

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching,
Learning and Teacher Education

Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher
Education

2016

Multilingual pedagogies and pre-service teachers: Implementing “language as a resource” orientations in teacher education programs

Theresa Catalano

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, tcatalano2@unl.edu

Edmund T. Hamann

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, ehamann2@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), and the [Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Catalano, Theresa and Hamann, Edmund T., "Multilingual pedagogies and pre-service teachers: Implementing “language as a resource” orientations in teacher education programs" (2016). *Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education*. 224.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub/224>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Multilingual pedagogies and pre-service teachers: Implementing “language as a resource” orientations in teacher education programs

Theresa Catalano and Edmund T. Hamann

University of Nebraska–Lincoln

Corresponding author — Theresa Catalano tcatalano2@unl.edu University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Department of Teaching, Learning & Teacher Education, Henzlik Hall 27, Lincoln, NE 68588-0355.

Abstract

While Ruiz’s (1984) influential work on language orientations has substantively influenced how we study and talk about language planning, few teacher education programs today actually embed his framework in the praxis of preparing pre-service and practicing teachers. Hence, the primary purpose of this article is to demonstrate new understandings and expansions of Ruiz’s language-as-resource (LAR) approach and ways in which teacher education programs can model this orientation in their own classes, including those programs, like ours, that prepare mostly monolingual preservice and in-service teachers to work with bi/multilingual students. The authors pursue this by laying out the theoretical framework for multilingual pedagogies that approach teacher education through the LAR orientation and then illustrate these pedagogies as they are realized in their own teacher education programs with the aim of moving closer to and expanding on Ruiz’s original proposal.

Introduction

In this special issue dedicated to Richard Ruiz and his research on language planning and orientations (1984), it seems appropriate for us to begin with our own memories of Richard as they relate to his seminal work. My (first author, Catalano, speaking) most salient memories of Richard connect mainly to his work as a member of my doctoral advisory committee. When I first met with him to talk about my dissertation, I remember experiencing a type of “brush with fame” awe, as he agreed to be on my committee and to work with me. What surprised me at our first meeting was the interest he expressed in *me*. He wanted to know all about my language background and experiences in Italy, so we spent most of that first meeting talking about the Italian language and culture and his desire to go there. At the time, I felt very flattered that he would care about my background and the context of my proposed dissertation work in Italy. However, as we now attempt to honor his theoretical contributions and take a look at where the field of language planning is some 30+ years after the writing of his most prominent language orientations article, I am struck by the fact that Richard didn’t just propose the idea that language should be viewed as a resource—he lived it. In his everyday performance as a teacher and researcher (such as in the case of my interactions with him), he

Theresa Catalano is Assistant Professor of Second Language Education/Applied Linguistics at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Her research focuses on education and migration and critical language studies. She teaches courses in language education such as Intercultural Communication, Schooling and the Multilingual Mind, and Linguistics for the ELL Teacher.

Edmund ‘Ted’ Hamann is a Professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, with a courtesy appointment in Anthropology. He began his career as a bilingual family literacy teacher in Kansas City, piloting an experimental curriculum—Family Reading—that emphasized language-as-resource.

didn't just talk about this theory; it was his praxis—he saw my language, interests, and experiences as resources *for him* (to work better with me).

While Hamann's (the second author's) direct interaction with Richard was more modest, even in those limited contacts Richard endeavored to learn enough about him to find common ground. For example, sitting next to each other and conversing at a dinner, Ruiz realized that he had lived for a year in the same Massachusetts town where Hamann grew up. That identified common ground then become a resource (however modest) that both Ruiz and Hamann used to continue their conversation.

So it is in the spirit of honoring Ruiz's work and a remembered friend that we heed this special issue's call to explore research, theoretical orientations, and methodologies that extend his important impact in language planning and bilingual education. In doing so, we focus particular attention on the orientation of language-as-resource (LAR) and the way in which this resources-oriented approach could "help to reshape attitudes about language and language groups" (Ruiz, 1984, p. 27).

While Ruiz's (1984) influential article has had an impact on the analysis and critique of language planning since it was published, few studies have explored how teacher educators actually implement his framework in the preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers. That is, while we talk of promoting LAR ideologies, teacher educators in U.S. higher education often fail to take into account the linguistic backgrounds of their university students (many of whom hail from international, multilingual contexts) in their own teaching methodologies in university classrooms (Liddicoat, Heugh, Jowan Curnow, & Scarino, 2014). In addition, in teacher education classes in which the majority of students are monolingual in the dominant language, multilingual pedagogies are rarely modeled. In our own program (and many others), there is little advantage (except in world language education) for pre-service teachers knowing any languages other than English and little disadvantage from English monolingualism.

Teacher education research shows that new teachers tend to teach the way they have been taught; that is, they replicate the familiar (Lortie, 1975). This means that if languages other than English are not broadly valued in contemporary K–12 education, a point Ruiz long both highlighted and lamented (Ruiz, 1984, 2010), then it is the task of teacher preparation programs to interrupt this sensibility. However, even when this is recognized as a task, it is more common to articulate it than actually pursue it substantively through modeling these more responsive practices in teacher education classrooms.

While also illustrating the potential of qualitative inquiry into multilingual pedagogies in action (as suggested by Fránquiz & Ortiz, 2014), one purpose here is to demonstrate ways in which teacher education programs can exemplify the LAR orientation in classes aimed at preparing pre-service and in-service teachers (who are mainly monolingual) to work with emergent bi/multilinguals (as well as students who are already highly proficient in multiple languages and language varieties). As Miramontes, Nadeau, and Commins (2011) reminded us, all educators in a school share responsibility for the education of emergent bi/multilinguals.

As an important aside, LAR is not just helpful for emergent bi/multilingual students. Much work in adolescent literacy (e.g., Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, 2005; Wilhelm & Smith, 2002) highlights how monolingual struggling students (i.e., students monolingual in the dominant language) can also gain from an LAR approach. That does not mean that what works for monolingual students necessarily works for bi/multilingual students, but we turn that equation around: What helps bi/multilingual students engage and succeed sometimes also is pertinent to the monolingual. Monolinguals too can gain from explicit consideration of the language dimensions of reading, writing, listening, and speaking in content areas and overt efforts to tie those to their existing knowledge of language. So we seek to demonstrate how the LAR approach can be modeled in classes required for all pre-service teachers.

Before we discuss our theoretical framework, it is important to address the terminology used for this article. In our discussion of students that our pre-service teachers will be prepared to

teach, we adopt García, Kleifgen, and Falchi (2008) use of *emergent bilinguals* to refer to students whose home language is different from the school language and who have been identified as needing language support. We use this term, instead of the more common terms *English language learner* (ELL) or *English learner*, because *emergent bilingual* celebrates rather than discounts the other language(s) students bring with them to school. However, when used in the literature, or to refer to teacher education courses of this name, we have kept the original “ELL.”

By adding *multi* to the term *emergent bilinguals*, we recognize the increasingly multilingual biographies of many students who come with standard and nonstandard varieties of their home languages or have studied other languages in school or fluidly move among different languages at home. Although traditionally the term *plurilingual* has been used by the Council of Europe to refer to “the individual’s ability to use several languages to varying degrees and for distinct purposes” (Council of Europe, 2000, p. 168), whereas *multilingual* has referred to “the many languages of societal groups and not of individuals” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 11), our use of *multilingualism* to refer to individuals who know and use more than two languages matches what is becoming more common in the literature, particularly in the research field of multilingualism. Thus, it is a more familiar term to many of our readers.

Theoretical framework

Ruiz proposed that language *orientations* “influence the nature of language planning efforts regardless of the context,” “delimit the ways we talk about language and language issues,” and “determine the questions we ask and the conclusions we draw” (1984, pp. 15–16). In contrast to approaches he referred to as *language-as-problem* and *language-as-right*, he proposed *language-as-resource* as a more promising orientation in which the status of socially subordinated languages could be contested and enhanced, in the process easing tensions between dominant and minority language communities. This was put forth as a promising alternative to dominant ideologies (dominant then and, unfortunately, also now) in which the study of foreign languages by native English speakers was encouraged while the continued study of heritage languages by those familiar with languages other than English was simultaneously discouraged.

A Nation At Risk (National Commission on Excellence of Education, 1983), the famous federal report that came out a year before Ruiz’s article and precipitated the now 30-year-old standards movement (Proefriedt, 2008) and its call to define what all students need to know, epitomized what Ruiz was challenging. That report excluded the study of any language other than English from its five “New Basics,” but did recommend two years of “foreign language” study for those heading on to four-year colleges. Among the working assumptions were that English was students’ starting language and key to knowing “*our* literary heritage” (emphasis added), while foreign language study would “introduce students to non-English-speaking cultures” and “heighten awareness and comprehension of one’s native tongue” (i.e., English). There was no suggestion that some students might already be familiar with the so-called “non-English-speaking cultures”—indeed that they might be from them—nor that such experience was prospectively a resource.

Ruiz recommended that language planning efforts begin with the assumption that language is a resource to be “managed, developed and conserved” and that they “regard language minority communities as important sources of expertise” (1984, p. 28). As an example of one way in which to do this, he introduced the idea of internships in a Japanese community center for foreign-service trainees in San Francisco, sponsored by the U.S. State Department. This program was to give those learning Japanese a more “natural” language learning experience while at the same time encouraging Japanese language maintenance in community centers.

Nonetheless, in the 30+ years since Ruiz wrote this important article, in teacher education programs across the country (including our own program and those that prepare teachers for bilingual education programs), English still overwhelmingly dominates the curriculum, and students read, write, listen, and speak largely only in English inside and outside teacher

preparation classrooms, regardless of the many languages they bring with them. Although he was not referring to teacher education per se, Cummins (2005) highlighted these concerns a decade ago, challenging the “squandering of bilingual resources in mainstream contexts” (as cited in Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 105) and arguing for a need to articulate bilingual instructional strategies that teach explicitly for two-way cross-language transfer and the acknowledgment of flexible approaches to language teaching. Ricento reinforced this need for a more complete realization of Ruiz’s theories by adding that, “we are still awaiting the ‘fuller development’ of a resource-oriented approach alluded to by Ruiz” (Ricento, 2005, p. 349).

In 2010 Ruiz wrote a response to three critiques that had been directed against LAR. He summarized the complaints (2010, p. 169):

- (1) LAR is only used by those who want to promote it for economic and military constructs, which is dangerous and misguided.
- (2) LAR when construed in an instrumentalist fashion (like the utilitarian economic/security framing just noted) is detached from its cultural and ethnic foundations, thus advancing a sense that language only has value to the extent it is useful to those wielding power.
- (3) LAR discourses diminish if not preclude a consideration of language rights.

Ruiz’s response to the first critique was to reject that minority languages don’t have instrumental value, such as Clyne’s argument that this is not the case in Australia (Wright & Kelly-Holmes, 1998). He then argued that understanding “resource” as primarily an economic construct was too narrow an interpretation. He insisted LAR ideology saw the “intrinsic value of multilingualism” rather than a narrower reference to economic value (Ruiz, 2010, p. 160).

In making this clarifying assertion, Ruiz relied heavily on Lo Bianco (who he also thanked in the paper’s acknowledgements [2010, p. 155]). In his monograph on language policy in Scotland, Lo Bianco (2001) had used LAR as the principal orientating framework and countered reductionist framings of “resource” by identifying six dimensions in which language can be conceptualized as a resource: intellectual, cultural, economic, social, citizenship, and rights. Regarding the second critique, Ruiz (2010, p. 160) favorably cited Bamgbose (2000) who, writing about Africa, had expressed the wish for a day when,

Multilingualism will cease to be looked at as a problem rather than an enrichment of the sociocultural life of the community, and acquiring more than one language becomes something to be envied and sought after rather than a necessary evil.

In response to the third critique, Ruiz clarifies that one cannot talk reasonably about or affirm language rights until there is an understanding of how rights are resources. In essence, he saw LAR as a precondition to language-as-right. He then acknowledged that the original model was incomplete and credited his students and others for bringing language rights into the conversation on language planning. Finally, he encouraged “working toward refining our discourse [of LAR] to make it more likely that good rather than evil come of it” (2010, p. 169). It seems to us that this is exactly the purpose of this special issue of *Bilingual Research Journal*; and our particular niche lies in laying out specific ways that teacher education can and should change to fit these new understandings of the LAR orientation that align with the new ways of viewing bi/multilingualism to which we will now allude.

Multilingualism, multilingual pedagogies, and teacher education

Multilingualism is “a social, linguistic, and individual phenomenon” that is fast becoming one of the core issues for defining/describing communities (Ruiz de Zarobe & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2015, p. 393). Although multilingualism has always existed, multilingualism today is different because of its scale; now it affects and reflects whole societies (Aronin, 2015). There is more

multilingualism in more places for more reasons than ever before because of “globalization, geographical and social mobility, economic and political transformations, and the omnipresence of technology in all areas of life” (Ruiz de Zarobe & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2015, p. 395).

The societies that emerge from this mobility/dislocation are characterized by *superdiversity*, a term that emphasizes the “increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants who have arrived over the last decade” (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1024). Even in the state capital of 250,000 inhabitants where we live and teach, our local school system hosts students from more than 100 countries and 96 language backgrounds (Lincoln Public Schools, n.d.).

One result of this superdiversity has been that “multilingual education is becoming the norm almost everywhere in the world” (Ruiz de Zarobe & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2015, p. 396), if by that we mean schooling at which skills in multiple languages are present but not necessarily where that multilingualism is planned for and treated as a resource. In the United States, only an estimated 2% of public schools have bilingual education programs (Wilson, 2011), and multilingual programs that make use of the multiple immigrant languages present in students’ repertoires are rare not just in the United States but also worldwide. Thus, despite the growing superdiversity and the theoretical backing for LAR orientations in language planning, there are still few examples of schools with multilingual education programs that take into account the language resources of both local and immigrant populations.

While many educators agree that they must prepare pluriliterate global citizens (García & Wei, 2014) and many studies provide myriad suggestions and guidelines as to how to prepare teachers to work with emergent bi/multilinguals (Bunch, 2013; Lucas & Villegas, 2013), few actually encourage or explain how to take full advantage of the language varieties spoken in their communities and schools. This is vexing given the new ways of thinking about language and language practices that have come forth in recent years (in no small part because of Richard Ruiz), but it reminds us that the publicly dominant language orientations that inform language planning can diverge sharply from what research points to as optimal.

Current theories and a few articulated extant examples account for superdiversity, view multilingualism as a natural and normal phenomenon, and result in language pedagogies that fit these new conceptualizations of language and multilingualism. This new way of thinking has come a long way since the time Ruiz’s (1984) seminal article was written, particularly because of what we now know about the way languages are stored in the brain and how languages are learned (Arabski & Wojtaszek, 2016). Agnihotri (2014) refers to this new way of thinking about multilingualism as “multilinguality,” and he calls for a pedagogy that does not see languages as separate entities in the mind and in social behavior but one that “treats the multilinguality of each child in the classroom as a resource and uses it for ongoing linguistic and cognitive growth” (p. 365). From this perspective, “the language of every child is important, and there is a very careful attempt to make sure that the multilinguality of every child becomes a part of the pedagogical process” (Agnihotri, 2014, p. 365).

Similarly, Flores and Beardsmore (2015) note that (as seen in García, 2009) there is increasing advocacy to shift away from monoglossic language ideologies that continue to treat bilingualism as “double monolingualism” (as was standard practice at the time Ruiz wrote his language orientations article). Instead, García argues for a heteroglossic approach, with languages neither seen as separable or countable, nor as associated with nation-states. These heteroglossic ideologies have emerged alongside changes associated with globalization. Plurilingualism (promoted highly in the European Union) “utilizes heteroglossic language ideologies to conceptualize bilingualism and multilingualism as a single complex competence in contrast to mastery over distinct languages” (Flores & Beardsmore, 2015, p. 214). Multilingual pedagogies such as CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) in Europe are informed by heteroglossic ideologies. These programs “seek to create spaces where students can demonstrate their understanding through the use of their entire linguistic repertoire” (Flores & Beardsmore, 2015, p. 216). These programs

do not adhere to the strict separation of languages that has informed the monoglossic perspectives of dual language programs in the United States. However, they still mostly ignore and erase immigrant languages. In keeping with the heteroglossic paradigm, Flores and Beardsmore advocate for a translangual approach that allows spaces for students to use their entire repertoire, shuttle back and forth between various aspects of their linguistic repertoire, and have opportunities to engage with tensions that emerge between the various discourse communities (p. 219).

García (2009) calls this heteroglossic approach *translanguaging*, referring to the multiple discursive natural language practices that bi/multilingual students use daily to navigate linguistic spaces in school and the expanded complex practices of speakers who “live between different societal and semiotic contexts as they interact with a complex array of speakers” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 18). This approach to language learning and language use questions the boundaries between languages, claiming that it is more important to understand what speakers do with language than to understand any formal structures or boundaries (Makalela, 2015). This marks a noted change from the 1980s, when languages were seen as separate both in the classroom and in the mind.

Although García and Wei talk about translanguaging in terms of bi/multilingual language practices in and outside of school, the original Welsh term—*trowsieithu*—which was coined by Cen Williams (1994, 1996), captured some of García and Wei’s insight. *Trowsieithu* refers to the pedagogical practice in Welsh schools where students are asked to alternate languages for learning purposes. Many other scholars (e.g., Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Canagarajah, 2011a, 2011b; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Hornberger & Link, 2012) have used translanguaging and related terms in slightly different ways, but we adopt García and Wei’s (2014) definition. This includes the idea that translanguaging occurs in all meaning-making modes (such as gesture, visual cues, sounds and digital, electronic, graphic and artifact-related signs) and “is part of a moral and political act that links the production of alternative meanings to transformative social action” thus contributing to a social justice agenda (García & Wei, 2014, pp. 29, 37). In addition, this definition identifies translanguaging not only as a language practice among bi/multilinguals, but as a pedagogy, a point we focus on momentarily.

Teachers engaged in translanguaging plan fluid movement between languages as needed in order to make meaning for their students and to mirror the versatile ways of communicating that “characterize multilingual communication outside the classroom” (Makalela, 2015, p. 202), encouraging and supporting students’ use of translanguaging at the same time. This is in stark opposition to pedagogical practices at the time of Ruiz’s article in which moving back and forth between languages was considered undesirable.

García and Wei (2014, p. 75) provide an excellent example of translanguaging as pedagogy in secondary classrooms where learners bring a variety of home languages to school, and teachers cannot possibly be expected to know all of them. Drawing on García and Sylvan (2011), they describe how students rely on peers and technology (such as iPads and Google Translate) with the teacher doubling as a facilitator who generates opportunities for language use and as a language learner herself. In this context, students collaborate with other students in whichever language(s) that advance the task, and multiple conversations in multiple languages occur throughout the room with occasional breaks for the teacher to explain a concept or for the class to practice a skill collectively. Students choose how to arrive at the final project and often involve different languages at different stages of the project. García and Wei (2014) call this *dynamic bi/plurilingual education*. It embodies exactly the notion of “resource” that Ruiz points out as being much more than just economic. In this case, the languages are used by learners as resources to learn the content.

Regarding how this type of learning can be fostered in higher education, particularly in teacher education classes, we have much to learn from highly multilingual contexts like South Africa. Van der Walt (2015, pp. 364–365), reviews many strategies for pedagogical translanguaging and recommends “bi/multilingual academic discussions, supported by bi/multilingual materials which are enhanced by technological applications.” She encourages teachers

to “use every single available resource to ensure successful learning at a high level” (van der Walt, 2015, p. 368). Although in places like South Africa with 11 official languages and many more spoken by Indian, African, and European immigrant communities, learners have always been engaged in natural translanguaging in order to survive in school systems that long ignored most indigenous languages in the curriculum, it is only recently that this type of learning has been explicitly discussed, encouraged, and taught to pre-service/in-service teachers.

In their highly informative volume *Multilingual Universities in South Africa*, Hibbert and van der Walt (2014) include chapters from numerous scholars in the field that demonstrate how they have incorporated heteroglossic ideologies that view language as a resource into instruction at the higher education level. For example, Makalela (2014) examines a new language program for language teachers at the University of Witwatersrand that requires students to study an additional language outside of their home language cluster. The overall goal of that program is to ensure that student teachers master at least one new language so that they are prepared for multilingual classrooms, even though they are not expected to teach in the additional language they are learning.

This teaching ideology “aligns with the African cultural and epistemological conception of *ubuntu*, which represents a communal orientation and continuum of social, linguistic, and cultural resources” and denotes the interconnectedness of humanity (Makalela, 2015, p. 214). From interviews and student self-reflections, Makalela was able to see how the study of a new language helped students find commonalities among themselves and their colleagues and students from other language/cultural backgrounds. Students also used Facebook, multilingual blogs, and further contact with native speakers to help them learn and discuss language learning and to develop positive associations with the target language. In so doing, they dismantled “ethno-linguistic divisions of the past,” creating spaces for a “pedagogy of integration that liberates historically excluded languages and affirms the fluid linguistic identities of their speakers” (Makalela, 2014, p. 102).

Similarly, Madiba (2014) described a translanguaging pedagogy that engaged students by using multilingual glossaries to easily find words in the languages used by all students. In addition, the students were encouraged to use all of their linguistic repertoires to make meaning in online discussion boards that demonstrated the fluid nature of multilingual conversation and the way in which multilingual speakers intentionally integrate local and academic discourse as a form of resistance and reappropriation. We assert that the type of pedagogy shown in these examples was exactly what Ruiz had intended with his LAR framework.

As another South African example, Parmegiani and Rudwick (2014) showed how exposure to mother tongue instruction (in this case, isiZulu) changed language attitudes of teachers who had trouble seeing the instrumental value of their home languages because they had not previously been taught to value them in their own schooling. They showed that the intertwining of formal and informal varieties of isiZulu and English utterances were naturally part of the world multilingual students in this area live in. Their interviews with students revealed these natural translanguaging practices but also the value of actually requiring students to learn in languages in which they have never had the opportunity to do so in school settings. By doing this, the students were able to see that it was possible, that it did have value, and that there was no need for artificial separation of languages (such as forcing students to take English words out of their isiZulu utterances).

Some other examples of translanguaging pedagogies in multilingual classrooms include the use of bilingual label quests (e.g., the teacher asks a question about a new word in one language and asks the students to explain in another language), repetition, and translation across languages, encouraging students to annotate texts in their language of choice, paying attention to cognate relationships, the creation of student-authored dual-language books, multimodal multimedia projects such as iMovies, digital storytelling, and sister-class projects, where students from different language backgrounds collaborate using two or more languages (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2005).

All of these pedagogical practices are important and useful, but when students have been marginalized within educational settings due to the subordinate status of their dominant language(s), teachers must also recognize their own power and agency to positively affect these students and to contest language subordination. According to Wortham (2005) and Meltzer and Hamann (2004), students' social identities are closely tied to their academic learning. This can be problematic for bi/ multilingual students whose identities are often marginalized within the *figured world* of educational settings.

Referencing Holland, Lachiocotte, Skinner, and Cain (1998), Valdez and Omerbašić described *figured worlds* as the "collectively imagined space where particular characters, actions, and outcomes are positioned as more valuable than others" (2015, p. 228). For those students whose social identities are linked to lower-status social positions because of language, race, ethnic, and/or class differences (Kozol, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Pimentel, 2010; Valencia, 2010; Valenzuela, 1999), self-authoring is one way in which deficit perspectives "that subordinate teachers and students in the figured world of education" can be disrupted (Valdez & Omerbašić, 2015, p. 221). Valdez and Omerbašić contend that educators need to attend to these social identity processes to promote positive academic learning for bi/multilingual students. They go on to assert that self-authoring (as seen in the Proyecto Bilingüe, a Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction program that they studied that uses cultural artifacts, such as journey boxes and digital iJourneys), was one effective way to do this (2015, p. 229). Another benefit of self-authoring is that it can bring marginalized perspectives forward through remembering and thus position teachers for advocacy roles (Ek & Domínguez Chávez, 2015).

As illustrated, much has been done in the field regarding how to prepare teachers to work with emergent bi/multilinguals. However, while we "now have a clear picture of what needs to be included and why... . Much work remains to be done on establishing how teachers can best be supported to make the necessary changes" (Edwards, 2015, p. 88). Edwards continues, "[We need to] add detail and substance as they gain confidence in translating theory into practice" (2015, p. 88).

García and Kleyn (2013) recently proposed three ways forward for teacher education, echoing the recommendations drawn up by Anderson, Hélot, McPake, and Obied (2010). First of all, they stressed the importance of developing understandings of bi/multilingual students and their families in order to become more aware of "the many home languages and cultural practices of the children and to be able to build on that knowledge ... to share it with all the children in the multilingual classroom" (García & Kleyn, 2013, p. 5544). They also recommended close collaboration with learners' families in order to have a more integrated vision of how students use their languages in different scenarios in their lives. The second recommendation for teacher education curricula is that practitioners need to have a knowledge base that includes knowledge about language in general, and about bilingualism, biliteracy, translanguaging, and processes of acquisition of multiple languages in particular. Finally, they asserted that teachers need help to construct pedagogies for multilingualism that are based on social justice and equity, as well as social practice, which the authors see as connected to students, worlds, and identities. So, teachers need not just the appropriate tools but a "change of mindset so that they are able to face the challenges of the multilingual classroom with more resources both professionally and personally" (Mejía & Hélot, 2015, p. 278).

Despite all of the recent research pointing to ways in which LAR orientations should be incorporated into teaching and professional development, little research has focused on specific ways in which teacher education programs can model the LAR approach in their own courses, and even fewer studies actually depict how this might be done in teacher education courses that are not focused on bilingual education but rather are designed to prepare all teachers (many of whom are monolingual and not prone to problematize that fact) to work with emergent bi/multilinguals. So our aim in the next section is to provide some examples of how teacher education courses might include LAR approaches that model pedagogies we would want our future teachers to use. Moreover, these pedagogies aim to change attitudes and create empathy for students.

Examples of LAR in teacher education

While in many other places in the world (e.g., Spain) teacher candidates must demonstrate mastery of a language other than the dominant one, the value of teacher multilingualism has been largely ignored and stepped over lightly in the United States. Nonetheless, we cannot accept that our teaching bodies should be largely monolingual when an increasing number of their students will be and are bi/multilingual. Thus, our view is that to truly honor and expand on an LAR orientation, we must move toward requiring all teachers to have a minimal mastery (e.g., Intermediate High on the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL] proficiency exams) of a language other than English, and preferably a language that is commonly used by many learners in their certifying state. Starting from this framework (which was illustrated by Makalela [2014]), it is much easier to imagine using actual translanguaging strategies in teacher education programs when all teacher candidates have another language they can draw from.

However, we recognize that in the times we live in, in which “English-only” movements and monoglossic ideologies and policies still prevail, such a dramatic shift may not quickly be realized in the United States. In the meantime, we introduce some “subversive” strategies (Postman & Weingartner, 1969) that can be pursued now. As seen in Catalano, Shende, and Suh (2016), we propose that teacher education courses require teachers to undergo “micro” language studies as part of their regular coursework.

This can be done by requiring students to study a language one/two hours a week and keep a journal that not only asks them to reflect on what they have learned but relate their language learning to what they have read and discussed in class. Students are allowed to choose their preferred new language and their way of learning the language (e.g., audit a language class at the university, use Rosetta Stone or Pimsleur from the library, exchange language tutoring with another student in the class, hire a tutor, etc.). We also recommend that the teacher educator and any bi/multilingual students in the class take up or refresh a language as part of the course in order to gain new perspective and empathy for their students. In this case, because the teachers (or pre-service teachers) in the class will undergo language study, even though they may be at a very low level in their target language, they will be able to draw on the language they are studying in the activities that model translanguaging and other multilingual pedagogies so that it is not only the multilingual students in the class (who, by the way, are increasingly present in higher education classrooms around the world) who can utilize their languages other than English. Even the primarily monolingual students gain another language to work with, if just in a modest way.

Engaging in this type of study helps future teachers see things in a new light and gain empathy for their students, as in the following examples. In the first, a coauthor reflects on how she had always used translanguaging when she taught French or Sanskrit in India but was discouraged from doing so:

When I was learning to teach languages, we were told not to use any other language. It was recommended to teach only the one language, no mixing—but I think, on the sly, all teachers used to try and make connections to Hindi or English and we shouldn't have to be sly about it, we should be encouraged to use these strategies. (Catalano et al., 2016, p. 13)

In a second example, the same coauthor reflected on how studying Chinese was not her choice (she did it for convenience since her classmate wanted to exchange Chinese lessons for Hindi), but it allowed her to have more empathy for students in tribal areas of India and what they must feel like when being forced to study particular languages in submersion models:

Had it not been a requirement of this course to learn a new language and had I chosen to continue studying Spanish or selected another Romance language, I may not have ever really got a feel of the struggles of the children who are forced into the submersion model. The studies in Mohanty, Kumar Mishra, Upender Reddy, and Ramesh (2009) on children from tribal communities in the two Indian states of Andhra Pradesh and Orissa also made me aware of some of the nascent measures against linguistic genocide that are being taken in my home country to

reduce the gap in the power relations between languages and therefore implicitly, the speakers of these languages. (Catalano et al., 2016, p. 14)

We will now outline a few concrete ideas for what translanguaging activities (which represent actual classroom realizations of LAR) in teacher education classes might look like when pre-service /in-service teachers are simultaneously engaged in language study and reflection as part of the course. Here again, the assumption is that the student body is largely monolingual and that the small number of bi/multilingual students are not accustomed to having their skills in languages other than English recognized or seen as resources. For all of these topics and levels, we try to shape class environments by encouraging students to consider the languages and backgrounds of their classmates as resources that they can tap into in order to learn from each other.

To address Ruiz's goals for teachers to not just see language as a resource but to change how those who speak certain languages are viewed, we require pre-service teachers in the course "School and Society" to read numerous scholarly works (e.g., Hamann & Reeves, 2013; Hamann, Zúñiga, & Sánchez García, 2006) that encourage them to think about family mobility and their students' task of negotiating different countries' different expectations regarding the languages and desired habits of schooling. This is an antecedent step to more overt scaffolding of Ruiz's (1984) LAR. Unless and until future teachers can see that students' previous experiences—including their negotiation of varying expectations at home and school—help shape who they are, what they want, and their starting dispositions regarding various instructional strategies, they cannot readily fully answer how language is a resource.

In the course "Teaching ELLs in the Content Areas" (which is required for all secondary education students) pre-service teachers start by reading Faulstich Orellana's (2009) *Translating Childhoods*, which describes the sometimes quite adroit interpreting that students (some identified as emergent bilinguals, others not) from households that primarily use languages other than English do on behalf of parents, siblings, and extended family. Here too the intent is to position pre-service and in-service teachers to see students as human beings negotiating real and varying social landscapes, including contexts where different language skills are called to the fore. Antecedent to the question of "What and how do I teach?" should be "Who am I teaching?" Answering clarifies how language is a resource not just for instruction but for the lives students lead and for which our instruction is supposed to be an aid.

In addition to readings, students view *When We Stop Counting* (Meier & Reinkordt, 2010), which shows a "year in the life" of six rural Midwestern Latino/a high school students and mixes both English and Spanish (with English subtitles). This brings forward useful discussions about what these students and their parents want and need from school, but most powerfully it demystifies claims that these students are somehow exotic and pushes back against any orientation that subordinates them. Their bilingualism and translanguaging are ordinary and natural (which sometimes surprises students).

In classes such as "Intercultural Communication," (taken as part of the English as a Second Language [ESL] endorsement pathway) readings are tailored to the backgrounds of students, and students are allowed to choose readings in any language (that they find themselves) that discusses the topic being discussed this week. This gives the lessons higher relevance and ensures students' greater identity investment in what they are learning (García & Flores, 2012). In addition, students make sense of the readings with their classmates, bridging their knowledge of how certain concepts they learn in English are referred to in their other languages, which terms overlap and draw on the English term, and which of the terms allow for a different understanding of the concept. This activity truly embodies LAR, as it allows students to use their language repertoires to make meaning in the course.

Another activity included in a course called "Schooling and the Multilingual Mind," is to require a multilingual microteaching activity in which students must utilize the languages of the other pre-/in-service teachers in the class and demonstrate translanguaging and other

pedagogies they have learned by teaching about them using multilingual pedagogies that incorporate the languages the students in the class know. In doing this activity, I (Catalano) found that the teachers were initially confused and somewhat skeptical about how this could be done, given they all did not speak each other's languages. In fact, this activity required great creativity in their thinking in order to figure out how to utilize different languages when not everyone in the class spoke them. After the microteachings, students remarked that doing this activity changed their thinking (and in particular, their skepticism) that these kinds of activities could actually work. Hence, by modeling this for students and then having them attempt to do this in class with their peers, it became clearer exactly how this pedagogy might work, particularly in classes where students do not speak all the same languages. Moreover, microteachings provided a space for the social justice component of the course in which pre-service teachers could "disrupt dominant discourses of the mastered figured world of education" for themselves and could see increased potential for their students (Valdez & Omerbašić, 2015, p. 235).

In a different activity for the course "Intercultural Communication," students read McGinnis (2007), who discusses how to engage students in multilingual, multimodal inquiry projects that make use of all the linguistic and cultural resources that students bring to classrooms while keeping those same students engaged because they are able to investigate a topic they are interested in. After reading this article, students were divided into groups and assigned the task of creating a multilingual, multimodal inquiry project that explains to the class a topic of intercultural communication (e.g., nonverbal channels of communication, theories related to culture, etc.). Learners were then instructed that one of the phases of the project (research, discussion, or presentation) must be multilingual in nature and that they must use different modalities (e.g., film, images, body movement, music, text, audio, painting) to present their information to the class. In doing this assignment, students were organized so that all groups contained both monolinguals and multilinguals, and they had to work collectively and creatively to figure out how to include the languages in the group in some way in their preparation and presentation. This activity is similar to that discussed earlier in García and Wei (2014) in which secondary education students in a class with emergent bi/ multilinguals made sense of the content in their various languages. However, it more directly disrupted the teachers' worldviews, allowing them to see pedagogy as possible not only in the dominant language.

Another way in which we have used multilingual pedagogies in our classroom practices is through the use of comparative analysis (Agnihotri, 1995; Kosch & Bosch, 2014). Comparative (also known as "contrastive") analysis allows students to take an element or concept they are learning in the dominant language and compare it to the way it is expressed in their other languages. In our case, we compared metaphors across languages. To do this, students identified metaphors in class readings and then, in groups, talked about these same metaphors and how they were manifested in the different languages represented in the class. In bringing the languages together for contrastive analysis (such as seen in García & Flores, 2012), we make discoveries about the way in which language, including metaphor, can shape and reflect thought (Santa Ana, 2002). One example was when we discussed the metaphor of "Time is money." Students were surprised and thoughtful when one pointed out that a common metaphor in her language (Turkish) was "Time is a river" [*Zaman bir su gibidir*]. Thus conversations followed in which students recognized that when one conceives of time in this way, the qualities of moving water (e.g., fast, continuous flow, a part of nature that we can't control) are mapped onto time, offering a different way of thinking that views time not as something that we can control by *spending*, *wasting*, or *saving*, but as a natural organic process.

This type of activity is particularly useful for classrooms in which multiple languages are represented because it not only gives various students an opportunity to contribute to the overall learning of the class, it encourages students to think about their own language background and how it shapes their worldview. This activity incorporates a LAR approach because students' home languages are seen as new frontiers for discovery of content that otherwise takes a very limited view since it comes from only one cultural and linguistic perspective. Agnihotri

(1995) practices similar strategies in his use of poetry when he has students translate poems into different languages which “leads to an appreciation of the similarities and differences between the languages” (Kosch & Bosch, 2014).

A further activity that can promote a LAR orientation that we have used in teacher education courses is that of service learning, which helps pre-service and practicing teachers to learn how to advocate for multilingual identities and attend to social identity processes to promote academic learning for multilingual students (Ek & Domínguez Chávez, 2015; Valdez & Omerbašić, 2015). One of our activities has been to have students go to local middle schools and help emerging bi/ multilingual students prepare digital stories. By experiencing the use of self-authoring to promote academic learning for multilingual students (mentioned earlier in Ek & Domínguez Chávez, 2015; Valdez & Omerbašić, 2015), pre-service teachers in this program learned how to include home languages and make use of multilingual repertoires of students. Furthermore, they learned how self-authoring experiences such as the digital stories mattered for understanding students’ linguistic and cultural identities and thus pertained to desirable teacher/student relationships. A variation of this activity has also been done in our world language education classrooms where pre-service teachers learn from local native speakers (of Spanish and German) and gain appreciation and knowledge of community language varieties.

Research potential

We hope the ideas presented here not only shed some light on how we might bring in and model LAR approaches in teacher education classes but also point to prospectively fertile research projects. First, as in Catalano et al. (2016), language study in teacher education classes can be a fruitful area for future research in terms of learning much more about how multilinguals think (i.e., fluid language processing) and learn. This is because when people who have experience learning and teaching languages and studying linguistics undergo language study, they have the cognitive knowledge, terminology, and metalinguistic awareness to talk about it in ways that can greatly inform the field of bi/multilingual education and research. Hence, they are not only able to describe their experiences but also relate them to theoretical concepts in multilingualism.

Second, research on LAR-informed approaches in teacher education classes should be used to inform teaching practices as well as teacher education practices. Hence, Edwards’s (2015, p. 86) call for multilingual learning communities to “add detail and substance as they gain confidence in translating theory into practice” can be advanced through improvements in the explicit teaching of these strategies in teacher education classes so that they could be used to improve the use of these pedagogies in K–12 schools. We also encourage studies that follow pre-service teachers into their first classrooms to see how they implement what they have learned about LAR.

Finally, by demonstrating that an LAR orientation pertains to all levels of education, primarily monolingual universities can make their curriculum more responsive to better account for the increasingly diverse enrollments in higher education. They can then begin to use these suggestions aimed at preparing teachers for all students (not just those aiming to be teachers). In this case, they will no longer ignore bi/multilingual students and the way in which (with the exception of a few places like those in Hibbert and van der Walt [2014]) their languages are never used as resources in most higher education classes.

Conclusion

In the present article, we have focused on Ruiz’s longstanding advocacy for an LAR orientation and its relation to language planning and policy, suggesting its central but not exclusive relevance to the preparation of language teachers. Ruiz’s relevance gets more expansive if we remember that all teachers are language teachers (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005; Miramontes

et al., 2011) and/or if we remember to see the LAR orientation as part of a holistic reminder that students (including teaching candidates) bring all kinds of developed skills and capacities to classrooms that are assets to those learners and their classmates if we enable them to function as such. We have demonstrated that theories related to language ideology, language planning, and language policy have come a long way since 1984, yet there is still much work to be done in terms of fully realizing the potential that LAR approaches can have in equalizing the educational playing field for multilingual immigrant students.

Multilingual pedagogies such as language study and reflection, multilingual microteachings, translanguaging, service-learning, digital storytelling, multimodal multilingual inquiry projects, and many more illustrate ways in which teacher education programs can ready future teachers to realize the possibilities and improvements that could be made for their increasingly diverse student bodies. Due to the superdiversity of today's classrooms and communities, teacher education programs must take the lead in engaging *all* teachers with LAR-influenced activities that model ways that teachers can utilize and value students' backgrounds, including attend to the multiple languages students come to class with.

This means that dominant languages should not be the only ones spoken, read, or present in these classes; there is a role for teachers to contest extant status hierarchies of languages. It also means that teacher educators need to work harder to practice what they preach by giving students opportunities to access multiple languages in the quest to learn about teaching. Teacher education programs need to do more to encourage language learning on the part of pre-service and in-service teachers irrespective of how many languages the teachers already speak (as seen in Makalela, 2014). Continuous language learning on the part of teachers (such as that seen in the reflective journal and language study activity) can spur increased and renewed empathy for language learners and students who must spend entire days in classrooms in which instruction is entirely in a language other than their home language(s). It can also lead to important research possibilities, including practitioner research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) and youth action research (Cammarota & Romero, 2011).

Still, we are convinced that the research gaze needs to turn more squarely on teacher education programs. We are two professors who can offer autobiographic explanations of what we do in our courses to model LAR pedagogy and thereby honor Richard Ruiz's legacy. But more impatient and systematic scrutiny is needed. If our examples prove how readily such an orientation can be deployed, research is still needed to ask why it is not more common and, to be self-effacing, to see whether what we do is consequential for what our pre-service and in-service teachers go on to understand and do.

References

- Agnihotri, R. K. (1995). Multilingualism in classroom discourse. In K. Heugh, A. Siegrühn, & P. Plüdemann (Eds.), *Multilingual education for South Africa* (pp. 3–7). Johannesburg, South Africa: Heinemann.
- Agnihotri, R. K. (2014). Multilinguality, education and harmony. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 11(3), 364–379. doi 10.1080/14790718.2014.921181
- Anderson, J., Hélot, C., McPake, J., & Obied, V. (2010). *Professional development for staff working in multilingual schools*. Geneva, Switzerland: Council of Europe.
- Arabski, J., & Wojtaszek, A. (2016). Contemporary perspectives in crosslinguistic influence. In R. A. Alonso (ed.), *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition* (pp. 215–224). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Aronin, L. (2015). Current multilingualism and new developments in multilingualism research. In P. Safont Jordà & L. Portolés Falomir (Eds.), *Learning and using multiple languages: Current findings from research on multilingualism* (pp. 1–28). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bamgbose, A. (2000). *Language and exclusion: The consequences of language policies in Africa*. Hamburg,

- Germany: Lit Verlag. Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 298–341. doi 10.3102/0091732X12461772
- Cammarota, J., & Romero, A. (2011). Participatory action research for high school students: Transforming policy, practice, and the personal with social justice education. *Educational Policy*, 25(3), 488–506. doi 10.1177/0895904810361722
- Canagarajah, S. (2011a). Code-meshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401–417. doi 10.1111/modl.2011.95.issue-3
- Canagarajah, S. (2011b). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. In L. Wei (ed.), *Applied linguistics review* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–27). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Catalano, T., Shende, M., & Suh, E. (2016). Developing multilingual pedagogies and research through language study and reflection. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. Advance online publication. doi 10.1080/14790718.2016.1181633
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Council of Europe. (2000). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/CADRE_EN.asp
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. doi 10.1111/modl.2010.94.issue-1
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 585–592.
- Edwards, V. (2015). Literacy in bilingual and multilingual education. In E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 75–91). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Ek, L. D., & Domínguez Chávez, G. (2015). Proyecto Bilingüe: Constructing a figured world of bilingual education for Latina/o bilingual teachers. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 38(2), 134–151. doi 10.1080/15235882.2015.1064834
- Faulstich Orellana, M. (2009). *Translating childhoods: Immigrant youth, language, and culture*. New Brunswick, NJ/ London, UK: Rutgers University Press.
- Flores, N., & Beardsmore, H. B. (2015). Programs and structures in bilingual and multilingual education. In W. E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 205–222). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fránquiz, M. E., & Ortiz, A. A. (2014). Coeditors' introduction: Toward strategically using languages in pre-K–12 classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(3), 219–222. doi 10.1080/15235882.2014.972779
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell.
- García, O., & Flores, N. (2012). Multilingual pedagogies. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 232–246). New York, NY: Routledge.
- García, O., Kleifgen, J. A., & Falchi, L. (2008). From English language learners to emergent bilinguals. Equity Matters. Research Review No. 1. Campaign for Educational Equity, Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved from http://www.equitycampaign.org/i/a/document/6532_Ofelia_ELL_Final.pdf
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2013). Teacher education for multilingual education. In C. A. Chapelle (ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 5543–5548). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 385–400. doi 10.1111/modl.2011.95.issue-3
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hamann, E. T., & Reeves, J. (2013). Interrupting the professional schism that allows less successful educational practices with ELLs to persist. *Theory Into Practice*, 52(2), 81–88. doi 10.1080/00405841.2013.770325
- Hamann, E. T., Zúñiga, V., & Sánchez García, J. (2006). Pensando en Cynthia y su hermana: Educational implications of U.S./Mexico transnationalism for children. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 5(4), 253–274. doi 10.1207/s1532771xjle0504_3

- Hibbert, L., & van der Walt, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Multilingual universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education (Vol. 97)*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Holland, D., Lachiocotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A bilingual lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261–278. doi 10.1080/13670050.2012.658016
- Kosch, I., & Bosch, S. (2014). African languages as languages of teaching and learning: The case of the Department of African languages, University of South Africa. In L. Hibbert & C. van der Walt (Eds.), *Multilingual universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education* (pp. 49–67). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, NY: Crown.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491. doi 10.3102/00028312032003465
- Liddicoat, A. J., Heugh, K., Jowan Curnow, T., & Scarino, A. (2014). Educational responses to multilingualism: An introduction. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 11(3), 269–272. doi 10.1080/14790718.2014.921174
- Lincoln Public Schools. (n.d.). *Federal programs: ELL English language learner program*. Retrieved from <http://home.lps.org/federal/ell-english-language-learner-program/>
- Lo Bianco, J. (2001). *National policy on languages*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Services.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological inquiry*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 52(2), 98–109.
- Madiba, M. (2014). Promoting concept literacy through multilingual glossaries: A translanguaging approach. In L. Hibbert & C. van der Walt (Eds.), *Multilingual universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education* (pp. 68–87). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Makalela, L. (2014). Teaching indigenous African languages to speakers of other African languages: The effects of translanguaging for multilingual development. In L. Hibbert & C. Van Der Walt (Eds.), *Multilingual universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education* (pp. 88–106). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education*, 29(3), 200–217. doi 10.1080/09500782.2014.994524
- McGinnis, T. A. (2007). Khmer rap boys, X-men, Asia's fruits, and Dragonball Z: Creating multilingual and multimodal classroom contexts. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(7), 570–579. doi 10.1598/JAAL.50.7.6
- Meier, B., & Reinkordt, E. (2010). *When we stop counting* [Motion picture]. Retrieved from <http://netnebraska.org/media/media.php?vidgroup=00012864S&bin=NET>
- Mejía, A. M., & Hélot, C. (2015). Teacher education and support. In E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 270–281). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E. T. (2004). *Meeting the needs of adolescent English language learners for literacy development and content area learning, Part One: Focus on motivation and engagement*. Providence, RI: Education Alliance at Brown University. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub/51/>
- Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E. T. (2005). *Meeting the needs of adolescent English language learners for literacy development and content area learning, Part Two: Focus on classroom teaching and learning strategies*. Providence, RI: Education Alliance at Brown University. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub/53/>
- Miramontes, O. B., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. L. (2011). *Restructuring schools for linguistic diversity: Linking decision making to effective programs* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Mohanty, A., Kumar Mishra, M., Upendar Reddy, N., & Ramesh, G. (2009). Overcoming the language barrier for tribal children: Multilingual education in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa, India. In T.

- Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 283–300). Bristol, CT: Multilingual Matters.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform: A report to the nation and the secretary of education*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.
- Parmegiani, A., & Rudwick, S. (2014). isiZulu-English bilingualisation at the University of KwaZulu-Natal: An exploration of students' attitudes. In L. Hibbert & C. Van Der Wal (Eds.), *Multilingual universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education* (pp. 107–122). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Pimentel, O. (2010). Mi pobre guerito. In L. Diaz Soto & H. Kharem (Eds.), *Teaching bilingual/bicultural children: Teachers talk about language and learning* (pp. 73–78). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1969). *Teaching as a subversive activity*. New York, NY: Delacorte Press.
- Proefriedt, W. A. (2008). *High expectations: The cultural roots of standards reform in American education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the “language-as-resource” discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the USA. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 348–368. doi 10.1111/josl.2005.9.issue-3
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *The Journal for the National Association of Bilingual Education*, 8 (2), 15–34.
- Ruiz, R. (2010). Reorienting LAR. In J. E. Petrovic (ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice and controversy* (pp. 155–172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, L., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2015). New perspectives on multilingualism and L2 acquisition: An introduction. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(4), 393–403. doi 10.1080/14790718.2015.1071021
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Valdez, V., & Omerbašić, D. (2015). Multimodal self-authoring across bi/multilingual educator and student learning spaces. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 38(2), 228–247. doi 10.1080/15235882.2015.1062816
- Valencia, R. (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Van der Walt, C. (2015). Bi/multilingual higher education. In E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 354–371). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054. doi 10.1080/01419870701599465
- Wilhelm, J. D., & Smith, M. W. (2002). *Reading don't fix no Chevys*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyddestun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog*. [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education] (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Wales, Bangor, UK.
- Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 39–78). Llangefni, UK: CAI.
- Wilson, D. M. (2011). Dual language programs on the rise. *Harvard Education Letter*, 2(2), 1–2.
- Worham, S. (2005). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, E., & Kelly-Holmes, H. (1998). *Managing language diversity*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.