UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

Sociolinguists trying to make a difference: Race, research, and linguistic activism

Permalink

Author

Bucholtz, Mary

Publication Date

2020

Peer reviewed

25

SOCIOLINGUISTS TRYING TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Race, Research, and Linguistic Activism[1]

Mary Bucholtz

Introduction

Back in January 1997, at the peak of the Ebonics controversy hysteria, I watched John R. Rickford give a media interview at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in Chicago. As the news crew left, I overheard them muttering in frustration that they had not been able to goad John into saying something inflammatory. Although their reaction left me troubled by the sad state of media discourse, as a graduate student in sociolinguistics I was proud that a linguist of such prominence—and a member of my own dissertation committee—had refused to abandon his scholarly principles for a sound bite on the evening news.

This does not mean that John is not passionate about the issues at the heart of his research or that he shies away from controversy: one of the most gripping experiences I have ever had at an academic conference was witnessing John's meticulous, thorough, and (to my mind) devastating critique of the neo-Anglicist theory of the origins of African American English (published as Rickford 2006a). Every word John writes and speaks conveys his deep moral conviction that linguists must do our work responsibly and use our knowledge to advance social justice for racialized speakers. Especially in this era of calculatedly outraged and outrageous rhetoric, accusations of 'fake news,' and denials of scientific fact, John's commitment to reasoned argument and evidence-based policy and practice must be recognized as a political act. While conducting and communicating rigorous empirical research about urgent social issues lacks the drama of protest marches, it is a form of activism nonetheless, as demonstrated powerfully throughout his authoritative body of scholarship, from his compelling defense of the linguistic adequacy of Creole speakers (Rickford 1986b) to his visionary work on educational equity for African American English-speaking schoolchildren (Rickford and Rickford 1995c) to his intellectual leadership during the Ebonics controversy (Rickford 1999d) to his tour-de-force study of the role of linguistic racism in reproducing legal injustice (Rickford and King 2016e). What all of John's courageous and groundbreaking work in this vein has in common is a concern with justice for Black speakers vulnerable to the negative judgments of White listeners, including White linguists, and the deeply damaging material consequences attendant on those judgments.

John's work has been crucial to my own sense of self as a linguist. He has helped me to understand that we do not have to choose between research that is academically significant and research that is socially meaningful—and that, in fact, we face an ethical imperative to do both. He has shown me that communicating the insights of linguistics to a general audience is just as important and demanding

as communicating abstruse new findings to a small group of specialists—and that, in fact, we have responsibilities to both kinds of audiences. Just as important in my career has been John's support for my research, especially when I was a graduate student and a beginning assistant professor, being informed repeatedly that what I was doing (sociolinguistic work that engaged with critical theories of race as well as feminist theory) was 'not linguistics.' To be taken seriously as a scholar by John, one of the linguists I admire most in the world, strengthened my faith in myself and my work.

Perhaps the publication of John's that has most inspired me over the years is his call for sociolinguists to redress our 'unequal partnership' with our African American research participants (Rickford 1997b). He persuasively argues, with his usual comprehensiveness of scope and deft marshaling of evidence, that while many linguists have built our field and made our careers on the strength of African American speakers' generous sharing of their linguistic expertise, we have by and large failed to demonstrate an equal commitment to the well-being of the communities where we conduct our research. Indeed, as he acknowledges, this critique applies equally to linguists of all subfields who work with other sociopolitically marginalized groups. John urges sociolinguists to use our professional knowledge to provide 'service in return' to the African American community, specifically with regard to three different goals: (1) making the linguistics profession more inclusive of Black students and scholars and more welcoming of the perspectives and agendas they bring to the field; (2) producing linguistic scholarship that is more accurate and complete in its representations of African American language and culture; and (3) using linguistics to challenge the injustices that Black Americans regularly confront in institutional settings such as schools, courts, and workplaces. And although John's focus is on the specific debt that sociolinguists owe to African Americans, he makes clear that linguists working with other communities, languages, and varieties have similar responsibilities.

Meeting these responsibilities is not only a fundamental ethical obligation for us as researchers, but also a necessary means of advancing knowledge within the discipline. First, making the profession more representative leads to new insights and innovations, as demonstrated, for example, by the pathbreaking scholarship of Black linguists from Lorenzo Dow Turner ([1949] 2002) to John himself to his students—and their students (see Rickford 2016d: 575, footnote 19). Second, ensuring that the representations of speakers that appear in our research reports are accurate is the very basis of sound scholarship. And third, exposing linguistic inequality in institutional contexts has resulted in important new concepts and research directions, such as linguistic profiling (Baugh 2003), code-meshing (Young et al. 2013), and raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores and Rosa 2015; see Alim et al. 2016). Yet our field as a whole has not done enough to achieve the goals that John's paper lays out for us, and many linguists still do not even agree that these are worthwhile, let alone vital, components of our discipline.

This situation suggests that we have a great deal of work ahead to undo what can only be called, to put it bluntly, the White supremacy of linguistics. By this I mean not that linguistics shares the values of militant racism that have found a sympathetic ear in government and the media in recent years, but that it tacitly and largely unthinkingly participates in mainstream racism through its acceptance of a racially unjust status quo. Nor is linguistics unusually egregious among academic disciplines in this regard; rather, it appears to be entirely typical (on White supremacy in the academy, see Delgado Bernal and Villalpando 2002; Patton 2004; Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008, among many others). In what follows I discuss the various ways that linguists have begun to take up the three charges that John has placed upon us and offer additional suggestions for how we can move toward realizing his vision of a truly equal partnership between our discipline and the language users—that is, the people—who make our work possible.

Making Linguistics Inclusive

The paramount problem that must be overcome in order to make linguistics more equitable is the discipline's failure to reflect the ethnoracial demographics of the US population—a situation that John rightly terms 'an academic limitation for our field as well as a socio–political embarrassment' (1997b:

171). As he points out, drawing on data collected by the Linguistic Society of America's Committee on Ethnic Diversity in Linguistics, the situation for African Americans in linguistics is dire: In 1995 'only 1.9% of all undergraduates and 2% of all graduates enrolled in linguistics programs were Black, and the percentage of Black faculty recorded by that survey was comparable' (Rickford 1997b: 169); the numbers he presents are likewise dismal for other racialized groups.

The overwhelming whiteness of linguistics that John documented in his article 20 years ago is little better today, although differences in group categories and methodology make it difficult to compare the data directly. According to the Linguistic Society of America's most recent annual report, 'The population of ethnic minorities with advanced degrees in linguistics is so low in the U.S. that few federal agencies report data for these groups' (Linguistic Society of America 2017: 20). Table 25.1 presents the ethnoracial breakdown of all degrees awarded in linguistics as of 2014, the most recent year for which data are available. When compared to the demographics of the general US population in the same year (Colby and Ortman 2015), at the doctoral level in particular Whites are overrepresented, while most racialized groups are extremely underrepresented; at best, some groups of color in doctoral programs are roughly proportional to their overall numbers in the population at large.[2] The figures are almost certainly even worse for linguistics faculty, as they generally were in 1995. Thus, even though the overall number of undergraduates of color in linguistics appears to have increased in the past 20 years, such students see few people who look like themselves teaching their classes.

The widespread strategy of simply waiting for students of color to discover linguistics or hoping that they will continue in the discipline after their first exposure is clearly inadequate to remedy these long-standing inequities. And just as importantly, those students who enter linguistics often choose to leave it, whether before or after earning their degree, finding it hostile or indifferent to their needs, concerns, and goals. As John remarks, with characteristic understatement, 'we are sometimes not sufficiently nurturing and encouraging to African American students and others of color who enroll in our classes' (1997b: 170)—and I would add that John's self-deprecating use of the first-person plural pronoun here is definitely not warranted, given his extraordinary record of mentoring work.

The exclusionary practices of linguistics that drive students and scholars of color to other fields include the everyday violence of raciolinguistic microaggressions, such as being praised for being 'articulate' or for 'speaking beautiful English' (and yes, such patronizing comments can often be heard among well-meaning White linguistics professors today) or being called upon to act as a representative and spokesperson for one's heritage language or variety (even when one may not speak the language or variety in question). Other alienating practices include the discipline's devaluation of the socially relevant work that impels many students and scholars of color as mere 'community service' or as an

Table 25.1 Degrees awarded in linguistics in 2014 by race and ethnicity (National Science Foundation 2017)

Race/Ethnicity	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Total
American Indian or Alaska Native	7 (0.3%)	6 (1.1%)	1 (0.7%)	14 (0.5%)
Asian	223 (10.5%)	45 (8.2%)	8 (5.8%)	276 (9.8%)
Black or African American	85 (4.0%)	18 (3.3%)	4 (2.9%)	107 (3.8%)
Hispanic or Latino	288 (13.5%)	59 (10.7%)	7 (5.0%)	354 (12.6%)
Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.2%)
White	1,312 (61.7%)	362 (66.0%)	100 (71.9%)	1,774 (63%)
Two or more races	102 (4.8%)	16 (2.9%)	2 (1.4%)	120 (4.3%)
Other or unknown race or ethnicity	106 (5.0%)	42 (7.7%)	17 (12.2%)	165 (5.9%)
Total	2,128 (100%)	549 (100%)	139 (100%)	2,816 (100%)

intellectually uninteresting 'application' of the 'real' work of research. Even the subfield of sociolinguistics itself, which attracts the largest number of students of color, is marginalized in a great many linguistics programs, exploited for its ability to get 'butts in seats' but given low priority in departmental requirements and hiring agendas. As John suggests, undergraduate programs in linguistics that include a service learning or community engagement component have considerable benefits for undergraduates and community members alike and may be especially meaningful for students of color (Fitzgerald 2009; Charity Hudley et al. 2008). A department- and discipline-wide commitment to community-based work as inherent to linguistics might help keep those undergraduates in the field for the long term.[3]

More generally, what is required is a collective commitment to structural change at the institutional level, from rethinking our undergraduate curricula to making our admissions, hiring, and tenure processes more equitable to reimagining linguistic research. This is a conversation that needs to take place throughout the discipline, and one that John invited us all to begin 20 years ago.

The Ethics of Representation

Regarding the second issue that John raises in his 1997b paper, the politics of scholarly representation, there has again been insufficient progress in the discipline since his article was published. Compared to its sister field of anthropology, linguistics has been slow to recognize that academic writing is an act of social representation and not simply of factual reporting. Within anthropology, extensive discussion and debate of the political issues around the representation of people and their practices has been ongoing for over three decades, resulting in a large-scale transformation of how anthropology is carried out and written about, for whom and by whom (e.g., Baker 2010; Behar and Gordon 1995; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Ntarangwi 2010; Vargas-Cetina 2013).

By contrast, critical discussions of similar issues in linguistics have not been taken up by the field as a whole, despite their potential to unsettle the very basis of linguistic research and writing. As John notes, with respect to racial representation this issue has been addressed primarily by two prominent linguists, both African American women (Morgan 1994a, 1994b; Smitherman-Donaldson 1988). These scholars problematize White linguists' narrow and highly sensationalized representations, which distort the richness and range of African American language and culture. Yet these important critiques have for the most part not been engaged by other researchers. Similar problems have been noted regarding linguistics textbooks' presentation of African American English structure in ways that are exoticizing, unsystematic, or both (e.g., Green 2002; Walters 1996). Despite these and other conversations around political issues of scholarly representation in linguistics, a wide-ranging, discipline-spanning critical exploration of the representational responsibilities of linguists is still lacking.

Part of the problem is that many linguists are invested in a traditionally understood science-based model of research that discounts the relevance of the researcher's own identity (other than as a potential obstacle to collecting 'authentic data'; see Bucholtz 2003). Yet when outsider researchers lack basic communicative competence in community norms (or flatter ourselves that we possess such competence to a far greater extent than we in fact do), our representational decisions are likely to be inaccurate and damaging to the community. Similarly, when White researchers write about racialized languages or varieties for an imagined audience of people like ourselves, our analytic and representational choices are inevitably less nuanced and insightful than those made by researchers of color for scholars, students, and community members who share their background. Indeed, as a number of linguists have demonstrated—all of whom, not coincidentally, are Black—researcher subjectivity has profound, indelible, and sometimes unexpected effects on the process and products of research (e.g., Alim 2004; Baugh 1983; Jacobs-Huey 2002; Morgan 2002). This raises the larger issue of whom research is for: Why do more linguists not view our research participants as potential audiences—and

also as potential collaborators? (As with the other issues I discuss in this essay, I too am culpable in this regard.) Here again White linguists have a great deal to learn from our colleagues of color about how to make our research stronger and sounder.

Challenging Institutional Racism

The final area in which John enjoins linguists to do better is in using our professional expertise to work toward greater justice for African Americans in institutional settings. Once again, his words continue to resonate in the current moment: the extreme inequities that African Americans face have certainly not improved, and have in many ways become worse, especially under the current United States political regime. The series of high-profile video-documented cases of horrific police violence against Black citizens simply provides evidence for a long-standing pattern of state-sanctioned murder which until recently was largely unpublicized (Lowery 2016). John himself has led the way in demonstrating what linguists can contribute to the goal of combating racism in the legal system, and as he and Sherese King point out in their landmark article on this topic, much more work remains to be done (Rickford and King 2016e).

A much more common focus of linguists' activities to promote social justice is the educational sphere. One key component is the important work by John and others demonstrating the value of dialect readers in African American English speakers' literacy development (Labov et al. 2010; Rickford and Rickford 1995c). In addition to these interventions at the elementary level, K–12 programs across the United States on dialect awareness and critical language awareness (e.g., Alim 2005; Bucholtz et al. 2016, Forthcoming; Higgins et al. 2012; Reaser and Wolfram 2007; Siegel 2006) give students, most of them from underrepresented groups, early exposure to linguists' ways of thinking and working, an opportunity that most students do not receive until college, if at all. In this way, young people themselves can set the agenda for research and social action regarding the sociolinguistic issues that matter to them most (Bucholtz et al. 2018). However, special programs can not replace the need for linguists to work for structural change in the educational system so that all students—and especially students of color, who are those most likely to suffer educational injustice—have equal access to learning experiences that validate their languages, their cultures, and their humanity (Paris and Alim 2017).

Conclusion

Never has it been so urgent for sociolinguists to make more equitable our 'unequal partnership' with African American communities that John identified two decades ago. His words are as damning today as they were when he first wrote them: 'we have been returning less, precisely when the community needs us more' (1997b: 168). And although John did not quite put it this way, I have argued here that it is the White supremacy of linguistics, the discipline's willingness to accept the status quo of structural racism, that has produced and reproduced this inequality year after year.

Despite the important efforts of individuals throughout the field, institutional change is urgently needed in our departments, our universities, and our discipline. In her comprehensive overview of the varieties of linguistic activism, Anne Charity Hudley (2013), in a metaphor that will be familiar to sociolinguists, identifies four 'waves' of sociolinguists' activism, which I paraphrase here:

1. Raising linguistic issues in academic and public discourse
2. Applying linguistic research findings
3. Using social action to inform research
4. Sharing linguistics widely with students, communities, and the public

As I have discussed in this chapter, all of these strategies are already under way in various parts of the field, and John has both called for and enacted all of them in his distinguished career. At this point what is needed, regardless of the specific strategy, is an expansion from individual and small-scale efforts to produce social change to a collective form of action that explicitly takes structural racism as its target; only then can linguists hope to achieve what my coauthors and I call sociolinguistic justice (Bucholtz et al. 2014).

As a beginning to this goal, linguists need to stop thinking of socially engaged work as either service, in the dismissive sense in which that term is often used in academic departments, or as the applied adjunct of the supposedly serious work of 'theoretical' research. To relegate these necessary undertakings to the margins of our discipline reduces them to academic 'shitwork' (see Fishman 1983) performed by scholars of color as well as women, LBGTQI scholars, and scholars with disabilities, enabling straight, cis, able-bodied White men to advance their careers on the backs of their harder-working colleagues. Such work, along with the additional mentoring and campus service required of scholars from underrepresented groups, must be recognized, valorized, expected, and fairly rewarded equivalent to other academic labor (e.g., Antonio 2002; Jayakumar et al. 2009; June 2015; Matthew 2016).

In his activism-oriented articles, John offers concrete steps that sociolinguists can take to enact social change. It is in the same spirit that I offer the following final suggestions for how linguists—and especially White linguists, who bear the greatest responsibility for dismantling White supremacy in our discipline—can use our scholarly expertise and our institutional access to work for greater racial and sociolinguistic justice.

1. Educate yourself and others. You can only be effective when you are well informed, and the same empirical spirit that drives our discipline should guide our policy and practice as educators, mentors, members of admissions, hiring, and promotion committees, and our many other roles. White linguists in particular should commit to the responsibility of learning by reading and listening to the ideas of people of color, rather than demanding that they take time out from their other work to teach us what we should already know (or by insisting that we have nothing to learn about these topics). In addition, those who enjoy structural privilege should continually scrutinize our subject position to understand how it limits and distorts our professional perceptions, and we must be open to critique, especially from those who don't share our privilege.
2. Recognize that activism comes in many forms, and that working behind the scenes is just as important as fighting on the front lines. At the same time, it can be important to go on record with your sociopolitical commitments, especially if you are White and/or in a position of institutional power (e.g., tenured), in order to help frame such work as normal, expected, and valued by your institution and the discipline.
3. Find and talk to others who share your goals, including not only faculty in your own and other departments but also students, staff members, administrators, community members, policy makers, and activists. Learn what innovations are working elsewhere, share your own goals and challenges, listen to those whom you seek to serve, and work collectively for the greatest impact.

My final suggestion echoes the personal narrative that John shares at the beginning of his 1997b article, when he recounts what led him to pursue a PhD in linguistics. He recalls that as an undergraduate he was inspired by sociolinguistic research that aimed to support Creole speakers' educational success, but laments that as his career progressed, he found himself more engaged with traditional research than with the real-world issues that had first inspired him. Again, John is being too modest: His admirable record of scholarship and service (where these are often not separable) demonstrates significant contributions both to 'basic' sociolinguistic research and to its real-world impact. Nevertheless, we

might all do well to emulate him by reflecting on what first drew us into the field and asking whether, looking back on our careers, we can say that our work, like John's, has truly made a difference in the world.

Notes

1. My title echoes the name of John R. Rickford's winter 2018 course at Stanford University, 'Applied Sociolinguistics: Tryna Make a Difference.' (My use of the hegemonic English form *trying to* rather than the vernacular *tryna* is an effort to avoid the problematic practice of White cultural appropriation of Black linguistic forms.) I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for valuable suggestions, as well as to the Black linguists who so deeply influence my work, especially Anne Charity Hudley, for conversations as this essay took shape; John Baugh, for his encouragement and feedback on an earlier version; and John R. Rickford, for his inspiration and guidance over many years. Any deficiencies are entirely my responsibility.
2. Colby and Ortman's (2015) Table 2 reports the following ethno-racial breakdown for the overall US population in 2014: non-Hispanic White 62.2%, Hispanic 17.4%, Black or African American 13.2%, Asian 5.4%, American Indian and Alaska Native 1.2%, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander 0.2%, two or more races 2.5%.
3. One example of such an effort to increase the number of Black linguists is the UCSB–HBCU Scholars in Linguistics Program, which Anne Charity Hudley and I recently created with funding from the University of California's UC-HBCU Initiative and the National Science Foundation (Award #1757654). The program guides Black undergraduate researchers to use community-based methods to investigate Black undergraduates' linguistic and cultural experiences.

References

Alim, H. Samy. 2004. How the other half speaks: Ethnosensitivity and the shifting roles of the researcher. In H. Samy Alim (ed.) *You Know My Steez: An Ethnographic and Sociolinguistic Study of Styleshifting in a Black American Speech Community*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 39–77.

Alim, H. Samy. 2005. Critical language awareness in the United States: Revisiting issues and revisiting pedagogies in a resegregated society. *Educational Researcher* 34: 24–31.

Alim, H. Samy, John R. Rickford and Arnetha F. Ball (eds.). 2016. *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes our Ideas about Race*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Antonio, Anthony Lising. 2002. Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education* 73(5): 482–602.

Baker, Lee D. 2010. *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Baugh, John. 1983. *Black Street Speech: Its History, Structure, and Survival*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Baugh, John. 2003. Linguistic profiling. In Sinfree Makoni, Geneva Smitherman, Arnetha F. Ball and Arthur K. Spears (eds.) *Black Linguistics: Language, Society, and Politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York: Routledge. 155–168.

Behar, Ruth and Deborah A. Gordon (eds.). 1995. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2003. Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3): 398–416.

Bucholtz, Mary, Dolores Inés Casillas and Jin Sook Lee. 2016. Beyond empowerment: Accompaniment and sociolinguistic justice in a youth research program. In Robert Lawson and Dave Sayers (eds.) *Sociolinguistic Research: Application and Impact*. London: Routledge. 25–44.

Bucholtz, Mary, Dolores Inés Casillas and Jin Sook Lee. (eds.). 2018. *Feeling it: Language, Race, and Affect in Latinx Youth Learning*. New York: Routledge.

Bucholtz, Mary, Dolores Inés Casillas and Jin Sook Lee. Forthcoming. California Latina/o youth as agents of sociolinguistic justice. In Netta Avineri, Laura R. Graham, Eric Johnson, Robin Riner and Jonathan Rosa (eds.) *Case Studies in Language and Social Justice*. New York: Routledge.

Bucholtz, Mary, Audrey Lopez, Allina Mojarro, Elena Skapoulli, Christopher VanderStouwe and Shawn Warner-Garcia. 2014. Sociolinguistic justice in the schools: Student researchers as linguistic experts. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 8(4): 144–157.

Charity Hudley, Anne H. 2013. Sociolinguistics and social activism. In Robert Bayley, Richard Cameron and Ceil Lucas (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press. 812–831.

Charity Hudley, Anne H., Jeree Harris, Joe Hayes, Katie Ikeler and Andrew Squires. 2008. Service-learning as an introduction to sociolinguistics and linguistic equality. *American Speech* 83(2): 237–251.

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus (eds.). 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Colby, Sandra L. and Jennifer M. Ortman. 2015. Projections of the size and composition of the U.S. population: 2014 to 2060. Report, U.S. Census Bureau. Online www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-1143.pdf.

Delgado Bernal, Dolores and Octavio Villalpando. 2002. An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the 'legitimate' knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity and Excellence in Education* 35(2): 169–180.

Fishman, Pamela. 1983. Interaction: The work women do. In Barrie Thorne, Cheris Kramarae and Nancy Henley (eds.) *Language, Gender, and Society*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House. 89–101.

Fitzgerald, Colleen M. 2009. Language and community: Using service learning to reconfigure the multicultural classroom. *Language and Education* 23(3): 217–231.

Flores, Nelson and Jonathan Rosa. 2015. Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review* 85(2): 149–171.

Green, Lisa J. 2002. *African American English: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Higgins, Christina, Richard Nettel, Gavin Furukawa and Kent Sakoda. 2012. Beyond contrastive analysis and codeswitching: Student documentary filmmaking as a challenge to linguicism in Hawaii. *Linguistics and Education* 23(1): 49–61.

Jacobs-Huey, Lanita. 2002. The natives are gazing and talking back: Reviewing the problematics of positionality, voice, and accountability among 'native' anthropologists. *American Anthropologist* 104(3): 791–804.

Jayakumar, Uma M., Tyrone C. Howard, Walter R. Allen and June C. Han. 2009. Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education* 80(5): 538–563.

June, Audrey Williams. 2015. The invisible labor of minority professors. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 8. Online www.chronicle.com/article/The-Invisible-Labor-of/234098.

Labov, William, Ivannia Soto-Hinman, Shirley Dickson, Anne H. Charity Hudley and B. J. Thorsnes. 2010. *Portals to Reading: Intensive Intervention*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Linguistic Society of America. 2017. The state of linguistics in higher education. Annual Report 2016. Online www.linguisticsociety.org/sites/default/files/Annual_Report_2016.pdf.

Lowery, Wesley. 2016. *'They Can't Kill Us All': The Story of the Struggle for Black Lives*. New York: Back Bay Books.

Matthew, Patricia A. (ed.). 2016. *Written/Unwritten: Diversity and the Hidden Truths of Tenure*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Morgan, Marcyliena. 1994a. The African-American speech community: Reality and sociolinguists. In Marcyliena Morgan (ed.) *Language and the Social Construction of Identity in Creole Situations*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Afro-American Studies, UCLA. 121–148.

Morgan, Marcyliena. 1994b. Theories and politics in African American English. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 325–345.

Morgan, Marcyliena. 2002. *Language, Discourse and Power in African American Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

National Science Foundation. 2017. Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering. Online www.nsf.gov/statistics/2017/nsf17310/.

Ntarangwi, Mwenda. 2010. *Reversed Gaze: An African Ethnography of American Anthropology*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Paris, Django and H. Samy Alim (eds.). 2017. *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Patton, Tracey Owens. 2004. Reflections of a Black woman professor: Racism and sexism in academia. *Howard Journal of Communications* 15(3): 185–200.

Reaser, Jeffrey and Walt Wolfram. 2007. *Voices of North Carolina: Language and Life from the Atlantic to the Appalachians*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Language and Life Project.

Siegel, Jeff. 2006. Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach. *Linguistics and Education* 17: 157–174.

Smitherman-Donaldson, Geneva. 1988. Discriminatory discourse on Afro-American speech. In Geneva Smitherman-Donaldson and Teun A. van Dijk (eds.) *Discourse and Discrimination*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press. 144–175.

Turner, Lorenzo Dow. (1949) 2002. *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Vargas-Cetina, Gabriela (ed.). 2013. *Anthropology and the Politics of Representation*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Walters, Keith. 1996. Contesting representations of African American language. In Risako Ide, Rebecca Parker and Yukako Sunaoshi (eds.) *SALSA 3: Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium about Language and Society: Austin* (*Texas Linguistic Forum 36*). Austin, TX: University of Texas, Department of Linguistics. 137–151.

Young, Vershawn Ashanti, Rusty Barrett, Y'Shanda Young-Rivera and Kim Brian Lovejoy. 2013. *Other People's English: Code-Meshing, Code-Switching, and African American Literacy*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Zuberi, Tukufu and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (eds.). 2008. *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.