



Literacies Across the Lifespan

Through the publication of peer-reviewed empirical research, working papers on field-based praxis, and conceptual pieces, *Literacies Across the Lifespan* contributes to ongoing conversations about literacy across learners' lives, from early childhood to adulthood, and in contexts across home, school, and community settings. *Literacies Across the Lifespan* is run by graduate students at UIC's Center for Literacy.

Editorial Introduction.....	2
Connections.....	3
Developing Critical Language Awareness Through the Evaluation of Multilingual Children's Literature.....	3
<i>Sara Vroom Fick</i>	
Translanguaging Pedagogy for Emergent Bilingual Immigrant Youths in the United States: Is It Transformative?.....	12
<i>Eun Young Yeom</i>	
How Pinteresting! The Emergence of a New Curricular Resource	24
<i>Joanne Yi</i>	
Culturally Relevant and Culturally Sustaining Practices in English Language Arts Classrooms.....	31
<i>Melina Lesus</i>	
Notes from the Field.....	41
Pedagogical Reflections on Making and Literacy Development: How to Transform Makerspaces to Cultivate Literacy.....	41
<i>Kylie Holcomb</i>	



EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the second issue of *Literacies Across the Lifespan* (LAL), a peer-reviewed, graduate student-run journal published by the Center for Literacy at the University of Illinois at Chicago. We are so happy you're here.

LAL is designed as a resource for graduate students at UIC and beyond, as well as a venue for contributing to ongoing discussions in our field about literacy teaching, learning, and practice across contexts, geographies, and lifetimes. The name of the publication reflects our view of literacies as multiple, hybrid, and ever-changing, situated in a specific sociocultural context, and reflective of learners' unique identities. The literacies that learners practice across their lifespans are vast and rich. From babies to elders, and everyone in between, all learners are engaged in making meaning with texts of various kinds. Just as we are doing right now!

As your new editors, we are privileged to build on the founding work of Andrea Vaughan and Sunah Chung, who established *LAL* as a new and relevant voice in our community. In this issue, we build on their efforts to offer inclusive, expanded discussions of how literacies take shape in research, as well as in curriculum design and teaching — in sum, about how our collective work can and should be a step toward celebrating the rich, vibrant, and varied literacies we observe every day in our classrooms and communities.

In this issue, Melina Lesus shows us that culturally relevant and culturally sustaining practices in English Language Arts classrooms are more important than ever, and that our work as educators must continue to improve and expand the range of curricular ideas and options we provide our students. To that end, Sara Vroom Fick offers a practical and essential rubric to help us evaluate the quality of multilingual children's literature. Eun Young Yeom challenges the monolingualism that dominates our classrooms and discusses the power of translanguaging pedagogy for immigrant youths. Joanne Yi provides a critical view of Pinterest as a teaching tool by contrasting its popularity with several considerations about what materials are created, for whom, and why. Finally, Kylie Holcomb recounts her experience teaching and learning in UIC's Make Good Lab and how she navigated the challenges of remote learning.

We are so grateful to the writers and reviewers who contributed to this edition of *Literacies Across the Lifespan*. As we look forward to our next issues, we are particularly excited to include thinking and writing experiences that nurture the widest range of possible ideas. Our best energy should be given to the communities we serve. To that end, we hope this publication will offer space for collaboration, learning, and an ongoing expansion of how we understand and embrace literacies in all their forms. Thank you so much for reading.

Kristine Wilber
Rachel Zein
Center for Literacy
University of Illinois at Chicago

Developing Critical Language Awareness Through the Evaluation of Multilingual Children’s Literature

Sara Vroom Fick

Despite the increased availability of multilingual literature within children’s literature as a whole, there remains a lack of high quality options. Existing research documents issues that can occur within translated materials, but this has not been converted into concrete tools individuals can use to analyze this literature to specifically critique the gaps. In order to provide this type of tool, the key criteria described in the existing research has been synthesized into a rubric which can be used to analyze texts. Strengths of the three main types of multilingual texts (translated, dual language, and translanguaging) are described, along with the unique elements which need to be considered when evaluating each form. The role of linguistic analysis in developing critical language awareness in teachers is discussed, along with developing community partnerships in order to expand linguistic resources.

“My students loved this book in English, so I bought it in Spanish too. Unfortunately, I had to get rid of it because the translation was so bad it was confusing students when they read.”

Elementary bilingual teacher

“I wanted to show my student that rhyming happens in every language, so I found a bilingual version of my favorite English rhyming text. I don’t speak her language, but just looking at the ends of the words, I realized that the translation didn’t actually rhyme. Why would they leave out that key element of the text?”

Primary grades literacy specialist

These quotes reflect common themes that have emerged during workshops focused on developing

critical language awareness in classroom teachers. These are teachers who, in general, are seeking to support and encourage the usage of their students’ full linguistic repertoires in the classroom, but who have either become frustrated by the variability in the quality of bilingual texts, or were not even aware of the pitfalls occurring in some texts. While many teachers have engaged in evaluating their classroom libraries for culturally responsive and diverse voices, they feel less equipped to do so when it comes to linguistically responsive texts.

Developing Critical Language Awareness

Teachers need to develop a critical eye for the examination of the texts they select for their students (Riley & Crawford-Garrett, 2016). Providing the skills and tools for evaluating multilingual texts starts with deepening teachers’ understanding of the role of language. Lucas, Villegas, and Freedson-González (2008) express the complexity of this well:

Because language is integral to almost all human endeavors, the majority of people do not attend to it at all. It is transparent. We look through language rather than at language. However, because language plays a central role in learning... it is imperative that teacher[s] cultivate... the willingness and skills for looking at language, rather than through it (pp. 367-368).

Sara Vroom Fick recently completed her Ph.D. at the University of Illinois at Chicago in Literacy, Language, and Culture. Her research is focused on multilingual pedagogy and teacher education.

It is important for teachers to develop a critical awareness of linguistic ideologies and their literary representations in order to serve all students, but especially those from non-dominant language backgrounds (Ghiso & Campano, 2013).

Alim (2010), defines critical language awareness as “interrogat[ing] the dominating discourse on language and literacy and foreground[ing] the examination and interconnectedness of identities, ideologies, histories/herstories and the hierarchical nature of power relations between groups” (p. 214). By developing critical language awareness, teachers can be further equipped to examine the linguistic practices occurring within the texts they use. Likewise, guided examination of bilingual texts can be a tool for developing critical language awareness. To engage in this type of guided examination, the use of rubrics and other evaluative tools is common (Dillon et al., 2018). However, there is not a widely available rubric for the assessment of multilingual books. In my teaching role within an undergraduate teacher preparation program, I direct a student research group. As a result of researching critical language awareness and its development in teachers, the students desired to create a concrete tool that they, and others, could use to increase their linguistic awareness and ability to evaluate the multilingual texts.

Value of Multilingual Books

Research on the value of bilingual books has grown exponentially in the last twenty years (de Jong & Gao, 2019). There is strong support within the biliteracy and broader literacy communities for the use of multilingual texts with students who are emergent bilinguals, but also with students across the board (Naqvi et al., 2013; Zapata & Laman, 2016). The provision of books in languages other than English establishes them as official materials within the curriculum that can be used in students’ multilingual development (Malsbary, 2013). Instead of simply being supplementary for emergent bilinguals, multilingual books become curriculum for all students (de Jong & Gao, 2019; Lotherington et al., 2008). The use of multilingual texts in both formal and informal ways serves to leverage both students’ own linguistic

knowledge and the knowledge and practices of their communities (Martinez et al., 2017; Stagg-Peterson & Heywood, 2007).

There are a variety of formats within bilingual children’s literature. Daly (2016) identifies them as Simultaneous or Sequential Publication, Parallel Texts, and Interlingual Books (p. 11). These are texts which a) are produced as separate books in two or more languages b) are designed with two languages side-by-side (commonly called Dual Language Books), and c) those which translanguage, or intermingle words and structures from multiple named languages. Each of these categories comes with its own strengths and cautions.

Simultaneous or sequentially translated monolingual books provide access to literature in multiple languages and can serve many functions. Students can use the two books together in ways similar to how they would utilize dual language books. However, separate texts can provide resources to support minority language development in contexts where it has been strongly suppressed (Daly, 2016). Creating separate texts is also a strong option for languages which have distinctively different written structures, such as directionality of text. Separating the languages allows for each language to follow its own written patterns. These books also fit the needs of language programs with policies which require the separation of languages. However, they fail to show the integrated way in which bilingual individuals function and limit the opportunities for comparative linguistic analysis that can occur with dual language texts (Alamillo, 2017).

The benefits of dual language books, or texts which provide the story in two languages within the same book, are equally documented. While there are critiques that these books allow students to focus on their stronger language and skip reading in their less proficient, there are key benefits as well. This specific structure allows students to see both languages and linguistic patterns represented in one text and supports the language practices of immigrant and indigenous communities, serving as a bridge between home and school (Daly, 2016). Children also use dual language texts to help develop their languages by identifying

cognates and developing other vocabulary strategies, using the more proficient language to support their holistic reading comprehension, and developing metalinguistic awareness – conceptual understanding of how language works – for both languages (Edwards et al., 2000). Bilingual children are not two separate entities but one whole individual possessing one linguistic repertoire and dual texts allow them to celebrate that. These books can also be a way for monolingual speakers to see other linguistic patterns and understand that those are just as valid (Riojas Clark et al., 2016).

The use of translanguaging in children's literature reflects the home practices of multilingual students and their communities (Alamillo, 2017; Riojas Clark et al., 2016). It allows students to see their common ways of communicating validated within a formal literacy setting. The use of additional languages can also give cultural authenticity and create connection when included in texts. However, it can also be done inappropriately and do a disservice to the story and its readers when used to simply "spice up" the text without a strong understanding of the practice as lived out in bilingual communities (Barrera et al., 2003, p. 146).

While one would hope that large, national publishers could be relied upon to put in the work to develop strong translated materials and also authentic language materials, that is too often not the case. Issues have been found across many languages and cultural backgrounds: Spanish/English (Alamillo, 2007; Barrera et al., 2003), Arabic/English (Dillon et al., 2018), Māori/English (Daly, 2016), Chinese/English (Huang & Chen, 2012, 2016), French/English (Van Coillie & Verschueren, 2014), English translated into Japanese, Chinese, and Korean (Jeong & Han, 2014), and Turkish/German (Ertem, 2014). From more discrete points to broader concepts, the main categories identified in the literature are: grammar and usage, language use, flow of text, presentation of languages, language integration, and cultural representation.

Within grammar and usage, the focus is on the correct usage of language and writing conventions within the translated text. This includes the proper use of diacritics (special symbols above the text, such as accent marks and umlauts) (Daly, 2016) and other phonetic indicators, such as vowel markers in Arabic (Dillon et al., 2018). Punctuation should also be correct, such as the inverted exclamation point in Spanish, or various ways of indicating dialogue. Translation should

While one would hope that large, national publishers could be relied upon to put in the work to develop strong translated materials and also authentic language materials, that is too often not the case.

Explosion of Interest ≠ Explosion of Quality Books

While changing childhood demographics and research on the use of bilingual texts has increased the interest in multilingual books, the publishing industry hasn't always responded in quality ways. As Naidoo states in her book *Celebrating Cuentos* (2011):

In an effort to exploit the market, publishers sometimes allow quantity to replace quality, resulting in stereotypical images, poor translations, and cultural inaccuracies. Books that were originally created with the best intentions have often paved a rutty road, misrepresenting the very people they were intended to carry forward. (p.64)

be comprehensive and conceptual, not a word for word rendering, which often leads to incorrect syntax in the translated text (Dillon et al., 2016; Huang & Chen, 2012). Jeong and Han (2014) and Dillon et al. (2018) also highlight how properly translated titles are key to maintaining and conveying the essence of the book. When considering the flow of text, language should be evaluated for its maintenance of rhythm, cohesiveness, and additional literary structures such as rhyme, where possible (Jeong & Han, 2014). Within language use, the formality level of the original text should be maintained, therefore maintaining the author's voice and more aligned reading levels (Huang & Chen, 2016; Walker et al., 1996). Alamillo (2007) and Dillon et al. (2018) stress

the need to represent various dialects of the presented language correctly, not rely solely on formalized, academic language, or mismatching story context and dialect.

For dual language books, the presentation of languages is highly important as it signals the statuses of the languages (Daly, 2016). Presentation includes the location of the various text and the font formatting for each language (Daly, 2016; Dillon et al., 2018; Huang & Chen, 2016). It also includes directionality of the text, and entire book, for languages that have opposite script directionality, like Arabic and English (Dillon et al., 2018). The final aspect of presentation is how the text interacts with the visuals – whether it appears integrated or more as an add-on (Kümmerling-Meibauer, 2013; Walker et al., 1996). Connected to presentation is the completeness of the translation. All the additional front and back matter should also be translated in order to convey equal status among the languages, but is often not (Daly, 2016; Dillon et al., 2018; Huang & Chen, 2016). The category of language integration is focused on evaluating texts that translanguage. Barrera et al. (2003) and Mendoza and Reese (2001) stress the importance of examining language use literarily and not solely linguistically or orthographically. Translanguaging within the text should serve to further the story in some way. For example, it can be used to provide deeper characterization, reflect the setting, or inject humor or word play (Alamillo, 2017; Barrera et al., 2003; Ghiso & Campano, 2013; Mendoza & Reese, 2001). Barrera et al., (2003) note the ways in which translanguaging texts make moves that allow for comprehension by monolingual readers, such as direct translation following a word or phrase, or embedding contextual clues. In contrast, Alamillo (2017) stresses that translanguaging's main goal should be to reflect bilingual community practices.

The final category, cultural representation, is one that applies in various ways. When texts are selected to mirror students' cultures, there are certain aspects to consider, such as how well they allow students to connect (Alamillo, 2007). However, there are other times where texts are acting as mirrors for students to understand additional cultures (Mendoza & Reese, 2001). In both contexts, the presentation of

cultures, especially historically marginalized cultures, should be examined for stereotypes in portrayal and language (Ertem, 2014; Mendoza & Reese, 2001). Cultures need to be portrayed in their full complexity and nuance.

Existing research has documented key issues within bilingual children's literature, but unfortunately that has not resulted in a widely available tool for use in text selection. Dillon et al. (2018), building off of Huang and Chen (2016), do include a five criteria checklist for analyzing bilingual books: Text Appearance (font format), Language Effects (arrangement of text), Book Information (front and back matter), Translation (overall quality), and Cultural Relevance. However, their checklist does not include specific points for analysis within the area of translation, therefore assuming the user knows what elements lead to a quality translation. The checklist also only applies to dual language texts. There remains a need for an assessment tool that goes deeper into the issues identified in the research above and can be used to evaluate any of the three multilingual formats.

Rubric Development and Usage

As mentioned above, the development of the rubric was a collaborative effort in the undergraduate research group of preservice teachers that I oversee. To create the rubric, we collaboratively summarized the evaluation criteria and key areas of difficulty noted in the research above, paying close attention to both the aspects that were repeated across articles and specific outliers, such as text directionality, mentioned in articles focusing on lower incidence languages. This summary was then used to develop an in-depth rubric for evaluating the three types of multilingual texts. Below, key items for evaluation for each type of text are highlighted. The full rubric is included in Appendix A. The rubric, in its current version, serves as a draft to further ongoing dialogue between researchers, teachers, and parents.

Translated books (either stand-alone or the translated portion of dual language books)

- Font design
- Translation process
- Grammar
- Flow of text
- Language use

Dual language books (either originally designed as such, or with translation added)

- Equality of presentation of languages
- Full translation of all sections, including front and back matter

Translanguaging books

- Language use for authentic purposes and reflects community practices.

The group then analyzed sample picture books. For a dual language book, *Caperucita Rosa/ Little Red Riding Hood* by Luz Oriduela and translated by Esther Sarfatti was chosen. It was assessed as meeting expectations for all the sections of Grammar and Usage – especially noted were the use of varying punctuation forms and conceptual translation word choices. Figurative language and complexity were both judged as meeting, with dialectal representation deemed not applicable as it was not seeking to match a specific dialect within the story context. Flow of Text was also deemed meeting in all areas, with specific focus on cohesiveness. In the key area of Presentation of Languages, the book scored meeting in all applicable areas. The font differed between Spanish and English only in that italics was used for English. This served to distinguish the two and did not give more prominence to one over the other. The fact that Spanish was presented first was noted as valuable for elevating its status in the text. As the text is fully a dual text, the section on Language Integration was not scored, as it is for translanguaging texts. For Cultural Representation, the overall score was approaching. This is due to the text being a retelling of a well-known fairy tale, that originated in Europe, but is presented in this text without deep cultural context. Therefore, while it does not reflect student culture, it also does not exclude them from accessing the text.

Abuela by Arthur Dorros was selected as a translanguaging text. As the text is not translated, but intersperses Spanish within the predominantly English text, the first four sections of the rubric can be skipped. For Language Integration, it is meeting for Authentic Purpose because the Spanish used is for the dialog the grandmother speaks to her granddaughter, therefore furthering her characterization in a way that reflects many individuals and relationships within Spanish-speaking and bilingual families. While the group eventually settled on meeting for the aspect of Systematic Usage, there were those who felt that the flow was a times stilted due to the consistent immediate translation that was provided by the granddaughter. This linguistic move seems most geared toward the goal of providing Linguistic Access to readers who are not proficient in Spanish, as is the inclusion of a glossary of terms and phrases at the end of the book. For Cultural Representation, the text was assessed as meeting all items. The text provides a vibrant look into the relationship between a grandmother and her granddaughter. It integrates a positive perspective on family relationships and portrays the grandmother as adventurous, knowledgeable, and deeply connected to her granddaughter.

After using the rubric within our group, it was then presented at two teacher conferences focusing on the development of literacy and language. In each context, teachers were asked to examine the rubric and, if their linguistic abilities allowed it, use it to evaluate sample children's literature. Responses from bilingual teachers highlighted the felt need for this kind of formalized assessment tool, and their frustration at the lack of resources which fully measure up to such rigorous scrutiny. The most common response from monolingual teachers, who were generally already familiar with culturally responsive rubrics, was that they had not considered the layers of linguistic nuance within translated materials.

A concern voiced by some conference workshop participants was the level of detail in the rubric. Like any assessment tool, the detail and complexity are meant to serve as an initial guide. As users become more familiar with the criteria it contains, our hope is that they are able to internalize the key

factors and will need to use the full tool only as a refresher resource from time to time. The next phase of our project is to create a simplified rubric to serve as a quick-glance tool for teachers. This follows the model of other existing resources, such as Learning for Justice's (2016) pair of complex and simplified rubrics for analysis of texts in terms of cultural responsiveness.

Partnering with Community Resources

Another concern voiced by workshop participants was how to utilize this tool for texts in languages they were not proficient in. Partnering with families and students is a key way to expand the linguistic resources teachers have to analyze the linguistic quality of their classroom libraries. While the current rubric is designed for adult use, it could easily be taught to students in middle and high school and with key supports, even to upper elementary.

When considering whether to utilize evaluative tools, such as this rubric, with students, we need to believe in their keen abilities to observe and analyze the language practices around them. Kim's (2016) study of bilingual (Korean/English) preschool children demonstrates that even our youngest students can analyze cultural and linguistic practices presented in texts. At the theoretical level, we need to remember, as Gutiérrez, Bien, Selland & Pierce (2011) state, "developing academic literacy is not simply about the acquisition of skills; it involves meaningful participation in practices in which children can extend and appropriate tools to use in the service of meaning-making" (pp. 235-236). Engaging students in a critical analysis of the language practices within children's literature not only provides a space for meaningful participation, but it sets the stage for them to advocate for themselves as multilingual beings.

In addition to the theoretical, there are strong pedagogical reasons to engage students in this process. Multilingual students often desire to incorporate all of their languages into their schooling practices when a supportive environment is created (Zapata & Laman, 2016) and text analysis provides a way for them to demonstrate a level of expertise to their multilingual and monolingual peers. Translation can be a key pedagogical tool for both language development

and metalinguistic awareness (Jiménez et al., 2015) and engaging students in the analysis of existing translations could have a similar positive impact on their linguistic development.

Families have a key role to play in their children's literacy development. This is even more true in contexts where families are working to develop literacy in languages not typically supported in schools (Stagg-Peterson & Heywood, 2007). Partnering with parents to select and analyze quality multilingual texts is imperative for teachers who are not proficient in the languages and dialects their students speak. The use of the rubric as a tool for parents to analyze materials for the classroom is a concrete way to invite parents into the education of their own children and others and leverage their expertise. The involvement of community members in the classroom can also help multilingual students to "claim their bilingualism and identities ... alongside their peers in ways that do not exoticize their heritage or their linguistic repertoires but rather recognize and leverage them" (Zapata & Laman, 2016, p.372). Extending biliteracy practices to include community members demonstrates to all students that there is value in linguistic abilities and in the individuals who possess them.

Conclusion

While there is great excitement about the increase in multilingual books available within children's literature, we need to continue to require high quality texts and translations which represent students and their linguistic communities well. Developing critical language awareness in ourselves, our students, and communities is one key step toward furthering the discussion of how languages are represented in children's literature. More research is needed evaluating specific texts and evaluating various assessment tools for their usability and application to various contexts. It is our hope that the draft rubric presented here will be a tool for furthering the dialogue.

Contribution Statement: *Sara Vroom Fick is the sole author of this article; however, an undergraduate research group completed the initial review of literature and developed the first draft of the rubric. The research group*

consisted of Bekah Dahm, Emily Heidick, and Anna James. All those listed co-presented the rubric to the first teacher workshop group.

Children's Literature Referenced

Dorros, A. (1991). *Abuela*. Dutton Books.
Oriduela, L. (2006). *Caperucita roja / Little red riding hood*. Scholastic.

References

- Alim, H. S. (2010). Critical language awareness. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.). (2010). *Sociolinguistics and language education* (205-231). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Alamillo, L. (2007). Selecting Chicano children's literature in a bilingual classroom: Investigating issues of cultural authenticity and avoiding stereotypes. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal*, 1(1), 26-32.
- Alamillo, L. (2017). Translanguaging con mi abuela: Chican@ children's literature as a means to elevate language practices in our homes. In L. Alamillo, L. M. Mercado-Lopez, & C. Herrera. (Eds). *Voices of Resistance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Chican@ Children's Literature* (151-162), Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Barrera, R. B., Quiroa, R. E., & Valdivia, R. (2003). Spanish in Latino picture storybooks in English: Its use and textural effects. In A. I. Willis, G. E. Garcia, R. B. Barrera, & V. J. Harris, (Eds). *Multicultural issues in literacy research and practice* (145-165). Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Daly, N. (2016). Dual language picture books in English and Māori. (2016). *Bookbird: A Journal of International Children's Literature*, 54(3), 10-17.
- de Jong, E., & Gao, J. (2019). Taking a multilingual stance: A continuum of practices. *MinneTESOL Journal*, 35(1).
- Dillon, A. M., Hojeij, Z., Perkins, A., & Malkawi, R. (2018). Examining the text quality of English/Arabic dual language children's picture books. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-14.
- Edwards, V., Monaghan, F., & Knight, J. (2000). Books, pictures and conversations: Using bilingual multimedia storybooks to develop language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 9(3), 135-146.
- Ertem, I. S. (2014). Critical content analysis of Turkish images in bilingual (German-Turkish) children's books. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 6(1).
- Ghiso, M. P., & Campano, G. (2013). Ideologies of language and identity in U.S. children's literature. *Bookbird: A Journal of International Children's Literature*, 51(3), 47-55.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Alvarez, H. H. (2001). Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. Reyes & J. Halcon (Eds.), *The best for the children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 122-141). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Huang, Q., & Chen, X. (2012). Chinese translation errors in English/Chinese bilingual children's picture books. *Reading Matrix*, 12(2), 133-145.
- Huang, Q., & Chen, X. (2016). Examining the text quality of English/Chinese bilingual children's picture books. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(5), 475-487.
- Jeong, W., & Han, H. (2014). Transformation of Newbery award books in Chinese, Japanese and Korean translations. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 51(1), 1-4.
- Kümmerling-Meibauer, B. (2013). Code-Switching in multilingual picturebooks. *Bookbird: A Journal of International Children's Literature*, 51(3), 12-21.
- Learning for Justice (2016). *Reading diversity*. <https://www.learningforjustice.org/magazine/publications/reading-diversity>
- Lotherington, H., Holland, M., Sotoudeh, S., & Zentena, M. (2008). Project-based community language learning: Three narratives of multilingual storytelling in early childhood education. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 65(1), 125-145.
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-González, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361-373.
- Malsbary, C. B. (2013). "It's not just learning English, it's learning other cultures": Belonging, power, and possibility in an immigrant contact zone. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(10), 1312-1336.

Martinez, D. C., Morales, P. Z., & Aldana, U. S. (2017). Leveraging students' communicative repertoires as a tool for equitable learning. *Review of Research in Education, 41*(1), 477–499.

Mendoza, J., & Reese, D. (2001). Examining multicultural picture books for the early childhood classroom: Possibilities and pitfalls. *Early Childhood Research & Practice, 3*(2), n2-32.

Naidoo, J. C. (2011). *Celebrating cuentos: Promoting Latino children's literature and literacy in classrooms and libraries*. Santa Barbara, California: Libraries Unlimited.

Naqvi, R., McKeough, A., Thorne, K., & Pfitscher, C. (2013). Dual-language books as an emergent-literacy resource: Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 13*(4), 501-528.

Riley, K., & Crawford-Garrett, K. (2016). Critical texts in literacy teacher education: Living inquiries into racial justice and immigration. *Language Arts, 94*(2), 94.

Riojas Clark, E., Bustos Flores, B., Smith, H., & Gonzalez, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Multicultural literature for Latino bilingual children: Their words, their worlds*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stagg-Peterson, S., & Heywood, D. (2007). Contributions of families' linguistic, social, and cultural capital to minority-language children's literacy: Parents', teachers', and principals' perspectives. *The Canadian Modern Language Review / La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes, 63*(4), 517-538.

Van Coillie, J., & Verschueren, W. P. (Eds.). (2014). *Children's literature in translation: Challenges and strategies*. Routledge.

Walker, S., Edwards, V., & Blacksell, R. (1996). *Designing bilingual books for children*. *Visible Language, 30*(3), 268-283.

Zapata, A., & Laman, T. T. (2016). "I write to show how beautiful my languages are": Translingual writing instruction in English-dominant classrooms. *Language Arts, 93*(5), 366-378.

Appendix A: Multilingual Literature Analysis Rubric

For use in evaluating 3 categories of books:

1. Translated text which may be monolingual or translated text in bilingual books
2. Bilingual books which may have a translation added or be originally written bilingually
3. Translanguaging books which incorporate two (or more) languages throughout one text

For Translated Text within Monolingual or Bilingual Books

Grammar and Usage

Elements	Unacceptable	Approaching	Meeting
Spelling: including diacritics (accents, tildes, umlauts, etc.)	Words are frequently spelled incorrectly and/ or no diacritics are used	The majority of words are spelled correctly (including diacritics)	All words are spelled correctly (including diacritics)
Punctuation: quotation notation, etc.	Language specific punctuation is ignored	Some language specific punctuation used, other is ignored	Language specific punctuation is used
Translation word choice	Words translated based on simplest definition	Words translated based on more comprehensive definition	Words are translated based on full contextual meaning
Syntax	Translated word for word following original syntax, not according to the target language	A majority of syntax follows target language structure	All syntax follows target language structure

Language Use in Text

Elements	Unacceptable	Approaching	Meeting
Figurative Language	Idioms, metaphors, and colloquialisms are translated literally, not into the appropriate figurative form	The majority of idioms, metaphors, and colloquialisms are translated into culturally appropriate figurative language	All idioms, metaphors, and colloquialisms are translated into culturally appropriate figurative language
Language Complexity / Formality	Language complexity does not match original - either overly complex or overly simple	Language complexity mirrors original language for the majority of the time, but there are noticeable gaps	Language complexity between original and translation is correlated throughout the text
Dialectal Representation	The dialect is inaccurate to the setting or culture portrayed	The dialect is somewhat accurate to the setting or culture portrayed	The dialect is fully accurate to the setting or culture portrayed

Flow of Text

Elements	Unacceptable	Approaching	Meeting
Rhythm (including rhyme, if original language rhymes)	Text has none of the rhythm of the target language	Text has some of the rhythm of the target language	Text has full rhythm of target language throughout the whole book
Cohesiveness	Sentences are not cohesive and transitions are awkward	Sentences are cohesive but the whole work does not flow together	Sentences are cohesive and the text flows well throughout
Voice	Text has lost all voice and personality	Author's voice and personality has been changed, but text still has personality	Text maintains author's voice and personality

Appendix A: Multilingual Literature Analysis Rubric (continued)

For use in evaluating 3 categories of books:

1. Translated text which may be monolingual or translated text in bilingual books
2. Bilingual books which may have a translation added or be originally written bilingually
3. Translanguaging books which incorporate two (or more) languages throughout one text

For Bilingual Books (either translated or originally bilingual)

Presentation of Languages

Elements	Unacceptable	Approaching	Meeting
Prominence of Text: location, size, style, integration into page design	Words are frequently spelled incorrectly and/or no diacritics are used	The majority of words are spelled correctly (including diacritics)	All words are spelled correctly (including diacritics)
Readability of Text: font style, size, color	Language specific punctuation is ignored	Some language specific punctuation used, other is ignored	Language specific punctuation is used
Directionality (if differs between languages)	Words translated based on simplest definition	Words translated based on more comprehensive definition	Words are translated based on full contextual meaning
Representation in Illustration	Translated word for word following original syntax, not according to the target language	A majority of syntax follows target language structure	All syntax follows target language structure
Front and Back Matter Translation: informational pages, author/illustrator descriptions, etc.	All information about the book is in one language only	Informational pages and copyright information remain in one language, but all bios have been translated	All of the information about the book is available in both languages

For Translanguaging Books: books that mix languages throughout the same text

Language Integration

Elements	Unacceptable	Approaching	Meeting
Authentic Purpose	Language usage is not clearly related to the story, may feel disconnected	Language usage is related to the story in general ways	Language usage is clearly connected to the storyline, characters, or setting
Systematic Usage	The mixing of the languages does not follow patterns and the flow of the text is disrupted	The mixing of languages sometimes follows patterns and sometimes the flow of the text is disrupted	The mixing of languages follows patterns in the flow of the text
Linguistic Access – to be considered when selecting texts for students from multiple language backgrounds	The additional language components are not translated, nor is there a glossary or word bank	Some of the additional language components are translated, are readily understood from context, or included in a glossary	Additional language components are accessible either through in-text means or a glossary

For All Books

Cultural Representation

Elements	Unacceptable	Approaching	Meeting
Interpersonal Relations	Dialogue between characters is culturally inappropriate for the setting presented	Dialogue between characters is not culturally accurate for the setting presented	Dialogue between characters is culturally accurate for the setting presented
Character Depth and Dimensionality	Characters are two-dimensional and only interacted with on a surface level	Some characters are given depth but non-principal characters are stereotypes	Each character is given depth and not represented by stereotyping
Accuracy of Illustrations	The illustrations misrepresent the culture	The illustrations represent only the <i>mainstream within the culture</i>	The illustrations accurately represent a spectrum of the culture
Cultural Diversity	The culture is portrayed solely based on stereotypes	The culture is portrayed with narrow minded orientation	The culture is portrayed in a way that allows for diversity within it
Cultural Accessibility – when selecting texts to mirror students' backgrounds	The book does not connect readily with students' backgrounds and can be excluding	The book may not connect with students but is not excluding	The book connects with students' backgrounds in ways that is sustaining and valuing

Translanguaging Pedagogy for Emergent Bilingual Immigrant Youths in the United States: Is It Transformative?

Eun Young Yeom

Despite the increasing number of immigrant youths with diverse linguistic backgrounds in U.S. classrooms, monolingual policy that valorizes white middle-class Standard English dominates the school curriculum. By conducting a literature review using heteroglossia and translanguaging as conceptual frameworks, this paper explores how immigrant youths engage with translanguaging practices and how their language practices are discriminated in U.S. schools and society. Also, this paper examines how translanguaging pedagogy for immigrant youths can bring changes to the monolingual curriculum by validating and affirming their languages and cultural identities, and to which extent these changes can be transformative in U.S. school contexts.

U.S. school classrooms are becoming linguistically and culturally diverse with the increasing flow of immigrant youths (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.; Warren & Ward, 2019). Immigrant youths often speak their heritage languages and English simultaneously. They intermix named languages and various semiotic repertoires, cultures, and identities to make sense of the world, which is called translanguaging (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Canagarajah, 2009; García & Li, 2014). That is, immigrant youths are in constant dialogues with their linguistic and cultural repertoires. Bakhtin (1981) also gives us insight into the interconnected nature of diverse meaning-making repertoires, or so-called heteroglossia, although he did not explain how people make meanings using different named languages in detail. That is, meaning-making repertoires do not “exclude

each other, but rather intersect with each other in many different ways” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 291), just like immigrant youths’ translanguaging.

Immigrant youths can be emergent bilinguals at an incipient stage of learning English as a second language with fledgling bilingual repertoires. They could be bilinguals at an advanced stage, moving dexterously between heritage languages and English. Or they could be the U.S.-born children of immigrant parents, and are learning their parents’ heritage languages in the United States. Whichever stage they are at and whichever language they are learning, immigrant youths can integrate their diverse linguistic and cultural repertoires to make meanings instead of arbitrarily turning on and off separate languages.

However, U.S. school classrooms are often “normed to white, middle-class, native English-speaking, college-bound, and non-working students with increasing standardization forced by high-stakes testing” (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017, p. 26), thereby dismissing immigrant youths’ heteroglossic translanguaging practices (García, 2009). Challenging the English-only language policy, translanguaging has entered the field of education to mobilize the full range of linguistic, cultural, and semiotic repertoires as enriching resources (García, 2009). That is, translanguaging pedagogy,

Eun Young Yeom is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of Georgia. Her research is focused on transnational emergent bilinguals’ translanguaging and their meaning-making processes.

which actively embraces heteroglossic translanguaging practices, has the potential to be transformative by disturbing the centralizing forces of the U.S. educational English-only policy.

Although attempts to separate languages run counter to most immigrant youths' linguistic realities, "keeping it linguistically real is often a threat to those who would prefer to keep it linguistically pure" (Pennycook, 2007, pp. 136–137). Hence, tensions could arise between the centralizing forces of monolingualism and the disruptive power of translanguaging. In this regard, by conducting a literature review, this paper will explore how immigrant youths' translanguaging practices and translanguaging pedagogy are realized in the United States, particularly amidst the push and pull between the disturbing forces of translanguaging and the assimilating forces of monolingualism. Also, by examining how decentralizing translanguaging pedagogy can be based on the literature review, this inquiry will assess to what extent translanguaging pedagogy can be transformative in U.S. school contexts.

The current literature review, therefore, will be guided by the following questions:

1. In what ways are immigrant youths' translanguaging practices and translanguaging pedagogy shaped between the disturbing forces of translanguaging and the centralizing forces of monolingualism?
2. Based on the findings from Question 1, to what extent can translanguaging pedagogy be transformative in U.S. monolingual school contexts?

Working Definitions

Immigrant youths

For the current inquiry, youths indicate the period between Pre-K and K–12 students, although the age range for the youth might vary. They came to live in the United States from non-English-speaking countries by themselves or with their parents, and are learning English as a second language. Or they were born in the United States as the children of immigrant parents and are learning their parents' heritage languages in the United States.

Translanguaging/ Translanguaging practices/

Translanguaging pedagogy

Translanguaging and translanguaging practices

for the purposes of this paper mean intermixing English, immigrant youths' heritage languages, and various semiotic modes. Translanguaging pedagogy indicates classroom practices or lesson plans that incorporate translanguaging practices into teaching and learning.

Conceptual Framework:

Heteroglossia and Translanguaging

Bakhtin (1981) mentions that:

At any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between different epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles, and so forth, all given a bodily form. (p. 291)

For Bakhtin (1981, 1984), endorsing linguistic purism and monolingualism does not make sense, because individuals creatively intermix or remix diverse forms of languages to make meanings. He sees language uses as inherently heteroglossic and contextualized, which cannot be homogenized through decontextualized monolingual uses.

When people make meanings, they are in dialogues with their past and present, feelings, identities, and perspectives, which are mixed and remixed with the various and ever-changing forms of consciousness of the society (Bakhtin, 1981, 1984). That is, meaning-making processes, which are usually realized via language practices, integrate various ways of thinking and histories on a personal and a societal level. In this regard, heteroglossia could be summarized as "the simultaneous use of different kinds of forms or signs, and the tensions and conflicts among those signs, on the socio-historical associations they carry with them" (Bailey, 2012, p. 504).

However, to understand heteroglossia, we should note that diversifying forces operate in tandem with the unifying or centripetal forces of societal norms in individuals' meaning-making processes. Individuals' utterances can stay in a unitary form because human beings tend to assimilate "our consciousness to the ideological world" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 341). That

is, meanings enunciated through languages are diverse and individualized, while they conform to socially agreed norms and values at the same time (Bakhtin, 1986). Bakhtin (1981) defines this personal and social nature of language practices as dialogized heteroglossia, which is not entirely variable and unique due to the unifying power of societal norms.

Bakhtin (1981, 1984, 1986) does not specifically explain the diversity across different named languages when illustrating heteroglossia, such as how bilinguals communicate. Hence, we need an additional theory, such as translanguaging, which can explicitly illustrate how bilinguals make meanings using two different languages as interconnected units. When the term translanguaging was conceived, it described the pedagogical practices in Wales that aimed to revitalize the diminishing heritage language Welsh while placing equal weight on English uses; hence, teachers teach in Welsh while students respond in English (Baker, 2011). The concept is now expanded to theory and pedagogy.

Translanguaging as a theory places weight on the natural and daily communication practices of bilinguals (García, 2009). Translanguaging theory explains bilinguals' dynamic language practices, which simultaneously incorporate and even transcend the boundaries between named languages and different modes (García & Li, 2014; Li, 2018; Pennycook, 2017). As a pedagogy, such as in U.S. English-only school contexts, it strategically integrates students' heritage languages into classroom practices (García, 2014). Translanguaging pedagogy actively integrates multilingual and multimodal resources into lesson plans, selects culturally relevant texts, and situates teachers as co-learners (García & Kleyn, 2016).

Contrary to the static nature inherent in the term target language acquisition, trans+linguaging contains the dynamic nature of language practices that people are actually doing. Linguaging illustrates "an assemblage of diverse material, biological, semiotic, and cognitive properties and capacities which languaging agents orchestrate in real-time and across a diversity of timescales" (Thibault, 2017, p. 82). And with the use of prefix trans-, translanguaging can denote the following aspects of the language practices of bilinguals. First, bilinguals are not confined to one single linguistic

entity, even if they are engaged in monolingual communications, and second, human beings can incorporate diverse semiotic resources to make meanings and think beyond the boundaries of defined languages (Li, 2018).

Bakhtin's notion of heteroglossia provides us with the insight into creative language uses and diverse voices helps us understand bilinguals' mixing and remixing different named languages. When immigrant youths engage in translanguaging, their diverse histories, ideologies, cultures, and subjectivities embedded in languages dynamically and continuously merge and remerge (Bakhtin, 1981, 1984). They also fluidly cross the boundaries between named languages (Makalela, 2015, 2019). That is, heteroglossia explains how diverse meaning-making resources are remixed dynamically, and translanguaging illustrates mobile and transgressive language uses between different named languages (Low & Sarkar, 2014).

It must be noted here that "linguistic signs are part of a wider repertoire of modal resources that sign makers have at their disposal and that carry particular socio-historical and political associations" (Li, 2018, p. 22). That is, heteroglossic translanguaging practices operate simultaneously on both individual and societal levels via diverse named languages and semiotic modes, which carry multifaceted and multilayered histories, ideologies, and individual identities. In this sense, heteroglossia provides us with "a lens through which to view the social, political, and historical implications of language in practice" (Blackledge & Creese, 2014, p. 1).

Translanguaging provides us with a lens of linguistic diversity between different named languages or interlingual diversity that inheres within dynamic and ever-changing social and cultural diversity. Social and cultural diversity in current society has even become superdiverse, expedited by the Internet and increased transnational migrations (Blommaert, 2013). Through monolingual viewpoints, we cannot explain immigrant youths' language practices because these language practices embody their superdiverse social, cultural, political, and historical affiliations across national borders.

If heteroglossic translanguaging practices are

integrated into language teaching, it can challenge monolingual institutional norms and affirm students' cultural identities by acknowledging interlingual diversity (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). However, considering that heteroglossia is also influenced by centralizing forces, we should acknowledge that translanguaging practices are simultaneously influenced by the forces of standardization and monolingualism of U.S. school curriculum.

Methodology

Given that all the retrieved research is based on qualitative designs, the current review employed an integrative literature synthesis. This methodology requires reviewing, synthesizing, and critiquing research on a specific topic to provide new understandings or perspectives (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). In this way, integrative literature review can go beyond mere summary of findings, challenge and extend current understandings through extensive analysis of patterns across studies, and generate new insights regarding a particular phenomenon (Torraco, 2005).

Search and Screening Strategy

I searched Google Scholar, UGA Libraries, and the ERIC database using the key terms *translanguaging*, *immigrant*, *youths*, and *the U.S.* The most relevant articles and dissertations published between 2010 and 2021 were retrieved to reflect the most recent trends of the research through the combination of Google Scholar and UGA Libraries. I subsequently searched ERIC to check other relevant articles that were not found using Google Scholar and UGA Libraries. The research was confined to the U.S. context because immigrants' experiences and their language practices may be different in other countries depending on respective countries' unique political circumstances and histories. The initial search through Google Scholar and UGA Libraries generated a total of 4220 peer-reviewed articles, doctoral dissertations, master's theses, and book chapters. Due to the expansive amount of research retrieved through the search, I sampled the first 100 peer-reviewed articles and doctoral dissertations, thus excluding book chapters and master's theses.

While reading titles and abstracts, I included studies concerning immigrant youths' translanguaging practices in and out of school from grades Pre-K to K-12. During the search process, I noticed that most of the research was conducted with Latinx immigrant youths in dual language programs. To balance the research contexts included in the review, I intentionally included the studies conducted with non-Latinx populations in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) or English as a second language (ESL) classes, English Language Arts classes, community centers, afterschool programs, and families. Through these processes, 32 peer-reviewed articles and 2 dissertations relevant to the aim of the current literature review were selected.

Assessing the quality of each study is important to eliminate any studies with undesirable validity levels. However, a standard quality assessment was not included for this literature review, because the central aim of this review is to understand how translanguaging practices and pedagogy go against and how they are situated within the larger centralizing forces of monolingual hegemony of the United States. My reasoning was that peer-reviewed articles and faculty-approved dissertations have already made a positive contribution to the field regardless of their quality. Hence, I focused more on assessing how the selected articles fit within a broader framework of heteroglossic translanguaging practices, which operates within and pushes back against monolingualism or English-only policies.

Coding and Analysis

I conducted full reads of each article and dissertation to be certain that each study about immigrant youths in the United States was presented therein, and I synthesized the findings of each study in a Word document. To prepare for analysis, an Excel spreadsheet was used to sort out information that was extracted from each article and dissertation, such as population of interest, methodology, key findings, and authors' assertions. Following the primary coding and pattern coding (Miles et al., 2019) for thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), codes were developed in a code book of an Excel spreadsheet based on the findings and authors' assertions. Examples from the articles

and my analytic notes were included next to each code. To identify codes regarding pushing and pulling forces inherent in translanguaging, I constantly read original articles and my synthesis of each article. I also referred to the notion of heteroglossia and the theory of translanguaging when identifying codes.

The developed codes based on this process include but are not limited to code-switching, changing registers, jokes, academic language practices, linguicism (linguistic racism), monolingualism, marginalization, equity through language, opening opportunities, academic success, community efforts, teacher efforts, family efforts, and multimodality as a resource. Pattern coding followed, through which larger themes were created. Three major themes emerged: 1) heteroglossic language practices, 2) linguistic and racial inequities, and 3) disrupting monolingual supremacy and embracing diversity. Using the results from the literature review, the transformative nature of translanguaging pedagogy was assessed.

Findings

Based on the literature review, the first three subsections will delineate how immigrant youths' translanguaging practices and translanguaging pedagogy are shaped, as well as various efforts to incorporate translanguaging pedagogy. The last subsection examines how transformative such efforts can be in the U.S. school system.

Heteroglossic Language Practices

Monolingual practices at schools and prioritizing Standard English in U.S. society do not align with the linguistic realities of immigrant youths, who constantly mix languages for academic purposes and in their daily lives (Hornberger & Link, 2012; Link, 2011). Even in dual language programs based on language separation policy, moving between and mixing Spanish and English is integral to the communication between teachers and students, and among peers (Gort & Sembiante, 2015). That is, immigrant youths' translanguaging practices cannot be homogenized in a monolingual frame.

Immigrant youths' translanguaging practices are nuanced and complex by strategically incorporating

translation, code-switching, and paraphrasing (Choi, 2019), flexibly switching registers (Ryu, 2019), integrating various multimodal means (Kim, 2018; Kwon, 2019), and engaging in language brokering (Alvarez, 2014). Bilingual repertoires can serve as assets for immigrant youths to express their whole selves (Ascenzi-Moreno & Espinosa, 2018) and strategically leverage their heritage languages to understand contents in English (Daniel & Pacheo, 2016; Esquinca et al., 2014; Lee, 2020). In other words, immigrant youths can make the best out of translanguaging to benefit their academic learning (Davila, 2020; Song & Cho, 2018). It is not random or compartmentalized but systematic and fluid, as seen in Korean immigrant youths' language uses (e.g., Lee, 2020; Song, 2016).

Linguistic and Racial Inequities

Despite the present-day trends of translanguaging and English becoming a translocal language due to increased transnational mobilities (Pennycook, 2007), white middle-class standard monolingualism is still the norm in most U.S. school curricula (Smith, 2010). The curriculum places white middle-class Standard English or Anglonormativity (McKinney, 2007, 2017) on top of immigrant youths' heritage languages. In other words, English-only policy based on homogeneous national identity (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017) and school administrators' monolingual policy along with standardized testing (Deroo & Ponzio, 2019) serve as a centralizing force in the U.S. school curriculum.

Particularly in the case of translanguaging practices of Black immigrant youths, their statuses as immigrants along with being racial and linguistic minorities create intersectionality to further marginalize these youths (Smith, 2010). Similarly, because of raciolinguistic ideologies or linguicism, people are socioeconomically stereotyped as underprivileged if they have Latinx racial and Spanish linguistic backgrounds (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Even if they are in Spanish-English dual language programs, Latinx immigrant children position themselves by favoring English over Spanish because they are aware of English dominance in the formal curriculum and in U.S. society (Hamman, 2018).

Also, immigrant children can develop negative attitudes toward translanguaging due to their constant disempowering experiences with the mixed use of languages at school (Bussert-Ween et al., 2018) or explicit English-only school policies (Sayer, 2013). For example, Korean immigrant adolescents tend to avoid using the Korean heritage language for their academic success and social mobility (Han, 2017), which is often enabled by higher English proficiency. In this sense, it could be argued that immigrant youths' unique communication, meaning-making processes, and bicultural identities are invalidated and silenced, thus being considered deviant at schools and in society. Altering what has been accepted as a norm could take an enormous amount of effort, and it could start from resisting the inequities that many of us have been socialized into. The next section will delineate the efforts of affirming, validating, and normalizing translanguaging practices at schools.

Disrupting Monolingual Supremacy and Embracing Diversity

Intentional integration of translanguaging classroom practices can push back against white English-only supremacy residing in school curriculum (Smith, 2010).

repertoires can be validated and leveraged (Sayer, 2013). Such efforts can decolonize the dominant intellectual knowledge (García & Leiva, 2014) that is often shaped by constant Standard English uses. Decolonizing through decentering the dominant white English-only supremacy and including culturally relevant lesson plans can be beneficial, particularly for Latinx immigrant youths, who are often socialized into the colonial ethnic history of their home countries (Ríos & Seltzer, 2017).

Actively integrating various named languages and semiotic modes can maximize the beneficial potential of translanguaging pedagogy. Multimodal activities such as making podcasts can let immigrant youths be more creative in their language uses and express their whole selves as immigrants living in the United States (de los Ríos, 2020). What is more, classroom discussions regarding culturally relevant topics such as immigration issues based on translanguaging practices can be empowering and culturally sustaining for immigrant youths, as translanguaging is part of their daily language practices and immigration issues are socio-politically relevant to their personal lives (Herrera, 2017).

In this regard, Bajaj and Bartlett (2017) suggest a

The tensions between the diversifying forces of translanguaging and the centralizing norms of white, English-only supremacy create a vortex; the energy of this vortex is constantly generated and maintained by these two opposite forces.

Translanguaging classroom practices are inherently transformative and political (García & Li, 2014) by keeping the language practices real and resisting the dominant norms (Langman, 2014) and by decentering what has been centered in the curriculum (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017). The tensions between the diversifying forces of translanguaging and the centralizing norms of white English-only supremacy create a vortex; the energy of this vortex is constantly generated and maintained by these two opposite forces.

If culturally relevant lesson plans and critical thinking activities are paired up with translanguaging, translanguaging pedagogy can reap more benefits because immigrant youths' cultural and linguistic

critical transnational curriculum, which engages transnational or immigrant youths to ponder political and environmental issues directly affecting their communities. Culturally relevant lesson plans and the transformative nature embedded in translanguaging can disrupt raciolinguistic ideologies, which immigrant youths might have been socialized into. Transformative translanguaging pedagogy is an effort to normalize bilingualism and diversity, which are often considered deviant in U.S. formal curriculum and society.

Disruptive power can also be generated by embracing differences. For example, embracing immigrant youths' linguistic and cultural identities can make the classroom environment more inclusive.

Teachers' efforts to create more linguistically inclusive circumstances help immigrant youths feel safe, because the inclusive environment allows the students to fully draw on their funds of knowledge shaped both in English and in their heritage languages (DeNicolò, 2019). The safety that immigrant youths feel through translanguaging in classrooms can "support the development of cross-linguistic awareness" (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017, p. 253). More importantly, this safe environment and cross-linguistic awareness can make a positive contribution to empowering bilingual identities in the long run (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017).

The inclusive environment generated by translanguaging pedagogy "provide practitioners, teachers, and researchers with a fuller understanding of the resources students bring to school and help us identify ways in which to draw on these resources for successful educational experiences" (Hornberger & Link, 2012, p. 264). In other words, immigrant youths' successful educational experiences can take place based on the understanding of their cultural identities and transnational affiliations with their home countries along with translanguaging practices (Stewart & Hansen-Thomas, 2016).

Linguistically inclusive classroom environments help immigrant youths open their whole selves, and such environments eventually enhance their academic achievement, such as academic writing (Ascenzi-Moreno & Espinosa, 2018; Bauer et al., 2017). Successful educational experiences can promote increased graduation rates, as evidenced by the English-learning immigrant students enrolled in International High School in New York City (García & Sylvan, 2011). In this high school, being immigrants, linguistic minorities, and low socioeconomic status do not get in the way for the enrolled students to achieve successful academic performance. This is mainly because of the core principle of "singularities in pluralities" (p. 386), which respects immigrant youths' distinct cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Academic enhancement based on translanguaging is possible mainly because immigrant youths' heritage languages act as a scaffold to make meanings of contents written in English. Considering

that language is a mediational tool for thinking (Vygotsky, 1986), it could be assumed that a second language (either English or heritage language) is interwoven "with the existing fabric of verbal thought" (John-Steiner, 1985, p. 365). García and Li (2014) also argue that bilinguals "are engaged in appropriating new language that makes up their own unique repertoire of meaning-making resources" (p. 80). For example, immigrant youths can model translanguaging for one another and scaffold other peers' translanguaging such as through translation of English words into their heritage languages, and heightened linguistic awareness mediates their understanding of academic contents written in English (e.g., Lee, 2020; Ryu, 2019; Sayer, 2013; Song & Cho, 2018).

Transformative Pedagogy: Transformation Within Centralizing Forces

The aforementioned efforts are aimed at resisting the norms and transforming the status quo. The transformative power inherent in translanguaging pedagogy can challenge the norm of Anglonormativity embedded in the scripted curriculum, which only valorizes white middle-class English and devalues multilingualism (McKinney, 2007). Translanguaging pedagogy also allows immigrant youths to perform their bilingual identities, and it can flatten the linguistic hierarchy, thereby alleviating social injustice embodied through linguistic inequities (García & Leiva, 2014). By resisting what has been constructed as a norm, translanguaging pedagogy tries to normalize what used to be deemed deviant and deficient in the U.S. school curriculum.

It must be noted, however, that translanguaging pedagogy may not be transformative as much as it is expected to be. Translanguaging pedagogy may not even disturb the societal norm but creates lethargic forces if it is misinterpreted. For example, learning English plays a crucial role in their academic and future professional success in the United States. However, English-learning emergent bilingual students might misinterpret a translanguaging space as a safe space where they can speak only in their heritage languages, instead of learning English through the use of their heritage languages in ESL classrooms (Lang, 2019).

At this point, we should consider what academic success and successful educational experiences mean and how much translanguaging pedagogy can disturb Anglonormativity. The reviewed studies often argue that translanguaging can leverage immigrant youths' heritage language repertoires to maximize their cognitive and metacognitive capacities during content learning, particularly in the research regarding Korean immigrant youths (e.g., Lee, 2020; Ryu, 2019; Song & Cho, 2018). It is important to note that these content learning experiences signify white middle-class college-bound monolingual U.S. school curricula. Hence, academic success and successful educational experiences based on translanguaging might mean showing legitimate academic performances by using Standard English in the formal U.S. curriculum.

The successful academic experiences in dual language programs (e.g., Alvarez, 2014; Daniel & Pacheco, 2016; Esquinca et al., 2014) also seem to imply the same message. Despite the name "dual," dual language programs sometimes act as a bridge for immigrant youths to become more proficient in English and promote their excellence in English-dominant school curriculum. By being transformative and inclusive, translanguaging pedagogy ironically socializes immigrant youths into the formalized discourses of schooling (Gort & Sembiente, 2015). Moreover, immigrant youths' translanguaging practices cannot even be acknowledged as legitimate outside of their dual language classrooms (Link, 2011). That is, the transformative potential of dual language programs does not seem to extend beyond the boundaries of the classroom.

When it comes to ESOL or ESL programs, highlighting academic success through English improvement is more evident. For example, Ascenzi-Moreno and Espinosa (2018) illustrate how the participating ESOL teachers incorporated Spanish and culturally relevant topics to improve English learning in Latinx emergent bilinguals' English writing proficiency. At a micro level, the teachers incorporated translanguaging into teaching English writing. However, it did not change the bigger social centralizing forces of teaching English as a new language. The program aimed to enhance the participating immigrant youths'

English proficiency, an integral part of academic success in the U.S. curriculum and society.

Similarly, regarding the program for English-learning immigrant youths' science learning through science teachers' and ESOL teachers' collaboration, Langman (2014) argues that the teachers' classroom language practices were somehow confined within the state language policy which promotes higher English proficiency. By allowing students' translanguaging,

where the students of these teachers are left in a context of a language whose authenticity does not appear to extend far beyond the confines of the individual classroom in which they find themselves—although, ironically it does align with District interpretations of State Policy (Langman, 2014, p. 196)

In this regard, García and Lin (2016) support bilinguals' improvement in academic language as follows: "bilingual education must develop bilingual students' ability to use language according to the rules and regulations that have been socially constructed for that particular language" (p. 127). García and Li (2014) also mention that "students need practice and engagement in translanguaging, as much as they need practice of standard features used for academic purposes" (pp. 71–72). Translanguaging pedagogy endorses linguistic diversity; however, it also operates within the forces of standardization and unification.

Translanguaging pedagogy could be transformative at a micro level in each classroom by embracing linguistic diversity and interrupting monolingualism. However, it might unintentionally place more weight on supporting immigrant youths' socialization into formal schooling rooted in Anglonormativity. This socialization into societal norms can cause immigrant youths to avoid using their heritage languages, as seen in Korean immigrant adolescents' determined use of English for both academic and communication purposes (Han, 2017).

Discussion and Conclusion

In the dynamic vortex created by the disruptive forces of translanguaging and the centralizing forces of the mainstream white English-only superiority, integrating translanguaging pedagogy into classrooms

can challenge the monoglossic linguistic hierarchy. It can also create an inclusive teaching and learning environment for linguistic and racial minorities. Such an inclusive environment empowers their bilingual identities and enhances their academic achievement using their heritage languages as a scaffold.

Translanguaging pedagogy, in this sense, could be transformative. It can “give back the voice that had been taken away by ideologies of monoglot standards” (García & Li, 2014, p. 105).

Even if it creates disturbing forces, translanguaging pedagogy operates within the centralizing forces of white middle-class Standard English. It can disturb the monolingual rhetoric of the curriculum and society. However, this does not dramatically change unequal social structures. Based on the analysis of the current literature review, the transformative possibilities of translanguaging lie in the potential of enhancing immigrant youths’ academic achievement defined by the formal school curriculum and standardized testing. By being more inclusive and supporting diversity, translanguaging pedagogy seems to inadvertently valorize the compulsory command of monolingual Standard English.

However, it is undeniable that the disruptive power lurks within translanguaging practices in daily lives and translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom. It challenges what conforms us to the imagined normativity called Standard English or monolingualism (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). Challenging the intersectionality of white supremacy and monolingualism can be transformative in and of itself. It opens the doors for linguistically and racially marginalized immigrant youths to feel validated. In such an inclusive and empowering environment, immigrant youths can express their thoughts by using their cultural, linguistic, and semiotic assets, which used to be devalued in the normative academic register.

Translanguaging practices in daily lives and integrating translanguaging into classrooms can create disruptive potential, but do not completely dismantle or deconstruct the centralizing forces of Anglonormativity. However, creative energy resides in diversity (Bakhtin, 1981). Without the creative power of heteroglossia, society, the community, and individuals would be

trapped within the dichotomy between socially defined intelligence and deficiency. In the dynamic whirlwind of the interruptive power of translanguaging and the centralizing forces of monolingualism, the arbitrary linguistic hierarchy can be disrupted, although slowly. All in all, translanguaging is not a metaphor but a transformative practice. It can challenge the centralizing rhetoric of white middle-class monolingual supremacy, which silences immigrant youths’ creative and splendid language uses.

References

- Alvarez, S. (2014). Translanguaging traesas: Emergent bilingual youth as language brokers for homework in immigrant families. *Language Arts, 91*(5), 326–339. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24575544>
- Ascenzi-Moreno, L., & Espinosa, C. M. (2018). Opening up spaces for their whole selves: A case study group’s exploration of translanguaging practices in writing. *NYS TESOL Journal, 5*(1), 10–29.
- Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism a social approach* (pp. 257–276). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bajaj, M., & Bartlett, L. (2017). Critical transnational curriculum for immigrant and refugee students. *Curriculum Inquiry, 47*(1), 25–35. doi: 10.1080/03626784.2016.1254499
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed). Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics*. University of Michigan Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres & other late essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.; V. McGee, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Bauer, E. B., Presiado, V., & Colomer, S. (2017). Writing through partnership: Fostering translanguaging in children who are emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research, 49*(1), 10–37. doi: 10.1177/1086296X16683417
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. Continuum.

- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 1–20). Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_1
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Multilingual Matters.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Bussert-Wenn, K. M., Masson, H. M., & Lewis, K. A. (2018). Latinx children's push and pull of Spanish literacy and translanguaging. *The Qualitative Report, 23*(11), 2648–2669. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss11/4>
- Canagarajah, S. (2009). The plurilingual tradition and the English language in South Asia. *ALIA Review, 22*, 5–22. doi: 10.1075/aila.22.02can
- Choi, J. Y. (2019). A child's trilingual language practices in Korean, Farsi, and English: From a sustainable translanguaging perspective. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 16*(4), 534–548. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2019.1593423
- Daniel, S. M., & Pacheo, M. B. (2016). Translanguaging practices and perspectives of multilingual teens. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 59*(6), 653–663. doi:10.1002/jaal.500
- Davila, L. T. (2020). Multilingual interactions and learning in high school ESL classrooms. *Tesol Quarterly, 54*(1), 30–55. doi: 10.1002/tesq.536
- de los Ríos, C. V. (2020). Translingual youth podcasts as acoustic allies: Writing and negotiating identities at the intersection of literacies, language, and racialization. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 1*–15. doi: 10.1080/15348458.2020.1795865
- DeNicolò, C. P. (2019). The role of translanguaging in establishing school belonging for emergent multilinguals. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 23*(9), 967–984. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2019.1602364
- Deroo, M. R., & Ponzio, C. (2019). Confronting ideologies: A discourse analysis of in-service teachers' translanguaging stance through an ecological lens. *Bilingual Research Journal, 42*(2), 214–231. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2019.1589604
- Esquinca, A., Araujo, B., & de la Piedra, M. T. (2014). Meaning making and translanguaging in a two-way dual-language program on the U.S.-Mexico border. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(2), 164–181. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2014.934970
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistics and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171. doi: 10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149
- 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. doi: 10.1080/15348458.2017.1329016
- García, O. (2009). Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2014). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface, language choice and hybridity* (pp. 100–118). Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. Routledge.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–216). Springer.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Lin, A. (2016). Translanguaging and bilingual education. In O. Garcia, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 117–130). Springer.
- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 385–400. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x
- Gort, M., & Sembiente, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International*

- Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 7–25. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2014.981775
- Hamman, L. (2018). Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: A case for criticality. *Language and Education*, 32(1), 21–42. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2017.1384006
- Han, J. H. (2017). *Bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic self-efficacy among adolescent Korean heritage language learners*. [Doctoral dissertation, New York University].
- Herrera, L. Y. (2017). *Translanguaging practices for educational equity: Moments in a bilingual middle school classroom*. [Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York].
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261–278. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2012.658016
- John-Steiner, V. (1985). The road to competence in an alien land: A Vygotskian perspective on bilingualism. In J. V. Wertch (Ed.), *Culture communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 348–371). Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, S. (2018). “It was kind of a given that we are all multilingual”: Transnational youth identity work in digital translanguaging. *Linguistics and Education*, 43, 39–52. doi: 10.1016/j.linged.2017.10.008 0898-5898
- Kwon, J. (2019). Parent–child translanguaging among transnational immigrant families in museums. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–16. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1689918
- Lang, N. W. (2019). Teachers’ translanguaging practices and “safe spaces” for adolescent newcomers: Toward alternative visions. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(1), 73–89. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2018.1561550
- Langman, J. (2014). Translanguaging, identity, and learning: Science teachers as engaged language planners. *Language Policy*, 13, 183–200. doi: 10.1007/s10993-013-9312-9
- Lee, C. H. (2020). Korean bilingual students’ strategic employment of translanguaging while writing. *US-China Foreign Language*, 18(4), 119–135. doi: 10.17265/1539-8080/2020.04.003
- Li, W. (2018). Traslanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. doi:10.1093/applin/amx039
- Link, H. (2011). “Hola” means “hello”: The intersection of language policy and language ideology in the early elementary classrooms of a New Latino Diaspora Community. *Working Paper in Educational Linguistics*, 26(2), 100–120.
- Low, B., & Sarkar, M. (2014). Translanguaging in the multilingual Montreal hip-hop community: Everyday poetics as counter to the myths of the monolingual classroom. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 99–118). Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_6
- Makalela, L. (2015). Translanguaging as a vehicle for epistemic access: Cases for reading comprehension and multilingual interactions. *Per Linguam*, 31(1), 15–29. doi: 10.5785/31-1-628
- Makalela, L. (2019). Uncovering the universals of ubuntu translanguaging discourses. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), 237–251. doi: 10.1080/19463014.2019.1631198
- McKinney, C. (2007). ‘If I speak English, does it make me less black anyway?’: ‘Race’ and English in South African desegregated schools. *English Academy Review*, 24(2), 6–24. doi: 10.1080/10131750701452253
- McKinney, C. (2017). *Language and power in postcolonial schooling: Ideologies in practice*. Routledge.
- Menken, K., & Sánchez, M. T. (2019). Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *Tesol Quarterly*, 53(3), 741–767. doi: 10.1002/tesq.513
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2019). *Fundamentals of qualitative data analysis*. SAGE Publications.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(3), 269–282. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2017.1315810

- Ríos, C. V., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, coloniality, and English classrooms: An exploration of two bicoastal urban classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English, 52*(1), 55–76.
- Ryu, M. (2019). Mixing languages for science learning and participation: An examination of Korean-English bilingual learners in an after-school science learning program. *International Journal of Science Education, 41*(1), 1303–1323. doi: 10.1080/09500693.2019.1605229
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *Tesol Quarterly, 47*(1), 63–88. doi: 10.1002/tesq.53
- Smith, P. (2020). The case for translanguaging in black immigrant literacies. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice, 69*, 192–210. doi: 10.1177/2381336920937264
- Song, K. W. (2016). “Ok, I will say in Korean and then in American”: Translanguaging practices in bilingual homes. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 16*(1), 84–106. doi: 10.1177/1468798414566705
- Song, K., & Cho, B. Y. (2018). Exploring bilingual adolescents’ translanguaging strategies during online reading. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 24*(4), 577–594. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2018.1497008
- Stewart, M. A., & Hansen-Thomas, H. (2016). Sanctioning a space for translanguaging in the secondary English classroom: A case of a transnational youth. *Research in the Teaching of English, 50*(4), 450–472. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24889944>
- Thibault, P. J. (2017) The reflexivity of human languaging and Nigel Love’s two orders of language. *Language Sciences, 61*, 74–85. doi: 10.1016/j.langsci.2016.09.014
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(3), 356–267. doi: 10.1177/1534484305278283
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Our Nation’s English Learners*. <https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/el-characteristics/index.html#three>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. (A. Kozulin, Ed.; A. Kozulin, Trans.). MIT Press.
- Warren, A. N., & Ward, N. A. (2019). Equitable education for English learners through a pedagogy of multiliteracies. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 55*(2), 89–94. doi: 10.1080/00228958.2019.1580989
- Whittemore, R., & Knaf, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52*, 546–553. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x

How Pinteresting! The Emergence of a New Curricular Resource

Joanne Yi

Amid the recent vocal debates and discussions over curriculum design, Common Core State Standards (CCSS), standardized test preparation, and literacy frameworks (Alismail & McGuire, 2015; Gabriel, 2018; Johnston, 2019; Wallender, 2014), a curricular wellspring has swept up a generation of teachers with little fanfare. The use of social media in school and educational contexts has surged, and digital platforms such as Pinterest, Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube have become bountiful sources of curriculum despite little regulation from school governing authorities. While the body of academic research concerning social media's impact is significant, the majority of this scholarship has attended to Facebook (e.g., Chugh & Ruhi, 2018; Hew, 2011; Irwin et al., 2012; Manca & Ranieri, 2013) and Twitter (e.g., Gao et al., 2012; Tang & Hew, 2017; Veletsianos, 2012). Investigation into teachers' use of Pinterest has emerged in the last 5 years, though much about the phenomenon remains unknown. In this literature review, I explore the growing trend of teachers using Pinterest as a curricular resource and survey the implications for curriculum. I also provide suggestions for teachers' use of this digital platform and highlight critical areas for future research.

Pinterest and Teachers

Pinterest, a visual bookmarking platform, was founded in 2010. Within 3 years, Pinterest displayed the fastest growth of any social network at the time, even surpassing the growth of Facebook and Twitter (Semiocast, 2013). A decade later, Pinterest is one of the world's most-used platforms, boasting over 459 million monthly active users (Sehl, 2021). Compared to

the popularity of relatively newer applications, such as Snapchat and TikTok, the growth of Pinterest remains impressive—in 2020 alone, the site gained over 100 million active users (Geysler, 2021; Sehl, 2021). These staggering statistics demonstrate the popular use of this online tool by a variety of users. The website allows users to save or bookmark images by virtually “pinning” them to personal inspiration boards. These images, called “pins,” often link back to the website where they were originally posted so that users, or “pinners,” may locate sources and more information. The site also provides easy access to others' pins, encouraging the sharing of ideas and social networking. Users may interact with one another through liking, commenting, direct messaging, and “repinning” content.

Among educators, Pinterest has become an invaluable resource (Cummings, 2015). In 2018, 73% of educators were estimated to be active Pinterest users; it is likely this number is significantly higher today (McCloud, 2019). According to the company, more than 1.3 million education-related ideas are pinned daily, and teacher influencers on the site often boast hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of followers.

Joanne Yi earned her PhD in literacy, culture, and language education from Indiana University Bloomington. A proud MotherScholar and former elementary teacher from Philadelphia, her research interests include Asian American children's literature, critical literacies, issues of inclusion and belonging in elementary and early childhood contexts, and digital literacies and social media in education.

Teachers use the site to gather ideas about thematic units and lessons, share pictures of model classrooms or activities, and save images of anchor charts, bulletin boards, and crafts. They can connect with a vast network of educators around the globe, comment on one another's pins, follow the boards of respected teachers and coaches, and integrate virtual planning with concrete classroom activities. At the same time, the use of Pinterest as a content-specific visual search engine for curriculum has become ubiquitous.

As one teacher influencer stated, "As a teacher, I use Pinterest like it's Google. Rather than typing into Google, teachers turn to Pinterest. It's their search engine and where they find what they need" (Joelle, 2019, para. 9). Importantly, "what teachers need" appears to be less about inspiration and more to do with actual content for use in the classroom. A RAND Corporation survey (Opfer et al., 2016) found that teachers, elementary and secondary, overwhelmingly consulted online resources such as Google, Pinterest, and Teachers Pay Teachers (TpT) for ELA and math instructional materials and ideas. Among the elementary teachers surveyed, 86% reported using Pinterest to select or self-develop curriculum, including individual lessons and/or activities, problems, writing prompts, assessments, texts for whole-class and individual use, and adaptations for students with special needs. Similar findings were established in other studies (Carpenter et al., 2018; Schroeder et al., 2019), in which teachers reported using Pinterest to gather curricular content and find tools and strategies for instruction. This utilization of social media, while not surprising, is critically important to acknowledge and explore further, as such ad hoc curricular content may reside outside the context of current research and established best practices.

Methodological and Theoretical Orientations

This review examines current literature that has centered the use of social media by teachers and other educators and particularly focused on Pinterest as a digital platform. Considering its wide use in educational spaces, scholarship in this area has been surprisingly limited. Popular media reporting on current trends have produced myriad blogs, thought pieces, and news

articles regarding teachers' engagement with Pinterest; however, it is only in the last few years that significant investigations of Pinterest in education have emerged in academic scholarship (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2016; Gallagher et al., 2019; Pittard, 2016; Rodriguez et al., 2020; Schroeder et al., 2019). A sample of these works, selected for their relevance and notable impact factor as identified through citations and peer-reviewed journals, is explored in this review.

Drawing on sociocultural frameworks that consider realities to be constructed through a host of social, cultural, political, and economic factors (Gee, 2010), this review engages a critical literacies lens that centers the interrogation of power, ideology, and race within phenomena (Lankshear & McLaren, 1993; Luke, 2012). Accordingly, in this review I consider who uses Pinterest, who benefits, and to what end. Simultaneously, the invisible and marginalized voices are recognized and amplified.

Critical Issues and Potential Pitfalls

Though the term "digital natives" (Prensky, 2001) has been used almost exclusively in reference to children, the first generations of digital technology users have now reached an age at which they have entered the workforce (Lei, 2009). A great number of preservice and novice teachers who are familiar with various technologies are entering classrooms, eager to integrate them into their professional lives. However, as with many other Internet resources for which authorship, accuracy, and efficacy are not readily verifiable, caution should be taken when procuring materials online. Considering the widespread utilization of Pinterest and other social media sites as sources of curricular material, I highlight critical issues raised in recent scholarship and their implications for practice.

"Pinterest Curriculum"

At its core, Pinterest indexes images, thus prioritizing visual content. Under the education category on the Pinterest homepage, it is easy to see how this impacts what is shared and circulated among teachers, as users click on the images they find interesting and save them by repinning them onto their personal boards. In her exploration of the site from a

teacher's perspective, Pittard (2016) found three general pin categories: classroom décor, curricular materials, and inspirational or humorous quotes about teaching. The abundance of pins appealing to décor included content such as thematic bulletin boards, organizational ideas, crafts, and displays. This dependence on maintaining the visual aesthetic of classrooms has been criticized by some scholars as "shallow" (Hertel & Wessman-Enzinger, 2017) and devoid of academic value (Huber & Bates, 2016), and teachers, intentionally or unintentionally, may prioritize "cuteness" over other factors (Schroeder et al., 2019).

Curricular materials have proliferated as well and include lesson plans, writing prompts, anchor charts, and more. Pittard (2016) described a relatively recent profusion of materials that fill a gap for teachers who are expected to teach CCSS curriculum but are not provided instructional materials. Consequently, trending curricular pins include instructional materials such as standard-specific task cards, skill-based worksheets, and word problems. While this type of content is undeniably useful and desperately needed by overwhelmed teachers, some scholars have warned that a "Pinterest curriculum" may suffer from a lack of coherence and continuity (Greene, 2016; Schroeder et al., 2019). After all, it is more difficult and time-consuming to sift through content that cannot be captured within a single image or video, for example, instructional models or year-long plans. Consequently, key curricular content is lost or deprioritized when a holistic approach or curriculum is replaced with discrete activities and lessons.

Along with the increased potential for ideas, lessons, and projects to be taken out of their original

for bad ideas disguised as 'cute' lesson plans" (p. 217). Educators sharing these concerns have begun to circulate the hashtag #PinterestIsNotPedagogy to bring attention to the need for more critical literacy when using the platform.

Demographic Implications

While the educational content that permeates Pinterest has been a key point of study in the literature, the question of *who* creates and uses Pinterest has been less explored. The demographics paint a picture of the average user that differs significantly from the makeup of many cities and schools (Rainie et al., 2012; Geysler, 2021). It is a female-dominated site; as recently as January 2021, 77.1% of users were women (Geysler, 2021), with the majority between the ages of 18 and 49, affluent, and White; the site also attracts women with a higher education (Geysler, 2021). That Pinterest attracts this subgroup is not problematic in itself, but it becomes a concern when placed in the context of the site's tremendous popularity in educational domains.

One critical issue is what Pittard (2016) described as the neoliberal gendering of education, in which an overwhelmingly White, female workforce operates to (re)produce discourses of "good" and "bad" teaching. This gendered imbalance is exacerbated by the system set up through Pinterest, in which search results link to items for purchase and women teachers engage in a cycle of buying and selling in addition to their teaching responsibilities. Importantly, Pittard pointed out that while the discourses of empowerment and choice are associated with the production and sale of curricular materials on sites such as Pinterest, often in day-to-day life, such discourses may narrow

If [the] average pinner does not reflect the racial or cultural diversity in schools, it is inevitable that a host of voices and experiences is made invisible in the curriculum enacted within classroom walls.

context, scholars have also found that curricular content found on Pinterest may be inaccurate or problematic (Gallagher et al., 2019; Hertel & Wessman-Enzinger, 2017). Gallagher et al. (2019) contended that "with no editorial board, vetting process, or quality control, [sites such as Pinterest] can act as turbocharged conduits

the choices available to women as they perpetuate the making and remaking of what counts as good teaching. Simultaneously, those teachers who do not fit this mold (or cannot afford to purchase it) may be marginalized.

The racial subjectivities implicit in such teaching and schooling narratives cannot be ignored.

As Gustafson (2019) noted, curriculum is not just about what is taught but also “who chooses what knowledge is taught” (para. 4). Considering the American teaching force is overwhelmingly White and female, a racial divide exists inside and outside of Pinterest (Shelton & Archambault, 2019). Thus, interrogating the role of race and racism in this digital platform is worthwhile. If what is assumed as “good teaching,” or the average pinner, does not reflect the racial or cultural diversity in schools, it is inevitable that a host of voices and experiences is made invisible in the curriculum enacted within classroom walls. This point is emphasized by Rodriguez et al. (2020), who analyzed preservice teachers’ reflections on curricular content on Pinterest and found that “both Pinterest and Teachers Pay Teachers direct users to resources that reproduce the color-evasive ideologies of racial capitalism” (p. 516). Consequently, the racialization of Pinterest must be understood as not merely a lack of voices but a mechanism for (re)producing dominant ideologies that actively harm non-White individuals and communities.

The Business of Teaching

Another issue that clouds the rise of Pinterest in the education realm lies in its social-communication origins. Pinterest is a networking and marketing tool. Individuals can connect to an immense system of global users through the sharing of information, and they are able to pursue personal motives in a professional domain. However, that these users include a vast and growing number of education-related businesses and organizations that promote their own content must be acknowledged. As Rodriguez et al. (2020) noted, “[TpT and Pinterest] exist not to foster curricular conversation, but to commercialize it” (p. 502). These groups, which range from publishing corporations to state education departments to small, independent LLCs, have their own agendas in promoting educational content that may or may not reflect the mission statements, goals, or needs of individual schools and districts. Moreover, a growing number of privatized groups, controlled by major corporations and media giants and driven by economic capital, have appeared disguised as educational and child development experts (Hade & Edmondson, 2003).

In tandem with the propagation of Pinterest in schools is the phenomenon of pinners promoting and selling their own content, often through online marketplaces such as TpT, and using Pinterest to boost traffic to their personal sites. These “teacherpreneurs” (Joelle, 2019) have been publicized as so profitable that many leave the classroom altogether to pursue their Pinterest and TpT work full-time (Joelle, 2019). While their success is enviable, the increasingly blurry line between teachers and businesses is worrisome, as these teacher influencers increasingly accept sponsorships and paid advertisements, often without clearly disclosing such partnerships (Davis & Yi, in press; Reinstein, 2018). These factors create a troubling combination in the purview of current curriculum and professional development.

Because there is no moderation of content, whether by experts in the field or guidelines created by professional organizations, what *looks* good is made and sold in droves. Whether it also does good is another question. Stein (as cited in Pondiscio, 2016) noted that within the domain of instructional design, the trajectory of curriculum is iterative, as instructional materials are developed, field tested, and modified before being used with students in classrooms. Bypassing such developmental processes for curriculum not only devalues those with the training and credentials to thoughtfully create materials but may also result in poor outcomes for students, who become unknowing test subjects in the field. As the purchase of curricular materials is contemplated, it is necessary to confront, in the words of Rodriguez et al. (2020), the elephant in the room: “What qualifies *you* to make this?” (p. 518). Within this digital domain, it is difficult to evaluate the motives and goals of online users, and it cannot be assumed that education-related pins are grounded in research or sound practice.

Suggestions for Teachers

Despite this literature review’s focus on the potential pitfalls of curating curriculum on Pinterest and other social media platforms, I do not pronounce that Pinterest is a poor tool or that it offers little to the field. Its explosive growth and near ubiquity in schools demonstrate its usefulness and popularity

with novice and veteran teachers alike who have long felt alienated in the field or underprepared to address the shifting sand of educational standards and expectations. Indeed, the sheer number of educators who use Pinterest indicate the platform's potential as a teaching resource as well as a marketing, business, and communication tool. Rather, I echo the growing number of scholars who have called for the use of Pinterest for educational purposes to be tempered with reflexivity and criticality (Gallagher et al., 2019; Rodriguez et al., 2020; Schroeder et al., 2019; Shelton & Archambault, 2019).

In light of the concerns laid out in this review, I offer suggestions for teachers to consider as they engage with Pinterest and other social media platforms:

1. Several scholars have created tools to help teachers critically evaluate instructional materials on Pinterest and TpT. Archambault et al. (2021) have provided a "Responsible Teachers-Buyer's Guide," (available for free download at <https://bit.ly/TeachersBuyersGuide>) which provides guidance for vetting sellers and critiquing resources. Gallagher et al. (2019) have constructed a "Pinning with Pause" checklist to help teachers assess reliability, purpose, and perspective in instructional materials. This checklist has been further amended by Rodriguez et al. (2020) to encourage more user dialogue and conversation among teachers, the purpose of which is recentering the focus of curriculum from the digital platform back to the specific needs of the learning community in question. Such resources may be enormously helpful for teachers, particularly because they provide explicit guidance in navigating a vast amount of education-related content.
2. Teachers must be purposeful about diversifying the pinners and boards they follow to interrupt and combat the "non-neutrality" (Rodriguez et al., 2020), or racialized and gendered mechanisms, driving the site. Archambault et al. (2021) recommended teachers "proactively seek out materials that have been created by teachers of color who explicitly call attention to the perspectives they've featured" (para. 14). Not only would such efforts likely result in more culturally authentic materials but could also

boost the visibility of BIPOC teachers and pinners on the platform.

3. Considering Pittard's (2016) warning about the association of "good teaching" with the perpetual labor and monetization of women's work, a prudent step would be for teachers to continually reflect on their own understandings of teaching excellence and "big picture" resolutions. Reflexive praxis holds the possibility of restoration and change, even in digital territories.
4. Finally, it is critical that teachers situate curricular content curated from Pinterest within the context of more cohesive curricula. Though much of the educational landscape has moved online, it is the case that excellent and expertly developed curricular material is available and appeal to a wide variety of student and classroom needs. To completely bypass such resources compromises the integrity of current research, but to supplement them with specific materials derived from sites such as Pinterest may be a boon.

Looking Ahead

Even among other forms of social media, Pinterest's evolution is remarkable. In just over a decade, it has engaged hundreds of millions worldwide and found niche purposes in a multitude of domains, and the substantial impact it is having in the field of education and on the landscape of curriculum must not be ignored. In particular, further research is needed to analyze content-specific curriculum on these sites, the continued intertwining of neoliberalism and teaching, and racial inequities in social media-derived curriculum. In addition, more empirical work with teachers and students who engage with these forms of curriculum is desperately needed. As fast-changing digital platforms come to be embraced by educators, collective attention must remain focused on curricular needs to bridge practice and theory.

References

- Alismail, H. A., & McGuire, P. (2015). 21st century standards and curriculum: Current research and practice. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(6), 150–154.

- Archambault, L., Shelton, C., & Harris, L. M. (2021). Teachers beware and vet with care: Online educational marketplaces. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 102(8), 40–44.
- Carpenter, J., Abrams, A., & Dunphy, M. (2016, March). Educators' professional uses of Pinterest. In G. Chamblee & L. Langub (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 1925–1930). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Carpenter, J., Cassaday, A. & Monti, S. (2018). Exploring how and why educators use Pinterest. In E. Langran & J. Borup (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 2222–2229). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Chugh, R., & Ruhi, U. (2018). Social media in higher education: A literature review of Facebook. *Education and Information Technologies*, 23(2), 605–616.
- Cummings, M. (2015, April 2). There's a big hole in how teachers build skills, and Pinterest is helping fill it. *Slate*. <https://slate.com/human-interest/2015/04/pinterest-and-teachers-how-the-site-is-filling-a-gap-in-teacher-training.html>
- Davis, S., & Yi, J. (In press). Double tap, double trouble: Teachers, Instagram, pedagogy, and profit. *E-learning and digital media*.
- Gabriel, R. (2018). Preparing literacy professionals: The case of dyslexia. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 50(2), 262–270.
- Gallagher, J. L., Swalwell, K. M., & Bellows, M. E. (2019). "Pinning" with pause: Supporting teachers' critical consumption on sites of curriculum sharing. *Social Education*, 83(4), 217–224.
- Gao, F., Luo, T., & Zhang, K. (2012). Tweeting for learning: A critical analysis of research on microblogging in education published in 2008–2011. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43(5), 783–801.
- Gee, J. P. (2010). A situated-sociocultural approach to literacy and technology. *The new literacies: Multiple perspectives on research and practice*, 165–193.
- Geyser, W. (2021, May 13). 26 mind-blowing Pinterest stats for 2021. *Influencer MarketingHub*. <https://influencermarketinghub.com/pinterest-stats/>
- Greene, K. (2016). For sale: Your lesson plans. *Educational Leadership*, 74(2), 28–33.
- Gustafson, J. (2019, June 26). On curriculum: How Pinterest and TpT exacerbate inequity. *Peers and Pedagogy*. <http://achievethecore.org/peersandpedagogy/curriculum-pinterest-tpt-exacerbate-inequity/>
- Hade, D., & Edmondson, J. (2003). Children's book publishing in neoliberal times. *Language Arts*, 81(2), 135–143.
- Hertel, J. T., & Wessman-Enzinger, N. M. (2017). Examining Pinterest as a curriculum resource for negative integers: An initial investigation. *Education Sciences*, 7(2), 45.
- Hew, K. F. (2011). Students' and teachers' use of Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(2), 662–676.
- Huber, R., & Bates, C. C. (2016). Are you (P)interested in 21st century teaching and learning? *YC Young Children*, 71(3), 25–29.
- Irwin, C., Ball, L., Desbrow, B., & Leveritt, M. (2012). Students' perceptions of using Facebook as an interactive learning resource at university. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(7), 1221–1232.
- Joelle, M. (2019, July 1). Meet the teacherpreneurs of Pinterest. *Pinterest for Business*. <https://newsroom.pinterest.com/en/post/teacherpreneurs>
- Johnston, V. (2019). Dyslexia: What reading teachers need to know. *The Reading Teacher*, 73(3), 339–346.
- Lankshear, C., & McLaren, P. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Critical literacy: Politics, praxis, and the postmodern*. SUNY Press.
- Lei, J. (2007). Digital natives as preservice teachers: What technology preparation is needed? *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 25(3), 87–97.
- Luke, A. (2012). Critical literacy: Foundational notes. *Theory Into Practice*, 51(1), 4–11.
- Manca, S., & Ranieri, M. (2013). Is it a tool suitable for learning? A critical review of the literature on Facebook as a technology-enhanced learning environment. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 29(6), 487–504.

- McCloud, S. (2019). Pinterest advertising: Target educators where they are. *MDR*. <https://mdreducation.com/2019/03/25/pinterest-advertising-target-educators/>
- Opfer, V. D., Kaufman, J. H., & Thompson, L. E. (2017). Implementation of K–12 state standards for mathematics and English language arts and literacy: Findings from the American teacher panel. *RAND Corporation*. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1529-1.html
- Pittard, E. A. (2016). Gettin' a little crafty: Teachers Pay Teachers©, Pinterest© and neo-liberalism in new materialist feminist research. *Gender and Education*, 29(1), 28–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1197380>
- Pondiscio, R. (2016, May 6). Education's dirty little secret. *U.S. News & World Report*. <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2016-05-06/why-teachers-rely-on-google-and-pinterest-for-course-materials>
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants: Part 1. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6.
- Rainie, L., Brenner, J., & Purcell, K. (2012, September 13). Photos and videos as social currency online. *Pew Internet & American Life Project*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2012/09/13/photos-and-videos-as-social-currency-online/>
- Reinstein, J. (2018, August 31). Teachers are moonlighting as Instagram influencers to make ends meet. *Buzzfeed News*. <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/juliareinstein/teachers-instagram-influencers-school-tpt-pinterest>
- Rodríguez, N., Brown, M., & Vickery, A. (2020). Pining for profit? Examining elementary preservice teachers' critical analysis of online social studies resources about Black history. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 20(3).
- Schroeder, S., Curcio, R., & Lundgren, L. (2019). Expanding the learning network: How teachers use Pinterest. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 51(2), 166–186.
- Sehl, K. (2021, Mar 25). 23 Pinterest statistics that matter to marketers in 2021. *Hootsuite*. <https://blog.hootsuite.com/pinterest-statistics-for-business/>
- Semiocast. (2013). *Geolocation and activity analysis of Pinterest accounts* [Graph illustrations of Pinterest activity July 10, 2013]. http://semiocast.com/en/publications/2013_07_10_Pinterest_has_70_million_users
- Shelton, C. C., & Archambault, L. M. (2019). Who are online teacherpreneurs and what do they do? A survey of content creators on TeachersPayTeachers.com. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 51(4), 398–414.
- Smith, R. (2018, November 29). What is a Pinterest repin and how do I optimize for them? *WPTasty*. <https://www.wptasty.com/blog/pinterest-repins>
- Srinivasan, M. (2013, August 13). *Say hello to teachers on Pinterest* [Weblog]. <http://blog.pinterest.com/post/58175180377/say-hello-to-teachers-on-pinterest>
- Tang, Y., & Hew, K. F. (2017). Using Twitter for education: Beneficial or simply a waste of time? *Computers & Education*, 106, 97–118.
- Veletsianos, G. (2012). Higher education scholars' participation and practices on Twitter. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 28(4), 336–349.
- Wallender, J. (2014). The Common Core State Standards in American public education: Historical underpinnings and justifications. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 80(4).

Culturally Relevant and Culturally Sustaining Practices in English Language Arts Classrooms

Melina Lesus

Historically, the classroom is a site where dominant cultural norms that center whiteness are taught and reinforced, in particular where “the racial violence that unfolds in various communities seeps into English Language Arts (ELA) classrooms” (Johnson, et al., 2017). This is to the detriment of BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color) students who are too often pathologized for enacting their own cultural norms, rather than assimilating to whiteness (Baker-Bell, 2019). Indeed, even informal interactions, such as mundane conversations, are more likely to be policed in an ELA classroom where “the ‘appropriate’ way to speak (and behave) in academic and professional settings aligns with the practices of white, middle class speakers” (Seltzer, 2019, p.147). Reviewing the literature on how instruction in ELA classrooms is relevant to, and sustaining of, students’ cultures, then, has important implications for practitioners and how we can work towards making our classrooms sites where students are free to learn in the comfort of their own skin.

Theoretical Framing

In order to examine ELA classrooms in relation to students’ cultures, this review will frame them through the lenses of Culturally Relevant Pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies (Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014; Ladson-Billings, 2014), which both center the ways in which teachers relate to their students. The ways that we teach matter, and if we, as teachers, view our classrooms through these lenses we are much more likely to create spaces that are humanizing and just, especially for our BIPOC students.

The findings that led to the conceptualization of Culturally Relevant Pedagogies (CRP) began with Ladson-Billings’ (1995a) desire to theorize around the successful teaching of African American students. Her eventual theory was based in field observations of teachers who she recognized as uncharacteristically successful in advancing their African American students academically. In order to truly understand what was going on in these classrooms and how these teachers were able to facilitate their students’ successes, Ladson-Billings (1995b) engaged in “a paradigmatic shift toward looking in the classrooms of excellent teachers, *through* the reality of those teachers” (p. 472).

As a result of this work, Ladson-Billings (1995a) was able to isolate and tangibly identify some criteria of culturally relevant pedagogy: “an ability to develop students academically, a willingness to nurture and support cultural competence, and the development of a sociopolitical or critical consciousness” (p. 160). While this concrete identification is surely a breath of fresh air to practitioner-readers, Ladson-Billings is careful to point out that engaging in culturally relevant pedagogy cannot be reduced to simply ticking off a checklist. To that end, Ladson-Billings (1995b) proposed that focusing exclusively on student outcomes is limiting progress. Instead, focus should be on implementing

Melina Lesus is a National Board Certified ELA teacher who has served the public school students of Chicago for 13 years. She is a doctoral candidate in the University of Illinois at Chicago’s Language, Literacy & Culture program researching teacher professional development and culturally sustaining literacy practices in secondary settings.

instructional practices that allow students “to accept and affirm their cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequities that schools (and other institutions) perpetuate” (p. 496). A teacher who adopts this as a model for their instructional practice will be enacting CRP.

Not surprisingly, Ladson-Billings’ works around CRP have become germinal texts in education. Paris (2012) was inspired and sought to extend the work of Ladson-Billings, which he acknowledges often:

“Recently, however, I have begun to question if the terms ‘relevant’ and ‘responsive’ are really descriptive of much of the teaching and research founded upon them, and, more importantly, if they go far enough in their orientation to the languages and literacies and other cultural practices of communities marginalized by systemic inequalities to ensure the valuing and maintenance of our multiethnic and multilingual society” (p. 93).

The questions were and are appropriate because, as Paris (2012) points out, since 1995 the country has evolved to be increasingly more multicultural in many multi-faceted ways. In making the transition from a pedagogy that is relevant to a single group to one that is sustaining to more and varied cultures, Paris writes of the requirement to “support young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of their communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant and cultural competence.” (p. 94) In other words, this requires a shift from the past in that the end goal is not seeking to erase students’ home cultures in favor of mainstream norms. Instead, BIPOC students should be learning about and using their cultural competencies even as they are gaining access to mainstream literacies, such as historically valued dialects of English.

Paris (2012) acknowledges research that embodies CSP well before he introduced the term. He is also quick to acknowledge that CSP is not a cure-all and that it still needs to be refined and problematized in order to truly carry out the work that is intended (Paris, 2012). For example, Paris and Alim (2014) offered up three “loving critiques” of past scholarship, including their own, acknowledging that “we are implicated in all three of our loving critiques, as some of our own

research and teaching has uncritically taken up and built on previous notions of asset pedagogies, has at times reified traditional relationships between race/ethnicity and cultural practice, and has not directly and generatively enough taken up problematic elements of youth culture” (p. 86). Paris and Alim (2014) acknowledge that much of the previous cultural work in education has focused on language practices, or heritage or traditional practices of BIPOC students. This is problematic as it becomes an oversimplification that has the potential to create a roadblock for truly studying and utilizing the multifaceted ways that BIPOC students can and do use their cultural practices in the classroom. Paris and Alim (2014) reiterate throughout their piece that CSP “must be open to sustaining [languages and cultures] in both the traditional and evolving ways they are lived and used by young people” (p. 91).

Ladson-Billings (2014) weighed in on CSP. In 2014 she was a part of a symposium with Paris and Alim, and published a reflective article in regards to CRP and its relationship to CSP. Her opinion can be inferred from the title of the article, *Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0 a.k.a. the Remix*. She writes, “Scholarship, like culture, is fluid, and the title of this essay, ‘Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. the Remix,’ is intended to reflect this fluidity. The notion of a remix means that there was an original version and that there may be more versions to come, taking previously developed ideas and synthesizing them to create new and exciting forms.” (Ladson-Billings, 2014, p.76). She fully sanctions Paris and Alim as they nudge teachers not only to create relevant curriculum, but to create an environment that truly sustains their students. In a sense, CSP drives at and furthers the third tenet of CRP – developing a sociopolitical or critical consciousness – that is often forgotten (Olson & Rao, 2016).

Though even the “newer” conceptualization of CSP is now nearly a decade old, the work continues to matter. Indeed, these pedagogies are central to new frameworks that are practitioner-friendly such as The Historically Responsive Literacy Framework (Muhammad, 2020) and The Textured Teaching Framework (Germán, 2021). As a practitioner, I can attest to the fact that only within the past couple of years has CRP become something of a norm in

conversations among teachers at my school and at district-level professional developments and meetings I attend; CSP, then, is still not something that many mainstream practitioners are familiar with. Currently, parent and administrative scrutiny of text selections and a growing debate over Critical Race Theory is playing out across the country. In light of this, as well as unprecedented shifts in education due to the COVID-19 pandemic, prescribed curricula are re-emerging in more and more schools. If we are looking at the ways we teach through the lenses of CRP and CSP, ELA teachers can contend with these current contextual obstacles and see that:

“A prescribed text list is not an unassailable constraint for teachers who strive to privilege students’ needs and ways of knowing. Teachers can encourage students to be critical consumers of texts, and make space for interpretations that grow from students’ multiple identities—including their cultural groups. Every text teachers present is an opportunity for students to question, relate, criticize, and debate. And all students deserve the opportunity to analyze literature in a manner that allows them to seek to understand their identities, and how those identities will affect their exchanges with others” (Ervin, 2021).

Purpose

Reviewing the ways that ELA educators are enacting CRP and CSP in their classrooms can provide a guide for teachers by using the work of Ladson-Billings (1995a, 1995b, 2014) and Paris & Alim (2014) to provide tangible implications.

ELA teachers, in particular, have a responsibility to enact CSP because, unfortunately, “[t]he teaching of English Language Arts can be, at its worst an enforcement of Whiteness, a staunch insistence that all

students comply and bend their affiliations to a culture not their own” (Bomer, 2017, p.12).

Methodology

This literature review seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How are both culturally relevant and culturally sustaining pedagogy models already being used in ELA classrooms?
2. What are the implications of the literature on changes that ELA teachers can make in order to make their classroom culturally relevant and/or culturally sustaining?

In order to locate articles relevant to this literature review, I utilized EBSCOhost, an online reference system that allows researchers to search various databases at once. Using EBSCOhost, I searched the following databases: Academic Search Complete, Education Research Complete, and ERIC. Combined these databases search more than 10,000 periodicals and journals.

EBSCOhost allows a Boolean search simultaneously across databases. I began by searching the terms “Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy” and “English Language Arts” and “High School.” This search proved too narrow as it only yielded two results. Omitting “High School” only yielded one additional result. Variations of “Literature,” “Writing,” and “Text Selection” were substituted for “English Language Arts” with and without the third term, “High School.” Still the results were quite narrow. The articles cited in this paper come from the results of the Boolean search, and from the reference pages of those articles as the search results were less than bountiful. Additionally, several of the chapters from the anthology entitled *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*, co-edited by Paris & Alim, are included in this review.

Though even the “newer” conceptualization of CSP is now nearly a decade old, the work continues to matter. [...] As a practitioner, I can attest to the fact that only within the past couple of years has CRP become something of a norm in conversations among teachers at my school and at district-level professional developments and meetings I attend; CSP, then, is still not something that many mainstream practitioners are familiar with.

Practitioners in their Classrooms

This section will focus on how ELA practitioners use CSP in their classrooms. Because the purpose of this literature review is to provide implications for practitioners, showcasing CRP practices is appropriate and useful. Similarly, shortcomings can teach practitioners just as well as exemplary practices can, so a range of experiences with CRP and CSP will be represented. Although some of the examples given may seem shallow, generic, or too vague, they are meant to begin a line of thinking that a practitioner could personalize to their own students, as would be necessary in moving towards a culturally sustaining classroom. Implications will be written in the third person plural as I am an ELA teacher also learning from the literature to better serve my own students.

ELA is a content area that is not necessarily well-defined (Bailey & Bizarro, 2017; Fisher, 2018) and so looking at findings in terms of three subsections of ELA: reading or literature instruction, writing instruction, and language ideologies can help to define it. These categorizations are also in line with how practitioners may be familiar with thinking about the field because education standards often fall into the categories of reading, writing, and speaking/listening. Despite the discrete categorizations offered by the Common Core, these areas are inextricably linked and do not have finite boundaries. For example, focusing only on reading or literature instruction would discount that a significant amount of writing instruction has to do with assignments that are based in literature, and the very ways in which we speak and *allow* students to speak in the classroom set the tone for the literature instruction that is taking place and so it is important for practitioners to think about and see examples from all of these aspects of the ELA classroom.

Speaking: Findings

While it may be common or easy to think of how to enact CSP for “minority” students who make up the majority of U.S. public school classrooms, other factors, such as immigration status, should also be taken into account. Lee and Walsh (2017) feature a network of schools that specifically serve students who

have recently immigrated to the United States. They observed that in addition to being presented with a rigorous curriculum with social justice materials serving as content, students were encouraged to retain the cultural identities of their homelands and incorporate them into their academic endeavors (Lee & Walsh, 2017). It was not uncommon for students to speak in their native languages in the hallways and they would even be asked to write key concepts on the board in these languages. The result was student ownership and huge strides towards, “[e]quipping immigrant youth with accurate historical knowledge and critical lenses with which to analyze current events and their reporting by the conservative and liberal media...” (Lee & Walsh, 2017, p. 256).

Of course, being truly consistent in valuing all the languages that students bring into the classroom with them can be difficult. Metz (2018) designed a study in which he spent time in five different ELA classrooms of practitioners who each expressed explicit goals about approaching language in a way that is asset-based for their students who speak dialects other than Standard American English (SAE). Even so, only one of the five teachers was consistent in rejecting SAE as *better than* other dialects of English after an average of almost 11 hours in each teacher’s classroom (Metz, 2018). In one instance a teacher admonished a student who asked if they should be “correcting” the excerpts written in Southern U.S. dialect used by African American characters, only to ask students how they “fixed” these same excerpts later in the same lesson (Metz, 2018, p. 470). He also found that, although these teachers were selected for the study based on the high importance they placed on language and honoring student language, they only spent between 3.1% and 13.5% of the observed lessons teaching and talking about language variation (Metz, 2018, p. 464). Unintentionally and unknowingly these teachers are perpetuating the “inescapable agenda in traditional English Language Arts [classrooms] to replace students’ language patterns, aesthetic tastes, literacy practices, and composing practices with those of a dominating culture (Bomer, 2017, p.12).

Speaking: Implications

Simply put, ELA teachers should be setting up their classrooms as places where SAE is one dialect that is available to students along with the various dialects in which they are already fluent. While students, especially those who are English Language Learners, may have experienced “English-only” biases in their lives, the English classroom should be a refuge where students are fostered to become better communicators by making effective choices that can include choosing not to use SAE. We may not realize that we are susceptible to the societal indoctrination that SAE is “correct,” implying that other dialects are “incorrect” and therefore “less than,” but we must be conscious of how we speak about language at all times so that we do not present microaggressions as truths in our classrooms.

The ways we speak, our languages, are entwined with our identities, with who we are. If teachers can find ways for students’ languages to be celebrated in classroom settings, it will be one more step towards ending the barrage of “metaphorical bullets” that Johnson, et al. (2017) warn us that “educators can intentionally and unintentionally shoot” (p.61). “Correcting” students’ languages in an effort to steer them towards SAE should be seen as “shots fired” and we should not only permit students to speak in their own languages when inside the classroom, but even when they are being assessed in speaking and listening skills, such as during Socratic seminars and other speaking-based assessments. Our criteria should focus on communication and the expression of ideas during oral assessments and not on grammar and conventions. This paradigm-shift can affirm a very important truth that is often negated in ELA classrooms: that the languages students bring to classrooms are expressive, beautiful, and worthy of being valued in academic spaces.

Writing: Findings

Writing cannot be separated from spoken language, or as Woodard, Vaughan, and Machado (2017) put it, “We take the stance that reading, writing, and talk are intimately connected in the writing curriculum...” (p.216). Similar to Metz, Woodard et al. were interested in language, though their focus was on how writing

teachers “(1) made space for explicit discussions of language, culture and power in the writing curriculum and (2) problematized dominant culture” (p. 216). They found that teachers enacted various strategies during their writing instruction that were culturally relevant and began moving toward the spectrum towards becoming culturally sustaining. They identified the following strategies: fostering metalinguistic awareness, encouraging linguistic plurality, acknowledging that language is not neutral, valuing communication over performance of Dominant American English, using texts by authors of students’ cultural background, use of nontraditional texts, recognizing nondominant forms of cultural capital, and pushing back on official curricula (Woodard et al., 2017, pp. 221-222).

These strategies can be seen in different ways in different classrooms. For example, Machado, Vaughan, Coppola, & Woodard (2017) document a Chicago teacher who designed a poetry unit based in the tradition of spoken word or slam poetry. By modeling the poetry unit in the tradition of out-of-school spaces, in this case slam poetry teams, students were more likely to be centered since the norms of slam poetry typically include students writing and feedback on self-selected topics. The teacher positioned urban student poets alongside the likes of Carl Sandburg and William Carlos Williams as mentor poets that students could look to as they created their own poems (Machado et al., 2017). He also used a documentary as an anchor text for the unit that featured student-poets from Chicago and the surrounding suburbs. In doing so, he reinforced the idea of student expertise and placed value in youth culture. A spoken word unit also drew upon “cultural and linguistic capital” that schools do not typically value (Machado, et al., 2017, p. 379).

Similarly, Johnson and Eubanks (2015) analyze a writing assignment, the “anthem essay” in a “summer bridge” program that “attempts to interrupt traditional writing assignments, illuminate student choice and voice, and celebrate the cultural and linguistic diversity within the classroom” (Johnson & Eubanks, 2015). In preparing to write the essay, students analyzed anthems, including The Star-Spangled Banner and, similar to the poetry slam unit, popular songs. Because the instructor designed the lesson and the classroom

in a culturally relevant way, students felt comfortable critiquing the National Anthem and deciding if songs that they are likely to have heard fall into the same category as anthems.

The importance of centering often devalued texts, such as popular songs and student-created poetry, can be seen in Paris & Alim's anthology of practitioner's experiences with CSP. Kinloch (2017), for example, centers her work around student identity-as-writer throughout her work in two Midwest high schools. Kinloch (2017) presented the cases of two students who enacted *performances of resistance* as responses to feelings of alienation and disillusionment in a school system that does not value them as African American students. Although in different ways, both students expressed to Kinloch that they simply were not writers. By meeting with the students individually and allowing them to celebrate aspects of their writing rather than simply judging the writing and pointing out any deficits, Kinloch helped to create a space where students were less resistant to writing than in their previous academic experiences. A key element that facilitated this process was the emergence of a personal narrative that included potential for success with writing and that was valued, even if it contained traditionally undervalued characteristics, such as the use of a dialect other than SAE.

In addition to valuing the various dialects that students code-switch between as they fulfill their various responsibilities, teachers must recognize and leverage the fact that modern students are digital natives and are often literate in digital tools that are not valued in school settings. Haddix and Sealy-Ruiz (2012) advocate for the use of "composing processes using digital and online tools, literacies that were ever present in the everyday, out-of-school lives of these... students" (p. 189). They argue against the notion that allowing students to use such tools would "dumb-down" curriculum. On the contrary, valuing this literacy that students are comfortable with empowers them and sustains an aspect of their culture that is often criminalized in school settings, as evidenced when students are punished for texting their friends when that display of literacy practice should be leveraged as a tool that students can bring to their writing (Haddix &

Sealey-Ruiz, 2012, pp.190-191).

Implications

Woodard et al. (2017) identified key strategies for reading, writing, and speaking/listening that can be enacted in culturally relevant and culturally sustaining ways. This list of strategies and the subsequent examples, though immensely useful, cannot be treated as a checklist, though. Instead teachers should use them as inspiration when personalizing the curriculum for the students who are in front of them on a daily basis. For example, a use of a non-traditional text such as a particular song cannot be used year after year with different students, or even at different schools with different student bodies. Instead, it is up to us, the teachers, to find different songs or even to choose a different form of a non-traditional text from year to year. Machado et al. (2017), show that instructors should design writing tasks that allow for students to use linguistic and cultural repertoires that they possess expertise in to be valued in a classroom setting. Including mentor texts that are written by peers is another way to value student expertise. Johnson and Eubanks (2015) illustrate how texts found in students' cultures, such as popular songs, should not be dismissed as unworthy of analysis. Furthermore, students are given opportunities to discuss their ideas before writing, even if those ideas may contrast with societal expectations.

Another way to value what students bring to the classroom is to allow their own personal narratives to emerge and to value those narratives even if certain aspects of them are not traditionally celebrated in schools. This is what Kinloch (2017) did in her ethnographic study of student's self-identity as writers. We must remember that our BIPOC students enter high school potentially having been told in so many ways that some aspects of their identities are not "right." This can include the way they carry themselves as Kinloch (2017) found, or even the ways that they communicate and write outside of school (Haddix and Sealy-Ruiz, 2012). Affirming those very same aspects in something as sacred as their writing, has the potential to make huge strides towards affirming and sustaining their cultures in an arena that usually does the opposite.

Introducing students to and not only allowing but encouraging them to use code-meshing (Young, 2009) rather than constantly requiring that they code-switch to SAE as they write their narratives and other assignments is one concrete way that students can see this affirmation. We must not only allow students to tell their own stories in their own language, but also allow them a choice of medium(s) as they do so (Haddix and Sealy-Ruiz, 2012; Woodard et al. 2017).

Literature: Findings

In her Florida classroom, Houchen (2013) enacted CRP when helping her students become more proficient readers through the lens of critical literacy, while also using culture to create community within her classroom. She sought to design her units based on student feedback and make instruction relevant to students' real-world contexts. In terms of text selection, she sought to "move beyond a narrow canon of literature often conceptualized as traditional or standard, and shift the focus into content that students find meaningful and relevant to their lives" (Houchen, 2013, p.96). She designed her first unit around creating culture and cultivating her knowledge-of-student. She used this expertise in the individuals in front of her to inform and personalize subsequent unit planning in a cycle that consisted of, "planning, action, assessment reflection, and re-planning" (Houchen, 2013, p.98). While the formal findings of Houchen's action research were social-emotional in nature, they are based in critical literacy and strategy-based pedagogy enacted with the three tenets of CRP as a foundation.

Wong and Peña (2017) explore a California classroom where the tenet of building critical capacity is at the center of the school's mission. As such, teachers are encouraged to use social justice materials as content in their classrooms as evidenced by the, "inclusion of texts that explore dynamic views of culture and language" (Wong & Peña, 2017, p. 169). The example highlighted was the use of *Zoot Suit*, a play by Luis Valdez, in a predominantly Latinx classroom. Students identified culturally with the characters in the play and also socially as they read with a focus on oppression of people of color. Making sure that students are able to identify with the texts may mean that teachers

will have to look in unlikely places for instructional content. Guerra (2012) explored the reading instruction of perhaps the most at-risk population, incarcerated students. She advocates for the use of "Urban Fiction," though she is sure to point out that she is not necessarily advocating that the whole of the genre should be used in classrooms, but rather that teachers can find titles that merit instructional time in this often overlooked genre (Guerra, 2012). While the teacher did not explicitly use Urban Fiction, the culminating research project allowed students to choose their own reading materials, so they certainly might have sought out undervalued genres. It is worth noting that this opportunity for self-selection led some students to college level material (Wong & Peña, 2017, p. 170).

In the previous example, the teacher set the stage so that students felt comfortable enough to seek out rigorous texts. Rigor is key, as many programs that have a majority of ELL students or remedial students (in which students of color are overrepresented) water down material as a means of helping students to succeed. Gifted students are a population of students who are not often thought of when discussing CRP and CSP, though they should be. Newell (2017) asserts that CRP should be enacted with gifted students because, "[e]xposure to and comprehensive analysis of literature by diverse authors will help prepare [gifted] students for the world they stand to inherit and will open their minds to the faulty systems that work to their advantage" (p. 96). Newell (2017) bravely admits that even as she had the above realization, the subsequent changes she made in her classroom made it culturally *responsive* rather than truly culturally relevant. Still she shares certain triumphs that have definite implications for practice with all populations of students. For example, she incorporated supplementary readings into her curriculum and has committed to making further revisions to her curriculum to include works by "writers, scientists, artists, philosophers, characters, and leaders from a variety of dynamic backgrounds" and "modern thinkers" (Newell, 2017, p. 99). In doing so, she hopes to move toward a social action approach, which would move her further along the spectrum towards CSP.

It is, unfortunately, too often true that teachers are forced into reading canonical texts with their

students. This could be because of required common curriculum or even because those texts are simply what is available and the school does not have the budget to purchase other texts. One British Literature teacher found himself in the position of being forced to teach what is often seen as the epitome of all canonical materials: William Shakespeare. The teacher was chosen as a participant in the study because “his initial interview revealed a sophisticated understanding and application of culturally responsive pedagogy in his canonical literature classroom” (Dyches, 2017, p.305). Though the teacher was frustrated with the curricular requirements imposed upon him, Dyches (2017) observed that he, “buttressed by his dialogic classroom community, [he] delivered a canonical counter-curriculum that cultivated students’ sociopolitical consciousness and provided them with multimodal opportunities to restory themselves into and against required British Literature texts” (p.300).

The teacher discussed here credits the relationships he has formed with his students for his success in enacting CRP even while being forced to teach a curriculum that he disagrees with (p.314). This includes his relationships with the students as well as their relationships with one another. Allowing students to collaborate as they worked to master the content that came along with the canonical texts was essential. Allowing the canonical texts to foreground and lead into discussions about salient issues in student lives was another key. For example, Chaucer’s “The Wife of Bath’s Tale” was paired with an article and led to a discussion about Rape Culture while the poetry of William Blake led to a discussion of child labor and even a subsequent project about sociopolitical movements such as Black Lives Matter. Dyches (2017) notes that, “While British literature was the foundation of these conversations, Sam, like teachers in other restrictive environments (Chapman 2008), subverted his required curriculum by using it to develop students’ sociopolitical consciousness...” (p. 316).

Implications

Houchen (2013) reminds us that knowledge of students is important even with high school students who are nearly adults. Educators cannot plan their

instruction to be relevant and can definitely not sustain a students’ cultures if they know nothing about them. Students are experts in themselves and are often given little or no ethos within the institution of schooling. Allowing them to be themselves can help a teacher not only in choosing relevant texts as Houchen (2013) did, but can also help instructors to relate more traditional texts to students. For example, knowing that a student writes poetry rife with wordplay can most definitely be used in a close reading of Katarina and Petruchio’s first one-on-one interaction in Shakespeare’s *The Taming of the Shrew*, as it is laden with word play such as puns and double entendre. A student can then be challenged to use this interaction as a mentor text for their own poetry. This is one very brief example of reading a canonical or traditional text while still maintaining relevance to students’ lives.

Wong & Peña (2017) show, through one California classroom, that students who are presented with texts that they can identify with on multiple levels will challenge themselves by choosing to read challenging texts that they deem as similarly relevant and genuinely important. It is up to ELA teachers then to design their instruction to include opportunities for students to seek out their own texts. Of course, they should also design a curriculum that includes characters and authors that students can identify with. This does not mean, however, that there is no place for canonical literature at all. Instead, the implication is that it is the job of the ELA teacher to help students to see connections and comradery with characters when it is not as apparent, as seen in Wong & Peña (2017). For example, time should be made when reading *The Great Gatsby* to think about Jay Gatsby’s motivations for becoming *the great Gatsby*. Surely adolescent students can identify with a sense of not belonging, of wanting to recreate oneself and have the ability to, for example, transcend their own socioeconomic class. ELA teachers need to plan for class discussions, as the teacher did in Dyches (2017), and present students with a line of questioning that allows them to see themselves in the books they read even if they deal with a seemingly opposite context.

Canonical plays and poetry were also paired with modern articles and is suggested by many scholars

(eg Muhammad, 2020; Ervin, 2021). Pairing texts is a strategy that can help teachers to make these nuanced connections explicit. This strategy would also help to bring more diverse voices into the classroom as Newell (2017) urges, while not omitting the canon completely. In my own 10th grade classroom, I frame a unit with the anchor text of *Night* by Elie Wiesel with Chimamanda Ngozi Adieche's *The Danger of a Single Story*. As my students and I read the canonical work, we think about how we as Americans have learned about WWII and seek out the stories of perspectives that have been forgotten in history. In this manner we value diverse perspectives as we read the canon. A modern, female African author informs the way we think about American and world history through an unlikely text pairing.

Concluding Thoughts

There is no one right way for ELA teachers to enact CSP in their classrooms, and it certainly cannot be reduced to a checklist. Instead, teachers must trust the expertise of their students and allow them to co-construct the learning taking place. In no way are culturally sustaining practices mutually exclusive to rigorous academic practices; on the contrary in order to be able to critique and change the power structures that work against them, our traditionally underserved BIPOC students need to be presented with a challenging and rigorous curriculum that is authentic to their lives. This in no way implicates the complete removal of, for example, canonical texts or grammar instruction from ELA classrooms. Instead, the impetus is on the teacher to design instruction so that all instruction is relevant to students and used to sustain their cultures.

References

Bailey, C., & Bizzaro, P. (2017). Research in creative writing: Theory into practice. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 52(1), 77-97.

Baker-Bell, A. (2020) Dismantling anti-black linguistic racism in English language arts classrooms: Toward an anti-racist black language pedagogy, *Theory Into Practice*, 59:1, 8-21.

Bomer, R. (2017). What would it mean for English

Language Arts to become more culturally responsive and sustaining? *Voices From the Middle*, 24(3), 11-15.

Dyches, J. (2017). Shaking Off Shakespeare: A White Teacher, Urban Students, and the Mediating Powers of a Canonical Counter-Curriculum. *Urban Review*, 49(2), 300-325.

Ervin, J. (2021). Critically Reading the Canon: Culturally Sustaining Approaches to a Prescribed Literature Curriculum. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 0(0), 1-9.

Fisher, R. (2018). Reconciling disciplinary literacy perspectives with genre-oriented activity theory: Toward a fuller synthesis of traditions. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 54(2), 237-251.

Freire, P., & trans. Ramos, M. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: 50th anniversary edition*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Germán, L. E. (2021). *Textured teaching: A framework for culturally sustaining practices*. Heinemann.

Guerra, S. F. (2012). Using urban fiction to engage at-risk and incarcerated youths in literacy instruction. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 55(5), 385-394.

Haddix, M., & Sealey-Ruiz, Y. (2012). Cultivating Digital and Popular Literacies as Empowering and Emancipatory Acts Among Urban Youth. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 56(3), 189-192.

Houchen, D. (2013). "Stakes Is High": Culturally Relevant Practitioner Inquiry With African American Students Struggling to Pass Secondary Reading Exit Exams. *Urban Education*, 48(1), 92-115.

Johnson, L., Jackson, J., Stovall, D., & Baszile, D. T. (2017). "Loving Blackness to Death": (Re)Imagining ELA Classrooms in a Time of Racial Chaos. *English Journal*, 106(4), 60.

Johnson, L. P., & Eubanks, E. (2015). Anthem or nah? Culturally relevant writing instruction and community. *Voices from the Middle*, 23(2), 31-36.

Kinloch, V. (2017). "You Ain't Making Me Write": Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies and Black Youths' Performances of Resistance. In Paris, D. & Alim, H.S. *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 25-42). Teachers College Press.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But That 's Just Good Teaching ! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159–165.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. the Remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 74–84.
- Lee, S. J., & Walsh, D. (2017). Socially Just, CulturallySustaining Pedagogy for Diverse Immigrant Youth. In Paris, D. & Alim, H.S. *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 191-206). Teachers College Press.
- Machado, E., Vaughan, A., Coppola, R., & Woodard, R. (2017). "Lived life through a colored lens:" Culturally sustaining poetry in an urban literacy classroom. *Language Arts*, 94(6), 367–381.
- Metz, M. (2018). Challenges of Confronting Dominant Language Ideologies in the High School English Classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 52(4), 455–478.
- Muhammad, G.E. (2020). Cultivating genius:An equity framework for culturally and historically responsive teaching. Scholastic Inc.
- Newell, S. (2017). Check Your Privilege. *Gifted Child Today*, 40(2), 96–102.
- Olson, J. D., & Rao, A. B. R. (2016). Becoming a Culturally Responsive Teacher: The Impact of Clinical Experiences in Urban Schools. *Journal of Urban Learning Teaching and Research*, 12, 133–141.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93–97.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What Are We Seeking to Sustain Through Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy? A Loving Critique Forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85–100.
- Seltzer, K. (2019). Performing Ideologies: Fostering Raciolinguistic Literacies Through Role-Play in a High School English Classroom. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 63(2), 147–155.
- Wong, C., & Peña, c. (2017). Policing and Performing Culture: Rethinking "Culture" and the Role of the Arts in Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies. In Paris, D. & Alim, H.S. *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 117-138). Teachers College Press.
- Woodard, R., Vaughan, A., & Machado, E. (2017). Exploring Culturally Sustaining Writing Pedagogy in Urban Classrooms. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 66, 215-231.
- Young, V. (2016). " Nah , We Straight ": An Argument Against Code Switching. *JAC*, 29(1), 49–76.

Pedagogical Reflections on Making and Literacy Development: How to Transform Makerspaces to Cultivate Literacy

Kylie Holcomb

Preface and Framework

At its core, literacy is the ability to communicate an understanding. A multimodal approach to literacy goes beyond the narrow definition of the ability to read and write a text. It encompasses the ability to comprehend and communicate vast sets of knowledge using a multitude of forms of expression. Literacy is both tangible and intangible. Literacy in something *tangible* is the ability to understand and perform a certain skill. For example, singing a song you wrote represents tangible literacies in singing and writing music. We may also have literacy in something *intangible* – in other words, to have a grasp of an idea or a concept. For example, singing a song you wrote about the importance of recycling demonstrates both tangible and intangible concepts: knowledge of sustainability and environmental issues (an intangible literacy) through the tangible literacies of singing and songwriting. Furthermore, in order to demonstrate these literacies, someone has to be listening to the song. Therefore, literacy must also be understood as something that is meant to be shared.

By expanding our understanding of literacy, we can consider every person literate in something, and therefore in possession of something valuable to share with others. In a teaching and learning environment, this understanding breaks down the traditional roles of teacher and student: the teacher as possessor of knowledge and the student as receiver. It allows for a more free flowing exchange of ideas and skills by allowing the individuals to switch between these roles. With this in mind, educators should be as flexible in their methods of teaching literacies as they are with their definition of literacy itself.

We are not simply teaching literacy. We are arming students with the skills to seek out knowledge

through experimentation and to exchange ideas with other knowledgeable individuals. In doing this, they build skills in literacy development that they will use across their lifetime. In order to accomplish this goal, educators should focus on creating a learning environment which encourages the development of literacies. One method of doing so, which I have experienced first hand, is creating learning environments using “maker” and “makerspace” pedagogies. Through my role as an employee of UIC’s Make Good Lab (MGL), a makerspace housed in the College of Education, I have observed and experienced purposefully cultivated learning environments, and have begun to identify traits of these environments which resulted in the successful development of literacies in a multitude of facets for both students and educators.

“Making Pedagogy” Does not Require Technology: A Quarantine Complication

UIC’s MGL is what I endearingly call “my happy place” on campus. As I entered the lab for the first time as a first year elementary education major, I was overwhelmed and intrigued by the vast amounts of technology and resources the space had to offer. I was shown woodworking projects, 3D printed models, music, jewelry, embroidered textiles, and tools for creating just about anything imaginable both in physical and digital forms. While all of these resources were incredibly exciting and useful, as I spent more time in the MGL, I learned it is not the physical tools in the lab which make it an ideal space for developing literacies, it is the environment which is

Kylie Holcomb studies elementary education at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

strategically curated to encourage creative expression without limitations. I have experienced this concept in practice through my time developing, researching, and evaluating the Youth Writing Their Lives (YWTL) program (a summer program for highschoolers in the Chicago area). The conceptual goal of the YWTL project was to assist youth in developing a diverse array of literacies by creating a narrative, using any modality of interest to represent their lives.

The YWTL program was initially imagined within the MGL, affording students access to all the resources and technologies the lab had to offer. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the program had to be moved online. As a consequence, the educators and program facilitators were tasked with building a curriculum without knowing what specific resources students would have access to (certainly not as many as originally planned). In the absence of the lab's physical space and resources, creating a program which utilized making pedagogies was still a vital goal of the teachers when developing their curriculum. The program facilitators asked themselves "What are the driving principles of the MGL?" The result of this conversion was an equitable and sustainable "making" pedagogy which could be utilized regardless of access to resources.

Maker's spaces are typically understood as facilities abundant with technology and resources for creating. While this is true, even if there is not a physical space or resources like this accessible to an educator and their students, maker and makerspace pedagogies can still be utilized. In a universal sense, a "maker" is someone who creates something to be shared, and a "maker-space" is the environment which allows for creativity and the exchange of ideas. By using this framework to understand making pedagogies, we need not rigidly associate making and makerspaces with access to advanced technologies or expansive resources. This is a far more equitable, sustainable, and realistic approach to incorporating these pedagogies into our teaching practices.

Youth Writing Their Lives (YWTL): Experimental Curriculum Succeeds Under Unprecedented Conditions

Using this pedagogy, the instructors

constructed a curriculum which was student driven, individualized, flexible, collaborative, and encouraging of the creative process and the exploration of new ideas. After watching the program unfold, I identified these principles as the most influential in creating an environment which is curated for developing literacies.

Each of these guiding principles were evident within the introductory activity to the program. Teachers began by asking students to create a virtual vision board which showcased who they were: from interests and hobbies, to causes they were passionate about, to identities which were fundamental to them as individuals. The teachers created and shared their own version of these vision boards first, which set the standard for collaboration between teachers and students. This activity also established a willing openness between the program participants (students and teachers), who were received with acceptance, encouragement, and mutual understanding as they shared their personal vision boards. Furthermore, the task of creating a vision board was *flexible* in that there were no specific requirements as to what aspects of their lives the students had to share. The students had agency in deciding what sort of vision board they would create, which they personalized by the various aspects of themselves they chose to share. Therefore, the task was *creative, student driven, and individualized*. The activity also encouraged the *exploration* of new ideas. As the students shared their vision boards with one another, they engaged in meaningful conversations surrounding each other's literacies (in the form of hobbies and passions). This activity set the standard for developing literacies through a collaborative learning process, which encouraged mutual growth.

The teachers aimed to help students build the necessary skills to tell a narrative of their choice in any modality. Therefore, their planned curriculum focused on building research skills while allowing a lot of flexibility for brainstorming, collaborative discussion, and time for providing individualized support. In practice, this meant educators led workshops such as finding and analyzing mentor texts. Students practiced seeking out mentor texts, analyzing what aspects of these works could be valuable to them, and what aspects they might learn from critiquing them. This

allowed the students to build literacy skills by guiding them to seek out, critique, and utilize information on any given topic. To account for the student-driven and individualized aspects of instruction, educators in the program also surveyed the students' interests in both their desired content area and modality for their projects. Students were allowed to choose any topic which was meaningful and relevant to their lives and utilize any modality which interested them; this kept students highly engaged throughout the learning process. Students were also grouped based on their chosen modality, and paired with a teacher most equipped to teach literacies in that area. For example, a student who chose poetry as their modality was paired with a teacher who was highly experienced with instructing creative writing. While the teachers in the program were well equipped with knowledge to share, the program's collaborative nature also allowed students to seek support from their peers and to step into the teacher or expert role and share the literacies they already possessed. For example, a student well versed in video editing techniques might share strategies to provide new facets of literacy for both their peers and instructors who do not have prior knowledge of these skills. Overall, throughout the program, students and educators were constantly developing both tangible and intangible literacies through this collaborative learning process.

At the conclusion of the program, students were asked to share what they had created at whatever stage of completion their composition was in. This flexibility allowed students to focus on exploring new facets of knowledge and developing literacy in these areas. They demonstrated their growth by utilizing both tangible and intangible literacies, which they gained or strengthened throughout the program. For example, one student created a "day in my life video" from a Black male perspective after recognizing a lack of Black male representation in this genre. He created a social commentary that recognized this lack of representation, and communicated the value this perspective can add to the genre, and simultaneously created content to rectify this issue. This demonstrated an understanding in *intangible* literacies such as the lack of representation in certain sectors of media and social

norms, in particular for Black men, as well as, *tangible* literacies such as, filming, acting/ performing, and video editing which he used as a modality for communicating his literacy in the aforementioned intangible aspects. Overall, student's success in the program was measured not by any particular metric of companionship or the completion of a particular end result but by demonstrating they were able to gain some sort of knowledge in an area which is relevant and interesting to them, and communicate that knowledge. Therefore, the students left the program with a sense of pride in what they had created, and a deepened connection to the learning process encouraging them to further expand upon their literacies.

Conclusions and Implications

The YWTL program utilized a curriculum built from the ground up, strategically designed to allow for literacy development without constraints of specified content or assessment standards. As a program which existed outside of a traditional school setting these were not factors which had to be considered. Freedom in curriculum can be hindered by the need to adhere to standards set by administration or not having access to the ideal resources to incorporate "making" in your classroom. However, starting with the notion that every student has literacy in some form, and therefore has something of value to share with the classroom is a basis for incorporating "making" pedagogies into curriculum. With this idea in mind, allow for open ended student interest driven projects. Create spaces for your students to explore and share their interests, and be creative with the resources you have available. When possible, be flexible with your expectations for students' work and allow them to their best product. Teaching in this manner does not mean abandoning content standards, but allowing for students to guide their own learning. Through these activities, students gain literacy in intangible and tangible forms, and most importantly they are strengthening their connections to the learning process.

UIC Center for Literacy

1040 W. Harrison St.
Chicago, IL 60607

Phone: (312) 413-1914

Email: cfl@uic.edu



UIC CENTER FOR LITERACY

The UIC Center for Literacy works with families and communities to promote educational equity through multi-generational literacy programming, research, and advocacy.

The CFL was established in 1991 through a joint effort by the University of Illinois at Chicago and the City of Chicago to build a partnership that serves racially and linguistically diverse families through research-based multigenerational literacy education that is asset-based and culturally relevant. Since its founding, the CFL has had a strong partnership with Head Start programs and the Department of Families and Social Services.

The CFL is known for its rootedness in the community it serves; many staff are former volunteers and/or participants in the programs. The CFL is also recognized as a distinguished center for research application and evaluation and has published numerous scholarly work that has been translated to practical community applications.

Each year, we serve over 5000 Chicago families in the South and West sides through a range of programming, including Family Start (FAST) parent workshops in financial literacy and digital literacy, GED courses, ESL classes, teacher and volunteer training, and support for families of children with autism and developmental delays.

Editors

Kristine Wilber (kwilbe2@uic.edu)

Rachel Zein (rzein2@uic.edu)

Advisors

Dr. Andrea Vaughan (avaugh6@uic.edu)

Dr. Sunah Chung (sunah.chung@uni.edu)

Faculty advisor: Dr. Kira J. Baker-Doyle (kirabd@uic.edu)

Editorial Review Board

Subul Ali

Evelyn Pollins

Gabrielle Kelenyi

Kristine Wilber

We appreciate our reviewers' efforts and time to thoroughly review the submitted manuscripts and provide knowledgeable comments. LAL is a student-centered, student-run, peer-reviewed journal. We are currently recruiting reviewers and fellow editors. Please contact the editors or our faculty advisor if you are interested in contributing your knowledge and gaining valuable experiences.