Linguistics and Education 84 (2024) 101358

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Linguistics and Education

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/linged

Promoting humanizing, meaningful, and just language instruction for multilingual learners and their peers: A pedagogical vision illustrated by examples from practice

Emily Phillips Galloway [a,*], Paola Uccelli [b]

[a] Vanderbilt University, United States
[b] Harvard Graduate School of Education, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Academic registers
Language learning
Academic language
Humanizing pedagogies
Translanguaging
Multilingualism

ABSTRACT

In this article, we engage with the question of how to create just and humanizing instructional conditions for learning *through* and *about* language at school. Rather than an empirical study, this article invites readers to rethink the role of languages in education by introducing and illustrating what we call *Pedagogies of Voices* (POV). Informed by research and practice, POV instructional approaches acknowledge and leverage the reality of multilingual and multidialectal repertoires in linguistically diverse classrooms, counteracting the tendency towards prescriptivism, which constrains what counts as language learning and teaching in schools. Through vignettes from middle-school multilingual classrooms implementing the TRANSLATE literacy curriculum, we illustrate how POV-inspired instruction transforms the conventions of classroom interactions by scaffolding language learning through relational activities that affirm and expand students' multilingual repertoires and metalinguistic strategies for learning through and about language. These POV-inspired practices shift the role of teachers, who become learners of their students' ways with language and shift the instructional goal from a narrow focus on teaching the language of school literacy to a concerted effort to foster flexible, resourceful, critical, and creative student voices—what we call *Critical Rhetorical Flexibility*. These two shifts, we argue, contribute to creating the enabling conditions to foster inclusive, humanizing communities in which students and teachers experience the joyful challenge of learning through languages together. We conclude with thoughts and considerations for theory, future practice-embedded research, and evidence-based educational practice.

1. Promoting humanizing, meaningful, and just language instruction for multilingual learners and their peers: A pedagogical vision illustrated by examples from practice

"You know, (pause)…umm…it's like I'm trying to make this like a place where they're using what they know about language to support them as readers and thinkers… to learn new things, not using just what they know just as individuals, but what they know together."

-Monica, TRANSLATE partner teacher of a 5th-grade multilingual classroom

Monica, a collaborating fifth-grade teacher, and I (Emily) sat in her classroom, discussing the language teaching philosophy that guided her instruction. Monica's primary goal was to cultivate her multilingual, multidialectal, and multicultural students' robust identities as readers and writers. She did this by drawing on their deep knowledge and skills acquired in home, school, and community settings around languaging—the dynamic social process of using language to shape knowledge and make meaning (Swain, 2006; c.f., academic languaging in Sembiante & Tian, 2021). This aligned with decades-long calls to honor and build upon learners' home languages, languaging practices, and cultures in the classroom (Ladson-Billings, 2014; Moll, 2019; Paris, 2012, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2017; Smitherman, 2017). Indeed, extensive research reveals that relationships, identities, and new knowledge are mainly, though not exclusively, constructed and reconstructed through language (e.g., Bedolla, 2003; Cummins, 2014; Giroux, 1988; Heller & Morek, 2015; Hornberger, 2020; Kibler et al., 2020; Pearson et al., 2024; Shin, 2017; Walqui & Van Lier, 2010).

However, Monica's first goal often felt at odds with her second: teaching students new concepts as well as the specialized languaging practices characteristic of academic communities, for example,

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: emily.phillips.galloway@vanderbilt.edu (E.P. Galloway).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101358
Received 4 March 2024; Received in revised form 27 September 2024; Accepted 1 October 2024
Available online 13 November 2024

cautiously expressing a perspective or marshaling evidence to support a claim. This demanded that she teach language for school literacy or linguistic resources that co-occur with the socioculturally situated knowledge development and reasoning practices frequent in schools and beyond in professional communities and civic discourse (Biber & Conrad, 2009; Snow & Uccelli, 2009). While these discourse skills can support social cohesion and change beyond the classroom (Haneda, 2014; Lee, 2020), they can also be wielded to exclude students whose everyday languaging practices differ from those common in schools (Anzaldúa, 1987; Baker-Bell, 2020; Valdés, 2004). This tension left Monica grappling with how to effectively teach new languaging practices to enable students' full participation in the classroom's learning community while meaningfully incorporating their existing linguistic and metalinguistic strengths. Fundamentally, she wondered: *How do I teach through and about language in humanizing, meaningful, and just ways that rigorously support my students in recognizing and realizing their full human potential?* In this article, we wrestle—alongside Monica and many other dedicated educators—with this complex though essential question of practice.

It is, indeed, challenging for teachers today to leverage students' linguistic diversity within educational systems designed, for the most part, to value and foster linguistic and cultural uniformity (Benson, 2013; Cummins, 2023; Gogolin, 2002; Ruíz, 1984). Despite linguistic heterogeneity being the norm in many educational systems and in communities around the world, most schools are still driven by a monolingual habitus, "a set of assumptions built on the fundamental myth of uniformity of language and culture" (Benson, 2013, p. 283). Such a worldview leads to systems that often pathologize linguistic diversity and characterize emerging multilingual/multidialectal learners as deficient in the language of schooling (Ortega, 2019; Smitherman, 2017; Souto-Manning et al., 2021). The assumptions, values, and routine behaviors shaped by a monolingual habitus have dire consequences for students' own learning and identity development in the present and, in turn, may deprive them of learning opportunities that support achieving their full potential in the future. It is also a missed opportunity to align education with today's reality of multidialectal, multilingual, multicultural, mobile, and interconnected communities (Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah, 2020).

2. The Pedagogies of Voices vision

Here, to address Monica's question and combat the reductive teaching of and through language in schools, we introduce our *Pedagogies of Voices (POV)* vision. POV is an umbrella term for instructional practices that scaffold language learning by acknowledging and leveraging the reality of multilingual and multidialectal classrooms and societies as an urgent and promising way to achieve excellence and equity in school literacy learning and belonging (Uccelli, 2023).

Aligned with what Hornberger and Kvietok Dueñas (2019) call "pedagogies of voice," which they specify as teaching in ways that "create conditions for student voice to develop and flourish" (p.19), our POV vision is operationalized through four instructional priorities: (1) promoting relational, agency-affirming learning through collective meaning-making; (2) affirming and amplifying all learners' full language repertoires; (3) scaffolding and expanding learners' language resources for school literacy and learning; and (4) fostering resourcefulness and creativity by amplifying students' and educators' *critical rhetorical flexibility* (CRF), i.e., the ability and awareness to use an expanding array of heterogeneous language resources flexibly, critically, and creatively across an array of contexts and purposes to negotiate meaning with others and with oneself, enact or resist identities, and critique or reimagine realities (see Galloway et al., 2020a; Uccelli & Phillips Galloway, 2017).

We situate our POV proposal within larger pedagogical frameworks. POV is aligned with culturally responsive and linguistically sustaining instructional frameworks that call for affirming and expanding students' cultural knowledge and identities, including languages and language varieties, as resources for learning (Freire, 1970/1996; García et al., 2017; Ladson-Billings, 2014; Moll, 2019; Palmer et al., 2019; Paris & Alim, 2017). POV is also aligned with social and emotional learning frameworks, emphasizing that learning, including language learning, is interconnected with emotion and social identities, and grounded on positive relationships (Pearson et al., 2024).

Yet, as we discuss in the following paragraphs, our framework diverges from existing ones in two ways. First, in addition to calling for the inclusion and expansion of learners' languaging practices learned in home and community settings, it aims to cultivate students' knowledge of language resources used in the social context of schools, offering a *what*-and-*how* instructional approach. Second, it seeks to integrate equity paradigms that are often viewed as antagonistic in educational research but which, we argue, must be integrated in today's classrooms.

In our work with teachers like Monica, who have adopted culturally sustaining/responsive pedagogy and socioemotional-learning frameworks, many ask us for more specific guidance to inform their instruction *of* and *through* language. Responding to teachers' calls, our POV vision proposes a *what*-and-*how* transformation. This entails broaden opportunities to learn language (the *what*), including language resources common in school texts, by actively supporting students to develop strategies to fully leverage their own and others' heterogeneous language repertories in creative and resourceful ways to meet the pragmatic demands of relating and learning across differences (the *how*) (Canagarajah, 2020).

Our POV vision aims to leverage this *what*-and-*how* approach to inform the design of instructional activities and classroom microinteractions to advance humanizing, meaningful, and just language teaching and learning. We define humanizing approaches to language teaching as those that, by design, include, affirm, and amplify students' complete selves—identities, languages, language varieties, other semiotic resources (gestural, visual), and languaging practices—as resources for learning, communicating, and building relationships in classrooms while cultivating genuine curiosity in fostering relationships and understanding across differences (Freire, 1970/1996; García et al., 2017; Salazar, 2013; c.f., García-Mateus et al., 2021; Harman et al., 2020; Sembiante & Tian, 2021). This calls for adopting a heteroglossic stance, which broadly promotes fluid and hybrid languaging practices in classrooms, potentially disrupting at school the power relations and hierarchies of languages entrenched in local and global communities outside of classrooms (Bakhtin, 1981; García & Wei, 2014; García, 2019). Moreover, meaningful approaches to language teaching are those that teach language and languaging practices for purposes that matter in schools (e.g., supporting students' conceptual learning and active roles as consumers and producers of knowledge through language) and also for purposes that matter to each learner, such as realizing their own academic, social, political, and economic aspirations (Pearson et al., 2024; Phillips Galloway & Meston, 2022; Phillips Galloway, 2023). This demands the integration of research insights from developmental and ethnographic language and literacy research that reveal the importance of scaffolding students' knowledge of a precise constellation of language resources common in school texts across and within the disciplines (Bailey, 2007; Bailey & Wilkinson, 2022; Schleppegrell, 2004, 2020; Schleppegrell & Go, 2007; Uccelli et al., 2015). Finally, we define just approaches as those that develop students', educators', and researchers' critical consciousness about the role of language in inequitable power dynamics while modeling and encouraging the agency to transform unjust languaging practices common in schools and beyond them (Galloway et al., 2020b; García & Kleyn, 2016; Harman et al., 2020; Janks, 2009; Palmer et al., 2019; Sembiante & Tian, 2021; Uccelli, 2023).

To date, the language-in-education field has been more preoccupied with debating the "thorny issue" of whether the goal of affirming/expanding students' language resources and the goal of scaffolding school-relevant language resources can coexist rather than with

proposing and illustrating how advancing both goals is doable (see Grapin & Llosa, 2024). In fact, Grapin and Llosa (2024) describe the field as divided by two research paradigms that many understand as irreconcilable: the "expansion and transformation paradigm" focused on the problem of students' marginalization and how to transform systems to expand what counts as legitimate communication in schools and the broader society; and the "access and achievement paradigm," focused on the problem of how to optimize the teaching and learning of dominant and school-specific ways of using language in order to provide access to learning opportunities (Grapin & Llosa, 2024). In contrast to authors who understand these paradigms as incommensurable, we concur with Grapin and Llosa, who argue that these paradigms are only "incommensurable in the sense that [research disagreements] are unlikely to be resolved empirically, but [that they are] not necessarily incompatible in the sense that there is potential for both peaceful coexistence and productive complementarity" to inform instructional practices (pp. 21). This is precisely what our POV vision contributes: a *what*-and-*how expansive model*, one that emphasizes the relevance of promoting students' access to the language of school texts but situates this pursuit within the more expansive project of broadening what is considered valid and valued participation in the classroom's languaging practices.

Thus, POV offers guidance for designing instruction that merges evidence from research programs using quantitative and qualitative methods to inform both the *expansion and transformation* and the *access and achievement* paradigms. Equally important, having been co-developed with teachers, students, and educational leaders, POV is responsive to practitioners' reflective practices and to the realities of schools and classrooms.

3. A roadmap

In the following section, we delineate the theoretical and empirical bases motivating our POV vision. We then discuss POV's four instructional priorities and illustrate these through classroom-based vignettes collected as part of the TRANSLATE research project (Teaching Reading And New Strategic Language Approaches for Emergent bilinguals, Phillips Galloway et al., 2020d; www.translatetoread.com), a curricular approach collaboratively designed with educators and multilingual students in grades 4 to 7 as part of a multi-year design-based research study (Cobb, 2000) in U.S. states that have adopted linguistically restrictive English-only legislation. Against this sociopolitical backdrop, we illustrate how implementing TRANSLATE's POV-informed instruction shifts the roles of teachers and students and the overall instructional goals they pursue together. The four instructional priorities that animate POV are equally relevant in classrooms serving monolingual students, who also bring language resources learned outside of school that POV-aligned approaches aim to center in instruction. Yet, in this article we draw examples from classrooms comprised of multilingual learners. We close with considerations for theory, future practice-embedded research, and a call for educators and researchers to continue to learn together by paying close attention to languages in the classroom.

4. Pedagogies of Voices (POV): Motivations from research, theory, and practice

Below, we delineate the multiple research, theory, and practice lines that motivated our POV vision proposal.

4.1. Motivation 1: To make visible the crucial (though underacknowledged) role of language in literacy and learning across development

Of great relevance for the POV approach is the notion that young adults are developing their voices, hastened by the rapid expansion of their language-mediated social worlds inside and outside of school (Heath, 2012; Skerrett, 2015). Our research has examined language development within the under-examined social world of middle grade classrooms. In middle school classrooms, where we have done extensive teaching (Emily) and research (Emily and Paola), the focus is generally on content. As a result, curricula and instructional practice often overlook the language demands of learning new concepts, as well as the rapid language development required of middle graders to comprehend the unfamiliar vocabulary and language structures encountered in school texts (Bailey, 2007; Berman, 2009; Biber & Conrad, 2009; Christie & Derewianka, 2008; Halliday, 2006; Nagy & Townsend, 2012; Schleppegrell, 2004).

To make these language demands visible, we have focused on students' learning of the language of school texts, known as Core Analytical Language Skills (CALS), i.e., the array of learners' language resources for understanding analytical texts (e.g., argumentation, explanation, description) across content areas. The CALS construct delineates the linguistic correlates that have been found to correspond with reasoning and inquiry practices prevalently used across disciplines and school content areas (e.g., making logical relations visible by using connectives like *nevertheless* or *therefore*; defending a position through arguments, counterarguments, and rebuttals; or, cautiously asserting a perspective via epistemic markers, such as *it is likely that…),* (Uccelli et al., 2015). CALS complement disciplinary language resources (e.g., the technical vocabulary and discourse moves distinctive of each content area), such as those highlighted by Gebhard (2019), Schleppegrell (2004, 2020), Wilkinson and Silliman (2000), and Bailey and Heritage (2014), among others. Thus, CALS reveal cross-disciplinary language resources often overlooked in curricula and instruction, yet essential to attend to for students' equitable and meaningful participation in school learning activities.

Decades of research support the assertion that language resources support literacy participation and require instructional attention. The CALS program has advanced the field by identifying a constellation of cross-disciplinary language resources and empirically demonstrating their contribution to mid-adolescents' reading, writing, and learning at school. In our own nearly fifteen years of research with teachers and almost 11,000 monolingual and multilingual students in grades 4–8 (ages 9 to 14), we have documented striking individual differences in mid-adolescents' understanding of the language for school literacy, as operationalized by the CALS construct. We and others have also empirically demonstrated strong associations between this language knowledge and learners' reading and writing performances (Barr et al., 2019; Cardoso & Paulet, 2020; Galloway & Uccelli, 2019; Meneses et al., 2018; Uccelli et al., 2015, 2019; Cervetti et al., 2020; Pearson et al., 2024). The finding that CALS contribute to text comprehension is robust and has been replicated across many studies in different languages and contexts (in English and English/Spanish bilinguals in the U.S.; in Spanish in Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru; and in Portuguese in Brazil). Our findings further showed that for middle schoolers educated in U.S. dual-language schools, both Spanish and English CALS were significant predictors of English reading comprehension, aligned with the notion that multilinguals do not operate unilingually but instead draw on their interconnected language systems (Aguilar et al., 2020; Phillips Galloway et al., 2020b; Wei, 2018). CALS also contribute to productive language use, with studies showing strong associations between students' receptive CALS and the quality of their expository and persuasive writing (Uccelli, 2023; Phillips Galloway et al., 2020c; Uccelli et al., 2020).

4.2. Motivation 2: To address inequities in language learning opportunities and counteract the prevalent exclusion of multilingual/multidialectal voices

Literacy, understood as the ability to access accumulated and forthcoming human knowledge encoded in texts, to communicate with the wider world across space and time, and to participate in knowledge production and self-growth through reading and writing, underscores

the urgent need to scaffold students' learning of the language of text as a human right and a matter of epistemic justice (Freire, 1970/1996; Fricker, 2007). Becoming independent readers and writers enables individuals to expand their resources to understand themselves and the world better, update their knowledge in today's ever-changing information society, and develop the hermeneutical tools to work towards transforming diverse societies into more civil, harmonious, and equitable ones. Thus, developing students' resources and practices to read, write, andlearn is a fundamental responsibility of educational systems.

Yet, on average, students from resource-restricted communities, who mostly attend under-resourced schools, continue to trail peers on standardized measures of reading and writing proficiency (McFarland et al., 2019). These discrepancies in opportunities to learn, while often interpreted through the lens of a worrisome deficit narrative, call, instead, for a critical examination of the factors that shape access to learning (Ladson-Billings, 2006). While multiple larger structural factors contribute to these concerning inequitable outcomes (e.g., Janks, 2010a), our research highlights one that is malleable through classroom instruction: differences in knowledge of the language common across content-area texts which stem from students' unequal access to concept, content, and associated language learning opportunities in schools (Adair, 2017). As contended by sociocultural-pragmatics-based theories of language development, and supported by decades of ethnographic literacy research (e.g., Heath, 2012; Hornberger & Kvietok Dueñas, 2019; Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000; Skerrett, 2015), learning the language of schooling (or any other way of languaging) requires ample opportunities to participate in communities and activities that call for its meaningful use.

Fortunately, research suggests that classrooms can be designed to better support students' development of the malleable languaging practices most associated with literacy participation. Studies have examined how students and teachers in linguistically diverse classrooms expand their language repertoires together to support meaning-making from texts in content-area classes (Phillips Galloway et al., 2019; Uccelli et al., 2019) and how educators craft classroom-based discourse communities where a broader range of student positionalities and identities are valued and acknowledged (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Phillips Galloway & Meston, 2022). In these classrooms, language learning thrives. Additionally, studies reveal that discussion-based interventions targeting these language resources, especially those that encourage students' authentic use of language to talk about ideas, use engaging texts and topics, and involve interconnected speaking, reading, and writing activities, are effective (Hsin et al., 2024; Jones et al., 2019; Proctor et al., 2020). Particularly relevant to this article is one recent study that found an intervention targeting the language of perspective-taking was particularly impactful for multilingual youth, who, on average, acknowledged more perspectives in their writing than their peers (Hsin et al., 2024). This may be due to multilingual students' experiences of routinely crossing languages and cultures and suggests the potential benefits of strengths-based instruction that builds on existing translingual skills and strategies to foster students' knowledge of language for school literacy.

Instruction must not only be designed to promote language learning but also to proactively resist the too-frequent marginalization of the sensemaking resources that students bring to school that occurs as part of the broader raciolinguistic minoritization of students of color and learners of English (Alim et al., 2016; Baker-Bell, 2020; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Valdés, 2004). Studies document how English proficiency often serves as a prerequisite for participation in learning or how educators fail to recognize student learning when not expressed using the language of schooling (Martínez, 2010). Therefore, creating relational classrooms that are places of belonging is closely intertwined with embracing and affirming students' broad array of linguistic and semiotic (e.g., gesture, expression, signs) resources. The work of transforming instruction must engage both teachers and students. In our studies, for example, students' voices give insight into how the internalization of linguicism can lead learners to understand 'home languages' as 'incorrect' or 'wrong' and 'school language' as 'smart' or 'polite' (Phillips Galloway et al., 2015/2022). These beliefs, too, must be transformed as part of a POV approach.

4.3. *Motivation 3: To propose a what-and-how pedagogical approach that responds to today's ever-evolving communicative demands within linguistically diverse schools and societies*

While our CALS work has been informed by corpora studies that reveal actual uses of language in today's academic communities (Biber & Conrad, 2009; Halliday, 2006), we recognize that the language needed for school literacy participation is continually evolving. In schools, however, this language is taught as static, and proficiency is defined as mastering a narrow set of language forms with little focus on preparing learners to use language creatively, flexibly, resourcefully, and critically across contexts and audiences. However, this creative resourcefulness–-as Canagarajah puts it, being "ready to negotiate different languages and communicative norms in every single interaction" (Canagarajah, 2020, p. 312)—is what is required for making meaning in today's linguistically heterogeneous societies (e.g., Benson, 2013). Grounded in a "flat ontology perspective," emerging from philosophical and applied linguistics orientations, Canagarajah conceptualizes meaning-making as co-created through activities in which non-verbal and semiotic resources are dynamically endowed with collective meanings; meanings, thus, lie beyond individual minds and are "always in the process of becoming" (Canagarajah, 2020, p. 299). Key in this orientation is the theorization of how "discourses and identities emerge from activities" and of "negotiation" as central to resisting and reinventing sedimented discourse norms linked to social power, which are often ill-fitted to the needs of multidialectal and multilingual classrooms. This view calls for practice-based pedagogies that, instead of solely focusing on *what* language to teach, also focus on *how* to prepare students to co-construct meaning in communities through "collaborative, negotiated, responsive, and situated strategies" (Canagarajah, 2020, p. 300).

Of course, as language-in-education researchers, we recognize the *how*-focused flat ontology orientation as distinct from our own theoretical orientation and from the focus of our prior work on identifying *what* linguistic resources need to be scaffolded in the context of school literacy. Nevertheless, as we stated above, we see great value in an integrating *what*-and-*how* approach. Therefore, the POV vision is informed by the idea that participation in activities intentionally designed to bring about interactions among heterogeneous communicative repertoires—that is, with teachers', classmates', and texts' language repertoires— expands discourses and identities of students and of their teachers (Canagarajah, 2020; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003; Gutiérrez, 2008; see also Grapin & Llosa, 2024).

4.4. *Motivation 4: To redefine the goal of language learning at school as expanding students' and educators' critical rhetorical flexibility (CRF)*

Integrating the three motivations described above with extensive work in developmental linguistics, our *what*-and-*how* POV vision redefines the goal of language learning at school as the expansion of students' and educators' CRF. We build on the work of developmental linguists Ravid and Tolchinsky (2002), who define "rhetorical flexibility" as the ability to use language resources flexibly across various social contexts (e.g., as learners move from home to school, from school to a work environment, or as they join a new peer group) (Tolchinsky & Berman, 2023).

As productive and insightful as the cross-linguistic research on rhetorical flexibility has been, we contend that one limitation is that the original construct as proposed by Ravid & Tolchinsky (2002) was not explicitly conceptualized with attention to multilingual or multidialectal

contexts or to the power relations that influence language-in-use primarily as an artifact of the prevailing focus in research on average developmental trends in mostly monolingual middle-class samples (see Tolchinsky, 2022; Tolchinsky & Berman, 2023).

We have, therefore, expanded the original construct of rhetorical flexibility by addressing this limitation. Borrowing from critical linguistics approaches (Fairclough, 2013), we add 'critical' to 'rhetorical flexibility' to underscore the need for language users to develop multifaceted awareness of entrenched language and power relations. Thus, CRF entails (a) metalinguistic awareness of patterns in languages and language varieties; (b) an awareness of how ways of using language(s) vary according to social context, audiences, and purposes; (c) an awareness of the power dynamics inherent in situations where multiple languages or language varieties interact and of the agency of language users to embrace or contest established language-based power differentials. This, in turn, enables language users to evaluate whether to conventionally follow the traditions of discourse prevalent in specific contexts–or, in Canagarajah (2020) words, patterns "sedimented" due to recurrent use over time—or whether instead, to contest these entrenched discourses with creative language moves. Of course, language users are best able to flexibly use language when they possess a deep and broad "system of meaning potential" consisting of a multiplicity of registers across languages, language varieties, and other semiotic resources (Halliday, 1978, pp.39, as cited in Janks, 2010b).

Within this perspective, promoting language learning at school is not about teaching the 'correct' use of vocabulary and grammar (the prescriptive approach still prevalent in classroom instruction); it is, instead, about expanding students' language resources alongside their critical reflective understanding of the factors to consider when selecting language options (Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002).

5. POV instructional priorities: Examples from practice

To bring the four POV instructional priorities to life, we examine classroom interactions occurring within the context of the TRANSLATE literacy curriculum (Phillips Galloway et al., 2020d), which utilizes young adult literature to center the experiences of multilingual youth in U.S. schools (e.g., *When Stars are Scattered*, by Victoria Jamieson & Omar Mohamed; *Inside Out and Back Again*, by Thanhhà Lai). To our knowledge, TRANSLATE is unique. In contrast to instructional materials adapted for multilingual youth, TRANSLATE was designed for and with multilingual middle-grade students and their teachers to amplify, affirm, and extend the voices of these learners and their teachers using translingual pedagogies.

Before moving to the next section, though, we briefly situate the TRANSLATE approach within the growing field of translanguaging pedagogies, which offer one pathway for operationalizing POV approaches. As a POV-informed curricular approach and intervention designed for multilingual middle-grade learners, TRANSLATE fosters literacy skills using translingual pedagogies or social practices in classrooms that, with particular pedagogical aims in mind, leverage learners' total semiotic repertoires (David et al., 2019). García and Li Wei refer to this instructional approach as "translanguaging," which they define as teaching that builds "on bilingual students' language practices flexibly in order to develop new understandings and new language practices, including those deemed 'academic standard'" (2014, p. 92), [c.f., "pedagogical translanguaging" in Cenoz & Gorter (2022) and "translanguaging" in García and Kleyn (2016) and Creese & Blackledge (2010)]. In TRANSLATE, we have elected to use the term 'translingual pedagogies' to distinguish instructional activities that intentionally promote fluid language use from multilinguals' spontaneous and everyday practice of fluidly languaging, which we call 'translanguaging.' Here, we add to the growing body of research that illustrates how translingual pedagogical approaches can support humanizing instructional aims (García-Mateus et al., 2021; López, 2019). It is worth clarifying that while students' outside-of-school languaging practices are sometimes viewed as resources only to the extent that they serve as means for developing the language of schooling (Ruíz, 1984), TRANSLATE, as a POV-aligned approach, explicitly positions all languages as useful for learning in community.

Both design-based research and quasi-experimental studies of the TRANSLATE curriculum reveal its efficacy, with educators reporting that the materials supported them to realize their vision for a linguistically inclusive classroom (White et al., 2024) and students experiencing statistically significant gains on standardized reading comprehension measures (Phillips Galloway et al., in preparation). Studies focused solely on TRANSLATE's collaborative translation activities, during which students work with classmates to translate short segments of English unit text as part of achieving deeper text understanding, reveal how the teacher's positioning as an arbiter of communicative clarity is shifted when students are given the agency to negotiate the language of their translations with peers (Cui & Pacheco, 2023; Pacheco et al., 2019). In addition, numerous studies now document how integrating TRANSLATE's structured collaborative translation protocol into evidence-based literacy instruction leads to a higher prevalence of instructional practices that draw on students' multilingual resources (Cole et al., 2016; David & Cole, 2021; David et al., 2019; Goodwin & Jiménez, 2016; Puzio et al., 2016).

While TRANSLATE is a comprehensive 27-week literacy curriculum, we focus in this study on selected excerpts from weekly collaborative translation activities structured by the TRANSLATE protocol (David et al., 2019; Jiménez et al., 2015) [for discussion of the genesis of collaborative translation protocols, see Hopewell et al. (2022) and Jiménez et al. (2015); for studies focused on the utility of collaborative translation see: David et al., 2019; Jiménez et al., 2015; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991; Martin-Beltrán, 2014; Pacheco et al., 2019; Park et al., 2020, among others)]. The TRANSLATE protocol guides students working in groups of four to produce a written translation that captures the gist of a segment of a focal English text (selected for its importance to comprehension of the broad themes in the unit's focal novel). The goal is twofold: (1) to develop students' strategic use of their multilingual skills in the service of comprehending conceptually rich text (Lin, 2019; Palmer et al., 2014), (2) and to foster what we call 'metalingualism' by exploring how language is used across languages and text types (Burton & Van Viegen, 2021; García-Mateus et al., 2021; Hernandez García & Schleppegrell, 2021; Myhill, 2018). Importantly, this instruction builds from translingual strategies that students have developed as multilingual users and as language brokers for family and community (Orellana et al., 2014; Orellana & Reynolds, 2008; Orellana, Reynolds, Dorner & Meza, 2003). The TRANSLATE Lessons support educators, who are often monolingual English speakers, to use inquiry methods to teach language structures commonly used by writers (e.g., teaching students to track participants in the text, comprehend the morphological ending *-ion,* or examine the connective *yet)*. Lessons also provide teachers with prompts to support students in making cross-linguistic connections.

We view collaborative translation as particularly powerful for developing CRF. In the context of collaborative translation, addressing misunderstandings becomes about inhabiting the linguistic repertoire of another and, in so doing, expanding one's own. This requires students and teachers to consider what language resources others know in the classroom and tailor their communicative resources, sometimes teaching others and sometimes calling on peers to utilize those resources not known by the teacher. Translation activities also allow educators to inhabit a learner's stance by learning language from and with students.

As stated above, four core Instructional priorities characterize our POV proposal. To illustrate each, we present instructional examples drawn from the classrooms of Monica and Adina (pseudonyms), two middle-grade educators who participated in year three of a five-year researcher-practitioner partnership with Team TRANSLATE. Both self-identified as white women and monolingual, although both reported learning Spanish from their students. Monica was in her mid-thirties and had taught in various settings for over ten years. Adina was in her late

twenties and had taught for four years. Author 1 (Emily) designed large segments of the curriculum, served as a coach, and coordinated all professional learning during this year of the study. We purposefully selected Monica and Adina as focal participants because they were teaching middle grade students and were regarded as skilled practitioners by district coaches.

Both educators worked in large urban school districts in the southeastern U.S., which were experiencing rapid growth in the population of students identified as English learners. At the time of the study, both districts served students who spoke over 130 languages, with the majority speaking Spanish, Arabic, Kurdish, or Vietnamese. Both teachers taught 4–6th graders in schools located in census tracts in which 83–88 % of respondents were economically disadvantaged. The U.S. state in which Adina and Monica taught had adopted English-only legislation, which placed restrictions on using languages other than English as a medium for instruction. Against this particularly restrictive backdrop, where policies silence the voices of multilingual and multidialectal youth, we illustrate the potential of a POV approach.

5.1. POV instructional priority 1: Promoting relational, agency-affirming learning through collective meaning-making

A relational view of language recognizes language as a means to relate to others and oneself and, conversely, relationships and belonging as drivers for language learning. For instance, the earliest language forms children produce are motivated by their desires to establish social connections with others and are thus social, not representational (Ninio & Snow, 1996). This social motivation is a constant throughout development. Immigrant-origin multilingual adolescents who have experienced home language attrition have been documented to reconnect with learning their heritage language as a "passport" to bond with peers (Tse, 2001, p. 688). Multidialectal middle schoolers are described as learning other language varieties most quickly when such learning enables them to belong to groups they care about (Delpit, 2002). Aukerman et al. (2017) further demonstrate how even the language-based processes of text comprehension, sometimes viewed as individual and cognitive, are augmented when multilingual youth are given the opportunity to relate to one another's ideas, making meaning together as part of what they call 'intercomprehending.'

POV approaches are inherently dialogic and require engaging in a collective conversation, akin to the tuning of an orchestral ensemble (Leander et al., 2023). In TRANSLATE, collaboration is key: students co-write short graphic novels, collectively contribute to a graffiti wall of unit terms and concepts and engage in discussion of text daily. In addition, TRANSLATE's collaborative translation protocol is designed to involve many students' voices (Cole et al., 2016), requiring teachers and students to engage in new ways of learning in community, thus forging new interactional and linguistic norms and identities. For both Adina (TEA-A) and Monica (TEA-M), this required transgressing the sociopolitical and interactional norms of typical instruction in their middle grade classrooms, where individual English development was often the primary focus. Supported by this curricular activity, examples 1 and 2 (below) illustrate how both educators embraced a heteroglossic worldview, helping students draw creatively from multiple language repertoires. Simultaneously, they worked to promote a collaborative ethos, which directly opposed the individualistic model at play in most schools.

Example 1:

TEA-A: …You're going to work with your partner or with the people you just worked with– it's OK if it's more than one, and you're going to try to translate the poem. … You and your group are going to try to translate that or put it into your own words. You can use whatever languages you want. You could do English and Spanish. And if somebody at your group knows Kurdish, you can use Kurdish, too. Whatever languages you have, you can use…You can use Google Translate, or you can just follow the best you can.

Example 2:

TEA-M: Remember, so the point is to use what you know, that could be language or other things, right? That's how we comprehend what we're reading. It doesn't have to be just English, OK?

STUDENT: Ya, we've done this… ¿Te acuerdas? Remember?

TEA-M: And, there's no, like, wrong translation…

For students, too, this was a shift as illustrated in Monica's classroom (Example 3), where students' internalized perceptions of what learning should look like conflicted with TRANSLATE's call for collaboration:

Example 3:

STUDENT 1: Miss, Miss, they're using our stuff! They're listening and…

TEA-M: So, what?

STUDENT 2: … That's copying. (To classmates:) You're copying us (crosstalk).

TEA-M: Wait, hold on, take a pause (crosstalk)! Stop talking, just hear me out. This isn't like usual. The goal, like I said, is for you to work together, to get creative with the words! Like, see D. and M., they're talking about the best way to say it, right?

STUDENT 3: Ya, I think it's gonna be 'ta'is' [Arabic: تعيس / تعس ; translation to English: 'unhappy', 'sad' ،or miserable], but like, M. says, it's 'malhuf' [Arabic: ملهوف ; translation to English: 'unhappy', 'worried', 'eager']. I don't know…

TEA-M: But it seems like in Arabic there are a few ways, and the point is to pick what gets the meaning across, together, you're choosing together, ya? So that's what we're doin' and maybe someone has a better idea, and you want to use it…

Monica reframed collaboration and agency as sources of collective creativity, problem-solving, and shared language learning. She underscored that collaborative translation 'isn't like usual' and situated students' negotiations and creativity 'with the words' as a pertinent resource for sensemaking. Through her framing, Monica imbued students with the agency to serve as teachers of language to both classmates and to Monica herself.

5.2. POV instructional priority 2: Affirming and amplifying all learners' full language repertoires

In TRANSLATE, the curriculum supports youth in creating identity texts , including language and identity portraits (students depict their language resources on a paper cutout representing the self) (Cummins et al., 2011; Siegman & Phillips Galloway, under review; Prasad, 2014), as well as language maps (students list language resources they use to participate in familial, social, academic, and shared interest communities as well as aspirational and imagined ones) (Phillips Galloway et al., 2022). For students and educators, these activities make visible the vast linguistic and identity resources that can be recruited for learning and used during collaborative translation (Cummins et al., 2011; Prasad, 2014).

In addition, through TRANSLATE's translation protocol, Monica and Adina surfaced students' multilingual resources and translingual strategies. In doing so, students showcased their strengths in ways that would be impossible in typical English-only instruction. Bringing these to the surface allowed other students to incorporate new resources and translingual strategies into their repertoires.

Below in Example 4, Adina's students discussed the translation of a segment from the young adult novel, *Inside Out and Back Again* ("I see them first/Two green thumbs that will grow into orange-yellow delights smelling of summer," p.45), focused on the protagonist's anticipation for the day she could consume the papayas slowly ripening in her yard in Vietnam, a day that would not come with the fall of Saigon.

Example 4:

TEA-A: All right. STU1, I want you to start us off. So, when STU1 translated, one of the words I asked him about was 'delight.' How did you translate that? So STU1, what word did you put? Hold on one second. STU2, you can keep working, but you also need to listen to STU1. Go ahead.

STUDENT 1: [Somali translation of'dessert']

TEA-A: And, tell them what language that's in.

STUDENT 1: Probably, it means 'dessert'.

TEA-A: But tell them what language you speak.

STUDENT 1: I speak Somali.

TEA-A: Beautiful. And you said it means 'dessert,' right? Tell us why do you think 'dessert' is a good translation for 'delights'?

STUDENT 1:(unclear)

TEA-A: Oh. What do you guys think? Are fruits sometimes like desserts?

STUDENTS (MULTIPLE): Yes.

TEA-A: How so?

STUDENT 3: Because you can (unclear) chocolate.

TEA-A: OK, so you could have them with chocolate. But what if you just bite into a fruit without any chocolate? How is it like a dessert?

STUDENT 4: Because it tastes like a dessert.

STUDENT 5: Because it's sweet.

TEA-A: It's so sweet, like a dessert. So that sweetness makes it like a dessert. So, I thought that was so cool, that you turned the word delights into desserts in Somali. That's so cool. It's OK. STU1 is going to read his in Somali, and then we'll get some other people to share theirs.

STUDENT 1: (reading in Somali) laba farood oo cagaar ah oo mac-macaan noqda oo oranji iyo jaalle ah [Somali translation of the English text 'two green thumbs that will grow into orange-yellow delights']

TEA-A: I noticed the use of the word 'orang-ey.' [:'oranji'] In Somali, is that like how you would say it, or you couldn't figure out how to translate it?

STUDENT 1: That's how you say it.

In Example 4, Adina's active promotion of Student 1's seeking of synonyms—a valuable translingual strategy for understanding text ('beautiful'... 'I thought that was so cool')—positioned this learner as academically engaged via his Somali use. Indeed, students may have never discussed the benefits of using their home language repertoires to make sense of new language in the text. In surfacing his metalinguistic problem-solving, Adina also made these strategic translingual processes available to other students. Also in Example 4, Adina showcased how this student's multiple identities, as a speaker of Somali and a user of English, were simultaneously recognized. This practice resisted the tendency to exclude students' multilingual identities from classroom spaces. This phenomenon occurs frequently in studies using TRANSLATE's protocol. Pacheco et al. (2019), in a study of an elementary classroom, illustrated the dynamism of translingual strategic practices: how Arabic-speaking students asserted their identities as Arabic speakers with a classroom teacher who, in turn, situated herself as an expert in English and an emerging user of Arabic. As Blommaert (2012) suggests in discussing how people employ elements drawn from broader "identity repertoires" to make meaning, identity boundaries are characterized by "flexibility and permeability" (p.8) (c.f., "transpositioning" in Wei & Lee, 2023).

Sometimes, educators think affirming and amplifying students' communicative repertoires can only be done if the teacher is fully proficient in them. However, educators in U.S. schools frequently bring communicative repertoires that overlap very little with those of their students. Therefore, an alternative approach is for educators to recognize the inherent value of communicative resources that differ from their own and to use strategies to create space for their students' multilingual resources in their classrooms. In Example 4, Adina, who was not a Somali speaker, drew attention to aspects of language that share similar phonological characteristics across languages ('oranji' in Somali and 'orange' in English). This promoted learners' awareness of cognate forms and positioned her as a curious, though naive, learner of a new language. Adina also modeled metalinguistic noticing as an available strategy to engage with languages with which students may be unfamiliar. This example supports an additional contention of this article: Educators who identify as monolingual and may not possess a multilingual repertoire can, nevertheless, notice and amplify their students' language resources and translingual strategies.

5.3. POV instructional priority 3: Scaffolding and expanding learners' language resources for school literacy and learning

No learner comes to middle school knowing the language of school literacy completely, although this knowledge exists along a continuum, and some students have had more opportunities to learn it. Therefore, an empowering POV entails affirming and amplifying students' known resources while expanding the school-specific language resources that allow access to accumulated and newly generated knowledge in texts. Indeed, without understanding individual differences in the language resources that mid-adolescents bring to school and the relation of these language skills to the emerging linguistic demands for reading, writing, and learning during the middle school years, schools run the risk of maintaining and even exacerbating inequalities (Uccelli, 2023). However, in classrooms where humanizing pedagogy is the goal, educators listen to students' meanings first and seek to teach language to sharpen these meanings second. This empathetic approach calls for pushing back on received societal expectations about students' languaging practices and ideologies (Martínez, 2010; Schleppegrell & Go, 2007). Thus, in Example 4 above, we note how Adina, when observing the student's replacement of the word 'delights' with 'desserts,' listened for the meaning the student was making rather than seeking a direct translation.

POV approaches call on educators to bring diverse linguistic repertoires into conversation. In collaborative translation episodes, educators occupy a liminal space between the text, which is an artifact of the linguistic repertoire of the writer, and students, who generally bring linguistic repertoires that may overlap only partially with the writer's or the teacher's linguistic repertoire (Galloway et al., 2020b). To access the writer's meaning, educators must teach the language of the text. The challenge is that classrooms are typically organized to view these resources hierarchically, and accessing the language of the text is often the most valued instructional goal. Even when teaching the language of text, Adina and Monica sought to actively unsettle this hierarchy by positioning the learning of classmates' language resources as equally valued learning outcomes. In a text-focused lesson that began with engaging with visual images of a papaya tree, Adina expanded students' vocabulary to support their comprehension of English text while signaling her valuing of students' existing vocabulary knowledge:

Example 5:

TEA-A: And by talking about this image, we talk about lots of different words, like 'palm tree,' 'papaya,' and 'ripe.' So, we really got to learn different words and even heard some in Kurdish. How awesome!

In the same lesson, Adina later scaffolded students' precise expression, an essential aspect of CALS, as part of supporting their generation of an English paraphrase. She also supported students' use of participant tracking, i.e., identifying referential chains in the text, to make inferences (Example 6):

Example 6:

STUDENT 1: This poem is about papaya trees that grow over the summer getting eaten by us.

TEA-A: What's getting eaten? The trees or the papayas?

(Previously, Adina had drawn lines to the various mentions of the papayas in the source text to illustrate that 'they' and 'two green thumbs' are both references to the 'papayas' mentioned in the title. The lesson goal was to support students in learning to track participants through text, a CALS focus that serves as a generalizable metalinguistic strategy that can be used when reading. At this moment, Adina pointed to the slide projected for the class that contained the novel's English text and used her finger to show how the first stanza, 'I see them first,' 'them' refers to 'papayas.')

STUDENT 1: The papayas.

STUDENT 1: OK. So, this poem is about papaya trees that grow over the summer with papayas that what?

STUDENT 2: That we can make into smoothies.

TEA-A: But think about this poem. Not what you and I would do. In this poem…

STUDENT 2: Just eat them.

TEA-A: OK. Somebody link on to that. I think we're missing a detail. This poem is about papaya trees that grow over the summer with papayas that? H.?

STUDENT 3: Are sweet.

STUDENT 4: Are sweet.

STUDENT 5: And get eaten.

TEA-A: And get eaten. Yeah, so sweet, juicy, and get eaten.

In Example 6, Adina explicitly taught the language of the text. What is particularly noteworthy, however, is how she also adopted her students' language, rather than paraphrasing using her own ('…so sweet, juicy, and get eaten'). Adina pushed students to express their ideas precisely while giving them authority to shape the classroom's language. Moreover, she ensured learners understood to use their knowledge and resources as she scaffolded text comprehension ("But think about this poem. Not what you and I would do").

When we produce language in classrooms, we are generally focused on meanings, yet sometimes we shift our focus to attend to language itself in an activity that requires metalinguistic reflection (Cazden, 1974). To make new language learning visible and collective, Adina and Monica relied on language to talk about language, or metalanguage. Often, this metalanguage supported the teaching of language for school literacy. Frequently, cross-linguistic comparisons led to the production of students' spontaneous metalanguage, which teachers then leveraged to introduce technical terms. This metalanguage supported students and teachers in drawing connections across languages and co-creating their classroom's communicative norms. Students and teacher appeared to be learning from each other in multiple instances. In Example 7 below, Monica learned about the correspondence between inflectional suffixes -'ando' and '-ing' in Spanish and English, respectively; her student learned the term suffix, expanding her metalanguage. In doing so, they shared the roles of teacher and learners as they developed their CRF together while learning the language for school literacy.

Example 7:

STUDENT 7: '-ing' and '-ando' [Spanish:ing], they's the same kind of thing.

TEA-M: Oh, man, OK, I missed that, but you didn't, STU1. I think you are right: 'crying,' that '-ing', seems like it's 'llorando', so the '-ando' is the same? That's called, now, I can't remember (laughing)…a suffix.

STUDENT 1: A suffix, stuff–ix…

TEA-M: Sounds like stuff, but it's just an ending that you add to a word… ⟨I teaching⟩ // so I'm teaching…but, you know how it works, I think? I'm just giving you a word to call it somethin'.

Notable across the examples above is how both the language of school text and the metalanguage used for discussing it are taught with the goal of supporting authentic text comprehension. As noted above, the CALS construct specifies language resources that co-occur with typical analytical, reasoning, and literacy languaging practices prevalent at schools. However, despite their relevance for instruction, we do not draw a straight line from CALS-informed research to practice. The goal is not to teach language forms in rote ways without links to meaning, nor is it to teach language in ways that interrupt conceptual understanding. Instead, CALS should be taught to help students sharpen their meanings and their understandings. Decades of accumulated research tell us that this learning requires that educators create contexts where this language would likely occur—as when working to make sense of a text that interests readers, writing to argue for a position in a persuasive essay, or debating a hot topic using evidence. Educators play a crucial role in this, as they are responsible for creating these conducive contexts for language learning.

5.4. POV instructional priority 4: Fostering resourcefulness and creativity by amplifying students' and educators' critical rhetorical flexibility (CRF)

In classroom practice, creative and flexible engagement with language often happens at the margins of instruction. For example, our work has examined middle graders' rich and generative language play when working in small groups of classmates, demonstrating how the collaborative study of word meanings can give rise to playful noticings about how language systems work (Phillips Galloway & McClain, 2020). We argue, aligned with Jones (2015), that this playful engagement with language is not just a byproduct but a valuable tool for educators. It is made possible by educators who promote student agency and bring language play from the margins to the center of instruction. Given the cross-language creativity documented in bilingual and multilingual populations (Orellana & Reynolds, 2008; Jones, 2015), multilingual classrooms are optimally positioned to engage in playful and creative metalinguistic contrasts and translinguistic reflections on the pragmatic norms and the resources used for communication across heterogeneous language repertoires (García & Kleyn, 2016). Underscoring the reciprocal nature of language teaching and learning for educators, Adina often engaged as an attuned listening and learning partner. As illustrated in Example 8, she was a keen observer of students' language use and often sought to learn from them:

Example 8:

TEA-A: Wait. Can you tell me what do these marks mean? (looking at a student's Kurdish writing, noting the diacritical marks)

STUDENT 1: Oh, those are if you find an 'e', you put those on top. So, if you have 'e', you put that on so that it can make more 'de.'

TEA-A: It makes the 'e' sound different?

STUDENT 1: Yes.

STUDENT 2: You're supposed to say the 'e' real longer.

TEA-A: OK. Did you learn how to write in Kurdish at home?

STUDENT 2: Well, yeah. I made a little bit. So, I know how to say 'Hello, are you good? And how was your day?' And I wrote that. I wrote that because I kept on learning how to write it because my dad taught me how to write each one of them.

TEA-A: How to write the letters in Kurdish? Thanks, STU2!

STUDENT 3: I know what does 'summer' means in Somalia. It's 'xagaaga' [Somali]. And 'gudaha' [Somali] means 'in' and 'xagaaga' [Somali] means 'summer.'

TEA-A: That's cool.

In Example 8, Adina playfully made observations across English, Kurdish, and Somali, modeling her curiosity as a way to expand her CRF. Of particular interest was her question to Student 2 ("Did you learn to write in Kurdish at home?"), which served as a pedagogical move to signal the array of language learning contexts in which this learner participated, and to establish the value of these outside-of-school contexts for language learning. In this way, the interaction around this translingual activity expanded Adina's CRF while providing her with an entry point to learn about her students' lives outside of school, contributing to stronger teacher-student relationships.

Other studies have documented how educators share power and interpretive authority in CRF-focused instructional activities like collaborative translation (Cui & Pacheco, 2023; Pacheco et al., 2019; Palmer et al., 2019). As was the case for Adina and Monica, students often bring language resources necessary for translation that teachers do not possess, shifting the traditional roles of teacher and student and transforming the classroom into a space of reciprocal learning. During one lesson (Example 9), Adina attempted to transcribe (through transliteration) an Arabic translation from *Inside Out and Back Again* in which the protagonist, Ha, describes slicing open a papaya to eat it before leaving her home in Vietnam with Saigon's fall: *Black seeds spill / Like clusters of eyes / Wet and crying* (p.60).

Example 9:

TEA-A: I don't know how to write in Arabic, I'll give it a try, and you help, STU1, OK?

STUDENT 1: Um, hmmm.

TEA-A: Boo-KAR-un? (attempt at Arabic pronunciation)

STUDENT 1: No, it's alratab walbuka' [Arabic: الرطب والبكاء ; translation to English: 'the moisture and the crying'], so…

TEA-A: You type? (begins typing for the teacher)

STUDENT 1: That's not what I wrote…but I wrote, 'euyun mubalalat watabki' (student uses transliteration, using the English alphabet to write the Arabic phrase) [Arabic: عيون مبللات وتبكي], which is more, I dunno, *'eyes wet and crying'*? Maybe, I think, I thought…

TEA-A: I'm confused. That's three, not the four (English) words, so, I'm, umm, what word isn't written out? (teacher is asking students to compare their translation to the original English text)

STUDENT 2: It's, um, connected, 'and' you can just like add it, so not (students' crosstalk in Arabic)

STUDENT 3: So, it's this? (pointing to writing)

STUDENT 1: Ya, it's here, (pointing to writing) see? It's not missing…you said missing, but it there.

TEA-A: Ah, OK, OK, I'm sorry, I meant, explain to me, I don't know, It's…I just don't know Arabic, at all, but that's why I'm doing it with ya'll. You're the ones who know this, and some day, STU1 and STU2, I'm gonna' hear you're translators at the UN, or somethin'!

Recognizing the relevance of Student 1′s and Student 2′s Arabic knowledge to English text understanding, Adina took on the role of an Arabic learner ("I just don't know Arabic at all"), allowing her students to naturally step into the role of teachers.

Our research in other middle grade classrooms revealed how teachers leveraged the expansiveness of identity repertoires that also encompassed students' present selves (and referenced their historical and past selves) as well as those that they were cultivating (i.e., imagined future selves) to engage students in using semiotic resources of high utility in academic and professional communities (Phillips Galloway & Meston, 2022). In Example 9, we see how Adina invoked her students' imagined future selves, drawing on her knowledge of Student 1's desire to become a professional translator ("someday, STU1 and STU2, I'm gonna hear you're translators at the UN or somethin'!"). At this moment, she established a clear trajectory from the present translation activity to students' aspirational multilingual selves. In doing so, she centered these students' goals for language learning—rather than her own goals or those of the curriculum as is typically the case— and foregrounded the importance of developing translingual understandings. This transformed her classroom into a site of student-centered language learning by welcoming and extending identities and resources beyond the expected standards, curriculum, and discourses typical of the sociopolitical context of schools. This was possible through Adina's established close relationships with her students and interest in students' multiple selves.

The critical nature of these interactions—the degree to which they worked to unsettle taken-for-granted power relations present in classrooms—is best understood with knowledge of the context. Adina and Monica, as educators in an English-only state, were prohibited from delivering instruction in languages other than English. Students were not prohibited from using these languages in the classroom, but these policies served to reify English monolingualism as the ideal. Therefore, in these classrooms, using students' additional languages qualified as a disruption to the status quo.

These vignettes serve as a powerful tool to help us envision classrooms as sociolinguistic borderlands (Anzaldúa, 1987), where the identity and linguistic repertoires of teachers, learners, and texts intersect. In multiple examples, including Example 10 below, we observed how classroom conditions supported youth to use their knowledge of the world, even when this differed from the teacher's, as a resource for text understanding:

Example 10:

STUDENT 1: This is a yam…

STUDENT 2:…Ms. J.? Did you know that they're actually from our culture, too?

TEA-A: What did you say, STU1?

STUDENT 2: Did you know that they're from our culture? They're from our culture. What is it called? Yams are from our culture because we sometimes cook it up.

TEA-A: Awesome. I was trying to figure out if it's the same as yucca. I like those. All right. So, we got that. 'Soft as yam' is what it says. 'Soft as a yam.'

STUDENT 2: It looks like a pumpkin, but it's—we go to different stores, and my little brother said it's pumpkins, but it's not.

In Example 10, Student 2 illustrated how addressing misunderstandings required inhabiting the linguistic repertoire (and, hence, knowledge schema) of another. In this instance, Student 2, by recognizing that Adina brought different knowledge of the world, modeled the kind of tuning to others needed to develop the linguistic and cultural sensitivity and flexibility characteristic of CRF.

6. Concluding thoughts

This article elaborated our POV vision by proposing four crucial pedagogical priorities for creating classroom conditions that foster humanizing, meaningful, and just language teaching. These priorities are not just theoretical constructs but practical guidelines that can significantly impact daily teaching and learning experiences. As we noted at the onset, we see a need to teach language resources (the *what*) and prepare students for the dynamic ways of languaging needed in today's hyper-diverse classrooms and societies (the *how*). Indeed, as language-in-education researchers who spend much of our time working in classrooms, we see the *what* and *how* as hardly irreconcilable. The debate about these binaries is, in fact, primarily academic, with little relevance for practitioners who face the daily demands of preparing their students with the *what* and the *how* for learning at school and beyond. Indeed, classrooms are places of intersection where multiple equity paradigms —what Grapin and Llosa (2024) refer to as the *access and achievement* and the *expansion and transformation* paradigms— can coexist. As the examples above show, some educators are breaking a new path as they reconcile these tensions. Monica and Adina offer a glimpse into how educators might teach new language in ways that reference and place multilingual students' existing broad and deep communicative repertoires on equal footing while fostering the critical rhetorical flexibility that supports the translingual resourcefulness needed in today's linguistically diverse schools and societies. While theoretical and research paradigms may be irreconcilable (Grapin & Llosa, 2024), practice-grounded research already integrates insights from multiple traditions and paradigms to inform transformative action.

We contend that the design and implementation of transformational practices requires a commitment to thoughtful eclecticism. Instruction informed narrowly by a single theoretical paradigm can potentially harm students and teachers, and it may fail to reflect the lived reality of classroom teaching. At the same time, working across multiple seemingly conflicting paradigms to draw the most relevant insights requires a careful integration of ideas and, importantly, the integration of teachers' and students' perspectives. We have much to learn from the educators and students who have long been engaged in creating equitable spaces and conditions for language learning. This naturally leads us to classrooms and to embrace research-practice partnerships that position teachers, students, and researchers as equal collaborators. In classrooms shaped by skilled educators, we can glimpse the potential of exemplary instruction to reconcile these paradigms to support equity and excellence. As Giroux (2018) has long argued, critical scholarship must turn to hope and the making of new futures. In this article, we carry this advice into practice.

In this concluding section, we reflect on the implications of the POV priorities for building theories that can inform and be informed by practice-embedded research, professional learning initiatives, and classroom instruction.

6.1. For theory

We view POV as an expansive model that works to move past theoretical debates. Among the new ideas pushing for transformation in language-in-education research, a broad and profound theoretical shift in applied linguistics—the "flat ontology" orientation referenced above—is pushing the field to move beyond binaries (Canagarajah, 2020, p. 298). In this orientation, researchers call for a reconceptualization of language use and meaning-making as "communicative assemblages" learned and used dynamically as part of networks that construct meaning collaboratively in particular contexts (Canagarajah, 2020; see also Rymes (2011) notion of the *communicative repertoire* and Pennycook (2017) concept of *semiotic assemblages*). Researchers in this orientation aptly call for studying language as inseparable from other semiotic multimodal means and for an instructional focus on *how* students and teachers employ strategies and practices to make meaning, not on *what* to teach. The *how* includes considerations such as "How to work with the ecological affordances in one's communicative setting; which strategies to use to negotiate meanings with the diverse people in a social network" (Canagarajah, 2020, p. 312). While our intention is not to fully engage the complexities of the flat ontology perspective, our four POV priorities build on these ideas. In this way, POV approaches embrace Canagarajah's pedagogical call for emphasizing the performance of resourcefulness, i.e., using all resources at hand to co-construct and convey meaning flexibly and creatively in a particular situation.

Yet, we argue that individuals will be able to be more strategic with more resources from which to draw. Because of this, focusing on *what* language resources to teach continues to be relevant in education and is, in fact, not contradictory with a focus on the *how*. Guided by our fifteen years of research that point to the need for expanding mid-adolescents' language resources for school literacy through intentionally designed instruction, in this article, we have argued for both a *what*-and-*how* approach, more precisely, to promote the *what* strategically embedded in and in support of the *how*.

Indeed, the POV vision shared here is only a starting point. For instance, we have yet to pay close attention to multimodal meaning-making. This vital aspect certainly needs to be integrated into a *what*-and-*how* approach. In addition, semiotic resources also include silence as a pragmatic skill that creates opportunities for internal reflection and deeper processing (see Ryan and colleagues, this issue). Importantly, it is worth emphasizing that POV tries to transform pedagogies of silencing, not those that promote silent reflection. In fact, integrating silent reflection to promote specific pedagogical goals as another way to foster students' voices can offer a valuable complement to discussion-based approaches inspired by our POV vision and, thus, worth studying.

To us, designing, studying, and testing expansive *what*-and-*how* pedagogical approaches is a matter of epistemic justice (Fricker, 2007). Instruction informed by theory, we contend, needs to counteract epistemic injustices (Uccelli, 2023). Indeed, we have argued that students should not experience exclusion from the knowledge construction happening in classrooms because they bring communicative and identity repertoires that differ from those typically privileged at school, nor should they be prevented from expanding their full repertoires through activities that give opportunities to come to know the repertoires of others, including those of teachers and classmates as well as those of contemporary, past, and future writers represented in texts.

6.2. For practice-grounded research

For research, the POV priorities offer a theory of action that begins with practice. In contrast to other critical approaches, the theory of action is not that we must first shift students' and teachers' mindsets as a precondition for changing instructional practice. Indeed, the POV theory of action does not start by fostering critical language awareness in students and teachers. Instead, the starting point is changing the conventional rules of school language learning. CRF is forged over time and through participation in transformative activities that champion language diversity as a resource for learning, such as collaborative translation. During these instructional activities that promote belonging and nurture students' multilingual identities, equity can be experienced and felt (Leander et al., 2023). Concrete instructional activities that foster students' translingual skills and encourage learning from the language of others equip students and teachers with knowledge of how to participate in environments that disrupt and reimagine inequitable classroom conditions. For teachers and students, we envision that these experiences of equity will become the criterion against which to critically examine language learning conditions in other settings. Future research is still needed to examine the potential longer-term effect of these instructional practices.

Our approach is thus different from those that assume a unidirectional pathway for achieving equitable language teaching: moving from first changing minds (beliefs about language) to changing the activities of hearts and hands (how we teach and learn *through* and *about* language). Instead, we offer a recursive and bidirectional theory of action. We posit that changing the activities of hands and minds and the experiences of hearts over time in classrooms transforms prevalent language and power relations, changing minds through action. This, in turn, paves the way for reimagining the world by collectively experiencing what it could be. In contrast to the proposed binary between preparing students "to play the game" vs. "to disrupt the game" (Grapin & Llosa, 2024), POV approaches seek to start by "disrupting the rules of the game" in order to invite learners to play an already transformed game in their classroom; a game that has been transformed through pedagogical tools and practices that create classroom conditions where multiple voices are present and all students' voices are listened to. In this context, students and educators gradually develop CRF, including knowledge of how to use language as a tool to critique and disrupt the status quo, from a place of strength and affirmation in a community that ideally has learned to repurpose language differences as bridges to forge closer relationships across identity and cultural boundaries.

6.3. For ongoing professional education

Here, we invite educators to reimagine instruction by providing glimpses of promising emerging practices. In today's increasingly diverse societal milieu, as Blommaert (2010) and Canagarajah (2013; 2020) argue, we must rethink the teaching of standard and normative communication practices. Our *what*-and-*how* approach calls for a profound shift in the instructional goal of promoting language at school: to strive not for learners to master a narrow set of standardized language forms but for learners and educators to expand their CRF. In other words, the instructional goal becomes equipping students with the resources, practices, and reflective strategies to use their available repertoires and those of their interlocutors creatively and constructively as they navigate diverse and ever-changing social realities in a society in constant flux (Wei & Lee, 2023). Of course, language is dynamic and will continue to evolve. Thus, we argue that just as we need to prepare students to be independent learners of new knowledge, we need to prepare them to be reflective and critical participants in the various evolving, mobile, and hybrid ways of using language (Deumert, 2014).

The POV priorities offer insights to enrich professional learning opportunities. This is in addition to the expansion of educator's content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of culturally responsive/sustaining pedagogies and funds of knowledge (Ladson-Billings, 2014; Moll, 2019; Paris, 2012, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2017; Walqui & Van Lier, 2010). We cannot underestimate the amount to be learned: implementing the POV priorities requires understanding CRF and how to create classroom conditions in which it can flourish. Particularly promising are activities (like those in TRANSLATE) that provide opportunities for researchers and educators to understand together how to teach and learn in new ways. In addition, ongoing collective reflection that leads educators to attend to daily

micro-interactions that either support or hinder this CRF learning seems fundamental so that educators are prepared to engage in spontaneous language interactions. After all, focusing instruction on cultivating CRF has profound implications for the relationships with and among students that teachers foster, the identities they project and help construct, and the depth of knowledge and understanding they promote through language.

Arguably, what counts as developing critical language use among learners and educators is challenging to characterize across different sociopolitical milieus. That is, language practices that unsettle language hierarchies in dual language programs differ from those that would do the same in states that have adopted English-only legislation. We also acknowledge that to some the instruction we describe, which works within schools as they currently exist and aims to transform them from within, may not seem critical enough. From our perspective, however, teachers who are open to learning from students' linguistic and cultural practices, and who see these as valuable resources for learning, are adopting a radically different role. By foregrounding listening and learning from students, these educators *are* meaningfully shifting the power dynamics in classrooms. For students, affective engagement with the joy of linguistic diversity prepares them to critically examine, question, and transform settings that impose a monolingual worldview. This resonates with what Hilary Janks describes as the dynamic relationship between 'Little-p politics' and 'Big-p politics' (2010a). As we change the micro-politics of how students' and teachers' identities are constructed by upending what counts as the authoritative and normative language and languaging practices inside classrooms, we also act on what Janks calls "big stuff" like linguicism and linguistic imperialism outside of schools.

7. In closing

Although we are hopeful, we end this article by acknowledging the ambition of our POV proposal. Like all institutions, schools are resistant to change, and there is much to be studied and many hypotheses still to be tested. To us, however, debates about teaching the language of school literacy that start (or end) with the argument that we should not teach these language resources in schools, underestimate the power, creativity, and agency of learners and their teachers. Indeed, educators and students can and do create contexts for learning that contest the hierarchical framing of language resources and co-invent new ways of using language in classroom communities. We encourage researchers to continue to examine whether the pedagogical priorities delineated and illustrated here, when embedded across a wide array of schooling contexts, lead to environments imbued by a heteroglossic habitus, trusting relationships, and inclusive and rigorous learning communities. The place to start this work is not by asking only: *What language resources should we teach?* The literature now offers a proliferation of answers to this question. The crucial question is: *How?* From here, there are still numerous questions that still need to be answered. In this article, we have only started to address a complex one: *How do we teach through and about language in humanizing, meaningful, and just ways?*

To conclude, we issue a call to action: The field of language research has long been divided. Yet educators and students are fashioning holistic language teaching models in today's classrooms; let's join them.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Emily Phillips Galloway: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Project administration, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Paola Uccelli:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Conceptualization.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

We are deeply appreciative of the time, effort, and expertise contributed by Drs. Alison Bailey and Louise Wilkinson, who led this special issue. We are also grateful for the collective contributions of all participants in the 2024 UCLA conference, TRANSLATE co-researchers, and L4All collaborators, which have been instrumental in advancing our understanding. Thank you also to Manar Hazzaa for support in Arabic transcription and analysis. We would also like to express our sincere gratitude to the Spencer Foundation for their generous support of this research project, although all persepctives are those of the authors. Finally, and most centrally, we would like to thank the teachers and students who participated in the study. Their invaluable insights, cooperation, and dedication were essential to the success of this endeavor.

References

Adair, J. K., Colegrove, K. S. S., & McManus, M. E. (2017). How the word gap argument negatively impacts young children of Latinx immigrants' conceptualizations of learning. *Harvard Educational Review, 87*(3), 309–334.

Aguilar, G., Uccelli, P., & Phillips Galloway, E. (2020). Toward biliteracy: Unpacking the contribution of mid-adolescent dual language learners' Spanish and English academic language skills to English reading comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(4), 1010–1036. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.570

Alim, H. S., Rickford, R., & Ball, A. F. (Eds.). (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Lute.

Aukerman, M., Schuldt, L. C., Aiello, L., & Martin, P. C. (2017). What meaning-making means among us: The intercomprehending of emergent bilinguals in small-group text discussions. *Harvard Educational Review, 87*, 482–511.

Bailey, A. L., & Heritage, M. (2014). The role of language learning progressions in improved instruction and assessment of English language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(3), 480–506.

Bailey, A. L., & Wilkinson, L. C. (2022). Linguistics and education article collection. introduction: Tracing themes in the evolution of the academic language construct. *Linguistics and Education, 71*, Article 101063.

Bailey, A. (2007). *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Baker-Bell, A. (2020). We Been Knowin': Toward an antiracist language & literacy education. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 16*(1).

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barr, C. D., Uccelli, P., & Phillips Galloway, E. (2019). Specifying the academic language skills that support text understanding in the middle grades: The design and validation of the core academic language skills construct and instrument. *Language Learning, 69*(4), 978–1021. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12365

Bedolla, L. (2003). The identity paradox: Latino language, politics and selective dissociation. *Latin Studies, 1*, 264–283. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.lst.8600038

Benson, C. (2013). Towards adopting a multilingual habitus in educational development. In C. Benson & K. Kosonen (Eds.), *Language issues in comparative education: Inclusive teaching and learning in non-dominant languages and cultures* (pp. 283–299). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Berman, R.A. (2009). Developing linguistic knowledge and language use across adolescence. In E. Hoff & M. Shatz (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of language development* (pp. 347–367). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2012). Sociolinguistics and English Language Studies. In B. Street & C. Leung (eds.), *Handbook of english language studies*. London: Routledge.

Burton, J., & Van Viegen, S. (2021). Spoken word poetry with multilingual youth from refugee backgrounds. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 65*(1), 75–84.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice : Global englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2020). English as a resource in a communicative assemblage. In C. Hall and R. Wicaksono (Eds.), *Ontologies of english: Conceptualising the language for learning, teaching, and assessment*, 295–315. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cardoso, B., Paulet, N., & de Laboratório Educação (2020). Aprender a estudar. https://aprenderaestudartextos.org.br/biblioteca/caracteristicas-da-linguagem-academica.

Cazden, C. B. (1974). Play and metalinguistic awareness: One dimension of language experience. *Urban Review, 7*(1), 28–39.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and its application to language classes. *RELC Journal, 53*(2), 342–354. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221082751

Cervetti, G. N., Pearson, P. D., Palincsar, A. S., Afflerbach, P., Kendeou, P., Biancarosa, G., … Berman, A. I. (2020). How the reading for understanding initiative's research complicates the simple view of reading invoked in the science of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*, S161–S172.

Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2008). *School discourse: Learning to write across the years of schooling*. New York: Continuum.

Cobb, P. (2000). Conducting teaching experiments in collaboration with teachers. In A.E. Kelly and R. Lesh, (Eds.). *Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education*, p.p.307–333. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cole, M. W., David, S. S., & Jiménez, R. T. (2016). Collaborative translation: Negotiating student investment in culturally responsive pedagogy. *Language Arts, 93*(6), 430–443.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103–115.

Cui, Y., & Pacheco, M. B. (2023). Meaning-making and collaboration: Teacher scaffolds within a translanguaging pedagogy. *Journal of World Languages* (*online ahead of press*).

Cummins, J. (2014). Language and identity in multilingual schools: Constructing evidence-based instructional policies. In D. Little, C. Leung, & P. Van Avermaest (Eds.), *Managing diversity in education: Language, policies, pedagogies* (pp. 3–26). Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2023). *Cultural and linguistic diversity in education: A mainstream issue? Mapping the field* (pp. 279–288). New York, NTY: Routledge.

Cummins, J., Early, M., Leoni, L., & Stille, S. (2011). It really comes down to the teachers, I think': Pedagogies of choice in multilingual classrooms. In J. Cummins, & M. Early (Eds.), *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools* (pp. 153–163). Staffordshire, UK: Trentham Books (Eds.).

David, S. S., & Cole, M. W. (2021). Jostling Isaac: Dynamic configurations of bodies and objects during a language problem solving event. *Classroom Discourse, 12*(1–2), 101–120.

David, S. S., Pacheco, M. B., & Jiménez, R. T. (2019). Designing translingual pedagogies: Exploring pedagogical translation through a classroom teaching experiment. *Cognition and Instruction, 37*(2), 252–275.

Delpit, L.. (2002). No kinda sense. In L. Delpit, & J. K. Dowdy (eds.), *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom,* pp. 31–48. New York: The New Press.

Deumert, A. (2014). *Sociolinguistics and mobile communication*. Edinburgh University Press.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Routledge.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed (revised)*. /1996. New York: Continuum.

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Phillips Galloway, E., & McClain, J. B. (2020). Metatalk moves: Examining tools for collective academic discourse learning. *The Reading Teacher, 74*(3), 305–314. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1950

Phillips Galloway, E., & Meston, H. (2022). Pedagogy of possibility: Proleptic teaching and language learning. *Journal of Literacy Research, 54*(4), 402–433. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X2211408

Phillips Galloway, E., & Uccelli, P. (2019). Examining developmental relations between core academic language skills and reading comprehension for English learners and their peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 111*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000276

Phillips Galloway, E., Dobbs, C., Olivo, M., & Madigan, C. (2019). 'You can…': An examination of language-minoritized learners' development of metalanguage and agency as users of academic language within a multivocal instructional approach. *Linguistics and Education, 50*, 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2019.01.002

Phillips Galloway, E., McClain, J. B., & Uccelli, P. (2020a). Broadening the lens on the science of reading: A multifaceted perspective on the role of academic language in text understanding. *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*, 331–345. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.359

Phillips Galloway, E., Uccelli, P., Aguilar, G., & Barr, C. (2020b). Exploring the cross-linguistic contribution of Spanish and English academic language skills to English text comprehension for middle-grade dual language learners. *AERA Open, 6*(1), Article 2332858419892575. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419892575

Phillips Galloway, E., Qin, W., Uccelli, P., & Barr, C. D. (2020c). The role of cross-disciplinary academic language skills in disciplinary, source-based writing: Investigating the role of core academic language skills in science summarization for middle grade writers. *Reading and Writing, 33*(1), 13–44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09942-x

Phillips Galloway, E., Jiménez, R., White, H., Khanna, M., & McFadden, S. (2020d). The TRANSLATE curriculum: A middle grades translanguaging curriculum to support text comprehension. *Curriculum*. Available at: www.translatetoread.com.

Phillips Galloway, E., Meston, H., & Dobbs, C. (2022a). Linguistic cartography: Exploring the power and potential of mapping language resources within classroom communities. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2022.2147935. ahead-of-print.

Phillips Galloway, E., Stude, J., & Uccelli, P.. (2015; re-print, 2022). Adolescents' metalinguistic reflections on the academic register in speech and writing. Linguistics and Education, 31, 221–237, 10.1016/j.linged.2014.10.006.

Phillips Galloway, E. (2023). Operationalizing the access-voice-choice framework for equitably and justly teaching the language for school literacy. *The Reading Teacher, 77*(2), 226–237. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2239

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 9–33). New York: Routledge.

García, O., Johnson, J., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

García, O. (2019). Decolonizing foreign, second, heritage, and first languages. In D. Macedo (Ed.), *Decolonizing foreign language education: The misteaching of English and other colonial languages* (pp. 152–168). Abingdon: Routledge.

García-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(4), 245–255.

García-Mateus, S. Henderson, K., Téllez-Arsté, M. & Palmer, D. (2021). An experienced bilingual Latina teacher and Pre-K Latinx students in the borderlands: Translanguaging as humanizing pedagogy. In M. Sánchez & O. García (Eds.). *Transformative translanguaging espacios: Latinx students and their teachers rompiendo fronteras* sin *miedo* (Vol. 133). Multilingual Matters.

Gebhard, M. (2019). *Teaching and researching ELLs' disciplinary literacies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). Literacy and the pedagogy of voice and political empowerment. *Educational Theory, 38*(1), 61–75.

Giroux, H. A. (2018). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling: A critical reader*. Routledge.

Gogolin, I. (2002). Linguistic and cultural diversity in Europe: A challenge for educational research and practice. *European Educational Research Journal, 1*(1), 123–138. https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2002.1.1.3

Goodwin, A. P., & Jiménez, R. (2016). TRANSLATE: New strategic approaches for English learners. *The Reading Teacher, 69*(6), 621–625.

Grapin, S. E., & Llosa, L. (2024). Thorny issues with academic language: A perspective from scientific practice. *Linguistics and Education, 83*, Article 101334.

Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher, 32*(5), 19–25.

Gutiérrez, K. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(2), 148–164. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3

Halliday, M. A. K. (2006). *The language of science*. New York: Continuum. (Original work published 2004).

Haneda, M. (2014). From academic language to academic communication: Building on English learners' resources. *Linguistics and Education, 26*, 126–135.

Harman, R., Buxton, C., Cardozo-Gaibisso, L., Jiang, L., & Bui, K. (2020). Culturally sustaining systemic functional linguistics praxis in science classrooms. *Language and Education, 35*(2), 106–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1782425

Heath, S. B. (2012). *Words at work and play: Three decades in family and community life*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, V., & Morek, M. (2015). *Academic discourse as situated practice: An introduction. Linguistics and Education, 31*, 174–186.

Hernandez García, M., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2021). Culturally sustaining disciplinary literacy for bi/multilingual learners: Creating a translanguaging social studies classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 64*(4), 449–454.

Hopewell, S., Escamilla, K., Ruíz-Martínez, M., & Zamorano, K. (2022). Designing and facilitating language interpretation experiences with 2nd and 3rd grade bilingual learners: Learning from teachers' experiences. *Bilingual Research Journal, 45*(2), 140–158.

Hornberger, N. H., & Kvietok Dueñas, F. (2019). Mapping biliteracy teaching in Indigenous contexts: From student shyness to student voice. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 50*(1), 6–25.

Hornberger, N. H., & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. *Language and Education, 14*(2), 96–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780008666781

Hornberger, N. H. (2020). Reflect, revisit, reimagine: Ethnography of language policy and planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 40*, 119–127.

Hsin, L. B., Phillips Galloway, E., & Snow, C. E. (2024). Supporting social strengths amid emerging bilingualism: Effects of Word Generation on social perspective taking in English learners' writing. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 27*(6), 854–869.

Janks, H. (2009). *Literacy is power*. New York: Routledge.

Janks, H. (2010a). Language, power and pedagogies. *Sociolinguistics and language education, 1*(3), 40–61.

Janks, H. (2010). "Language as a system of meaning potential": The reading and design of verbal texts. In *Beyond the grammar wars* (pp. 161–179). Routledge.

Jiménez, R. T., David, S., Fagan, K., Risko, V. J., Pacheco, M., Pray, L., & Gonzales, M. (2015). Using translation to drive conceptual development for students becoming literate in English as an additional language. *Research in the Teaching of English, 49*, 248–271.

Jones, S. M., LaRusso, M., Kim, J., Yeon Kim, H., Selman, R., Uccelli, P., … Snow, C. (2019). Experimental effects of Word Generation on vocabulary, academic language, perspective taking, and reading comprehension in high-poverty schools. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 12*(3), 448–483.

Jones, R. H. (2015). Creativity and language. In R.H. Jones & J.C. Richards (Eds.). *Creativity in language teaching: Perspectives from research and practice* (p.p. 16–31). New York: Routledge.

Kibler, A., Valdés, G., & Walqui, A. (Eds.). (2020). *Reconceptualizing the role of critical dialogue in American classrooms: Promoting equity through dialogic education*. Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in US schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3–12.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: Aka the remix. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 74–84.
Leander, K., Carter-Stone, L., & Supica, E. (2023). We got so much better at reading each other's energy": Knowing, acting, and attuning as an improv ensemble. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 32*(2), 250–287.
Lee, C.D. (2020). Social and cultural diversity as lens for understanding student learning and the development of reading. In E. B. Moje, P. Afflerbach, N. K. Lesaux, & P. Enciso (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. V, pp. 37–56). Routledge.
Lin, A. M. (2019). Theories of trans/languaging and trans-semiotizing: Implications for content-based education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(1), 5–16.
Malakoff, M.E., & Hakuta, K. (1991). Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness in bilinguals. In E. Bialystok (Ed.) *Language processing and language awareness in bilingual children*. NY: Oxford University Press.
Martínez, R. A. (2010). 'Spanglish' as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 124–149.
Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). What do you want to say?" How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 8*, 208–230.
McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S., … Barmer, A. (2019). The condition of education 2019. NCES 2019-144. *National Center for Education Statistics*.
Meneses, A., Uccelli, P., Santelices, M. V., Ruíz, M., Acevedo, D., & Figueroa, J. (2018). Academic language as a predictor of reading comprehension in monolingual Spanish-speaking readers: Evidence from Chilean early adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly, 53*(2), 223–247. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq
Moll, L. (2019). Elaborating funds of knowledge: Community-oriented practices in international contexts. *Literacy Research, 69*(1), 130–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336919870805
Myhill, D. (2018). Grammar as a meaning-making resource for im-proving writing. *L1–Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 18*, 1–22.
Nagy, W., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as tools: Learning academic vocabulary as language acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(1), 91–108. https://doi.org/10.1002/RRQ.011
Ninio, A., & Snow, C. E. (1996). *Pragmatic development*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Orellana, M. F., & Reynolds, J. F. (2008). Cultural modeling: Leveraging bilingual skills for school paraphrasing tasks. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*, 48–65.
Orellana, M. F., Martínez, D. C., & Martínez, R. A. (2014). Thoughts from the Editors: Language brokering and translanguaging: Lessons on leveraging students' linguistic competencies. *Language Arts, 91*(5), 311–312.
Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the study of equitable multilingualism. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*, 23–38.
Pacheco, M. B., Daniel, S. M., Pray, L. C., & Jiménez, R. T. (2019). Translingual practice, strategic participation, and meaning-making. *Journal of Literacy Research, 51*(1), 75–99.
Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(3), 757–772.
Palmer, D. K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice, 58*(2), 121–133.
Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12441244
Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Paris, D. (2021). Culturally sustaining pedagogies and our futures. *The Educational Forum, 85*(4), 364–376. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2021.1957634
Park, J., Simpson, L., Hernandez, C., Hernandez, S., Isom, O., Nguyen, T., ... & O'Connor, C. (2020). Translating words and worlds in poetry inside out: Intergenerational research with multilingual youth on productive group talk. In A. Kibler, G. Valdés, & A. Walqui. *Reconceptualizing the role of critical dialogue in American classrooms* (pp. 105–131). New York: Routledge.
Pearson, D., Salinger, T., Lee, C., Uccelli, P., Alexander, P. Vogt, M.E. (2024). *Bridging sciences: An integrated approach to supporting student literacy development.* White Paper, CASEL. https://casel.org/student-literacy-white-paper/.
Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 14*(3), 269–282.
Prasad, G. L. (2014). Portraits of plurilingualism in a French international school in Toronto: Exploring the role of visual methods to access students' representations of their linguistically diverse identities. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 51–77.
Proctor, C. P., Silverman, R. D., Harring, J. R., Jones, R. L., & Hartranft, A. M. (2020). Teaching bilingual learners: Effects of a language-based reading intervention on academic language and reading comprehension in grades 4 and 5. *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*(1), 95–122.
Puzio, K., Keyes, C. S., & Jiménez, R. T. (2016). It sounds more like a gangbanger: Using collaborative translation to understand literary concepts. *Language Arts, 93*(6), 444–456.
Ravid, D., & Tolchinsky, L. (2002). Developing linguistic literacy: A comprehensive model. *Journal of Child Language, 29*(2), 417–447. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000902009169
Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15–34.
Rymes, B. (2011). Communicative repertoires and English language learners. In M. Shatz, M. & L.C. Wilkinson, (eds.). *The education of English language learners: Research to practice* (p.p. 177–197). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
Salazar, M. (2013). A humanizing pedagogy: Reinventing the principles and practice of education as a journey toward liberation. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 121–148.
Schleppegrell, M. J., & Go, A. L. (2007). Analyzing the writing of English learners: A functional approach. *Language Arts, 84*(6), 529–538.
Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. New York: Routledge.
Schleppegrell, M. J. (2020). The knowledge base for language teaching: What is the English to be taught as content? *Language Teaching Research, 24*(1), 17–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818777519
Sembiante, S. F., & Tian, Z. (2021). Culturally sustaining approaches to academic languaging through systemic functional linguistics. *Language and Education, 35*(2), 101–105.
Shin, S. J. (2017). *Bilingualism in schools and society: Language, identity, and policy*. Routledge.
Skerrett, A. (2015). *Teaching transnational youth: Literacy and education in a changing world*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Smitherman, G. (2017). Raciolinguistics,"mis-education," and language arts teaching in the 21st century. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan, 32*(2), 3.
Snow, C.E., & Uccelli, P. (2009). The challenge of academic language. In Olson, D. R., & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of literacy* (pp. 112–133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Souto-Manning, M., Martell, J., Pérez, A. Y., & Pión, P. (2021). Translanguaging as norm: Rejecting narrow and restrictive notions of reading. *The Reading Teacher, 75*(3), 339–350.
Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency (p.p. 95–108). In H. Byrnes (Ed.), Advanced language learning: The contribution of halliday and vygotsky, Continuum, London.
Tolchinsky, L., & Berman, R. A. (2023). *Growing into language: Developmental trajectories and neural underpinnings*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Tolchinsky, L. (2022). Linguistic Literacy: Twenty Years Later. In R. Levie, A. Bar-On, O. Ashkenazi, E. Dattner, & G. Brandes (Eds.). (2022). *Developing language and literacy: Studies in honor of dorit diskin ravid* (pp. 321–347). Cham, Germany: Springer International Publishing.
Tse, L. (2001). Resisting and reversing language shift: Heritage-language resilience among U.S. native biliterates. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*, 676–708.
Uccelli, P., & Phillips Galloway, E. (2017). Academic language across content areas: Lessons from an innovative assessment and from students' reflections about language. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 60*(4), 395–404. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.553
Uccelli, P., Phillips Galloway, E., Barr, C. D., Meneses, A., & Dobbs, C. L. (2015). Beyond vocabulary: Exploring cross-disciplinary academic-language proficiency and its association with reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 50*(3), 337–356. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.104
Uccelli, P., Deng, Z., Phillips Galloway, E., & Qin, W. (2019). The role of language skills in mid-adolescents' science summaries. *Journal of Literacy Research, 51*(3), 357–380. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X19860206
Uccelli, P., Phillips Galloway, E., Aguilar, G., & Allen, M. (2020). Amplifying and affirming students' voices through CALS-informed instruction. *Theory into Practice, 59*(1), 75–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665413
Uccelli, P. (2023). Midadolescents' language learning at school: Toward more just and scientifically rigorous practices in research and education. *Language Learning, 73*(S2), 182–221.
Siegman, R.M. & Phillips Galloway, E. (under review). Teacher Sensemaking of Translanguaging curricular tools: Pursuing culturally sustaining practices & instruction for plurilingual learners.
Valdés, G. (2004). Between support and marginalisation: The development of academic language in linguistic minority children. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(2–3), 102–132.
Walqui, A., & Van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise*. WestEd.
Wei, L., & Lee, T. K. (2023). Transpositioning: Translanguaging and the liquidity of identity. *Applied Linguistics* (available ahead of print).
Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39*, 9–30.
White, H., Phillips Galloway, E., & Jiménez, R. T. (2024). Bridging theory to practice: Exploring the role of an educative translingual curriculum to support linguistically diverse classroom practices. *TESOL Quarterly, 58*(2), 802–829. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3258
Wilkinson, L. C., & Silliman, E. R. (2000). Classroom language and literacy learning. *Handbook of Reading Research, 3*, 337–360.