Toward Racial Justice in Linguistics: Interdisciplinary Insights into Theorizing Race in the Discipline and Diversifying the Profession

Anne H. Charity Hudley, Christine Mallinson, and Mary Bucholtz[*]

Abstract

This article builds on the Linguistic Society of America's Statement on Race to argue that linguistics urgently needs an interdisciplinarily-informed theoretical engagement with race and racism. To be adequate, a linguistic theory of race must incorporate the perspectives of linguistic researchers of different methodological approaches and racial backgrounds and must also draw on theories of race in neighboring fields, including anthropology, sociology, and psychology, as well as speech and hearing sciences, composition and literacy studies, education, and critical interdisciplinary race studies. The lack of comprehensive and up-to-date theoretical, analytical, and political understandings of race within linguistics not only weakens research by erasing, marginalizing, and misrepresenting racially minoritized groups, but it also diminishes the impact of the entire field by devaluing and excluding the intellectual contributions of researchers of color, whose work on this topic is rarely welcome within linguistics departments. The article therefore argues for a rethinking of both linguistic scholarship and linguistics as a discipline in more racially inclusive and socially just terms.

Keywords. Race and racism; discipline of linguistics; diversity; interdisciplinarity; racial justice; social justice; social theory

1. Why an examination of race in linguistics? Extensive research in linguistics has made use, implicitly or explicitly, of the concept of race. Race has been integral to how the study of language has developed as a research area and to how languages have been academically, socially, and politically defined over time (see, e.g., Makoni 2003, Makoni & Pennycook 2006), while language has likewise been central to how race has been theorized and taken up in scholarship, particularly in the Western modern era (see, e.g., Baker 2010, Bonfiglio 1999, Hutton 1999). Yet, as Charity Hudley (2017) discusses, conflicting models of racial classification have been used in linguistics, including race as researcher attribution (often on the basis of phenotype or language use), race as self-identification (often on the basis of culture), and race as a stand-in for other phenomena such as inequality. Moreover, such models are rarely informed by explicit theoretical perspectives that would enable them to address race-related questions in an adequate way.[1]

Different trajectories of linguistic investigation have created competing as well as complementary notions of the role of race in linguistic processes. Linguistic research concerning language variation and linguistic diversity within and across racial and cultural categories has traditionally centered on who speaks (or does not speak) a particular language or variety. Relatedly, linguists frequently characterize language varieties with respect to race, such as African-American English or Chicano English. In large-scale variationist sociolinguistic studies, which have been prevalent in the past fifty years of empirical research about language and race within linguistics, the absence or presence of linguistic features is generally correlated with broadly defined racial categories, but accurate correlation with particular cultural groups in time, place, space, and context has proved more challenging. In contrast, in ethnographic studies, where race is often more explicitly theorized, it is defined primarily by cultural description and self-identification. For the past two decades, ethnographic linguistic studies have been deeply influenced by the theories and methods of linguistic anthropology and generally rely on practice-based (e.g., Eckert 2012, Mendoza-Denton 2002) models of language and race, including a focus on socialization, identity, and the construction of community and culture (e.g., Alim 2004, Bucholtz 2011, Mendoza-Denton 2008, Morgan 2002).

Given the complicated sociohistorical history of racial contact and classification, both theoretical and methodological concerns arise in linguists' attempts to classify language users by race. Linguists, like other researchers, struggle with models of racial classification, which capture the tension inherent in racialization processes: in some cases, a racial classification is attributed to a person or group, while in other cases an individual or group claims a racial classification for themselves. Further difficulties arise when researchers examine linguistic systems that they themselves do not participate in, because they may not be aware of or may overlook important cultural and sociopolitical distinctions, dimensions, or insights that have important bearing on the research question at hand—not to mention knowledge of cultural norms

---

[1] In this article, we focus on the discipline of linguistics as it is currently practiced within linguistics departments and programs as well as by scholars in other institutional contexts who understand themselves to be linguists. As we discuss, this scope often includes work being done in other fields, but as we also note, such work is often viewed by professional gatekeepers as marginal to or outside of linguistics. We are therefore concerned to bring interdisciplinary work on race more centrally into our discipline.

Here we primarily consider linguistics in the U.S. context. Because the racial system of the United States combines what are generally understood as ethnic categories as well as racial categories, our use of the term *race* includes ethnicity unless otherwise specified.

that are crucial both in building trust and partnerships with members of oppressed groups and in conducting ethically responsible research. Too often, those whom Speas (2009) and others refer to as "outsider linguists" may be overly focused on disciplinary norms and audiences and may fail to recognize the limits of their knowledge and its relevance for racially minoritized communities; the resulting situation creates ethical as well as theoretical and methodological problems, despite the good intentions those researchers may have.

Thus, a clear challenge remains to develop theoretically grounded approaches to racial analysis in linguistics that, first, center the expertise of scholars from minoritized racial backgrounds and, second, incorporate the perspectives of researchers of various fields and subfields using different theoretical and methodological approaches. This article proposes that linguists draw from and build on the work on race that has already been developed in neighboring disciplines, while being mindful of the limitations and lacunae of some of this work. Among these are other social science disciplines where race has received fuller attention. We recognize the interdisciplinary nature of linguistics and linguistic research, but we emphasize that our primary concern in this article is the examination of research done in Ph.D.-granting linguistics departments, especially of the sort that might plausibly be found in the pages of *Language*: as sociological research has demonstrated, institutional whiteness is a structuring force in academia, informing the development of theories, methods and models in ways that reproduce racism and white supremacy as structural social processes rather than simply acts of individual ill will (e.g., Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva 2008). For comparison, we also consider research in the neighboring disciplines of anthropology, sociology, and psychology, as they have issued statements on race that directly informed the development of the LSA's (2019) Statement on Race, as discussed further in section 3, below. We address more briefly the approaches to race that have been taken in other language-related disciplines, including speech and hearing sciences, modern language studies, applied linguistics, composition and rhetoric, language and literacy studies, and education. Finally, we argue that it is essential for linguistics as a discipline to learn from the interdisciplinary fields that have as their raison d'être a central critical engagement with race and racism, such as Black studies, Indigenous studies, Latinx studies, and Asian American and Pacific Islander studies. The failure of linguistics to engage seriously with the cutting-edge theoretical and political perspectives that these fields offer has significantly hampered linguists' ability to address questions of race and racism in our scholarship, in our academic discipline, and in our profession.

In short, when examining race, interdisciplinary thinking and disciplinary critical reflection are equally crucial. The incorporation of interdisciplinary understandings of race in linguistics will have considerable benefits for the quality of research and at the same time will help move the field toward greater inclusion and racial justice. Our aim is that this article might further illuminate how improving linguists' ways of theorizing and analyzing race can yield new insights into the study of language while reducing inequities in the profession of linguistics.

2. The need for a disciplinary stance on language and race. As we discuss throughout this article, linguists of color have taken the lead in conducting research on race as well as in exposing and interrogating historical and contemporary practices of white supremacy within linguistics. In general, however, the discipline has been slow to take up the charge issued by these scholars. The lack of an explicit and comprehensive theorizing of race within linguistics as

a discipline—as opposed to the important yet underappreciated work on race by individual linguists in a variety of fields—is inextricably bound to the discipline's dismal record of racial diversity. Compounding this issue is the severe underrepresentation of faculty and students of color within linguistics—especially those who are of African-American, Latinx, and Native American descent, as well as many Asian American and Pacific Islander groups. In its 2018 Annual Report, the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) reported, "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 2018:28; see also Rickford 2014). Moreover, the leadership within the LSA suffers from an extreme lack of racial diversity. Until very recently few or no linguists of color served as members of the Executive Committee in any given year (Linguistic Society of America 2019a), and the number of LSA presidents of color since the organization was founded nearly a century ago can be counted on one hand (Linguistic Society of America 2019b). In other words, the scholars who most often deal with race in their research and can contribute insights based on their lived experience are less likely to hold leadership positions that would enable them to shape understandings of race within the discipline.

These persistent factors have likely contributed to the lack of open, thorough, and critically-engaged discussion of race within linguistics in the United States. To be sure, in recent years the LSA has issued an increasing number of resolutions, statements, and endorsements on race-related topics, such as condemnation of anti-immigrant policies, support for the resistance of the Standing Rock Sioux to the Dakota Pipeline, and censure of racism and other forms of extremism (Linguistic Society of America 2019c). However, until the LSA Statement on Race (Linguistic Society of America 2019d), which was approved in 2019, the discipline had no formal statement on race and racism, either in linguistic research or in linguistics as a profession (but see Baugh 1988, Lanehart 2019, Lo & Reyes 2009, Mufwene 2008, Rickford 1997, Rosa & Flores 2017, and Zentella 2018 for important contributions toward this bipartite goal). In comparison, the flagship organizations of related disciplines—the American Anthropological Association (1998), the American Sociological Association (2003), and the American Psychological Association (2001)—all have relatively longstanding formal statements regarding race and approaches to studying this social phenomenon and its attendant social inequalities. Likewise, professional organizations with a scholarly focus on language, literacy, and culture, such as the National Council of Teachers of English (which includes the Conference on College Composition and Communication) have issued similar official statements, as well as being active—again, thanks primarily to the efforts of their members of color—in calling attention to racial issues in their fields through a series of position statements related to race and inclusion in the profession, research, and teaching (National Council of Teachers of English n.d.a). To be sure, every academic discipline must continue to work to overcome continuing legacies of racism; this is an issue that many scholars across the fields mentioned above have acknowledged and have strived to correct. For this reason, it is also necessary to draw on the insights of the various interdisciplinary fields that critically investigate race and openly challenge racism both in contemporary society and in academia as a microcosm of that society, such as the fields of critical race studies mentioned above. We therefore consider in turn how these disciplines and interdisciplinary fields of study engage with race as both an intellectual and a professional concern.

2.1 Race in anthropology. Anthropology and linguistics have long had a close relationship that was forged early in the development of both disciplines in North America (e.g., Hymes 1964, Murray 1998, Paulston & Tucker 1997). Yet, the disciplines became increasingly separated throughout the twentieth century, and as a result a widening gap has also become evident in the understanding of and engagement with race by scholars in each field. Franz Boas, a major figure in linguistics as well as anthropology, is usually credited with debunking the "scientific" racism that dominated early twentieth-century anthropological research (e.g., Boas 1912); it is often overlooked that a much earlier and far more comprehensive critique of racist anthropological research was issued by Anténor Firmin, a Haitian anthropologist (Fluehr-Lobban 2000).

Building on this long (if sometimes uneven) tradition of antiracism, for more than eighty years the American Anthropological Association (AAA) has produced multiple statements related to race and racism, often but not always in response to current events and public discourse (e.g., American Anthropological Association 1962, 1994, 1998; Flannery [1939] 1976, Stern & Bohannan 1970:11). The most extensive such statement was adopted by AAA in 1998 and published in the organization's flagship journal, *American Anthropologist*, a prominent placement that makes clear to members the central importance of this topic for the entire discipline. Anthropologists have continued to confront the colonial racist legacy of the discipline and the urgent need to challenge racism both within its own ranks and more broadly. These interlinked efforts have often been led by anthropologists of color (e.g., Baker 1998, Dominguez 1994, Harrison 1995, Jackson & Depew 2017, Mukhopadhyay & Moses 1997, Smedley & Smedley 2012; on the intellectual leadership of Black anthropologists in particular, see Allen & Jobson 2016, Drake 1980, Harrison & Harrison 1999).

AAA and its sections and members have also engaged in numerous other antiracist activities and initiatives. These efforts include organizing regular prominent sessions on race and racism at annual meetings, commissioning special issues and edited volumes theorizing race and racism (e.g., Harrison 1997, 1998); creating the "Race: Are We So Different?" traveling museum exhibit and accompanying resources, including a book (Goodman, Moses, & Jones 2012) and interactive website sponsored by the association (AAA n.d.); conducting surveys to expose continuing racism within the discipline (Brodkin et al. 2011), and establishing a designated "minority" seat on the AAA Executive Committee. It is important to highlight that linguists—and especially linguists of color—have played crucial roles within AAA in addressing issues of race and racial justice. For example, in 1990 Arthur Spears became the founding editor of *Transforming Anthropology*, the journal of the Association of Black Anthropologists, an organization that seeks to make anthropology more inclusive of the work of Black scholars. He Spears also authored a chapter, "Negotiating Racism in the Academy" (Spears 2012) that appeared in *Racism in the Academy* (Smedley & Hutchinson 2012), a publication that emerged from a 2010 AAA report by the Commission on Race and Racism in Anthropology. Spears also edited a special issue for *Transforming Anthropology* that invited prominent linguists to address the intersection of linguistic and racial injustice (Spears 2010). In 2010, led by Ana Celia Zentella and other linguists, the Society for Linguistic Anthropology established the Committee on Language and Social Justice, which supported the production of a recent edited volume on that topic, with a significant focus on race (Avineri et al. 2019).

As this body of scholarship attests, for the past thirty years a central project of anthropology has been to shine a light on unquestioned beliefs about race in canonical

anthropological research, to acknowledge the political agenda of purportedly scientifically neutral scholarship, to recover the groundbreaking yet often neglected work of scholars of color, and to rethink the very basis of the discipline.

2.2. Race in sociology. As with anthropology, a gap exists between sociology and linguistics regarding attention devoted to race. While sociology once had a closer relationship to linguistics, the trajectories of these disciplines have diverged over time. In 1963, Lévi-Strauss wrote that the methodological similarity between sociology and linguistics "imposes a special obligation for collaboration upon them" (32). Despite this early engagement, the scholarly interests of sociologists and linguists diverged (Paulston & Tucker 1997). Theoretical and methodological connections to sociology became tenuous for linguistics, and conversely language-related issues are today relatively marginal to sociology (Mallinson 2013). One result of these divergences, Fishman (1991:130-32) has noted, is that "only a small proportion of the worldwide sociolinguistic literature is getting through to sociology," while sociolinguists have "created their sociology as they went along," resulting in "self-imposed underexposure to serious sociological stimulation." To solve this problem, Fishman recommends that we "bring the 'socio' back in" to sociolinguistics, in order to refine our theorizing and analyzing about the social context of language use. One crucial aspect of this social context is race.

In sociology, as Winant (2000:169) describes, race has been a significant theme from the founding of the discipline to the present: from the colonialism and biologistic racism inherent in 19th-century sociology, to challenges to racism in sociology in the 20th century, to a more critical, global 21st-century perspective. In the early 20th-century United States, the concept of race in sociology was still framed by biological underpinnings, including by sociologists such as Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Emile Durkheim, whose work often critiqued—but also often supported—slavery and colonialism (Winant 2000:173-74). Sociology's contemporary concept of race was largely ushered in by the work of African-American sociologist W. E. B. Du Bois, who, in recent years, has begun to receive due acclaim as the father of American sociology (Morris 2015). Du Bois underscored the consequences of African enslavement in the U.S. and argued for racial democratization (Winant 2000:174-76). Now in the 21st century, society has largely, if not necessarily permanently, dismantled transparent vehicles for social stratification and prejudice (e.g., imperial rule, state-backed genocide, Jim Crow, apartheid), giving rise instead to more opaque carriers of inequality and bias. To combat and surmount racial injustice and inequality, Winant argues, sociology must refine and redevelop racial theory in ways that "address the persistence of racial classification and stratification in an era officially committed to racial equality and multiculturalism" (180). Racial formation theory (Omi & Winant 2015), which emphasizes the sociohistorical contingency of racial systems, stands as an influential contribution to this effort.

Like anthropology, sociology is confronting its own race problem. Since the time of Du Bois, the discipline has been divided into a "Black sociology" and a "white sociology" (Bhambra 2014), and for many years sociologists of color have been challenging white disciplinary hegemony (Brunsma & Wyse 2019; Ladner 1973; Morris 2017) along with its negative impacts on the field's epistemology (Collins 1986, 1990; Stanfield [2011a] 2016), methodology (Stanfield [2011b] 2016; Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva 2008), and professional training and practice (Margolis & Romero 1998).

The profession has started to address these issues more formally. For example, in 2003, the American Sociological Association (ASA) issued a statement that explores the contemporary challenges and contradictions inherent in collecting statistics that allow for comparisons by race, as discussed further below. On the one hand, doing so can reify race in ways that promote misconceptions and social divisions; on the other hand, the lack of such measures can obscure significant race-based social inequalities and impede social justice efforts. Nevertheless, as the statement makes clear, the study of race and ethnicity is crucially important both to the scientific work of studying society and to everyday people. Indeed, as Hillsman, a former ASA Executive Officer, put it, "race is real in the eyes of social beings, and its measurable consequences run deep in all realms of social life" (Hillsman 2002). The ASA has also approved several statements related to race and current events (American Sociological Association n.d.a). Further, it provides extensive content related to race on its website (American Sociological Association n.d.b), including a topic page on race and ethnicity that explains how and why sociologists study race and a section featuring important research by sociologists about race. The website additionally makes available teaching resources about race and ethnicity, as well as the 2003 ASA statement on race.

2.3. Race in psychology. Finally, psychology has also devoted a great deal of attention to the concept of race and particularly to the workings of racism as a psychological phenomenon; again, much of this work has been carried out by scholars of color. As with anthropology and sociology, the discipline has a long history of racism (e.g., Fernando 2017, Howitt & Owusu-Bempah 1994, Richards 2012). Psychologists of color have formed scholarly and professional societies both to foster research that has not been well-supported within the white-dominated American Psychological Association (APA) and to create welcoming spaces for more researchers of color to enter the field. These organizations include the Association of Black Psychologists, which publishes the *Journal of Black Psychology*; the Asian American Psychological Association, which publishes the *Asian American Journal of Psychology*; and the National Latinx Psychological Association, which publishes the *Journal of Latinx Psychology*. The latter two journals are published through APA, while the *Journal of Black Psychology* is independent.

Through publications in such venues and elsewhere, scholars of color in the field have been at the forefront of theorizing race and racism, often in ways of direct relevance to linguistics. Early work by Black Martinican psychiatrist and political theorist Frantz Fanon ([1952] 1967) offered an important account of the psychological harm inflicted by racism and colonialism, published in English as *Black Skin, White Masks*; this work has had a profound impact both in revolutionary struggles around the world and in the field of postcolonial studies. (Fanon's original text was famously rejected as his Ph.D. dissertation in psychiatry in France.) His book also contains valuable insights for linguists into the racialized politics of language under colonial conditions. Within the United States, African-American scholars were particularly prominent in early psychological advances in race and racism. Mamie Phipps Clark and Kenneth Clark conducted an extremely influential study of racism (Clark & Clark 1950). A generation later, the field of Black psychology was established (Coleman & Johnson 2009); it was one of the founders of this field, Robert Williams, an expert in linguistic and cultural bias in intelligence testing, who coined the term *Ebonics*, a cover term for Black linguistic practices that includes but

is not synonymous with what linguists now usually refer to as *African American English* (Williams 1975).

For over a decade, the APA has begun to heed the crucial work of such groundbreaking scholars by engaging deeply and critically in issues of race and racism. The first APA resolution related to these topics called for the recruitment and retention of people of color in the discipline (American Psychological Association 1993). A general statement on race was then issued as an emergency action in 2001 (American Psychological Association 2001), and in 2004, the organization published a volume tracing both racist and antiracist scholarship within the discipline (Winston 2004). In addition, the organization has produced other publications and a series of working documents on race (American Psychological Association n.d.a). These materials are designed to inform research as well as internal and external policy and action, as exemplified by the APA's amicus brief on two high-profile Supreme Court cases related to affirmative-action policies in higher education, Grutter *v.* Bollinger and Gratz *v.* Bollinger (American Psychological Association 2003). The APA has also created an Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs (American Psychological Association n.d.b) and has established numerous other guidelines, policy statements, and resolutions relevant to racial issues (American Psychological Association n.d.c).

2.4. Race in other language-related disciplines. In addition to the three social science disciplines we have discussed thus far, it is important to consider how the professional organizations of other fields that focus on language have engaged with the issue of race. These include organizations that serve the disciplines of speech and hearing sciences, modern language studies, language teaching, composition and rhetoric, and education.

Similar to psychology, the field of speech and hearing sciences is overwhelmingly white (Rodriguez 2016), a situation that has given rise to a range of organizations that aim to support scholars of color. These organizations, which are independent of but loosely connected to the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA), are known as multicultural constituency groups (MCCGs) (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association n.d.a). The MCCGs include the Asian Indian Caucus, the Asian Pacific Islander Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, L'GASP–GLBTQ Caucus, the National Black Association for Speech-Language and Hearing, and the Native American Caucus. As their names indicate, most of these groups function primarily as caucuses to ASHA; however, the National Black Association for Speech-Language and Hearing is an entirely separate, parallel organization that was created to support Black American professionals, students, and clients. The MCCGs are only one of the many resources ASHA makes available through its Office of Multicultural Affairs (American Speech and Hearing Association n.d.b), along with resources about bilingualism, cultural competence, outreach to Minority Serving Institutions, and more. In addition, the organization has a Multicultural Issues Board (formerly the Committee on the Status of Racial Minorities) as part of its governing structure, which has issued position statements on such race-related topics as social dialects (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association 1983) and English language learners (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association 1998).

Like linguistics, the Modern Language Association (MLA) has a historically weak record when it comes to engagement with issues of race. As a direct result of the MLA's racially

exclusionary policies and practices in the first half of the twentieth century, in 1937 African-American literary critics founded an alternative organization, the College Language Association (CLA) (Buncombe 1987). Since the 1970s, when the MLA established a Commission on Minority Groups and the Study of Language and Literature, the MLA and its members have begun to undo the organization's racist legacy by bringing race more centrally into the discipline, primarily by broadening the literary canon, as indicated by the existence of the Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada (Modern Language Association n.d.a). However, advances made through this undertaking have not been matched by equal success on the part of the MLA in creating and implementing structural efforts to diversify modern language departments and programs. For example, there is no committee on racial diversity in the profession, and such issues fall to the Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada by default.

Among the positive steps the MLA has taken toward this goal is the recent expansion of the scope of its advocacy arm to include the dissemination of materials on teaching about racism (MLA Action Network 2017) and on supporting students from underrepresented groups (MLA Action Network 2019). In addition, the MLA's online professional journal, *Profession*, provides an important venue for members to bring attention to these issues (Aparicio 2013, Warrior 2013; see also Miñana 2013 for how one department is working toward greater inclusion). Finally, the MLA has an extensive series of resolutions, a number of which relate to race (Modern Language Association 2019). Nevertheless, the efforts of the MLA could significantly be expanded in reach and impact, particularly given its size and prominence as an organization.

Scholars in the field of applied linguistics have noted similar shortcomings with respect to how the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) attends to race, both in scholarship and in the discipline. In a recent article in a major journal of applied linguistics, Bhattacharya, Jiang, and Canagarajah (2019) extensively document these issues. As the authors note, the "Resolution Affirming Commitment to Promoting Diversity in AAAL" (American Association for Applied Linguistics 2013) has not in fact resulted in a more representative and inclusive organization, as demonstrated through their analysis of the demographics of presidents, committee members, journal editors and board members, conference coordinators, and award recipients. The authors propose numerous recommendations for remedying this situation; thus far the article and a related letter to the AAAL Executive Committee have yielded a number of encouraging signs, including an open-letter response (AAAL Executive Committee 2019), the formation of a task force, and increased representation of applied linguists of color on the editorial board of the *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, which has close ties to AAAL.

Compared to these other organizations, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) and its umbrella organization, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), have demonstrated a much greater commitment to racial equity in research and the profession. As early as 1974, CCCC issued "Students' Right to Their Own Language," its much-discussed position statement in support of minoritized linguistic varieties; this influential statement, which was crafted by linguists as well as composition specialists (Smitherman 1995), has been expanded and reaffirmed several times since that time (Conference on College Composition and Communication [1974] 2014). In addition, CCCC issued a statement in response to the 1997 Ebonics controversy in Oakland, California (Conference on College

Composition and Communication [1998] 2016). Besides dispelling popular misconceptions about the nature of African American English, the CCCC's statement also focuses on the contributions of Black researchers to scholarly understanding of the variety. Moreover, compared to LSA, CCCC has a better, though by no means ideal, record of electing scholars of color to top leadership positions. This is not to say that the field is free of racism, a point powerfully made by Royster (1996), an African American scholar specializing in Black women's literacy, in her Chair's Address to CCCC, delivered the previous year.

NCTE, which includes K-12 as well as college-level English instructors among its members, also has an unusually strong track record of support and advocacy for scholars and students of color. In 2007, NCTE issued its Statement on Anti-Racism to Support Teaching and Learning, which was developed by the Committee Against Racism and Bias in the Teaching of English; this statement was revised and reissued in 2018 (National Council of Teachers of English 2018). Like other disciplines we have discussed above, NCTE also has multiple caucuses to support the concerns of its members, including the American Indian Caucus, the Asian/Asian American Caucus, the Black Caucus, the Jewish Caucus, and the Latinx Caucus (National Council of Teachers of English n.d.b). NCTE has been a lifeline for many contemporary scholars of color (as well as white scholars) who do not want to limit the scope of their research and teaching to conform to narrow definitions of linguistics and who instead view a holistic approach to language, literacy, and culture as crucial for the advancement of racial equity. In fact, for many years, the LSA's Language in the School Curriculum Committee has been committed to co-sponsoring a session relevant to K-12 education at the annual NCTE convention (Linguistic Society of America n.d.).

A growing commitment to the idea of comprehensively supporting culturally and linguistically diverse learners has also propelled a greater focus on language within the American Educational Research Association (AERA). AERA is has been more effective than most academic organizations in directly addressing race because of its recognition that research-related, educational, professional, and political matters are intertwined; one of the more strikingly inclusive aspects of the organization is that it represents both practitioners and academics in a way that blurs the distinction between these professional roles. AERA has Special Interest Groups (SIGs) for specific racial/ethnic groups as well as language-focused SIGs for Language and Social Processes and Bilingual Education. The AERA also has a SIG that critically examines race as well as SIGs that focus on individual racially minoritized groups.

To be sure, the history of educational research is rife with racial discrimination (Ladson-Billings 2012). Education researchers have had to contend with this past and its effects in the present, and some are making amends through structural changes. For example, the AERA Annual *Brown* Lecture in Education Research was inaugurated in 2004 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Brown *v.* Board of Education decision, in which the U.S. Supreme Court took into account scientific research in issuing its landmark ruling. Each year a distinguished scholar notable for producing significant research related to equality in education is invited to give a public lecture in Washington, DC. In addition, thanks to the efforts of members of the Research Focus on Black Education SIG, AERA established a Commission on Research in Black Education and in 2005 published a book by the commission that seeks to expose and correct anti-Black bias in the discipline (King 2005).

In sum, many scholars with a deep interest in language and race center their own scholarship and professional activity not in linguistics departments, but rather in departments of communication, English, modern languages, or education, where they often receive a warmer reception, more support to pursue research on race, and more opportunities to take part in professional initiatives that advance racial justice. These disciplines, though often devalued within linguistics (Baker 2010, Mallinson & Charity Hudley 2018), collectively provide a model for linking theoretical racial knowledge to the real-world contexts in which language users go about their day talking, writing, learning, and expressing themselves.

2.5. Race in fields of critical race and ethnic studies. As the preceding discussion makes clear, disciplines adjacent to linguistics are well ahead of our own in theorizing race and confronting racial inequities within the academy. However, due to the fact that most of these fields, like linguistics, originated in and often remain enmeshed in racist theories, methodologies, and professional practices, it is not sufficient to rely on old academic models and tools in order to develop and change our theoretical thinking around race within linguistics. Indeed, some of the most significant theoretical work on race has been conducted not in traditional disciplines (such as those we discuss above) but rather in interdisciplinary fields that were established as deliberate alternatives to the "quotidian white supremacy" (see Rosa & Bonilla 2017: 203) of discipline-based knowledge. In the U.S. context, these fields include Black studies (Asante & Karenga 2006), Asian American and Pacific Islander studies (Cheng 2016), Chicanx and Latinx studies (Flores & Rosaldo 2007, Lomelí et al. 2018), Native and Indigenous studies (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith 2008; Simpson & Smith 2014), comparative race and ethnic studies (Collins & Solomos 2010), and mixed-race studies (Ofekwungigwe 2004).

Researchers in these fields have produced a rich and varied body of scholarship that advances theoretical understandings of race as well as racism, often but not exclusively through the lens of Critical Race Theory (Crenshaw et al. 1995). The departments and programs housing these fields—though typically institutionally marginalized and underresourced compared to predominantly white disciplines—are invaluable to their campuses, both for creating innovative, engaging, and inclusive curricula for students and for shouldering a disproportionate amount of the work of training, mentoring, hiring, and advocating for scholars of color.

To date, the cutting-edge theories of race emerging from these fields have had very little impact on linguistics as a discipline. Most linguists have not engaged with traditional discipline-based theories of race—let alone with more recent developments grounded in critical theories—and it is vanishingly rare for linguists to wade into current interdisciplinary theoretical debates over race, which are often led by scholars in critical race studies. In sociolinguistics, for instance, much quantitative work continues to rely on traditional, positivistic sociological models of race, while even research within third-wave sociolinguistics (Eckert 2012) that is concerned with race typically draws on social constructionism and racial formation theory, frameworks that are both decades old and not grounded in contemporary critically engaged frameworks. In this way, linguistic scholarship fails to keep up with current discussions and debates—such as critiques by Black studies scholars, which point toward theories of social constructionism and racial formation as being circular, rooted in a liberal understanding of race and racism, and implicitly or explicitly anti-Black (e.g., Saucier & Woods 2016; see also Morrison 1992). Perhaps the

subfield that is currently most holistically engaged in critical race studies is that of language revitalization/reclamation, where new scholarship is increasingly informed by Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies, thanks to the important work of Native and Indigenous linguists, as we discuss further below. In short, there is a great deal of room for linguists to learn from our colleagues who theorize race and who, on a daily basis, work for racial justice within and outside of the academy.

3. The LSA Statement on Race. This article is accompanied by the Statement on Race (Linguistic Society of America 2019), and our aim is for the discussion initiated by the statement, this article, and responses to it to advance theorizing, research, critical reflection, and collective action on race and racism in linguistics. In this section, we explain how insights gleaned from the fields and disciplines discussed above have informed our own thinking about race as well as the drafting of the Linguistic Society of America's (2019) Statement on Race.

In 2018, Charity Hudley and Mallinson organized the symposium "Linguistics and Race: An Interdisciplinary Approach Towards an LSA Statement on Race" at the Linguistic Society of America annual meeting. Participants included scholars from a range of racial and other intersectional backgrounds, each of whom has conducted research that directly involves the topic of language and race: in alphabetical order, the symposium participants were Mary Bucholtz (University of California, Santa Barbara), Anne H. Charity Hudley (University of California, Santa Barbara), Elaine Chun (University of South Carolina), Nelson Flores (University of Pennsylvania), Nicole Holliday (Pomona College), Christine Mallinson (University of Maryland, Baltimore County), and Arthur Spears (City University of New York). In their remarks, each of the scholars drew upon their training from various subdisciplines and approaches to linguistics, as well as training in related fields, to consider issues of race in interdisciplinary perspective. The papers and discussion during the symposium laid the groundwork for the LSA Statement on Race, which was drafted in Summer 2018, followed by several months of collecting feedback and revising the draft. In 2019, the LSA Statement on Race was officially approved by the LSA's Executive Committee.

The LSA Statement on Race dovetails with statements, position papers, and insights from neighboring fields and disciplines that critically interrogate race. In totality, the various disciplinary statements discussed above recognize race as a set of beliefs and ideologies about human differences that serves as a basis for the inequitable distribution of material and symbolic benefits and resources. These statements acknowledge that prejudice, discrimination, and racism remain profound social problems. They carefully document the historical and social motivations for current racial categories, describe how scholarly thought about race in these disciplines originated and how it has changed over time, and discuss which modes of classification of race and racial work are predominant in these fields. In sum, these statements guide the study of race within these disciplines: they establish a set of grounding principles for the study of race from their disciplinary perspectives, and they affirm that race and racism are important topics of scholarly inquiry within their fields and of advocacy and activism within their professions.

In addition, interdisciplinary fields that are centrally focused on critically theorizing race offer linguistics the recognition that, whether acknowledged or not, race is central, not peripheral or irrelevant, to every aspect of academic knowledge production. These fields also prioritize

topics, epistemologies, and methodologies rooted in the histories and experiences of people of color; consequently, they understand that what traditional disciplines often consider "data" produced by people of color is better conceptualized as grounded theoretical knowledge in its own right (e.g., Collins 1990). Finally, these fields emphasize that race imposes differential and distinctive effects on each racially minoritized group, even as coalitional perspectives are also sometimes necessary and valuable. These views of race are often not reconcilable with those articulated within hegemonically white disciplines.

Although no field or discipline is exempt from the charge to continue to engage in work that reimagines their theories, methods, and professional activities from an antiracist perspective, the models and inspirations we have highlighted above may help spur a deep and comprehensive self-examination of our own field. At the same time, we emphasize that neither the LSA Statement on Race nor this article are intended to be a definitive take on the status of race and racism in linguistics or on the types of work that remain to be done. Research is urgently needed that uncovers the dynamic and changing nature of understandings of race in our field, due to the many ways in which language can be measured, analyzed, and observed. Yet, any such work is never complete and that notions of race are constantly changing and in dispute. In addition, models of race are different over time, across contexts, and around the world (see, e.g., Alim, Rickford, & Ball 2016; DeGraff 2003, 2004, 2005a, 2005b; Makoni, Smitherman, Ball, & Spears 2003; Mufwene 2001; Omi & Winant 2015; Smedley & Smedley 2012) and these variations must be also brought into our disciplinary and interdisciplinary conversations. We therefore consider the LSA's (2019) Statement on Race as well as this article to be starting points for ongoing investigation, analysis, and dialogue.

In the following sections, we demonstrate how insights from neighboring fields can have particular utility when we consider two key areas. First, we consider the task of dismantling raciolinguistic ideologies that often unconsciously undergird and permeate the study of language and race (Rosa & Flores 2017; cf. Alim, Rickford & Ball 2016). Second, we consider the task of moving beyond "counting" race in the study of language toward research that is grounded in identity-, culture-, and community-based models and frameworks, while not losing sight of the fact that racism remains central to the experience of racially minoritized people. In relation to each of these two key areas, we draw upon insights from related disciplines as well as interdisciplinary fields of critical race studies with which linguistics has not often engaged to suggest ways that linguists can refine our ideological approaches, theoretical perspectives, and analytical models in the study of language and race—and, in so doing, develop a more comprehensive and productive understanding of race within and beyond linguistics.

The following discussions further address how the hegemonic whiteness of our discipline has been profoundly damaging both for linguistic scholarship and for linguistics as a profession. Although these might appear to some readers to be separate issues, in fact what linguists look like and how we identify and are identified—and the structural advantages or disadvantages we experience as a result—are all fundamental to how (and whether) research is done, by whom, and for what purposes. Although researcher subjectivities are particularly salient in scholarship on race (e.g., Twine & Warren 2000), all research proceeds from a point of view, regardless of whether it is acknowledged, examined, denied, or suppressed (Daston & Galison 2007). Finally, because it is impossible to theorize race and racism without the leadership of those who most

directly experience and understand racial inequities—that is, people of color—and because the structural exclusion of scholars from racially minoritized groups from our field is not only intellectually but morally wrong, we conclude this article both with a discussion of the need to advance racial justice in the discipline of linguistics and an outline of potential pathways for how to do so.

4. Dismantling raciolinguistic ideologies in linguistic research. As a predominantly white, scientifically oriented discipline based, at least since the early twentieth century, in a liberal rejection of scientific racism, linguistics has been reluctant to acknowledge its role in reproducing white supremacy. Many linguists, particularly those who are white-identified, seem to hold the implicit assumption that whether thanks to Boas's cultural relativism and anti-racist activism or Chomsky's linguistic universalism and left-wing politics, linguistics has adequately addressed racism. This disciplinary failure to acknowledge the racism within linguistics is largely due to the deeply entrenched societal ideology that positions racism as intentional and individual, rather than structural and often below the level of awareness of those who enact it (Hill 2008; Hodges 2016). Because of the structural nature of racism, even well-intentioned white people in "nice" disciplines that espouse progressive goals inevitably contribute to its reproduction (Kubota 2002), especially when such stances are aligned with the widespread racial ideology of colorblindness, or the belief that race is irrelevant and that to discuss race is itself racist (Bonilla-Silva 2003; Delgado & Stefancic 2017).

As a starting point for overcoming these ideologies, it is crucial for linguists to understand that race is a powerful system for justifying social inequality. There is abundant historical and present-day evidence that demonstrates social domination as being what race is for and why it exists (Smedley & Smedley 2012). At the center of this system of structural inequality is whiteness, a social category that has enabled those people designated as white not just to claim but to take for granted a supposed entitlement to unearned advantages, privileges, and power (Morrison 1992, Painter 2010). In other words, white supremacy is not simply an explicitly stated ideology of racial superiority but more fundamentally the global structures and systems of racial hierarchy and domination, which include both material advantages and ideological domination. White supremacy confers a wealth of benefits for white people; most importantly, it allows white people to deny the fact of their ongoing racial domination of people of color (Bucholtz forthcoming a). White linguists, who continue to dominate the field both numerically and sociopolitically, must reject this ideology and overcome their white fragility concerning race (DiAngelo 2018) in order to adequately address issues of racism within the discipline. To do so, the discipline of linguistics must take at least the following steps:
- Fully acknowledge the ongoing legacy of the field's history of colonial racism (Errington 2001, Bolton & Hutton 2000);
- End scholarly practices of racial erasure and racial displacement through reliance on untheorized conceptual and methodological substitutes for race such as "culture" (Ladson-Billings 2008);
- Eliminate research that considers racially minoritized groups and their language only as marked and "exotic" and the treatment of whiteness as the unmarked norm rather than as a phenomenon requiring critical analysis (Lanehart 2009; Trechter & Bucholtz 2001);

- Understand racialization as a system for reproducing white supremacy (Murji & Solomos 2005) as well as the centrality of raciolinguistic ideologies in supporting that system (Rosa & Flores 2017);
- Critique research that reproduces inequality through (what may even be benevolently intended) claims of racially minoritized groups' linguistic deficits; and
- Restructure the discipline to be fully inclusive of the ideas, work, and presence of scholars of color and the experiences, practices, and contributions of racially minoritized language users (Lanehart 2019), even—and especially—when these differ from disciplinary norms and traditions.

Above all, linguists need to acknowledge that the white supremacy of linguistics emerges from its origins as a tool of colonialism and conquest, a repugnant history that continues to haunt the discipline. Although it is tempting and can feel reassuring to imagine that racism safely resides in a benighted earlier age of colonization and violent oppression, in fact linguists of color (including Davis 2017, Green 2002, Leonard 2011, Meek 2011, Morgan 1994, 2009; Rickford 2006, and Zentella 2018, among others) have identified scholarly practices that diminish and distort the language of racially minoritized groups that persist in contemporary linguistic research (see also work by white linguists such as Walters 1996, Wolfram 2007). Generally, however, white linguists have not taken race-related critiques made by linguists of color as a mandate to scrutinize the foundational assumptions of the discipline.

The most basic of linguistic assumptions rooted in problematic notions of race, as discussed by a number of researchers, is the imposition of Eurocentric standards on non-Indo-European languages and racially minoritized linguistic varieties (Bolton & Hutton 2000; DeGraff 2005a; Errington 2001; Irvine & Gal 2000; Kroskrity 2013; Zentella 2017). These range from the grossest Orientalist and racist stereotypes to the more well-intentioned but no less racist ideologies found in today's deficit approaches (see section 5, below). Moreover, a colonial perspective in linguistics leads to the devaluation of the intellectual contributions and social agency of language users from marginalized and racially minoritized groups. This is most evident in the longstanding pattern of taking linguistic data from communities without providing adequate "service in return," in the words of Rickford (1997:182)—and using those data for the linguist's own purposes, with little or no consultation of community members' own perspectives (Leonard & Haynes 2010). This approach too often remains standard practice. At the same time, linguistics is witnessing a counter-trend of deeply community-centered research, particularly in the area of language revitalization/reclamation, and especially in work by Indigenous linguists (e.g., Chew, Greendeer, & Keliia 2015; Davis 2016; Leonard 2017; Meek 2012; Nicholas 2009; Zepeda & Hill 1998). Nevertheless, a meaningful and overarching, discipline-wide discussion of the ethical responsibilities of all linguistic researchers to language communities is long overdue.

Dismantling racism within linguistic scholarship requires focusing on how debates within our field are imbued with raciolinguistic ideologies that reinforce white supremacy. One particularly illuminating example is research on the so-called "language gap," or the notion that children from low-income families confront a linguistic disadvantage compared to children from affluent homes. According to one much-sensationalized and much-contested claim, by the time they enter school, poor children supposedly hear some 30 million fewer words than their peers in the middle class (Hart & Risley 1995). In other words, the very premise of language gap research

is a deficit perspective regarding the language of low-income children (Avineri et al. 2015; Johnson & Zentella 2017). And because children from racially minoritized groups are more likely to be from low-income homes than their white counterparts, this deficit perspective is also a racialized and racializing perspective, despite the fact that extensive research has demonstrated that children and youth of color have abundant linguistic abilities, even if these may not always be appropriately acknowledged or fully valued by schools and researchers (e.g., Bucholtz, Casillas, and Lee 2015; Charity Hudley and Mallinson 2011, 2014; Heath 1983; González, Moll, & Amanti 2005). As a result, "language gap" research, which is generally conducted with the best of intentions, ends up reproducing the logics and structures of white supremacy (Rosa and Flores 2017).

5. "Counting" race: From racial categorization to racialization and beyond. As the language gap example reveals, a deficit approach does not merely identify but actively constructs differences across racial groups, contributing to biased analyses. Extensive research in many fields over the past several decades has argued that race is a complicated, dynamic social construct that has taken hold as a dimension of social reality, even though racism as the material domination of marked bodies remains intransigent. As race continues to shift and change, scholars have recognized the need to avoid relying on outmoded ways of conceptualizing and theorizing race and on outmoded ways of modeling and analyzing racial data. We focus here on analytic approaches to race within the traditional social sciences of anthropology, psychology, and sociology, which also inform much of the research in other fields and are closest to the methods currently used in linguistics. However, we encourage linguists to consider as well the ways in which they might adjust these approaches in light of the critiques of disciplinary methods that have emerged from critical race studies.

5.1. Race in anthropological analysis. The topic of race has been at the center of anthropology since its colonial beginnings, when it was used in explicitly racist ways, and it continues to play a key role in the discipline. Over the past century anthropologists have sought to debunk the biological concept of race (e.g., Boas [1940] 1982, Marks 2017), and the field's analytic shift from race to culture led to an erasure of race and racism in most anthropological research for several decades (Harrison 1995; Mullings 2005; Shanklin 2000). Both race and racism are again drawing increasing attention in anthropological research (e.g., Allison & Piot 2013; Dick & Wirtz 2011), where they are approached from a critical and sociohistorical perspective. In anthropology, race is currently viewed as a culturally created category and especially as a product of cultural processes of sociopolitical domination. Social institutions—including academic institutions and disciplines—are seen as being implicated in racism by inscribing political inequality and cultural meaning onto people's bodies.

Because cultural anthropology relies almost entirely on qualitative ethnographic methods, in which the goal is to understand everyday social practices from the perspective of a cultural insider, race is typically not subject to quantitative analysis in the field. Instead, researchers examine local racial categories, identities, and practices as well as how social actors variously reproduce or resist the structures, processes, and effects of racism. However, race is often enlisted in ethnography in ways that have been critiqued for reproducing inequality (Saucier 2016; Tuck & Yang 2014). Interrogating qualitative as well as quantitative approaches to race is therefore crucial in undoing racism in research.

Linguists can find connections with anthropologists on a number of issues involving race. Obvious linkages connect researchers of language documentation and revitalization/reclamation with anthropologists who engage in community-based methods (scholars in these areas are sometimes affiliated with both disciplines). For example, a careful, critical version of the ethnographic method of participant-observation is likely to yield more deeply collaborative research relationships across racial difference than traditional elicitation-based methodologies (Dobrin & Schwartz 2016). Meanwhile, local understandings of Indigeneity as both a political and a cultural category are necessary for navigating research in communities as well as for making sense of linguistic data, including views of speakerhood that may differ from those of linguists (e.g., Ahlers 2006, Davis 2016). Similar linkages are found between sociolinguists who employ practice-based models and scholars of linguistic anthropology. Particularly over the past two decades, linguistic anthropology has become increasingly active in researching race through a critical lens. The subfield has benefited from the theoretical advances on race made in the field of anthropology as a whole, while contributing insights into the linguistic dimensions of race that are often overlooked in other subfields, where language is not a central analytic focus. Many of the linguists of color we cite in this article are also linguistic anthropologists who have published important ethnographies that shed light on the ways that race is linguistically organized and vice versa (e.g., Alim 2004, Meek 2012, Mendoza-Denton 2008, Morgan 2002, Reyes 2007, Rosa 2019, Zentella 1997).

Theoretical and methodological models informed by anthropology can similarly benefit other linguistic subfields. Psycholinguists and other researchers who rely on experimental methods can use more open-ended, participant-driven methods for classifying participants' racial identification. Scholars of language who rely on archival and historical sources should also consider how the dynamics of colonialism and racism may have influenced the nature of the data (cf. Makoni and Pennycook 2006). And all linguists can gain valuable theoretical and methodological insight into race from linguistic anthropology's deep cultural and sociohistorical focus as well as its critical, reflexive attention to the role of the researcher in shaping every step of the research process.

5.2. Race in psychological analysis. In psychology, approaches to race have often focused on quantifiable taxonomies, such that racial classification is reduced to a variable that is put into a statistical program for quantitative analysis. These methods are not only incomplete, but in many cases also misleading and inappropriate. Guthrie (2004) discusses white bias in psychology in conjunction with the underrepresentation of insights from researchers of color in psychological research. Racial falsehoods have been claimed to be true, as in the continued use of IQ testing; the development of psychometrics and classifications based on purported intelligence has also contributed to systems of racial classification (Lemann 1999). Beliefs about race and IQ still persist, and gross racial classifications continue to be correlated with intelligence scores and academic performance (Herrnstein and Murray 1994) as well as with linguistic features, including vocabulary (Hart and Risley 1995), as described above. Hart and Risley's language gap work has also influenced the development of "dialect density" measures as a method used by psycholinguists and speech and hearing scientists, in which speakers' rate of use of racialized linguistic features is calculated across utterances, a technique that has led to vast mischaracterizations of the language of people in racially minoritized groups. More current

psychological work on growth mindsets, or what is more informally known as "grit," also carries on a similar tradition of ignoring the dynamics of race and culture as well as the social situatedness of language users (Love 2019). Such methods are not informed by theories of race or racism. Even the most advanced of these approaches still tend to operate on a naturalistic sorting or assignment model of race (see Zuberi 2003) rather than examining the racist structures that have been created through the embedding of racist practices in social, legal, and economic systems.

In addition, many existing psychological models related to race have taken a deficit perspective, in which racial groups are primarily studied as the objects of discrimination and racism without a corresponding focus on community or individual responses, alternative models, equity measures, and so forth. For example, the famous Clark Doll Study (Clark & Clark 1950), which the authors suggested demonstrated internalized racism and self-hatred in African-American children, was important for research and policy and had direct implications for the Supreme Court's decision in Brown *v.* Board of Education. Nevertheless, the researchers failed to consider other psychological dimensions and aspects, such as resistance to racism and psychological resilience. As such work demonstrates, there is a danger of conflating the impact of racism with the identities, cultures, politics, and experiences of racial groups. Through later work carried out by scholars of color, a psychological focus on culture, wellness, identity, resilience, and empowerment was introduced (see, e.g., Helms & Cook 1999; Henderson, DeCuir-Gunby & Gill 2016; Neville, Tynes, and Utsey 2009; Rowley et al. 2012; Tatum 1997; 2000; Villarruel et al. 2009). This work does not deny the profound harm of racism or the fact that race was created and is maintained in the service of racism, but it nonetheless highlights the ways in which racially minoritized groups confront and resist their own oppression.

Current quantitative and qualitative approaches to psychological research continue this line of inquiry. Salter and Haugen (2017) recommend incorporating Critical Race Theory into psychological frameworks in much the same way that we recommend for linguistics. Helms, Jernigan, and Mascher (2005) as well as Sen and Wasow (2016) have called for the development of more complex empirical models of race, if psychological research is to resonate among racially minoritized groups and to yield reliable and valid data for meaningful applications. Psychology has advanced understandings of the educational, social, health, and wellness impacts of racial confidence as well as ways to mitigate discrimination. Meanwhile, research on the physiological impact of racist stressors is still in the early stages, and psychological and biological factors that contribute to individual differences in the health impact of racism are still being identified (see Harrell, Hall, & Taliaferro 2003). Researchers note that racism may impact physiological outcomes and health through a variety of psychophysiological and epigenetic pathways (Harrell et al. 2011), and the role that language has in both causing and mitigating these stressors (Richeson & Sommers 2016) could be an important focus for linguists. The American Academy of Pediatrics has also published a statement on the impact of racism on child and adolescent health, which advocates for more training in culturally competent care for physicians and other health care professionals. Suggestions for developing wider and more comprehensive linguistic and communicative abilities among the pediatric workforce include "active learning strategies, such as simulation and language immersion," in order to "adequately prepare pediatric residents to serve the most diverse pediatric population to date to exist in the United States and lead diverse and interdisciplinary pediatric care teams" (Trent, Dooley, &

Dougé 2019).

Another promising research direction could be to meld sociolinguistic insights with psychologically motivated ways to decrease discrimination and bias. This line of research could build on the findings of psychology to examine the role of language in such issues as internalized racism, the empowerment of racially minoritized groups, and the learning processes of racially minoritized students. Greater work on the role of language in social psychology is also needed, particularly as it relates to well-studied areas including stereotype threat (Steele 2010), micro- and macro-aggressions (Sue 2010; see also Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso 2000), and implicit and explicit bias in language (Gaither et al. 2016; Porter et al. 2016).

Linguistically informed models of inclusion that intersect with these psychological insights bring the two literatures and approaches together (see the Multicultural Training Resources of the American Psychological Association, n.d.a). Charity Hudley (2017) points out that contemporary definitions of race that do not include considerations of both race and language as fundamental to culture only serve to further subjugate and racialize already marginalized groups. For example, much information for educators about African-American English employs a situational codeswitching model that is designed to encourage speakers of African-American English to become adept at switching between African-American English and the language variety of the school or dominant culture.[2] Success is measured by acquisition of school knowledge, which points to an ability to switch as a tacit goal. At their worst, codeswitching models push speakers of African-American English to acquire standardized language while demeaning African-American English in the process. At their best, such models enable students to use, value, and build on their knowledge of African-American English while helping them acquire standardized English. Either way, the educational ideology of situational codeswitching, while touted as practical and effective in classrooms, is highly racialized (Charity Hudley & Mallinson 2011, Flores & Rosa 2015, Hankerson 2017, Smitherman 2017). The message that students glean from the hidden curriculum of codeswitching is that students and educators are best served by leaving African-American English at the classroom door—an ideology that can promote internalized racism as well as linguistic insecurity for both Black students and Black educators.

How do we disrupt such models? What are their psychological impacts? Further research on race at the intersection of psychology and linguistics is vital to more fully answering such questions and the implications for racially minoritized groups. Future research should explore ways to move beyond merely counting language users or their linguistic features, and instead work toward models that more explicitly aim to center, and not simply describe, language users and their practices, using social-justice-centered community-based approaches (Bucholtz, Casillas, & Lee 2016, 2017; Charity Hudley 2017, Charity Hudley & Mallinson 2018, Mallinson & Charity Hudley 2018).

5.3. Race in sociological analysis. The question of whether and how to "count" race has been tackled in depth within the discipline of sociology. There is considerable variability by

---

[2] The educational valorization of situational codeswitching between racialized and hegemonic varieties of English stands in striking contrast to the educational devaluation of intraclausal codeswitching, or more broadly translanguaging, by racialized bilingual youth (see Martínez 2013).

sociological subdiscipline as well as across qualitative and quantitative traditions with respect to whether race is viewed more fluidly or as a variable that can stand as a proxy for culture. Quantitative sociological studies often use race as a variable in ways that draw upon what are (particularly in the U.S.) broadly agreed-upon, relatively rigid understandings of racial categories. Further (and again, particularly in the U.S.), there is a tradition of collecting a great deal of data by race, which both facilitates and constructs racial comparison. This work poses a challenge whereby race, while widely viewed as a dynamic social construct across most of the social sciences, is nevertheless in many theoretical and analytical approaches made to fit statistical models that are still fairly discrete and binary. If race is a social construct, then it is more complicated than a discrete variable in a cell on which a correlation analysis is run in a statistical model.

As a result of these limitations, there has been considerable discussion in sociology as to whether or not race should be an object of sociological inquiry at all, particularly with regard to the collection and quantitative analysis of race-based data. The ASA's (2003) statement on this issue explores the challenges and contradictions inherent in collecting statistics that allow for comparisons by race. The statement poses this fundamental question: If race is a social construct, then should we stop collecting data about race? Having people check boxes about their racial or ethnic identities in a survey can reify race in ways that could inadvertently promote "social divisions and [fuel] a mistaken perception that race is a biological concept" (ASA 2003:1). On the other hand, the lack of such measures presents serious limitations for the study of society, given the fact that much social inequality in the U.S. and globally—including in education, housing, health care, the legal system, and so on—stems from and correlates with perceived racial differences (ASA 2003:2). If sociologists were to stop collecting data about and measuring race, not only would they be unable to observe race-based trends, but this could also obscure inequalities and impede social justice efforts (ASA 2003:1).

Accordingly, the ASA advises against ending the collection of data by race, noting further that race will likely become even more significant in U.S. society as the national population continues to diversify (2003:11). Public interest in the topic of race and racial classification will also likely persist—which merits the continued attention of sociologists, who have much to contribute to this dialogue. As the ASA statement concludes, "Studying race as a social phenomenon makes for better science and more informed policy debate" (11). Thus, the position of the ASA is not simply that social scientists should measure race, but rather that sociological knowledge and findings about the role of race in society should contribute to improving society. In fact, this was one of the main sentiments in August 2002, when the ASA released its statement about race at the organization's annual conference and invited the organization's officers to respond. As Hillsman, who introduced the statement, asserted in her remarks, "We need to face the larger challenge of ensuring that scientific knowledge about race is placed in a meaningful social context and that our work should advance public understanding about how race affects everyday life" (2002). It is also critically important not to discount the central role of racism in the invention of race, which must be central to any effort to understand race as a social phenomenon.

Winant (2000) makes the case that sociologists ought to carry out studies that center on race in ways that are careful and thoughtful and that avoid empirical fetishism; such studies must

have strong theoretical footing, and they must also be placed within social context, in ways that contribute to broad, often public debate about the role of race in society. Winant further identifies several key themes in current sociological work on race: research on overcoming prejudice, discrimination, and racism; studying the pervasive yet often-subtle processes of racial formation (Omi and Winant 2015); combating racial injustice; and promoting racial equality, both domestically and globally. These are all broad areas to which the study of language can contribute. Some important areas of mutual interest for sociologists and linguists include the study of language as a mechanism in racial categorization and stereotyping processes; the role of language in activating bias and discrimination; how linguistic biases can lead to inequality and discrimination related to education, the workplace, and housing; the disproportionate racial impact of linguistic, educational, social, and public policies; the rhetorics of race, racist discourse, and racial microaggressions; and the role of language in equity and activism efforts (Mallinson 2013). Each of these areas of inquiry may be fruitful avenues for sociologists and linguists to engage in interdisciplinary conversations and collaborations about race and language, in ways that can enrich both disciplines. These areas also lend themselves to exploring how various groups of people are considered in relation to the changing landscape of race and language, moving beyond binary classifications of race and ethnicity and toward community- and individual-centered models.

5.4. Race in educational analysis. Because education is a highly interdisciplinary field, educational research on race draws on all of the perspectives described above as well as others. Rather than survey that vast literature here, we point to the important role of Critical Race Theory, as well as more specific instantiations such as Latinx Critical Theory, in educational engagements with race. Education researchers working within this theoretical framework have developed approaches that challenge the racist assumptions that often underlie traditional social science methodologies. Notably for linguists, many of these alternative methodologies, especially in higher education contexts, emphasize language use (e.g., Pérez Huber 2009; Solórzano, Ceja, and Yosso 2000). For example, Solórzano and Yosso (2002) frame the deficit race-based claims of traditional social science as "majoritarian stories" (28) and offer the method of counter-storytelling to combat the racist representations produced within hegemonic academic research. Bringing the analytic tools of linguistics to the examination of such narratives would enrich multiple fields simultaneously.

Linguistics also intersects with education through its place in the college and university curriculum. One key issue that linguists must grapple with as they design analytic models is: How will people of color be represented racially in such work, and what will students of color who read it learn as a result? Impact-focused research design models of this kind, which are standard in education, are greater in scope and scale than most models in current linguistic research, which tend to be focused on theory and analysis rather than policy and practice. The issue of representation and educational impact is not only prevalent at the K-12 level. For example, as Charity Hudley, Mallinson, Berry-McCrea, and Muwwakkil (under submission) point out, it also affects African-American college students who attend Historically Black Colleges and Universities: the fact that linguistics is largely absent from the curriculum at these institutions leaves linguists without an adequate model for how best to use our discipline to serve such students. Much more research therefore remains to be done on the racialized educational impact of linguistic research in higher education.

5.5. Bringing race into linguistic analysis. Research from these and other fields makes clear that scholars must not simply "count" race, mechanically classify participants racially, or assume that race is irrelevant to a given research question or an entire subfield. Rather, we must draw upon and contribute to scholarly theories of race by asking what methods will best enable us to be racially inclusive in our work as well as by examining language and race in ways that aim for social justice. Linguistic research has demonstrated that how information is gathered and by whom plays a large role in the findings, not only in relation to the "observer's paradox" (Labov 1972) but also due to the fact that researchers' own identities and subjectivities inform the topics they choose to study, the research questions they ask, and the methodologies they use (Lanehart 2019). For instance, on the one hand, the study of African-American English (AAE) is generally viewed as central to the field of sociolinguistics (see Baugh 2019). On the other hand, the fact that the vast majority of the sociolinguists who have historically carried out research on AAE have been white has contributed directly to circumscribing what research questions have been asked about AAE and what findings have been generated—as Wolfram puts it, the "academic exclusivity" that has surrounded the study of AAE is a major factor that has contributed to the perpetuation of sociolinguistic "folklore" about the variety (2007:16; see also Spears 2009). Thus it is not enough to have an abundance of language data from people of color; rather, critical attention must be paid to how racial dynamics and raciolinguistic ideologies play a role in affecting each part of the research, including not only what types of data have been gathered but also what data may have been overlooked, omitted, or excluded in the research process and over time.

One important consideration for any linguistic study, whether community-based or lab-based, is the importance of avoiding simplistic characterizations of the race of participants and instead clearly describing participants' background and providing information about the social and racial history of their community as part of the analysis. Linguists in some subfields are accustomed to formulating detailed questionnaires that inquire about participants' social and personal backgrounds. In the absence of participant storytelling or careful ethnography, including questions about participants' own views of their race, culture, and sociohistorical context can help provide much-needed social and demographic information. In cases where it is difficult to ask questions in ways that make race freely discussable, it is possible to ask about other indicators, such as segregation in the neighborhood and family life histories, to get a better sense of racializing and racialized processes in participants' communities and in their own lives. Questions about the language user's family heritage, when worded carefully, can have a much less threatening effect than when racial classification is prompted through direct questioning. Firsthand accounts of racial identity can then be supported and expanded with demographic information from the language user's community. Whatever approach is taken, researchers must remain aware of the role of their own racial positionality in the research and should address this issue in their research reporting.

Similar efforts can be seen in the field of natural language processing (NLP), where increasing attention is being paid to the need for researchers to adopt the use of data statements to avoid and alleviate exclusion and bias in their work (Bender & Friedman 2018). Bender (2019) has argued that it is important for NLP researchers always to identify which language or languages are being used in their analyses; otherwise, (standardized) English is too often treated

as the default, unmarked language or as a proxy for all languages in ways that perpetuate linguistic and social inequalities and undermine the goals of NLP research.

More work is also needed that explores how research contributes to racialization processes and how researchers ourselves view race, given the fact that subjectivities, whether recognized or not, inform scholarship. In this way, researchers who are interested in language, culture, cognition, and society are not only compelled to examine the impact of race in these areas but also to actively and race-consciously create an intellectually and racially inclusive scholarly community. Investigations of language and race are fraught with tension in part because scholars who study such topics and issues must decide if their primary responsibilities are to their racial or cultural group (an issue in particular for scholars of color); to the task of advancing racial justice; or to the discipline and to positivistic ideologies of researcher "objectivity." For instance, in psychology, basic research models are often far removed from communities—especially communities of color—and as a consequence, many scholars of color choose to carry out their research in applied contexts where they can have a greater beneficial impact on their own communities (O'Doherty and Hodgetts 2019). Meanwhile, white scholars may feel no obligation to advance social change through their research, unfairly leaving this task to their colleagues of color in ways that can negatively impact these scholars' advancement, due to traditional systems of evaluation and reward (see also Taylor, as quoted in Ellison and Eatman 2008:18). Research will become more accurate and more valuable when disciplinary understandings of rigor and impact go beyond restrictive notions that dominate linguistics and academia today, when researchers acknowledge their subjectivities, and when the discipline comes to see social impact as an inherent part of research and a valued contribution to scholarship, not as an optional addendum. In this way, scholars of all racial backgrounds can take up their responsibilities and intertwine their allegiances to carry out work that has both scholarly rigor and social impact (for more on these issues, see Ellison & Eatman 2008).

6. Conclusion: Advancing racial justice in linguistics. The Linguistic Society of America's (2019) Statement on Race is necessary, but it is by no means sufficient in combating racism, white supremacy, and colonialism within linguistics. Scholars and students of linguistics are rarely trained to develop a critical perspective on how race and racism, as mechanisms of structural inequality, shape and harm both our research and our discipline. This lack amounts to a "race gap" in linguistics—that is, linguists have significant deficiencies compared to practitioners in other disciplines when it comes to the critical study of race and the inclusion of racially minoritized groups in our student and faculty ranks. There is thus a dire need for more research in linguistics—using tools from related social sciences as well as language-related fields and critical race studies, which are more welcoming to and structurally supportive of scholars of color and their work—to interrogate why such a "race gap" exists and how to resolve it.

Indeed, one obvious reason for linguists' race gap in thinking about language is precisely the race gap in the discipline's ranks: Compared to many other fields, linguistics remains predominantly white, even twenty years after Rickford exposed this shameful fact as "an academic limitation for our field as well as a socio-political embarrassment" (1997: 171). It may be more comfortable to convince ourselves that linguistics just isn't for everyone, but to do so is to abdicate our professional ethical responsibility to make the discipline an equitable and inclusive place for students and scholars of all backgrounds, and particularly for those whose

communities provide a disproportionate amount of the data that advance linguistic knowledge. Alienating undergraduate and graduate curricula; narrow definitions of excellence in admissions, hiring, and promotion decisions; and the constant policing both of what counts as linguistics and what counts as research collectively create a hostile climate that drives away many linguists of color, whether emergent scholars or seasoned researchers. As we have argued, the dearth of interdisciplinarily-informed theories of race within linguistics as a whole reproduces inaccurate representations of racialized groups. In addition, this gap diminishes the entire field of linguistics by excluding scholars and students of color, whose lived experiences yield important theoretical insights and epistemological perspectives that can broaden and transform the discipline. And for any readers who may find our ethical arguments unconvincing, we add a final point of simple enlightened self-interest: By keeping linguistics narrow and exclusive, researchers artificially limit the amount of ever-shrinking resources allocated to the discipline, whether at the level of individual departments and programs or at the level of external grant funding for the entire field.

Linguists—and especially white linguists, who bear the greatest responsibility for dismantling white supremacy in the discipline (Bucholtz forthcoming b)—can use our scholarly expertise and our institutional access to work for greater social and racial justice (Charity Hudley 2013). If linguists are to take seriously our responsibility to undo the racism and colonialism that were a founding motive of our discipline and that continue to do damage to our research, we must begin a process of critical, race-conscious self-examination and reparative and restorative work—for racialized language communities as well as linguists from racially minoritized groups, for practicing linguists as well as linguists-in-training.

As we have maintained throughout this article, although the race crisis we have identified in linguistics is shared across academic disciplines (Crenshaw et al. 2019), in many ways linguistics lags behind neighboring fields in addressing the situation and its effects. This article as well as the LSA Statement on Race have raised key sets of questions that are worth continuing to explore, such as the following:

- How are theories of race formulated and operationalized in linguistics, whether explicitly or implicitly? What existing racial theories does linguistic scholarship draw from and what is missing from our current thinking?
- What methods or forms of analysis should we use to best capture contemporary and historical realities of how race and language intersect? What race-related theoretical, methodological, and analytic tools from other fields would be useful for linguistics, and how can we incorporate them?
- How might specific insights from linguistics influence theories of and research on race and racism in other fields? What can linguistics uniquely or in combination with other fields contribute to a broader academic and societal understanding of race and racism?
- How does linguistic research, in its questions, methods, assumptions, and norms of dissemination, either reproduce or challenge racism and its impact on language users and communities?
- What is the racial culture of linguistics and of its constituent subfields? How can linguistics dismantle racist structures within the discipline and profession? How can people from racially minoritized groups be empowered rather than isolated in linguistics? How can we learn from the racially supportive organizational and publication models of

other disciplines, whether or not they are closely related to linguistics? In short, *what will it take for linguistics to be racially diverse, equitable, and just?*

Addressing these questions is crucial for achieving both intellectual and social inclusion within linguistics (Charity Hudley and Mallinson 2018). It can also help linguists critically examine how linguistics as a discipline is currently engaging with communities from a variety of linguistic and racialized positionalities, and how those forms of engagement may need to be changed. It is important to ensure, for example, that linguistic work, whether explicitly socially focused or not, does not have unintentional negative consequences for particular racial groups. It is insufficient for research in linguistics to address current theoretical questions within the discipline or to meet minimal ethical standards set by institutional review boards; instead, in an equitable linguistics, all scholarship must be premised on inclusive research questions and epistemological and methodological ways of answering those questions.

Many linguists want to know how to help dismantle systems of racism and promote racial equity but have not had a chance to engage in antiracist or inclusion-focused education or professional development. Linguistic Society of America-sponsored workshops and webinars are obvious starting points for such efforts, and more such opportunities are needed; ongoing departmental and campus-based activities are needed as well. We also recommend as a first step that readers who are new to these ideas treat our bibliography as a syllabus, with an emphasis on the publications of scholars of color. Discussion groups with like-minded others are also encouraged, but if white linguists wish to learn from scholars and students of color in such settings, they must recognize their colleagues' expertise and fairly recognize, acknowledge, cite, and/or compensate these specialists for their time and insight. In addition, we suggest that readers attend conferences, research presentations, seminars, and even introductory classes on race taught in other disciplines as a way to become better versed in current racial issues, scholarship, and debates.

Initiating conversations within linguistic scholarship and teaching on these matters as well as other topics of central relevance to people of color can also promote diversity and inclusion within linguistics by creating more space for researchers of diverse racial backgrounds within the field. In this process, it is important to avoid replicating the problems created by most institutional initiatives, in which "diversity" and "inclusion" are approached in ways that reproduce rather than challenge existing structures of power (Ahmed 2012). First steps here include ensuring that all linguistics classes, both graduate and undergraduate, are racially inclusive in content, diverse in enrollment, and situated in the curriculum where they are accessible by and useful to students of all racial backgrounds. Some simple but powerful acts of equity are for linguists to cite scholars of color in articles and research presentations, to assign their work in classes, and to share the authors' photos and life histories in order to raise awareness of the important work being done by linguists from racially minoritized groups. For linguists seeking to mentor and support graduate students of color, acknowledging and addressing rather than denying our discipline's role in the reproduction of racism is central to ensuring equity and inclusion in the theory, practice, and teaching of linguistics. Interrogating and conducting research on how the profession of linguistics deals with these issues can be a starting point for change. In these among myriad other ways, linguists are able not simply to examine the impact of race in our research but also actively to create an inclusive antiracist

community in our own departments and classrooms.

If students of color tend not to major in linguistics, questions about what historical and contemporary factors might be contributing to this situation ought to be asked, and thoughtful, informed, structural solutions ought to be explored and developed; one pathway is to discover which majors are being sought out by students of color and to seek out ways to forge partnerships with those programs and departments (Charity Hudley and Mallinson 2018). Indeed, historically low numbers of undergraduate majors and graduate students in linguistics can be traced to the continuing devaluing within linguistics of language-related scholarship produced by such fields as communication, English, education, and applied linguistics, as discussed above. Pressures on students regarding what are and are not "acceptable" or legitimate topics for linguistic study as well as overt or covert ideologies about the boundaries of what does and does not count as linguistic scholarship loom large, beginning with what is included in an introductory course. It is distressing and problematic yet unsurprising, then, that students of color have historically not gravitated toward linguistics. It is also unsurprising that, when they do, they tend to seek out the more socially engaged subfields such as sociolinguistics, educational and applied linguistics, and language revitalization/reclamation research. These patterns not only persist at undergraduate and graduate levels, but also contribute to a narrowing of the pipeline of linguists of color in faculty and leadership ranks, where a general lack of other colleagues and mentors of color compound to create a sense of professional isolation and other adverse effects. Ideological divisions that play out along differentially racialized cross-disciplinary and subdisciplinary lines therefore stifle deep discussion and research around race and racism within linguistics while also systemically marginalizing linguists from racialized groups to the detriment of the discipline and the profession. Such exclusionary boundaries must be eliminated, and community issues must be recognized as intellectual issues within a larger social justice framework.

Finally, linguistics must provide opportunities for scholars to engage in antiracist and inclusion-focused education in ways that promote equity in the theory, practice, and teaching of the field. The work to increase theoretical understanding of race within linguistics should be coupled with efforts to increase political understandings of race within linguistics, through active engagement with students, faculty, and administrators to develop effective and evidence-based approaches to achieving greater racial justice in admissions, hiring, publication, promotion, retention, and linguistic leadership. As we have noted, discussions of the ideologies, historical processes, and past and present politics that surround knowledge creation and evaluation are taking place across academia, with many of the leading voices being scholars of color; it is critically important for linguistics to join in these conversations and analyses. Theorizing race in linguistics requires us not only to interrogate the study of race and current forms of racial analysis within the discipline, but also to actively pursue racial justice as a matter of professional practice. In order to increase the impact of our research, linguists must also consider more seriously how to engage scholars and educators working within the language sciences and humanities, as well as representatives of governmental and non-governmental organizations whose work intersects with linguistic issues—and most importantly, communities themselves. In this way, power is shifted, and our collaborators become recognized as authorities on the workings and relevance of language in their own lives (Bucholtz et al. 2014).

As we have emphasized throughout this article, to do this work it is necessary to turn our

analytic lens on linguistics itself. We must discover how people from groups that are underrepresented in linguistics navigate the discipline's cultural ideologies and practices as well as its intellectual spaces, and we must investigate the ways in which the field continues to exclude, marginalize, and colonize the experiences of racialized groups. By advancing our scholarly understandings of and everyday engagements with race in all of these ways, we can draw more students and scholars of color into the discipline and bring linguists into conversation with racial justice and diversity work both in other fields and in the academy at large.

References

AAAL Executive Committee. 2019. An open letter regarding diversity in AAAL. January 30. https://www.aaal.org/news/an-open-letter-regarding-diversity-in-aaal

Ahlers, Jocelyn C. 2006. Framing discourse: Creating community through Native language use. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 16(1). 58-75.

Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alim, H. Samy. 2004. *You know my steez: An ethnographic and sociolinguistic study of styleshifting in a Black American speech community. Publication of the American Dialect Society* 89. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alim, H. Samy, John R. Rickford & Arnetha F. Ball (eds.). 2016. *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Allen, Jafari Sinclaire & Ryan Cecil Jobson. 2016. The decolonizing generation: (Race and) theory in anthropology since the eighties. *Current Anthropology* 57(2). 129-148.

Allison, Anne & Charles Piot (eds.). 2013. Race theory/anthropology today. Special issue of *Cultural Anthropology* 28(3).

American Anthropological Association. 1962. Resolution on race. *American Anthropologist* 64(3). 616-617.

American Anthropological Association. 1994. Statement on "race" and intelligence. December. http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/cmtes/minority/upload/AAA_Statement_on-_Race_Intelligence1994.pdf (February 28, 2019).

American Anthropological Association. 1998. AAA statement on race. *American Anthropologist* 100(3). 712-713.

American Anthropological Association. n.d. Race: Are we so different? http://www.understandingrace.org (February 28, 2019).

American Association for Applied Linguistics. 2013. Resolution affirming commitment to promoting diversity in AAAL. https://www.aaal.org/resolutions

American Psychological Association. 1993. APA resolution on ethnic minority recruitment and retention. https://www.apa.org/pi/oema/programs/recruitment/resolution-1993

American Psychological Association. 2001. Resolution against racism and in support of the goals of the 2001 UN World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance. https://www.apa.org/about/policy/racism

American Psychological Association. 2003. Grutter *v.* Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306, and Gratz *v.* Bollinger, 539 U.S. 244. http://www.apa.org/about/offices/ogc/amicus/grutter.aspx (February 28, 2019).

American Psychological Association. n.d.a. Psychology topics: race. http://www.apa.org/topics/race/index.aspx (February 28, 2019).

American Psychological Association. n.d.b. Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs. http://www.apa.org/pi/oema/index.aspx (February 28, 2019).

American Psychological Association. n.d.c. Guidelines, policy statements and resolutions. http://www.apa.org/pi/oema/resources/policy/index.aspx (February 28, 2019).

American Psychological Association. n.d.d. Justification statement resolution on racism and racial discrimination: A policy statement in support of the goals of the World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance. https://www.apa.org/pi/oema/programs/racism/un-justification.pdf (February 28, 2019).

American Sociological Association. 2003. The importance of collecting data and doing social scientific research on race. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association. http://www2.asanet.org/media/asa_race_statement.pdf (February 28, 2019).

American Sociological Association. n.d.a. ASA statements. https://www.asanet.org/asa-statements

American Sociological Association. n.d.b. Race and ethnicity. http://www.asanet.org/topics/race-and-ethnicity (February 28, 2019).

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. 1983. Position statement: Social dialects. www.asha.org/policy

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1998). Position statement: Provision of instruction in English as a Second Language by speech-language pathologists in school settings. www.asha.org/policy

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. n.d.a. Multicultural constituency groups. https://www.asha.org/practice/multicultural/opportunities/constituency/

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. n.d.b. Multicultural affairs and resources. https://www.asha.org/practice/multicultural/

Aparicio, Frances R. 2013. Insisting on race, ethnicity, and gender: Reflections of a Latina scholar (who is also a professor of Spanish). *Profession* (November). https://profession.mla.org/?s=aparicio

Avineri, Netta, et al. 2015. Invited forum: Bridging the "language gap." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 25(1). 66-86.

Avineri, Netta, Laura R. Graham, Eric J. Johnson, Robin Conley Riner & Jonathan Rosa (eds.). 2019. *Language and social justice in practice*. New York: Routledge.

Baker, Lee D. 1998. *From savage to Negro: Anthropology and the construction of race, 1896-1954*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baker, Lee D. 2010. *Anthropology and the racial politics of culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Baugh, John. 1988. Language and race: Some implications for linguistic science. In Frederick J. Newmeyer (ed.), *Language: The socio-cultural context.* Vol. 4 of *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey*. 64-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baugh, John. 2019. Sociolinguistic evaluations of inequality. Social Science Research Council. https://items.ssrc.org/sociolinguistic-frontiers/sociolinguistic-evaluations-of-inequality/

Bender, Emily. English isn't generic for language, despite what NLP papers might lead you to believe. Symposium on Data Science & Statistics. https://aclweb.org/anthology/papers/Q/Q18/Q18-1041/

Bender, Emily & Batya Friedman. Data statements for Natural Language Processing: Toward mitigating system bias and enabling better science. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6. 587–604. http://faculty.washington.edu/ebender/papers/Bender-SDSS-2019.pdf

Benedicto, Elena, Modesta Dolores Demetrio Antolín, M. Cristina Feliciano, Gloria Fendly, Tomasa Gómez, Baudilio Miguel & Elizabeth Salomón. 2007. A model of participatory action research: The Mayangna Linguists Team of Nicaragua. In Maya Khemlani David, Nicholas Ostler & Caesar Dealwis (eds.), *Working together for endangered languages: Research challenges and impacts*. 29-35. Bath: Foundation for Endangered Languages.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2014. A sociological dilemma: Race, segregation and US sociology. *Current Sociology* 62(4). 472–492.

Bhattacharya, Usree, Lei Jiang & Suresh Canagarajah. 2019. Race, representation, and diversity in the American Association for Applied Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 1-7. doi:10.1093/applin/amz003

Boas, Franz. 1912. The instability of human types. In *Papers on Interracial Problems Communicated to the First Universal Races Congress Held at the University of London July 26–29, 1911*. Gustav Spiller (ed.). 99–103. Boston: Ginn and Co.

Boas, Franz. [1940] 1982. *Race, language, and culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bolton, Kingsley & Christopher Hutton (eds.). 2000. Orientalism and linguistics. Special issue of *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 2(1).

Bonfiglio, Thomas Paul. 2002. *Race and the rise of standard American*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2003. *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brodkin, Karen, Sandra Morgen & Janis Hutchinson. 2011. Anthropology as white public space? *American Anthropologist* 113(4). 545-556.

Brunsma, David L. & Jennifer Padilla Wyse. 2019. The possessive investment in white sociology. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 5(1). 1-10.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2011. *White kids: Language, race, and styles of youth identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, Mary. Forthcoming a. The public life of white affects. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*.

Bucholtz, Mary. Forthcoming b. Sociolinguists trying to make a difference: Race, research, and linguistic activism. In Renée Blake & Isabelle Buchstaller (eds.), *The Routledge companion to the work of John Rickford*. New York: Routledge.

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

Bucholtz, Mary, Dolores Inés Casillas & Jin Sook Lee. 2017. Language and culture as sustenance." Pp. 43-59 in *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*, edited by Django Paris and H. Samy Alim. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bucholtz, Mary, Dolores Inés Casillas & Jin Sook Lee (eds.). 2018. *Feeling it: Language, race, and affect in Latinx youth learning*. New York: Routledge.

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

Buncombe, Marie H. 1987. Legacy from the past, agenda for the future: The College Language Association, 1937-1987. *College Language Association Journal* 31(1). 1-11.

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

Charity Hudley, Anne H. 2017. Language and racialization. In Ofelia García, Nelson Flores, and Massimiliano Spotti (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language and society*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Charity Hudley, Anne H. & Christine Mallinson. 2011. *Understanding English language variation in U.S. schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Charity Hudley, Anne H., and Christine Mallinson. 2014. *We do language: English language variation in the secondary English classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Charity Hudley, Anne H. & Christine Mallinson. 2018. Dismantling "the master's tools": Moving students' right to their own language from theory to practice. *American Speech* 93(3-4). 513-537.

Charity Hudley, Anne H., Christine Mallinson, Erin L. Berry Mc-Crea, & Jamaal Muwwakkil. Submitted. Empowering African-American Student Voices in College. In *Reconceptualizing the Role of Critical Dialogue in American Classrooms: Promoting Equity through Dialogic Education*, eds. Amanda Kibler, Guadalupe Valdés, and Aída Walqui. New York: Routledge.

Cheng, Cindy I-Fen (ed.). 2017. *The Routledge handbook of Asian American studies*. New York: Routledge.

Chew, Kari A B., Nitana Hicks Greendeer & Caitlin Keliia. 2015. Claiming space: An autoethnographic study of Indigenous graduate students engaged in language reclamation. *International Journal of Multicultural Education* 17(2). 73-91.

Clark, Kenneth B. & Mamie Phipps Clark (1950). Emotional factors in racial identification and preference in Negro children. *Journal of Negro Education* 19. 341-350.

Coleman, M. Nicole & Adanna J. Johnson. 2009. Sankofa: History of and aspirations for Black psychology through the eyes of our elders. In Neville, Helen, Brendesha Tynes & Shawn O. Utsey (eds.), *Handbook of African American psychology*. 19-34. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1986. Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems* 33(6). S14-S32.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Collins, Patricia Hill, and John Solomos (eds.). 2010. *The SAGE handbook of race and ethnic studies*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. [1974] 2014. Students' right to their own language (with bibliography). https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/srtolsummary

Conference on College Composition and Communication. [1998] 2016. CCCC Statement on Ebonics. https://www2.ncte.org/statement/ebonics/

Crenshaw, Kimberlé W., Luke Charles Harris, Daniel Martinez HoSang & George Lipsitz (eds.). 2019. *Seeing race again: Countering colorblindness across the disciplines*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Daston, Lorraine, and Peter L. Galison. 2007. *Objectivity*. Boston: Zone.

Davis, Jenny L. 2016. Language affiliation and ethnolinguistic identity in Chickasaw language revitalization. *Language and Communication* 47. 100-111.

Davis, Jenny L. 2017. Resisting rhetorics of language endangerment: Reclamation through Indigenous language survivance. *Language Documentation and Description* 14. 37-58.

DeGraff, Michel. 2003. Against creole exceptionalism. *Language* 79. 391-410.

DeGraff, Michel. 2004. Against creole exceptionalism (redux). *Language* 80. 834-839.

DeGraff, Michel. 2005a. Linguists' most dangerous myth: The fallacy of Creole Exceptionalism. *Language in Society* 34. 533-591.

DeGraff, Michel. 2005b. Morphology and word order in "creolization" and beyond. In Guglielmo Cinque & Richard S. Kayne (eds.), *Comparative syntax*. 293-372. New York:

Oxford University Press.

Delgado, Richard & Jean Stefancic. 2017. *Critical race theory: An introduction.* Third ed. New York: New York University Press.

Denzin, Norman K., Yvonna S. Lincoln & Linda Tuhiwai Smith (eds.). 2008. *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DiAngelo, Robin. 2018. *White fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Dick, Hilary Parsons & Kristina Wirtz (eds.). 2011. Racializing discourses. Special issue of *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*.

Dobrin, Lise M., and Saul Schwartz. 2016. Collaboration or participant observation?: Rethinking models of "linguistic social work." *Language Documentation & Conservation* 10. 253-277.

Dominguez, Virginia R. 1994. A taste for "the Other": Intellectual complicity in racializing practices. *Current Anthropology* 35(4). 333-348.

Drake, St. Clair. 1980. Anthropology and the black experience. *The Black Scholar* 11(7). 2-31.

Eckert, Penelope. 2012. Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41. 87-100.

Ellison, Julie and Timothy K. Eatman. 2008. Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university. *Imagining America*. 16. https://surface.syr.edu/ia/16

Errington, Joseph. 2001. Colonial linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30. 19-39.

Fanon, Frantz. [1952] 1967. *Black skin, white masks.* Charles Lam Markmann, trans. New York: Grove.

Fernando, Suman (2017). Institutional racism in psychiatry and clinical psychology: Race matters in mental health. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. Putting the "socio" back into the sociolinguistic enterprise. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 92. 127-138.

Flannery, Regina. [1939] 1976. American Anthropological Association resolution on racial theories. In George W. Stocking (ed.), *American anthropology, 1921-1945: Papers from the American Anthropologist.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 539.

Flores, Juan & Renato Rosaldo (eds.). 2007. *A companion to Latina/o studies*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

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

Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn. 2000. Anténor Firmin: Haitian pioneer of anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 102(3). 449-66.

Gaither, Sarah E., Ariel M. Cohen-Goldberg, Calvin L. Gidney & Keith B. Maddox. 2015. Sounding Black or White: Priming identity and biracial speech. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6. 457.

González, Norma, Luis Moll, and Cathy Amanti (eds.). 2005. *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goodman, Alan H., Yolanda T. Moses & Joseph L. Jones. 2012. *Race: Are we so different?* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Green, Lisa J. 2002. *African American English: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guthrie, Robert V. 2004. *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology*, 2nd edn.

Boston, MA: Allyn Bacon.

Hankerson, Shenika. 2017. Black voices matter. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan* 32(2), Article 7.

Harrell, Jules P., Sadiki Hall & James Taliaferro. 2003. Physiological responses to racism and discrimination: An assessment of the evidence. *American Journal of Public Health* 93(2). 243–248.

Harrell, Camara Jules P., Tanisha I. Burford, Brandi N. Cage, Travette McNair Nelson, Sheronda Shearon, Adrian Thompson & Steven Green. 2011. Multiple pathways linking racism to health outcomes. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 8(1). 143–157.

Harrison, Faye V. 1995. The persistent power of "race" in the cultural and political economy of racism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24. 47-74.

Harrison, Faye V. (ed.). 1997. *Decolonizing anthropology: Moving further toward an anthropology for liberation.* 3rd edn. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Harrison, Faye V. (ed.). 1998. Special issue: Race and racism. *American Anthropologist* 100(3).

Harrison, Ira E. & Faye V. Harrison (eds.). 1999. *African-American pioneers in anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Hart, Betty & Todd R. Risley. 1995. *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Heath, Shirley Brice. 1983. *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Helms, Janet E. & Donelda A. Cook. 1999. *Using race in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Helms, Janet E., Maryam Jernigan & Jackquelyn Mascher. 2005. The meaning of race in psychology and how to change it: A methodological perspective. *American Psychologist* 60(1). 27-36.

Henderson, Dawn X., Jessica T. DeCuir-Gunby & Vandna K. Gill. 2016. "It really takes a village": A socio-ecological model of resilience among economically disadvantaged ethnic minority youth. *Journal of Primary Prevention* 37(5). 469-485.

Herrnstein, Richard J. & Charles A. Murray. 1994. *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hill, Jane H. 2008. *The everyday language of white racism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hillsman, Sally. 2002. A bold and necessary stance on race data. http://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/savvy/footnotes/septoct02/exec.html (February 28, 2019).

Hodges, Adam. 2016. Hunting for "racists": Tape fetishism and the intertextual enactment and reproduction of the dominant understanding of racism in U.S. society. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 26(1). 26-40.

Howitt, Dennis & J. Owusu-Bempah. 1994. *The racism of psychology: Time for change*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hutton, Christopher M. 1999. *Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-tongue fascism, race, and the science of language*. New York: Routledge.

Hymes, Dell (ed.). 1964. *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.

Irvine, Judith T. & Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*. 35-84. Santa Fe,

NM: School of American Research Press.

Jackson, John L. Jr., & David J. Depew. 2017. *Darwinism, democracy, and race: American anthropology and evolutionary biology in the twentieth century*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Johnson, Eric J. & Ana Celia Zentella (eds.). 2017. Introducing the language gap. Special issue of *International Multilingual Research Journal* 11(1).

Jung, Moon-Kie, João H. Costa Vargas, and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (eds.). 2011. *State of white supremacy: Racism, governance, and the United States*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

King, Joyce E. (ed.). 2005. *Black education: A transformative research and action agenda for the new century*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association/Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2013. Discursive discriminations in the representation of Western Mono and Yokuts stories: Confronting narrative inequality and listening to indigenous voices in Central California. *Journal of Folklore Research* 50(1-3). 145-174.

Kubota, Ryuko. 2002. The author responds: (Un)raveling racism in a nice field like TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 36(1). 84-92.

Labov, W. (1972). Academic ignorance and black intelligence. *Atlantic* (June). https://www.theatlantic.com/past/docs/issues/95sep/ets/labo.htm (February 28, 2019).

Ladner, Joyce (ed.). 1973. *The death of white sociology*. New York: Vintage.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 2008. It's not the culture of poverty, it's the povery of culture: The problem with teacher education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 37(2):104-109.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 2012. Through a glass darkly: The persistence of race in education research and scholarship. *Educational Researcher* 41(4). 115-120.

Lanehart, Sonja L. 2009. Diversity and intersectionality. In Danny Law (ed.), *Proceedings of the seventeenth Symposium About Language and Society—Austin*. 1-8. Austin: University of Texas Department of Linguistics. <http://studentorgs.utexas.edu/salsa/proceedings/2009/01_TLS53_Lanehart.pdf>.

Lanehart, Sonja L. 2019. Can you hear (and see) me now?: Race-ing American language variationist/change and sociolinguistic research methodologies. In Jessica T. DeCuir-Gunby, Tandeka K. Chapman & Paul A. Schutz (eds.), *Understanding critical race research methods and methodologies: Lessons from the field*. 34-47. New York: Routledge.

Lemann, Nicholas. 1999. *The big test*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Leonard, Wesley Y. 2011. Challenging "extinction" through modern Miami language practices. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35(2). 135-160.

Leonard, Wesley Y. 2017. Producing language reclamation by decolonising "language." In Wesley Y. Leonard & Haley De Korne (eds.), *Language Documentation and Description,* vol. 14. London: EL Publishing. 15-36.

Leonard, Wesley Y. & Erin Haynes. 2010. Making "collaboration" collaborative: An examination of perspectives that frame linguistic field research. *Language Documentation and Conservation* 4. 269-293.

Leonardo, Zeus. 2004. The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of "white privilege." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 36(2). 137-152.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1963. *Structural anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.

Lim, Shirley Geok-lin & María Herrera-Sobek (eds.). 2000. *Power, race, and gender in academe: Strangers in the tower?* New York: Modern Language Association.

Linguistic Society of America. 2018. *Annual report: The state of linguistics in higher education*.

https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/state-linguistics-higher-education-annual-report

Linguistic Society of America. 2019a. Past Executive Committees.
https://www.linguisticsociety.org/content/past_executive_committees

Linguistic Society of America. 2019b. Presidents. https://www.linguisticsociety.org/about/who-we-are/presidents

Linguistic Society of America. 2019c. Resolutions, statements, endorsements, and related actions. https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/resolutions-statements-and-guides

Linguistic Society of America. 2019d. LSA statement on race.
https://www.linguisticsociety.org/content/lsa-statement-race (July 27, 2019).

Linguistic Society of America. n.d. Language in the School Curriculum Committee (LiSC).
https://www.linguisticsociety.org/about/who-we-are/committees/language-school-curriculum

Lo, Adrienne, and Angela Reyes. 2009. Introduction: On Yellow English and other perilous terms. In *Beyond Yellow English: Toward a linguistic anthropology of Asian Pacific America*, Angela Reyes and Adrienne Lo (eds.). 3-20. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lomelí, Francisco A., Denise A. Segura & Elyette Benjamin-Labarthe (eds.). 2018. *Routledge handbook of Chicana/o studies*. New York: Routledge.

Love, Bettina. 2019. We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Makoni, Sinfree, Geneva Smitherman, Arnetha F. Ball & Arthur K. Spears. 2003. *Black linguistics: Language, society, and politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York: Routledge.

Makoni, Sinfree, and Alastair Pennycook. 2006. *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mallinson, Christine. 2013. Sociology and sociolinguistics: Current trends, future partnerships. In Fatos Tarifa (ed. & trans.), *The sciences of society: Sociology as an integrative discipline for the study of social life*. Tirana, Albania: Albanian Academy of Arts and Sciences/Onufri. 281-314.

Mallinson, Christine & Anne H. Charity Hudley. 2018. Turning the lens onto our own language: Engaging in critical reflexivity in the pursuit of social change. Commentary. *Language in Society* 47(3). 361-364.

Margolis, Eric & Mary Romero. 1998. "The department is very male, very white, very old and very conservative": The functioning of the hidden curriculum in graduate sociology departments. *Harvard Educational Review* 68(1). 1–32.

Marks, Jonathan M. 2017. *Is science racist?* Cambridge: Polity.

Martínez, Ramón Antonio. 2013. Reading the world in *Spanglish*: Hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Linguistics and Education* 24(3). 276-288.

Meek, Barbra A. 2011. Failing American Indian languages. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35(2). 43-60.

Meek, Barbra A. 2012. *We are our language: An ethnography of language revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan community*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2002. Language and identity. *The handbook of language variation and change*. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.). 475-499. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2008. *Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among Latina*

youth gangs. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Miñana, Rogelio. 2013. The new mission and location of United States Spanish departments: The Mount Holyoke College experience. *Profession* (December). https://profession.mla.org/?s=miñana

MLA Action Network. 2019. How colleges support their diverse student bodies. July 3. https://action.mla.org/stories-how-colleges-support-their-diverse-student-bodies/

MLA Action Network. 2017. Resources for teaching about racism. October 13. https://action.mla.org/stories-resources-for-teaching-racism/

Modern Language Association. 2019. Resolutions ratified by the membership. https://www.mla.org/About-Us/Governance/Delegate-Assembly/Motions-and-Resolutions/Resolutions-Ratified-by-the-Membership

Modern Language Association. n.d.a. Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada. https://www.mla.org/About-Us/Governance/Committees/Committee-Listings/Professional-Issues/Committee-on-the-Literatures-of-People-of-Color-in-the-United-States-and-Canada

Morgan, Marcyliena. 1994. 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: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, Marcyliena. 2009. The African American speech community: Reality and sociolinguistics. *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*. Alessandro Duranti (ed.). 74-92. Oxford: Blackwell.

Morris, Aldon. 2015. *The scholar denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the birth of modern sociology*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Morris, Aldon (ed.). 2017. Voices from the margins: Inequalities in the sociological house. Special issue section of *Social Problems* 64.

Morrison, Toni. 1992. *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. New Haven: Harvard University Press.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2008. Race, racialism, and the study of language evolution in America. In *Language evolution: Contact, competition, and change*. 93-112. London: Continuum Press.

Mukhopadhyay, Carol C. & Yolanda T. Moses. 1997. Reestablishing "race" in anthropological discourse. *American Anthropologist* 99(3). 517-533.

Murji, Karim, and John Solomos (eds.). 2005. *Racialization: Studies in theory and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Murray, Stephen O. 1998. *American sociolinguistics: Theorists and theory groups*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

National Council of Teachers of English. [2007] 2018. Statement on anti-racism to support teaching and learning. https://www2.ncte.org/statement/antiracisminteaching/

National Council of Teachers of English. n.d.a. All position statements. https://www2.ncte.org/resources/position-statements/all/

National Council of Teachers of English. n.d.b. Caucuses. http://www2.ncte.org/groups/caucuses/

Neville, Helen, Brendesha Tynes & Shawn O. Utsey (eds.). 2009. *Handbook of African American psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nicholas, Sheilah E. 2009. "I live Hopi, I just don't speak it": The critical intersection of language, culture, and identity in the lives of contemporary Hopi youth. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 8(5). 321-334.

O'Doherty, Kieran C. & Darrin Hodgetts (eds.). 2019. *The Sage handbook of applied social psychology*. London: Sage.

Ofekwunigwe, Jane O. (ed.). 2004. *"Mixed race" studies: A reader*. London: Routledge.

Omi, Michael & Howard Winant. 2015. *Racial formation in the United States* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Painter, Nell Irvin. 2010. *The history of white people*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Paulston, Christina B. & G. Richard Tucker (eds.). 1997. *The early days of sociolinguistics: Memories and reflections*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Pérez Huber, Lindsay. 2009. Disrupting apartheid of knowledge: Testimonio as methodology in Latina/o critical race research in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 22(6). 639-654.

Porter, Shanette C., Michelle Rheinschmidt-Same & Jennifer A. Richeson. 2016. Inferring identity from language: Evidence that the linguistic intergroup bias informs social categorization. *Psychological Science* 27(1). 94-102.

Reyes, Angela. 2007. *Language, identity, and stereotype among Southeast Asian American youth: The other Asian*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Richards, Graham. 2012. *Race, racism and psychology: Towards a reflexive history.* Second ed. London: Routledge.

Richeson, Jennifer A. & Samuel R. Sommers. 2016. Race relations in the 21st century. *Annual Review of Psychology* 67. 493-463.

Rickford, John R. 1997. Unequal partnership: Sociolinguistics and the African American speech community. *Language in Society* 26(2). 161-198.

Rickford, John R. 2006. Down for the count?: The Creole Origins Hypothesis of AAVE at the hands of the Ottawa Circle, and their supporters. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Linguistics* 21(1). 97-155.

Rickford, John R. 2014. Increasing the representation of under-represented ethnic minorities in linguistics. Paper presented as part of the symposium Diversity in Linguistics at the Linguistic Society of America annual meeting. Minneapolis, MN. January.

Rodriguez, Jacquelynne C. 2016. Our clients are diverse: Why aren't we? The ASHA Leader 21(5). 40-42. https://leader.pubs.asha.org/doi/full/10.1044/leader.SSAY.21052016.40

Rosa, Jonathan. 2019. *Looking like a language, sounding like a race: Raciolinguistic ideologies and the learning of Latinidad*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rosa, Jonathan & Yarimar Bonilla. 2017. Deprovincializing Trump, decolonizing diversity, and unsettling anthropology. *American Ethnologist* 44(2). 201-208.

Rosa, Jonathan & Nelson Flores. 2017. Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society* 46(5). 621-647.

Rowley, Stephanie J., Fatima Varner, Latisha L. Ross, Amber D. Williams & Meeta Banerjee. 2012. Toward a model of racial identity and parenting in African Americans. In Jas M. Sullivan & Ashraf M. Esmail (eds.), *African American racial identity: Racial and cultural dimensions of the Black experience.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. 273-88.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones. 1996. When the first voice you hear is not your own. *College Composition and Communication* 47(1). 29-40.

Salter, Phia S. & Andrea D. Haugen. 2017. Critical race studies in psychology. In Brendan

Gough (ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of critical social psychology*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 123-145.

Saucier, P. Khalil. 2016. In P. Khalil Saucier & Tryon P. Woods (eds.), *Conceptual aphasia in black: Displacing racial formation*. 51-68. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Saucier, P. Khalil & Tryon P. Woods (eds.). 2016. *Conceptual aphasia in black: Displacing racial formation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Sen, Maya & Omar Wasow. 2016. Race as a "bundle of sticks": Designs that estimate effects of seemingly immutable characteristics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 19. 499-522.

Shanklin, Eugenia. 2000. Representations of race and racism in American anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 41(1). 99-103.

Simpson, Audrey & Andrea Smith (eds.). 2014. *Theorizing Native studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Smedley, Audrey & Janis Hutchinson. 2012. *Racism in the academy: The new millennium.* https://www.americananthro.org/LearnAndTeach/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2639

Smedley, Audrey & Brian Smedley. 2012. *Race in North America: Origin and evolution of a worldview*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Smitherman, Geneva. 1995. "Students' right to their own language": A retrospective. *The English Journal* 84(1). 21-27.

Smitherman, Geneva. 2017. Raciolinguistics, "mis-education," and language arts teaching in the 21st century. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan* 32(2). Article 3. https://doi.org/10.9707/2168-149X.2164

Solórzano, Daniel, Miguel Ceja & Tara Yosso. 2000. Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *The Journal of Negro Education* 69(1/2). 60-73.

Spears, Arthur K. 1999. On shallow grammar: African American English and the critique of exceptionalism. In Jo Anne Kleifgen and George C. Bond (eds.), *The languages of Africa and the diaspora: Educating for language awareness*. 231-248. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Spears, Arthur K. (ed.). 2010. Language, inequality, and endangerment: African Americans and Native Americans. Special section of *Transforming Anthropology* 18(1): 3-47.

Spears, Arthur K. (2012). "Negotiating racism in the academy." In Audrey Smedley and Janis Hutchinson (eds.), *Racism in the academy: The new millennium.* http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/cmtes/commissions/upload/12_Spears.pdf

Speas, Margaret. 2009. Someone else's language: On the role of linguists in language revitalization. In Jon Reyhner and Louise Lockard (eds.), *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance, and lessons learned*. 23-36. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Stanfield, John H., II. [2011a] 2016. *Black reflective sociology: Epistemology, theory, and methodology*. New York: Routledge.

Stanfield, John H., II. (Ed.). [2011b] 2016. *Rethinking race and ethnicity in research methods*. New York: Routledge.

Steele, Claude M. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi: How stereotypes affect us and what we can do*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Stern, Gwen & Paul Bohannan. 1970. *American Anthropologist*: The first eighty years. *Newsletter of the American Anthropological Association* 11(10):1, 6-12.

Sue, Derald W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Tatum, Beverly D. (1997). *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?": A psychologist explains the development of racial identity*. New York: Basic Books.

Tatum, Beverly D. 2013. The complexity of identity: "Who am I." In Maurianne Adams, Warren J. Blumenfeld, Heather W. Hackman, Madeline L. Peters, & Ximena Zuniga (eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice*, 3rd ed. 6-9. New York: Routledge.

Trechter, Sara & Mary Bucholtz. 2001. White noise: Bringing language into whiteness studies. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1). 3-21.

Trent, Maria, Danielle G. Dooley, & Jacqueline Dougé. 2019. The impact of racism on child and adolescent health. *Pediatrics* 144(2). e20191765. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2019-1765

Tuck, Eve & K. Wayne Yang. 2014. R-words: Refusing research. In Django Paris and Maisha T. Winn (eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities*. 223-247. Los Angeles: Sage.

Twine, France Winddance, and Jonathan W. Warren (eds.). 2000. *Racing research, researching race: Methodological dilemmas in critical race studies*. New York: New York University Press.

Villarruel, Francisco A., Gustavo Carlo, Josefina M. Grau, Margarita Azmitia, Natasha J. Cabrera & T. Jaime Chahin (2009). *Handbook of U.S. Latino psychology: Developmental and community-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walters, Keith. 1996. Contesting representations of African American language. *SALSA 3: Proceedings of the third annual Symposium about Language and Society—Austin.* Risako Ide, Rebecca Parker, and Yukako Sunaoshi (eds.). 137-151. Austin: University of Texas, Department of Linguistics.

Warrior, Robert. 2013. Double-crossed (or stabbed twice), again and again (and again): Reflections on our data-driven academic economy. *Profession* (November). https://profession.mla.org/double-crossed-or-stabbed-twice-again-and-again-and-again-reflections-on-our-data-driven-academic-economy/

Williams, Robert. 1975. *Ebonics: The true language of Black folks*. St. Louis: Robert L. Williams and Associates.

Winant, Howard. 2000. Race and race theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26(1). 169-185.

Winston, Andrew S. (ed.) 2004. Defining difference: Race and racism in the history of psychology. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wolfram, Walt. 2007. Sociolinguistic folklore in the study of African American English. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 1:1-22.

Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Zentella, Ana Celia. 2017. "Limpia, fija y da esplendor": Challenging the symbolic violence of the Royal Spanish Academy. *Chiricú Journal: Latina/o Literatures, Arts, and Cultures* 1(2). 21-42.

Zentella, Ana Celia. 2018. LatinUs* and linguistics: Complaints, conflicts, and contradictions – The anthro-political linguistics solution. In Naomi L. Shin & Daniel Erker (eds.), *Questioning theoretical primitives in linguistic inquiry: Papers in honor of Ricardo Otheguy*. 189–207. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zepeda, Ofelia, and Jane Hill. 1998. Collaborative sociolinguistic research among the Tohono O'odham. *Oral Tradition* 13(1). 130-156.

Zuberi, Tukufu. 2003. *Thicker than blood: How racial statistics lie*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Zuberi, Tukufu, and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2008. *White logic, White methods: Racism and methodology*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.