

Critical and decolonizing approaches to language education: A review of the literature

November 2024

Alex Ross, Graduate Academic Assistant



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Faculty of Education

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Introduction	4
Critical and Decolonizing Pedagogies in Language Education	6
<i>Defining criticality</i>	6
<i>Decoloniality in applied linguistics language education studies</i>	8
Critical and Decolonizing Language Pedagogies: Key Strategies	9
<i>Critiquing settler colonial discourses and ideologies</i>	9
<i>Leveraging translingual approaches to learning</i>	11
<i>Centering relationality</i>	13
Conclusion	14
<i>Challenges and Limitations</i>	15
References	17
Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations	21
Appendix B: Resources and Recommendations for Further Reading	23

Acknowledgements

The University of British Columbia's Vancouver campus is located on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territories of the xwmə0-kwəy'əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish) and səl'ilwətaʔɩ (Tsleil-Waututh) peoples, and the Okanagan campus is situated on the unceded territory of the Syilx Okanagan Nation.

This literature review was conducted under the supervision of:

Dr. Reginald D'Silva, Professor of Teaching, Department of Language and Literacy Education, Faculty of Education

Dr. Lee Gunderson, Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education, Faculty of Education

Introduction

In the Canadian higher education system, equity, diversity, inclusion, and decolonization (EDID) remain a top priority. This is evidenced by various projects and initiatives that have developed in recent years, such as student equity and diversity census initiatives at leading universities (e.g., McGill University, 2024; University of British Columbia, 2023; University of Toronto, 2023) as well as the federal government's official EDID action plans (Canadian Research Chairs, 2022). While acronyms and terminology encompassing EDID are constantly evolving, its definitions are typically based on frameworks that promote the fair treatment and full participation of all people (American Psychological Association, 2024). In particular, EDID initiatives in higher education settings aim to better support students, faculty, and staff who have been historically excluded and underrepresented in universities and colleges. Despite this crucial objective, previous research has highlighted the limitations of EDID efforts at an administrative level among postsecondary institutions. For instance, recent scholarship has highlighted the ambiguity encompassing definitions of EDID in Canadian universities' policies (Tamtik & Guenter, 2019). Moreover, in discussion of both Canada and the United States, scholars have argued that these institutions often incorrectly equate the inclusion of historically marginalized students – e.g., racialized students, students with disabilities, and first-generation students – to equity and justice (Stein, 2022; Tienda, 2013). In practice, this may lead to an emphasis on student recruitment strategies without addressing equity-deserving students' needs through changes in institutional policies and pedagogical practices (Tamtik & Guenter, 2019).

Honing the topic of EDID and Canada's considerable international student population at the postsecondary level, research has found that EDID policies seldom acknowledge international students as an equity-deserving group (Buckner et al., 2022). This is particularly notable in Canada, where the majority of international students come from East Asian, South Asian, South-East Asian and Latin American countries (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2023) and therefore may experience various forms of discrimination and racialization. It might be suggested that this oversight aligns more broadly with the lack of intersectional perspectives embedded within such policies, as noted by Tamtik and Balasubramaniam (2024). Correspondingly, EDID policies and

related initiatives rarely address linguistic diversity among student populations, even though linguistic differences often intersect with EAL speakers' experiences of racialization in English-speaking contexts (e.g., Flores & Rosa, 2015; Ramjattan, 2022). These considerations of linguistic discrimination are especially relevant to racialized international students studying at Canadian Anglophone universities, as the majority come from countries where English is not an official language (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2023). Against the backdrop of Canada's official language policy, those who are learning EAL or using EAL in Anglophone postsecondary contexts are frequently positioned from a deficit-based perspective (e.g., Marshall, 2009; Surtees, 2019; Tavares, 2021). Furthermore, recent scholarship has underscored the tensions between instructors' asset-based beliefs about multilingualism and the reality of pedagogical practices that reinforce monolingualism (e.g., Burner & Carlsen, 2023; Shin & Sterzuk, 2019). Ultimately, it may be argued that more work is needed to attend to linguistic differences as part of the work of EDID in higher education settings, and this is especially pertinent to Canada's large population of international EAL students at the postsecondary level. Additionally, it is imperative to balance top-down, policy-level EDID initiatives with more bottom-up, pedagogically oriented research and practices that foster inclusive learning environments for multilingual students.

In consideration of these core issues related to EDID, the following guiding question is proposed: from an EDID perspective, which theories and corresponding pedagogical approaches may inform current teaching practices involving racialized, multilingual international students studying in Canadian postsecondary settings? In an attempt to answer this question, this literature review first outlines key theoretical concepts that have shaped current scholarly conversations around critical and decolonizing pedagogies for multilingual students learning additional languages. Following this, a select number of theoretical and empirical texts are discussed to illustrate how critical and decolonial pedagogical approaches may be operationalized in classroom settings. To conclude, potential challenges and limitations of carrying out critical and decolonizing pedagogical approaches will be examined. This will be followed by a review of the implications of this area of research for both researchers and educators working with racialized, multilingual international students at Canadian postsecondary institutions.

Critical and Decolonizing Pedagogies in Language Education

In an effort to provide more linguistically and culturally inclusive education to historically marginalized students, scholars have argued for both *critical* and *decolonial* approaches to teaching. Broadly speaking, critical approaches to education seek to foreground structural issues of inequity and power (Pennycook, 2022), and such an approach aligns with EDID's broader aims for equity and justice. At the same time, decolonizing pedagogies encourage both educators and students to decenter Eurocentricism in educational settings and instead draw on their local ontologies and epistemologies (Hudley et al., 2024). Before exploring how both criticality and decoloniality can be operationalized in language teaching practices, definitions of both will be elaborated on below.

Defining criticality

Before exploring prevalent critical approaches to teaching multilingual EAL students, it is important to attempt to define *criticality* and situate it within language and literacy education. As stated by López-Gopar (2019), there is no singular definition of criticality but rather a multitude of approaches to incorporating criticality in language and literacy education¹. Nevertheless, critical theories in language education have historically been shaped by Marxist-influenced critical theory and poststructuralist theory, respectively (Kubota & Miller, 2017; Pennycook, 2021). Despite the vast array of learning contexts and theories that have informed critical language pedagogies, a few common features of criticality in language and literacy education may be highlighted.

Critique

To begin, Pennycook (2021) stipulates that criticality involves *critique* of taken-for-granted beliefs and ideologies, particularly as they relate to issues of power and inequality. Heavily informed

¹ See Pennycook (2021) for a succinct overview of critical domains of applied linguistics, which includes critical language pedagogies.

by poststructuralist theory, critical approaches to applied linguistics often examine how power manifests in everyday meaning-making practices, thus connecting unequal social relations on a micro level to broader structures on a macro level. Accordingly, critical *pedagogies* are expected to attend to local issues and seek to resist the ways in which institutions (e.g., educational, professional) often reproduce social inequities (López-Gopar, 2019). Situated in the local context, such critiques may address intersecting issues of gender, race, class, sexuality, disability, and beyond. This key tenet of criticality has important implications for language and literacy educators working with multilingual students. As highlighted by Darwin and Norton (2023), cognitive-based theories of learning have been emphasized in the fields of applied linguistics and language and literacy education. Such theories conceptualize learners' personality traits as static (e.g., motivated vs. unmotivated), and position students' identities as homogenized through the use of labels. Correspondingly, cognitive-based notions of learning also foreground individual differences and undertheorize the social context in which learning takes place. Alternatively, engaging in critique may encourage important conversations about power, and at the same time, counter practices of denying or essentializing parts of students' identities. In turn, this may create more opportunities for students to fully participate in the classroom, as students are encouraged to draw on their own lived experiences and engage in social issues that are relevant to the local context (Shapiro, 2022).

Praxis

While critique is a crucial first step in critical approaches to applied linguistics and language and literacy education, prominent scholars in the field have argued that critique must be paired with *praxis* (Kubota & Miller, 2017; Pennycook, 2021). In other words, critique of current issues is insufficient without collaborative action that strives to address the issues at hand. These latter tenets of criticality have been heavily informed by Freirean critical pedagogy, with praxis being defined as “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (Freire, 2000, p. 51). Described as a cyclical process, *reflection* and *action* prompt both educators and learners to critically consider the ways in which oppression occurs, and subsequently work collectively towards social change (Kubota & Miller, 2017). These two components of praxis are especially important for those working with

multilingual students who experience various forms of racism, ableism and discrimination in formal education settings. Considering the needs of international students in particular, previous research and corresponding policies have been criticized for positioning the experience of international students as something that happens *to* them, rather than framing international students' experiences in postsecondary institutions as something they are active participants in (Deuchar, 2022). In turn, Deuchar (2022) argues that international students are positioned in literature as primarily seeking different forms of capital by attending postsecondary institutions, rather than positive contributors to higher education learning and teaching practices. Thus, by reframing *experience* through the notion of praxis, researchers and educators may resist dominant discourses about how international students, multilingual or otherwise, shape the learning experience in universities and colleges. Practically speaking, embracing praxis in pedagogical approaches also encourages students to apply their prior knowledge and experiences to address real-world problems cooperatively, therefore repositioning students as *co*-contributors.

Decoloniality in applied linguistics language education studies

In addition to the growing field of critical applied linguistics and critical language pedagogies, decolonization has also become an important topic of discussion among scholars (e.g., Canagarajah, 2023; Motha, 2020; Schissel, 2024). Importantly, Hudley et al. (2024) frame decolonization in the fields of linguistics and applied linguistics as “distinct but related” to other EDID efforts, and this draws parallels to Tuck and Yang’s (2012) earlier critiques of decolonization in the academy. More specifically, Tuck and Yang advocate for decolonization efforts in education to be distinct from other social justice initiatives, rather than a concern that is added on to or used interchangeably with other critical and antiracist work. Situating decolonization in linguistics specifically, Hudley et al. (2024) describe such efforts as the simultaneous recognition of the ongoing effects of colonialism – particularly for Indigenous and Black Diasporic people – and affirmation of their epistemologies and knowledges that have persisted despite colonialism. This is especially important in consideration of long-standing beliefs and ideologies about the superiority of colonial (e.g., English) languages (Motha, 2020). Furthermore, particular varieties of these languages have been historically

privileged in the classroom as they are perceived as more closely aligned with “White users of English” (Kubota, 2022, p. 2). To combat these prevailing ideologies, decolonial approaches to language education prioritize locally situated and embodied epistemologies (López-Gopar & Sughrua, 2023). Hudley et al. (2024) also draw parallels to the notion of praxis by underscoring the importance of action through collaboration and partnership. Such collaboration places responsibility for the labour involved in decolonization efforts among both those from colonized *and* colonizing communities.

Critical and Decolonizing Language Pedagogies: Key Strategies

To exemplify how key theoretical concepts encompassing criticality and decolonization may be applied to the classroom, the subsequent sections will discuss relevant theoretical and empirical texts that explore one or more associated pedagogical strategies: critiquing settler colonial discourses and ideologies, leveraging translingual and embodied approaches to language learning, and centering relationality in language teaching and learning. Accordingly, each section will highlight a pedagogical strategy or concept that can be utilized in the classroom. It should be noted that these sections do not provide an exhaustive summary of the different strategies for critical and decolonizing pedagogical approaches. Instead, these suggested pedagogical strategies and concepts may be viewed as a point of departure for scholars and practitioners who wish to infuse EDID in their everyday practices while working with multilingual international students. Moreover, each strategy can and should be used in combination with others.

Critiquing settler colonial discourses and ideologies

As previously stated, critical and decolonizing approaches to language teaching often begin by questioning taken-for-granted beliefs that have become sedimented through settler colonial history and education. For example, Sterzuk and Hengen (2019) describe their process of destabilizing colonial discourses in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program for newcomers at a

Canadian university. After identifying harmful discourses encompassing Indigenous peoples that students had encountered before and after arriving in Canada, Sterzuk and Hengen (2019) sought to challenge these ideologies through a series of inquiry-based pedagogical activities. Importantly, these activities still maintained a focus on language (e.g., reviewing question formation, relative clause structures) while also stimulating students' thinking and questioning about what it means to be Canadian. Sample activities described in the study began with reading and listening to authentic materials about Indigenous political figures and contemporary artists. These materials provided alternative discourses to the prevalent settler colonial ideologies often embedded in popular teaching materials. Subsequently, the students participated in the construction of a historical timeline on the walls of the classroom, and this prompted students to ask important questions about treaties, reserves, and other key aspects of settler colonial history that are typically obscured in mainstream education. Ultimately, the goal of these activities was to guide students "towards asking critical questions about Canada" and provide students with tools and strategies to question settler colonial discourses they see and hear in everyday life.

Centering antiracism in English language teaching (ELT) pedagogies, Kubota (2021) similarly advocates for an approach that begins with teachers fostering "a critical awareness, knowledge, and stance regarding issues of racism and antiracism" (p. 243). Part of this critical awareness involves what she describes as "de-essentializing" antiracism. More specifically, Kubota argues that racism and antiracist efforts cannot be conceived through simple binaries (e.g., settler/Indigenous, White/racialized), but instead must be conceptualized through an intersectional lens. This aligns with Gorski's (2016) broader call to decenter culture and prioritize equity in EDID frameworks, as the former risks essentializing and stereotyping students through the frameworks that are intended to support them. Thus, an intersectional lens and critical reflexivity are essential for both educators and learners to begin problematizing taken-for-granted assumptions and stereotypes. In practical terms, Kubota (2021) suggests carrying out awareness-raising activities in a dialogic manner among both educators and students. Echoing Sterzuk and Hengen's (2019) inquiry-based approach to addressing settler colonialism, Kubota (2021) emphasizes the importance of leading students to ask questions through different teaching materials on contemporary topics and events. Thus, through the strategic use of authentic materials and activities that promote critical questions and

discussions of contemporary issues, it may be possible to challenge settler colonial discourses found within and outside of the language classroom.

Leveraging translingual approaches to learning

In addition to critiquing prevalent ideologies that present themselves in the language classroom, a growing body of literature has pointed towards the importance of incorporating students' multilingual and multimodal practices into language and literacy education (e.g., Cummins, 2007; May, 2013). The term multilingualism may refer to instances of language knowledge and use that draw on speakers' whole linguistic repertoire (Cenoz & Gorter, 2019). Related terms such as translanguaging (García, 2009) and translingual practices (Canagarajah, 2012) highlight the fluid and dynamic ways multilingual students may simultaneously use different linguistic and semiotic resources to achieve communicative goals and enact multiple identities. Ultimately, these pedagogical approaches shift teaching practices from deficit-based, monolingual strategies that position students as lacking in the target language to asset-based teaching, the latter which builds on students' whole linguistic repertoire (Lin, 2020; Van Viegen & Zappa-Hollman, 2019). Importantly, as argued by Kubota (2022), a translingual or multilingual stance towards language use invites educators and students to “dismantle unequal relations of power between standardized English used by White L1 English users and other forms of English used by L2 English users, many of whom are racialized” (p. 5). Considering ongoing EDID efforts at postsecondary institutions, translingual pedagogies may help counter forms of raciolinguistic discrimination experienced by racialized, multilingual international students in Canada (Task Force on Anti-Racism and Inclusive Excellence, 2022).

In López-Gopar and Sughura's (2023) approach to decolonizing ELT through “critical” thematic units for young learners in Oaxaca, Mexico, a translingual stance towards students' different semiotic resources was essential. As a rationale for the creation of the units, the authors appraised prior research on material development and thematic units in language education and noted that very little of the literature discusses ways to problematize English-only ideologies embedded in teaching materials and practices. This starting point draws parallels to both Kubota's (2021) and Sterzuk and Hengen's (2019) suggested pedagogical strategies, and it allows educators

to deliberate on the best way to begin to incorporate criticality and decoloniality into their institutions' already-existing teaching materials and practices.

Considering the high level of linguistic diversity in Oaxaca, López-Gopar and Sughura (2023) designed critical thematic units to simultaneously promote students' multilingual identities and stimulate thinking about real-life issues impacting the local community. The teachers in the study focused on problematizing dominant beliefs about English by questioning the "what" and "why" of English language learning in Oaxaca. Moreover, decolonizing pedagogical approaches were centered "by valuing children's othered languages as well as their ways of knowing and being" (p. 4). In practice, this was achieved by encouraging the students to create multilingual teaching materials (e.g., flashcards) and collaborate through multilingual and multimodal projects (e.g., student-directed videos based on a unit's theme, picture books created by the whole class). In all of these activities, the students were asked to draw on their local knowledges and experiences, as well as their full linguistic repertoires, to engage in real-world problems while also learning the target language.

While López-Gopar and Sughura's (2023) study focused on young learners, the implications of a translingual stance can be seen in an adult language classroom as well. Shifting the focus to a Canadian EAP program with international students, Galante's (2020) mixed-methods study explored the use of translanguaging pedagogies to foster vocabulary learning among international students in a Canadian EAP program. Compared to a control group who completed monolingual pedagogical tasks, the results of this study showed significant gains in vocabulary learning among the students who completed translingual learning activities. More importantly, qualitative data from student reflective journals suggests a perceived positive impact on the classroom environment. Notably, some participants expressed that through the pedagogical activities, they viewed their multilingual identities as a strength rather than a deficiency. Other participants highlighted the affordances of collaborating with peers in their first languages to build a sense of community and understanding in the classroom. In summary, these studies indicate that a translingual approach to teaching languages in the classroom may benefit students not only in terms of their additional language learning goals, but also for the purpose of identity affirmation and community building. This latter point leads to the final pedagogical strategy, which involves centering relationality.

Centering relationality

As highlighted by earlier discussions of critical and decolonizing pedagogies, forming collaborative relationships is vital for social action and change. In broad terms, Halle-Erby (2024) defines relationality as “the belief that our reality, at any given moment, is constructed by the relationships between and among the people, places, animals, and things around us” (p. 3). In applied linguistics and language education studies, relationality has been described as essential to the work of social justice (Avineri & Martinez, 2021). Applying this view to prevalent pedagogical practices in language and literacy education, Canagarajah (2024) also emphasizes relationality among both human and non-human actors in his discussion of decolonizing academic writing pedagogies. More specifically, he argues that an ecological view of the writing process is required to take stock of how different participants, languages, technologies, and other resources come together to generate meaning. Beyond the process of writing itself, Canagarajah (2024) also advocates for relationality in communication and meaning-making processes to address “mutual concerns for the claims and interests of all parties involved” (p. 284). Therefore, an ecological and relational approach to teaching language can still support students to achieve their communicative goals while also decentering individualism from meaning-making processes.

The importance of relationality to effect meaningful change is also evidenced in Porto’s (2023) focus on intercultural citizenship for a content and language integrated learning program in Argentina. Similar to the critical thematic units featured in López-Gopar and Sughura’s (2023) study, Porto’s (2023) pedagogy of intercultural citizenship encourages students to engage in issues that go beyond the classroom and forge connections with the local community. Notably, such an approach embraces the Freirean notion of praxis, as it aims to facilitate forms of civic engagement that are political in nature, while also effecting change on a local level through cooperative work. For example, Porto describes a mural project that required the students to work together, share personal aspects of their identities through multimodal representations, and question whether murals should be considered art or graffiti. Through this process, the students were able to find commonalities with their peers and engage with local political issues that were represented multimodally through the creation of their own murals. These murals were created in different areas

of the local community, such as on the side of a student's house or in the town square. Therefore, the project prompted students to position themselves as active citizens within the broader community while also encouraging them to leverage their multilingual and multimodal resources to engage with critical issues. Ultimately, such pedagogical initiatives demonstrate that relationality in language and literacy education can function to not only help students achieve their communicative goals, but also foster deeper engagement with social justice issues and their communities both within and beyond the classroom.

Conclusion

To conclude, critical and decolonizing approaches to language and literacy education emphasize the importance of challenging taken-for-granted beliefs about settler discourses and standard language varieties, collaborating within and beyond the classroom, and addressing broader social issues and inequities. More specifically, these approaches encourage both educators and students to critique dominant ideologies encompassing settler colonialism and monolingualism, while also promoting translingual and relational practices that validate students' full linguistic repertoire and local knowledges. Additionally, notions of praxis are seen throughout different approaches to critical and decolonizing pedagogies, and this provides students and practitioners with the impetus to work together towards action for social transformation. Therefore, for scholars and practitioners working with international postsecondary students who are learning or using EAL, the implications of critical and decolonizing approaches to language education are significant. In particular, these approaches encourage scholars and practitioners to move beyond deficit-based discourses, and the strategies discussed in this literature review provide just a few tangible ways that more culturally and linguistically inclusive pedagogies can be enacted in the classroom. By leveraging relational, translingual and action-oriented pedagogical strategies while engaging with real-world issues, scholars and practitioners can support students in achieving their academic goals while also being positioned as active contributors to their respective communities. Thus, even through top-down EDID policies may fail to address the needs of racialized, multilingual

international students, it is possible to effect positive change on a micro level through more inclusive pedagogical practices.

Challenges and Limitations

Challenges for practitioners

While there are clear benefits to engaging in critical and decolonizing pedagogies for language education, these approaches may raise distinct challenges for practitioners. To begin, a common difficulty of engaging in critical and decolonizing work is the tendency to revert to more comfortable, familiar discourses and pedagogical approaches, rather than embracing the discomfort required to engage in decolonizing work (Tuck & Yang, 2012). As discussed by Shin and Sterzuk (2019), this discomfort and tension may stem from various contextual factors, such as monolingual policies enforced on an institutional level through admission and assessment practices, or expectations from colleagues and students to continue the status quo. Similarly, some students may not feel comfortable navigating controversial topics, which are central to critical pedagogies. For these reasons, Kubota (2021) recommends that educators must exercise a high degree of self-reflexivity when planning lessons that address difficult topics and carry out such activities in a way that is responsive to the local context. Finally, educators must grapple with the "access paradox" (Janks, 2004; Lodge, 1997), which involves navigating a decolonial, translingual stance in the language classroom while also supporting students who may desire to learn communicative norms, particularly in postsecondary settings. This remains an ongoing point of tension in the literature around translanguaging, as racialized multilingual students' translingual practices in professional and academic settings may lead to further discrimination and exclusion (Dryden & Dovchin, 2022). To address this issue, Kubota (2022) recommends providing students with access to these norms while working to transform them through flexible pedagogical practices that encourage the use of other languages and varieties of the target language. Ultimately, these challenges highlight the need for practitioners to critically reflect on the possible limitations of critical and decolonizing pedagogical strategies discussed in the literature. Furthermore, educators must navigate the boundaries of what types of strategies are viable within their own teaching contexts.

Limitations

In addition to challenges for practitioners, there are a few key theoretical limitations presented in this literature review that must be addressed. As previously mentioned, decolonization efforts in education institutions have been critiqued as a whole – most notably by Tuck and Yang (2012) – for being framed as an additive to other social justice initiatives that simply placate, rather than dismantle, settler colonialism. Therefore, the term EDID itself is problematized, and both scholars and educators must think reflexively about how to best approach the work of decolonizing their work, in addition to other social justice initiatives. Relatedly, Kubota (2022) critiques discussions of decolonization in academia as too often “abstract,” leading to the creation of “a new canon as well as hierarchies of knowledge and scholars” (p. 3). This latter point underscores the importance of language and literacy education scholarship that seeks to apply the tenets of decoloniality into action-oriented, pedagogical approaches. Finally, Kubota (2022) warns of the risk of essentializing and romanticizing Global South epistemologies through scholars’ efforts to engage in critical and decolonizing work. This may occur by oversimplifying such epistemologies and glossing over the nuances of power and diversity found within particular communities from the Global South. Thus, without a critical approach to decolonizing language education theories and practices, binaries and hierarchies that are prevalent in critical theories of the Global North may be inadvertently reproduced (Canagarajah, 2024). For this reason, self-reflexivity is crucial (Kubota, 2021). In light of these challenges, embracing critical and decolonial approaches to language education remains vital for creating more equitable and transformative teaching practices for multilingual international students.

References

- American Psychological Association. *Equity, diversity, and inclusion framework*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 28, 2024, from <https://www.apa.org/about/apa/equity-diversity-inclusion/framework>.
- Avineri, N., & Martinez, D. C. (2021). Applied linguists cultivating relationships for justice: An aspirational call to action. *Applied Linguistics*, 42(6), 1043–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amab065>
- Buckner, E., Chan, E., & Kim, E. (2022). Equity, diversity, and inclusion on Canadian universities: Where do international students fit in? *Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée et Internationale*, 51(1), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.5206/cie-eci.v51i1.14613>
- Burner, T., & Carlsen, C. (2023). Teachers' multilingual beliefs and practices in English classrooms: A scoping review. *Review of Education*, 11(2), e3407. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3407>
- Canadian Research Chairs. (2022, June 28). *Equity, diversity and inclusion action plan*. https://www.chairs-chaire.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/action_plan-plan_action-eng.aspx
- Canagarajah, S. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (2023). Decolonization as pedagogy: A praxis of 'becoming' in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 77(3), 283–293. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad017>
- Canagarajah, S. (2024). Decolonizing academic writing pedagogies for multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 58(1), 280–306. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3231>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2019). Multilingualism, translanguaging, and minority languages in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103, 130–135.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), Article 2.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2023). Investment and motivation in language learning: What's the difference? *Language Teaching*, 56(1), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000057>
- Deuchar, A. (2022). The problem with international students' 'experiences' and the promise of their practices: Reanimating research about international students in higher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 48(3), 504–518. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3779>
- Dryden, S., & Dovchin, S. (2022). Translingual English discrimination: Loss of academic sense of belonging, the hiring order of things, and students from the Global South. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(4), 1231–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2022-0065>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). Continuum.
- Galante, A. (2020). Translanguaging for vocabulary development: A mixed methods study with international students in a Canadian English for Academic Purposes program. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens: Global perspectives* (pp. 293–328). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47031-9_14
- García, O. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Gorski, P. (2016). Rethinking the role of “culture” in educational equity: From cultural competence to equity literacy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 18(4), 221–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2016.1228344>
- Halle-Erby, K. (2024). “Relationships are reality”: Centering relationality to investigate land, indigeneity, blackness, and futurity. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 37(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2022.2025471>
- Hudley, A. H. C., Mallinson, C., & Bucholtz, M. (2024). *Decolonizing linguistics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197755259.001.0001>
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2024, January 29). *CIMM – International student population – October 24, 2023*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/transparency/committees/cimm-oct-24-2023/international-student-population.html>
- Janks, H. (2020). The access paradox. *English in Australia*, 139, 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.849538151512751>
- Kubota, R. (2021). Critical antiracist pedagogy in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 75(3), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab015>
- Kubota, R. (2022). Decolonizing second language writing: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58, 100946. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100946>
- Kubota, R., & Miller, E. R. (2017). Re-examining and Re-envisioning criticality in language studies: Theories and Praxis. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 14(2–3), 129–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2017.1290500>
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2020). From deficit-based teaching to asset-based teaching in higher education in BANA countries: Cutting through ‘either-or’ binaries with a heteroglossic plurilingual lens. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 33(2), 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1723927>
- Lodge, H. (1997) *Providing access to academic literacy in the Arts Foundation Programme at the University of the Witwatersrand in 1996 - the theory behind the practice*. [Unpublished Masters Research Report, University of the Witwatersrand].
- López-Gopar, M. E. (2019). Introducing international critical pedagogies in ELT. In M. E. López-Gopar (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Critical Pedagogies in ELT* (pp. 1–15). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95621-3_1
- López-Gopar, M., & Sughrua, W. M. (2023). Decolonizing ELT methods through critical thematic units. *ELT Journal*, 77(3), 305–315. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad012>
- Marshall, S. (2009). Re-becoming ESL: Multilingual university students and a deficit identity. *Language and Education*, 24(1), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780903194044>
- May, S. (2013). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. Taylor & Francis Group. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ubc/detail.action?docID=1323290>
- McGill University. (2024). *Student census*. Equity at McGill. Retrieved October 3, 2024, from <https://www.mcgill.ca/equity/resources/student-census>
- Motha, S. (2020). Is an antiracist and decolonizing applied linguistics possible? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40, 128–133. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190520000100>
- Pennycook, A. (2021). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical re-introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003090571>

- Pennycook, A. (2022). Critical applied linguistics in the 2020s. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 19(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2022.2030232>
- Porto, M. (2023). Intercultural citizenship as CLIL in foreign language education. In D. L. Banegas & S. Zappa-Hollman (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781003173151-13>
- Ramjattan, V. A. (2022). Accenting racism in labour migration. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 42, 87–92. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190521000143>
- Schissel, J. L. (2024). Decolonizing English language testing. *TESOL Journal*, n/a(n/a), e832. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.832>
- Shapiro, S. (2021). *Cultivating Critical Language Awareness in the Writing Classroom* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003171751>
- Shin, H., & Sterzuk, A. (2019). Discourses, practices, and realities of multilingualism in higher education. *TESL Canada Journal*, 36(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v36i1.1307>
- Stein, S. (2022). *Unsettling the University: Confronting the Colonial Foundations of US Higher Education*. Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.56021/9781421445052>
- Sterzuk, A., & Hengen, S. (2019). “When I came to Canada like I heard lots of bad stuff about Aboriginal people”: Disrupting settler colonial discourses through English language teaching. In M. E. López-Gopar (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Critical Pedagogies in ELT* (pp. 19–37). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95621-3_2
- Surtees, V. (2019). Challenging deficit constructions of the international student category in Canadian higher education. *TESL Canada Journal*, 36(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v36i1.1302>
- Tamtik, M., & Balasubramaniam, P. (2024). Equity, diversity, and inclusion in Canadian colleges: Examining definitions and unveiling perceptions. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 48(7), 714–726. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2024.2386460>
- Tamtik, M. & Guenter, M. (2019). Policy analysis of equity, diversity and inclusion strategies in Canadian universities: How far have we come? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 49(3). 41-58. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1066634ar>
- Tavares, V. (2021). Multilingual international students at a Canadian university: Portraits of agency. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 5(2), 92–117. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/11135>
- Task Force on Anti-Racism and Inclusive Excellence. (2022). *54 steps on the pathway to an anti-racist and inclusively excellent UBC*. <https://antiracism.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2022/07/00-UBC-Complete-Report-UBC.0847-ARIE-TF-Digital-11-complete.pdf>
- Tienda, M. (2013). Diversity ≠ inclusion: Promoting integration in higher education. *Educational Researcher*, 42(9), 467–475. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X13516164>
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1). <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>
- University of British Columbia. (2023). *Student diversity census*. UBC Equity & Inclusion Office. Retrieved October 1, 2024, from <https://equity3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/about/institutional-initiatives/student-demographic-data-project/student-diversity-census/>
- University of Toronto. (2023). *Student equity census dashboard – Office of the Vice-Provost, Students*. Retrieved October 1, 2024, from <https://www.viceprovoststudents.utoronto.ca/news-initiatives/u-of-t-student-equity-census/student-equity-census-dashboard/>

Van Viegen, S., & Zappa-Hollman, S. (2020). Plurilingual pedagogies at the post-secondary level: Possibilities for intentional engagement with students' diverse linguistic repertoires. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 33(2), 172–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2019.1686512>

Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations

- Acknowledge and incorporate linguistic diversity into teaching practices: Recognize students' linguistic repertoires as assets rather than deficits. Incorporate translingual pedagogical strategies to encourage students to draw on their full linguistic repertoires.
- Promote critical inquiry: Encourage students to question and critically analyze dominant ideologies in Canada, such as settler colonialism and monolingual norms, that may shape their experiences of language education. When possible, use authentic and current materials to explore these issues.
- Implement praxis-oriented activities: Move beyond critique by incorporating praxis (reflection combined with action) into classroom activities. Create opportunities for students to engage in social issues relevant to their lived experiences and local communities.
- Foster relationality: Build strong relationships within the classroom and beyond through the local community. Emphasize collaborative learning and encourage students to view their education as interconnected with the world around them.
- Teach with an intersectional lens: Consider how race, disability, gender, sexual orientation, linguistic difference and other identities intersect in students' experiences of language learning. Avoid essentializing students by focusing solely on culture; instead, prioritize equity and the diverse identities of each student.
- Engage in reflexive practices: Practice self-reflexivity to understand your own biases and experiences encompassing (linguistic) discrimination and prejudice. This is vital when addressing complex issues related to race, language, and cultural identity in the classroom.

- Balance translingual approaches with students' individual needs and goals: While supporting students' translingual practices, also acknowledge students' desire to learn communicative norms in academic and professional settings.

Appendix B: Resources and Recommendations for Further Reading

The following resources were gathered as part of the literature review and do not comprise a comprehensive list.

- Galante, A., Chiras, M., dela Cruz, J. W. N., & Zeaiter, L. F. (2022). *Plurilingual guide: Implementing critical plurilingual pedagogy in language education*. Plurilingual Lab Publishing. https://www.mcgill.ca/plurilinguallab/files/plurilinguallab/plurilingual_guide.pdf. This guidebook was created by a professor and graduate students in McGill University's Educational Studies program. The guidebook provides an overview of key concepts encompassing critical plurilingual pedagogy, as well as sample tasks that can be adapted to different language teaching contexts. The sample tasks are intended for students with transnational and migrant backgrounds who are studying in Canada.
- Shapiro, S. (2024). *Critical Language Awareness (CLA) Collective*. <https://cla.middcreate.net/>. This website, created by Dr. Shawna Shapiro, hosts a range of resources to support instructors and researchers interested in Critical Language Awareness (CLA). This website will be of particular interest to educators who are interested in incorporating more critical approaches to language teaching. Accordingly, the "Teaching Resources" section of the website provides suggestions for classroom activities that focus on issues of language, identity, power, and privilege.
- Task Force on Anti-Racism and Inclusive Excellence. (2022). *54 steps on the pathway to an anti-racist and inclusively excellent UBC*. <https://antiracism.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2022/07/00-UBC-Complete-Report-UBC.0847-ARIE-TF-Digital-11-complete.pdf>. Although this UBC task force report does not focus exclusively on language education and issues related to linguistic discrimination, Recommendation #38 (p. 257-258) provides a succinct summary of how linguistic differences intersect with discrimination.
- UBC Master of Educational Technology (MET). (2023, September 26). *EDID Resources*. <https://met.ubc.ca/about/edid/edid-resources/>. This is a collection of EDID resources

arranged by UBC's Master of Educational Technology program. The materials and resources provided place an emphasis on topics relevant to the Canadian teaching context.