
LANGUAGE DIVERSITY AND INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION

Dr. Arindam Bose

Associate Professor

Centre of Excellence in Teacher Education

School of Education

Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS)

Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

Language diversity has become a defining feature of contemporary classrooms as learners bring different home languages, dialects, literacy practices, cultural experiences, and communicative preferences into shared learning spaces. Inclusive classroom communication therefore requires more than the use of a common language of instruction. It requires deliberate teaching practices that recognise students' linguistic repertoires as learning resources, reduce barriers to participation, and create equitable opportunities for students to listen, speak, read, write, question, collaborate, and demonstrate understanding. This paper examines the relationship between language diversity and inclusive classroom communication through a descriptive and analytical review of relevant scholarship, international guidance, and classroom-oriented practice. The study focuses on four connected areas: the educational significance of linguistic diversity, communication barriers that may arise in linguistically heterogeneous classrooms, inclusive pedagogical strategies, and the role of teachers and institutions in sustaining language-responsive learning environments. The analysis shows that exclusion may occur when classroom interaction is organised around a single dominant language, when academic language is assumed rather than taught, when students' home languages are treated as deficits, or when assessment and feedback depend on narrow forms of expression. Conversely, inclusive communication can be strengthened through clear teacher talk, purposeful visual and multimodal support, structured peer interaction, flexible language use, explicit teaching of subject-specific vocabulary, culturally responsive examples, and multiple ways for learners to express knowledge. Practices associated with translanguaging, scaffolding, universal design for learning, formative feedback, and community engagement can help teachers maintain high academic expectations while supporting access and participation. This paper does not report an original intervention or a statistically representative survey. Instead, it synthesises evidence and professional guidance to develop a practical framework for educators who wish to communicate inclusively across language differences. The framework emphasises language awareness, learner voice, equitable participation, accessible materials, respectful feedback, and continuous professional development. The paper concludes that language diversity should be approached as a pedagogical asset and a matter of educational equity. When classroom communication affirms students' linguistic identities and provides meaningful support for academic participation, it can improve belonging, comprehension, collaborative learning, and opportunities for achievement.

Keywords: Language Diversity; Inclusive Communication; Multilingual Classrooms; Translanguaging; Linguistically Responsive Teaching; Classroom Participation; Universal Design for Learning; Educational Equity; Teacher Communication; Cultural Inclusion.

1. INTRODUCTION

Classrooms increasingly bring together learners who use different home languages, regional languages, dialects, registers, scripts, and forms of cultural expression. This diversity is visible in schools, colleges, vocational institutions, and online learning environments. It is also visible within individual learners, who may use one language at home, another language in the community,

and a different language for formal academic work. For teachers, this situation creates an important question: how can classroom communication support rigorous learning without requiring students to set aside their linguistic identities? Inclusive communication responds to this question by treating language as central to access, participation, relationships, and assessment rather than as a background issue.

Language is not limited to spoken words. In classrooms, communication includes explanation, questioning, classroom routines, instructions, gestures, visuals, reading materials, written feedback, peer talk, digital content, and assessment tasks. A student may understand an idea but find it difficult to express that understanding in the dominant language of instruction. Another student may follow informal conversation yet struggle with the specialised vocabulary of mathematics, science, social studies, or academic writing. When these differences are overlooked, learners may be incorrectly judged as less capable, less engaged, or less prepared. Inclusive communication seeks to prevent this misunderstanding by making learning language visible and teachable.

International guidance on multilingual education recognises that learners benefit when education systems value languages they understand and when schools create conditions for meaningful participation. UNESCO identifies language as a foundational factor for inclusion and notes that multilingual approaches can support learning, social cohesion, and respect for diversity. This perspective is important because it shifts the focus from asking students to fit a single communication norm to asking how educational settings can be designed to include varied linguistic resources.

Inclusive classroom communication does not mean reducing academic expectations or translating every classroom activity into every language. It means planning instruction so that students can access concepts, practice academic language, contribute ideas, and receive feedback through multiple supportive pathways. Teachers may use concise directions, advance organisers, modelled examples, bilingual glossaries, visual cues, sentence frames, collaborative tasks, and opportunities for students to plan ideas in familiar languages before presenting in the language of instruction. Such measures can support all learners while offering particular benefits to students who are developing proficiency in the instructional language.

The present paper explores language diversity and inclusive classroom communication from an educational and practical perspective. The objective is to clarify major concepts, identify

barriers and enabling practices, and present a framework that teachers and institutions can adapt to local contexts. The discussion is relevant to multilingual societies as well as to classrooms where migration, mobility, internationalisation, disability, socioeconomic difference, and digital learning create diverse communication needs.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on multilingual education, culturally responsive teaching, language development, and inclusive pedagogy shows that language is deeply connected to learning opportunity. Students learn subject content through language, but they also learn how to participate in academic communities through the ways language is used in classrooms. The literature therefore encourages teachers to examine who speaks, who is heard, which forms of expression are rewarded, and how language-related barriers are addressed during instruction.

A common theme across this literature is the rejection of deficit assumptions. Learners who are developing the dominant language of schooling are not empty of knowledge; they bring linguistic and cultural resources that can support meaning-making. At the same time, students need purposeful instruction in the language and discourse practices that are valued in formal learning. Inclusive communication balances these two responsibilities: affirming students' existing repertoires and teaching the additional language practices needed for academic success.

2.1 LANGUAGE DIVERSITY AS A CLASSROOM RESOURCE

Language diversity refers to the presence of different languages, dialects, registers, and communicative traditions within a learning community. It includes differences between home and school language, variation within a language, sign languages, indigenous and minority languages, and the shifting language choices that multilingual learners make across settings. In many classrooms, diversity is not an exception but a normal condition of learning. A resource-oriented approach recognises that learners can draw on more than one language to connect new concepts with prior knowledge, cooperate with peers, and develop confidence in academic tasks.

Scholarship on multilingualism argues that learners' language practices are dynamic rather than neatly separated into independent systems. Translanguaging research, for example, describes how multilingual learners may use their full communicative repertoire to make meaning, solve problems, and participate in learning. This does not remove the importance of learning the official language of instruction. Instead, it recognises that strategic use of familiar languages can serve as a bridge to deeper comprehension and more confident engagement with academic language.

Language diversity also shapes identity and belonging. When students hear their names pronounced respectfully, see familiar examples in learning materials, or are invited to share knowledge from their linguistic and cultural communities, they are more likely to view the classroom as a place where they can participate authentically. By contrast, persistent correction of accent, informal language, or home-language use can discourage participation and signal that only one way of communicating is legitimate. Inclusive practice therefore requires teachers to distinguish between supportive teaching of academic conventions and messages that devalue a learner's identity.

KEY FINDINGS

- Language diversity includes home languages, dialects, registers, scripts, sign languages, and culturally shaped communication practices.
- Learners' existing linguistic resources can support comprehension, collaboration, and the development of academic language.
- A resource-oriented perspective avoids treating multilingualism as a barrier or evidence of lower ability.
- Respect for language is closely connected to student identity, confidence, and classroom belonging.

2.2 INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION

Inclusive classroom communication is the deliberate design of teaching interactions so that all students can access information, contribute ideas, and demonstrate learning. It involves attention to the clarity of teacher language, the pace and structure of explanations, the accessibility of classroom materials, the organisation of talk, and the

fairness of feedback and assessment. It also requires teachers to recognise that understanding is not always visible through rapid oral response in a dominant language. Students may need preparation time, visual support, peer rehearsal, or alternative modes of expression before they can participate fully.

Clear communication begins with purposeful teacher talk. Directions should be sequenced, concise, and supported by demonstrations or written prompts. New academic vocabulary should be introduced in context, revisited across lessons, and connected to examples that students can understand. Teachers can check understanding by inviting students to explain ideas in their own words, use diagrams, complete quick written reflections, or discuss concepts with a partner. These strategies are more informative than asking only whether students understand.

The organisation of classroom dialogue is equally important. Whole-class discussion can privilege students who are already fluent, confident, and accustomed to the expected communication style. Structured routines such as think-pair-share, turn-and-talk, small-group roles, discussion protocols, and wait time can widen participation. When teachers value multiple ways of contributing, students have more opportunities to practice language, test ideas, and learn from peers. This approach promotes communication as a shared classroom responsibility rather than a performance by a limited number of students.

Feedback can either strengthen inclusion or create silence. Feedback is most useful when it identifies what a student has understood, names the next step, and offers a manageable way to improve. For language learners, correction should be selective and linked to the learning purpose. Correcting every grammatical feature in a spoken contribution can interrupt meaning-making and discourage risk-taking. A more inclusive approach separates feedback on ideas, organisation, vocabulary, and language accuracy according to the task's goals.

KEY FINDINGS

- Inclusive communication plans for access, participation, and expression rather than relying on a single dominant mode of interaction.

- Clear instructions, explicit vocabulary teaching, modelling, and visual support reduce avoidable language barriers.
- Structured peer interaction and adequate wait time make classroom talk more equitable.
- Feedback should preserve learner dignity while supporting academic and language development.

2.3 TRANSLANGUAGING, SCAFFOLDING AND MULTIMODAL EXPRESSION

Translanguaging is often discussed as a practical approach for multilingual classrooms because it permits learners to use available linguistic resources while engaging with complex ideas. In practice, a teacher may allow students to discuss a concept in a familiar language before writing a response in the language of instruction, compare key terms across languages, create bilingual vocabulary notes, or use community examples to explain a topic. The purpose is not to replace academic language learning, but to make it possible for students to reason, collaborate, and participate while they develop proficiency in that language.

Scaffolding complements this approach. Scaffolding refers to temporary supports that enable learners to complete tasks they could not yet manage independently. In language-diverse classrooms, scaffolds may include model texts, worked examples, visual organisers, sentence starters, word banks, labelled diagrams, guided questions, and opportunities to rehearse orally before writing. Effective scaffolds are connected to clear learning goals and are gradually withdrawn as students gain confidence. They should not oversimplify intellectual work; rather, they make the language demands of that work more transparent and manageable.

Multimodal communication is another important dimension of inclusion. Meaning can be represented through images, symbols, maps, gestures, demonstrations, audio, video, graphic organisers, and digital tools as well as spoken and written language. Multiple representations can support comprehension for multilingual learners, students with disabilities, students who are still developing literacy, and students who benefit from different ways of processing information.

Multimodality also provides varied opportunities for learners to express understanding, for example through a poster, concept map, oral explanation, short video, annotated diagram, or written response.

Universal Design for Learning offers a useful planning framework because it encourages educators to anticipate learner variability before instruction begins. By providing multiple means of engagement, representation, and action or expression, teachers can reduce barriers without waiting for individual students to experience difficulty. Language-responsive and multimodal practices therefore work together: they create accessible routes into learning while preserving high expectations for content understanding and academic communication.

KEY FINDINGS

- Strategic use of familiar languages can help students connect prior knowledge with new academic concepts.
- Scaffolds make language demands visible and support students to work toward independent performance.
- Multimodal materials support both comprehension and equitable ways of demonstrating learning.
- Universal Design for Learning helps teachers plan proactively for variability in language and communication needs.

2.4 TEACHER LANGUAGE AWARENESS AND CLASSROOM CLIMATE

Teachers play a central role in shaping the linguistic climate of a classroom. Language awareness includes noticing the language demands of a task, understanding how academic registers differ from everyday conversation, and recognising the cultural assumptions built into communication routines. A teacher who is language-aware can plan for key vocabulary, syntax, discourse patterns, and participation structures without lowering the cognitive level of the lesson. This capacity is especially important for mainstream teachers who teach learners developing proficiency in the language of instruction.

Classroom climate is influenced by everyday interactions. Respectful pronunciation of names, openness to questions, clear norms against ridicule, and acknowledgement of

diverse communication styles can make students more willing to contribute. Teachers can model curiosity by inviting students to compare words, metaphors, or examples across languages while ensuring that no student is placed under pressure to act as a spokesperson for an entire group. The goal is to make diversity visible and valued without turning individual learners into cultural exhibits.

Professional learning is necessary because inclusive communication cannot depend only on individual goodwill. Teachers need opportunities to develop knowledge of language acquisition, multilingual pedagogy, accessible material design, and fair assessment. They also need time to collaborate with language specialists, special educators, families, and community members. Institutional policies can support this work by providing multilingual resources, translation where appropriate, and procedures that welcome family participation in more than one language.

The literature also warns against simplistic solutions. Translation software, bilingual labels, or occasional cultural celebrations can be helpful, but they do not by themselves create inclusive communication. Inclusion depends on sustained attention to who has access to classroom dialogue, who receives meaningful feedback, and whose knowledge is recognised as relevant. The most effective practices are embedded in daily teaching rather than reserved for special occasions.

KEY FINDINGS

- Language-aware teachers identify both the content and communication demands of learning tasks.
- Respectful everyday interaction contributes to psychological safety and participation.
- Professional development and collaboration are essential for sustained inclusive practice.
- Visible diversity initiatives are insufficient unless they influence routine teaching, feedback, and assessment.

3. OBJECT OF THE STUDY

The primary object of this study is to examine how language diversity influences classroom

communication and how inclusive pedagogical practices can improve students' access, participation, and expression. The study considers linguistic diversity not as a single learner characteristic but as a classroom condition involving different home languages, levels of proficiency in the language of instruction, dialects, academic registers, and culturally influenced ways of speaking and learning.

The study further focuses on the communicative choices made by teachers and institutions. These choices include the design of instructions, classroom interaction patterns, vocabulary support, visual and digital resources, feedback practices, assessment formats, family communication, and professional development. By bringing these elements together, the study develops a practical framework for interpreting inclusive classroom communication in diverse educational settings.

3.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To examine the educational significance of language diversity in contemporary classrooms.
- To identify communication barriers that can limit participation for linguistically diverse learners.
- To analyse the role of teacher language, classroom dialogue, and feedback in inclusive learning.
- To explore the contribution of translanguaging, scaffolding, and multimodal communication practices.
- To consider how academic language can be taught explicitly without devaluing students' home languages.
- To examine equitable participation structures for whole-class, peer, and group learning.
- To identify accessible approaches to assessment and demonstration of learning.
- To analyse the role of teacher professional development and institutional support.
- To propose a practical framework for inclusive classroom communication.
- To support educators in treating language diversity as a resource for learning and belonging.

TABLE 3.1: OBJECT OF THE STUDY FRAMEWORK

S. No.	Research Objective	Description	Expected Outcome
1	Language Mapping	Identify languages, dialects, registers, and communication needs present in the classroom.	Context-aware planning
2	Access to Meaning	Use clear teacher talk, explicit vocabulary, visuals, examples, and demonstrations.	Improved comprehension
3	Participation Design	Structure peer interaction, wait time, and multiple low-risk ways to contribute.	Equitable learner voice
4	Linguistic Affirmation	Respect home languages and identities while teaching academic conventions.	Belonging and confidence
5	Scaffolded Expression	Provide models, sentence frames, organisers, and multimodal response options.	Stronger academic communication
6	Feedback and Assessment	Separate feedback on ideas, language, and task conventions; use varied evidence of learning.	Fairer evaluation
7	Teacher Capacity	Develop linguistically responsive knowledge through collaboration and professional learning.	Sustained practice
8	Family and Institutional Support	Build multilingual communication channels and inclusive policies.	Shared responsibility for inclusion

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a descriptive and analytical research methodology. It does not report an experimental intervention, classroom observation, or survey of participants. Instead, it synthesises ideas from peer-reviewed research, foundational books in multilingual and inclusive education, international policy guidance, and practice-oriented frameworks. This approach is appropriate for the study because the central objective is to clarify concepts, compare recurring themes, and develop an inclusive communication framework that can be adapted to different classroom contexts.

The methodology is organised around the relationship between language diversity and participation. Sources were selected for their relevance to multilingual education, linguistically responsive teaching, translanguaging, scaffolding, culturally responsive pedagogy, universal design for learning, formative assessment, and educational inclusion. The analysis focuses on practical implications for classroom communication rather than attempting to rank languages, learners, or educational systems.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

A qualitative, literature-based design guides the study. The design allows the researcher to identify concepts and practices that recur across different bodies of work, including language education, inclusive education, teacher development, assessment, and classroom discourse. Rather than treating individual sources as isolated findings, the study examines how their insights can be connected to everyday teacher decisions about explaining, questioning, grouping, providing resources, responding to learner contributions, and assessing understanding.

The design is interpretive because inclusive communication must be understood in relation to local context. A strategy that is useful in one classroom may require adaptation in another due to differences in age group, language policy, subject area, school resources, student mobility, disability access, and community expectations. For this reason, the study presents principles and examples rather than a fixed sequence of universal steps.

4.2 SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND ANALYTICAL FOCUS

The source base includes scholarly publications on multilingualism, academic

language development, culturally responsive teaching, translanguaging, and inclusive pedagogy, along with guidance from UNESCO, OECD, CAST, and rights-based education frameworks. Sources were read for recurring statements about learner access, classroom participation, identity, teacher knowledge, assessment, and institutional conditions. The inclusion of both research and professional guidance helps connect theoretical perspectives with teaching practice. The analytical focus is on four questions: What language-related barriers can limit participation? Which communication practices reduce those barriers? How can teachers support academic language while affirming linguistic identities? What institutional supports make inclusive communication more sustainable? These questions were used to organise the discussion and the final framework.

4.3 ANALYTICAL PROCEDURE

The analysis proceeded through thematic comparison. First, source material was grouped into broad themes: language diversity, communication access, participation, instructional scaffolding, feedback and assessment, teacher capacity, and institutional support. Second, common problems and enabling practices were identified within each theme. Third, the relationships between themes were examined to determine how classroom communication can be planned as an integrated process rather than as an isolated language-support activity.

The final stage involved translating the thematic findings into practical implications. This process produced the study framework in Table 3.1 and the analysis in the following section. Because the study is literature-based, the findings should be read as an evidence-informed synthesis. They do not claim to measure causal effects in a particular school or to replace context-specific research involving learners and teachers.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

In this study, data analysis refers to the thematic analysis of the selected literature and professional guidance. The analysis identifies patterns in how language diversity is linked with classroom access, participation, identity, and assessment. The findings are presented as analytical themes rather than numerical

results. Across the reviewed material, a consistent message emerges: inclusive communication depends on how educators design learning interactions, not only on students' current proficiency in the language of instruction.

The themes below should be interpreted as interconnected. For example, clear teacher explanations can improve access, but access alone does not ensure participation. Students also need opportunities to rehearse ideas, contribute in varied formats, and receive feedback that enables improvement. Similarly, valuing home languages can strengthen belonging, but it should be combined with explicit instruction in the academic discourse needed for success in formal learning.

5.1 COMMUNICATION BARRIERS IN LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE CLASSROOMS

A major barrier occurs when the language demands of a task are hidden. Teachers may believe that students are struggling with content when the difficulty actually lies in unfamiliar vocabulary, complex sentence structures, dense instructions, or unexplained expectations for academic talk and writing. For example, a science question may require students to compare, justify, infer, and use evidence, but these discourse moves may not be explicitly taught. Students who understand the phenomenon may still find it difficult to produce the expected response.

Another barrier is the unequal distribution of talk. Fast-paced whole-class questioning can favour students who already know when to speak, how to phrase answers in the dominant register, and how to recover from errors publicly. Learners who need more processing time, who are translating internally, or who worry about accent and grammar may participate less often. This pattern can be mistaken for low engagement even when students are thinking carefully about the task.

Communication barriers are also linked to material design. Text-heavy worksheets, uncaptioned videos, unfamiliar cultural references, and instructions presented only orally can exclude learners with differing language and literacy experiences. The barrier is not always the absence of effort by students; it can be the absence of multiple routes to meaning. Inclusive materials make essential

ideas visible through examples, images, labels, demonstrations, and opportunities to revisit information.

KEY POINTS

- Language demands can be hidden inside content tasks, especially where academic vocabulary and discourse expectations are not taught explicitly.
- Rapid whole-class interaction may conceal students' understanding by privileging quick, confident speakers.
- Text-heavy or single-mode materials can create unnecessary barriers to comprehension and participation.
- Teachers need to distinguish between difficulty with concepts and difficulty with the language used to access or express those concepts.

5.2 INCLUSIVE COMMUNICATION PRACTICES

The analysis identifies clarity, redundancy, and interaction design as core features of inclusive communication. Clarity involves expressing the lesson purpose, modelling the desired process, breaking complex directions into steps, and checking understanding in more than one way. Redundancy does not mean repetition without purpose. It means presenting important information through complementary modes, such as oral explanation paired with a visual organiser, key terms paired with examples, or a written task accompanied by a model response.

Purposeful peer interaction is another high-value practice. Students often need a protected space to test language and ideas before sharing with the entire class. Think-pair-share, collaborative problem solving, partner reading, reciprocal teaching, and group roles can create such opportunities. For these routines to be inclusive, teachers should make participation expectations explicit, provide language supports where useful, and monitor whether all students have meaningful roles rather than allowing fluent speakers to dominate.

Flexible language practices can also support learning. Teachers may permit students to plan, annotate, compare terms, or discuss preliminary ideas using familiar languages while still supporting the use of the official language of instruction for specified learning goals. This approach can strengthen conceptual understanding and reduce the false

choice between linguistic identity and academic achievement. It also communicates that multilingual knowledge is valuable in the classroom.

KEY POINTS

- Clear objectives, modelled examples, and multi-step directions reduce avoidable misunderstandings.
- Visual, oral, written, and interactive supports work together to make key ideas accessible.
- Structured peer talk provides rehearsal opportunities and distributes participation more equitably.
- Flexible use of learners' linguistic resources can support conceptual understanding and academic language growth.

5.3 PARTICIPATION, ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

Participation should be understood broadly. A student may participate by explaining orally, asking a clarifying question, annotating a diagram, contributing to a group product, writing a reflection, or using a digital response tool. When participation is defined only as spontaneous whole-class speech, many students' contributions are missed. Inclusive classrooms therefore offer varied entry points and make assessment criteria clear in advance. Assessment can become more equitable when teachers separate the construct being assessed from the language form used to show it. If the purpose of a task is to assess scientific reasoning, the teacher may allow labelled diagrams, oral explanation, bilingual planning notes, or a scaffolded written response where appropriate. Where academic writing is the target, language features should be taught and assessed explicitly rather than treated as invisible prerequisites. This distinction helps educators maintain standards while avoiding inaccurate conclusions about students' knowledge.

Feedback should be timely, specific, and aligned with the task purpose. For linguistically diverse learners, feedback can be prioritised in stages: first the meaning or content, then organisation, then key vocabulary or language conventions. Teachers can use conferencing, annotated exemplars, peer feedback protocols, and short audio or video comments to make feedback more

accessible. The aim is to help students see a path forward, not simply to identify errors.

KEY POINTS

- Participation includes multiple forms of contribution, not only fluent public speaking.
- Assessment should distinguish between the target knowledge or skill and the language format used to demonstrate it.
- Explicit criteria and model responses help students understand expectations for academic communication.
- Feedback is more inclusive when it is prioritised, actionable, and connected to a clear next step.

5.4 DIGITAL AND MULTIMODAL SUPPORT

Digital resources can expand access when they are chosen carefully. Captioned videos, text-to-speech, speech-to-text, visual dictionaries, collaborative documents, translated glossaries, audio instructions, and interactive diagrams can provide flexible ways to encounter and express ideas. Such tools are most effective when they are integrated into lesson design rather than offered as an afterthought. Teachers should also consider unequal access to devices, connectivity, digital literacy, and privacy when selecting tools.

Technology should not be treated as a substitute for relationships or professional judgment. Automatic translation may be inaccurate, particularly for specialised terminology, idiomatic expressions, and low-resource languages. A teacher's role remains essential in interpreting learner needs, clarifying meaning, and creating a respectful climate for communication. Digital tools are valuable when they increase access and choice while preserving dialogue, accuracy, and student agency.

Multimodal support can be used without advanced technology. Posters, manipulatives, real objects, diagrams, picture cards, maps, gestures, and board work can all make classroom communication more accessible. The key principle is that important concepts should be available through more than one channel and that learners should have more than one supported way to show what they know.

KEY POINTS

- Accessible technology can provide additional routes to information, interaction, and expression.
- Digital tools require attention to accuracy, privacy, equity of access, and teacher mediation.
- Low-tech visual and tactile supports are also valuable forms of multimodal communication.
- Multiple channels of representation and response support a broader range of learners.

6. DISCUSSION

The thematic analysis confirms that language diversity is inseparable from classroom communication. Students' opportunities to learn are shaped not only by what is taught but by how instructions are delivered, how dialogue is organised, how responses are evaluated, and how linguistic differences are interpreted. When classrooms rely on implicit communication norms, students who are unfamiliar with those norms may be positioned at a disadvantage even when they possess strong ideas and relevant knowledge. This is why inclusive communication must be treated as a core element of pedagogy rather than a specialised add-on.

The reviewed literature supports a balanced approach. Teachers should affirm students' home languages and cultural repertoires while also providing explicit access to the academic language needed for formal learning. This balance avoids two harmful extremes: expecting students to abandon their linguistic identities, or assuming that respect for diversity eliminates the need for systematic language instruction. Inclusive classrooms can value multilingual resources and maintain ambitious goals for reading, writing, discussion, inquiry, and disciplinary reasoning. The discussion also highlights the importance of participation design. Students are more likely to contribute when lessons provide preparation time, clear roles, sentence supports where needed, and varied ways to share understanding. These features benefit multilingual learners but are not limited to them. They can improve learning for students with disabilities, students who experience anxiety in public speaking, students who are unfamiliar with dominant classroom norms,

and students who simply need time to think. Inclusive communication is therefore a way of improving the learning environment for the whole class.

Finally, sustained change depends on institutional support. Teachers need access to high-quality materials, specialist collaboration, professional development, and policies that respect linguistic diversity. Family engagement should also be considered part of classroom communication, particularly where parents and caregivers use languages different from the school's dominant language. When schools create accessible channels for family communication, they strengthen trust and gain valuable knowledge about students' experiences, strengths, and needs.

7. CONCLUSION

Language diversity is a central feature of education, and it should be approached as a resource for learning, identity, and community rather than as a problem to be managed. Inclusive classroom communication enables students to access ideas, participate in dialogue, develop academic language, and demonstrate understanding through equitable and respectful pathways. The present study shows that inclusive communication is strengthened by clear teacher language, explicit vocabulary instruction, scaffolding,

structured peer interaction, multimodal materials, flexible language practices, fair assessment, and constructive feedback.

The study also emphasises that inclusion requires high expectations together with meaningful support. Students should not be denied challenging content because they are developing proficiency in the language of instruction. Instead, teachers can make the language of learning visible, provide supports that preserve intellectual challenge, and create opportunities for students to draw on their full communicative repertoire. This approach helps prevent language difference from being misread as limited ability.

Future research may build on this conceptual study through classroom-based investigations, student voice research, comparative studies across language policy contexts, and evaluations of professional development models. For educators, the practical priority is to examine everyday communication: who understands the directions, who gets time to speak, whose knowledge is recognised, and how students are supported to grow in academic language. When these questions guide planning and reflection, language diversity can become a source of richer dialogue, stronger belonging, and more equitable learning.

8. REFERENCES

1. Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
2. Banks, J. A. (2015). *Cultural Diversity and Education: Foundations, Curriculum, and Teaching* (6th ed.). Routledge.
3. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
4. CAST. (2018). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2*. CAST. <https://udlguidelines.cast.org/>
5. Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment - Companion Volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.
6. Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
7. de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101-124.
8. García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. Routledge.
9. García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
10. Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

11. Gibbons, P. (2015). *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom* (2nd ed.). Heinemann.
12. Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor Among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students*. Corwin.
13. Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. Routledge.
14. Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (2003). *Continua of Bilinguality: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research, and Practice in Multilingual Settings*. Multilingual Matters.
15. Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford University Press.
16. Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
17. Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 52(2), 98-109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770327>
18. Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361-373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108322110>
19. McCarty, T. L., & Lee, T. S. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 101-124. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.q83746nl5pj34216>
20. OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 Results (Volume II): Where All Students Can Succeed*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/b5fd1b8f-en>
21. Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching Every Student in the Digital Age: Universal Design for Learning*. ASCD.
22. Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistics Perspective*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
23. UNESCO. (2003). *Education in a Multilingual World*. UNESCO.
24. UNESCO. (2020). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education - All Means All*. UNESCO.
25. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining Our Futures Together: A New Social Contract for Education*. UNESCO.
26. UNESCO. (2024). *Multilingualism and Language Diversity for Inclusion in Education: Brief on Inclusion in Education*. UNESCO.
27. United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. United Nations.
28. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.
29. Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
30. Zwiers, J. (2014). *Building Academic Language: Meeting Common Core Standards Across Disciplines, Grades 5-12* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.