
**Confronting the Raciolinguistic Hegemony of White
Standardized English in U.S. Literacy Education:
Promoting Multilingualism in Policy, Theory, and Practice**

Rachele Lawton

Community College of Baltimore County

Bogum Yoon

State University of New York at Binghamton

Ryuko Kubota

University of British Columbia

Kristen L. Pratt

Western Oregon University

ABSTRACT: This conceptual article discusses language ideologies in the context of white standardized English hegemony by critically examining historical and contemporary perspectives on U.S. language policy across the intersection of race and language. Its primary goal is to promote equitable multilingualism in literacy education in the United States. Because educational language policy is inseparable from its colonial history, equity cannot be achieved without structural changes. Through a critical examination of policy, theory, and practice, this article emphasizes the role of raciolinguistic ideologies in literacy instruction, offering recommendations for research and practice to support more equitable approaches to instruction for multilingual learners.

KEYWORDS: English hegemony, raciolinguistic ideologies, language policy, literacy education, multilingualism

Why Multilingualism Matters

Overarching Framework

Monoglossic Language Ideologies in the U.S. English Only Movement

Race and Heteroglossic Approaches to Literacy Education

Discussion: Implications and Suggestions for Literacy Educators

Conclusion

References

Author Contact

There is a significant gap between the multilingual realities of plurilingual, raciolinguistically diverse learners, and the hegemony of white standardized English, which perpetuates monolingual approaches to teaching in the United States. U.S. language ideology and education policy have been shaped by the European colonial project's attempts to delegitimize racialized speakers' language practices. By critiquing the European paradigm of rational knowledge (Quijano, 2007), which is entrenched in racialized whiteness (Bauer et al., 2021; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Smith, 2020), we can make visible the ways in which such frameworks are systematically couched in ordinariness (Qin, 2020; Smith, 2019), both in schools and in literate practices in general. To problematize this issue, this article discusses language ideologies in the context of white standardized English hegemony, examining the crucial role that language ideologies play for raciolinguistically diverse learners in U.S. literacy education settings.

We use the terms “raciolinguistically diverse” and “raciolinguistics” to refer to the intersection of race, language, and ideologies, or as Alim and colleagues (2016) denote, “racing language and languaging race in hyperracial times” (p.1), as we critique the racialization of language across instructional contexts, specifically within and during literacy instruction, as the linguistic practices of racialized populations are often stigmatized (Flores, 2020; Rosa & Flores, 2017). Because decentering Eurocentric theories is an important step in decolonizing our collective knowledge, we examine U.S. educational language policy from historical and contemporary perspectives, exploring the ideological impact of policy as it relates to the intersection of race and language during literacy instruction. This article argues for multilingual inclusivity and explores how more heteroglossic approaches can promote equitable multilingualism for learners.

We conceive of multilingualism as a linguistic and political movement that recognizes the value of multiple languages, including learners' primary languages, in the mainstream English context during literacy instruction. We also situate multilingualism in raciolinguistics to examine how language and race as intersected constructs shape ideas and experiences (Rosa & Flores, 2017, 2020). This conceptual article helps educators consider how a monolingual paradigm can be shifted to a multilingual paradigm in this multilingual, multiliterate, and raciolinguistically diverse world. While this article specifically addresses language policy and literacy education in the United States, we acknowledge the hegemony of white standardized English throughout the world and aim to provide critical insights that may be applied to both local and global contexts.

Why Multilingualism Matters

Monolingualism and white supremacy are deeply embedded in U.S. language policy and ideology through the historical dominance of white standardized English (Cushing & Snell, 2022). Examining language from a raciolinguistic perspective allows us to interrogate “the historical and contemporary co-naturalization of language and race” (Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 622). The

discourse on diversity in literacy education is often framed by race and ethnicity, but racial and ethnic identities can be more fully understood when we consider how historically minoritized learners are positioned linguistically within literacy instruction. Research demonstrates that emergent multilinguals (i.e., learners acquiring English as a new language) actively participate in literacy activities when their linguistic and cultural references are valued as learning resources (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Yoon, 2007, 2009; Zapata & Laman, 2016).

However, studies also demonstrate inequities for raciolinguistically diverse emergent multilinguals, whose heritage languages are often treated as obstacles to English proficiency that need to be eliminated (Yoon, 2015) while learners are expected to “assimilate their language practices towards idealised whiteness” (Cushing, 2023, p. 1). This forced assimilation can occur through the use of concepts such as “academic” language, an imagined language register seen as crucial for academic success that targets raciolinguistically diverse learners whose language practices are seen as non-academic (Garcia & Solorza, 2020). From a raciolinguistic perspective, labels such as “academic language” can be seen as ideological notions which maintain “raciolinguistic dichotomies, borders, and discourses of inherent linguistic deficiency within marginalized individuals” (Cushing, 2024, p. 3). Consequently, emergent multilinguals may withdraw from participating in literacy activities when white standardized English is normalized and their linguistic and cultural differences are not accommodated (Yoon, 2008) or when they are excluded from the dominant culture and classroom (Souto-Manning et al., 2021).

These findings indicate that monoglossic language ideologies, which treat monolingualism as the norm (Flores & Schissel, 2014), are prevalent in U.S. educational language policy. Designed as a construct to maintain the status quo, white standardized English contributes to raciolinguistic discrimination in the United States through English Only policies (Cushing & Snell, 2022). Approaches to language that stigmatize racialized students’ linguistic practices are explicitly linked to “historical and contemporary colonial power structures that continually shape racialized perceptions of deficiency” (Flores & Rosa, 2022, p. 4). Raciolinguistic ideologies frame these learners as linguistically deficient and in need of remediation (Flores, 2020; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017).

Through an examination of U.S. educational language policy, theory, and practice, this article argues for inclusivity for raciolinguistically diverse, emergent multilingual learners, asking readers to critically reflect on the crucial role that language ideologies play in affording or restricting equitable access for these students during literacy instruction (Babino & Stewart, 2020). Although an increasing number of studies have explored the intersection of race, language, and literacy instruction in relation to emergent multilinguals, there is still a lack of comprehensive discussion on multilingualism in literacy contexts through a raciolinguistic lens.

Overarching Framework

This article is guided by theoretical perspectives on additive multilingualism, which is based on heteroglossic language ideologies that view languages as integrated, diverse, and multidimensional. As noted by Bakhtin (1981), the coexistence of language varieties, contextual inputs, and perspectives exist within a single repertoire as all language use is inherently dialogic in nature and perpetually shaped and informed in and across every interaction. García (2009) builds on Bakhtin's notion of heteroglossia through translanguaging as not only a functional reality of the coexistence of multiple language varieties within a single linguistic repertoire, but also as the ideological framework that influences language form, function, and use within dual/bilingual education specifically where students are afforded opportunities to utilize their "entire linguistic repertoire" (Flores & Beardsmore, 2015, p. 216). Within heteroglossic approaches, all languages are seen as inseparable entities for learning (García, 2009), and students' home languages and cultures are valued. Heteroglossic language ideologies offer more possibilities for successful learning (e.g., Flores & Schissel, 2014; García & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging, specifically, supports the development of multiple linguistic identities (García, 2009).

Heteroglossic approaches demonstrate how language, identity, and literacy are interconnected. For instance, language expresses the identities of individuals, which influences their literacy learning in a positive or negative manner (see García & Wei, 2014; Yoon, 2009). However, the relationship between language, identity, and literacy is complex. The valuing of bilingualism across race and language parallels sociopolitical agendas of those in power (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Flores & Rosa, 2019; Johnson & Johnson, 2015). The resulting power dynamics between speakers within any context influence interactions and outcomes. Without a paradigm shift from monoglossic to heteroglossic language ideologies, emergent multilinguals are unlikely to fully enact their own power within the context of English hegemony, which perpetuates the coloniality of power and language (Quijano, 2000), layered throughout repressive systems, policies, and practices. For decades, literacy education reforms and policies in the United States have been guided by monoglossic ideologies, which ensure that language and literacy instruction are not neutral (Freire, 1968; Jaumont & Stein-Smith, 2019). The linguistic resources of raciolinguistically diverse individuals are viewed from a deficit perspective because of the hegemony of white standardized English.

Monoglossic and heteroglossic language ideologies should be deconstructed through a critical lens that closely examines language policies and theories in order to provide direction for more inclusive literacy education. Below, we first discuss how English monolingualism has been reproduced as de facto language policy in the United States in the absence of an official national monolingual or multilingual policy historically.¹ We then examine how such

¹ In March 2025, President Donald Trump signed an executive order designating English as the official language of the United States.

monoglossic ideologies have been challenged, but are also entrenched in raciolinguistic ideologies, demonstrating how race and language intersect. Next, we consider pragmatic challenges for resistance to monoglossic normative approaches. Finally, this critical discussion culminates with implications for practice, suggestions for literacy educators, and guidance for future research.

Monoglossic Language Ideologies in the U.S. English Only Movement

We begin with a brief historical overview of language policy and ideology in the United States, focusing on the contemporary English Only movement and its monoglossic ideologies, which are rooted in colonialism and reflect covert linguistic racism (Kroskrity, 2021). Policies informed by English Only ideologies impose white standardized English, discriminating against raciolinguistically diverse students. From there, we discuss implications for educational contexts and advocate policies that promote multilingualism through heteroglossic perspectives.

Critical Language Policy and Ideology

To examine multilingualism in the context of U.S. educational language policy, we consider critical language policy (CLP), which examines the relationship between language, power, and inequality, highlighting how historical and structural forces create and sustain inequality (Tollefson, 1991, 2012), including a lack of equal educational opportunities for minoritized individuals (Johnson, 2023). Policy makers typically promote the interests of dominant social groups, and policies themselves often create and sustain inequality in various forms (Bristol & Martin-Fernandez, 2019; Cervantes-Soon & Carillo, 2016; Darvin & Heineke, 2017). Policies can be viewed as multiple layers of texts, discourse, and practice that influence decisions and serve as mechanisms of power, often privileging dominant groups and languages to deny equal access to political power and economic resources (Johnson, 2013; Sánchez et al., 2017). More specifically, historical-structural educational language policies are defined as “the official and unofficial policies that are created across multiple layers and institutional contexts (from national organizations to classrooms) that impact language use and education in schools” (Johnson, 2013, p.77). Language policies are often based on raciolinguistic ideologies, which can mediate covert linguistic racism, i.e., linguistic practices that connect to political-economic structures from which bias emerges, resulting in projects of racialization and white supremacy (Kroskrity, 2021).

English Only: An Overview of the Contemporary Movement and its Historical Origins

U.S. language policy, which is influenced by the country's colonial legacy, positions white standardized English as a single national language that is necessary for full participation in society (Flores, 2013). This positioning is manifested in English Only, a political movement that has emphasized education policy, linguistic access to political and civil rights, and official English legislation (Schmidt, 2000). Starting in the 1980s, proponents argued that English was threatened by immigrants, particularly Spanish speakers, making inaccurate claims about the role of English in U.S. society and links between educational failure and a lack of English (May, 2001).

A historical understanding of language ideology in the United States is crucial to grasping the motivation of English Only, both as an ideology and a movement whose policies justify the exclusion of raciolinguistically diverse groups and deny the plurilingual foundations of the United States (Nieto, 2021). Languages other than English were widely spoken within and outside of the American colonies (May, 2001), and bilingual schools were widespread until the early 20th century. However, multilingualism was never consistently embraced or tolerated in the US, in spite of the nation's plurilingual roots. Thus, English Only's aims may reflect the desires of early U.S. leaders, who promoted Standardized American English, which was imposed on language-minoritized populations (Flores, 2014) through explicit and implicit policies. After the nation's inception, non-English speakers—Native Americans, enslaved Africans, and Mexicans in annexed territories—were forced to use and learn English (Nieto, 2021).

English Only policy also relates directly to immigration. Throughout U.S. history, language restrictions and nativist movements typically flourished when restrictions on immigration from certain countries were lifted, ultimately leading to ideological shifts regarding language (Pavlenko, 2002). By the late 20th century, over 90 percent of immigrants to the U.S. were from non-European countries—a significant departure from earlier patterns that favored white European immigrants—with Mexico serving as the top country of origin in the 1980s (Schmid, 2001). The rapid increase in Spanish speakers fueled fears that English was under threat, spurring hostility toward minoritized languages and their speakers, which gave rise to English Only groups. These forces led to ballot initiatives designed to make English official, proposed English Language Amendments, and official English laws in thirty-two states. Although these laws were often symbolic, in some cases, they have curtailed multilingual services and led to English Only education policies, which have impacted raciolinguistically diverse learners in literacy contexts. Current language policies, which are rooted in monoglossic ideologies, reflect a long history of efforts to suppress and delegitimize the languages of colonized speakers. The "English Only" movement functions as a raciolinguistic instrument designed to portray the United States as a white, English-speaking nation (Nieto, 2021), which in turn shapes experiences of raciolinguistically diverse students.

As an example, Dual Language Education (DLE) has faced opposition from English-only advocates who have pushed for restrictive legislation and misrepresented DLE as “Spanish-only” programs that result in underachievement, although research has shown that developing both Spanish literacy and English proficiency can lead to higher success in English (MacSwan et al., 2017). Various DLE models exist, and programs that view languages as separate, discrete entities are not guided by heteroglossic language ideologies (Garcia, 2009). However, it is well-established that effectively designed programs can lead to positive outcomes. Additionally, there is a clear link between the imposition of English-only policies and higher failure rates among students whose primary language is not English (Macedo, 2017). While DLE has more recently become popular in U.S. schools, policies and practices that impose white standardized English persist. Involving both language majority and minoritized groups (e.g., “native” English speakers and “native” Spanish speakers) learning school subjects in both languages, dual language originally aimed to foster bilingualism, biliteracy, academic achievement, and intercultural competence. However, given the recent neoliberal thrust for white middle-class students to acquire bilingual skills, DLE has been criticized for perpetuating raciolinguistic inequality between white bilingualism, which is highly valued, and racialized bilingualism, which continues to be positioned as deficient (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Flores et al., 2021), a manifestation of the monoglossic ideologies that undergird English Only.

Reactions to English Only Ideology: From Monoglossic to Heteroglossic Approaches

The monoglossic ideologies that encourage English Only normalize white standardized English and construct it as desirable, functioning as a form of covert linguistic racism. When white standardized English is positioned in relation to other languages in U.S. public life, including in educational settings, “the reproduction of language ideology leads to the valuation of some languages and speakers over others” (Lawton, 2016, p. 107). This devaluing directly and disproportionately impacts raciolinguistically diverse speakers in educational contexts, denying them the opportunity to draw from their entire linguistic repertoires. This marginalization has been exacerbated, in part, by the historical absence of a national language policy, which often left state and local governments to enact their own policies (Gomez, 2015). Restriction-oriented policies influenced by English Only discourse construct a contest between English and other languages, leaving educators to negotiate, advocate, and support multilingual learners in creative ways. Because monoglossic ideologies prevail, there are obstacles to enacting real reforms in literacy education; this situation is compounded by variation among states, increases in the number of multilingual learners in schools, and current teacher shortages. Even when multilingual policies do exist, emergent multilinguals may be excluded from opportunities to develop fluency and literacy in multiple languages, which should coexist and interact as resources in literacy learning.

However, in reality, monoglossic ideologies inform policies that function as gatekeepers of linguistic and cultural capital (Gomez, 2015).

García (2009) criticizes the monoglossic language ideologies that have informed dual/bilingual education, arguing that they view languages as discrete rather than reflecting the fluid language practices that exist in multilingual communities. She recommends that these ideologies be replaced with heteroglossic language ideologies through translanguaging approaches that honor the power of all language users to shape language, recognize the linguistic heterogeneity of all languages, and confront English monolingualism by researching and teaching how we can work against monolingual expectations (Horner et al., 2011). This is but one example of conceptualizations within heteroglossic language ideologies that can inform policies through an inclusive view of multilingualism, moving beyond dominant models that see multilingualism as a sum of separate languages and underscore an either/or approach, and creating potential for change through multilingualism in policy and practice. Heteroglossic language ideologies call for an epistemological shift in critical applied linguistics that critiques both the mono-language and bi-language subject and seeks to develop new conceptualizations of language outside of idealized subject positions (Flores, 2014). Within such a paradigm, educators are empowered to challenge English Only ideologies and explore new possibilities for multilingual inclusivity. Educators and educational researchers have power in the policy process, and in partnership and tandem, must expose and challenge hegemonic practices to create equal opportunities for minoritized language users (Johnson & Pratt, 2014).

In summation, a critical examination of how monoglossic ideologies become normalized within monolingual power structures and their impact on multilingual inclusivity within literacy education—as exemplified by the history of English Only as an ideology and a movement—is an essential next step toward situating multilingualism within heteroglossic language ideologies. We advocate the creation of spaces that increase equity and access for linguistically, culturally, and often raciolinguistically diverse students in historically English-dominant schools. This critical discussion on historical perspectives regarding language ideologies provides foundational knowledge to understand how language policies subtly permeate our understanding of race, ethnicity, and language. In the following section, we focus on heteroglossic approaches to language in language and literacy studies, the intersectionality between race and language, and the tensions between resisting and acquiring white standardized English.

Race and Heteroglossic Approaches to Literacy Education

As the above overview of U.S. language policy suggests, normative language ideologies, which intersect with covertly racist linguistic practices, predominate literacy education. These often monoglossic ideologies posit that “legitimate” (white standardized) English is used by “native” speakers of a standard

variety of English, that a language should be defined by a fixed boundary, and that meshing languages should be avoided in the learning process. However, scholarship in language education has increasingly emphasized linguistic diversity and fluidity, or the multi/plural turn (Kubota, 2016; May, 2014).

Somewhat similarly, more than 30 years ago, whole language became a popular approach to moving away from a prescriptive way of conceptualizing and teaching literacy. The fixed monoglossic approach to teaching reading and writing was problematized and, instead, students' authentic and creative expressions were valorized. However, this approach was critiqued by educators such as Lisa Delpit (1995) for its neglect of social, linguistic, and economic disparities that disadvantaged racially minoritized students. The solution was to help these students acquire the dominant form of English through the explicit teaching of linguistic forms. This counter-approach was later critiqued by Flores and Rosa (2015), who argued that it perpetuates the power of white standardized English. Underlying this debate is the recognition of how language used by racialized people is judged by a normative lens, or white listening subject (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Research findings on (reverse) linguistic stereotyping provide insight into this question, with implications for literacy contexts.

(Reverse) Linguistic Stereotyping

English has many varieties arising from diverse geography, race/ethnicity, generation, gender, and social class, for example. None of its variations are inherently attached to a certain group of people. Theoretically, anyone could learn to use American English accents and varieties, such as southern accents, Black English, Chicano English, and Valley Girl speech. However, these varieties are typically used by certain groups and thus stereotypically linked to them. For instance, an audio input of Black English often evokes a Black person as speaker. This is referred to as linguistic stereotyping or linguistic profiling (Baugh, 2018). Certain "non-standard" varieties of English are racialized and stigmatized, and educators such as Delpit (1995) have advocated the idea that racialized students should acquire the dominant linguistic code while simultaneously developing critical awareness of why it is positioned as dominant. Obviously, this dominant "standard" variety is racially coded as white. As Kroskity (2021) observes, this standard may not be explicitly linked to racial categories, but it has historically been associated with the language practices of middle-class white populations rather than those of other racial, ethnic, or socio-economic groups. Although racially diverse learners often employ heteroglossic practices in informal settings, they are expected to acquire and use white middle-class English through education. Thus, what is considered the standard variety of English is indeed white standardized English. It is important to point out, however, that not all white people use this form of English. Here, we can use the term "white English" in a metaphorical way. In examining the politics of race and language, Alim and Smitherman (2012)

discussed how the former U.S. President Barack Obama needed to *sound white* in order to be taken seriously.

The intersection of race and language is also observed in *reverse* linguistic stereotyping, in which the perceived race or other features of a speaker influences the listener's perception of the speaker's proficiency and overall competence (Kang & Rubin, 2009). Experimental research conducted by Kang and Rubin (2009) and Rubin (1992) demonstrated that when undergraduate students in the United States listened to a lecture with a photo of an instructor of color (e.g., an East Asian woman), they heard more accent and gave lower teaching evaluations than a lecture that they listened to along with a photo of a white person as the instructor, even though they listened to the same recording in white standardized English. Research on listeners' speech recognition has revealed the impact of their expectations of the speaker's social background on their speech recognition (Lindemann & Subtirelu, 2013).

This phenomenon demonstrates how race matters in communication, with significant implications for literacy education. Even when a student or a teacher uses what may be perceived as "perfect" (i.e., white standardized) English, if the speaker does not fit the white stereotype due to their race, they are not treated as a legitimate language user. Although encouraging raciolinguistically diverse students to learn white standardized English is potentially empowering, unless systemic racism is eradicated—which would require significant structural changes—racialized students will continue to suffer from raciolinguistic stigmatization. In this regard, Flores and Rosa (2015) argue that white listening subjects would automatically position heritage language learners (e.g., Black or Latine students) as deficient, regardless of their actual language competence due to raciolinguistic ideologies, which "conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices" (p. 150).

Tension Between Resisting and Acquiring White English: Non-Performativity of Resistance

Flores and Rosa (2015) also argue that the acquisition of *appropriate* academic language to gain access to upward socioeconomic mobility will only perpetuate raciolinguistic ideologies because this approach legitimates the power of white standardized English and fails to address the fundamental problem of racism. Encouraging raciolinguistically diverse students to code switch between white standardized English and their own English will only maintain the status quo. This is a legitimate critique according to the following logic: (1) Because "appropriate" English is white standardized English, any effort to gain competence in it would position the racialized subject as white. (2) Nonetheless, racialized people's speaking white standardized English cannot emancipate them due to raciolinguistic ideologies. (3) Thus, it is necessary to resist teaching white standardized English in order to disrupt raciolinguistic ideologies and provide literacy education that is informed by heteroglossic language ideologies. The

heteroglossic orientation to language education is indeed liberating as it affirms the linguistic plurality of racialized students. For example, raising the consciousness of the legitimacy of Black language among Black students can lead to disrupting the hegemony of white English (Baker-Bell, 2020).

However, what would be a truly empowering pedagogical approach for all raciolinguistically diverse students in literacy education? Resisting white standardized English and encouraging the use of Black English, Chicano English, and other Englishes? Allowing racialized students to practice translanguaging? Resisting school curricula written in white standardized English? Even if the answers were clear, research shows a lack of movement among educators to challenge the supremacy of white standardized English in their classrooms (Anderson et al., 2024). We must also acknowledge that pedagogical approaches that resist white standardized English contradict what scholars and educators of color often do in our daily professional activities. We often enforce white standardized English in high-stakes academic tasks, such as writing tests, papers, and publishing (Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014). Unless we accommodate white standardized English, it is almost impossible to succeed in a dominant society, as (1995) would argue.

These contradictions reveal a level of hypocrisy. Progressive scholars claiming that we should resist white standardized English and English Only policies are complicit in reifying these norms when we write and present in only English—even though we may in fact be multilingual ourselves—because we know the value placed on conforming to such norms to further our careers. Put differently, we tend to fall into the non-performativity (Ahmed, 2012) of resisting white English. Of course, using non-white standardized English can bring socioeconomic success, and some academics can be successful without using “native”-like white standardized English. Others find niche careers that leverage their racial and linguistic identities. However, it seems necessary to acknowledge the reality of both linguistic “fluidity and fixity” (Jaspers & Madsen, 2019) or understand the fact that language is always heterogeneous but also inseparable from ideologies that impose fixed norms. At the same time, we must seek to develop pedagogical strategies that legitimize heteroglossic practices. Ultimately, we must dismantle the normative system of assessment and gatekeeping practices to achieve antiracist heteroglossia in academic domains.

Discussion: Implications and Suggestions for Literacy Educators

What do these discussions on language policy, colonialism, and the intersection of race and language imply for literacy educators? Below we draw on the common elements of these subjects to envision possibilities for plurilingualism among our students. One of the common elements is that language is viewed as an ideological symbol, beyond a pragmatic skill and tool, which is represented by the English Only movement and its colonial history. Further, multiple Englishes embed ideological symbols, with white standardized English occupying a superior

position. English hegemony has been achieved through a white standardized English Only assimilationist ideology enacted in K-12 settings where students are socialized to embrace the ideologies of those in power (Alim, 2010; Freire & Macedo, 2001; Kubota, 2020a). As demonstrated, the prevalent linguistic discrimination in the United States should be understood from the historical perspective on settler colonialism, where the English language “carries a colonial, imperialist legacy and a Eurocentric, human centered worldview” (Meighan, 2023, p. 147). As such, language use and acceptance arise from a prescriptive normality—white standardized English—which is imposed and enforced as a tool of power as children are socialized into the dominant ideological frameworks in schools (Alim, 2010). Prescriptive normality reifies the production of “inequitable social relations” (Janks, 2000, p. 176) in which white standardized English is the measure by which racialized speakers are judged. If we have never critically considered this normality, we are trapped within it and unconsciously accept it. The arguments in this paper imply that normality, as well as the monoglossic, raciolinguistic ideologies framing our understanding of normality, should be critiqued and challenged in order to decenter Eurocentric theories and allow multiple Englishes and other languages to coexist and interact in literacy classrooms. Otherwise, what are perceived as “non-standard” forms of English will be continuously marginalized, which has negative implications for students’ literacy experiences.

Additionally, we see the dilemmas of white standardized English. It is essential to challenge the linguistic hegemony of English, to resist the dominant variety as the only acceptable linguistic variety. Yet, educators may also feel obligated to help students access the dominant variety to pass high-stakes tests, for example, where hegemonic and monoglossic understandings of language use are pervasive and the power of white standardized English is perpetuated. This dilemma requires us, as literacy educators, to further examine alternatives to promote multilingual inclusivity in literacy contexts. Shapiro (2022) emphasizes the tension between pragmatism—what students need right now to be successful—and progressivism—what the world needs for a more just future. Thus, we must consider the issue of access to white standardized English while we constantly challenge and resist its normativity in order to create spaces in which emancipatory multilingualism empowers raciolinguistically diverse students, in part through developing their own critical consciousness (see Chavez-Moreno, 2022, Shapiro, 2022).

Heteroglossic Literacy Approaches to Support Multilingualism: Suggestions for Research and Practice

This paper has aimed to provide a critical review of the issues and challenges that impact multilingual learners, encouraging readers to consider the United States’ colonial history, the raciolinguistic language ideologies and policies it has engendered, as well as alternatives, and their implications for literacy

education. In this final section, we provide suggestions for how literacy teacher educators can seek to empower raciolinguistically diverse, often emergent multilingual students through emancipatory multilingualism, particularly when working with pre-service and in-service teachers in teacher education programs.

First, literacy teacher educators should promote and perform heteroglossic approaches to pedagogy in feasible and accessible ways (Babino & Stewart, 2020). Within bottom-up approaches to language policy and practice (Johnson, 2013), literacy educators can promote diverse expressions in discourses, redefining normality through plurilingualism. For example, literacy teachers can use identity texts to encourage students to showcase their multilingual competence (Cummins & Early, 2011; Pratt et al., 2018). Identity texts are understood to be texts that function as mirrors, windows, and doors (Bishop, 1990; Botelho & Rudman, 2009) for ethnoracially and linguistically diverse students and families. For example, a critical review of Pura Belpré award-winning texts (Pratt et al., 2023) revealed that the texts written and illustrated by Latine authors by and about Latine excellence, experiences, and stories served as culturally sustaining identity texts for Latine students. More specifically, immigrant children's identity in relation to their names in their home language as shown in "My name is Yoon," originally published in 2003 by Farrar, Straus, and Griou (Recorvits, 2014), and "The Name Jar" (Choi, 2003) could be used to support multilingual learners' complex identity development process in English-dominant classrooms (Yoon et al., 2010).

However, multi/plurilingualism has become a contentious space within the current climate of neoliberal multiculturalism, in which diversity is commodified (Kubota, 2016). Linguistic diversity can easily be co-opted by the dominant group, further creating raciolinguistic disparity with regard to multilingualism between white English-dominant students and raciolinguistically minoritized students, as seen in dual language programs in the United States (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Flores et al., 2021). Thus, it is necessary to continuously view unequal power relations through a critical lens in literacy education contexts.

Second, literacy teacher educators are challenged to transform monoglossic assessment practices with heteroglossic assessment practices (García & Leiva, 2014). Assessment is a significant barrier to multilingualism, so educators may start with small changes in the local context that integrate opportunities for students to use their full linguistic repertoires to demonstrate content understanding. For instance, in discussing university-level teaching of writing, Lee (2018) argues that teachers may consider de-universalized assessment criteria by prioritizing negotiation with learners' unique aspirations, desires, and linguistic tools. Wider-scale testing is hard to change, but we need to continue exploring solutions. Decentering Eurocentric "English Only" theories is an important step in decolonizing our collective knowledge as a means to enact social change and challenge the ways literate identities are positioned within current pedagogical frameworks for bilingual, bicultural, and transnational students. According to Janks (2014), "While the social constructs who we are, so do we construct the social. This dialectic relationship is fluid and dynamic, creating possibilities for social action and change" (p. 33). That is to say, the socio-political

context constraints literacy teachers' meaningful action on assessment, but it is not a one-way relationship. Literacy educators can influence the politics of teaching for change.

Third, literacy teacher educators are encouraged to continue developing pre-service and in-service teachers' critical consciousness (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017) regarding assessment that is rooted in monoglossic ideologies by posing critical questions. Such questions include: "How does the international assessment data such as Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) influence U.S. education in this neoliberal era? How does PISA influence language education policy and its practice? How do PISA results contribute to the creation of standardized tests? Readers can refer to Berliner (2011) and Zhao (2020) on issues of PISA, including the imposition of monolithic and Eurocentric views. These questions can help teachers become conscious of how international data could be used to disempower them and their students by emphasizing a focus on test preparations. Teachers can also learn how to develop students' critical language awareness (see Shapiro, 2022; Yoon, 2022) and critical consciousness, particularly in dual-language programs (see Palmer et al., 2019).

Fourth, literacy teacher educators should recognize the tension between fluidity and fixity. It is necessary to challenge racism and linguicism to promote heteroglossia. However, this challenge should not prevent minoritized students from learning standardized English since withholding access to the dominant variety of English may do a disservice to raciolinguistically diverse students (e.g., Delpit, 1995; Tardy, 2016). Literacy professionals should recognize the hegemony of white standardized English while striving to whittle it with their own agentive power. What is essential is not to become complicit with the hegemony but to use it as a weapon (Canagarajah, 1999; Delpit, 1995). At the same time, professionals who have the power to transform the system need to proactively promote diverse ways of expression. Language policy processes can be used to combat raciolinguistic ideologies and "promote ideological and implementational spaces for historically marginalised languages and speakers of those languages" (Johnson, 2023, p. 34).

Fifth, we recommend that literacy teacher educators engage in anti-racism and anti-linguicism through building ideological clarity. Grappling with the truth of our shared histories and present realities compels us to refine our ideological clarity (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; DeMink-Carthew et al., 2023), and the iterative process of juxtaposing our conceptions of the social, political, and cultural frames that shape our lives with those propagated by groups in power (Bartolomé, 2002) through a lens of criticality and mindfulness. As we pursue ideological clarity, this lens of criticality and mindfulness charges us to examine how our research and practice either reify the existing social order or move us dialogically forward. Because the hegemony of white standardized English is ingrained in white supremacy and colonialism, our recommendations must be situated in engagement with anti-racism and anti-linguicism in our own classrooms, institutions, and broader society. We must address all forms of racism/linguicism—from individual microaggressions to institutional/systemic inequalities—and

epistemological inequalities, including the content of curriculum, instruction, and materials, as well as citation practices (Haddix, 2020; Kubota, 2020b). Teacher education programs should include courses on race, language, and literacy to help teachers understand how racism/linguicism is institutional, personal, explicit, and implicit. We understand that literacy teacher educators cannot do this alone; we must find allies and make collective efforts to promote anti-racism and anti-linguicism in order to give heteroglossia and plurilingualism legitimate status in education and beyond, which is only possible if we decolonize our collective knowledge and the white supremacist system within which we are embedded.

Sixth, literacy teacher educators should provide more opportunities for pre-service and in-service teachers to practice inviting students to utilize their plurilingual repertoires in the classroom (Yoon & Pratt, 2023). In this process, it is important for pre- and in-service teachers to recognize the value of familia in school contexts (see Wunseh & Nomlomo, 2023) and integrate it into lessons to promote multilingual learners' language and literacy development. Studies (e.g., Pratt et al., 2023) show that when language and literacy activities are related to their home culture, family events, and family experiences, multilingual learners are more engaged in learning. Through this process, the hidden, monolingual, and politically embedded curriculum (see Przymus & Huddleston, 2021) could be transformed into more culturally sustaining curriculum and practice.

Specifically, activities for teacher development might include designing a series of lessons, implementing those lessons in teachers' own classrooms, and sharing lessons with their colleagues in teacher education programs and in schools. Pre- and in-service teachers need to learn and experience dynamic and multilingual literacy instruction (Lam, 2013) before enacting these practices with their students. Multilingualism should not be treated as a sum of separate languages. Rather, we need to consider integrated, translanguaging practices that allow students to utilize their full linguistic repertoires to develop their ways of thinking in truly plurilingual spaces.

Seventh, we recommend that we, as literacy educators, shift our thinking to avoid centering the idea that heteroglossic approaches are beneficial to multilingual learners only. When we talk about multilingualism, we might assume that target learners are students from non-English backgrounds. This mindset should be reexamined to include students who only use English, including multiple varieties of English. In order to create plurilingual classroom spaces where all students' languages can co-exist, we must validate bilingualism, translanguaging, and multilingualism as assets. To achieve this goal, we need to work with all of our students as we strive to normalize plurilingualism as a new standard in literacy education. Therefore, when teachers design literacy lessons, they should consider the importance of including all students and providing more opportunities to engage in translanguaging practices (see Garcia & Wei, 2014; Horner et al., 2011; Horner & Tetrault, 2017).

Finally, additional research should examine how teachers can create spaces where raciolinguistically diverse and emergent multilingual learners can utilize their entire linguistic repertoires and be empowered to make choices about

when and how to do that. Although there is interest in plurilingual and translingual practices in educational settings (e.g., Lau & Van Viegen, 2020), the field would benefit from more classroom-based research focused on practical ideas for implementing pedagogies that challenge monoglossic ideologies and enact heteroglossic visions. In addition, research on bilingual education and racism that centers critical consciousness and racial ideologies is needed (Chavez-Moreno, 2022).

Conclusion

In promoting the development of literacies in a multicultural and multilingual world, this article advocates multilingual policy, theory, and practice so that raciolinguistically diverse students have the possibility to negotiate their plurilingual linguistic identities and use their full linguistic repertoires for successful literacy learning. Clearly, it is difficult to dismantle monoglossic ideologies and promote heteroglossic ideologies in the context of white standardized English hegemony in the United States, as this requires decolonization at the systemic level. To start, educational reforms through both top-down and bottom-up approaches are needed. Literacy educators can model resistance to prescriptive normality by enacting plurilingual pedagogies in literacy teacher education programs and allowing multilingualism to be established as a new norm to support multilingual learners' identities and success.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press.
- Alfaro, C. & Bartolomé, L. (2017): Preparing ideologically clear bilingual teachers: Honoring working-class non-standard language use in the bilingual education classroom. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 11-34.
- Alim, H. S. (2010). Critical language awareness. In N. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 205-231). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692849-010>
- Alim, H. S., Rickford, J. R., & Ball, A. F. (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. Oxford University Press.
- Alim, H. S., & Smitherman, G. (2012). *Articulate while Black: Barack Obama, language, and race in the U.S.* Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, K. T., Rodríguez-Martínez, S., & Yoon, S. S. (2024). Educators' stancetaking on standardized english: From prescriptivist to critically conscious and somewhere in-between. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2023.2299696>

- Babino, A. & Stewart, M. A. (2020). *Radicalizing literacies and languaging: A framework toward dismantling the mono-mainstream assumption*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic Justice: Black Language Literacy, Identity and Pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press. (Original work published 1975).
- Bartolomé, L. (2002). Creating an equal playing field: Teachers as advocates, cultural border crossers, and cultural brokers. In Z. Beykont (Ed.), *The power of culture: Teaching across language differences* (pp. 167-191). Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Bauer, E., Compton-Lilly, C., Li, G., & Razfar, A. (2021). Centering Learners: Literate Identities and literacy Education. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 53(4):435-436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X21105245>
- Baugh, J. (2018). *Linguistics in pursuit of justice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Berliner, D. C. (2011). The context for interpreting PISA results in the USA: Negativism, chauvinism, misunderstanding, and the potential to distort the educational systems of nations. In M. A. Pereyra, H.-G. Kotthoff, & R. Cowen (Eds.), *PISA under examination* (pp. 77-96). Springer.
- Bishop, R. S. (1990). Mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors. *Perspectives: Choosing and using books for the classroom*, 6 (3), ix-xi.
- Botelho, M. J., & Rudman, M. K. (2009). *Critical multicultural analysis of children's literature*. Routledge.
- Bristol, T. J., & Martin-Fernandez, J. (2019). The added value of Latinx and Black teachers for Latinx and Black students: Implications for policy. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 6(2), 147–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732219862573>
- Canagarajah, S. A. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the new Latin@ Diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 37(1), 64-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893267>
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. B. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education*, 41, 403–427. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X17690120>

- Cervantes-Soon, C. & Carrillo, J. F. (2016). Toward a pedagogy of border thinking: Building on Latin@ students' subaltern knowledge. *The High School Journal*, 99(4), 282-301. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2016.0016>.
- Chavez-Moreno, L. (2022). The continuum of racial literacies: Teacher practices countering whitestream bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 57(2), 108-132.
- Choi, Y. (2003). *The name jar*. Dragonfly Books
- Cummins, J., & Early, M. (2011). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Trentham Books.
- Cushing, I. (2023). The knowledge-rich project, coloniality, and the preservation of whiteness in schools: a raciolinguistic perspective. *Educational Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eduling-2022-0018>
- Cushing, I. (2024). Tiered vocabulary and raciolinguistic discourses of deficit: from academic scholarship to education policy. *Language and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2024.2308824>
- Cushing, I & Snell, J. (2022). The (white) ears of Ofsted: A raciolinguistic perspective on the listening practices of the schools inspectorate. *Language in Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000094>
- Darvin, K. J., & Heineke, A. J. (2017). The seal of biliteracy: Variations in policy and outcomes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(3), 486-499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12279>
- Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2012). (2nd ed.). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. NYU Press.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. The New Press.
- DeMink-Carthew, J., Smith, K. W., Burgess, K., Leonard, S.Y., Yoon, B., Andrews, P. G., Nagle, J. & Bishop, P. (2023). Navigating common challenges: Guidance for educators in racial justice work. *Middle School Journal*, 54(4), 25-36.
- Flores, N. (2013). Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual and bilingual education in the United States. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 10(4), 263-287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2013.846210>
- Flores, N. (2014). Creating republican machines: Language governmentality in the United States. *Linguistics and Education*, 25, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2013.11.001>
- Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory Into Practice*, 59(1), 22-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665411>

- Flores, N. & Beardsmore, H. (2015). Programs and structures in bilingual and multilingual education. In W. Wright, S. Boun, and O. García (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85, 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2019). Bringing race into the second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(S1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12523>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2022). Undoing competence: Coloniality, homogeneity, and the overrepresentation of whiteness in applied linguistics. *Language Learning*, 7(S2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12528>
- Flores, N. & Schissel, J. L. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: Envisioning a heteroglossic approach to standards-based reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 454-479. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.182>
- Flores, N., Tseng, A., & Subtirelu, N. (Eds.) (2021). *Bilingualism for all?: Raciolinguistic perspectives on dual language education in the United States*. Multilingual Matters.
- Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (2001). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. Bergin and Garvey.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_11
- García, O., & Solorza, C. R. (2020). Academic language and the minoritization of US bilingual Latinx students. *Language and Education*, 35(6), 505–521.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1329016>
- Gomez, L. (2015). Past & present: Arizona's language/literacy policies and their educational impact. *Literacy & Social Responsibility*, 8(1). <http://www.csulb.edu/misc/l-sr/ejournal/ejournal.html>

- Haddix, M. M. (2020). This is us: Discourses of community within and beyond literacy research. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 69, 26–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336920937460>
- Heng Hartse, J., & Kubota, R. (2014). Pluralizing English? Variation in high-stakes academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24, 71–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.04.001>
- Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J. & Trimbur, J. (2011). “Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach.” *College English*, 73(3), 303-321.
- Horner, B., & Tetreault, L. (Eds.) (2017). *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs*. Utah State University Press.
- Janks, H. (2014). *Doing critical literacy: Texts and activities for students and teachers*. Routledge.
- Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis model for critical literacy education. *Educational Review*, 52(2), 175-186.
- Jaspers, J., & Madsen, L. M. (2019). Fixity and fluidity in sociolinguistic theory and practice. In J. Jaspers & L. M. Madsen (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on linguistic fixity and fluidity: Linguagised lives* (pp. 1–26). Routledge.
- Jaumont, F. & Stein-Smith, K. (2019). *The gift of languages: Paradigm shift in U.S. foreign language education*. TBR Books.
- Johnson, D.C. (2023). Critical empirical approaches in language policy and planning. In M. Gazzola, F. Gobbo, D.C. Johnson, & J.A. Leoni de Leon (Eds.), *Epistemological and theoretical foundations in language policy and planning* (pp. 15–40).
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Johnson, E. J., & Johnson, D. C. (2015). Language policy and bilingual education in Arizona and Washington State. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1), 92-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.882288>
- Johnson, D.C. & Pratt, K.L. (2014). Educational Language Policy and Planning. In C. Chapelle, (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1416>
- Kang, O, & Rubin, D. L. (2009). Reverse linguistic stereotyping: Measuring the effect of listener expectations on speech evaluation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 28, 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X09341950>
- Kroskrity, P. (2021). Covert linguistic racism and the (re-)production of white supremacy. *Linguistic Anthropology*, 31(2), 180-193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12307>
- Kubota, R. (2016). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics.

- Applied Linguistics, 37(4), 474-494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu045>
- Kubota, R. (2020a). Promoting and problematizing multi/plural approaches in language pedagogy. In S. M. C. Lau & S. Van Viegen (Eds.), *Plurilingual pedagogies: Critical and creative endeavors for equitable language in education* (pp. 303–321). Springer.
- Kubota, R. (2020b). Confronting epistemological racism, decolonizing scholarly knowledge: Race and gender in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 41(5), 712–732. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz033>
- Lam, W. S. E. (2013). Multilingual practices in transnational digital contexts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(4), 820-825. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.132>
- Lau, S. M. C., & Van Viegen, S. (Eds.) (2020). *Plurilingual pedagogies: Critical and creative endeavors for equitable language in education*. Springer.
- Lawton, R. (2016). A critical integrated approach to language policy as discursive action: Strengths, challenges and opportunities. In Barakos, E. and Unger, J. (Eds.), *Discursive approaches to language policy* (pp. 105-125). Palgrave.
- Lee, J. W. (2018). *The politics of translanguaging: After Englishes*. Routledge.
- Lindemann, S., & Subtirelu, N. (2013). Reliably biased: The role of listener expectation in the perception of second language speech. *Language Learning*, 63(3), 567-594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12014>
- Macedo, D. (2017). Imperialist desires in English-Only language policy. *The CATESOL Journal*, 29(1), 81-110.
- MacSwan, J., Thompson, M.S., Rolstad, K., McAlister, K., & Lobo, G. (2017). Three theories of the effects of language education programs: An empirical evaluation of bilingual and English-only policies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 218-240. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000137>
- May, S. (2001). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. Longman.
- May, S. (Ed.) (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. Routledge.
- Meighan, P. (2023). Colonialinguism: colonial legacies, imperial mindsets, and inequitable practices in English language education. *Diaspora, Indigenous and Minority Education*, 17(2), 146–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2022.2082406>
- Nieto, D. G. (2021). Making it official: The institutionalization of the hegemony of English. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 29(96), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.29.5741>
- Palmer, D., Cervantes-Soon, C. Dorner, L., & Heiman, D. (2019). Bilingualism, biliteracy, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a

- fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice*, 58(2), 121-133.
- Pavlenko, A. (2002). We have room for but one language here: Language and national identity in the US at the turn of the 20th century, *Multilingua*, 21, 163-196. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.2002.008>
- Pratt, K. L., Puzio, K., Lee, Y. H. (2018). “¡Olé!” Locating capital and cultural wealth within multicultural children’s literature. *The Journal of Latinos and Education*, 20(1), 48-61. DOI: 10.1080/15348431.2018.1540350
- Pratt, K. L., Puzio, K., Lee, Y. H., Crawford, L., & Hatton, A. (2023). A mixed methods critical content analysis of Pura Belpré award and honor texts: Applications for practice. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 25(1), 81-102. <https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v25i1.2201>
- Przymus, S. D., & Huddleston, G. (2021). The hidden curriculum of monolingualism: Understanding metonymy to interrogate problematic representations of raciolinguistic identities in schools. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 23(1), 67–86. <https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v23i1.2435>
- Qin, K. (2020). Curriculum as a discursive and performative space for subjectivity and learning: Understanding immigrant adolescents’ language use in classroom discourse. *The Modern Language Journal*, 104(4), 842-859. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12675>
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005>
- Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(3), 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353>
- Recorvits, H. (2014). *My name is Yoon* (G. Swiatkowska, *Illus.*). Square Fish.
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46(5), 621–647. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562>
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2020). *Reimagining race and language: From raciolinguistic ideologies to a raciolinguistic perspective*. In H.S. Alim, A. Reyes and P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language and race* (pp. 90-107). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190845995.013.3>
- Rubin, D. L. (1992). Nonlanguage factors affecting undergraduates’ judgments of nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *Research in Higher Education*, 33, 511-531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00973770>
- Sánchez, M. T., García, O., Solorza, C. (2017). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1405098>

- Schmid, C. (2001). *The Politics of language: Conflict, identity, and cultural pluralism in comparative perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. Sr. (2000). *Language policy and identity politics in the United States*. Temple University Press.
- Shapiro, S. (2022). *Cultivating critical language awareness in the writing classroom*. Routledge.
- Smith, P. (2019). (Re)Positioning in the Englishes and (English) literacies of a Black immigrant youth: Towards a transraciolinguistic approach. *Theory into Practice*, 58, 292-303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1599227>
- Smith, P. (2020). Silencing invisibility: Toward a framework for Black immigrant literacies. *Teachers College Record*, 122(13), 1-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146812012201301>
- Souto-Manning, M., Malik, K., Martell, J., & Pión, P. (2021). Troubling belonging: The racialized exclusion of young immigrants and migrants of Color. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 53(1), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-021-00286-8>
- Tardy, C. M. (2016). *Beyond convention: Genre innovation in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality*. Longman.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2012). Language policy in a time of crisis and transformation. In J. W. Tollefson (ed.), *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues* (2nd Edition), (pp. 11–32). Routledge.
- Wunseh, Q. K., & Nomlomo, V. (2023). ‘Having a tongue and mouth but not able to speak’: Francophone immigrant parents’ experiences of child language brokering in South Africa. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 25(3), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v25i3.3401>
- Yoon, B. (2007). Offering or limiting opportunities: Teachers’ roles and approaches to English language learners’ participation in literacy activities. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(3), 216-225.
- Yoon, B. (2008). Uninvited guests: The influence of teachers’ roles and pedagogies on the positioning of English language learners in regular classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(2), 495-522.
- Yoon, B. (2009). Language, identity, and power: The needs of the newcomer Korean English language learner. In P. Dam, & M. T. Cowart (Eds.), *Understanding the English language learner* (pp. 71-90). Canh Nam Publishers.
- Yoon, B. (2015). Complexities of critical practice: The conflict between the teacher’s ideological stance and the students’ critical stance. In B. Yoon and R. Sharif (Eds.), *Critical literacy practice: Applications of critical theory in diverse settings* (pp. 79-93). Springer.

- Yoon, B. (2022). Critical literacy for English language learners. *The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1740>.
- Yoon, B., & Pratt, K. L. (Eds.) (2023). *Primary language impact on second language and literacy learning: Linguistically responsive strategies for classroom teachers*. Lexington.
- Yoon, B., Simpson, A., & Haag, C. (2010). Assimilation ideology: Critically examining underlying messages in multicultural literature. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 54(2), 109-118.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X19877462>
- Zhao, Y. (2020). Two decades of havoc: A synthesis of criticism against PISA. *Journal of Educational Change*, 21(2), 245-266. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-019-09367-x>

Author Contact

Rachele Lawton, rlawton@ccbcmd.edu

Bogum Yoon, byoon@binghamton.edu

Ryuko Kubota, ryuko.kubota@ubc.ca

Kristen L. Pratt, prattk@wou.edu