), 404-421.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1914). Letter to Yolande. https://www.themarginalian.org/2016/02/23/w-e-b-du-bois-yolande-letter/
Du Bois, W. E. B. (Ed.). (2017 [1935]). *Black Reconstruction in America: Toward a history of the part which black folk played in the attempt to reconstruct democracy in America, 1860-1880*. Routledge.
Dumas, M. (2014). "Losing an arm:" Schooling as a site of Black suffering. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 17*(1), 1-29.
Dyrness, A. (2011). Cultural exclusion and critique in the era of good intentions: Using participatory research to transform parent roles in urban school reform. *Social Justice*, *36*(4), 36-53.
Ee, J. (2017). Two dimensions of parental involvement: What affects parental involvement in dual language immersion? *Bilingual Research Journal*, *40*(2), 131-153.
Ee, J. (2018). Understanding parents' expectations and concerns for a dual-language program through the lens of community cultural wealth. *The Korean Language in America*, *21*(2), 218-249.
Epstein, J. L. (1986). Parents' reactions to teacher practices of parent involvement. *Elementary School Journal*, *86*(3), 277-294.
Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*(9), 701-712.
Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2006). Prospects for change: Preparing educators for school, family, and community partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *81*(2), 81-120.
Fennimore, B. S. (2017). Permission not required: The power of parents to disrupt educational hypocrisy. *Review of Research in Education*, *41*(1), 159-181.
Fergus, E., Noguera, P., & Martin, M. (2009). Construction of race and ethnicity for and by Latinos. *Handbook of Latinos and education: Theory, research, and practice*, 170-181.
Fine, M. (1993). (Ap)parent involvement: Reflections on parents, power, and urban public schools. *Teachers College Record*, *94*(4), 682-729.
Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*(2), 337-365.
Flores, N. (2016a). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, *30*(1), 13-38.
Flores, N. (2016b). Bilingual Education. In O. García, N. Flores, & M. Spotti (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language and society* (pp. 525-543). Oxford University Press.
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.
Flores, N., Phuong, J., & Venegas, K. M. (2020). "Technically an EL": The production of raciolinguistic categories in a dual language school. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(3), 629-651.
Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 149-171.
Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1969.)
Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Vol. I: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1976.)

Freeman, M. (2010). 'Knowledge is acting': Working-class parents' intentional acts of positioning within the discursive practice of involvement. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *23*(2), 181-198.
Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2021). The fiftyfication of dual language education: One-size-fits-all language allocation's "equality" and "practicality" eclipsing a history of equity. *Language Policy*, *20*(3), 351-381.
García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Basil/Blackwell.
García, O., Flores, N., & Spotti, M. (Eds.). (2016). *The Oxford handbook of language and society*. Oxford University Press.
García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R., & Rosa, J. (2021). Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *18*(3), 203-228.
García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners*. Teachers College Press.
García, O., & Solorza, C. R. (2021). Academic language and the minoritization of US bilingual Latinx students. *Language and Education*, *35*(6), 505-521.
Gerena, L. (2011). Parental voice and involvement in cultural context: Understanding rationales, values, and motivational constructs in a dual immersion setting. *Urban Education*, *46*(3), 342-370.
Giacchino-Baker, R., & Piller, B. (2006). Parental motivation, attitudes, support, and commitment in a Southern Californian two-way immersion program. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *5*(1), 5-28.
Gillborn, D. (2009). Education policy as an act of White supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory, and education reform. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 51-72). Routledge.
Gillborn, D. & Ladson-Billings, G. (2010). Education and critical race theory. In M. W. Apple, S. J. Ball, & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Sociology of Education* (pp. 37-48). Routledge.
Gilmore, R. W. (2002). Fatal couplings of power and difference: Notes on racism and geography. *The Professional Geographer*, *54*(1), 15-24.
Gómez, L. E. (2018). *Manifest destinies: The making of the Mexican American race.* New York University Press.
Golash-Boza, T. (2016). A critical and comprehensive sociological theory of race and racism. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *2*(2), 129-141.
Goodall, J., & Montgomery, C. (2014). Parental involvement to parental engagement: A continuum. *Educational Review*, *66*(4), 399-410.
Gordon, V., & Nocon, H. (2008). Reproducing segregation: Parent involvement, diversity, and school governance. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *7*(4), 320-339.
Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Rowman & Littlefield.
Graue, M. E. (2005). Theorizing and describing preservice teachers' images of families and schooling. *Teachers College Record*, *107*(1), 157-185.
Graue, M. E. & Oen, D. (2009). You just feed them with a long-handled spoon: Families evaluate their experiences in a class size reduction reform. *Educational Policy*, *23*(5), 685-713.

Graue, M. E. & Sherfinski, M. (2011). The view from the Lighted Schoolhouse: Conceptualizing home-school relations within a class size reduction reform. *American Journal of Education*, *117*(2), 267-297.
Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual*. Harvard University Press.
Haney López, I. (2003). *Racism on trial: The Chicano fight for justice*. Harvard University Press.
Hanks, W. (1996). *Language and communicative practices*. Westview Press.
Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, *106*(8), 1707-1791.
Harris, C. (1995). Whiteness as property. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 276-291). The New Press.
Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement.* National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools.
Henderson, A., Mapp, K. L., Johnson, V. R., & Davies, D. (2007). *Beyond the bake sale: The essential guide to family-school partnership*. The New Press.
Herbert, C., Spader, J., Molinsky, J., & Rieger, S. (Eds). (2018). *A shared future: Fostering communities of inclusion in an era of inequality.* Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies.
Hernandez, S. (2013). *When institutionalized discourses become familial: Mexican immigrant families interpreting and enacting high stakes educational reform* [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley].
hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics.* South End.
Hong, G. K. (2018). Intersectionality and incommensurability: Third World feminism and Asian decolonization. In L. Fujiwara & S. Roshanravan (Eds.), *Asian American feminisms and women of Color politics* (pp. 27-42). University of Washington Press
Hughey, M. (2012). *White bound: Nationalists, antiracists, and the shared meaning of race*. Stanford University Press.
Hurtado, A. (2019). "Race" in search of a discipline. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 52*(1), 75-88.
Ishimaru, A. M. (2014). When New Relationships Meet Old Narratives: The Journey towards Improving Parent-School Relations in a District-Community Organizing Collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, *116*(2), 1-56.
Ishimaru, A. M. (2019). From family engagement to equitable collaboration. *Educational Policy*, *33*(2), 350-385.
Ishimaru, A. M., Lott, J., Equitable Parent-School Collaboration Research Project, & UW Kent School District Design Team. (2015). Families in the driver's seat: Parent-driven lessons and guidelines for collective engagement, a Road Map Parent/Family Engagement Curriculum. College of Education, University of Washington.
Ishimaru, A. M., & Takahashi, S. (2017). Disrupting racialized institutional scripts: Toward parent–teacher transformative agency for educational justice. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *92*(3), 343-362.
Ishimaru, A. M., Torres, K. E., Salvador, J. E., Lott, J., Williams, D. M. C., & Tran, C. (2016). Reinforcing deficit, journeying toward equity: Cultural brokering in family engagement initiatives. *American Educational Research Journal*, *53*(4), 850-882.
Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. Routledge.

Jefferson, A. (2015). Examining barriers to equity: School policies and practices prohibiting interaction of families and schools. *The Urban Review*, *47*(1), 67-83.
Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Urban Education*, *42*(1), 82-110.
Johnson, M. (2012). *The 21st century parent: Multicultural parent engagement leadership strategies handbook*. Information Age.
Johnson, E. J., & Johnson, D. C. (2015). Language policy and bilingual education in Arizona and Washington state. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,18*(1), 92-112.
Kainz, K., & Aikens, N. L. (2007). Governing the family through education: A genealogy on the home/school relation. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *40*(4), 301-310.
Kelly, L. B. (2018). Interest convergence and hegemony in dual language: Bilingual education, but for whom and why? *Language Policy*, *17*(1), 1-21.
Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), 47-68.
Ladson-Billings, G. (2010). Race to the top, again: Comments on the genealogy of critical race theory. *Connecticut Law Review*, *43*, 1439-1457.
Lagemann, E. (2000). *An elusive science: The troubling history of education research.* University of Chicago Press.
Lareau, A., & Horvat, E. M. (1999). Moments of social inclusion and exclusion: Race, class, and cultural capital in family-school relationships. *Sociology of Education*, *72*(1), 37-53.
Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. L. (2004). *The essential conversation: What parents and teachers can learn from each other.* Ballantine Books.
Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2005). Reflections on portraiture: A dialogue between art and science. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *11*(3), 3-15.
Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J. H. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture.* Jossey-Bass.
Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. Routledge.
Leonardo, Z., & Broderick, A. A. (2011). Smartness as property: A critical exploration of intersections between whiteness and disability studies. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(10), 2206-2232.
Leonardo, Z., & Zemblyas, M. (2013). Whiteness as technology of affect: Implications for educational praxis. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *46*, 150-165.
Lewis-McCoy, R. H. (2014). *Inequality in the promised land: Race, resources, and suburban schooling*. Stanford University Press.
Levinson, B. A., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power: Theoretical tools, ethnographic methods, democratic options. *Educational Policy*, *23*(6), 767-795.
Lipsitz, G. (2007). The racialization of space and the spatialization of race: Theorizing the hidden architecture of landscape. *Landscape Journal, 26*(1), 10-23.
Love, B. L. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Beacon Press.
De Lissovoy, N. (2013). Pedagogy of the impossible: Neoliberalism and the ideology of accountability. *Policy Futures in Education*, *11*(4), 423-435.
Lomawaima, K. T. (1999). The unnatural history of American Indian education. In K. G. Swisher & J. W. Tippeconnic III (Eds.), *Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education* (pp. 2-30). ERIC/CRESS.

López, G. (2001). The value of hard work: Lessons on parent involvement from an (im)migrant household. *Harvard Educational Review*, *71*(3), 416-437.
Lu, M. (1992). Conflict and struggle: The enemies or preconditions of basic writing? *College English, 54*(8), 887-913.
Luet, K. M. (2017). Disengaging parents in urban schooling. *Educational Policy*, *31*(5), 674-702.
Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). ON THE COLONIALITY OF BEING. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2-3), 240-270.
Mangual Figueroa, A. (2011). Citizenship and education in the homework completion routine. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *42*(3), 263-280.
Mapp, K. L. (2012). *Tightening up Title I: Title I and parent involvement: Lessons from the past, recommendations for the future*. Center for American Progress and American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
Mapp, K. L., & Kuttner, P. J. (2014). *Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships*. SEDL. http://www.ed.gov/family-and-community-engagement
Marcelo, P., & Fonseca, F. (2018, July 4). *Land-trust case for Wampanoag Tribe raises concerns across Indian country*. WBUR News. https://www.wbur.org/news/2018/07/04/wampum-wampanoag-trust-case
Massey, D. (1991). The political place of locality studies. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, *23*(2), 267-281.
Matias, C. E. (2016). "Mommy, is being Brown bad?": Critical race parenting in a "post-race" era. *Journal of Race and Pedagogy, 1*(3). Article 1.
McCarthy Foubert, J. L. (2019). 'Damned if you do, damned if you don't:' Black parents' racial realist school engagement. *Race Ethnicity and Education*.
Mediratta, K., Shah, S., & McAlister, S. (2009). *Community organizing for stronger schools: Strategies and successes.* Harvard Education Press.
Miles, M., Huberman, M., & Saldaña, J. (2013) *Qualitative data analysis.* Sage.
Mizes-Tan, S. (2018, September 13). *Wampanoag Tribal land dispute.* WCAI News. https://www.capeandislands.org/post/wumpumwampanoag-tribal-lands-dispute#stream/
Molina, N. (2014). *How race is made in America: Immigration, citizenship, and the historical power of racial scripts.* University of California Press.
Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, *3*, 132-141.
Mora, G. C. (2014). *Making Hispanics: How activists, bureaucrats, and media constructed a new American.* University of Chicago Press.
Morales, M. C., & Harris, L. M. (2014). Using subjectivity and emotion to reconsider participatory natural resource management. *World Development*, *64*, 703-712.
Morita-Mullaney, T., Renn, J., & Chiu, M. M. (2020). Obscuring equity in dual language bilingual education: A longitudinal study of emergent bilingual achievement, course placements, and grades. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(3), 685-718.
Moynihan, D. P. (1965). *The negro family: The case for national action.* United States Department of Labor.
Muñoz, C. (1989). *Youth, identity, power: The Chicano movement.* Verso.
Muro, J. A. (2016). "Oil and water"? Latino-white relations and symbolic integration in a changing California. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *2*(4), 516-530.

Nakagawa, K. (2000). Unthreading the ties that bind: Questioning the discourse of parent involvement. *Educational Policy*, *14*(4), 443-472.
Newcomer, S. N., & Puzio, K. (2016). *Cultivando confianza*: A bilingual community of practice negotiates restrictive language policies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *19*(4), 347-369.
Nieto, S. M. (2002). Profoundly multicultural questions. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(4), 6-10.
Ngai, P. B., & Koehn, P. H. (2016). Teacher/family partnerships for student learning: Lessons from Indian education for all in Montana. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *55*(1), 23-48.
Nightingale, A. J. (2011). Beyond design principles: subjectivity, emotion, and the (ir)rational commons. *Society and Natural Resources*, *24*(2), 119-132.
Nopper, T. K. (2011). The wages of non-Blackness: Contemporary immigrant rights and discourses of character, productivity, and value. *Tensions Journal*, *5*, 1-25.
Nuñez, I. (2021). Collective (re)constructions of linguistic surveillance at home: Transfronterizx families as cultural and linguistic guardians. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *54*(3), 238-251.
Oliva, N., & Alemán Jr, E. (2019). A *muxerista* politics of education: Latina mother leaders enacting educational leadership and policy advocacy. *Educational Policy*, *33*(1), 67-87.
Olivos, E. M., & Lucero, A. M. (2018). Latino parents in dual language immersion programs: Why are they so satisfied? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(10), 1211-1224.
Olivos, E. M., Ochoa, A. M., & Jiménez-Castellanos, O. (2011). Critical voices in bicultural parent engagement: A framework for transformation. In E. M. Olivos, O. Jiménez-Castellanos, & A. M. Ochoa (Eds.), *Bicultural parent engagement: Advocacy and empowerment* (pp. 1-17). Teachers College Press.
Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the US: From the 1960s to the 1990s.* Routledge.
Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as a NNES": One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*, 127-151.
Parkes, J., & Ruth, T. (2011). How satisfied are parents of students in dual language education programs?: 'Me parece maravillosa la gran oportunidad que le están dando a estos niños'. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *14*(6), 701-718.
Patel, L. (2016a). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. Routledge.
Patel, L. (2016b). Pedagogies of resistance and survivance: Learning as marronage. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *49*(4), 397-401.
Patel, L. (2022). Social categories and the differences within: a theoretical call for dynamic analyses. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *35*(1), 90-107.
Patton, M. Q. (2002). Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry: A personal, experiential perspective. *Qualitative Social Work*, *1*(3), 261-283.
Pérez-Torres, R. (2000). Ethnicity, ethics, and Latino aesthetics. *American Literary History, 12*(3), 534-553.
Pennycook, A. (2006). Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 60-76). Blackwell Publishing.

Phuong, J. (2021). *Teacher collaboration and learner categories in bilingual special education: An exploration of race, language, and disability* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania].
Player, G. D. (2021). "People get mistaken": Asian American girls using multiple literacies to defy dominant imaginings of Asian American girlhood. *Reading Research Quarterly*.
Posey-Maddox, L. (2014). *When middle-class parents choose urban schools: Class, race, and the challenge of equity in public education*. University of Chicago Press.
Posey-Maddox, L. (2017). Race in place: Black parents, family-school relations, and multi-spatial microaggressions in a predominantly white suburb. *Teachers College Record, 119*(11), 1-42.
Prins, E., & Toso, B. W. (2008). Defining and measuring parenting for educational success: A critical discourse analysis of the parent education profile. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*(3), 555-596.
Ramos, F. (2007). What do parents think of two-way bilingual education? An analysis of responses. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *6*(2), 139-150.
Reynolds, R. E. (2010). "They think you're lazy," and other messages Black parents send their Black sons: An exploration of Critical Race Theory in the examination of educational outcomes for Black males. *Journal of African American Males in Education*, *1*(2), 144-163.
Reynolds, R. E. (2014). From their perspectives: Using critical race theory as a methodology to examine the experiences of Black middle-class parents in public secondary schools. In A. D. Dixson (Ed.), *Researching race in education: Policy, practice, and qualitative research* (pp. 133-152). Information Age Publishing.
Reynolds, R. E. (2015). We've been post-raced: Negotiations between race, agency, and school structures Black families experience. *National Society for the Study of Education*, *114*(2), 148-170.
Rickford, J. R. (1999). *African American Vernacular English: Features, evolution, educational implications*. Blackwell Publishers.
Ringrose, J. (2002). Developing feminist pedagogical practices to complicate whiteness and work with defensiveness. In C. Levine-Rasky (Ed.), *Working through whiteness: International perspectives* (pp. 289-318). State University of New York Press.
Robinson, C. (2000 [1983]). *Black Marxism: The making of the black radical tradition*. University of North Carolina Press.
Romano, B. (2017, May). *Watch City/La Ciudad del Reloj*. Brandeis University Heller School for Social Policy and Management. https://heller.brandeis.edu/news/items/releases/2017/summer-magazine-waltham-dual-language.html
Rosa, J. D. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: Raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *26*(2), 162-183.
Rosa, J. (2019). *Looking like a language, sounding like a race*. Oxford Studies in Anthropology.
Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, *46*(5), 621-647.
Rousseau, C. K., & Dixson, A. D. (2006). The first day of school: A CRT story. In A. D. Dixon & C. K. Rousseau (Ed.), *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 57-65). Routledge.

Scanlan, M., & Palmer, D. (2009). Race, power, and (in)equity within two-way immersion settings. *The Urban Review*, *41*(5), 391-415.
Shannon, S. (2011). Parent engagement and equity in a dual language program. In E. M. Olivos, O. Jiménez-Castellanos, & A. M. Ochoa (Eds.), *Bicultural parent engagement: Advocacy and empowerment* (pp. 83-102). Teachers College Press.
Shedd, C. (2011). Countering the carceral continuum: The legal of mass incarceration. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *10*, 865-871.
Shiffman, C. D. (2013). The juggling act: Navigating parent involvement in the welfare reform era. *Educational Policy*, *27*(1), 64-91.
Shirley, D. (1997). *Community organizing for urban school reform*. University of Texas Press.
Schissel, J. L. (2019). *Social consequences of testing for language-minoritized bilinguals in the United States*. Multilingual Matters.
Shuffelton, A. (2020). What parents know: Risk and responsibility in United States education policy and parents' responses. *Comparative Education*, *56*(3), 365-378.
Shumow, L., & Miller, J. D. (2001). Parents' at-home and at-school academic involvement with young adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *21*(1), 68-91.
Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Wayne State University Press.
Snyder, R. (2020). The right to define: analyzing whiteness as a form of property in Washington state bilingual education law. *Language Policy*, *19*(1), 31-60.
Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). A critical race counterstory of race, racism, and affirmative action. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 155-168.
Stefancic, J., & Delgado, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Temple University Press.
Stephens, R., & Zhang, M. (2020). From builders to their tools: Crafting 'poverty knowledge' from "the Moynihan Report" to today. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, *14*(2), 87-95.
Stovall, D. O. (2016). *Born out of struggle: Critical race theory, school creation, and the politics of interruption*. SUNY Press.
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.
Sung, K.-Y. (2020). Parent satisfaction and one-way Mandarin Chinese dual language programs in Utah. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *43*(4): 384-399.
The National Family, School, and Community Engagement Working Group. (2010). *Taking leadership, innovating change: Profiles in family, school, and community engagement*. http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-ourpublications/taking-leadership-innovating-change-profiles-in-family-school-andcommunity-engagement
Thompson, G. L. (2003). *What African American parents want educators to know*. Rowman & Littlefield Education.
Tienda, M., & Mitchell, F. (2006). *Multiple origins, uncertain destinies: Hispanics and the American future.* National Academies Press.
Tuck, E., & McKenzie, M. (2015). *Place in research: Theory, methodology, and methods.* Routledge.
Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1).

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014a). Unbecoming claims: Pedagogies of refusal in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *20*(6), 811-818.
Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014b). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities* (pp. 223-248). Sage Publications.
Turner, A. M. (2016). Third space openings at a two-way immersion elementary school in North Carolina: Lessons from parent language classes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *39*(2), 107-120.
U.S. Census (2020 [1990]). 2020/1990 Demographic Analysis Estimates. https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2020/2020-demographic-analysis-estimates.html
U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Good Start, Grow Smart: The Bush administration's early childhood initiative: Executive summary.* http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/earlychildhood/earlychildhood.html
U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Obama administration announces $500 million for Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge: New state competition to establish and expand high quality early learning programs*. Press Office, U.S. Department of Education. http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/obama-administrationannounces-500-million-race-top-early-learning-challenge
Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67*(3), 391-430.
Valdés, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *41*(4), 388-412.
Valdez, V. E., Freire, J. A., & Delavan, M. G. (2016). The gentrification of dual language education. *The Urban Review*, *48*(4), 601-627.
Vaught, S. E. (2011). *Racism, public schooling, and the entrenchment of white supremacy: A critical race ethnography*. SUNY Press.
Vuilleumier, M. (1970). *Indians on Olde Cape Cod*. Wm. S. Sullwold Publishing.
Warren, M. R., Hong, S., Rubin, C. L., & Uy, P. S. (2009). Beyond the bake sale: A community-based relational approach to parent engagement in schools. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(9), 2209-2254.
Washington, S. A. (2021). An Indigenous Community's Fight for Cultural Continuity and Educational Equity With/In and Against a New England School District. *Teachers College Record*, *123*(12).
Weaver, S. M., & Reising, B. (2007). Cultivating connections with parents. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *81*(1), 5-7.
Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructural theory*. Wiley.
Weedon, C. (2007). Postcolonial feminist criticism. In G. Plain & S. Sellers (Eds.), *A history of feminist literary criticism* (pp. 282-300). Cambridge University Press.
Weinstein-Farson, L. (1989). *The Wampanoag*. Chelsea House Publishers.
Weiss, H. B., Lopez, M. E., & Rosenberg, H. (2011). *Beyond random acts: Family, school, and community engagement as an integral part of education reform*. Harvard Family Research Project. http://www.nationalpirc.org/engagement_forum/beyond_random_acts.pdf
Wesely, P. M., & Baig, F. (2012). The "extra boost": Parental involvement and decision making in immersion programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *35*(3), 314-330.

Wilinski, B., & Morley, A. (2019). “Parent leadership and voice”: How mid-level administrators appropriate pre-Kindergarten parent involvement policy. *Educational Policy*.

Wilinski, B., & Vellanki, V. (2020). A comparative case study of public pre-K teachers’ enactment of parent involvement policy. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *51*(3), 359-375.

Winn, M. T. (2021). Futures matter: Creating just futures in this age of hyper-incarceration. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *96*(5), 527-539.

Woods, C. (2019, May). Changes faces throughout Greater Boston. Institute for New England Native American Studies-UMass Boston. Retrieved from: https://www.umb.edu/inenas/publications_presentations

Woodson, C. G. (2006). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Book Tree.

Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation–An argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review, 3*(3), 257-337.

Youdell, D. (2006). Subjectivation and performative politics—Butler thinking Althusser and Foucault: Intelligibility, agency and the raced–nationed–religioned subjects of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *27*(4), 511-528.