Teaching and Teacher Education 113 (2022) 103653

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Teaching and Teacher Education

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

Research paper

From humanizing principles to humanizing practices: Exploring core practices as a bridge to enacting humanizing pedagogy with multilingual students☆,☆☆

Megan Madigan Peercy [a, *], Johanna Tigert [b], Daisy Fredricks [c], Tabitha Kidwell [d], Karen Feagin [a], Wyatt Hall [a], Jennifer Himmel [a], Megan DeStefano Lawyer [a]

[a] University of Maryland, 2311 Benjamin Building, College Park, MD, 20742, USA
[b] University of Massachusetts, Lowell, Coburn Hall, 850 Broadway St., Lowell, MA, 01854, USA
[c] Grand Valley State University, 401 W. Fulton St., Building C, Grand Rapids, MI, 49504, USA
[d] American University, 217 Gray Hall, Washington, DC, 20016, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 24 November 2020
Received in revised form
19 January 2022
Accepted 26 January 2022
Available online 22 February 2022

Keywords:
Core practices
Humanizing pedagogy
Multilingual students
Teacher education
Novice teachers

ABSTRACT

Humanizing approaches to the education of multilingual students have been limited by scholarship that lacks an empirical basis or clear implications for teacher education, making it challenging for teacher education programs to support teachers' enactment of equitable practice with multilingual students. We argue that although core practices have been criticized for marginalizing issues of justice, they may provide a bridge from humanizing principles to humanizing practices. Drawing on novice teachers' enactment of some of the core practices we have identified, we suggest that with further development these core practices have potential to humanize the teaching and learning of multilingual students.

We always hear 'be culturally responsive.' I see the importance of being culturally responsive, but what does that really look like in the classroom?...Those are the things that I think about when I learn different techniques or strategies from my coursework. Like can I really apply this…and what does it really look like with my students? (Nadine, finishing her internship year, 5/18/15 Team Meeting).

Upon entering the demanding spaces of classrooms and schools, novice teachers (NTs) encounter a number of challenges that are often characterized by questions about how to apply university-taught theories and concepts to specific learners and settings, particularly when teachers' linguistic, cultural, racial/ethnic, socioeconomic backgrounds, and family, community, and life experiences differ from those of their students. Like Nadine, NTs frequently ask questions regarding how to enact equitable and humanizing pedagogy, which raises important considerations for the scholarship and practice of teacher education. Although there is general agreement that teachers should engage in humanizing teaching, there is less clarity on how to support teachers as they learn to *enact* humanizing pedagogies, and limited examples of what humanizing pedagogy looks like in day-to-day NT practice.[1]

☆ We gratefully recognize the teachers, students, and administrators who have so generously given their time and insights to this project. We also thank those colleagues who have provided feedback on this manuscript at various stages in its development, including Drs. Jamy Stillman and Linda Valli.

☆☆ The research reported in this article was made possible, in part, by a grant from the Spencer Foundation (#201900094). The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Spencer Foundation.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: mpeercy@umd.edu (M.M. Peercy), Johanna_Tigert@uml.edu (J. Tigert), fredrida@gvsu.edu (D. Fredricks), tkidwell@american.edu (T. Kidwell), kfeagin@umd.edu (K. Feagin), whall125@terpmail.umd.edu (W. Hall), jhimmel@umd.edu (J. Himmel), mdestefa@umd.edu (M. DeStefano Lawyer).

[1] We do have examples of research that has included some NTs among the participants (Huerta, 2011); teachers analyzing the alignment of their own practice with humanizing principles (Mehta & Aguilera, 2020; Osorio, 2018); and more global accounts of programs for multilingual students with more or less humanizing aspects to them (Fránquiz & Salazar 2004).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103653
0742-051X/

This gap in how to support NTs' enactment of humanizing practice is particularly striking for teachers of multilingual students,[2] and creates challenges for teacher educators trying to cultivate equitable practice. As Faltis and Valdés (2016) noted, the scholarship on teaching multilingual students "presents a collection of disconnected strategies …. [with] little to say about what teacher educators or preservice teachers in general need to know and be able to do" (p. 550), and there is a dearth of research about doing so in humanizing ways. Humanizing pedagogy is rare in U.S. schools, which generally foster White, monolingual English, middle-class epistemological and ontological norms and emphasize assimilation and achievement through high stakes testing, narrow curricula, and punitive discipline (e.g., Jacobs, 2019; Skiba et al., 2002). Schooling can be especially dehumanizing for students who have linguistic and cultural ways of participating in school practices that differ from those of their majoritized peers and teachers (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003; Heath, 1983). Rather than valuing these students' resources and drawing upon them to support meaningful learning, advocacy, and deeper relationships (Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), schools frequently ignore and obliterate them (e.g., Valenzuela, 1999).

It takes much struggling against the current, therefore, particularly for NTs, to commit to and develop practices for engaging in humanizing pedagogy, and for teacher educators to foster their growth as humanizing practitioners. We draw upon a number of theoretical models for teaching linguistically and culturally diverse learners (e.g., Bartolomé, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995, 1994; López, 2016; Moll & González, 1994; Paris, 2012), and on Salazar's (2010) description of humanizing pedagogy, to define what humanizing pedagogy looks like in teacher practice.

We argue that one possible response to the gap in scholarship on the preparation of teachers to move theory to action and serve multilingual students in humanizing ways might lie in practice-based teacher education. Its emphasis on "core" practices (CPs), and their iterative cycle of practice, feedback, and reflection, has potential to address the theory-practice gap highlighted by Faltis and Valdés (2016), and the related "problem of enactment" (Kennedy, 1999) raised by Nadine. We acknowledge that previous scholarship has pointed to the dangers of operationalizing humanizing pedagogy through narrowly specified classroom practices, and has in some cases been critical of a focus on the CPs movement as marginalizing issues of equity, (e.g., Daniels & Varghese, 2020; Freire & Macedo, 1998; Philip et al., 2019). However, we argue that offering CPs and representations of their enactment can provide a bridge between humanizing ideals and much-needed examples situated in NTs' contexts. In the absence of such examples, even educators who articulate strong commitments to equity-based practices— and particularly novices—struggle to enact them (e.g., Janssen et al., 2015; Schiera, 2020; Sleeter & Delgado Bernal, 2004; Young, 2010).[3] Thus, while we must avoid overgeneralizing "what works" and essentializing particular student populations, teacher educators also have a responsibility to scaffold NTs' development of equity-oriented practice. We explore the following question: How can core practices be leveraged to support NTs of multilingual students in enacting humanizing pedagogies?

We share examples from two NTs on our team who engaged in emerging humanizing pedagogy. We illustrate how their practice is representative of the CPs our team has collaboratively identified (e.g., Peercy et al., 2019; Fredricks & Peercy, 2020; Kidwell et al., 2021; Peercy et al., 2020), and how these practices are humanizing, drawing upon Salazar's (2010) description of teachers who are oriented to a humanizing pedagogy. In doing so, we hope to demonstrate how CPs might offer a bridge from humanizing *principles* to the preparation of NTs to engage in humanizing *practice* with multilingual students. Drawing on work in practice-based teacher education regarding key dimensions of professional preparation, we offer these examples of NT practice as "representations," which, according to Grossman (2011) are "all the different ways in which the work of practitioners is made visible" (p. 2837). Representations can include video, case study, direct observation, and student work samples, and may be used to illustrate different parts of professional practice (Grossman, Compton, et al., 2009).

Through transcripts from observations, interviews, and team meetings, we aim to represent what it might look like when NTs work toward the enactment of humanizing pedagogies with multilingual students. As McDonald et al. (2013) note, representations of practice "help teacher candidates develop an image of the activity and embedded practices under study" (p. 383), and we believe that representations from NTs can help both teacher educators and NTs develop an understanding of possible aspects of emerging humanizing pedagogy.

1. From humanizing principles to humanizing practices

Although there is a substantial body of scholarship about teaching culturally diverse learners in humanizing ways (e.g., *resource* pedagogies, Paris, 2012), this work exhibits two important gaps. First, much of it does not attend to the specific needs of teachers of language learners (e.g., Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Second, it largely comprises theoretical models that focus on developing teachers' asset-based *mindsets*, and thus is frequently perceived by NTs as providing insufficient guidance in how to *apply* these important ways of thinking to their practice (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2006, 2008; McDonald, 2005).

We are not dismissing the critical conceptual foundations laid by the scholarship on *resource,* or *asset-based, pedagogies* since the 1970s (e.g., López, 2016; Paris, 2012). This scholarship has been essential to shifting perspectives from a deficit-oriented lens to one of valuing the language, literacy, and cultural practices of minoritized students. The existing literature base provides examples of teachers' humanizing pedagogies and has drawn some connections between teachers' practices and pedagogical frameworks (e.g., Au, 1980; Bartolomé, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995; Moll et al., 1992), but has not generally developed coherent models for integrating these frameworks, representations of practice, and the specific capacities and needs of NTs (and particularly NTs of multilingual students). However, recent scholarship has argued that social justice frameworks and CPs could be integrated in complementary ways (Schiera, 2020). We use CPs to extend the existing resource pedagogy scholarship to NTs' work with multilingual students. We argue that CPs may provide the kind of support and examples of practice NTs need in order to use what they learn from teacher education about "ways of being" to develop "ways of doing" (Ladson-Billings, 2008, p. 176) that are responsive to their particular contexts and learners.

As part of a shift toward deeper attention to practice in teacher education, CPs have been suggested as a way for teacher education programs to focus on a limited number of key (or "core") practices that can be enacted by NTs, and that have the potential to improve

[2] Often identified as English language learners (ELLs) or the U.S. federal designation, English learners (ELs). Here we use the term multilingual students to indicate the capabilities and potential of these learners.

[3] We acknowledge that NT resistance to ideas that challenge their privilege can be manifested as confusion or complaints about the lack of applicability of justice-oriented pedagogies (e.g., Kidd et al., 2008; Ukpokodu, 2002), however, scholarship also provides compelling evidence that novices have special learning needs, and benefit from more direct guidance when learning to put knowledge into embodied activity.

student achievement (e.g., Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009; Lampert et al., 2013; McDonald et al., 2013). This scholarship has argued the importance of preparing novices for "ambitious" pedagogy that "attends to the learning of all students – across ethnic, racial, class, and gender categories" (McDonald et al., 2013, p. 385), and the potential of CPs to support teachers in responding to historicized injustices in schools (Calabrese Barton et al., 2020). In our collaborative work between NTs and teacher educators (Fredricks & Peercy, 2020), we drew upon these central tenets as criteria as we developed CPs for teaching multilingual students, a student population not yet carefully examined in CP literature (Grossman & McDonald, 2008; McDonald et al., 2013; Fredricks & Peercy, 2020). Specifically, we worked together to identify pedagogies that emerged as centrally important in the teachers' K-12 academic contexts, attending to factors that support multilingual students in school settings where they are frequently minoritized due to their language, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, immigration status, religion, and other factors.

Although the principles of humanizing pedagogy were not at the fore of our conversations as we initially worked to identify and develop the CPs, we saw the potential in CPs to support NTs and teacher educators in developing a deeper understanding of practice, and sought to ground this deeper understanding of what the enactment of practice with multilingual students could look like with an explicit commitment to equity. We recognized that CPs needed to be carefully conceptualized through a humanizing lens to avoid reproducing yet another accountability movement leading to a continued "erasure of equity and justice and the reinforcement of market-oriented ideologies and practices" (Philip et al., 2019, p. 259) in education. We also felt it critically important to connect our CPs more directly to humanizing aims to explicitly support NTs of multilingual students, particularly because multilingual students are minoritized in multiple ways, and because NTs often have questions like Nadine's about how to do so in practice ("*What does that really look like in the classroom?..What does it really look like with my students*?").

Bartolomé (1994) argues that a humanizing pedagogy "casts students as critically engaged, active participants in the co-construction of knowledge" (Salazar, 2013, p. 128). Crucially, she argues, this pedagogy must be additive and move students from an object position to a subject position by enacting "pedagogy that respects and uses the reality, history, and perspectives of students as an integral part of educational practice" (p. 173). Like Bartolomé, Carter Andrews and Castillo (2016) emphasize the importance of centering humanizing interactions when they describe "mindsets and practices that foster learning environments where the needs of the whole student are considered; power is shared by students and instructors; and students' background knowledge, culture, and life experiences are valued …. help[ing] students realize and enact more fully human identities … [and] foster[ing] inclusion in the classroom" (p. 113). They also assert the importance of developing "critical consciousness" and challenging inequity in the educational system. They draw on Salazar (2013), who defines critical consciousness as Freire (1970) does: "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (p. 17).

We specifically build upon the work of Salazar (2010), who synthesized foundational literature on the principles of humanizing pedagogy, and framed them in terms of practices and stances of teachers oriented to humanizing instruction. Drawing upon the work of Freire, Bartolomé, Macedo, Moll and colleagues, Banks, Cochran-Smith, Fránquiz, and others, she identified the following ways that teachers enact humanizing practice:

- value students' background knowledge, culture, and life experiences;
- promote respect, trusting relations between teachers and students, and academic rigor;
- focus on what students can do and achieve with the cultural and linguistic resources they bring;
- incorporate a student-centered approach aimed at developing critical consciousness;
- increase academic rigor through a focus on higher-order thinking skills;
- build trusting and caring relationships between teachers and students;
- acknowledge and capitalize on students' and parents' cultural and linguistic resources to improve teaching and learning;
- strengthen students' ethnic and linguistic identities;
- challenge the role of educational institutions and educators in maintaining inequitable systems; and
- advocate for innovative approaches to improve the education of all learners.

We use Salazar's (2010) characteristics of humanizing practice as a conceptual tool to examine the instructional practices of NTs of multilingual students. Below, we share details of our participatory design research that yielded the representations of practice that we share here. We use these representations to illustrate how CPs may provide a bridge between humanizing principles and NTs' enactment of practice with multilingual students.

2. Methods

We began our collective work by identifying, developing, and refining CPs for teaching multilingual students (Fredricks & Peercy, 2020; Peercy et al., 2020; Kidwell et al., 2021), drawing upon collaborative, dynamic understandings of knowledge construction (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Zeichner et al., 2015), as well as calls for praxis (Gutiérrez & Penuel, 2014; Medin & Bang, 2014) and the disruption of researcher-participant, scholar-practitioner, and expert-novice hierarchies (Bang & Vossoughi, 2016; Calabrese Barton et al., 2020; Gutiérrez et al., 2019). We recognize that because humanization of pedagogy was not foregrounded when we initially created the CPs, there are limitations in their scope. However, we find value in sharing these CPs as a starting point for the field to consider what emerging humanizing practice with multilingual students looks like, and how to move forward in supporting the development of such pedagogy.

The data we examine here represent our collective examination of ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) NTs' early teaching experiences over a period of three years. During this time, we had gotten to know the NTs through our roles as course instructors and university supervisors, later following them into their early years of teaching, and working together as a team in an iterative dialogic cycle to develop and refine what we identified as core to the teachers' work (Fredricks & Peercy, 2020).

Our collaboration began with whole team meetings (NTs and teacher educators), in which we discussed NTs' early classroom experiences, the practices they were using to engage in their work, and their challenges. Keeping in mind the criteria we had for CPs, we jointly explored practices we identified as centrally important to teaching multilingual students, that were enactable by NTs, and had the potential to improve student achievement, and began to create a figure to represent this (Fredricks & Peercy, 2020). We then moved back and forth between our growing data set of conversations, classroom observations, interviews, and artifacts, and used our ongoing data analysis to continually revise our CPs. Through this iterative and participatory process, we eventually refined a set

Table 1
A priori codes for core practices.

1. **Knowing students** within the context of both school and their lives outside of school, and integrating knowledge of their:
• **1.1** Home language and English language background. • **1.2** Home language and English literacy. • **1.3** Prior schooling. • **1.4** Interests. • **1.5** Experiences at home and in community.
2. Building a **positive learning environment** through:
• **2.1** Consistent **routines**, high **expectations**, and **procedures** that support learning. • **2.2 Culturally and linguistically responsive/sustaining** pedagogy. • **2.3** Development of students' **social-emotional skills.**
3. **Planning and enacting** content and language **instruction** in ways that meet **students** at their **current level** through the use of:
• **3.1** Comprehensible input. • **3.2** Scaffolding. • **3.3** Differentiation. • **3.4** Content and language objectives.
4. Supporting **language and literacy development**.
• **4.1** Promoting **vocabulary** development. • **4.2** Using **students' home language knowledge as a resource**. • **4.3** Attending to and appropriately prioritizing **receptive and productive language skills** at the word, sentence, and discourse level. • **4.4.** Adapting instruction based on awareness of the **complexity of language** and **students' language development needs**.
5. **Assessing** in ways that are attentive to students' language proficiency.
• **5.1** Designing and using **formal** and **informal assessments** that match **content** and **language objectives** and approaches to instruction, and measure content and language knowledge separately and fairly. • **5.2** Interpreting **standardized testing** (including English language proficiency tests) and other formal assessments to design appropriate instruction for students. • **5.3 Differentiating** formal and informal **assessment** to match student abilities.
6. Developing **positive relationships** with colleagues, families, stakeholders, and self.
• **6.1 Collaborating with** and reciprocally sharing expertise with **mainstream colleagues and other specialists.** • **6.2 Connecting with families** to support students, families, and instruction. • **6.3** Engaging in **advocacy** with colleagues, administrators, policy makers, community to support student learning and social-emotional needs. • **6.4** Practicing **self-care** for well-being.

of CPs and enactment statements for teaching multilingual students (Table 1 shows a detailed version we used for our initial coding of the entire data set). Through this process, we also generated a set of examples from teachers' work that both shaped our understanding of CPs and provided representations of teachers enacting them (Peercy et al., 2020).

2.1. Participants

We worked with thirteen NTs who were enrolled in or had recently graduated from one of our M.Ed. in TESOL programs at the time of data collection. These programs included a one-year intensive M.Ed. certification program, and a two-year M.Ed. certification program. Both programs included a year-long practicum and certified teachers in K-12 ESOL. The first author invited NTs to participate based on evidence from coursework of thoughtfulness about their work as teachers, interest in participating, and willingness to attend regular meetings and be observed while teaching. NTs ranged in age from early 20s to late 30s, and largely mirrored the demographics of the U.S. teaching force, being majority White and female. They taught in a variety of contexts, including elementary pull-out and plug-in[4] models, and secondary settings in which they taught ESOL or sheltered content area instruction[5] to multilingual students (e.g., science, math, English language arts).

Here we highlight lessons from two teachers as representations of emerging humanizing practice. One lesson was taught by Catherine, an African American woman in her mid-twenties with no prior teaching experience, and the other was taught by Kendra, a White woman in her mid-thirties who had two years of prior experience teaching adults in Tanzania. Both taught in the same large school district in the mid-Atlantic U.S. with a growing population of multilingual students, and recently, large numbers of students fleeing violence in Latin American countries. They both taught in schools whose student populations were mostly Latinx, where the majority of students received free and reduced meals, and which enrolled large numbers of multilingual students whose home language was predominantly Spanish. Catherine, who had an undergraduate degree in environmental science, taught ESOL biology to ninth and tenth grade students designated as newcomer ELs at a large high school, and Kendra taught kindergarten and second grade students designated as ELs. Catherine taught students in 90-min periods on an A/B day schedule. Kendra, who had majored in history in her undergraduate program, taught 20-25-min lessons in a primarily pull-out model, aligning her instruction with the mainstream curriculum and supporting other linguistic needs she identified. She generally worked with each group 3–5 times per week. Kendra had some basic skills in Spanish but had not studied it formally, and Catherine had minored in Spanish as an undergraduate. These two lessons represent a diversity of grade

[4] In pull-out models, instruction occurs individually or in small groups separate from grade-level classroom instruction. In plug-in models, instruction occurs in the grade-level classroom and can occur in small group rotations, co-teaching of the entire class, and other formats.

[5] In sheltered instruction, the focus is on supporting multilingual students' learning of content so that they can gain the same content knowledge that same-age English dominant peers are learning. Through sheltering of the content through deliberate scaffolding, focus on meaning of new vocabulary, and explicit attention to learning strategies, students have the opportunity to access content while still being supported in their development and understanding of English. Because teachers of sheltered courses need to have both knowledge of teaching language learners, and content knowledge, ESOL teachers often teach sheltered courses, and have varying degrees of content expertise.

levels (kindergarten and 9th/10th grade), content (math and biology), and a range of practices that offer a glimpse of the NTs' emerging humanizing pedagogy. We limited the number of representations so that we could illustrate each with some depth. We have intentionally selected these representations of practice to illustrate both what is possible and where there is room for further development of NT practice as we consider how to foster the equity-oriented work of novices.

The teacher educators involved in the project included one tenured faculty member, one clinical faculty member, and six doctoral students who worked with the NTs by teaching courses or supervising field placements. The majority of the teacher educators on the team were White females, with one identifying as Korean American, and one White male teacher educator. All specialized in the teaching and learning of multilingual students in a variety of areas, including ESOL methods, literacy development in multilingual students, second language acquisition, language policy, and language assessment, and had previously taught ESOL and ESOL pedagogy in a variety of contexts.

2.2. Data sources and analysis

We draw on observation and interview data, classroom artifacts, and data from team meetings collected between 2015 and 2018. Observational data were collected in the form of field notes and audio/video recordings of lessons, which were selectively transcribed based upon examination of field notes. Interviews and meetings were audio/video recorded and transcribed.

Data analysis was conducted iteratively throughout the data collection process. In our initial analysis, we employed the constant

Table 2
Core practices as a bridge to humanizing pedagogy.

Core Practices for Working with Multilingual Students (Authors)	Humanizing Pedagogy (Salazar, 2010)
1. **Knowing students** within the context of both school and their lives outside of school. Integrating knowledge of students': • Language background • Literacy • Prior schooling • Interests • Experiences at home and in community	Value students' background knowledge, culture, and life experiences.
	Focus on what students can do and achieve with the cultural and linguistic resources they bring.[6]
	Build trusting and caring relationships between teachers and students
2. Building a **positive learning environment** through: • Consistent **routines**, high **expectations**, and **procedures** that support learning. • **Culturally and linguistically responsive/sustaining** pedagogy. • Development of students' **social-emotional skills**.	Promote respect, trusting relations between teachers and students, and academic rigor
	Build trusting and caring relationships between teachers and students
	Focus on what students can do and achieve with the cultural and linguistic resources they bring
3. **Planning and enacting** content and language **instruction** in ways that meet **students** at their **current level** through the use of: • Comprehensible input. • Scaffolding. • Differentiation. • Content and language objectives.	No clear alignment
4. Supporting **language and literacy development**. • Promoting **vocabulary** development. • Using **students' home language knowledge as a resource**. • Attending to and appropriately prioritizing **receptive and productive language skills** at the word, sentence, and discourse level. • Adapting instruction based on awareness of the **complexity of language** and **students' language development needs**.	No clear alignment

5. **Assessing** in ways that are attentive to students' language proficiency. • Designing and using **formal** and **informal assessments** that match **content** and **language objectives** and approaches to instruction, and measure content and language knowledge separately and fairly. • Interpreting **standardized testing** (including English language proficiency tests) and other formal assessments to design appropriate instruction for students. • **Differentiating** formal and informal **assessment** to match student abilities	No clear alignment
6. Developing **positive relationships** with colleagues, families, stakeholders, and self. • **Collaborating with** and reciprocally sharing expertise with **mainstream colleagues and other specialists**. • **Connecting with parents/caregivers** to support students, families, and instruction. • Engaging in **advocacy** with colleagues, administrators, policy makers, community to support student learning and social-emotional needs. • Practicing **self-care** for well-being.	Acknowledge and capitalize on students' and parents' cultural and linguistic resources to improve teaching and learning Advocate for innovative approaches to improve the education of all learners
Pedagogies from Salazar (2010) with no clear alignment with our CPs	
No clear alignment	Incorporate a student-centered approach aimed at developing critical consciousness
No clear alignment	Strengthen students' ethnic and linguistic identities
No clear alignment	Challenge the role of educational institutions and educators in maintaining inequitable systems

[6] Text in black font indicates clear alignment between our CPs and Salazar's (2010) principles, text in gray font indicates less direct alignment, but practices where we still see a connection.

comparative method (Corbin & Strauss, 2015) to identify emerging themes and patterns in the data for the identification of CPs. This process allowed us to develop a priori codes for our analysis of teachers' enactment of practice (see Fredricks & Peercy, 2020). A priori codes included key words identified in Table 1 as codes and subcodes. In a second phase of analysis, we coded a common set of data sources using the a priori codes, and then met to discuss our coding and any discrepancies in our coding. We used these conversations as the basis to establish a shared understanding of our codes for CPs. Each data source was coded by two members from the research team, and any discrepancies in coding were discussed by the two coders until agreement was reached.

In a subsequent phase of analysis, we identified characteristics of the enactment of humanizing pedagogy from Bartolomé (1994), Carter Andrews and Castillo (2016); Freire (1970), and Salazar (2010, 2013), and ultimately adopted a list of characteristics of humanizing pedagogy from Salazar (2010) because it framed these characteristics in terms of teacher practice. We then carefully examined our a priori codes for CPs to explore how they aligned with Salazar's characterization of humanizing pedagogy, creating a table comparing the two (Table 2). We used this table to re-examine our data, identifying excerpts from classroom observations, teacher interviews, and team meetings that we had coded to seek examples of instances where the NTs' enactment of those CPs showed emerging evidence of humanizing pedagogy as conceptualized by Salazar (2010).

As can be seen from Table 2, there were some gaps in the alignment of the CPs we identified versus the characteristics of humanizing pedagogy put forth by Salazar (2010). However, we also note that our CPs included practices not discussed by Salazar that nevertheless have the potential to be humanizing in ways we describe in the findings and discussion (see also Tables 3 and 4, column "Additional CP").

Next, we illustrate how the CPs we identified are manifested in lesson excerpts from the two NTs, and offer them, together with the teachers' reflections on their practice in interviews and team meetings, as representations of NTs' emerging humanizing practice. We note that in order to highlight teacher practice, we purposely have selected excerpts in which the NTs are centered in classroom instruction, and we acknowledge that this backgrounds students and student interactions. While student interactions and development are central to humanizing pedagogy, as Hatch and Grossman (2009) have discussed, any representation makes certain aspects of practice more visible, and we agree with the authors that a careful examination of what a particular representation does and does not show is useful in itself.

3. Representations of practice

Below, we share data from Catherine and Kendra to illustrate their emerging humanizing pedagogy and how they grappled with different dimensions of their practice during lesson debriefs and team meetings. By sharing these representations of practice, we strive to go beyond reiterating the importance of socially just and humanizing pedagogies or listing practices suggested to be effective for working with multilingual students (e.g., Echevarría et al., 2017; Herrell & Jordan, 2019). Rather, we hope to illustrate, through representations from two NTs' instruction, how CPs may be taken up in NTs' emerging practice, and how they may help build a bridge between humanizing aims and humanizing practices used with multilingual students. Each of the tables that we use to share the teachers' practice (Tables 3 and 4) are organized as follows: the first column contains the transcript of the classroom representation; the second column represents humanizing pedagogy from Salazar (2010) that we coded in the transcript; the third column indicates the connection between humanizing pedagogy as conceptualized by Salazar and the CPs from our initial coding; and the fourth column indicates CPs that we coded during our initial coding phase where we did not see specific alignment with Salazar's characterization of humanizing pedagogy.

3.1. Catherine

Catherine's 90-min high school class periods in ESOL Biology were regularly packed with 30–40 newcomer multilingual students. Throughout the year, she organized them in smaller teams with students taking turns serving as captains who ensured that their entire group engaged with the material, understood new content, and turned in assignments. This organization helped students get to know one another, learn classroom procedures and science content, and create a supportive learning environment, while also helping Catherine manage large classes with often transient student populations.

Because her students had recently arrived in the U.S., most from Latin American countries, she sprinkled her instructions and explanations with Spanish to support student comprehension and infused science content with attention to vocabulary, punctuation, and grammar. Catherine also actively included and regularly invited use of students' other home languages. She was aware that they needed to know the vocabulary and language structures embedded in biology, and used repetition and regular practice to give students access to the same foundation that their English-dominant peers were learning. Additionally, through conversations she sought out with other science and ESOL colleagues, she learned that newcomers typically needed stronger basic writing and notetaking skills as they moved from her course into other science classes, and worked hard to provide that foundation. In a lesson we observed in her first semester as a teacher (Table 3), she taught about measurement as part of an introductory science unit that prepared students for measuring plant growth in her class, as well as for later units on measurement in non-ESOL science classes. This brief excerpt illustrates the warmup at the beginning of the lesson.

(11/6/15 Lesson Observation).

As can be seen from Table 3, the CPs enacted by Catherine in this lesson (column 3) aligned particularly closely with four characteristics of humanizing pedagogy highlighted by Salazar (2010, column 2): building trusting and caring relationships between herself and students; promoting respect, trust, and academic rigor; valuing students' background knowledge, culture, and life experiences; and focusing on what students can do and achieve with their cultural and linguistic resources. Catherine's focus on what students could achieve with their linguistic resources was especially evident in her use and valuing of multiple home languages in her classroom (Spanish and Russian in this excerpt). She also intentionally drew on students' home languages to aid their understanding of new concepts in English, thereby honoring the linguistic expertise held by multilingual students.

After this lesson, Johanna raised Catherine's use of Russian as a point for further conversation.

Johanna: So I noticed you've learned some Russian!

Catherine: … [When Tanya] came in, nobody wanted to be in her group because… they only wanted to speak Spanish to each other and they're like 'She doesn't understand me!' So I was like, 'Let's learn some of her words.' We all learned some phrases in Russian like *hello, goodbye, thank you*. She loves it, and she feels a lot more comfortable now. Because at first she was not talking. (11/6/15 Lesson Debrief).

Catherine's keen awareness of how students' language backgrounds were shaping classroom interactions and her willingness to tackle an unfamiliar language were testament to her intentional use of a student's home language not only for content and language learning, which is standard practice in many ESOL classrooms, but

Table 3
Representation of practice: Catherine.

Transcript	Humanizing Pedagogy, Salazar (2010)	Related CP (Authors)	Additional CP (Authors)
Catherine greets students as they enter the classroom, and talks to two new students who have recently come to the U.S. and have just been enrolled in her class, Nelson and Aliyah. Catherine directs the class to get started on their warmup question for a lesson on measurement.	Build trusting and caring relationships	Knowing students	
	Promote respect, trust, and care	Consistent routines and procedures	
Catherine: We're going to start. Please, put your name, *su nombre* [at the top of the page for warmup question]. [Asking the only Russian speaker in the class, Tanya] How do I say it ('My name is') in Russian, again, Tanya? Tanya: [Russian]. Catherine repeats. Tanya repeats, as do a couple students. C: All right, your name. So Nelson, and Aliyah, your name, okay? *Su nombre*. Also period. Student: 4 A. C: What's the date? Student: Today is November 6, 2015.	Value students' background knowledge and experiences	Integrating knowledge of students' language background	
	Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources	Linguistically responsive pedagogy	

(*continued on next page*)

Table 3 (*continued*)

Transcript	Humanizing Pedagogy, Salazar (2010)	Related CP (Authors)	Additional CP (Authors)
C: Perfect, what's our warmup [question]? [Question posted is 'How can we use a ruler?']	Value students' background knowledge	Integrating knowledge of students' literacy	Using informal assessment
Tanya: How can we use a ruler?			
C: Perfect. How can….			Promoting vocabulary development
Tanya: We use a ruler.			
C: Good job. Is this correct? [Shows a sentence with no ending punctuation.]			
Students: Noooo.	Build trusting and caring relationships	Consistent routines, procedures, and high expectations	Attending to receptive and productive language skills at the sentence level
C: No, what do I need?			
Student: *Punto* [period].			
C [Correcting student response]: Question **mark** [She adds a question mark]. You see a question word, you think question mark, okay? What is a ruler? [To a student who has drawn a picture of a ruler]: Perfect, oh, look at that beautiful picture. That is a **ruler**!			
C: How do you say ruler?	Value students' background knowledge, culture, and life experiences	Integrating knowledge of students' language background	
Students: *Regla.*			
C: *Regla.* [To Tanya] How do you say ruler in Russian?			
Tanya: *Lineika.*			
C: *Lineika.* Everybody [Prompting class to repeat it].	Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources		
Students: *Lineika.*			
C: …. So how **can** we use a ruler?.. I want to hear from you, because you know some of this vocabulary ….	Value students' background knowledge	Integrating knowledge of students' language background	Scaffolding
Student: *Medir*! [To measure!]C: *Medir.* How do you say that in English?			
Students: Measure.			
C: Measure, everybody repeat. Measure.	Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources	Consistent routines, high expectations, procedures that support learning	Attending to receptive and productive language use at the word level
Students: Measure.			
C: [Prompting one of the new students to repeat after her.] Nelson, Measure.			
Nelson: Measure.			
C: Perfect, thank you. [Prompting the other new student to repeat after her.] Aliyah, measure.	Promote respect, trust, and academic rigor		Promoting vocabulary development
Aliyah: Measure.			
C: Thank you. Okay, so we always repeat, new students.			
C: Okay, so what do we measure on things?...	Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources	Integrating knowledge of students' language background	Scaffolding
Student: Length?			
C: Somebody's using the vocabulary!			
Student: Length.			
C: I heard length.		High expectations, procedures that support learning	Using informal assessment
Student: Width.			
C: I heard width.			Promoting vocabulary development
Students: Height.			
C: …. These are three types of measurement, okay? So you measure the width, you measure the height, and you measure the length.			
[Catherine begins to move in a "dance" to physically illustrate each one.] So what's this one? I'll show you, and you tell me, okay? So length. [Catherine takes a long step forward to represent length.] Width [She places her hands on her hips to indicate the width of her body]. Height [She points upwards]. Okay, what's this? [Steps forward.]	Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources	Integrating knowledge of students' language background	Comprehensible input
Students: Length.			Scaffolding
C: [Points upward] What's this?			Promoting vocabulary development
Students: Height.			
C: Perfect. What's this?			
Students call out different vocabulary words as Catherine changes her dance.			Attending to receptive and productive language use at the word level
C: … So you're going to show me the three types of measurement with this desk.			
A volunteer comes up to demonstrate as Catherine calls out each type of measurement ….			
C: Okay, so one more thing. I'm going to give you the description for **each** measurement. You can tell me. This is length, is long. [For instance] 'How **long** is the table.' What's the description for height?	Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources	Integrating knowledge of students' language background	Comprehensible input
Students: High.			
C: High. [Then she points to width.]			
Students: Wide (pronouncing/i/as a short vowel).			Scaffolding
C: Wiiide (Pronouncing/i/as a long vowel).			
Students: Wide (Pronouncing/i/as a long vowel).			Adapting instruction for students' language development needs
Catherine writes each adjective under its corresponding noun on the board.			
			Promoting vocabulary development
			Attending to receptive and productive language use at the word level

also for the humanization of a student by repositioning her in the eyes of her peers, through her purposeful valuing of Tanya's linguistic resources.

Catherine's commitment to respect, trust, and care was evident in her detailed attention to expectations, procedures, and daily routines that helped both existing and new students know how to fully participate in the class, and in her ongoing support for them to collectively engage with the material. She regularly used a routine designed to help students access content, which involved introducing new vocabulary by first presenting and pronouncing new words, then defining them and identifying them in a paragraph, and finally having students use them in a scaffolded paragraph. She also helped the two new students, Nelson and Aliyah —who might be new to U.S. classrooms altogether— begin integrating into the classroom community by illustrating how to begin their notes for the day, and encouraging them to participate in its routine of repeating key vocabulary. Later in the lesson, she also made sure that Nelson and Aliyah knew that they could ask any other student in the class for help ("*todos son maestros*"- "they're all teachers"), and what time she arrived at school each morning if they wanted to get help from her. Her commitment to developing a welcoming community demonstrated her attention to students as not only academic beings, but also as humans who needed social and emotional connections in a new setting.

Over time, Catherine continued to display the importance of promoting respect, trust, and rigorous expectations to build a positive learning environment. One manifestation of this was her system of rotating captains, who distributed responsibilities among group members and ensured that each member understood new concepts before the group could move on together. Catherine explained how her trust in students to be serious thinkers and responsible leaders made a difference in students' learning and growth:

> You know how some teachers are like 'Oh my god, my kids are lazy'? You have to figure out what the kids want …. You would think that they want something that's super easy, but no, they want something that's challenging but possible to do …. It's been really cool to see how they work this year …. [One kid] came up to me and said, 'Miss Turner, I don't want to be captain,' and I was like, 'Why?', and he was like, 'My grades are lower than everyone else in this group, I still need to participate more.' I was like, 'Well, let me show you how far you've come.' And I showed him first quarter grades, second quarter grades, third quarter grades, and how they've improved every single quarter, and I was like, 'And not only that, you're helping other students, you're the teacher in the group.' He came back the next day and he was like, 'Okay, I think I want to be captain,' and he was captain in two groups. (6/5/17 Team Meeting)

Catherine's trust in and respect for her students helped them to see the potential in themselves and in their classmates. She made conscious efforts to actively engage students in their own learning and to share power with her students. Students, such as the one who questioned his ability to be captain, were encouraged to re-evaluate their capacities. Catherine explained how this development of students' social-emotional skills (present in Authors' CPs, Table 1) made a difference in her relationship with students:

> I had these kids down, they were on lock. And it wasn't like strict or anything, it was just, we have an understanding, we have a rapport …. I don't see it with other teachers, and the kids even tell me 'This is my favorite class,' and not because of the material, because I made it hard as hell this year, but because they know – hopefully they know – that I'm there for them. (6/5/17 Team Meeting)

These relationships between Catherine and her students were a concrete manifestation of her emerging ability to humanize her teaching of multilingual students.

There were also practices evident in Catherine's lesson that we had identified as CPs with humanizing potential even though were not as clearly aligned with Salazar (2010; see column 4 of Table 3). For example, Catherine carefully scaffolded concepts and vocabulary for measurement, including length, width, and height; and used comprehensible input in her measurement "dance." She promoted vocabulary development, and adapted her instruction based on students' language development needs, carefully addressing punctuation, parts of speech, and the pronunciation of new words. She used questioning as an informal assessment to decide whether students knew the measurement vocabulary or would benefit from more support. These practices gave her newcomer students greater access to the content, allowed for their fuller participation in the lesson, and built the understanding they would need to participate in other classrooms and subject matter.

However, it is important to note that although Catherine's representation sheds light on some of the ways that she and other NTs might engage in emerging humanizing practice with multilingual students, she could have more deeply humanized her practice in multiple ways. For instance, she might have connected her lesson on measurement to a real-world environmental justice problem (such as less green space or higher pollution in minoritized communities) to increase students' critical consciousness, and challenged her role as the educator in possession of knowledge by encouraging students to come up with solutions to the problem. Furthermore, in the representation from Catherine's lesson and across our dataset, there was relatively less attention to students' cultural resources and life experiences, and no evidence from her practice of incorporating families as resources (though this can be common among secondary educators in general, e.g., Simon, 2004). Additionally, her support of students' home languages was relatively limited. She mostly used isolated vocabulary and phrases, and her instruction did not trend toward practices that aimed to further develop students' ethnic, cultural, nor linguistic identities (Paris, 2012). It is critical to note, however, that some of our CPs did not have strong alignment with Salazar's characteristics of humanizing pedagogy, such as developing critical consciousness and challenging the maintenance of inequitable systems (see column 1 of Table 2). Thus, what appear to be limitations in Catherine's practice are also related to shortcomings of our data set, coding, and research design.

Next, we illustrate how Kendra, another teacher in our group, demonstrated emerging humanizing pedagogy with her students, as well as limitations in her practice.

3.2. Kendra

Kendra generally taught brief pull-out lessons to small groups of kindergarten and second grade multilingual students in a portable classroom behind the main building of her elementary school, seeing students several times a week. Her lessons ranged in their content focus to complement the various lessons going on in the students' mainstream classrooms. Like Catherine, she developed a supportive classroom environment that valued students as capable contributors with important knowledge, often praising students for their work and encouraging them to model for newly arrived students. Her instruction was characterized by a warm, caring demeanor and clear expectations that allowed her and her students

to form a strong and accepting classroom community. In a 30-min pull-out lesson in the fall of her second year of teaching (Table 4), we observed her approach to teaching multilingual students unfold as she taught a math lesson about *more than*, *less than*, and *equal* to five kindergartners with beginning level proficiency in English who spoke Spanish at home.

(10/14/16 Lesson Observation).

The CPs present in Kendra's lesson (Table 4, column 3) demonstrated evidence of her emerging ability to attend to several of Salazar's (2010) characteristics of humanizing pedagogy (column 2), including valuing students' background knowledge; promoting respect and trust between herself and her students; promoting academic rigor in her instruction; focusing on what students can achieve with their linguistic resources; and building relationships of trust and care between herself and students. She began this segment of the lesson by valuing students' background knowledge of the vocabulary to express numbers and the concept of and word to describe "more." She asked students to show her more blocks than she had, and built upon students' existing linguistic resources by asking them the number of blocks that she had, and helping them with their recognition and pronunciation of "more." In an asset-oriented manner, Kendra assumed Flora understood the concept of 'more,' and simply needed the vocabulary to name numbers in English, drawing upon Flora's classmates as resources to help count aloud and confirm the meaning of more. When they examined the concept of 'equal,' Kendra focused on what students could achieve with their existing linguistic resources, setting up her question with her blocks and Liana's blocks in a way that students could articulate their understanding of equal, even if they did not have knowledge of the word. In doing so, Kendra positioned students as having sufficient knowledge and resources to articulate their understanding. She was also setting up a rigorous lesson for kindergartners to express understanding of mathematical concepts and practice using mathematical language.

When students struggled to make the shift from showing an understanding of the concept of 'more' to the concept of 'less,' Kendra valued their background knowledge and focused on what they could achieve by drawing upon their own work from the previous lesson. She relayed to students that she trusted their existing knowledge and ability to engage with her question reminding them of their prior understanding of the concepts they were learning ("Remember when we made our fish?"). As she explained later, she knew that the earlier fishbowl activity would support them:

> They loved doing this fishbowl thing, and it was a highly motivating activity for them. So, when some of them got confused with more and less, I like to use their own work as

Table 4
Representation of practice: Kendra.

Transcript	Humanizing Pedagogy, Salazar (2010)	Related CP (Authors)	Additional CP (Authors)
Kendra places colorful plastic blocks in front of herself and each child. Kendra: How many blocks do I have here, Flora? Flora: Two. Samuel: Three. Flora: Three. K: I have three blocks. I want you to show me more blocks. Show me more than three. [Students all take more than 3 blocks] …. Lucas: One, two, three, four, five, six, I have six.	Value students' background knowledge	Integrating knowledge of students' language background	Using informal assessment
K: Okay, now [Holds up a card with the word "more," with 11 blue dots and three red dots, and the blue dots circled.] Can you guys tell what this word might say? It starts with MMM. MM—OO—RR. Ss: More! K: More! I have two groups right here. I have blue group and red group. Which group has more? Ss: Blue! K: Blue! Okay. So, I have three blocks. Do you have more than I have? Ss: Yes.	Value students' background knowledge Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources	Integrating knowledge of students' language background Procedures that support learning	Promoting vocabulary development Attending to receptive and productive language skills at the word level
K: All right, Flora, show us how many blocks you have. Flora: Two. K: [Helping Flora to adjust her number vocabulary]: How many? Let's count, can you count them for us? Ss, with Flora: One, two, three, four, five, six. K: Six! She has six blocks. Friends, is six more than three? Lucas: Yes!	Value students' background knowledge Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources	Integrating knowledge of students' language background Procedures that support learning	Promoting vocabulary development Attending to and prioritizing receptive and productive language skills at the word level Adapting instruction based on students' language development needs
K: Should we line them up? Here are Flora's blocks, and here are my blocks. Who has more? Lucas: Flora. K: …. Okay, let's look at Liana's blocks. Here are Liana's blocks. Here are Miss Everett's blocks. Who has more? [Both have three blocks.] [Students giggle.] Lucas: You, and Liana, Liana, you. K: Liana and me? Who has more? Lucas: Nobody.	Value students' background knowledge Promote respect, trust, and academic rigor	Integrating knowledge of students' language background High expectations, procedures that support learning	Using informal assessment

Table 4 (*continued*)

Transcript	Humanizing Pedagogy, Salazar (2010)	Related CP (Authors)	Additional CP (Authors)
K: Nobody? Lucas: Uh-uh.			
K: How many blocks does Liana have? Ss: Three! K: How many blocks do I have? Ss: Three! K: It's the same number! That means they're equal. Everybody say 'equal.' Ss: Equal. K: If it's the same number, that means they're equal.	Focus on what students can do and achieve with the resources they bring	High expectations and procedures that support learning	Adapting instruction based on complexity of language Promoting vocabulary development Attending to productive language skills at the word level
K: Now, Miss Everett has three blocks. I want you to make *less*. [K shows a card with 'less' written on it, with 11 blue dots and 3 circled red dots.] Remember, we talked about those big words, more and less. I have three, I want you to make less blocks than three. [Ss are having difficulty].	Promote respect, trust, and academic rigor	High expectations and procedures that support learning	Using informal assessment Promoting vocabulary development
K: Remember when we made our fish? [K reaches for student work they created in the previous lesson; papers with two fishbowls and fish of five different colors, with numbers on each fishbowl. The paper has 'I see ….' printed twice, and students have completed the sentences by writing 'more' or 'less,' and pasting a colored fish based on the fish pasted in the fishbowls above.] Julia [Pointing to the top fishbowl paper]: This one is mine. K: That's yours? Oh, Julia, which fishbowl has more? [Julia points to the bowl with more.] And which one has less? [Julia points to the bowl with less.] … K: Which fishbowl has less? [Lucas points to the one with less]. And Liana, [Shows Liana's paper]. Which one has more? [Liana points to the correct fishbowl.] Which one has less? [Liana points to the correct fishbowl] All right.	Value students' background knowledge Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources Promote respect, trust, and academic rigor Build trust and care	Integrating knowledge of students' language background High expectations and procedures that support learning	Comprehensible input Scaffolding Scaffolding Using informal assessment
K: Now, how many blocks do I have? Students: Three! K: Three! I want you to make less. Less, less, it's a smaller number, is less. Samuel: One. Flora: I have two. K: … Oh! Lucas, show me less. This is good! Let's do this. [Lines the blocks up.] Here's Miss Everett's blocks. Here are Lucas's blocks. Which one is less than three? [A student points to the group with less]. That one? Oh, it is less! It's shorter. Which one is more than three? [K prompts them to count with their finger on the blocks.] Students: The yellow!..	Focus on what students can do and achieve with their linguistic resources Promote respect, trust, and academic rigor	High expectations and procedures the support learning	Using informal assessment Scaffolding

> scaffolding. Because then they see that it's not me telling them what they did wrong, and [saying] 'Here's how you do it right.' [Instead,] it's like, 'Here's what you did, you know how to do this, let's kind of break this down.' (10/14/16 Lesson Debrief)

In revisiting their fishbowl assignment, Kendra was able to value students' background knowledge and position students as knowledgeable by reminding them of their work in the previous lesson on 'more' and 'less.' Rather than assuming they had not learned the concept in their prior lesson, or using a banking approach to teach them the word 'less,' she focused on what students could achieve with their linguistic resources, encouraging them to apply the 'less than' concept from their fishbowl activity to their work with the blocks. In doing so, she reinforced their identities as competent learners. She also gave them an opportunity to demonstrate to her and to themselves that they understood the meaning and concept of 'less' by extending the concept from the fishbowls to the blocks.

Kendra was also able to engage in practices with humanizing possibilities in ways that were distinct from Salazar's characteristics of humanizing pedagogy, but matched the CPs we had identified (see column 4 of Table 4). For instance, she embedded attention to rigor in her humanizing practice by consistently recognizing the complexity of language, and students' ability to use new and complex language by providing entry points and support for it. Throughout her lesson, she utilized informal assessment, constantly gauging whether students were building both a greater understanding of and the language for expressing the concepts of 'more' and 'less,' and acting upon this assessment by offering additional support in the form of further scaffolding and comprehensible input. She regularly offered opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding by using receptive and productive language and new vocabulary. In general, Kendra found it important to break down language for students whom she viewed as fully capable of understanding lesson concepts with appropriate linguistic support, thus creating a foundation for greater engagement with concepts. For Kendra, making language transparent and meaningful was key to multilingual students' equitable access to curriculum, and she demonstrated an ability to anticipate the complexity of language within a lesson and then to teach vocabulary students would need to fully participate in instruction. In one of our team meetings during her first year as a teacher, Kendra noted how challenging this could be for teachers and administrators who did not have that same language awareness:

> I just came from this meeting, and I was the only ESOL teacher there. Someone was showing us how to use a particular app to teach math word problems. The math word problem said something like 'So and so needs to make a flowerbed that is these dimensions.' I realized that I was the only one there that

was thinking, 'Oh, flowerbed, that's a compound word that's hard to understand what it means, when you just put the word flower and bed together.' And some countries don't have flowerbeds, why would you take time to make flowers in an intentional place when you have other things to do? [laughter] There's so much background knowledge [needed]. (12/14/15 Team Meeting)

Kendra viewed students as capable and knowledgeable, and she challenged instructional decisions based on presumed shared cultural knowledge, such as the assumption that everyone would know what a flowerbed was, or intentionally create one. Though Kendra's assertion that "some countries don't have flowerbeds" was an overgeneralization, it reflected her growing awareness of how differing cultural expectations and points of reference might impact student learning. Whereas she felt that her colleagues did not notice that math word problems might create barriers to student access through culturally laden concepts and word choices, Kendra recognized that if they could make their meaning more accessible, students would be able to more equitably engage with lesson content without sacrificing academic rigor.

Like Catherine, there were also ways in which Kendra's humanizing approach could be expanded. For instance, in her math lesson on more/less/equal, she might have turned more of the conversation of the math concepts over to her students, encouraging them to take greater responsibility as resources for one another in their exploration of the topics, and engaging in more opportunities for language development. Additionally, in this lesson excerpt and across the dataset we did not see regular evidence of other aspects that are central to humanizing practice (Salazar, 2010, see column 2 of Table 2), including developing students' critical consciousness, strengthening students' ethnic and cultural identities, deep attention to capitalizing on students' and families' cultural and linguistic resources, or challenging the role of educators and educational institutions in maintaining inequities. As in Catherine's case, the CPs we identified in our initial analyses did not include these dimensions of humanizing pedagogy, but neither did they emerge in our subsequent analysis that utilized Salazar's understanding of humanizing pedagogy. Thus, these are likely limitations of both Kendra's pedagogy and of our research design and initial vision for CPs.

4. Discussion

These representations and our data set as a whole show that Catherine and Kendra engaged in emerging humanizing practice by promoting respect and academic rigor; building trusting relations between themselves and students; valuing students' background knowledge; and focusing on what students could do and achieve, particularly with the existing knowledge and linguistic resources they possessed. As illustrated in Tables 3 and 4, these representations of their practice were partially consistent with Salazar's (2010) synthesis of teachers' humanizing pedagogy, and also demonstrate important connections to the CPs we have identified, including CPs 1, 2, and 6 (see Table 2). We believe that these intersections illustrate how CPs can serve as a bridge to enacting humanizing practice, and may offer needed support for teachers and teacher educators who are committed to teaching multilingual students in humanizing ways. For instance, looking at the details of Catherine's and Kendra's instruction alongside Salazar's synthesis of humanizing pedagogy, we see how aspects of their instruction that we coded as particular CPs represent humanizing pedagogy in action, in ways that NTs seek ("*What does that really look like?*") and that teacher educators could offer as concrete examples and break down for further analysis with NTs. Even through seemingly minor moves, such as Kendra's offering manipulatives to provide students with visual opportunities to represent their understanding of concepts when their English vocabulary was limited, and Catherine's repositioning of Tanya as the classroom expert on Russian, we can identify humanizing pedagogy. We believe that examining these representations in light of both CPs that we view as specific and foundational to instruction of multilingual students, *and* how that instruction can be enacted in humanizing ways may add to how NTs can be supported in the *doing* of humanizing work.

Nevertheless, our findings also demonstrate that our field's understanding of humanizing pedagogy must continue to evolve and develop. Catherine and Kendra's representations of emerging humanizing pedagogy demonstrate aspects that are not specifically addressed by Salazar's synthesis of humanizing pedagogy, particularly as they relate to practices we have identified in CP3, CP4, and CP5, which provide guidance specific to teaching multilingual students (see column 1 of Table 2). These practices in Catherine's and Kendra's representations offer deeper access to content and more meaningful lesson participation for multilingual students, including explicit attention to language and literacy (CP4) through vocabulary development, receptive and productive language skills, and adaptation of instruction based on the NTs' awareness of the complexity of language and of students' language development needs (see Tables 3 and 4). Likewise, instruction and assessment practices represented in Catherine's and Kendra's practices include their careful use of scaffolding and comprehensible input (CP3) to support students' access to content, and their use of informal assessment (CP5) to gauge and value students' existing knowledge, and focus on what their students know and how to build upon it. These practices were developed out of a recognition that there are specific practices teachers need to enact to afford multilingual students both equitable participation in classrooms and access to meaningful content through attention to their needs as students still in the process of acquiring the language of instruction. Additionally, not evident in these brief representations, but present in the larger data set in the practices of Catherine, Kendra, and other NTs are several aspects of our CPs that we do not find explicitly referenced in Salazar's (2010) synthesis, but that we have found are also important to teachers' humanizing practice with multilingual students because they attend to the complexity involved in the instruction and assessment designed to assist content, language, and socio-emotional development, and offer support for the unique challenges teachers of multilingual students may encounter (see Table 1). Thus, while Salazar's (2010) synthesis identifies many useful aspects of humanizing pedagogy, the ways in which we develop an understanding of teachers' enactment of humanizing practices need to also be specified and represented for NTs working with particular populations, in particular contexts, and with particular content.

Conversely, our CPs as currently conceptualized are also missing significant aspects of humanizing pedagogy from Salazar's (2010) synthesis, including practices that develop students' critical consciousness, strengthen students' ethnic and linguistic identities, and challenge the ways that educators and educational institutions maintain inequities (see column 1 of Table 2). As we described above, we began using a humanizing lens to frame our work *after* we had identified our CPs. Thus there are important gaps in the connections between our CPs and the ways in which scholarship has situated and framed humanizing practice. However, as Nadine's comment at the beginning of the paper reminds us, teacher education has yet to develop strong relationships between NTs' propositional knowledge of practice and their ability to enact particular practices (Kennedy, 1999), and this is especially critical for asset-based practice. The existing literature on resource pedagogies has

not brought together frameworks for developing equity-oriented mindsets and examples of practice in actionable ways for NTs of multilingual learners. By shining a light on the kinds of practices that Catherine and Kendra enacted and discussed, we offer representations of NTs' emerging humanizing practice in a field that is currently lacking a clear model for preparing teachers of multilingual students. We argue that CPs may offer some of the instructional support that Faltis and Valdés (2016) noted is gravely lacking in the field when they argued, "there is little consensus among teacher educators about the kinds of knowledge, skills, and inclinations teachers need to develop in order to be *good* and *effective* teachers and advocates for students who are speaking a language other than English" (p. 549).

Although we believe we have made important strides in offering practices that may create a bridge from humanizing principles to enacting humanizing pedagogy, we readily recognize that there are some foundational dimensions of humanizing pedagogy that need to be more deeply addressed in our CPs if teachers of multilingual students, and their teacher educators, are to enact them in ways that are fully humanizing for students. Further identification of what these aspects of humanizing pedagogy look like represented in teacher practice, and theorized through the development of particular CPs, may provide important additional support to NTs and teacher educators committed to engaging in equitable and humanizing practice with multilingual students.

5. Implications and conclusion

Opportunities to connect "ways of being" with "ways of doing" (Ladson-Billings, 2008, p. 176) may help foster NTs' humanizing approaches to teaching and learning. Here we examined CPs for multilingual students that we have recently developed (Fredricks & Peercy, 2020) alongside Salazar's (2010) synthesis of humanizing pedagogy as one way of considering how CPs might be leveraged to support NTs in enacting humanizing pedagogies. We do not advocate a singular approach to this work, but instead believe that CPs can be taken up in different ways, depending on the content and the context (e.g., Calabrese Barton et al., 2020; Grossman, 2018). Grossman and Dean (2019) found that "building shared understanding and common language" around CPs helped teacher educators across several institutions to "work through tensions created by institutional, subject-matter, and grade level differences" (pp. 157–158) while still being responsive to the demands of their own contexts. We extend their findings to argue that there are potentially significant affordances that a shared understanding of humanizing ways of teaching multilingual students could offer across university and school settings to support preparation and induction of NTs. For instance, it could offer much-needed guidance to teacher educators (including university faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers) for developing coursework, programs, and practicum experiences that support the enactment of humanizing practice. In our own experience, such opportunities are limited, and teacher educators are often on their own as they develop ways to support humanizing practice among NTs (e.g., Chang-Bacon, 2021; Goodwin & Darity, 2019; Gorski, 2016; Gorski et al., 2012; Jacobs & Perez, 2021; Peercy & Sharkey, 2022).

However, for CPs to support the enactment of humanizing pedagogy by NTs of multilingual students, these practices must be open to development, transformation, and change. Darder (2012) reminds us of "Freire's persistent assertion that critical pedagogical principles must always remain open to reinvention" (p. 100), and we believe that to be the case here also. Our findings demonstrate that we are not done thinking about what humanizing practice looks like in classrooms, and how to support teachers in the doing of this work in their situated contexts. Our CPs have important gaps when examined alongside Salazar's (2010) synthesis of teachers' humanizing pedagogy, and Salazar's synthesis does not take into account the specifics of working with particular populations, such as multilingual students. This seems to point to the need for various disciplinary areas to deeply consider how their field-specific practices can be enacted in humanizing ways, with different student populations, and the means for helping NTs learn to do so. In part this may require reconsidering existing CPs from a variety of disciplinary areas in light of humanizing principles, and examining the strengths and gaps in how these practices allow for humanization of instruction. In our case, we believe that further participatory design experimentation involving more stakeholders, including multilingual students, families, community members, mentor teachers, and administrators (e.g., Fredricks & Peercy, 2020) could help to further develop the CPs we have identified and shared here to be more humanizing, critical, and responsive, and could help to avoid the mechanistic ends that Philip et al. (2019) have critiqued regarding the CPs movement.

In conclusion, we believe that CPs for teaching multilingual students may offer a path forward to develop humanizing approaches that are enactable by NTs. Further examples that demonstrate how these—and likely other— CPs could also be leveraged for NTs of multilingual students across a variety of contexts and content areas. Such examples could help us to identify a focused array of humanizing pedagogies for multilingual students (Faltis & Valdés, 2016), particularly those still lacking here, including CPs that develop students' critical consciousness, strengthen their ethnic and linguistic identities, and challenge the maintenance of inequitable systems by educators and educational institutions. We have provided examples of NTs' enactment of the CPs our team has identified, and illustrated the connections and gaps in how our CPs align with Salazar's (2010) synthesis of humanizing pedagogy. We hope we have illustrated the potential of CPs to provide a bridge between humanizing principles and representations of what some of the emerging humanizing practices themselves might look like when enacted by NTs. In doing so, we aim to help Nadine and other NTs of multilingual students, as well as the teacher educators who prepare them, to answer the question: "What does that really look like in the classroom?"

References

Au, K. H. P. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 11*(2), 91–115.

Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497–511.

Bang, M., & Vossoughi, S. (2016). Participatory design research and educational justice: Studying learning and relations within social change making. *Cognition and Instruction, 34*(3), 173–193.

Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64*(2), 173–195.

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & Birmingham, D. J. (2020). Rethinking high-leverage practices in justice-oriented ways. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1–18.

Carter Andrews, D. J., & Castillo, B. M. (2016). Humanizing pedagogy for examinations of race and culture in teacher education. In F. Tuitt, C. Haynes, & S. Stewart (Eds.), *Race, equity and higher education: The continued search for critical and inclusive pedagogies around the globe* (pp. 112–128) (Stylus).

Chang-Bacon, C. K. (2021). "We sort of dance around the race thing": Race-evasiveness in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871211023042

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24*(1), 249–305.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). Sage.

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

Darder, A. (2012). *Culture and power in the classroom: A critical foundation for the education of bicultural students*. Paradigm Press.

Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2017). *Making content comprehensible for English*

learners: The SIOP model (5th ed.). Pearson.
Faltis, C. J., & Valdés, G. (2016). Preparing teachers for teaching in and advocating for linguistically diverse classrooms: A vade mecum for teacher educators. In D. H. Gitomer, & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 549–592). AERA.
Fránquiz, M. E., & Salazar, M. del C. (2004). The transformative potential of humanizing pedagogy: Addressing the diverse needs of Chicano/Mexicano students. *High School Journal, 87*(4), 36–53.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed. Continuum*.
Fredricks, D., & Peercy, M. M. (2020). Youth perspectives on humanizing core practices. In L. Cardozo-Gaibisso, & M. V. Dominguez (Eds.), *Handbook of research on advancing language equity practices within immigrant communities* (pp. 107–128). IGI Global.
Freire, A., & Macedo, D. (1998). *The paulo Freire reader*. Continuum.
Goodwin, A. L., & Darity, K. (2019). Social justice teacher educators: What kind of knowing is needed? *Journal of Education for Teaching, 45*(1), 63–81.
Gorski, P. C. (2016). Making better multicultural and social justice teacher educators: A qualitative analysis of the professional learning and support needs of multicultural teacher education faculty. *Multicultural Education Review, 8*(3), 139–159.
Gorski, P. C., Zenkov, K., Osei-Kofi, N., & Sapp, J. (2012). Introduction. In P. Gorski, K. Zenkov, N. Osei-Kofi, & J. Sapp (Eds.), *Cultivating social justice teachers* (pp. 1–10). Stylus.
Grossman, P. (2011). Framework for teaching practice: A brief history of an idea. *Teachers College Record, 113*(12), 2836–2843.
Grossman, P. (2018). *Teaching core practices in teacher education*. Harvard Education Press.
Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009a). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9), 2055–2100.
Grossman, P., & Dean, C. G. P. (2019). Negotiating a common language and shared understanding about core practices: The case of discussion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 80*, 157–166.
Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009b). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15*(2), 273–289.
Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(1), 184–205.
Gutiérrez, K. D., Higgs, J., Lizárraga, J. R., & Rivero, E. (2019). Learning as movement in social design-based experiments: Play as a leading activity. *Human Development, 62*(1–2), 66–82.
Gutiérrez, K. D., & Penuel, W. R. (2014). Relevance to practice as a criterion for rigor. *Educational Researcher, 43*(1), 19–23.
Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher, 32*(5), 19–25.
Hatch, T., & Grossman, P. (2009). Learning to look beyond the boundaries of representation: Using technology to examine teaching (Overview for a digital exhibition: Learning from the practice of teaching). *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(1), 70–85.
Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
Herrell, A. L., & Jordan, M. (2019). *50 strategies for teaching English language learners* (6th ed.). Pearson.
Huerta, T. M. (2011). Humanizing pedagogy: Beliefs and practices on the teaching of Latino children. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*(1), 38–57.
Jacobs, K. B. (2019). "I believe in home language, but the tests don't": Addressing linguistic diversity within assessment practices across literacy teacher preparation and classroom practice. *Teachers College Record, 121*(7), 1–42.
Jacobs, J., & Perez, J. (2021). *Teacher preparation for social justice: A qualitative metasynthesis of teacher educator self-studies focused on social justice* [Paper]. American Educational Research Association (Virtual conference).
Janssen, F., Grossman, P., & Westbroek, H. (2015). Facilitating decomposition and recomposition in practice-based teacher education: The power of modularity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 51*, 137–146.
Kennedy, M. (1999). The role of pre-service teacher education. In L. Darling-Hammond, & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession* (pp. 54–85). Jossey-Bass.
Kidd, J. K., Sánchez, S. Y., & Thorp, E. K. (2008). Defining moments: Developing culturally responsive dispositions and teaching practices in early childhood preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(2), 316–329.
Kidwell, T., Peercy, M. M., Tigert, J., & Fredricks, D. (2021). Novice teacher's use of pedagogical language knowledge to humanize language and literacy development. *TESOL Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.590
Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. Jossey-Bass.
Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American. *Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.
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. (2008). 'Yes, but how do we do it?': Practicing culturally relevant pedagogy. In W. Ayers, G. Ladson-Billings, G. Michie, & P. A. Noguera (Eds.), *City kids, city schools: More reports from the front row* (pp. 162–177). The New Press.
Lampert, M., Franke, M. L., Kazemi, E., Ghousseini, H., Turrou, A. C., Beasley, H., Cunard, A., & Crowe, K. (2013). Keeping it complex: Using rehearsals to support novice teacher learning of ambitious teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(3), 226–243.
López, F. A. (2016). Culturally responsive pedagogies in Arizona and Latino students' achievement. *Teachers College Record, 118*(5), 1–42.
Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice, 52*(2), 98–109.
McDonald, M. A. (2005). The integration of social justice in teacher education: Dimensions of prospective teachers' opportunities to learn. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(5), 418–435.
McDonald, M., Kazemi, E., & Kavanagh, S. S. (2013). Core practices and pedagogies of teacher education: A call for a common language and collective activity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(5), 378–386.
Medin, D. L., & Bang, M. (2014). *Who's asking?: Native science, western science, and science education*. MIT Press.
Mehta, R., & Aguilera, E. (2020). A critical approach to humanizing pedagogies in online teaching and learning. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology, 37*(3), 109–120.
Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.
Moll, L. C., & González, N. (1994). Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 26*(4), 439–456.
Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. Teachers College Press.
Osorio, S. L. (2018). Toward a humanizing pedagogy: Using Latinx children's literature with early childhood students. *Bilingual Research Journal, 41*(1), 5–22.
Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93–97.
Peercy, M. M., Kidwell, T., Lawyer, M., Tigert, J., Fredricks, D., Feagin, K., & Stump, M. (2020). Experts at being novices: What new teachers can add to practice-based teacher education efforts. *Action in Teacher Education, 42*(3), 212–233.
Peercy, M. M., & Sharkey, J. (2022). Who gets to ask "Does race belong in every course?": Staying in the anguish as White teacher educators. In A. Martin (Ed.), *Self-studies in urban teacher education: Advancing equity and social justice in the preparation of teachers for city schools*. Springer. forthcoming.
Peercy, M. M., Tigert, J., Feagin, K., Kidwell, T., Fredricks, D., Lawyer, M., & Mallory, A. (2019). "I need to take care of myself": The case for self-care as a core practice for teaching. In C. R. Rinke, & L. Mawhinney (Eds.), *Opportunities and challenges in teacher recruitment and retention: Teacher voices across the pipeline* (pp. 303–325). Information Age Publishing.
Philip, T., Souto-Manning, M., Anderson, L., Horn, I., Andrews, D. J. C., Stillman, J., & Varghese, M. (2019). Making justice peripheral by constructing practice as "core": How the increasing prominence of core practices challenges teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 70*(3), 251–264.
Salazar, M. (2010). Pedagogical stances of high school ESL teachers: Huelgas in high school ESL classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal, 33*(1), 111–124.
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.
Schiera, A. J. (2020). Seeking convergence and surfacing tensions between social justice and core practices: Re-presenting teacher education as a community of praxis. *Journal of Teacher Education, 72*(4), 462–476.
Simon, B. S. (2004). High school outreach and family involvement. *Social Psychology of Education, 7*(2), 185–209.
Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The Urban Review, 34*(4), 317–342.
Sleeter, C. E., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2004). Critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiracist education: Implications for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks, & C. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research in multicultural education* (pp. 240–258). Jossey-Bass.
Ukpokodu, N. (2002). Breaking through preservice teachers' defensive dispositions in a multicultural education course: A reflective practice. *Multicultural Education, 9*(3), 25–33.
Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: The politics of schooling in a US Mexican high school*. SUNY.
Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20–32.
Young, E. (2010). Challenges to conceptualizing and actualizing culturally relevant pedagogy: How viable is the theory in classroom practice? *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(3), 248–260.
Zeichner, K., Payne, K. A., & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 122–135.