Fostering Shared Understanding: Negotiating Interpretive Practices Across Discursive Boundaries

Prof. Kenji Saito
Graduate School of Intercultural Studies, Kobe University, Japan

Dr. Fatima El-Hadji
Center for Language, Society, and Culture, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco

ABSTRACT

In an increasingly interconnected world, individuals routinely encounter and engage with diverse discursive communities, each possessing unique epistemologies, rhetorical conventions, and methods of constructing and validating interpretive claims. This article explores the theoretical underpinnings and pedagogical implications of navigating and hybridizing these varied interpretive practices. Drawing upon research in literacy studies, cultural-historical activity theory, and the sociology of science, we conceptualize "interpretive claim-making" as a dynamic, intersubjective process influenced by disciplinary norms, cultural backgrounds, and digital participatory cultures. We synthesize existing scholarship to argue that fostering shared understanding across discursive boundaries necessitates explicit instruction in disciplinary literacies, the cultivation of "boundary spanners," and the embrace of "syncretic" or "hybrid" approaches to meaning-making. This conceptual analysis proposes a framework for examining how learners (and educators) can develop agency in negotiating divergent interpretations, highlighting the critical role of dialogic assessment and the integration of out-of-school literacies. Ultimately, cultivating the capacity to engage meaningfully with multiple interpretive frameworks is presented as a fundamental skill for navigating complex contemporary knowledge landscapes.

Keywords: Interpretive communities, discursive practices, intersubjectivity, boundary crossing, hybrid literacies, disciplinary literacy, meaning-making, pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary society is characterized by an intricate tapestry of "discursive communities," where knowledge is constructed, validated, and communicated according to distinct norms, values, and interpretive frameworks. These communities range from academic disciplines (e.g., literary studies, physics, history) to professional fields, cultural groups, and burgeoning online participatory cultures like fan communities [10, 11, 20, 23]. Within each community, "interpretive claim-making"—the process by which individuals articulate, justify, and challenge understandings of texts, data, or phenomena—operates under specific conventions regarding evidence, argumentation, and authority [20, 23]. However, the increasing demand for interdisciplinary collaboration, intercultural communication, and engagement with diverse forms of digital media necessitates that individuals not only operate within their primary discursive communities but also navigate and potentially "hybridize" interpretive practices across these boundaries.

The challenge lies in fostering a shared understanding when diverse interpretive lenses are brought to bear on the same subject matter. While agreement is often a goal, true "intersubjectivity" can exist even without full consensus, requiring instead a shared understanding of differing perspectives [19, 22]. This negotiation of meaning across boundaries is crucial for effective learning and collaboration in complex environments [8]. This article posits that merely understanding different interpretations is insufficient; learners must develop the capacity to actively bridge, blend, and critically engage with multiple interpretive frameworks, moving beyond singular modes of claim-making. Such a process often involves "boundary crossing," facilitated by "boundary objects"—shared artifacts or ideas that maintain coherence across different interpretive contexts while allowing for local adaptations [1, 15].

This conceptual article aims to explore the theoretical landscape surrounding interpretive claim-making across discursive communities and to articulate the pedagogical implications for cultivating the skills necessary for such navigation and hybridization. We argue that effective engagement with multiple interpretive practices fosters intellectual flexibility, critical thinking, and a more robust understanding of knowledge itself. By examining how individuals position themselves within these communities [7] and leverage various literacies—including those developed in informal, out-of-school contexts—we can better prepare learners to engage meaningfully with the complexities of contemporary information and knowledge production [13, 18].

Research Questions:

1. How do distinct discursive communities shape interpretive claim-making?

2. What theoretical constructs (e.g., intersubjectivity, boundary objects, syncretic literacies) illuminate the processes of navigating and hybridizing interpretive practices across these communities?

3. What pedagogical approaches can effectively support learners in engaging with and integrating diverse interpretive frameworks?

4. What are the implications for teaching, learning, and assessment when fostering the negotiation of interpretive claims across discursive boundaries?

2. Literature Review

The act of interpreting and making claims is fundamentally shaped by the "discursive communities" in which it occurs. This section reviews key theoretical constructs that underpin an understanding of how individuals navigate and hybridize interpretive practices across these varied contexts.

2.1 Interpretive Communities and Disciplinary Discourses

Academic disciplines, in particular, function as distinct interpretive communities, each with its own epistemological assumptions, preferred methodologies, and criteria for valid claim-making [20, 23]. For instance, a literary scholar's interpretation of a text might prioritize thematic analysis and intertextual connections, drawing on theories of genre or reader-response [12, 16, 25], whereas a historian's interpretation of the same text might focus on its historical context, authorial intent, and archival evidence. Rainey [23] emphasizes the social and problem-based nature of literary reading and reasoning, highlighting how disciplinary literacy in English Language Arts involves specific ways of engaging with texts. Moje [20] similarly calls for foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching, acknowledging that disciplinary literacies are distinct from general literacy skills. The challenge for learners is not only to understand the content within a discipline but also to internalize its unique ways of seeing, thinking, and communicating [20, 23].

2.2 Intersubjectivity and the Negotiation of Meaning

Central to navigating diverse interpretations is the concept of "intersubjectivity," which refers to the shared understanding that emerges through interaction [3, 19]. Matusov [19] argues that intersubjectivity can exist even "without agreement," emphasizing that shared understanding might simply mean recognizing and understanding the other's perspective, even if one ultimately disagrees. Nathan et al. [22] illustrate this in mathematics classrooms, demonstrating how "to disagree, we must also agree" on the underlying framework of discussion. Beck [3] further elaborates on subjectivity and

intersubjectivity in the teaching and learning of writing, highlighting the dialogic nature of meaning-making. The negotiation of interpretive claims is thus not merely about finding a single correct answer but about engaging in a process of shared sense-making, where different perspectives are articulated, understood, and sometimes reconciled or hybridized.

2.3 Boundary Crossing, Hybridity, and Syncretic Literacies

The concept of "boundary crossing" offers a powerful lens for understanding how individuals move between and integrate knowledge from different discursive communities [1]. Akkerman and Bakker [1] define boundary crossing as a process where individuals "encounter differences and come to terms with them," often leading to new insights or a transformation of understanding. "Boundary objects" are crucial in this process: they are artifacts, concepts, or ideas that serve as shared points of reference across different communities, flexible enough to be adapted to local contexts while retaining a common identity [1, 15]. For instance, a diagram of a cell might serve as a boundary object between biology and art, interpreted differently but understood in both contexts. Buxton et al. [8] identify "boundary spanners" as individuals who can bridge student and school discourses, demonstrating how specific individuals can facilitate this crossing.

Beyond merely crossing boundaries, individuals often engage in "hybridity" or "syncretic approaches" to meaning-making. Gutiérrez [10] advocates for "syncretic approaches to literacy learning," leveraging "horizontal knowledge and expertise" that students bring from their everyday lives into academic settings. Lizárraga and Gutiérrez [17] further explore "nepantla literacies" from the Borderlands, emphasizing the richness that comes from leveraging "in-betweenness" in learning. This involves actively blending or juxtaposing interpretive strategies from different contexts to create new forms of understanding and expression [17]. This is particularly evident in the realm of "transliteracies," which acknowledge the fluid and interconnected nature of literacies across various modes, media, and contexts [18].

2.4 Digital Literacies and Challenging Normative Interpretations

The rise of digital and participatory cultures, such as fan communities, has provided fertile ground for examining how interpretive claims are made and negotiated outside traditional academic settings. Jenkins and Kelley [11] explore "reading in a participatory culture," highlighting how practices like "remixing Moby Dick" in the English classroom challenge conventional interpretations and engage learners in active meaning-making. Similarly, Lammers et al. [13] discuss "playful multiliteracies" and the role of fan-based literacies in English Language Arts

pedagogy, demonstrating how these informal interpretive practices can be leveraged for academic learning. Gray [9] explores "paratexts" (promos, spoilers) which shape interpretation of media texts, indicating the complex interplay of explicit and implicit cues in meaning-making. These digital spaces often foster intertextuality and allow for the challenging of normative interpretations. Jones et al. [12] illustrate how the digital serialization of *Dracula* facilitated "literary play gone viral," demonstrating how intertextual engagement can lead to delight and new interpretive claims that push against established academic readings. This phenomenon also connects to broader discussions of linguistic justice [2] and the recognition that diverse cultural backgrounds and lived experiences profoundly shape interpretation [21, 27, 28]. For instance, Morrell and Duncan-Andrade [21] show how engaging hip-hop culture can promote academic literacy with urban youth. Thomas and Stornaiuolo [28] discuss "restorying the self" and "bending toward textual justice," recognizing how personal narratives and identity influence interpretation. This highlights that interpretive communities are not just disciplinary but also socio-cultural [7, 26].

2.5 Dialogic Practices and Assessment for Agency

Effective negotiation of interpretive claims relies heavily on dialogic interaction. Beck and Jones [5] emphasize fostering agency through dialogue in classroom writing assessment, where learners are active participants in evaluating their own and others' claims. Beck et al. [6] further detail how "scaffolding students' writing processes through dialogic assessment" supports the development of sophisticated interpretive skills. Beck [4]'s work on a "think-aloud approach to writing assessment" demonstrates how externalizing interpretive processes can reveal the complex cognitive moves involved in making claims. Levine [16] offers an "affect-based strategy" for making interpretation visible, indicating that emotions also play a role in meaning-making. Storm et al. [26] discuss "designing interpretive communities toward justice," emphasizing the role of "indexicality" in classroom discourse to navigate diverse perspectives equitably. Finally, Lee [14] provides insights into teachers' reflection on innovative feedback approaches in EFL writing, underscoring the importance of metacognitive engagement with interpretive practices.

3. Methods (Conceptual Framework and Research Approach)

This conceptual article proposes a framework for investigating how individuals navigate and hybridize interpretive claim-making across diverse discursive communities. While this paper does not present empirical data, it outlines the methodological considerations for future research designed to explore this complex phenomenon. Such research would ideally employ qualitative, interpretive methodologies to capture the nuanced processes of meaning-making in situ.

3.1 Research Design

A suitable research design would involve an interpretive case study approach, focusing on specific learning environments or collaborative projects where individuals from different discursive backgrounds engage in shared interpretive tasks. This could include interdisciplinary courses, online collaborative writing platforms, or community-based projects. The emphasis would be on understanding the participants' lived experiences and the situated nature of their interpretive practices. Longitudinal studies might also be employed to observe the development of interpretive flexibility over time.

3.2 Participants and Contexts

Participants would be selected based on their involvement in contexts that naturally bring together different interpretive approaches. This could include:

- Students in interdisciplinary programs: For example, students simultaneously enrolled in science and humanities courses, or those undertaking capstone projects requiring integration of knowledge from multiple fields.

- Participants in online participatory cultures: Individuals active in fan communities (e.g., fan fiction writers, cosplayers) who engage in complex literary analysis and creative production [12, 13].

- Collaborative learning groups: Students working on projects that require them to synthesize information from various disciplinary sources or cultural perspectives.

The focus would be on capturing a diversity of backgrounds and exposure to different discursive norms.

3.3 Data Collection Approaches

To capture the dynamic processes of interpretive claim-making and hybridization, a multi-modal data collection strategy would be employed:

- Think-Aloud Protocols: Participants would be asked to articulate their thoughts and interpretive processes aloud while engaging with complex texts or problems that require cross-community interpretation [4, 16]. This method provides direct insight into cognitive strategies and the negotiation of meaning.

- Discourse Analysis of Interactions: Audio and video recordings of collaborative discussions, debates,

and peer feedback sessions would be collected and transcribed. Analysis would focus on:

- o Indexicality: How participants use language to point to, invoke, and negotiate different interpretive frameworks [26].

- o Positioning: How individuals take up and challenge different roles and stances within the interpretive process [7].

- o Argumentation Patterns: How claims are constructed, evidenced, and challenged within and across discursive boundaries.

- o Intersubjective Negotiation: Identifying instances where understanding is achieved, where disagreement is managed, and where new shared meanings emerge [3, 19, 22].

- Analysis of Artifacts: Examination of student work (e.g., essays, research papers, digital media projects) that requires the integration of diverse interpretive practices. This could include analysis of how "boundary objects" manifest in their work or how "hybrid" claims are constructed.

- Semi-structured Interviews: Follow-up interviews would explore participants' metacognitive awareness of their interpretive strategies, their perceived challenges in navigating different communities, and their insights into how they learn to bridge interpretive gaps. Teachers' reflections on feedback approaches [14] would also be relevant here.

3.4 Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis techniques, particularly those rooted in discourse analysis and thematic analysis [29], would be used to identify patterns in how individuals navigate and hybridize interpretive claims. The analysis would aim to:

- Identify the characteristic interpretive practices of different communities as observed in interaction.

- Trace the moments of "boundary crossing" and the role of "boundary objects" [1, 15].

- Unpack the strategies individuals employ to make sense of, reconcile, or integrate divergent interpretations.

- Identify instances of "syncretic" or "hybrid" claim-making, where elements from multiple discursive traditions are combined [10, 17].

- Analyze the role of dialogue and feedback in fostering interpretive agency and negotiating shared understanding [5, 6].

- Explore how out-of-school literacies and cultural backgrounds influence interpretive processes [2, 13, 18, 21].

3.5 Ethical Considerations

All research involving human participants would adhere to strict ethical protocols, including informed consent, ensuring anonymity and confidentiality, and prioritizing the well-being of participants. Particular attention would be paid to power dynamics within classroom or online settings, ensuring that all voices are heard and respected in the interpretive process.

4. RESULTS (CONCEPTUAL ILLUSTRATIONS)

As a conceptual paper, this section offers illustrative "results" derived from the theoretical framework and existing empirical literature, demonstrating the types of insights that an empirical study employing the outlined methods would likely yield. These conceptual illustrations highlight the dynamic nature of interpretive claim-making across discursive communities and the strategies individuals employ to foster shared understanding.

4.1 Manifestations of Disciplinary Interpretive Norms

In a hypothetical classroom scenario where students are tasked with analyzing a complex socio-scientific issue (e.g., climate change), we would observe distinct interpretive patterns emerging based on students' primary disciplinary affiliations. For instance, a student trained in physics might prioritize quantitative data, statistical significance, and the reproducibility of experiments in their claim-making, adhering to the rigorous empirical standards of their field [20, 23]. Conversely, a student from a humanities background might focus on the social implications, ethical dilemmas, or narrative construction of climate change reports, emphasizing qualitative data and rhetorical analysis. Disagreement could arise not from differing facts, but from conflicting interpretive frameworks regarding what constitutes valid evidence or a compelling argument, echoing the concept of intersubjectivity without full agreement [19].

4.2 Boundary Objects and Intersubjective Negotiation

The use of "boundary objects" would be crucial in facilitating communication between these disciplinary perspectives. A complex infographic illustrating climate data might serve as a boundary object [1, 15]. The physics student would interpret the data points and error bars, while the humanities student might analyze the visual rhetoric, the source's credibility, and the implied narrative. During collaborative discussions, the infographic would become a

point of shared reference, allowing students to articulate their discipline-specific interpretations while gradually understanding the other's lens. This process exemplifies how intersubjectivity is built, where initial disagreements in interpretation lead to a deeper shared understanding of each other's claims [3, 22]. For example, the physics student might explain the scientific uncertainty of a data point, while the humanities student explains how the visual framing of that uncertainty impacts public perception.

4.3 Hybridization and Syncretic Claim-Making

Instances of "hybridization" would be observed when students begin to actively blend interpretive strategies. For example, in a research paper on climate change, a student might integrate quantitative data analysis with a critical discourse analysis of media representations of climate science. This "syncretic" approach [10, 17] demonstrates an ability to draw upon the strengths of different interpretive communities to construct a more comprehensive and nuanced claim. This isn't merely juxtaposing different claims but actively synthesizing them. Consider the analysis of literary texts. A student, influenced by digital fan communities, might analyze the "paratexts" (e.g., fan theories, memes, promotional materials) surrounding a novel like *Dracula* [9, 12, 25], blending academic literary criticism with insights from popular reception and intertextual play. This hybrid interpretation can challenge normative academic readings, opening up new avenues for meaning-making [12, 28].

4.4 Leveraging Out-of-School Literacies and Dialogic Assessment

Crucially, "results" would highlight how learners draw upon their "horizontal knowledge" and "transliteracies" from out-of-school contexts [10, 18]. A student from a culturally diverse background, for instance, might bring a "nepantla literacy" [17]—an "in-betweenness" perspective—to interpret a historical event, offering insights that bridge official narratives with community-based understandings. Similarly, students engaged in fan-based literacies [13] might demonstrate sophisticated abilities in intertextual analysis, critical evaluation of sources, and collaborative meaning-making, skills directly transferable to academic contexts if explicitly valued.

Dialogic assessment practices would be observed to foster students' agency in navigating these complexities [5, 6]. Through peer feedback sessions and reflective activities, students would articulate their interpretive processes ("think-aloud" [4]), receive feedback on the clarity and validity of their claims, and negotiate differing perspectives. This iterative dialogue would allow students to refine their interpretive strategies, understand the impact of their "positioning" [7], and consciously make choices about how to frame their claims for different

audiences. Such interactions would make the often-invisible interpretive processes visible, allowing for critical reflection and skill development [14, 16].

5. DISCUSSION

The conceptual framework and illustrative "results" highlight the imperative of explicitly addressing interpretive claim-making across discursive boundaries in educational settings. The increasing complexity of knowledge production and consumption demands that learners become adept at navigating, negotiating, and even hybridizing diverse ways of knowing and meaning-making.

The distinction between disciplinary interpretive norms [20, 23] underscores that teaching is not merely about content delivery but about inducting learners into specific ways of thinking and validating claims. Educators must make these disciplinary practices explicit, helping students understand *why* certain types of evidence or arguments are valued in one field but not another. This transparency is crucial for fostering authentic engagement and preventing students from feeling that academic discourse is arbitrary or inaccessible.

The role of "intersubjectivity" [3, 19, 22] in facilitating shared understanding, even amidst disagreement, is paramount. Learning to navigate conflicting interpretations without necessarily reaching full consensus is a vital skill for collaboration and critical thinking. Educational environments should cultivate spaces where learners can articulate their interpretive claims, listen to and genuinely understand divergent perspectives, and engage in respectful intellectual debate. This involves fostering a classroom culture where "to disagree, we must also agree" on the terms of engagement [22].

The concepts of "boundary crossing" and "boundary objects" [1, 15] offer concrete pedagogical strategies. Educators can intentionally design learning experiences that require students to move between different discursive communities and utilize shared artifacts or ideas as bridges. Identifying and utilizing "boundary spanners" [8] – whether they are texts, concepts, or even individual students who naturally bridge different domains – can significantly facilitate this process. Furthermore, actively promoting "syncretic" or "hybrid" approaches to claim-making recognizes and legitimizes the complex interpretive skills learners already possess [10, 17]. This means valuing the blending of academic rigor with insights drawn from cultural backgrounds or informal literacies, leading to richer and more innovative interpretations [2, 18, 21].

The profound influence of digital and participatory cultures on interpretive practices cannot be overstated. By engaging with fan-based literacies and the ways in which online communities challenge normative interpretations [11, 12, 13], educators can tap into students' existing expertise and demonstrate the fluidity of meaning-making. This requires a

pedagogical shift towards recognizing the validity of diverse forms of knowledge and expression, aligning with calls for linguistic justice and textual justice [2, 28]. Critically analyzing "paratexts" [9] and the broader media landscape also equips students to understand how meaning is constructed and manipulated beyond traditional texts.

Finally, the emphasis on "dialogic assessment" [5, 6] provides a powerful mechanism for cultivating agency in interpretive claim-making. By making the interpretive process visible through think-alouds [4, 16] and fostering continuous feedback, educators can guide students in developing metacognitive awareness of their own and others' interpretive strategies. This iterative dialogue helps students refine their claims, understand how "positioning" [7] influences interpretation, and learn to adapt their arguments for diverse audiences. Designing interpretive communities "toward justice" [26] ensures that all voices, particularly those from marginalized backgrounds [27], are valued and contribute meaningfully to the negotiation of understanding.

Limitations:

This article presents a conceptual framework rather than empirical findings. The proposed "results" are illustrative and drawn from existing literature, not direct data collection. Consequently, the specific nuances and challenges of implementing these pedagogical approaches in real-world contexts are not detailed. Future empirical research is essential to validate these concepts and explore their practical applications and effectiveness across diverse educational settings.

Future Research Directions:

Future empirical research should investigate:

1. The effectiveness of specific pedagogical interventions designed to foster boundary crossing and hybrid interpretive claim-making in K-12 and higher education contexts.

2. Longitudinal studies tracking how students develop interpretive flexibility and agency across their academic careers.

3. The role of educator training in preparing teachers to facilitate discussions around diverse interpretive practices and integrate hybrid literacies.

4. How specific digital tools and platforms can be designed to support the negotiation of interpretive claims across communities.

5. Comparative studies examining interpretive practices in different cultural or linguistic contexts to further understand the influence of background on meaning-making.

6. CONCLUSION

Navigating and hybridizing interpretive claim-making across diverse discursive communities is a fundamental challenge and a crucial skill for learners in the 21st century. As individuals increasingly encounter a plurality of knowledge forms—from disciplinary academic texts to cultural narratives and digital media—the ability to engage critically with varied interpretations becomes indispensable. This conceptual article has synthesized key theoretical constructs, including intersubjectivity, boundary objects, and syncretic literacies, to propose a framework for understanding this complex process. We argue that pedagogy must proactively prepare learners to not only understand different interpretive frameworks but also to actively bridge, blend, and negotiate meaning across them. By cultivating spaces for dialogic engagement, explicitly teaching disciplinary literacies, valuing out-of-school literacies, and employing innovative assessment practices, educators can empower learners to become adept navigators of knowledge, capable of fostering shared understanding and making robust claims within and across the rich tapestry of human discourse.

7. REFERENCES

1. Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(2), 132–169. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311404435

2. Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Taylor & Francis Group.

3. Beck, S. W. (2006). Subjectivity and intersubjectivity in the teaching and learning of writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 40*(4), 413–460.

4. Beck, S. W. (2018). *A think-aloud approach to writing assessment: Analyzing process and product with adolescent writers*. Teachers College Press.

5. Beck, S. W., & Jones, K. (2023). Fostering agency through dialogue in classroom writing assessment. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 124*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.104012

6. Beck, S. W., Jones, K., Storm, S., & Smith, H. (2020). Scaffolding students' writing processes through dialogic assessment. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 63*(6), 651–660. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1039

7. Bomer, R., & Laman, T. (2004). Positioning in a primary writing workshop: Joint action in the discursive production of writing subjects. *Research in the Teaching of English, 38*(4), 420–466.

8. Buxton, C. A., Carlone, H. B., & Carlone, D. (2005). Boundary spanners as bridges of Student and school discourses in an Urban Science and Mathematics High school. *School Science and Mathematics, 105*(6), 302–

312. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2005.tb18131.x

9. Gray, J. (2010). *Show sold separately: Promos, spoilers, and other media paratexts*. NYU Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt155jkjw

10. Gutiérrez, K. D. (2014). Syncretic approaches to literacy learning- leveraging horizontal knowledge and expertise. In P. Dunston, L. Gambrell, K. Headley, S. Fullerton, & P. Stecker (Eds.), *63rd Literacy Research Association Yearbook* (pp. 48–61). Literacy Research Association.

11. Jenkins, H. G., & Kelley, W. (Eds.). (2013). *Reading in a participatory culture: Remixing moby-dick in the English Classroom*. Teachers College Press.

12. Jones, K., Storm, S., & Corbitt, A. (2023). Literary play gone viral: Delight, intertextuality, and challenges to normative interpretations through the digital serialization of dracula. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique, 22*(2), 177–190. https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-08-2022-0116

13. Lammers, J., Magnifico, A., & Wang, A. (2022). Playful multiliteracies: Fan-Based literacies' role in English Language Arts Pedagogy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 66*(2), 80–90. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1253

14. Lee, I. (2014). Teachers' reflection on implementation of innovative feedback approaches in EFL writing. *English Teaching, 69*(1), 23–40. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.69.1.201403.23

15. Leigh Star, S. (2010). This is not a boundary object: Reflections on the origin of a concept. *Science, Technology, & Human Values, 35*(5), 601–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243910377624

16. Levine, S. (2014). Making interpretation visible with an affect-based strategy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 49*(3), 283–303. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.71

17. Lizárraga, J. R., & Gutiérrez, K. D. (2018). Centering nepantla literacies from the Borderlands: Leveraging "in-betweenness" toward learning in the everyday. *Theory into Practice, 57*(1), 38–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1392164

18. Low, D. E., & Rapp, S. M. (2021). Youth Identities and Affinities on the Move: Using a Transliteracies Framework to Critique Digital Dichotomies. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 16*(2), 111–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2021.1914053

19. Matusov, E. (1996). Intersubjectivity without agreement. *Mind Culture and Activity, 3*(1), 25–45. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327884mca0301_4

20. Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(2), 96–107. https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.52.2.1

21. Morrell, E., & Duncan-Andrade, J. M. R. (2002). Promoting academic literacy with urban youth through Engaging Hip-Hop Culture. *The English Journal, 91*(6), 88. https://doi.org/10.2307/821822

22. Nathan, M., Eilam, B., & Kim, S. (2007). To disagree, we must also agree: How intersubjectivity structures and perpetuates discourse in a Mathematics Classroom. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 16*(4), 523–563. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508400701525238

23. Rainey, E. C. (2017). Disciplinary literacy in English Language Arts: Exploring the Social and problem-based nature of literary reading and reasoning. *Reading Research Quarterly, 52*(1), 53–71. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.154

24. Roth, W.-M., & Lee, Y.-J. (2007). "Vygotsky's neglected legacy": Cultural-historical activity theory. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(2), 186–232. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654306298273

25. Schaffer, T. (1994). "A wilde desire took me": The homoerotic history of dracula. *English Literary History, 61*(2), 381–425. https://doi.org/10.1353/elh.1994.0019

26. Storm, S., Jones, K., & Beck, S. W. (2022). Designing interpretive communities toward justice: Indexicality in classroom discourse. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique, 21*(1), 2–15. https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-06-2021-0073

27. Thomas, E. E. (2019). *The Dark Fantastic: Race and the imagination from Harry Potter to the Hunger Games*. NYU Press.

28. Thomas, E. E., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2016). Restorying the self: Bending toward textual justice. *Harvard Educational Review, 86*(3), 313–338. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-86.3.313

29. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.