Hamline University

DigitalCommons@Hamline

School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Projects

School of Education and Leadership

Spring 2022

Linguistic Justice in Peer Tutoring

Emily Livingston
Hamline University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_cp

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Livingston, Emily, "Linguistic Justice in Peer Tutoring" (2022). *School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Projects*. 774.
https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_cp/774

This Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education and Leadership at DigitalCommons@Hamline. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Hamline. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@hamline.edu.

Linguistic Justice in Peer Tutoring

by

Emily K.H. Livingston

A capstone project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in English as a Second Language.

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

May 2022

Capstone Project Facilitator: Maggie Struck
Content Reviewers: Amy Fairgrieve, Julie Garner-Pringle, Lance Livingston & Kate Raleigh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2

CHAPTER ONE 4
- Introduction 4
- Research Questions 4
- Journey to the Question 4
- The Program 8
- The Stakeholders 9
- Conclusion 13

CHAPTER TWO 14
- Introduction 14
- Research Questions 14
- Curriculum Design and Evaluation 15
- Statement of Problem 19
- Linguistic Foundations 36
- Language and Identity & Language Bias 44
- Communicating Across Difference 49
- Student-Empowering Tutoring Techniques 50
- Conclusion 54

CHAPTER THREE 55
- Introduction 55
- Research Questions 55
- Project Context 55
- The Peer Tutors 58
- Training Structure 58
- Curriculum Overview 59
- Timeline 61
- Assessment 61
- Conclusion 62

CHAPTER FOUR 63
- Introduction 63
- Research Questions 63
- Major Learnings 63
- Next Steps 68
- Conclusions 69

REFERENCES 70

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Chapter one begins with the research questions which guided this linguistic justice project and continues to describe the inequitable outcomes in higher education that led me to these questions. A description of the college context for the project and an overview of this project's stakeholders follows.

Research Questions

- How have the monolingual language policies of the U.S. education system encouraged linguistic biases?
- How might linguistic biases lead to inequitable outcomes for students who use American English as an additional language and students who communicate with dialect markers from Black English?
- What training and education can be provided to peer tutors to critically reflect on and begin to address these inequities while tutoring peers in a college context?

Journey to the Question

In January 2021, I left a job I loved as an adult English Language Instructor to join the staff of a community college as a professional tutor specializing in working with students who use American English as an additional language. I made this move because I needed health insurance; as a type one diabetic, I had significant medical bills, and my previous employer's medical benefits were insufficient. I was new to higher education, and I was nervous about what I had heard from my colleagues about inequitable outcomes for students who used American English as an additional language, specifically in developmental education classes (Spartz, Waleag, Fontaine & Green, 2019).

I quickly learned that the outcomes for students using American English and an additional language, minority students, first-generation college students, and students tracked into developmental education (pre-college level coursework) were unacceptable. At my college, Black students were 13% less likely than White students to have received a passing grade in spring and fall semesters between 2017 and 2021, and were 5% more likely to have withdrawn from a course during this same time (Research & Planning, 2017-2021).

At my college, Students of Color lagged behind White Students in all but one measure of retention, persistence and completion in 2021 (*Factbook*, 2021). The retention rate of the fall 2019 cohort into spring 2020 was 81% for Students of Color and 84% for White Students; in fall 2020, the retention rates for this cohort were 56% for Students of Color and 52% for White Students (*Factbook*, 2021). Persistence rates, which are quantified as an addition of retention, graduation and transfer numbers, show that for the Fall 2019 cohort, Students of Color achieved an 85% persistence rate, while White Students achieved a 87% persistence rate by the first spring; by the second fall, the persistence rate for Students of Color dropped to 69% and the persistence rate for White Students dropped to 71% (*Factbook*, 2021). The greatest disparity can be found in the graduation rate for two-year programs. Of the students enrolled in fall 2017, 15% of Students of Color had completed their program in two years while 22% of

White Students had completed their program in the same timeframe (*Factbook*, 2021).

Minnesota State, the network of 30 state colleges and 7 state universities, takes this disparity seriously, and started an initiative called Equity 2030 in an attempt to remedy these unequal outcomes; my college has planned to meet these goals more quickly: by 2025 (Minnesota State, n.d.a; “Mission, vision & values,” n.d.).

I was not sure what I, as a professional tutor, could accomplish beyond supporting the all-too-few students who I could fit on my schedule. I knew that much of what I had learned both in my Master’s program and in my experience as an adult English language instructor were valuable, and so I approached the Writing Center coordinator about putting together some video trainings and activities that she could share with her peer writing tutors as part of their training. We piloted the first such video, “The History of English,” with two tutors during the summer of 2021 (Livingston, 2021). After making revisions based on student feedback, we used the video as part of the Writing Center peer tutor training in fall 2021. Overall, the video and activities fostered some interesting discussion and insights, but we did not budget enough time to satisfyingly conclude the training.

As I was developing an outline of what other trainings would be of use to peer tutors, the Writing Center coordinator invited me to join a summer book club. In the book club I read Greenfield and Rowan's collection *Writing Centers and the New Racism: A Call for Sustainable Dialogue and Change*. The essays in this collection highlight the linguistic knowledge that is critical to writing center work, as well as some harmful linguistic injustices that higher education and writing centers work to perpetuate. This was eye-opening, and I could no longer ignore the obvious connection between linguistic injustice and inequitable outcomes for students who use American English as an additional language and students who communicate with dialect markers from stigmatized dialects.

In between sessions with my students, I found myself being quietly radicalized by thinkers like Lippi-Green, dr. vay, and Baker-Bell. I was suddenly aware of my code-meshing in professional settings, my own prescriptivist impulses, and ultimately, the White-supremacy inherent in the Standard American English I was helping students employ. I began to understand how critical an awareness of linguistic justice was in my work, as well as the role linguistic injustice plays in inequitable outcomes for students who have limited access or exposure to Standard American English. This burgeoning awareness became the driving focus for this project.

This project is a five-unit linguistic justice curriculum that will be delivered as a series of training sessions for peer tutors from my college’s Writing and Tutoring Centers. The goal of this curriculum is to foster an awareness of the stakes around language use so that peer tutors can more effectively support students who use American English as an additional language and students who communicate with markers of stigmatized dialects, with a special emphasis on Black language.

The Program

The community college where I work employs 319 faculty and about 300 staff, who serve about 15,000 students a year (“Working at Normandale,” n.d.; *Factbook*, 2021). According to the college’s *Factbook* for fiscal year 2021-2022, 66% of students who enroll seeking a degree are from underrepresented groups, which the college defines as first generation college students, low-income students, and/or students of color. The college offers Associate of Arts, Associate of Fine Arts, Associate of Science, and Associate of Applied science degrees as well as twenty seven certificate programs (*Factbook*, 2021). In 2021, the college awarded 1,380 degrees (*Factbook*, 2021). The fiscal year 2021 success rate, which is defined as receiving an A, B, or C grade or a P (Pass) in a course, was 70% for degree seeking undergraduates, 89% for high school students enrolled in postsecondary enrollment options at Normandale, and 84% for other undergraduates (*Factbook*, 2021). The college’s three-year graduation rate for full time students in 2021 was on par with a national comparison group of similar colleges, with 25% and 24% respectively (*Factbook*, 2021). The college performed 5% higher than the national comparison group on the second fall retention rate for first-time, part-time students: 46% to 41% (*Factbook*, 2021).

The Tutoring and Writing Centers (The Centers) at my college offer a wide variety of services to support students, mostly using a peer-to-peer model. Student workers are recruited based on faculty recommendations as well as targeted outreach to students who received an A or B in the class previously. The Writing Center employs both peer writing tutors that meet with any interested students one-on-one and embedded tutors who are assigned to a specific developmental English class (ENCG 800), attending it and meeting with students one-on-one outside of class to work on assignments. Currently, none of the embedded tutors are former developmental education students themselves. The Tutoring Center employs both subject-specific peer tutors who meet with students one-on-one as well as Peer Assisted Study Session (PASS) leaders, who are assigned to a specific class and lead weekly group study sessions. The PASS program is based on the Supplemental Instruction program that was developed by the University of Missouri - Kansas City (*Supplemental Instruction*, n.d.).

The staff of the Tutoring and Writing Centers includes a Tutoring Center director, Writing Center coordinator, and a full-time professional tutor for students who use American English as an additional language. The PASS program coordination is divided into two positions, one full-time staff functions as the STEM PASS coordinator and one part-time staff serves as the humanities PASS coordinator and also serves as a professional tutor for students who use American English as an additional language. Most services are delivered via Zoom, but limited in-person services were available in Fall 2021 with plans to increase in-person services in Spring 2022.

The Stakeholders

I believe that the linguistic justice curriculum can provide a framework not just for Tutoring and Writing Centers, but could be adapted to address wider audiences including college faculty and staff, adult basic education professionals, and the general public.

College Stakeholders

While my first impulse was to focus this curriculum on the needs of peer writing tutors, after discussing my outline with other Tutoring Center staff, I decided to make some alterations to the outline so that sections of the curriculum could be applicable to peer tutors in the Writing and Tutoring Centers, embedded tutors, and PASS leaders. Outside of the Writing and Tutoring Centers, there is some interest in exploring the linguistic justice topics as professional development opportunities for staff and faculty, but this remains in a nascent stage.

The students who receive support at the Writing and Tutoring Centers are also significant stakeholders in this work. One of the limitations of this project is that there was no input from students in the development of the curriculum, and if this training is to be revised and improved upon, their input will need to be gathered.

The Writing and Tutoring Center Community

The Writing and Tutoring Centers in Minnesota both have professional groups of which my colleagues and I are an active part. As mentioned previously, it was the Writing Center Professionals summer book club that first introduced me to the idea of linguistic justice, and there is a great deal of interest in this framework, but limited capacity. In addition to getting feedback from the Writing Center Professionals group, I plan to make this curriculum available to them to use, alter and adapt as they see fit. The Tutoring Center Professionals group has been on hiatus due to COVID-19, but has plans to reassemble in the future. I would also be interested in providing my materials to them.

The Minnesota State Community

While there is a great deal of equity work occurring at my college and Minnesota State generally, there are no offerings that I am aware of focusing on linguistic justice topics. Much of Minnesota State's professional development for education is hosted by the Network for Educational Development (NED). NED's course catalog themes its trainings into categories of academic technologies, accessibility, open educator resources, the scholarship of teaching and learning, academic equity, and special topics (*NED course catalog*, n.d.). The specific offerings under the academic equity umbrella include two-to-three-week courses on culturally responsive pedagogy, anti-racist pedagogy, equity and technology, and equity 101; a 12-week faculty learning community on culturally responsive pedagogy; and one-hour webinars on culturally responsive pedagogy, trauma responsive pedagogy, open educational pedagogy, caring in an unjust world, Latinx students and the complicated history with higher ed, and an equity book club (*NED course catalog*, n.d.). While these offerings cover a range of critical topics, a discussion of linguistic justice is noticeably absent.

In addition to the omission of professional development trainings focused on linguistic justice, the employment-focused framing of the Equity 2030 goals is equally troubling from a linguistic justice lens. According to Minnesota State's Equity 2030 outline:

> Employers will increasingly need to draw workers with postsecondary credentials from diverse and marginalized communities, communities that have historically had a low proportion of their population with higher education credentials. Only by enhancing access to higher education and closing the educational equity gaps will low-income and first-generation students, Black, Indigenous students, and students of Color have the opportunity to gain social mobility and economic security, while providing Minnesota the skilled, resilient workforce it needs. (Minnesota State, n.d.b, para. 7)

As will become apparent in later chapters, much of the pressure placed on students to conform to Standard American English is based on the claim that students must master the conventions of Standard American English in order to succeed in the “real world” or the “working world.” While I myself have made such claims in the past, looking at evidence-based research exploring the intersection of language use and marginalized identities, mastering the conventions of Standard American English does not in fact improve access to opportunities in the “real world.” Not only does mastering Standard American English not improve access to opportunities, but it does real harm to students’ sense of self. This curriculum, therefore, might be adapted and distributed through the Minnesota State D2L platform or NED offerings to begin to address the flaws in its framework.

External Stakeholders

Literacy Minnesota offers an excellent training on Accent Bias that I attended in 2020, and while I will be touching on some of the same research and themes of their presentation, my curriculum will provide a more comprehensive overview of linguistic justice topics (Echelberger, 2020). Having provided presentations for Literacy Minnesota in the past, if this curriculum is a success, I would be interested in providing it to them as part of their Equity and Cultural Awareness in Education certificate program.

In conclusion, I hope this project will be a small but useful step toward addressing linguistic inequities throughout our community.

Conclusion

This chapter introduced my research questions, the influences that drew me to these questions, the context in which the project would occur as well as stakeholders that might benefit from and build on this work.

Chapter two will explore the theoretical framework for these research questions. This project synthesizes the expertise of scholars in the areas of tutor training, peer tutoring, applied linguistics, raciolinguistics, American English pronunciation, translanguaging, code-meshing, the history of U.S. education policies, and equity in higher education.

CHAPTER TWO

Introduction

Chapter two provides a synthesis of the scholarship of the intellectual giants on whose shoulders this project rests. Due to the wide range of topics incorporated into the curriculum, this literature review provides more breadth than depth. This chapter begins with a description of the frameworks, theories, and practical limitations that guided the design of the curriculum. Each of the following sections corresponds to each unit of the curriculum. The sections are: Statement of Problem, Linguistic Foundations for Peer Tutors, Language: Identity & Bias, Listening Across Difference, and Student-Empowering Tutoring Techniques.

Myriad scholarship on translanguaging and code meshing has been written for an audience of classroom instructors who have the power to determine the content of class, the nature of assignment and their associated evaluation rubrics. There is, however, less published focusing on how these frameworks can be applied in tutoring contexts, where so much is out of the control of both the student and their peer tutor. I believe that the tutoring strategies outlined in the curriculum represent a significant contribution to the field.

Research Questions

- How have the monolingual language policies of the U.S. education system encouraged linguistic biases?

- How might linguistic biases lead to inequitable outcomes for students who use American English as an additional language and students who communicate with dialect markers from Black English?
- What training and education can be provided to peer tutors to critically reflect on and begin to address these inequities while tutoring peers in a college context?

Curriculum Design and Evaluation

> …if tutoring and teachers of literacy look forward to a time when the way people speak and write is not held against them, then there must be ways for all educators, tutors included, to help make this future. —Ben Rafoth, 2016, p. 9

Form follows function. —Louis Sullivan

Much of the framework for my curriculum was shaped by advice from writing center scholars Laura Greenfield and Karen Rowan's work on incorporating discussions of race into writing center training (2011a); they advocate for an integration of diversity, equity and inclusion framework into all peer tutor trainings, the development of a critical lens for peer tutors, and a framework that avoids othering groups of learners. Even with these tenets in mind, there are limitations in what can be achieved with a single curriculum, and one major hurdle experienced by linguistic justice advocates is the disconnect between theory and practice.

Greenfield and Rowan (2011a) argue that discussions of diversity, equity and inclusion should not be confined to one training, but rather integrated as fundamental principles of all training materials in order for such training to be meaningful and effective. While my curriculum does function as a stand-alone training, one long-term goal for this curriculum is to serve as a basis for extended diversity, equity and inclusion trainings for peer tutors in the Centers. By continuously exploring equity topics, we can foster a more considerate and supportive learning community. In their 2003 study of New York teacher's attitudes toward African American Vernacular English (AAVE), linguists Renee Blake and Cecilia Cutler found that teachers tended to have more positive attitudes about AAVE in schools that had explicit philosophies around multilingualism. Due to their small sample size of five schools, they didn't draw a strong correlation, but rather found "enticing suggestions as to why teachers may be more attuned to linguistic difference as a resource rather than a liability" (Blake & Cutler, 2003, p. 186). One goal of this curriculum, therefore, is to help foster a culture of equity and asset-building that continues to reflect on and refine its philosophy and praxis.

The first three units of the curriculum focus on theory and reevaluations of personal assumptions to foster the development or enhancement of a critical lens that can be applied in other contexts. As Greenfield and Rowan state, trainings should "empower tutors with the critical lenses through which to interrogate their world and to explore and understand their own agency; understanding their own agency is critical to their ability to help writers do the same" (Greenfield & Rowan, 2011a, p. 127). By including activities for students to develop lines of inquiry and reflect on their own academic careers and language use, this curriculum aims to foster this critical lens.

Greenfield and Rowan (2011a) also assert that separate trainings that focus exclusively on strategies for working with users of American English as an additional language and neuro-divergent students can “other” those learners in the minds of tutors; therefore, these strategies should be integrated as best practices to be used for any learner. The praxis-focused fourth and fifth units of the curriculum, therefore, asks peer tutors to consider how these strategies could be effective even when working with students who are not users of American English as an additional language, in an attempt to mitigate othering. As Cox (2016) describes:

> While it is true that tutors need to adjust their approach for each student they meet, the differences in tutoring L2 students [who use American English as an additional language] may not be as extreme as these tutors fear if they recognize that these students are not just L2 students; they are also students trying to develop an effective writing process, express themselves in ways seen as effect in different disciplines, negotiate often opaque assignment descriptions, find out how readers will respond to a draft, and learn how to use past writing experience when facing new ones--the same challenges all student writers face. If tutors identify L2 students by their multiple experiences as students as writers as much as

> they identify them by their linguistic backgrounds, anxieties will cease. (Cox, 2016, p. 63)

Ultimately, while every student has different needs in a tutoring session, this curriculum is interested in contextualizing these approaches within a Universal Design framework, where strategies intended to benefit students who use American English as an additional language are strategies that might benefit all learners.

To develop the specific curriculum activities, I applied backwards design principles, moving from goals to assessments to activities. The advantage of backwards design is that “all methods and materials we use are shaped by a clear conception of the vision of desired results" (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, p. 14). Because I was planning around peer tutor time and tutoring center budget constraints, making the most of every moment I had with the peer tutors was critical, and backwards design helped me focus my goals for that time. Starting from goals also helped me gain buy-in from the Writing Center coordinator and Tutoring Center director.

The curriculum begins and ends with a self-assessment on language attitudes that was adapted from Blake and Cutler’s 2003 survey of New York public school teacher’s attitudes toward AAVE. The pre- and post-survey and personal reflection will allow students to reflect on what attitudes they hold that they might wish to continue questioning, as well as a rough measure of the effectiveness of the content of the curriculum.

There are, of course, limits to what one series of trainings can achieve, and Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez (1972) offer a word of caution: “although [people] may express linguistically enlightened attitudes… [they] are still quite likely to be influenced by what they perceive as deviant speech” (as cited in Blake & Cutler, 2003, p. 188). This warning of the disconnect between theory and practice echoes a limitation found by Greenfield and Rowan (2011a) with their new peer tutors: “they challenged dominant standards for literacy and writing in the context of their own experiences, but they had difficulty recognizing how they uncritically applied those same standards in the context of their peers’ experiences and writing” (p. 146). By emphasizing the specific strategies to apply the theory in tutoring sessions in units four and five, I hoped to bridge this disconnect.

Statement of Problem

Inequity in Minneosta’s Higher Education

> Unless systematic reforms take adequate account of the dynamics of linguistic diversity among students, we are unlikely to meet our desired goal to combine high academic standards with greater educational equity for all. —John Baugh (as cited in Blake & Cutler, 2003, p. 164)

As mentioned previously, the course passing rates for Black students at my college for the fall and spring semesters was 13% lower than the passing rate of their White peers (Research & Planning, 2017-2021).

These outcomes, while shocking, make more sense when they are contextualized historically: the standards of higher education were designed to serve able-bodied, White men, and so the system is functioning as it was designed to by continuing to meet their needs at the expense of others (Lee, Johnson & Schreiber, 2022, 5). To put it another way, these outcomes are a direct result of historical inequities; therefore, a review of history is a critical part of understanding what attitudes, policies and practices created—and continue to foster—injustice.

Monolingual Language Ideology and Policies in the U.S.

> The primary function of myth is to validate an existing social order. Myth enshrines conservative social values, raising tradition on a pedestal. It expresses and confirms, rather than explains or questions, the sources of cultural attitudes and values…. Because myth anchors the present in the past it is a sociological charter for a future society which is an exact replica of the present one. — Ann Oakley (as cited in Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 66)
>
> This is America. Speak English. –Lots of Americans on lots of street corners, schools, stores, restaurants, parks, etc.

History of Language Eradication in the U.S.

The U.S. government and education system has historically fostered a monolingual language ideology which privileges English above other languages. Despite the fact that there is no explicit declaration of English as an official language in the Constitution, English has been the de facto national language since the country's inception, and numerous policies throughout American history have been developed to support English supremacy (Hernández-Chávez, 2010).

In his article “Language policy in the United States: A history of cultural genocide,” Eduardo Hernández-Chávez (2010) outlines the United States’ extensive suppression of non-English languages within its borders. Policies barring “foreign” languages have existed in the U.S. before the country declared its independence and continued as the U.S. expanded westward with the Louisiana Purchase and the spoils of the Mexican-American War. These policies have proven especially harmful for Native Americans and enslaved people from Africa.

Not all the founding members of the Continental Congress were native English speakers, and amidst the struggle for independence, English speakers targeted German-speaking members of the Continental Congress (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). Some members of the Continental Congress attempted to revoke the voting rights of their German-speaking peers (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). While that motion was ultimately unsuccessful, anti-German sentiment continued, and eventually the Continental Congress stopped issuing proclamations in German, only publishing documents in English (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). This type of language descrimiation continued throughout the formation of what is now the United States.

After purchasing the Louisiana Territory from the French in 1803, the American government made several decisions that undermined French’s linguistic dominance in the region. An English-speaking governor was appointed immediately even though the majority of the denizens of the territory he governed spoke French as their first language (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). President

Jefferson even proposed sending 30,000 English-speaking settlers to the area to artificially create an English-speaking majority (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). While that plan was ultimately abandoned, the first constitution of Louisiana declared English the state's official language (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). This policy clearly illustrates the false equivalency of being "American" and speaking English.

The United States again employed policies of linguistic suppression after the Mexican-American War as Texas, California and New Mexico were annexed (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). Fueled by anti-Mexican sentiment resulting from the slaughter at the Battle of the Alamo, just five years after winning its independence from Mexico, Texas stopped printing its laws in Spanish in 1841 despite the large number of Spanish-speaking Texans (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). By 1858, English was the sole language of instruction in the state of Texas's schools (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). There were, however, considerable problems enforcing the English-only policy due to the large numbers of Spanish speakers, so in 1870, Spanish was allowed to be used as a bridge to English in ESL classrooms (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). By 1905, however, the use of Spanish was restricted to only foreign language classrooms (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). Spanish-speaking students were forced to stop using Spanish in school in order to acquire English while English-speaking students had the option to learn Spanish as a foreign language if they chose to do so (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). These policies again frame English as the sole language of the United States by actively discouraging the use of Spanish for its native speakers living in the U.S.

During the period of Manifest Destiny and westward expansion, the U.S. government employed outright genocide and educational policies designed to exterminate the cultures and languages of surviving Native peoples. In 1879, the U.S. government created a system of boarding schools which housed and “reeducated” Native children (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). The goal of these boarding schools was to remake Native children in the image of White children (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). The Commissioner of Indian Affairs believed that forcibly removing Native children from their community was a necessary part of achieving this goal when he wrote that boarding schools would stop children from “regressing” like they did while attending day school: “Freeing the children… from the language and habits of their untutored and often savage parents. When they return to their homes at night… they relapse more or less into their former moral and mental stupor” (as cited in Hernández-Chávez, 2010, p. 145). The eradication of the “language and habits” of Native peoples was an explicit goal of boarding schools. Once at boarding schools, students were beaten if they were heard speaking in their native language (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). After graduating from school, the Native children were indentured to White families for three years. (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). These re-educated children were ostracized upon their return to their home communities (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). While these re-education policies were eventually phased out, after WWII the federal government revoked the official recognition of dozens of tribes, ending their sovereignty and self-determination (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). These assimilationist programs were successful when measured against the unethical goal; when linguists Yamamoto and Zepeda examined twenty Native American languages in 2004, there were three with no native speakers and six with somewhere between a few and a dozen. Even the largest group, the Navajo—with around 130,000 native speakers—is in imminent danger of dying out since few of the tribe's youth speak Navajo (Krauss, 1992).The assimilationist, monolingual language policies of the U.S. government have resulted in the death of many Native languages.

The well-documented practice of slaveholders separating Africans from their families and others who spoke the same language was employed to remove the agency of enslaved people and limit their ability to collaborate with others in order to revolt or escape from bondage (Hernández-Chávez, 2010). This linguistic isolation was built upon by laws prohibiting the education of enslaved people. This intentional, systematic disempowerment is unique to the enslaved African diaspora. Linguist John Baugh elaborates:

> When compared to the linguistic circumstances of United States immigrants who hailed from Italy, Germany, France, Poland, Sweden, Russia, Japan, China Korea, Mexico, Brazil and countless other countries, slaves never had the luxury of being able to speak to others using their native language once they were brought to America—again, against their free will. Secondly, but crucially from a linguistic point of view, it was illegal to teach slaves to read and write. Thus, in addition to the linguistic isolation that resulted from being captured in Africa and prevention from interacting with others who shared a common African language, once sold

> in America slaves were intentionally denied access to literacy by law. (as cited in Baker-Bell, 2020, pp. 17-18)

Out of this system of inhumane oppression, Black language was forged and flourished. Geneva Smitherman articulates the importance of the Black language, which developed in spite of deliberate attempts to remove agency from enslaved people, in her definition of what Black language is:

> [Black language is] a style of speaking English words with Black Flava—with Africanized semantic, grammatical, pronunciation, and rhetorical patterns. [Black language] comes out of the experience of U.S. slave descendants. This shared experience has resulted in common language practices in the Black community. The roots of African American speech lie in the counter language, the resistance discourse, that was created as a communication system unintelligible to speakers of the dominant master class. (as cited in Baker-Bell, 2020, pp. 12-13)

Black language, therefore, is a unique celebration of the heritage and resilience of enslaved people from Africa; contrary to many Americans' beliefs, Black language isn't "bad English," but rather a complex, rule-bound language created in the face of violent oppression.

In the forward to April Baker-Bell's *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy* (2020), scholar Geneva Smitherman provides an overview of attitudes surrounding Black language and "studies" of Black language from 1884 to the present. Unsurprisingly, early White scholarship around Black language was exceedingly racist, with two published writings by

J.A. Harrison and George Krapp, respectively, describing Black language as "baby-talk" and "infantile English" (as cited in Baker-Bell, 2020, p. xiii). At this same time, Black luminaries and scholars Dr. W.E.B. DuBois and Dr. Carter G. Woodson advocated for rigorous study of the characteristics of Black language and its use in higher education for what are now historically Black colleges and universities (Baker-Bell, 2020, p. xiii). In 1949, Dr. Lorenzo Dow Turner, who was likely America's first Black linguist, conducted a seminal descriptivist study of Black language use along the coast of South Carolina and Georgia; his work inspired dozens of other linguists to approach Black language as legitimate and worthy of study (Baker-Bell, 2020, xiii). According to Dr. Smitherman, research by linguistics, sociolinguists, and dialectologists on Black language has "demonstrated that it was a highly developed, functional rule-government linguistic system… [and] that Black students needed Black language in order to communication with other Black speakers in their families and communities" (Baker-Bell, 2020, p. xv). Yet the legitimacy and utility of Black language is still called into question: despite the robust scholarship conducted in this area, Black language is still often considered "inappropriate" and inadequate" for use in professional and educational contexts, even by users of Black language themselves, who assert they are "breakin verbs" or "talkin ghetto" (Baker-Bell, 2020, p. xv). For over one hundred years, there has been a disconnect between what linguists know to be true about Black language and what the public believes about it. Doubtless, this disconnect is rooted in the racism that encouraged early White linguists to dismiss Black language; they used pseudoscience to justify their own racist beliefs, and this practice continues to this day. As Baker-Bell argues, “linguistic hierarchies and racial hierarchies are interconnected…the way a Black child’s language is devalued in school reflects how Black lives are devalued in the world. Similarly, the way a White child’s language is privileged and deemed the norm in schools is directly connected to the invisible ways that White culture is deemed normal, neutral, and superior in the world” (2016, p. 2). Linguistic justice and racial justice are inextricably intertwined. Any academic discussion of equitable outcomes in higher education, therefore, should include a review of policies around language as part of the solution to inequity.

This brief overview of suppressionist historical policies and dismissive attitudes toward languages other than English and nonstandard dialects establishes several key themes that will be expanded on throughout chapter two: the connections among language, experience, and identity; the intersection of linguistic bias, racism, and xenophobia; and the disconnect between what academics know about language and what society believes about it. These themes will be illuminated further through an examination of the status of minority languages and dialects in the U.S. today.

The State of Non-English Languages in the United States Today

The supremacy of English in the U.S. today is apparent; English is both the de facto language of the United States and the de jure language as well in many states. One requirement of the U.S. Naturalization interview, which must be passed to obtain U.S. citizenship, is to“[b]e able to read, write and speak basic English” (General eligibility requirements). There are, however, exceptions for individuals with disabilities as well as legal permanent residents over the age of 50 who have resided in the U.S. for at least 20 years and those over the age of 55 who have lived in the U.S. for at least 15 years (Exemptions and accommodations). With these limited exceptions, English is a requirement for U.S. citizenship. As of 2016, West Virginia became the 32nd state to affirm English as its official language (U.S. English efforts). While the federal government has not declared English the official language of the United States, many continue to advocate for its adoption. By examining their arguments through a critical lens, we can begin to see the harm done by these policies.

In the following subsection of this chapter, we will explore what arguments are put forth by the organization U.S. English, which "is the nation's oldest, largest citizens' action group dedicated to preserving the unifying role of the English language in the United States. [U.S. English was] Founded in 1983 by the late Senator S.I. Hayakawa, an immigrant himself" (About U.S. English, n.d.). It is worth noting that the organization highlights the immigrant status of its founder as well as that of its current chairperson, Mauro E. Mujica, an immigrant from Chile (About U.S. English, n.d.). While placing immigrants as central to the official English movement is an attempt to legitimize their work—*even immigrants advocate for the adoption of English as the official language of the United States!*—their arguments and policy agendas run counter to both the principles of linguistic justice and basic linguistic principles that are based on empirical understandings of linguistics.

Current advocates for English-only policies describe such legislation as a common sense tool to promote national unity (Sen. Hayakawa's speech). In 1982, California Senator S.I. Hayakawa attempted to add an amendment declaring English as the official language of the U.S. to an immigration bill. Before Congress, he declared, “Language is a unifying instrument which binds people together. When people speak one language they become as one, they become a society” (Sen. Hayakawa’s speech). This statement, of course, fails to understand that any language with more than one speaker contains variation, and that English—even American English—is fragmented into numerous dialects (Lippi-Green, 2012). This also ignores a key theme that will be further elaborated on in a later section of this chapter: the intersectionality of language bias, racism, and xenophobia do not guarantee that the “full benefits of membership” of being a fluent speaker of American English will be allowed to nonwhite bodies, even if they achieve native-like fluency.

Later in his speech, Senator Hayakawa asserted that the place of languages other than English in school is as a bridge to English in ESL classrooms and in foreign language classrooms. This “use your home language until you can get English right” and “all business should only be conducted in English” approach encourages subtractive bilingualism. Subtractive bilingualism is “The acquisition of a *second language at the expense, or ultimately the expense of the first, e.g that of English by many immigrant communities in North America or Britain” (Matthews, 2014). In other words, speakers lose their native language as a result of disuse after learning a more “instrumental” language that offers social, economic, and educational benefits and opportunities. The loss of fluency in a person’s L1 reduces our nation’s linguistic resources. It is more expensive to teach a native speaker of English to learn Oromo than to teach a native speaker of Oromo to learn English while maintaining their language. Furthermore, this situation supposes a neutral exchange in linguistic fluency and ignores the loss of identity, culture and connection to a community that accompanies subtractive bilingualism.

Translanguaging, a relatively new approach to language acquisition, offers a framework for learning another language (i.e. English for the purposes of this project) that uses the students L1 and other linguistic resources to scaffold their learning of a target language (Beres, 2015). This framework places an inherent and critical value on *all* of a learner’s linguistic resources, thereby discouraging subtractive bilingualism.

Otheguy, García, and Reid (2015) define translanguaging as “the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages” (p. 281). In essence, translanguaging scholars believe that all languages that a person knows are part of a single linguistic repertoire. Just as national boundaries are widely agreed upon social constructions rather than physical realities, the differentiation between languages is a social construction rather than a cognitive or physiological one. When engaging in a translanguaging-supportive tutoring session, students are able to use everything that they do know, including the languages they are familiar with, to explore and comprehend what they do not yet know.

According to García (2014), translanguaging allows students to employ their existing language practices to build academic language. Importantly, García does not characterize the acquisition of academic language as a linear process during which students transition from home language practices to academically appropriate language like a person crossing a bridge. Rather, she characterizes the addition of academic language as an expansion of a student's linguistic resources that is more akin to adding new ingredients to a pantry; students can make new recipes using the new ingredients, make changes to previous recipes with the new ingredients, or continue to cook as before. Specific strategies for employing translanguaging in tutoring sessions will be outlined later in this chapter.

Black Language in the United States: Code Switching vs. Code Meshing

The question of how educators approach Black language has been influenced by systemic racism; historically, many instructors have approached Black language as, at best, an impediment to their student's educational and career goals, or, at worst, as a substandard form of English. These deficit-based approaches neglect to understand Black language as a rich, useful, and expressive dialect that can meet the needs of any educational or professional context (Young, 2018).

One popular approach to Black language is code-switching, in which students are taught to "switch" from using Black language in personal contexts to standard American English in academic settings (Young, 2018, p 30). Code-switching is based on a contrastive analysis framework, in which students compare how two different dialects (or languages) express an idea in order to move from their native dialect to the target dialect (Young, 2018). In the case of users of Black language, students would compare their native dialect against standard American English to understand what the differences are in order to learn to use standard American English. The ultimate goal of code-switching is to produce students who can converse fluently in both standard American English in school and professional settings and in Black English with members of their community. There are numerous drawbacks to this approach: it puts an undue burden on Black language users, it falsely conflates Black language and informal language, it ignores the root cause of the stigma around Black language (which is racism), and it ignores the hypocrisy of the appropriation of Black language by non-Black speakers and the ability of White-bodied people to use informal dialects in academic and professional settings without negative consequences. Ultimately, teaching people to navigate, rather than alter, a racist system perpetuates injustice, so this project rejects a code-switching framework and instead approaches the rhetorical choices students make with a code meshing framework (Young, 2018).

Code-switching reinforces a hierarchy between the “correct” standard American English and the “incorrect” Black language, thereby undermining students’ sense of confidence. Speakers of nonstandard dialects carry an additional communicative burden according to dr. vay, who states “...the idea that

Standard English is inherently better than other dialects places an unfair burden on the speakers of undervalued varieties, who must continually accommodate those who hold negative attitudes toward them and/or their abilities" (Young, 2018, p. 21). In other words, Black language users are not only required to build their language repertoires—which is, abstractly, a good goal for all communicators—but to do so from a position of inferiority because the language they use is “bad.” This framework of Black language as inferior is a concretely harmful way to approach education because it is damaging to student’s self or self-efficacy. This idea will be explored further in the language and identity section of chapter two.

Code-switching is also based on a false equivalency drawn between using different levels of formality of a single dialect and the classification of the whole of Black language as an “informal” dialect. Teachers, myself included, will often say that you greet a boss differently than your friend to explain the idea of formal and informal style, which is “Defined by a relation between aspects of the forms and structures employed and a range of contexts or situations in which they are appropriate” (Matthews, 2014). Cultivating a formal, academic style is an important rhetorical skill for college writers, and is an explicit goal for many freshman composition classes. In fact, Goal 1 of the Minnesota transfer curriculum states that one requirement of fulfilling this goal is that “students will be able to… Employ syntax and usage appropriate to academic disciplines and the professional world” (Goal 1: Communication, n.d.). Understanding the distinction between formal and informal communication is not inherently problematic, and expanding a student's communicative tool set is, in fact, a worthy goal. An issue arises, however, when a whole dialect is classified as "informal." One of the important linguistic tenants is that "all spoken languages are equal in linguistic terms" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 8). This means that Black language has the ability to adapt to both formal and informal contexts, but due to social stigma, Black language is not welcomed in academic or professional contexts; there is nothing inherent in the features of Black language that somehow make it incompatible with those contexts. The marginalization of Black language is a social construction rather than a linguistic fact, and so a code-switching approach contributes to the unjust stigma around Black language by labeling it as useful and appropriate only in certain contexts.

Baker-Bell describes how Black language has been co-opted, exploited, and colonized for marketing purposes by companies, such as MARS Incorporated's use of "cray cray," Trader Joe's use of "Oh, snap" and MTV's 2016 article that called upon their White viewers to stop using Black language from 2015 and to start using new Black slang that was popularized in 2016, among others (2020, p. 13). From this evidence, she concludes that there is an obvious double standard for the use of Black language: "It is acceptable for Black Language to be used and capitalized on by non-native Black-language speakers for marketing and for play, but it is unacceptable for Black kids to use it as a linguistic resource in school" (2020, p. 14). This use of Black language for marketing purposes illuminates the hypocrisy of the ability of nonnative speakers of Black language to use the language for their own gains while the creators and native speakers of that dialect are punished and scorned for its use.

Like translanguaging, code meshing asks students to draw on the whole of their linguistic repertoire to express themselves (Young, 2018). Rather than only writing in standard American English, students should be allowed to blend their home dialect (e.g. Black English, Appalachian English, etc.) with standard American English to articulate their thoughts and establish new ways of knowing. The use or omission of dialect signifiers becomes a rhetorical choice, rather than “good” or “bad” writing. Techniques for code meshing in peer tutoring contexts will be explored in more detail later in chapter two.

A Way Forward: Students’ Right to Their Own Language

In 1974, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCC) adopted a resolution on the language use of students in a 79-20 vote (Students' right to their own language). This resolution reads:

> We affirm the students’ right to their own patterns and varieties of language—the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style. Language scholars long ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another. Such a claim leads to false advice for speakers and writers, and immoral advice for humans. A nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly that teachers must have the

> experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language.

This resolution establishes a framework in which every language and dialect of any student is respected. The value of this framework is underscored by scholarship around the key themes of this project: that all languages are equally rule-bound and equally expressive for their users and that language is an important expression of identity. The implementation of this framework, however, is complicated by inaccurate beliefs about language, such as well intentioned assumptions like “isn’t Black language informal?” and “don’t people need access to standard English to meet their goals?” The following sections of this chapter will expand on key themes, address some well-intentioned assumptions, and explore what tutoring strategies, informed by translanguaging and code meshing, can help actualize the theory that students have the right to their own language.

Linguistic Foundations

> Linguistists… know that many popular beliefs about language are false and that much we are taught about language is misdirected. — Ronald Wardhaugh, as cited in Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015, p. 74.

The purpose of this section of the training is to address the disconnect between what linguists know to be true about language and what the general public—peer tutors included—tend to believe about language. This includes: facts about language, descriptivist and prescriptivist approaches to language, as well as language standardization and Standard American English.

Myths About Language

Much has been written about the false assumptions about language that the general public holds as facts. Jennifer Grill, a teacher to students who speak English and additional language, classified three key assumptions that perpetuate linguistic injustice that was noted by Condon and Olson (2016) in brackets:

> Myth 1: Standard English is the Best and Most Correct Form of English
>
> Myth 2: English Dialects are Improper and Randomly Created Forms of the Language. [We would add that perceived linguistic "divergences" regarded as improper and randomly created forms of language is also a myth]
>
> Myth 3: Dialects Interfere with Learning "Proper" English and Should Not Be Used in the Classroom. [We would add that linguistic "divergences" as interference in also a myth; in fact, these "divergences" can help enrich as text] (as cited in Condon & Olson, 2016, p. 44)

This first myth, that the English used in school is the "right" English, is at the core of what is damaging to speakers of nonstandard dialects; if Standard English is "right" then their language is "wrong." Misinformed people can extend this perceived wrongness to reflect on the speaker: it's not just their language that's wrong; it's them. They're using "wrong" English, so they must be uneducated or unintelligent (Jackson & Williamson-Ige, 1986). Therefore, the goal of this unit is to help peer tutors transition from a tutoring framework in which Standard English is "correct" and to one where using Standard English, alongside their native dialect of Black language, English with markers of nonnative speakers, or a dialect of World English, is a rhetorical choice that they can help student writers think through using.

The groundwork for addressing the first myth comes from Wardhaugh and Fuller's (2015) definitions of languages and dialects: "the word 'language' is used to refer either to a single linguistic norm or to a group of related norms, and a 'dialect' is used to refer to one of the norms" (p. 28). In other words, a dialect is one way of using a language. The linguistic elements that differentiate one dialect from another include sounds (phonetics/phonology), words and word parts (morphology), and phrases (syntax) (Mihalicek & Wilson, 2011). Importantly, Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) continue to describe the power dynamics that affect language and dialects: "A language has more power than any of its dialects. The standard is the most powerful dialect but it has become so because of non-linguistic factors" (p. 32). Ultimately, the "standard" dialect carries the most prestige of any dialect, but not because it is linguistically "better" but because it is more socially powerful.

As mentioned previously in chapter two, one of the reasons that Black language is stigmatized is the false conflagration of dialect and style. Wardhaugh and Fuller describe style as, "the level of formality in the way of speaking; there are more formal and less formal styles of every [language] variety" (p. 419). Linguistically, Black language can function effectively in formal and informal settings, but it's perceived inappropriateness for professional and academic contexts is related to the racist ideas that Blackness itself does not belong in those contexts.

Addressing the second myth, that dialects are “improper” and “random,” needs to be understood in order to put nonstandard dialects onto an even playing field with Standard English. Peer tutors need to know that all languages, dialects included, are equally rule-bound, meaning that even if they personally don’t understand the grammar rules of a given dialect, there are still rules that native users of that dialect follow. Furthermore, peer tutors need to understand that *all* languages, not just dialects, are “random” and arbitrary; therefore, the expectations of college writing are equally arbitrary. For example, why do periods go inside quotation marks in dialogue, but come after the parenthesis when using a quote with a parenthetical citation? It’s not “right” or “good” or “correct;” it’s an arbitrary rule. I hypothesize that by highlighting the arbitrary nature of the norms of college writing, peer tutors can help remove the stigma of being an outsider who is still learning these rules. I have found myself saying during tutoring sessions, “Look, I know it’s weird, but that’s an expectation of college writing, so now that you know, you can decide if you want to do that or not.” Often students are surprised and empowered by not only gaining knowledge that doesn’t come at the expense of their confidence, but also by having a choice of how to apply that learning.

Language Police: Tutor Buy-in to Standard American English

One requirement of becoming a peer tutor is previous educational success, which is often, though not always, predicated on a mastery of Standard

American English. As communications scholar Shanti Bruce describes, “tutors may be considered employable only if they speak and write with a minimal level of accent, and in some writing centers, even a minimal written accent is seens as suspect” (2016, p. 81). Because their success has usually required peer tutors to master Standard American English and because so many college faculty’s rubrics penalize deviations from Standard American English, there is a built-in incentive for tutors to apply a prescriptivist lens to student writing. If this underlying assumption is not interrogated, peer tutors can become enforcers of unjust standards. Therefore, intentional discussions need to be had to avoid the “language policing,” and a discussion of prescriptivism vs. descriptivism, as well as an overview of the language standardization process are frameworks within which to hold these intentional discussions.

Descriptivism vs. Prescriptivism in Tutoring Contexts

While linguists and peer tutors have different goals in working with language—linguists want to understand language itself and peer tutors want to help student understand how to use language to reach their goals—an understanding of the difference between a descriptive approach to language and a prescriptive approach is critical to avoid language policing in peer tutoring sessions. Sociolinguists Wardhaugher and Fuller (2015) define a descriptive approach to language as, “a systematic analysis of the structure of a language as it is spoken in a particular group” (p. 402). They continue to describe a prescriptivist approach to language as, “the view that one variety of language is inherently correct and that this way of speaking ought to be imposed on all speakers of that language” (Wardhaugher & Fuller, 2015, p. 414). In other words, prescriptivists study language as it is without judgment while descriptivists are interested in forcing language to be used in certain “correct” ways.

If the ultimate goal of college is to develop flexible, critical thinkers, a descriptivist approach to language better encourages critical inquiry around the impact of language choices. Prescriptivism requires a familiarity with a set of rules about Standard American English: for example, an understanding of how a comma functions differently than a semicolon and a colon. Descriptivism, on the other hand, requires an understanding of what language choices are being made and what impact those choices have on a given audience: for example, how would the use of code meshing Black language and Standard Americans English in an research essay about police brutality against Black Americans impact a reader differently than that same code meshing in an research essay about the environmental impact of overfishing? How might code meshing be received differently if it appears only in the introduction, body paragraph, or conclusion of an essay? Or if it appears throughout the essay? How might the impact of code meshing change based on the genre of writing assigned? Or the linguistic resources of the course instructor? Clearly, the answers to the descriptivist questions require more critical thinking than the prescriptivist approach, which requires the memorization of the rules of punctuation.

While a descriptists framework is most appropriate to create a fruitful learning environment, it is important to note that there are appropriate levels of prescriptivism in a learning community, such as not allowing hate speech, racial slurs, and other forms of harmful language. In tutoring contexts, this line of unacceptable language is generally established by a code of student conduct.

The Illusive Nature of Standard Language

Pinning a linguist down on the definition of Standard American English is difficult, often resulting in the confusing response that it’s a myth or a nonexistent, idealized form of language. In her book *English with an Accent,* Rosina Lippi-Green likens Standard American English to a unicorn: we can all describe a unicorn, and everyone generally agrees on its characteristics, but that doesn’t make a unicorn a real animal. The goal of this characterization might be to undermine the power of Standard American English by proving that it, like the monster you feared under your bed as a child, isn’t real.

I believe that while this metaphor is accurate, it is also an unhelpful characterization for those new to the study of language because it fails to emphasize the significant impact that the myth of Standard American English has over our language use. Imagine someone believes themselves to have been kicked in the head by a unicorn; sitting them down to explain that it was really just a white horse isn’t nearly as helpful as getting them checked for a concussion. Therefore, I believe that the comparison of Standard American English to race is a more apt characterization; race (like Standard American English) is a social rather than biological (linguistic) construction, but even as a social construction, it has a huge impact on a person’s life.

The multiple definitions of Standard American English are combined with some characterizations of the language standardization process to offer peer tutors a firm grounding in how Standard American English is understood by linguists. Most of Lippi-Green's definitions of Standard American English circle around the idea that Standard American English is based on what is taught in school and widely presented in the media (p. 57-61). According to Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015), "Standardization refers to the process by which a language has been codified in some way. That process usually involves the development of such things as grammars, spelling books, and dictionaries, and possibly a literature" (p. 33). These two definitions link Standard American English to education, but don't strongly emphasize the role of power in what is perceived to be the standard, as Patricia Bizzell (2002) does. Bizzel writes, "at any given time [Standard American English's] most standard or widely accepted features reflect the cultural preferences of the most powerful people in the community" (as cited in Condon & Olson, 2016, p. 39). While having the power to influence to educational standards are implicit in the Wardhaugh and Fuller definition of standardization and in Lippi-Green's definitions of Standard American English, Bizzell's explicit reference to power is critical in understanding how Standard American English excludes and disempowers English speakers who deviate from the Standard. By understanding the language standardization process as a linguistic manifestation of social, political, and economic power, peer tutors will be primed to explore the biases inherent in "Standard American English" in unit three.

Language and Identity & Language Bias

> …white linguistic and cultural hegemony that advances the needs, self-interests and racial privileges of whites at the expense of linguistically marginalized communities of color. —April Baker-Bell, 2020, p. 16

The goal of this unit of the curriculum is to establish the stakes by illuminating the connection between language and identity and to draw attention to the realities of language bias in higher education in the United States. According to communications scholar Shanti Bruce (2016), language is closely related to personal identity. Language use is deeply personal, and asking students to adopt the conventions of Standard American English can be a rejection of the identity and lived experiences of users of Black language and users of American English as an additional language. Furthermore, rejection of the "other" cannot be separated from rejection of the language of the other: "... there are critical linkages between the identification of linguistic difference as a fundamental difference, the racialization of an Other, and the operations of linguistic supremacy over and against that Other" (Condon & Olson, 2016, p. 45). Ultimately, the promise that conformity to Standard American English will create opportunity is hollow due to the underlying forces of racism and xenophobia.

For users of Black language, the intersectionality of linguistic bias and racism must not be ignored. According to Baker-Bell (2021), "...without analyzing language through the lens of race and racism, we ignore how linguistic violence and racial violence go hand-in-hand … children of color's experience navigating and negotiating language will be impacted by the interlocking systems and structures of longuisicism, racism, classism, which are interrelated and continuously shaping one another" (Baker-Bell, 2020, p. 16). As chapter one's subsection "History of Language Eradication in the U.S." introduced, the stigma around Black language is rooted in the stigma around Blackness itself. According to academic Michael Eric Dyson, "Every conversation about Black speech is a conversation about Black intelligence and ultimately Black humanity" (as cited in Baker-Bell, 2020, p. 11). If we say that Black language does not belong in college spaces, what does that say about the belonging of Black students?

According to second language writing specialist Michelle Cox (2016), fixing grammar "...implies that a written accent—indicated by such markers as missing or incorrect articles, pluralization, verb endings, and prepositions—should not remain on the page, though written accent can be seen as a display of identity" (p. 60). Ultimately, asking students to edit out their dialect is well meant, but harmful. Many tutors believe that helping a student "polish" their writing will create academic success: "...many of the tutors wrested with their belief that they job was to assist multilingual students to earn their access and opportunity by normalizing their identities—by helping multilingual writers perceive, feel and think, read, write, and speak as if there were 'white,' 'American' (in the case of international student-writers) native speakers of American academic Englishes" (Condon & Olson, 2016, p. 39). However, research indicates that this is an unreasonable goal:

> ESL students can become very fluent writers of English, but they may never become indistinguishable from a native speaker, and it is unclear

> why they should. A current movement among ESL writing teachers is to argue that, beyond a certain level of proficiency in English writing, it is not the students’ texts that need to change; rather it is the native-speaking readers and evaluators (particularly in educational institutions) that need to learn to read more broadly, with a more cosmopolitan, less parochial eye. The infusion of life brought by these ESL students’ different perspectives on the word can only benefit a pluralistic society which is courageous enough truly to embrace its definition of itself. —Ilona Leki as cited in Cox, 2016, p. 67

In a context where there are more users of English as an additional language than there are native speakers of American English—let alone those who tend to adhere to the conventions of Standard American English—all users English should be prepared to actively participate as listeners and readers of content created by people who use English as an additional language, people who use a variety of World English, and people who communicate with nonstandard dialects of American English. The power of Standard American English has historically placed the burden of communication on the shoulders of the person using a less powerful language variety, and higher education should be undermining rather than replicating this burden.

Some scholars assert that “fixing” student writing is sometimes appropriate in high-stakes writing like with resumes, application essays and scholarship essays (Cox, 2016, p. 60). However, this “fixing” “send[s] the message that only native-like English is valued, and writing in native-like English is an unattainable goal for most L2 students without the help of an English L1 writer" (Cox, 2016, p. 60). Baker-Bell describes how Black students are de-incentivized from attempting to learn the conventions of Standard American English because there is no benefit to them in a deeply racist system:

> If y'all actually believe that using 'standard English' will dismantle white supremacy, then you not paying attention! If we, as teachers, truly believe that code-switching will dismantle white supremacy, we have a problem. If we honestly believe that code-switching will save Black people's lives, then we really ain't paying attention to what's happening in the world. Eric Garner was choked to death by a police officer while saying "I cannot breathe." Would you consider "I cannot breathe" "standard English" syntax? (p. 5)

Baker-Bell's point is that accommodating racist linguistic standards will not end racism; directing a black student how to employ Standard American English in a resume will not benefit them if, during the interview, a biased employer discriminates against them. Why then, are we asking students to reject a very personal part of their identity if the rejection doesn't guarantee the desired outcome?

Likewise, empirical studies suggest that the promise of attaining success through mastering Standard American English does not hold true for people who use American English as an additional language in academia; numerous studies show that racism and xenophobia affect college student's listening comprehension. Rubin (1992) conducted three studies examining undergraduate student attitudes regarding teaching assistants who use American English as an additional language. In one study, a White, native speaker of American English from Ohio who was studying speech communication recorded two lectures, one focusing on a physical science topic and the on humanities. These two recordings were each paired with two pictures of the “instructor” who was giving the lecture, one was a White woman and the other was a Chinese woman. Despite the fact that the audio was recorded by the same speaker, students who heard the lectures paired with the photo of the Chinese “instructor” responded that they heard a nonstandard accent and, most significantly, scored lower on a comprehension test than those who listened to the same lectures paired with the White “instructor” (Rubin, 1992). These students were not reacting to any existing accent, but to their own expectations of an accent from a non-White “foreign” body. Based on the results of this study, Rubin (1992) concluded that “even vigorous pronunciation training for NNSTAs [teaching assistants who use American English as an additional language] will matter little. Ethnically Asian instructors who speak SAE [Standard American English] apparently confront similar dysfunctional attitudes as those who do speak with marked nonnative [English] accents” (510). In other words, when a listener expects that a speaker has an accent based on their skin color or country of birth, that listener hears an accent regardless of whether or not an accent is actually present. Importantly, the undergraduate students who were best able to understand accent speech were those who had enrolled in classes with other teaching assistants who used American English as an additional language. The issue of accent in higher education is clearly a result of racism and xenophobia rather than actual lingustic factors, and no amount of training on speaking in Standard American English will solve this issue.

Communicating Across Difference

The goal of this unit of the curriculum is to build peer tutors' communicative repertoire by reframing the responsibilities of speakers and listeners, exploring several distinctive and challenging aspects of American English pronunciation, and to practice specific strategies for communicating across difference. The ultimate goal is to encourage "grit" when encountering unfamiliar accents.

The unit begins with pre-work to help students build awareness of their own accent using *The New York Times'* Dialect quiz and a series of reflection questions that help students evaluate their accent as it relates to Standard American English and how this relationship (dis)empowers them during tutoring sessions (Katz & Andrews, 2013). Then the presentation transitions to key concepts related to pronunciation including segmentals, suprasegmentals, stress, rhythm, stress-timed language, syllable-timed language, allophones, relative functional load, and the American English Color Vowel chart. The goal of introducing tutors to these topics is to build awareness around areas of linguistic difference that can be challenging for students who use American English as an additional language and to generate empathy for the challenges unique to acquiring American English. Next, suggestions are made for ways for students to improve their listening repertoire by gaining exposure to challenging or unfamiliar accents. The post-work involves students listening to samples of English from the International Dialects of English Archive and applying some of the concepts introduced in the unit to their evaluation of an unfamiliar dialect of English.

Student-Empowering Tutoring Techniques

While there is a great deal of literature around peer tutoring techniques as well as code meshing and translanguaging pedagogy, there have been relatively few publications dealing with the implementation of code meshing and translanguaging in college peer tutoring contexts where the tutor and student might not have a shared language aside from English to collaborate in. Furthermore, most of the code meshing and translanguaging literature focuses on classroom policies and assignment structure, over which peer tutors have no control. The majority of the techniques that will be covered in this unit have been reimagined from a classroom context to peer tutoring context, manifested from theory into concrete strategies, or been employed in my own tutoring sessions. The seven tutoring techniques in this unit include using an asset-based approach to multilingualism and dialect variation, scaffolding new processes/concepts with a student’s first language/dialect, normalizing confusion, naming the productive struggle, (re)framing academic standards as arbitrary, evaluating assignment stakes, and (re)framing academic standards as a choice.

An asset-based approach to multilingualism and dialect variation requires intentionally acknowledging the linguistic resources students bring with them and encouraging pride in these resources. During my tutoring sessions, students will commonly say that writing well in English is difficult because English is not their first language or they don't use "good" English at home. This is an opportunity to address the internalized deficit mindset by reminding students that their voice is unique and important, and that good ideas don't just happen in "good" English.

Identifying processes or concepts that can be scaffolded by a multilingual student's first language/dialect can help them concretely leverage their language assets. Many steps in the writing process can easily be scaffolded by their first language, such as brainstorming or drafting in a first language. For subject-based tutoring, having students explain new concepts in their native language can be a good way to assess learning even if the peer tutor doesn't understand the student's first language since body language can help distinguish a speaker who is confidently explaining an idea from a speaker who is confused or uncertain.

Normalizing confusion can help students feel less behind or like outsiders in a learning community; remind students that the Tutoring and Writing Centers exist to serve all students, even those who speak English as a native language, and that those students also come in for help. Needing support does not mean that a student is behind or that they don't belong; it means they were smart enough to ask for help when they felt they needed it.

The productive struggle describes the moments when students struggle to grasp a new concept and persevere through that discomfort (Productive struggle & math rigor, n.d.). Highlighting and normalizing these moments can encourage students to work through them so that they are not derailed by confusion in the future. Another way to frame the productive struggle is "the power of yet," meaning that a student doesn’t know how to do X *yet*, but they can learn in the future if they work through the awkward, vulnerable stage of not-knowing.

If all language is arbitrary, then academic standards around writing must be too. Letting students know that what their instructors are asking them to do isn’t “right” or “good,” but just what is expected in this context, can help minimize the embarrassment or anxiety some students feel at not already knowing the standards. Why does MLA not want a “p.” in in-text citations, but APA does? It’s arbitrary.

Evaluating the stakes can help inform how much attention is given to grammar during a writing tutoring session. Tutors should look at any rubrics to see how important “edited” grammar is (Cox, 2016, p. 66). Knowing instructor’s policies on grammar can help guide how much editing of written accent is required (Cox, 2016, p. 67).

Building on an understanding that academic standards are arbitrary and that the stakes of a given assignment may vary, peer tutors can empower students to make choices about what language resources they want to employ.

Student Attitudes Toward Linguistic Justice Tutoring Strategies

One tension that exists in peer tutoring is the occasional mismatch of student expectations and tutoring philosophy. Many of the negative attitudes that American academic culture holds regarding students who use nonstandard dialects and who use American English as an additional language have been internalized by these students. Employing linguistic justice practices might meet resistance from students

The use of translanguaging and code meshing strategies will likely contribute to the existing tension between tutoring praxis and student expectations. In a study examining the use of translanguaging during tutoring sessions, writing center professional Kevin Dovrak (2016) outlined three categories of possible responses from tutors, students, staff and community members: some will actively advocate for a multilingual approach that incorporates translanguaging, others will try to maintain an English-only status quo, and the final group will have ambivalence about translanguaging (p. 103). While a number of students found using their L1 helpful during sessions in the writing center, others felt that it was taking away the opportunity to practice their English or slowing down their learning process (pp. 111-117). In her examination of student's use of Spanish in a Puerto Rican college writing center, Bruce (2016) found that students have complicated opinions about the use of English; some saw the use of English as tool for economic and social mobility while others felt that using English was a capitulation to colonialism and a rejection of Puerto Rican identity. Other students held both beliefs simultaneously. Ultimately, students do not expect to take notes in their L1 or explain a concept back to the tutor in their L1, and students may find the prospect undesirable.

Baker-Bell (2020) characterized the multifaceted relationship between Blackness and Black language: "Internalized anti-Blackness is REAL and it will have you on the frontlines reinforcing a system of White supremacy and upholding racist policies and practices…" (p. 6). Baker-Bell continues to lament the impact of Black teacher's anti-Black sentiments on White teachers, who see such comments “as justifications for racist language policies, practices pedagogies, and classrooms” (p. 7). While Black stakeholders might reject code-meshing due to the stigma around Black language, it is nonetheless important to offer students choices. While research does support the efficacy of a translingual and code-meshing approach, it runs counter to many of the language and language acquisition myths people take for granted (Dovrak, 2016, p. 118). It, therefore, makes sense that tutors should be prepared to explain the benefits of translanguaging or code meshing, but also let the student they are tutoring decide if they want to try that approach or not. Ongoing support, reflection and collaboration will be required on the part of peer tutors in order to successfully navigate these moments of disconnect and decision.

Conclusion

Chapter two introduced the existing literature that has informed the development of the training curriculum, including monolinguistic ideologies, the current equity gap in higher education, the CCC’s resolution on Students’ Right to Their Own Language, myths about language, descriptivist and prescriptivist approaches to language, the language standardization process, the intersections between language and identity and language bias, and translanguaging, code meshing and other student-empowering tutoring techniques. Chapter three outlines the specific nature of the curriculum and training structure.

CHAPTER THREE

Introduction

Chapter three outlines the context that gave rise to this project, the structure of the training, an overview of the curriculum, the timeline for its delivery and how its efficacy was evaluated.

Research Questions

- How have the monolingual language policies of the U.S. education system encouraged linguistic biases?
- How might linguistic biases lead to inequitable outcomes for students who use American English as an additional language and students who communicate with dialect markers from Black English?
- What training and education can be provided to peer tutors to critically reflect on and begin to address these inequities while tutoring peers in a college context?

Project Context

This project aims to address an existing gap in training for peer tutors in the Writing and Tutoring Centers. Currently, the peer tutor training for each program is designed by the staff who run the program, such as the Tutoring Center director, the Writing Center coordinator, the STEM Pass Coordinator, or the Humanities PASS coordinator. Some trainings are utilized by multiple programs, and currently the Writing Center coordinator is working to develop a video training library that student workers can access during their work shifts if no students want to meet with them.

The majority of the training and professional development for Tutoring Center and Writing Center peer tutors and PASS leaders occurs in one-to-two hour training blocks in the first week of a fall or spring semester. Most of the trainings are led synchronously over Zoom by staff supervisors, but some trainings have been recorded and posted on a D2L training site for tutors to complete independently and asynchronously. Support throughout the semester is provided through weekly meetings with the student's staff manager; each program has a slightly different structure and emphasis due to the differences in roles and responsibilities related to each program. The Tutoring Center director meets with peer tutors informally to discuss training topics, how their sessions went, reminders about documentation, events, timesheets, and upcoming holidays, as well as adjusting hours, vacations, sick time, covid policies (Cook, 2022). Weekly, hour-long check-ins with the Writing Center coordinator are student-driven and focus on the highs and lows of specific tutoring sessions (Fairgrieve, 2021). They also include informal, relationship-building conversation and any important updates from the college (Fairgrieve, 2021). PASS leaders in the STEM program do weekly, fifteen-minute check-ins with the STEM PASS coordinator and a 30-minute group meeting with the coordinator and PASS leaders in related classes for brainstorming, learning new activities, team building, Q & A, and important reminders (Person, 2022). Likewise, the humanities PASS coordinators meet with their supervisor weekly to discuss successes, new strategies, attendance and marketing strategies (Nordlie, 2022). While some Tutoring and Writing Centers will offer a for-credit training course for peer tutors, my college currently has no-such option.

The majority of the peer tutor trainings for the Tutoring Center is determined by the certification requirements of the College Reading & Learning Association (CRLA). Prior to the pandemic, the Tutoring Center had received CRLA's International Tutor Training Program Certification (ITTPC), but its membership has since lapsed. Regardless of membership status, the peer tutor training was designed around ITTPC's requirements. The ITTPC offers three levels of tutor certification, with level I as the foundational training and level 3 as the expert training (*ITTPC certification*, n.d.). One major flaw of the levels of certification for ITTPC is that only one ethics and/or equity training is required at each of it's three tutor certification levels; this is contrast with level 1's four required tutoring "basics" sessions, two "communications" topics, two "studying and learning" trainings, and one elective (*ITTPC certification*, n.d.). The proposed ethics/equity topic for level 1 certification are "Compliance with the Privacy Act (FERPA), Professional Ethics (Academic Integrity and Academic Honesty, Copyright Compliance, Plagiarism), and Title IX and/or Sexual Harassment" (*ITTPC certification*, n.d.). No true equity topic is suggested at level 1, and even if they were, FERPA training would take precedence for peer tutor training since they have access to students' academic records. At level 2, the ITTPC proposes "Race, Class, and Privilege" as a one-hour training topic, and at level 3, they suggest an equity training on implicit bias (*ITTPC certification*, n.d.). The

ITTPC's requirements de-emphasize work on diversity, equity, inclusion and linguistic justice for peer tutors, which has incentivised tutoring programs to limit time dedicated to these critical topics. Due to these flaws in ITTPC's framework as well as budget and time constraints, the Writing Center does not plan to seek ITTPC approval for its tutors. Both Centers, however, are interested in adding a linguistic justice component to their trainings.

The Peer Tutors

Student workers in the Writing and Tutoring Centers work between six and 20 hours a week. They are selected based on a number of factors, including instructor recommendations, grades in the classes they're tutoring, and a friendly, positive demeanor. Generally, the peer tutors are required to be enrolled in a minimum of six courses to be eligible to tutor, but exceptions are granted on a case-by-case basis.

Training Structure

The curriculum for this project was shaped by the two opposing forces of the expansive, revolutionary nature of linguistic justice praxis and the practical constraints of time and funding. All peer tutors must balance work and school, and many have additional obligations including second jobs, internships, family responsibilities, as well as the challenges of everyday life in a pandemic. As a result, making time for additional trainings can be a real challenge. From the administrative side, every hour of training is paid time for student workers, as it should be, but this makes such a program expensive to implement. For these reasons, this curriculum would ideally be a series of videos, readings, and activities that students could view and work through independently when their work time is not booked with students. However, linguistic justice is an intellectually difficult topic because it calls into question many closely held assumptions about language use. Furthermore, linguistic justice is inextricably linked to racial justice, descrimintion, xenophobia, identity issues, and other emotionally charged topics. Additionally, this curriculum is asking students to examine a system that has benefited them; as peer tutors, they are academically successful and as a result, they are more likely to accept the status quo. Peer tutoring is often framed as a collaborative learning effort between a more advanced student and a less proficient student, which can lead to a deficit-minded and unjust model if the meanings of “more” and “less” proficient are not interrogated and contextualized (Sanford, 2021). As a result of all of these factors, I decided to first deliver this curriculum as in-person workshops, and after their delivery, evaluate if they might be successfully adapted into independent learning or a flipped classroom model.

Curriculum Overview

The five units of the linguistic justice curriculum are designed to balance theory and practice so that peer tutors have a clear understanding of the necessity of this work as well as the practical skills necessary to accomplish it. All units were created using a backwards design template.

Unit one introduces the contemporary equity gaps in higher education, provides an overview of the historical context that created these inequities, and introduces linguistic justice as one aspect of the solution to inequitable outcomes in higher education.

Unit two provides an overview of the linguistic principles required to call into question many faulty assumptions about language that must be examined in order to achieve linguistic justice. These principles include: the arbitrary nature of language, the standardization process, the equal validity and utility of all languages and dialects, that the classification of “good” and “bad” English is a social rather than linguistic construction, and the exclusionary nature of Standard American English.

Unit three explores the connection between language and identity, as well as the intersectionality of language bias with xenophobia, racism and other forms of discrimination. In this unit, peer tutors will explore the harm created by telling students that the language they use is most appropriate for nonacademic and nonprofessional contexts. They will also be introduced to research-based counter arguments to the assumption that using the “right” English creates opportunities for students who use American English as an additional language or students who use nonstandard dialects of American English.

Unit four focuses on the praxis of listening across difference; peer tutors will build an awareness of some uniquely challenging features of American English and learn some techniques for communicating effectively across dialects as both a listener and speaker.

Unit five describes student-empowering tutoring techniques based on code-meshing, translanguaging, and other asset-based frameworks.

Timeline

These trainings were developed and implemented during the Spring 2021 semester. The trainings were delivered synchronously weekly over Zoom, with some pre-work and reflection for each unit completed independently. Materials were emailed directly to participating peer tutors and hosted on the Tutoring Center's learning management system, D2L.

Assessment

The effectiveness of the training was evaluated based on multiple qualitative measures that engage the project stakeholders, including Tutoring and Writing Center staff, peer tutors, and students who use the Tutoring and Writing Centers. Throughout the training, Tutoring and Writing Center staff evaluated the efficacy of activities based on peer tutor engagement in activities as well as peer tutor performance on formative assessment measures built into the curriculum, including weekly discussion posts and emails. Additionally, a summative assessment encouraged students to reflect on their learning and growth throughout training,

Peer tutors were provided a pre- and post-curriculum survey evaluating their attitudes toward language difference and appropriate peer tutoring strategies. After completing the post-curriculum survey, peer tutors drafted a reflection on any shifts in attitude that resulted from the training. Informal evaluation questions were also integrated into the weekly one-on-one meetings between peer tutors and their supervisors to assess student's attitudes about the pacing, clarity and relevance of the curriculum.

In order to measure student’s attitudes toward the incorporation of code-meshing, translanguaging, and other asset-based tutoring strategies outlined in the curriculum, explicit questions about the activities they engaged in during a tutoring session and their perceived relevance and usefulness were added to the post-tutoring session surveys that students receive following a tutoring session.

All of this data was compiled and compared to the learning outcomes outlined in each unit to evaluate the curriculum’s strengths and necessary revisions.

Conclusion

The five-unit curriculum was delivered synchronously over Zoom in the Spring of 2021, with some work completed independently before and after each training. The efficacy of the curriculum was evaluated based on input from staff, peer tutors, and students receiving tutoring from peer tutors who completed the training. This data was compared to the learning objectives established for each individual unit. The discussion of the program’s effectiveness and needed revisions is elucidated in chapter four.

CHAPTER FOUR

Introduction

Chapter four outlines the major learnings from this project, reviews the key literature that my project built upon, offers next steps for others interested in linguistic justice, and communicates the benefits of the project to myself, my community and the field of education.

Research Questions

- How have the monolingual language policies of the U.S. education system encouraged linguistic biases?
- How might linguistic biases lead to inequitable outcomes for students who use American English as an additional language and students who communicate with dialect markers from Black English?
- What training and education can be provided to peer tutors to critically reflect on and begin to address these inequities while tutoring peers in a college context?

Major Learnings

This project was a major learning experience for me as I was attempting to explain complex linguistic concepts that I am still grappling with myself to people totally unfamiliar with the field of applied linguistics. I was nervous about how this training would be received by participants, but overwhelmingly, the feedback has been positive. There are, of course, opportunities for improvement, but many participants have expressed an interest in sharing the concepts of linguistic justice with others. For example, three tutors who participated in the training were also working as editors for the college's literary magazine, and they invited me to present an overview of the concepts of linguistic justice to their fellow editors. The three students followed my overview with their own reflections about how the principles they learned in the training for peer tutors could help inform their work on the literary magazine. This invitation felt like a huge success when it was offered, and when I heard what the peer tutors took from the training, I was so proud of how thoughtfully and deeply they engaged with the concepts.

One theme that emerged from the training evaluation was how this training impacted not just how students will tutor, but how they interact with others. One student wrote, "The learning objectives were not just relevant to peer tutoring. The learning objectives also made us all think about how we treat people and engage with them in regards to our preconceived notions of what monolingual [language] ideology creates." This student is clearly applying their new understanding of monolingual language ideology to a broader setting than just peer tutoring. Another student reflected on how this training helped them grow as a person: "My perception of what proper language means, how language is not only a tool, but can also be used as a weapon is an eye-opener. I feel that this course made me change as a person in some ways— for the better."

> There was so much value in reflecting on how we have come to this point, linguistically speaking. I feel that the evolution of language (specifically English and American dialects of English) was presented well. It makes sense that to understand how we have come to accept these grammar

> rules now, we must know how it all started— and by whom. Emily did a fantastic job of setting the linguistic foundation for what was to come as the weeks progressed. The most valuable concept that was discussed was how a monolingual ideology can disenfranchise groups of people from opportunities in the classroom and beyond. I will now remember that there is value in language in all its forms and will be more aware of whether I am judging someone when they deviate from the norm.

This statement was especially meaningful to me, as it came from a student who initially resisted the idea that education's single-minded focus on Standard American English could be harmful for students (Young, 2018). To see her transition from someone who was unsure about these concepts to a fierce advocate for them was inspiring.

Everyone who completed the training was asked to reflect on how confident they felt with each of the units' learning objectives, and all self-reported their confidence as satisfactory or higher on a 5-point likert scale which included the options of poor, fair, satisfactory, good, or excellent. The unit with the most "satisfactory" answers was unit five, in which students began learning how to connect the abstract concepts of linguistic justice with practical applications in tutoring, and I believe that adding specific role plays into this unit would improve student's confidence with these techniques, per one students' feedback: "Maybe include some practice on how to include the skills and techniques that we learned in tutoring sessions. These are very important topics and when working with students, I don't want it to feel like I'm experimenting on a student by trying out concepts and techniques that I just learned.” I did offer to extend the training one additional week to provide this opportunity for these students, but with finals looming, the students declined this opportunity.

One student requested more visuals to be incorporated into the training: ”The pictures really helped solidify some of the more compact ideas;if possible [sic], I believe adding a little bit more to give a visual representation of some more topics would make the presentation even better!” While the concept of visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles has been largely discredited, research has shown that information presented through a variety of media can reinforce learning, and I believe that adding more visuals could help concretize some of our more abstract concepts (Stanford, 2021). I plan to add more visuals to the curriculum over the summer semester in 2022.

While I attempted to make my training and website accessible to all students by following best practices outlined by my college’s Office for Students with Disabilities, one of my reading assignments, Gloria Anzaldúa's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue," (Anzaldúa, 1987) received some pushback from a student since it was written in part in Spanish, and asking some students with disabilities who do not speak Spanish to use Google translate could create an undue barrier to them accessing the reading. While I stand behind the course’s use of multilingual texts, I acknowledge that I should have included an annotated version of the text with translations for some students with certain learning differences. Creating an accessible annotated version of the text will be another summer project for me.

The one-hour length training time was a limiting factor; quiet time is needed for participants to be able to process new information, and due the the overwhelming amount of content in each hour, I think I did a disservice to participants and would recommend lengthening each training session to an hour and thirty minutes. Furthermore, given that this training required participants to opt-in, a participant bias was created. That is, students who were interested in this topic and ready to commit time to learn about it were the only participants. If, however, this is presented as mandatory training, I believe that a minimum of two hours would be required to allow for space for more pushback, negotiation and discussion.

Literature Review

The four most important works that I drew upon specifically for this project were

Writing Centers and the New Racism: A Call for Sustainable Dialogue and Change edited by Laura Greenfield and Karen Rowan, *Other People's English: Code-Meshing, Code-Switching and African American Literacy* by Vershawn Ashanti Young, Rusty Barrett, Y'Shanda Young-Rivera, *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy* by April Baker-Bell, and *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States* by Rosina Lippi-Green. In addition to these works, however, I also incorporated materials and resources from a number of classes I took as part of my Master's program, including Language and Society, Linguistics for Language Teachers, Advanced Linguistics, Phonetics and Phonology, Assessment in Adult Education, and Course Design for Adult ESL Courses.

Next Steps

I believe that there is a great deal of possibility for expansion and adaptation of this training. I hope to continue to refine and streamline materials for use in future semesters for Normandale peer tutors and PASS leaders. Additionally, I am interested in exploring how these concepts can be adapted to meet the needs of a variety of audiences at my college including staff and faculty, as well as audiences beyond my specific context. I have distributed my materials to the Writing Center Professionals of the Midwest professional group and contacted Literacy Minnesota’s training director. Furthermore, one of my peer reviewers has expressed interest in using this training for her adult basic education staff. At this point, I believe that the curriculum is a starting point that can be improved through refining and adapting by different instructors in different contexts.

Communicating Results and Benefits

This training will be featured as an equity accomplishment in my department’s end-of-year report, and I hope that this helps raise its profile on campus so that I can continue to advocate for students who communicate in nonstandard dialects. A new page of testimonials was added to the website to help communicate the value of the training to others.

Sharing the Curriculum

This project is published on Google Sites under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. This means that my materials are able for use and adaptation by anyone so long as the following conditions are met:

1. Credit for the original materials is given to Emily Livingston and changes from the original are noted
2. The materials may not be used for commercial purposes
3. Any adaptations are made available to the public under the same license

My hope is that this encourages others to adapt my materials in a way that will be useful for their specific context. Additionally, because there has been interest in adapting this project for new audiences, including faculty and student affairs, I plan to expand the site to include adapted materials for these other audiences.

Conclusions

Ultimately, I believe that these materials address a significant gap in equity professional development for Minnesota State and a gap in linguistic justice theory in the areas of peer and professional tutoring. The concepts of linguistic justice are critical for all people working in education to be aware of, and I believe that the resources I've drawn together and the lesson plans I've established can offer a starting place for others who are interested in doing this work in their own learning communities.

REFERENCES

About U.S. English. (n.d.). U.S. English. Retrieved February 6, 2022, from https://www.usenglish.org/about-us/

Anzaldua, G. (1987). How to Tame a Wild Tongue. In *Borderlands La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. Pp. 53-64. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Baker-Bell, A. (with Smitherman, G.). (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. NCTE-Routledge Research Series.

Baese-Berk, M. M. (2019, April 3). *A linguist's trick to perfectly understanding people with different accents*. Quartz. Retrieved February 17, 2022, from https://qz.com/1586592/a-linguists-trick-to-perfectly-understanding-accented-speakers/

Beres, A. M. (2015). An overview of translanguaging: 20 years of 'giving voice to those who do not speak'. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 1(1), 103-118.

Blake, R., & Cutler, C. (2003). AAE and variation in teachers' attitudes: A question of school philosophy? *Linguistics and Education*, 14(2), 163-194. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(03)00034-2

Bruce, S. (2016). El centro de competencias de la comunicacion and the fraught status of English. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *Tutoring second language writers* (pp. 78-97). Utah State University Press.

Cook, B. (2022, February 3). Weekly check ins [E-mail to the author].

Condon, F., & Olson, B. (2016). Building a house for linguistic diversity. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *Tutoring second language writers* (pp. 27-52). Utah State University Press.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2014). *Students' right to their own language*. Conference on College Composition and Communication. Retrieved February 6, 2022, from https://cdn.ncte.org/nctefiles/groups/cccc/newsrtol.pdf

Cox, M. (2016). Identity construction, second language writers, and the writing center. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *Tutoring second language writers* (pp. 53-77). Utah State University Press.

Dvorak, K. (2016). Multilingual writers, multilingual tutors: Code-switching/mixing/meshing in the writing center. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *Tutoring second language writers* (pp. 101-122). Utah State University Press.

Echelberger, A. (Presenter). (2020, October 22). *Accent bias and discrimination in the United States.* Lecture presented at Literacy Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN, United States.

Exemptions and accommodations. (2020, July 5). U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Retrieved November 28, 2021, from https://www.uscis.gov/citizenship/exceptions-and-accommodations

Factbook 2021-2022. (2021). Normandale Community College. Retrieved December 11, 2021, from https://www.normandale.edu/factbook

Fairgrieve, A. (2021, December 14). *Weekly check ins* [E-mail to the author].

García, O. (2014). Theorizing translanguaging for educators*, Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators* (1-6). New York: The City University of New York.

General eligibility requirements. (2020, November 18). U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Retrieved November 28, 2021, from https://www.uscis.gov/citizenship/learn-about-citizenship/citizenship-and-naturalization/i-am-a-lawful-permanent-resident-of-5-years

Goal 1: Communication. (n.d.). Minnesota Transfer. Retrieved February 9, 2022, from

http://www.mntransfer.org/educators/mntc/goals/goal1.html

Gramley, S. (2012). *The history of English: An introduction.* Routledge.

Greenfield, L., & Rowan, K. (2011a). Beyond the "week twelve approach": Toward a critical pedagogy for antiracist tutor education. In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing Centers and the new racism: A call for sustainable dialogue and change* (pp. 124-149). Utah State University Press.

Greenfield, L., & Rowan, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Writing centers and the new racism: A call for sustainable dialogue and change*. Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgk6s

Hernández-Cháves, E. (2010). Language policy in the United States: A history of cultural genocide. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & R. Phillipson (Eds.). *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination* (141-158). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, Inc

ITTPC certification requirements. (n.d.). CRLA. Retrieved December 14, 2021, from https://www.crla.net/index.php/certifications/ittpc-international-tutor-training-program

Jackson, F. L., & Williamson-Ige, D. K. (1986). *White Students' Judgments of Education and Social Mobility of Black English Speakers*.

Katz, J., & Andrews, W. (2013, December 21). How y'all, youse and you guys talk. *New York Times*. Retrieved February 24, 2022, from https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/upshot/dialect-quiz-map.html

Krauss, M. (1992). *The world's languages in crisis*. Language, 68(1), 4-10. Linguistic Society of America. https://doi.org/10/1353/lan.1992.0052

Lee, E., Johnson, J. T., & Schreiber, B. R. (2022). Why linguistic justice, and why now? [Introduction]. In B. R. Schreiber, E. Lee, J. T. Johnson, & N. Fahim (Eds.), *Linguistic justice on campus: Pedagogy and advocacy for multilingual students* (pp. 1-16). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/SCHREI9493

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203348802

Livingston, E. (2021, August 6). The history of English [Video]. Youtube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kz3S2bSYpC0&t=912s&ab_channel=EmilyTutors%2CNormandaleCommunityCollege

Matthews, P. (2014). *The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Mihalicek, V., & Wilson, C. (Eds.). (2011). *Language files: Materials for an introduction to language and linguistics* (11th ed.). The Ohio State University Press.

Minnesota State. (n.d.). *About Minnesota State*. Minnstate. Retrieved December 11, 2021, from https://www.minnstate.edu/system/index.html

Minnesota State. (n.d.c). *Why Equity 2030?* Minnesota State. Retrieved January 22, 2022, from https://www.minnstate.edu/Equity2030/why.html

Mission, values & vision. (n.d.). Normandale Community College. Retrieved December 11,2021, from https://www.normandale.edu/why-normandale/mission-values-and-vision

NED course catalog. (n.d.). Minnesota State. Retrieved December 12, 2021, from https://www.minnstate.edu/system/asa/innovations/docs/NED%20Course%20Catalog.pdf

Nordlie, C. (2022, February 3). Weekly check ins [E-mail to the author].

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281-307. doi:10.1515/applirev-2015-0014

Person, T. (2022, February 3). Weekly check ins [E-mail to the author].

Rafoth, B. (2016). Second language writers, writing centers, and reflection. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *Tutoring second language writers* (pp. 5-23). Utah State University Press.

Research & Planning (2017-2021). *Course-Level Outcomes by Race/Ethnicity.* [unpublished raw data]. Normandale Community College.

Rubin. (1992). Nonlanguage Factors Affecting Undergraduates' Judgments of Nonnative English-Speaking Teaching Assistants. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(4), 511–531. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00973770

Sanford, D. R. (2021). T*he Rowman & Littlefield guide for peer tutors*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Sen. Hayakawa's speech. (n.d.). *U.S. English.* Retrieved November 28, 2021, from https://www.usenglish.org/legislation/hayakawa-speech/

Spartz, M., Waleag, N., Fontaine, E., & Green, M. (2019). College Readiness Academy: Increasing equity by removing barriers to higher education. MinneTESOL, 35(2). https://minnetesoljournal.org/journal-archive/mtj-2019-2/college-readiness-academy-increasing-equity-by-removing-barriers-to-higher-education/

Productive struggle & math rigor. (n.d.). ST Math. Retrieved February 24, 2022, from https://www.stmath.com/productive-struggle-math-rigor#:~:text=Productive%20struggle%20is%20the%20process,want%20them%20to%20give%20up.

Students' right to their own language (with bibliography). (2022). Conference on College Composition and Communication. Retrieved February 6, 2022, from https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/srtolsummary

Supplemental Instruction. (n.d.). University of Missouri - Kansas City. Retrieved December 12, 2021, from https://www.umkc.edu/asm/supplemental-instruction/index.html#

U.S. English efforts lead West Virginia to become 32nd state to recognize English as official language. (2016, March 5). *U.S. English*. Retrieved November 28, 2021, from https://www.usenglish.org/u-s-english-efforts-lead-west-virginia-to-become-32nd-state-to-recognize-english-as-official-language/

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Wiley Blackwell.

Wiggns, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Working at Normandale. (n.d.). Normandale Community College. Retrieved December 12, 2021, from https://www.normandale.edu/departments/human-resources/working-at-normandale

Yamamoto, A. Y. & Zepeda, O. (2004). Native American Languages. In E. Finegan & J. Rickford (Eds.). *Language in the USA: Themes for the twenty-first century* (153-181). Cambridge, UK: CUP.

Young, V. A. (2018). Are you part of the conversation? In V. A. Young, R. Barrett, Y. Young-Rivera, & K. B. Lovejoy (Authors), *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy* (pp. 1-11). Parlor Press.