

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

From theory to action: Working collectively toward a more antiracist linguistics (Response to commentators)

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2fd09249>

Journal

Language, 96(4)

ISSN

0097-8507

Authors

Charity Hudley, Anne H
Mallinson, Christine
Bucholtz, Mary

Publication Date

2020

DOI

10.1353/lan.2020.0081

Peer reviewed



[This content has been declared free to read by the publisher during the COVID-19 pandemic.]

PERSPECTIVES

From theory to action: Working collectively toward a more antiracist linguistics (Response to commentators)

ANNE H. CHARITY HUDLEY

*University of California,
Santa Barbara*

CHRISTINE MALLINSON

*University of Maryland,
Baltimore County*

MARY BUCHOLTZ

*University of California,
Santa Barbara*

1. INTRODUCTION. The conscience of the world has shifted greatly since we started this direct engagement with the linguistics community on issues of race, racism, and social justice. The COVID-19 pandemic and the widespread protests in response to state-sanctioned police violence toward Black and African-American people have renewed and intensified conversations about racial justice and equity. Many linguists and linguistics departments are now actively grappling with what race and racism mean as theoretical concepts, how we can both address the study of race and act against racist practices in our discipline, and how to work on being not just ‘less racist’ but indeed antiracist in every aspect of our intellectual, professional, and personal lives. We are challenged to think about how we can center the lives and experiences of people of various racial backgrounds, rather than primarily centering whiteness, in linguistics departments. In doing so, we must more directly ask the question: how would linguistics have to change in order for more people from various racial groups to actively want to study, teach, and learn linguistics? We also need to emphasize that these are necessarily intersectional issues and that racialization is intimately tied to inequities on the basis of gender identity, socioeconomic status, disability, citizenship, and other parameters of social difference.

We are grateful to everyone who has written responses to our article (Charity Hudley et al. 2020) and to all who have engaged in conversations with us on their campuses, at conferences, and in discussions in real and virtual spaces; we also thank the editors and referees who selected the responses that appear here. At the same time, however, we want to challenge the gatekeeping practices of our discipline, so we therefore also discuss the responses we received directly from authors that were not accepted for publication. We extend an invitation to other linguists to reach out to us if your response was not selected for this issue of *Language* or if you have not yet had a chance to engage with us, so that you can share your perspective. The responses presented in this issue, as well as the other commentaries we received, establish an excellent dialogic model for how antiracist work in linguistics can happen. We respond to each of the contributions we received and then turn to a discussion of the next steps that we need to engage in together to work toward the goal of racial justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion in linguistics.

2. ANTIRACISM IN LINGUISTICS: A DIALOGUE. In his commentary, Michel DeGraff (2020) demonstrates that the positions we take in our original article are crucially relevant to conducting linguistic research that is at once theoretically engaged, culturally and linguistically valid, and responsive to community needs. DeGraff traces the moment he became ‘woke’ on these issues, which inspired him to challenge linguists’ raciolinguistic ideologies of Creoles. His commentary inspires us to talk about the too-often taboo relationship between the personal, the professional, and the political, and he offers his MIT-Haiti work as a powerful and effective model for how to achieve racial and linguistic justice and social impact via linguistic research. With his aptly

named ‘funder principle’, he reminds us that such innovative projects require financial support, and he rightly calls for a refocusing of the priorities of funding organizations to serve the needs of the colonized communities whose languages form the foundation of linguistic scholarship and linguists’ careers. We address this crucial issue in more detail below.

Raciolinguistic ideologies in linguistic research are also at the heart of Aris Clemons and Anna Lawrence’s (2020) direct and effective call for antiracist scholarship. The authors center their response on research on bilingualism, which, as they point out, often evades and even defensively rejects questions about race in conventional framings of bilingual education. As they persuasively show, this resistance to necessary critique perpetuates racial inequities and reproduces the white supremacy of the field, despite researchers’ explicitly progressive goals. An especially powerful aspect of the authors’ response is their argument that critical interdisciplinarity and collaboration across difference, informed by researchers’ reflections on their own subject positions, are essential tools in producing antiracist linguistic scholarship. Clemons and Lawrence importantly highlight the perils of this undertaking, noting that although they have accrued expertise across fields, they remain more professionally vulnerable than their colleagues doing conventional, uncritical work. Other fields offer a model for the kind of critical interdisciplinary collaboration that they envision, such as the scholarship and advocacy work of Ibram X. Kendi, founder and director of Boston University’s new Center for Antiracist Research (Kendi 2020).

The next two responses center the still-underexamined white supremacy of language documentation research. Like Clemons and Lawrence, Alice Gaby and Lesley Woods (2020) take up the issue of ethical collaboration, presenting a primer on the issues that must be considered in language documentation and reclamation research with Indigenous nations and communities. Focusing on the continuing colonial legacy of linguistics, they point to a wide range of ways that conventional linguistic research practices reproduce colonial oppression, from what constitutes linguistic knowledge, how it is produced, by whom, and for what purpose, to the dispossession of Indigenous knowledge and the historical trauma that Indigenous collaborators may experience in working on their languages. The authors then share a set of principles and practical steps for Indigenous and non-Indigenous linguists’ collaborations with community experts in ways that recognize the sovereignty of Indigenous peoples and acknowledge the broader contexts in which linguistic research is carried out. This work offers a blueprint for how linguists can more ethically work with and in support of Indigenous nations and communities. We particularly underscore the urgent need to make linguistics as a discipline more just to and more inclusive of Indigenous linguists, since language documentation and reclamation research must be led, at every level, by the communities that are most deeply affected by this work.

The exclusion of Indigenous scholars from linguistics is addressed specifically with respect to the experience of Native Americans in Wesley Y. Leonard’s (2020) essay. Leonard points to the near-absence of Native linguists: Native Americans, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders continue to be the least represented racially minoritized groups within the discipline (Linguistic Society of America 2019), in stark contrast to the hyperpresence of (decontextualized and disembodied) Native American languages in linguistic scholarship. Leonard draws on foundational principles of TRIBAL CRITICAL RACE THEORY to foreground issues of race and racism that researchers of Native American languages must address, especially the simultaneously political and racialized positionality of Native Americans as members of sover-

eight nations. He notes two general ways in which racism shapes Native American languages and linguistics: first through the genocidal practices of colonialism that produced language shift, and second through the violence of linguistic analyses that displace Native systems of knowledge in favor of Western epistemologies. We join Leonard in urging linguists to interrogate our own scholarly assumptions and to broaden our theoretical and methodological scope through the insights of tribal critical race theory and Indigenous epistemologies in order to advance a decolonial linguistic science.

Ignacio L. Montoya (2020) similarly calls for linguists to abandon white-supremacist conceptualizations of scholarly knowledge. Like several other commentators, Montoya writes from his position as a racially minoritized scholar, and he offers a compelling and illustrative explanation of his decision to address his racialized subjectivity in a scholarly publication. Montoya's discussion points out some of the professional challenges of being a 'pioneer' in doing justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion work as a scholar of color, including lack of mentorship, greater workload, and isolation. He relates these issues to a broader, interconnected web of obstacles that reproduce institutional racism, such as rigid, inflexible, and often variable expectations for the tenure and promotion processes; difficulties in finding outlets and appropriate reviewers for innovative research, particularly community-oriented scholarship; and a devaluation of interdisciplinary and collaborative work. He closes with practical solutions that require not only individual linguists but also academic institutions, including universities, as well as organizations such as the Linguistic Society of America, to create more racially just and equitable processes for evaluating and rewarding scholarly excellence.

Finally, Elizabeth Peterson (2020) extends to a global scale our original call for work on issues of race and racism within linguistics. We welcome the effort to examine systems of racial hierarchy in the discipline worldwide; indeed, this critical scrutiny is vital to the future of our field. One example of the globalized nature of structural inequities in the discipline is the lack of any published responses to our article by linguists of color working outside the United States. We directly invite those working in Europe, the Global South, and other contexts to reach out for further dialogue. Because we recognize the specificity of the US perspective, our purpose was not to provide a formula that would work for every situation but rather to offer a starting point for critical reflexivity and discussion. Peterson also raises important questions regarding how to address race specifically in the overwhelmingly white Finnish context in which she works; we note that critical examinations of raciolinguistic ideologies are already being undertaken by Finnish linguists as well as researchers in related fields (e.g. Ennser-Kananen et al. 2017, Nishiyama 2020), and we would encourage direct engagement with these scholars in this ongoing dialogue. More generally, we urge linguists worldwide to seek out research and academic initiatives on race and racism in their local contexts, both within and beyond linguistics.

We turn now to engage with three commentaries that were not selected by the journal for inclusion in this set of responses but that were shared with us directly by their authors, in order to address the important perspectives that they offer. First, Kamran Khan (2020) issues a powerful call for more antiracist work in European linguistics. Like Peterson's response, Khan's excellent essay makes clear that it is critical for European linguists to join efforts to create a global response on disciplinary racism. Courageously sharing his own experiences as a scholar of color in Europe, Khan documents the broad scope of academic racism, from structural exclusion to insidious as well as gross macroaggressions. His decision to speak openly about topics that are often hidden or silenced underscores

the need for honest conversations on race and racism in intellectual and academic spaces where they are currently largely absent. Khan draws theoretical inspiration from the work of Sara Ahmed (e.g. 2007), bracingly describing and confronting an ‘inherited’, ‘comfortable’ academic whiteness in Europe that allows racism to go unchecked. His concluding recommendation ‘to consider it an act of trust when a POC [person of color] raises racism’ encourages white readers to set aside instinctive defensive reactions and instead to listen and learn from the experiences of linguists of color.

In the same way, Kelly Wright and Rachel Weissler’s (2020) response reminds us that in the struggle to undo racism, ‘[t]he onus of this work belongs to linguistics at large and not simply minoritized people of color’. The authors offer a wealth of specific suggestions for antiracist actions that scholars can take right now. These include calling explicit attention to the absence of research by scholars of color in course materials when such research is unavailable (rather than passing over this structural exclusion in silence); naming race in all descriptions of research, and not only when the study participants are from racially minoritized groups; and learning about and acknowledging linguists’ fraught history of labeling and describing racially marked languages and linguistic varieties. Wright and Weissler also call on linguists to debunk the discipline’s own raciolinguistic ideologies in our classrooms and to shift our expectations regarding linguistic training so that knowledge of race and racism in linguistics becomes required for any well-trained linguist. In concluding, the authors refer to Savithry Nambodiripad et al.’s (2019) groundbreaking survey on the climate for minoritized groups within linguistics. The findings of that survey, they note, provide extensive evidence, in the form of testimonials as well as quantitative data, documenting the pressing need for racial justice in linguistics.

Finally, Margaret Thomas (2020) provides a valuable historical lens that contextualizes the structural underpinnings of racism in linguistics in the present day. We must be aware of this history, Thomas convincingly argues, if we aim to truly dismantle the historical precedent for and contemporary manifestation of racism in linguistics. Thomas’s focus is Paul Broca, the nineteenth-century anthropologist credited with identifying the region of the brain associated with language production, now dubbed ‘Broca’s area’. Broca’s early work in neurolinguistics is a standard topic in linguistics textbooks, yet such discussions never mention Broca’s well-documented racist ideologies, which Thomas meticulously details. Her essay should inspire linguistics to be more cautious about whom we canonize in our textbooks and hold up as models and representatives of our field to our students and the general public. Thomas’s discussion reveals that, as their full stories come to light, we must consider how elevating such figures and their legacies may do lasting damage to the discipline.

3. BREAKING CONSTRICTIVE NORMS TO ACHIEVE RACIAL JUSTICE. These responses collectively invite us not only to examine racism in linguistics more deeply but also to act upon what we learn. Before taking action, however, we must break long-standing disciplinary constrictive norms that hinder progress toward inclusion and equity. The first constrictive norm concerns how prestige is constructed and controlled in linguistics. The second constrictive norm centers on how individuals seek economic gain through their linguistic work: that is, the economics of linguistics and linguists. The third forces us to grapple with the question of intellectual interest. Such norm-breaking work will require the participation of the discipline as a whole. Without discussion of these issues, without effort to dismantle these structures, and without the dedication of institutional resources to linguistics departments to do inclusion work, these problems

will continue to be unquestioningly reproduced, thus further embedding and maintaining structural racism in the academy.

3.1. PRESTIGE. To break the most pressing and overarching constrictive norm, we need to ask: Who controls prestige in linguistics? This question extends to the perceived prestige and stature of individuals as well as the rankings of departments and programs. Many of the objections to diversity and inclusion efforts, particularly regarding admissions, hiring, and diversification of the curriculum, that we have heard (mostly from white senior scholars) since we started this discussion are focused on loss of prestige or competitiveness; indeed, such objections are typical of higher-education spaces (Gutiérrez y Muhs et al. 2012). There is a fear that racialized bodies bring with them an inherent lack of prestige that permeates perceptions of departments, journals, and other institutional structures. Researchers of color who study language in ways that are more aligned with the intellectual and social values of their racial and cultural group than with conventional linguistic thinking are thus viewed as inferior, rather than innovative, scholars. We alluded to this ideology in our original article, and we now call on linguists to directly challenge this flawed and damaging perception with university administrators, admissions, hiring, and tenure and promotion committees, journal editors, grant agencies, reviewers, and colleagues.

More generally, racialized notions of prestige result in a white-centered monopoly on the publication process in academia and in linguistics. Because of the hierarchical structure of neoliberal academic publishing, in which a very narrow, intellectually conservative set of journals accrue prestige, linguists are often rewarded only for publishing in these journals, leading to self-censorship sparked by the fear that innovative or unconventional ideas will not be published and might even harm one's career. As Montoya also describes, this system results in a process of structural exclusion in which the innovative work of scholars of color is rejected for publication, further disadvantaging them on the job market, in grant and award competitions, and in opportunities for professional advancement. The Cite Black Women movement (<https://www.citeblackwomencollective.org/>) has been working on this issue for the past several years, but most linguists still have not yet recognized the problem of racism in their own bibliographies. Now is the time for our discipline to dismantle this barrier, a process that starts by critiquing, broadening, and replacing bibliographic citations in our research as well as in our course reading lists and lecture content.

Likewise, in submitting to journals with editorial boards that lack Black or Brown members and have never had an editor of color, linguists reproduce racism through implicit support of white-centered, white-supremacist publication structures. Senior linguists can take a stand on this issue by declining invitations to serve on overwhelmingly white editorial boards and offering the names of linguists of color instead, and editors can take a stand by committing to diversifying their boards and the pages of their journals and book series. In addition, this editorial work must be financially compensated and professionally rewarded in order to avoid the all-too-common problem of looking to scholars of color to undertake uncompensated 'service' work in the name of 'diversity'. We also want to emphasize the importance of recognizing the diversity within the umbrella term **PEOPLE OF COLOR** and to underscore the need for full representation of all racially minoritized groups in the publishing process.

3.2. ECONOMIC GAIN. The problematic ways in which professional organizations and funding agencies ascribe prestige in linguistics and related fields is directly connected to the issue of economic gain. That is, when scholars of color face structural challenges

that disproportionately prevent them from receiving graduate fellowships and other support (e.g. Wilcox et al. 2019), from being hired into tenure-track lines (Porter et al. 2020), from being retained, tenured, and promoted (e.g. Matthew 2016), and from receiving grant funding (e.g. Erosheva et al. 2020, Silbiger & Stubler 2019), it generates and widens income and prestige gaps. These gaps are compounded by the fact that many white scholars have enhanced their careers, academic prestige, and economic gain as a direct result of the study of linguistic practices of racially minoritized groups. This form of academic colonialism perpetuates structural discrimination. An equity lens must be brought to examine how graduate fellowships are awarded, how faculty tenure lines are decided upon, and how other rewards are distributed within the discipline and the academy: Who is driving these decisions, both on local departmental and university levels and more widely across the discipline? Too often, the power stream regarding economic issues in academia is obscured, resulting in a lack of transparency surrounding decision-making processes that can compound and exacerbate social inequalities.

Building on the insights of Christopher Hutton (2019), who complicates and interrogates the prevailing narrative in modern linguistics that the discipline is devoid of state, political, and economic interest, we call here for further open discussion of the question of economics in our field. What are the profit models for individual linguists as well as departments and programs that examine racially minoritized languages and language varieties as part of their agenda? How can departments and programs ensure greater rewards for more ethical, more community-centered, and more equity-driven research? We also call for a closer focus on external funding for linguistic research, as generated by federal agencies, nonprofit organizations, private foundations, and for-profit industries. Who is invited to apply for funding and who is excluded? Who is seen as a 'good investment' and who is not? How are these decisions made, and by whom? Recent research (Erosheva et al. 2020) shows that the evaluation metrics of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) systematically devalue the work of Black researchers, and similar structural biases no doubt disadvantage linguists of color across funding agencies. An earlier study found that the NIH tends not to fund research on health disparities, a topic that is more likely to be proposed by Black researchers (Hoppe et al. 2019). As DeGraff also points out, linguistic funding agencies are subject to similar biases against 'applied' and community-based research, thereby contributing materially to the white supremacy of the discipline. Economic gain thus directly relates to the constrictive norm of prestige, as noted above, as well as that of intellectual interest, to which we turn next.

3.3. INTELLECTUAL INTEREST. As the NIH studies cited above indicate, intellectual interests and preferred research topics are not mere matters of individual taste, but instead participate in and contribute to the formation of highly racialized and economically stratified reward structures. Grappling with the taboo topic of intellectual interest requires accepting that a just and inclusive linguistics makes room for new ideas and the scholars who produce them, even when these disrupt traditional departmental and disciplinary identities. This understanding runs counter to the usual academic rhetoric of 'good fit' and 'intellectual community', and for this reason, creating space for unfamiliar lines of research can lead some scholars to police the boundaries of the discipline by declaring certain topics off limits, as 'not linguistics'. Our question to those who seek to keep the discipline's scope artificially narrow is simply this: Why is your linguistics so small? We envision a capacious field that has room for a wide range of questions, theories, methods, and scholarly perspectives. Indeed, to exclude racially minoritized students or scholars

on the basis of some imagined litmus test of theoretical purity (of whatever kind) contributes to maintaining a white-centered academic structure and culture, since linguists from racially minoritized and other underrepresented backgrounds often do not have the luxury of engaging in the discipline's theoretical squabbles but must choose graduate programs, research foci, and academic positions based on such practical considerations as safety and financial resources rather than ideological orientation.

For minoritized linguists, these decisions also rest on a deep commitment to research that advances justice and equity for their own communities. Questions of intellectual interest are driven by an often unarticulated but materially consequential ideology of 'academic freedom', which for white scholars is better termed intellectual self-interest. Senior white scholars with tenure are generally free to study whatever topic they choose and to recruit graduate students and junior colleagues who can help them strengthen or expand their research area. But this approach works against inclusion, for reasons directly related to the intersection of intellectual interest, prestige, and economic gain. Linguistics students and scholars of color are not necessarily interested in advancing or complementing the work that white scholars are doing, but rather are more likely to pursue research agendas that often are devalued within linguistics and, as a result, lead them to turn away from the field.

Although linguistics is belatedly addressing the need to be inclusive of users of the languages and language varieties that we study, it has become increasingly clear that attracting students of color into the discipline is a major challenge for this and many other related reasons. With respect to Black students specifically, some of these issues include the low visibility of the field, a lack of career opportunities, and an absence of linguistics degree programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). A survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics in the US Department of Education showed that Black students overwhelmingly choose majors related to helping fields (Beasley 2011). These are also fields with high visibility: it is likely that Black students have encountered professionals in business administration, nursing, social work, and accounting before entering college. Due to the low visibility of linguistics and linguists, as well as the field's limited career opportunities beyond research and university teaching, many Black students are not even aware of the major, let alone have a desire to pursue it. Moreover, because no HBCU offers a linguistics degree and most have few or no linguistics courses, the potential for Black students to discover the discipline is further reduced. If linguistics wants to diversify, then linguists need to be proactive in identifying, recruiting, and retaining Black students who are interested in language and who may be pursuing other language-related fields. One such field is speech and hearing sciences, which is represented at a wide range of universities and colleges, including HBCUs, and offers a wealth of professional opportunities. The skills and knowledge that students gain in this major are compatible with those required in linguistics. By engaging with Black students and faculty in the speech and hearing sciences or connecting with them through the National Black Association for Speech-Language and Hearing, linguists can find Black students who might be interested in linguistic research if only they knew about the field—and if the field can expand to incorporate their interests and goals. One way to attract the much-needed scholarship and perspective of Black students to linguistics, then, is to forge relationships with Black scholars and students in adjacent fields, and then to welcome them warmly for what they bring to our own discipline.

As a final point, we note that the above problems are further compounded by the fact that most linguistic research on marginalized or racially minoritized populations has

been conducted by white researchers. The story of African American English needs to be told by its speakers, both so that often-missing elements, particularly a focus on culture and the lived experiences of African-Americans, can be brought to the forefront of research and so that the representation of the language is determined by those for whom it is essential to their lives and communities.

Once we break free from the constrictive norms around prestige, economic gain, and intellectual interest, we can more fully learn from the transformative work that scholars and students of color are doing to further racial justice in linguistics. In our final section, we consider how the discipline can move from theorizing race and racism to addressing and dismantling racial inequities.

4. THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW. Having reflected on the insights of the scholars who engaged with our original article and then having offered our own ideas about how to break the constrictive norms in linguistics that hold back progress toward racial justice, we now seek to initiate further discussion and action at the institutional level. Such conversations and actions need to take place in departments and programs, at conferences and in professional societies, and within funding agencies, among other contexts. In undertaking this work, linguists should seek and appropriately compensate expert guidance from individuals who have led such changes, as well as organizations that aim to create a more equitable academy, such as the SPARK Society for cognitive science and related fields, including linguistics (<https://www.sparkociety.org>). What follows is a set of guidelines and examples for starting these discussions and movements toward change in readers' own institutional contexts.

4.1. DEPARTMENTS AND PROGRAMS. Key questions that we encourage you to start discussing now with colleagues in your departments and programs are:

- How do your department and institution view diversity, equity, and inclusion? What specific challenges related to racial injustice does your department or program currently face? Do administrators have both academic and experiential knowledge of what racism is and how it functions? Does the institutional view differ from perspectives held by faculty, students, and staff from racially minoritized groups?
- In your experience, what values about language use and racial and cultural experiences are communicated within your department? Has your department ever taken positions on linguistic diversity with respect to race? Is there consensus in your department on these positions? What about at your institution, broadly speaking?
- What racial justice-related programming, initiatives, or other efforts has your department carried out? What were the goals of these initiatives? What impacts were achieved—or if not achieved, what impacts were envisioned, and why weren't these impacts realized?
- How do colleagues in your department envision that linguists can be leaders in taking action to further racial justice—in research, on college and university campuses, and in the world?

Several linguistics departments have started on this work in the current moment of antiracist protest and global pandemic by issuing statements and plans that we can now read and learn from as the work to enact them unfolds. At the University of Oregon, for example, the Department of Linguistics has laid out a set of goals for progress on racial justice issues, with specific strategies and tactics for achieving them (<https://linguistics.uoregon.edu/diversity-and-inclusion>). Similarly, the University of Washington's Department of Linguistics identifies recurring and one-time departmental changes as well as changes at the individual level to advance racial justice in linguistics (<https://linguistics>

.washington.edu/news/2020/06/30/uw-linguistics-anti-racism-statement). We look forward to the progress of these and similar endeavors over the next year and beyond.

We also offer an extended example of how one linguistics department has implemented comprehensive actions toward racial justice goals. The University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) is the highest-ranked and highest-resourced minority-serving institution in the world. Considering this designation both an honor and a call to action, the UCSB Department of Linguistics, guided by the expertise and insights of its faculty from racial groups that are underrepresented on the faculty, has been making significant changes regarding community partnerships, student recruitment, and undergraduate and graduate curricula.

First, in order to share the resources of the research university with those who face structural barriers to access, UCSB Linguistics faculty have created several community partnerships. The SKILLS program (e.g. Bucholtz et al. 2018) creates partnerships between local schools and organizations and UCSB faculty and students and guides local K–16 students from racially minoritized groups to carry out and publicly share original research and activism projects on language in their lives and communities. For first-generation college-bound students, the program provides academic support through the experience of university-level coursework as well as free college credit. Similarly, the NSF-funded Mexican Indigenous Languages Promotion and Advocacy (MILPA) project, directed by Eric Campbell (e.g. Bax et al. 2019), works closely with a local organization to support linguistic and social justice for Mexican Indigenous diasporic communities in coastal California. The community-centered project supports this highly marginalized group through research, linguistic training, and educational and professional opportunities.

With regard to undergraduate education, the UCSB-HBCU Scholars in Linguistics Program, funded by the University of California and the National Science Foundation's Research Experience for Undergraduates program, mentors Black undergraduates from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds toward graduate school and careers in linguistics and related fields. Students from HBCUs, UCSB, and other institutions take linguistics courses (including at the LSA's biennial Linguistic Institute at UC Davis in Summer 2019), carry out collaborative research via the Talking College project on the role of language and culture in Black undergraduates' lives, and benefit from extensive networking and mentorship. The program has led to the creation of a special online version of UCSB's introductory linguistics class that centers Black language and culture (Calhoun et al. 2021). Results from the ongoing Talking College study will shed further light on the linguistic and cultural experiences of Black college students, which have direct implications for inclusive teaching and mentoring.

With regard to graduate education, the UCSB Department of Linguistics has developed a special recruitment event, UCSB Sneak Peek, to raise awareness of its graduate program among minoritized students. Participants are brought to UCSB in late May for a day of meetings, workshops, and social gatherings in anticipation of the fall admissions cycle. The event includes an orientation to UCSB's distinctive approach to linguistics, an in-depth workshop on preparing a successful graduate application, individual meetings with faculty and graduate students with shared research interests and/or social identities, a showcase of research by current graduate students, and a closed-door interdisciplinary panel session featuring current graduate students from minoritized groups. In the six years that Sneak Peek has been running, it has become a successful avenue for recruiting highly competitive applicants to UCSB's graduate program.

Most recently, the department has started work on an Inclusive Curriculum Initiative, which forms teams of justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (JEDI) experts and ap-

prentices to create more inclusive content, materials, and pedagogical strategies in UCSB's linguistics graduate and undergraduate courses. The initiative also funds a year-long speaker series on inclusive teaching in linguistics as well as a public symposium to share the results of the work at the end of the 2020–21 academic year.

Through such activities UCSB has addressed some of the many inequities facing racially minoritized undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty, and this work may inspire similar undertakings elsewhere. Nevertheless, UCSB's Department of Linguistics, like all linguistics departments in the United States, still has a great deal of work ahead to create a more inclusive, just, and welcoming climate for scholars and students of color.

4.2. CONFERENCES AND PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES. As we have described, racial justice in linguistics requires a wholesale rethinking of the activities of linguistics departments and programs. Professional societies, and especially the discipline's flagship organization, the LSA, can support these efforts by producing a comprehensive inclusion plan at the organizational level, as well as model action plans that individual scholars and their linguistics departments or programs can draw on and tailor to their specific goals and needs. Inclusion guidelines and initiatives are also important to develop for linguists who work in industry and other settings.

In addition, greater attention to inclusion is necessary for linguistics conferences, from large national and international conferences like the LSA's annual meeting to smaller and more specialized events. As with the biased review practices that deny linguists of color equal access to academic publishing, scholarly conferences impose gatekeeping mechanisms that racially restrict whose work is deemed worthy to share with the discipline. This issue is compounded by the often prohibitively high cost of conference registration, travel, and hotel accommodations for many scholars and students of color. Larger conferences can learn from the practices of conferences that explicitly center the interests and needs of linguists of color, such as the annual Advancing African American Linguist(ic)s Symposium (<https://ucsbbhbculing.com/aaal2020/>) and the NSF-funded Natives4Linguistics series of events at the LSA annual meeting, led by Wesley Y. Leonard, Megan Lukaniec, and Adrienne Tsikewa (<https://natives4linguistics.wordpress.com>). One small silver lining of the current COVID-19 crisis is the proliferation of online conferences, thus eliminating some of the usual economic barriers to participation.

As the examples of Natives4Linguistics and UCSB-HBCU Scholars in Linguistics show, scheduling programming for linguists of color jointly with the activities of larger organizations can be an important opportunity to bring racially minoritized scholars and students into dialogue with the discipline and vice versa. Conversely, the loss of such partnerships can be devastating for racial diversity in linguistics. For example, before 1990, the American Association for Applied Linguistics met jointly with the LSA, but as the latter conference became less welcoming of applied and educational linguistics work, the AAAL stopped meeting with the LSA, thus sharply reducing the presence of Latinx scholars, many of whom were specialists in these areas. Repair work with Latinx linguists remains a pressing task for the LSA. This example points to the general need for professional societies and conferences to build inclusion into all aspects of their activities, from leadership and governance to the details of conference schedules.

4.3. FUNDING AGENCIES. As discussed above, the reviewing practices of funding agencies are structurally biased against the scholarship of researchers of color, particularly because of the inherent intellectual conservatism of funders. Anonymous peer review, even when efforts are made to involve reviewers of color, is therefore insufficient

to address these inequities. Creating more inclusive funding models requires extensive and ongoing training of program officers and reviewers, the presence of designated and effective equity officers for every review panel, and a commitment of all involved to proactively supporting truly innovative research, among other necessary changes. As a first step, both public and private funding agencies should compile and release data regarding the effect of race on funding decisions, similar to the NIH analyses discussed above. In addition, funding agencies must develop and publicly share action plans to eradicate these inequities.

5. CONCLUSION: CONTINUING THE DIALOGUE. Rather than conclude, we hope to continue this discussion by extending a formal call for contributions to two edited collections that we are currently developing for Oxford University Press. The first volume, *Inclusion in linguistics* (Charity Hudley et al. 2022a), will present theories, resources, and models for how to achieve broader participation in the discipline. We invite contributions on a range of themes, including:

- Contributions that present racial inclusion models in linguistics and that present findings and results from their implementation;
- Contributions that present inclusion models in P–12 education and address the importance of linguistics in student learning and/or in preparing educators;
- Contributions that present inclusion models in undergraduate and graduate linguistics education, including recruitment and retention, curricular changes, instruction and training, research, and mentorship;
- Contributions that speak to the dire need for more inclusion among linguistics faculty and that highlight the experiences of linguists from underrepresented and racially minoritized groups;
- Contributions that discuss the experiences of linguists in administrative and staff positions in higher education, including student affairs and other roles, that highlight the importance of inclusion issues;
- Contributions that address the experiences of linguists of color working in industry settings;
- Contributions that present models for community partnerships as a means of broadening and aligning inclusion research, teaching, and advocacy work in linguistics.

The second edited volume, *Decolonizing linguistics* (Charity Hudley et al. 2022b), will focus on the methodologies and practices of linguistic researchers and other professionals. Contributions are invited on the following and related themes:

- Contributions that present models for decolonizing linguistic fieldwork, with a focus on community-centered participatory action research;
- Contributions that discuss language reclamation in action, emphasizing person-centered and humanizing perspectives, knowledge, and insights;
- Contributions that offer ways of navigating researcher obligations and responsibilities to individuals and communities, particularly via inclusive ethical and participatory models;
- Contributions that engage social justice theories and methodologies and how they can be incorporated into linguistic research;
- Contributions that address the experiences of linguists working as activists in scholarly or professional settings or contexts;
- Contributions that present practical and/or theoretical models for racial reparations that can be done through or with linguistic research;

- Contributions that reimagine the purposes of linguistic research by creating models for sharing knowledge, collaborating with communities, and making scholarly communication directly accessible, particularly to communities.

A full call for submissions for each book may be found at: <http://annecharityhudley.com/inclusiondecolonizing>. We particularly welcome contributions that make connections to insights, models, and perspectives from other disciplines that can be adapted into linguistics. Taken as a set, these edited collections, building on the foundation of the present dialogue, will present theories, methods, and models for transformative linguistic practice, establish frameworks for the growth of the discipline and profession, and help linguists establish innovative research agendas centered on equity, inclusion, social justice, and antiracism.

REFERENCES

- AHMED, SARA. 2007. A phenomenology of whiteness. *Feminist Theory* 8(2).149–68. DOI: 10.1177/1464700107078139.
- BAX, ANNA; MARY BUCHOLTZ; ERIC CAMPBELL; ALEXIA FAWCETT; GABRIEL MENDOZA; SIMON PETERS; and GRISELDA REYES BASURTO. 2019. MILPA: A community-centered linguistic collaboration supporting Indigenous Mexican languages in California. Paper presented at the International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation, Honolulu, HI, February.
- BEASLEY, MAYA. 2011. *Opting out: Losing the potential of America's young black elite*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BUCHOLTZ, MARY; DOLORES INÉS CASILLAS; and JIN SOOK LEE (eds.) 2018. *Feeling it: Language, race, and affect in Latinx youth learning*. New York: Routledge.
- CALHOUN, KENDRA; ANNE H. CHARITY HUDLEY; MARY BUCHOLTZ; JAZMINE EXFORD; and BRITTNEY JOHNSON. 2021. Attracting Black students to linguistics through a Black-centered introduction to linguistics course. *Language* 97(1), to appear.
- CHARITY HUDLEY, ANNE H.; CHRISTINE MALLINSON; and MARY BUCHOLTZ. 2020. Toward racial justice in linguistics: Interdisciplinary insights into theorizing race in the discipline and diversifying the profession. *Language* 96(4).e200–e235.
- CHARITY HUDLEY, ANNE H.; CHRISTINE MALLINSON; and MARY BUCHOLTZ (eds.) 2022a. *Inclusion in linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, to appear.
- CHARITY HUDLEY, ANNE H.; CHRISTINE MALLINSON; and MARY BUCHOLTZ (eds.) 2022b. *Decolonizing linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, to appear.
- CLEMONS, ARIS, and ANNA LAWRENCE. 2020. Beyond position statements on race: Fostering an ethos of antiracist scholarship in linguistic research (Response to Charity Hudley et al.). *Language* 96(4).e254–e267.
- DEGRAFF, MICHEL. 2020. Toward racial justice in linguistics: The case of Creole studies (Response to Charity Hudley et al.). *Language* 96(4).e292–e306.
- ENNSER-KANANEN, JOHANNA; SAARA JÄNTTI; and SIRPA LEPPÄNEN. 2017. Does Finland need raciolinguistics? *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies* 11(4).101–11. DOI: 10.17011/apples/urn.201711224341.
- EROSHEVA, ELENA A.; SHERIDAN GRANT; MEI-CHING CHEN; MARK D. LINDNER; RICHARD K. NAKAMURA; and CAROLE J. LEE. 2020. NIH peer review: Criterion scores completely account for racial disparities in overall impact scores. *Science Advances* 6(23): eaaz4868. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aaz4868.
- GABY, ALICE, and LESLEY WOODS. 2020. Toward linguistic justice for Indigenous people: A response to Charity Hudley, Mallinson, and Bucholtz. *Language* 96(4).e268–e280.
- GUTIÉRREZ Y MUHS, GABRIELLA; YOLANDA FLORES NIEMANN; CARMEN G. GONZÁLEZ; and ANGELA P. HARRIS (eds.) 2012. *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- HOPPE, TRAVIS A.; AVIVA LITOVITZ; KRISTINE A. WILLIS; REBECCA A. MESEROLL; MATTHEW J. PERKINS; B. IAN HUTCHINS; ALISON F. DAVIS; MICHAEL S. LAUER; et al. 2019. Topic choice contributes to the lower rate of NIH awards to African-American/black scientists. *Science Advances* 5(10):eaaw7238. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aaw7238.

- HUTTON, CHRISTOPHER. 2019. Linguistics and the state: How funding and politics shape a field. *Items*, March 19, 2019. Online: <https://items.ssrc.org/sociolinguistic-frontiers/linguistics-and-the-state-how-funding-and-politics-shape-a-field/>.
- KENDI, IBRAHIM X. 2020. Founder's statement. Boston University, Center for Antiracist Research. Online: <https://www.bu.edu/antiracism-center/the-center/founder-statement/>.
- KHAN, KAMRAN. 2020. In response to racial justice: A perspective from Europe. Personal communication, May 12.
- LEONARD, WESLEY Y. 2020. Insights from Native American Studies for theorizing race and racism in linguistics (Response to Charity Hudley, Mallinson, and Bucholtz). *Language* 96(4).e281–e291.
- LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA. 2019. *The state of linguistics in higher education: Annual report 2019*. Online: <https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/state-linguistics-higher-education-annual-report>.
- MATTHEW, PATRICIA A. (ed.) 2016. *Written/unwritten: Diversity and the hidden truths of tenure*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- MONTOYA, IGNACIO L. 2020. Enabling excellence and racial justice in universities by addressing structural obstacles to work by and with people from racially minoritized communities: Response to Charity Hudley et al. *Language* 96(4).e236–e246.
- NAMBOODIRIPAD, SAVITHRY; CORRINE OCCHINO; LYNN HOU; HAYLEY HEATON; MARJORIE HERBERT; DOMINIQUE CANNING; and DOMINIQUE BOUAVICHITH. 2019. Survey of linguists and language researchers. Online: <https://sites.google.com/umich.edu/lingclimatesurvey/our-team>.
- NISHIYAMA, HIDEFUMI. 2020. Racializing surveillance through language: The role of selective translation in the promotion of public vigilance against migrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 43(10).1757–75. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2019.1654115.
- PETERSON, ELIZABETH. 2020. The US is not enough: Why the real world of linguistics needs your voice (Response to Charity Hudley et al.). *Language* 96(4).e247–e253.
- PORTER, CHRISTA J.; CANDACE M. MOORE; GINNY J. BOSS; TIFFANY J. DAVIS; and DAVE A. LOUIS. 2020. To be Black women and contingent faculty: Four scholarly personal narratives. *Journal of Higher Education* 91(5).674–97. DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2019.1700478.
- SILBIGER, NYSSA J., and AMBER D. STUBLER. 2019. Unprofessional peer reviews disproportionately harm underrepresented groups in STEM. *PeerJ* 7:e8247. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.8247.
- THOMAS, MARGARET. 2020. Racialization, language science, and nineteenth century anthropometrics. *History and Philosophy of the Language Sciences*, June 8, 2020. Online: <https://hiphilangsci.net/2020/06/08/racialization-language-science/>.
- WILCOX, MELANIE M.; LARISSA BARBARO-KUKADE; KIPP R. PIETRANTONIO; DANIELLE N. FRANKS; and BRITTAN L. DAVIS. 2019. It takes money to make money: Inequity in psychology graduate student borrowing and financial stressors. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*. DOI: 10.1037/tep0000294.
- WRIGHT, KELLY, and RACHEL WEISSLER. 2020. Response to *Perspectives* article: 'Toward racial justice in linguistics'. Personal communication, June 9.

Charity Hudley
University of California, Santa Barbara
3432 South Hall
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3100
[acharityhudley@ucsb.edu]
[mallinson@umbc.edu]
[bucholtz@ucsb.edu]

[Received 12 August 2020;
accepted 13 August 2020]