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Rejoining the arguments presented in Charity Hudley, Mallinson, and Bucholtz’s (2020) target article responding to the Linguistic Society of America’s Statement on Race, we affirm calls for increased participation from diverse scholars and underscore the need for attention to racial perspectives in linguistic research. We argue that beyond position statements on race and increased diversity, antiracist scholarship requires transparent research subjectivities and an acknowledgment of the traditional privileging of certain positionalities and methodologies. Through discussions of current linguistic debates, our research trajectories, and the race-based perspectives in our work, we advocate for collaborative research in the creation of more nuanced scholarship to challenge social injustices within the academy and within our society.*
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1. Introduction. In response to conflicting models of racial classifications and the traditional lack of diversity within the field of linguistics, the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) published its official statement on the discussion and treatment of race within the field. The statement came as a result of a meeting among top scholars in the field who have dedicated their careers to the theorization of language and race. Calling upon their diverse training in fields across the social sciences, they developed the statement as a way to expand current race discussions introduced in those fields, which have long been ignored in linguistics. Explicitly, the statement calls for an inclusion of viewpoints from scholars of varied backgrounds and for the integration of methods practiced in a wider variety of disciplines that have been actively engaged in race theorization for quite some time. In this way, linguistics scholars will be able to address unexplored aspects of race as well as the inequality of viewpoints that are championed in the field.

In their target article responding to this statement, Anne Charity Hudley, Christine Mallinson, and Mary Bucholtz (2020) review the points presented by the LSA by identifying the ways that the social sciences and myriad language-related disciplines have handled conversations and treatment of race as models for the advancement of racial justice in linguistics. Moreover, they assert the need for race-related research to be recognized and promoted in language departments, and more critically, that this research be contributed by a more diverse body of scholars. To a certain degree, both the LSA statement and the response from Charity Hudley et al. serve as a call to action to the field of linguistics, which remains dominated by white middle-class cisgender male scholars, to actively engage with race theorization in the way that many linguists and other scholars of color have done for years. These works are a signal for the production of antiracist scholarship and departmental environments more capable of attracting and retaining scholars of color engaged in the study of linguistics.

There is no doubt that Charity Hudley et al. effectively illustrate the innumerable opportunities that would allow for the expansion of theory on race in linguistics, as well as the institutional constraints that have long prevented this growth. Indeed, both the LSA

*We would like to acknowledge our colleagues A. Jacqueline Toribio and Belem G. López for their tireless mentorship and for taking the time to read and re-read our work during our drafting and revision process.
and the aforementioned authors pinpoint numerous questions surrounding race that remain to be explored in linguistics. Nonetheless, we argue that to move beyond the questions that can be taken up to expand the study of race, linguistic theorists need to first evaluate the ways in which traditional research questions reproduce structural racisms that permeate social institutions across the Americas and beyond. Although an in-depth discussion of the ‘other language-related disciplines’ mentioned in the response by Charity Hudley et al. goes beyond the scope of this paper, we elaborate on the potential of merging educational approaches to language and race with those used in the field of linguistics, focusing on educational contexts as target sites of interest. Specifically, we argue that there is a need to incorporate a variety of perspectives (i.e. research subjectivities) and real-life experiences (i.e. responsive methodologies) in academic research in order to redress the theoretical gaps surrounding race in linguistics, and to resist the state of affairs present in the academy. Further, we argue that collaborative efforts among scholars of all backgrounds can allow for more nuanced understandings of race and thus aid in the production of antiracist scholarship.

With that aim, we (i) discuss a current debate in educational linguistics that explicates the ways that a lack of diverse perspectives can result in the perpetuation of hegemonic ideologies that often fail to create racially just scholarship despite having well-meaning goals. We then (ii) support an increase in diverse and interdisciplinary scholarship by elaborating on our own personal histories. We reveal the ways that theory on race was handled in our linguistic training, the means by which each of us began to incorporate integrative approaches into our research, and the benefits that this incorporation has granted our scholarship in revealing innovative information about race and language that would have been overlooked without the frameworks adopted. Moreover, responding to Charity Hudley et al.’s call for an interrogation of ‘the study of race and current forms of racial analysis within the discipline’ (p. e224), we (iii) discuss our own work, focusing on the ways that we invoke current practices taken up in critical race studies, education, and literacy studies to exemplify how antiracist theorization can be mobilized within linguistics.

2. The bilingual education debate: Framing our discussion in race-based perspectives. There are two possible explanations for the relatively limited attention given to race and racism perspectives in linguistic research (for previous work incorporating racial perspectives, see Hoover 1978, Spears 1999, 2009, Baugh 2005, Wolfram 2007, Hill 2008, Rickford 2014, Rosa & Flores 2017). First, for many scholars—who are often white, monolingual, and monoglossic—a lack of race-based knowledge may leave them unable to engage racial perspectives critically; second, some scholars (even those who inhabit racialized bodies) may be prone to underestimate the role of race relations and power structures in the production of specific linguistic forms due to the tendency to reduce these phenomena to more easily defined categories such as class, gender, or level of education (Omi & Winant 2014). While the first can be taken up in Charity Hudley et al.’s comments about the need for diversity and inclusion at all levels and ranks of linguistics as a profession, the second is more detrimental to the goal of producing antiracist scholarship. To be clear, neither the LSA statement nor the attendant response present a complete absence of race as a variable within the field of linguistics; rather, they point to a lack of an active and concerted integration of antiracist perspectives, which requires critical attention to the way that we theorize language production from racialized populations (for examples of scholars doing this work, see Smitherman 1986, Rickford & McNair-Knox 1994, Alim 2004, Mendoza-Denton 2008,
In this section, we present one of the most recent debates (otherwise known as a ‘Twitter beef’) that has emerged from the incorporation of racial frameworks in the analysis of a linguistic situation. In referencing this debate, we question whether antiracist position statements and racially diverse leadership in academic organizations are effective ways of creating more racially just scholarship in linguistics.

In the ensuing discussion, we present bilingual and multiliteracy studies as an area of research that often draws on ideas developed in linguistics and one that focuses on the language production of minoritized populations. Again, it is important to note that studies exploring bilingualism issue from departments and disciplines that Charity Hudley et al. correctly identify as providing positive models for the integration of race theory and a commitment to the support and advocacy of scholars of color—education and language teaching. A noted and applauded commitment to racial justice in organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the American Educational Research Association (AERA) has resulted in the designation by Charity Hudley et al. of these disciplines as models ‘for linking theoretical racial knowledge to the real-world contexts in which language users go about their day talking, writing, learning, and expressing themselves’ (p. e209). Nevertheless, while these disciplines have been more proactive in their incorporation of antiracist position statements, Charity Hudley et al. point out that even these disciplines suffer from varying forms of racism (p. e208). They further acknowledge that knowledge production regarding bilingualism and multiliteracies is often produced in fields with long histories of racism, such as psychology and cognition. The subsequent discussion attends to a debate that exists on the margins of education, cognition, and linguistics and illustrates what happens when critical race-based perspectives are introduced to challenge ‘well-intended’ research produced by academic authorities who have positioned themselves as antiracist. Though this review does not reveal the nuances of the debate, our intention is to call attention to the consequences of scholarly production from established academics within a racial system that still actively marginalizes certain groups of people.

For the present purposes we call this discussion the bilingual education debate. The research question that has guided this debate for over fifty years can be summed up as: should students with limited English proficiency have access to education in their home languages while acquiring the English necessary for school? Prior to the 1960s, research that connected language practices to intelligence noted cognitive delays for bilingual children, which resulted in educational policies that stripped minoritized students of all home language practices (Darcy 1953). Subsequent research aimed at countering the perspectives that positioned bilingualism as cognitively dangerous was produced in contexts, such as Canada, which were largely unaffected by issues of race (Peal & Lambert 1962, Lambert & Tucker 1972, Lambert 1974). Ultimately this research, along with a fair amount of community advocacy, produced enough traction to result in the passing of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, which was introduced to fund initiatives aimed at educating linguistic minority children. In an effort to respond to the monolingual and monoglossic ideologies that have dominated educational institutions in the United States since at least World War II (Wiley 2014), Jim Cummins produced a tradition of scholarship that called for support of additive bilingualism, where instead of replacing the home language through exclusive teaching of the domi-

1 Note here that the context of bilingualism/multilingualism in Canada, where much of this research was produced, was very different in that much of it ignored racialized indigenous minorities and relied on white middle-class socioeconomic status bilingual and monolingual students.
nant language (i.e. subtractive bilingualism), curriculums could support the development of the L1 and L2 concurrently (Cummins 1986, 2001). This research sought to dispel deficit-framed orientations toward minoritized students’ language practices (Cummins 2017), which, without a doubt, resulted in increased support for bilingual education programs, especially in areas with large populations of minoritized students. Nonetheless, while suggesting solutions for what can be referred to as ‘the non-English speaker problem’, the framing of the issue itself represents a raciolinguistic ideology by failing to acknowledge that many minoritized students are bilingual before they ever reach a US classroom; this distinction is the genesis of the current debate.

Contemporary scholarship (García 2009, Bartlett & García 2011, Flores 2013, Rosa & Flores 2017) has aptly pointed out that much of the prior research failed to incorporate racial perspectives and thus misses the crux of the issue, which is that questions that guide this research are rife with standard language and monolingual ideologies that ultimately allow for the continued marginalization of linguistically minoritized students and their natural forms of language production. These researchers are not arguing against additive bilingual education, but rather adding nuance to a conversation about justice in education. What concerns them about the research traditions of bilingual advocacy is not the advocacy itself, but rather that the advocacy for bilingual education is often free from racial analysis. This lack of a racial perspective can result in the rearticulation of racialized ideologies that further marginalize students who exhibit biliteracy in ways that are not traditionally ratified by educational institutions. This point is made explicitly in a recent tweet by Nelson Flores, stating that ‘normative views of biliteracy are raciolinguistic ideologies that erase the fact that children who are positioned as needing to develop biliteracy are already biliterate’.² Flores goes on to argue that in not recognizing the biliterate practices of the students in the first place, Cummins ‘has overdetermined [minoritized students] to not be biliterate’. This is in response to articles (Cummins 2017, 2019) in which the author critiqued Flores and Rosa’s (2015) raciolinguistic perspective, arguing that ‘these conceptions of additive bilingualism load the construct with extraneous conceptual baggage that is not intrinsic to its basic meaning’ (Cummins 2017:405).³ Cummins then goes on to critique the work of Ofelia García (2009), which took issue with additive bilingualism for its unintended advocacy of the ‘two separate languages in one mind’ approach. This approach, which further extends monolingual ideologies, often invalidates the many forms of bilingualism that naturally occur in multilingual communities (i.e. passive bilingualism, heritage language forms, code-switching, etc.) (Grosjean 1989).

In his 2017 article, Cummins positions Rosa and Flores as opponents of additive bilingualism, which he argues is an actively progressive and antiracist research position. He also points to incorporations of his theory into educational practice in places with highly marginalized minority populations as evidence of his positionality. However, as Charity Hudley et al. so appropriately state,

² December 5, 2019: ‘Once again Jim Cummins offered a critique of my work with @DrJonathanRosa that misrepresents our argument while also conveniently changing the definition of additive bilingualism to one that ignores the historical uses of the term (a history he helped create)’ [Tweet]. This tweet and its subsequent thread can be accessed online at https://twitter.com/nelsonlflores/status/1202735123160092673.

³ Here we acknowledge the ambiguity of the term ‘biliteracy’; noting that the debate between these scholars is rooted in an inability to agree on a single definition of the phenomenon. While Cummins adopts an understanding of biliteracy as an ability to engage with the ‘standard’ (i.e. written) forms of both languages, Flores and Rosa defend its characterization by the fluency in and use of communicative practices in both languages.
Because of the structural nature of racism, even well-intentioned white people in ‘nice’ disciplines that espouse progressive goals inevitably contribute to its reproduction (Kubota 2002), especially when such stances are aligned with the widespread racial ideology of colorblindness, or the belief that race is sociopolitically irrelevant and that to discuss race is itself racist (Bonilla-Silva 2003, Delgado & Stefancic 2017). (p. e212)

We understand that for Cummins, who has built his career on contesting racist hegemonic discourses encountered in educational institutions, any sort of critique pointing out the ways that racism continues to be rearticulated through well-meaning research projects can feel like a personal affront. However, as minoritized women who have seen firsthand how raciolinguistic ideologies circulate within dominant societal institutions, we find two issues especially unsettling. First, the fact that a well-established scholar with a prolific publication record has access to a highly reputable venue—Harvard Education Review—to discredit the arguments of scholars of color provides some indication of the climate that the latter encounter in the field. The wording that Cummins uses as a counter-critique basically amounts to an argument of reverse racism, and it is aimed at scholars of color who themselves probably lived the political consequences of his research (e.g. constantly being placed in English language learner (ELL) classes based on home language survey or arbitrary cultural signifiers rather than English proficiency assessments). Second, instead of restructuring an argument to include a critically generated racial perspective, the well-established researcher points to the ‘successful’ incorporation of his theories across the globe as evidence of its utility, failing to engage seriously with the recommendations of scholars who have dedicated their careers to incorporating race as an empirical variable of inquiry. So, where a group of researchers may be pointing to the ways that well-intended research can be marshaled to reproduce systemic injustices, the response was to attack the premise of their arguments and dismiss the possibility that adding a racial perspective might in fact enhance this already rich research tradition. Thus, this debate demonstrates that antiracist scholarship requires an engagement with even the most ostensibly progressive of research agendas.

Other linguistic debates additionally illustrate the ways in which well-respected research, primarily produced by white male scholars, can be employed with deleterious effects on already marginalized populations. Take, for example, the debate in cognitive psychology on whether bilingualism (and thus multilingualism) results in positive cognitive effects, that is, the bilingual advantage debate (Paap 2019, Schwieter 2019). Though we do not present a full synthesis of this debate here, we want to assert that any research that positions bilingualism as potentially detrimental can have tremendous negative effects for a huge population of speakers who are forced to navigate state institutions that function on monolingual ideologies. This line of research is often mobilized against minority populations. In California, where Kenneth Paap produces much of the scholarship contesting the bilingual advantage (Paap & Greenberg 2013, Paap 2014, Paap et al. 2018), cognitive research has been utilized to support bans on bilingual education (e.g. California Proposition 227), which stripped all funding to programs meant to create equitable education for minority language students. By constantly comparing and homogenizing populations of bilingual speakers in relation to monolingual comparison groups, the research erases the racial and sociopolitical histories of these groups. Further, it ignores huge swaths of the planet where multilingualism is common, natural, and absolutely beneficial. Instead, most cognitive studies make use of experimental data, which rely on convenience samples (e.g. college age, middle-class student populations) in test conditions that lack ecological validity and may or may not mimic real-world language processing (Baum & Titone 2014, López 2020). In fact, the wide-scale acceptance of
research that questions the bilingual advantage provides evidence for an overreliance on quantitative statistical methods as indicative of true and empirical scientific data, an issue in both cognitive psychology and linguistics. Moreover, the research question itself—whether bilingualism is beneficial or detrimental—is guided by a raciolinguistic ideology grounded in the neoliberal assumption that all language production must be economically beneficial to be supported (Flores 2013).

Ultimately, what the debates surrounding bilingual education and the bilingual advantage show is that beyond the inclusion of antiracist position statements and the affirmation of racially marginalized scholars within the field, research practices need to be grounded in critical racial perspectives. In this way, researchers can reconceptualize the questions guiding the field in order to produce more racially just scholarship. These debates make clear that linguistic theorizing is integral to the creation of language management for societies’ primary institutions, and therefore a failure to integrate race and racism into the practice of ‘doing linguistics’ presents a dangerous possibility for unintentionally (re)producing systematic racial oppressions.

3. Research subjectivities: advocating for racial perspectives in the navigation of linguistic studies. Charity Hudley et al. call for an investigation of ‘how people from groups that are underrepresented in linguistics navigate the discipline’s cultural ideologies and practices as well as its intellectual spaces’ (p. e224). While it is common in fields that privilege qualitative methods (e.g. humanities and education) to introduce research subjectivities, rarely have these practices been taken up in fields that privilege quantitative methods (e.g. sciences and social sciences). Nonetheless, we argue that research subjectivities affect the kinds of questions that get asked as well as the interpretation of findings, so an inclusion of positionality statements could allow for the cultivation of antiracist ethos. Herein, and offering an acknowledgment of our research subjectivities, we present our personal trajectories as linguistic students, researchers, and scholars.

The first author, Aris Clemons, identifies as a bilingual Black woman who first acquired Spanish in an immersive home-study situation at nineteen years old. Due to her language learning experience and her upbringing within multilingual spaces, Clemons has cultivated a positive stance toward language learning, multilingualism, and multiculturalism. And yet, her path toward a career in linguistics has been anything but direct. As a first-generation college student, Clemons had limited academic guidance. But she was a skillful communicator, and friends, family, and high school teachers pushed her into a Communications and Public Relations track. It was not until after a study-abroad trip in her junior year of college that she realized it was not the business of communication, but rather the science of communication that interested her. However, even after a series of transfers from a Historically Black College/University (HBCU) to a community college to a large state university, she had still not been introduced to linguistics as a field of possible study. In fact, prior to conducting research to enhance her teaching at a bilingual primary school in Madrid, Spain, she was unaware of linguistics as an academic discipline. Searching the internet for research that could help her understand the difficulties in promoting bilingualism through restrictive and antiquated classroom pedagogies, she came across second language acquisition work that eventually led her to apply for a linguistics M.A. program. Still, it was in her role as a high-school Spanish teacher in Brooklyn where she began to understand how the racialization of certain students shaped their classroom experiences. Her time as a researcher in practice informs her research positionality as much as her academic investigations, and this is often shown in her methodological decisions.
As a Ph.D. student, Clemons has been confronted with conflicting discourses that simultaneously call for increased interdisciplinary work while privileging traditional quantitative methods that rely on social theories predominantly produced by white male scholars. Therefore, as a trained linguist, much of Clemons’s education has relegated engagement with race and racism to the confines of interdisciplinary work not involved in formal linguistic (i.e. scientific) investigation. Even the most social form of linguistic research—variationist sociolinguistics—calls on large-scale data sets to make its claims, which does little to incorporate the linguistic dexterity and language choice of most marginalized peoples. In fact, many linguistics graduate students are advised to seek out training in statistical programming and analysis, much of which is not actually offered in linguistic departments. In doing so, students are rarely presented with alternative and viable options that incorporate aspects of data not easily captured by quantitative methods. This has been the academic ethos that Clemons has encountered in much of her training.

Nonetheless, her work is marked by a commitment to honoring critical race theorizations carried out by dedicated scholars in education, cultural studies, linguistic anthropology, educational linguistics, sociology, and psychology (Bailey 2000, Collins 2000, Flores 2013, Rosa 2016, Valenzuela 2016, López et al. 2019). Clemons’s current research explores the ways in which teachers’ perceptions of student language practices shape students’ identity construction and subsequent language maintenance, development, and usage. In her work, she frequently uses critical discourse and conversation analyses in order to explore differentiated linguistic performances produced by racialized subjects, with the aim of interpreting them in relation to the sociohistorical conditions under which they were produced. In addition to a focus on linguistic scholarship on code-switching (Toribio 2001), style-shifting (Baugh 1983), and stance-taking (Goodwin & Alim 2010), Clemons draws from methodologies developed in cultural studies to give voice to her data, often soliciting full-length testimonials from her participants to reveal the ways they believe their language is functioning in society.

In a current study, Clemons is examining the identity construction of four adolescent Dominican(-American) male students from a Northeastern high school. Instead of using a traditional sociolinguistic interview in which participants would be instructed to produce language at varying levels of attention in order to solicit natural language, Clemons moved from a cultural studies perspective, allowing participants to give witness (testimonios) to how they saw themselves and their language use in different situations (Reyes & Curry Rodríguez 2012).

Participants narrated stories from their lives and invented stories about culturally situated characters that were presented to them. Analysis was then conducted on the language forms produced during these testimonios and also on the sociocultural performances of self that were embodied in their testimonies. While the students made several explicit comments about themselves and their own identities, they also produced a variety of comments about in-group and out-group membership that informed the ways that they have constructed their own identities and those of others. In addition, analysis of shifts in language variety, style, and forms that occurred above the level of consciousness (i.e. ‘I’m going to tell you in Spanish because it just feels better’) and below the level of consciousness (e.g. when a participant would switch variety or style with no explicit mention of the switch) indicated stances toward named identity categorizations, interlocutor preferences, perceptions of language varieties, and the ever-shifting conceptualizations of self. By integrating both linguistic and cultural studies methodologies, the work is meant to provide more nuanced understandings of the development,
maintenance, and performance of ethnoracial identity among a population that does not fit neatly into hegemonic conceptions of race. The combined methodological effort of this study holds implications not only for the study of race, but also for the study of language, especially the study of language produced by minoritized populations.

The second author, Anna Lawrence, is a bilingual white woman of Spanish descent on her mother’s side. She identifies as a heritage speaker of Spanish, having acquired the language simultaneously with English at home as a child. She hails from an educational background; aside from the several generations of teachers in her family on both sides, her father is an academic librarian, and her mother a university Spanish instructor. She acknowledges that although her mother inspired her interest in the Spanish language and her positive stances of Spanish cultural identity, she distinctly recalls the transmission of prescriptivist and standard language ideologies surrounding her use of Spanish and English in the household from an early age. She also notes that her mother’s adamance that her children be fluently bilingual emerged from a belief in the utility of the language in their future endeavors, which is not necessarily the attitude adopted by the majority of first-generation Spanish-speaking immigrants to the United States, who often find bilingualism to be a burden rather than an asset.

Upon beginning her undergraduate studies at the large state school in her hometown, Lawrence had virtually no awareness of the field of linguistics, despite having long been fascinated with phenomena such as dialectal variation as she had perceived them during her summer visits to Spain. Declaring a double major in anthropology and Hispanic studies (a degree integrating mostly Spanish-language cultural and literary studies over linguistics), she was provided glimpses of the interaction of language and culture without being formally introduced to the field of linguistics. It was not until her third year that she met her department’s only Spanish linguist; she later became his research assistant and mentee for her honors thesis. Her undergraduate research focused primarily on Spanish-English contact in her rural eastern North Carolina community, specifically in the morphosyntax of heritage speakers. As with Clemons’s experience, she found that she was encouraged to employ methodologies that quantitatively analyzed social variables, rather than to examine these variables and their interaction with language qualitatively.

Concurrently with her undergraduate research experiences, another factor that motivated Lawrence’s decision to pursue a Ph.D. was her work at her university’s writing center, both as a general consultant and as a designated mentor to upper-division writing-intensive classes in Spanish cultural studies. In her position as a mentor, she provided structural and organizational advice to L2 and heritage Spanish-speaking students. Although her job did not emphasize microlevel editing such as grammar correction, she observed the insecurity that many heritage speakers carried toward their Spanish speaking and writing skills; many of them explicitly requested her review of their language because they had been penalized repeatedly for orthographical errors and constructions that strayed from the standard that professors expected of their work. It was not until this experience that she had ever questioned the arbitrariness of the standard, or the effects of standard language ideologies on speakers required to enforce it.

In beginning her Ph.D. studies, Lawrence was immediately daunted by the expanse of linguistic theory, literature, and subfields with which she had not become familiar as an undergraduate student. As mentioned, her training in linguistics had been limited; aside from the experiential training she acquired through research, she possessed an interdisciplinary linguistics minor that had at no point introduced the theoretical framework behind the field. Although her department emphasized an interdisciplinary approach to
linguistics, she observed that each of her courses from the departments of linguistics, sociology, anthropology, and Spanish and Portuguese, among others, practiced completely different theoretical approaches to the study of language and advocated for adherence to traditionally practiced methodologies. Her introduction to work on mock Spanish, the downgrading of US Spanish, and white racism (Hill 1998, 2008, Zentella 2003, 2014, Barrett 2006), as well as the effects of this marginalization in bilingual education (Flores & Rosa 2015, Rosa 2016, Flores 2017, Rosa & Flores 2017), impelled her to reorient her own research toward a qualitative raciolinguistic approach. She had long been aware that her experience as a US heritage speaker was not necessarily typical; she knew that she was privileged by the phenotypical whiteness, the ancestry from an uncolonized country, and the prestige dialect that allowed her to grow up with almost exclusively positive attitudes toward her bilingualism. Becoming conscious of precisely why her experience was atypical for most Spanish-English bilinguals motivated her to adopt an activism-oriented approach in her work that revealed the injustices produced by standard language ideologies in the context of the United States.

In her current work, Lawrence focuses on the processes involved in the socialization of raciolinguistic and standard language ideologies for American children. Inspired by the work of linguistic anthropologists such as Hill, Zentella, Rosa, and Flores, as well as by other sociolinguists investigating the power structures surrounding Spanish use and display in the United States such as Adam Schwartz (2006, 2011), she examines the use of Spanish as a symbolic resource for Anglos in children’s literature. In a case study of the best-selling Anglo-written book series *Skippyjon Jones* (Schachner 2003), Lawrence brings to light the limited forms of Spanish that Anglo children are encouraged, and more importantly permitted, to know via an intersectional perspective that combines theories in linguistics, Latino studies, and literary studies. Though the display of cultural stereotypes in children’s entertainment and media has been previously studied (see Barrera & Quiroa 2003, Dávila 2012, Martínez-Roldán 2013), Lawrence applied approaches combining sociolinguistic analysis of the reference Spanish and mock Spanish displayed in the series with a sociocultural analysis drawing from Latino Studies that examined tropicalizations, or the symbolic troping of Latino cultures through the display of language (Aparicio & Chávez-Silverman 1997). Collectively, these methods of analysis revealed the insidiousness of Anglo-targeted instructive materials in Spanish as potential sources constructing children’s conceptions of race in relation to language. Further, they uncover the damaging effects of attempting to foster the valuation of diversity from a hegemonic perspective that does not take into account the voices of those whose inclusion is being emphasized. Ultimately, it was through this interdisciplinary approach to her linguistic study that Lawrence was able to formulate her findings and critically evaluate the educational materials she targets in her work.

Though the present authors have experienced completely different journeys surrounding our linguistic training and emergence of the interests that have led us to adopt the interdisciplinary perspectives informing our work, it is through these individual experiences that we assert the importance of incorporating diverse perspectives in scholarship studying language and race. Our positionalities have been significantly informed by exposure to the injustices created by current perspectives in bilingual education and have fostered a commitment to antiracist work meant to shed light on the lived experiences of marginalized peoples. Additionally, we aim to reveal and critique hegemonic perspectives on race in the academy that are ostensibly based in a desire for inclusion and diversity without consulting the voices of those they seek to include. It should be noted that in order to take on our work, we had to become well versed not only in lin-
guistic theory, but also in cultural, anthropological, sociological, and educational theories. To be understandable in any of these fields, we had to gain expertise in all of them. At the same time, we remain vulnerable researchers, as the value of our academic contributions is often held to a standard that forces us to compete with those who uncritically produce scholarship about marginalized populations without ever consulting them, their cultural leaders, or the ideas produced in art, politics, and other social movements that affect their language production. To be sure, any academic who is dedicated to producing antiracist scholarship in any truly interdisciplinary capacity will have gained expertise across a variety of fields. As such, we advocate for a recognition of such efforts in a way that proves beneficial to careers rather than personal satisfaction. To do so would most assuredly result in the cultivation of academic environments more desirable and suitable for scholars of color, especially those who are navigating precarious sociohistorical realities.

4. Antiracist linguistic scholarship: cultivating more critically based research questions. In our response, we have contended that collaboration among researchers who possess varying research subjectivities can lead to a more holistic analysis of linguistic production. We are far from being the first scholars to draw on theories of racial profiling and apply them to linguistic situations—see the influential works of Zentella on *chiquitification* of US Spanish, Alim’s description of *transracialization* as a tool in achieving racial justice, or Rosa and Flores’s theorization of raciolinguistic ideologies, to cite but a few examples—but we have also observed throughout our careers that these perspectives are few and far between within the scope of our chosen field, a reality that contradicts the sociopolitical relevance of race in the study of sociolinguistics. Charity Hudley et al. aptly call for a greater variety of perspectives in academia, especially when addressing the subject of race in linguistics; indeed, we have demonstrated through the work of the above scholars as well as through our own personal subjectivities that the experiences, training, and points of view of researchers are influential in the generation and circulation of innovative approaches and methodologies. Rather than be pressured to adhere to the hegemonic structure of their discipline, scholars early in their careers should be encouraged to draw from other relevant fields in their research, and to incorporate approaches that account for the lived experiences of the individuals they study without being met with resistance from their home departments. Because young scholars remain vulnerable within the academy, they are often forced to fall back on traditional forms of research that will grant them security in their careers. Thus, decisions to include race in a linguistic analysis and to do so in collaborative research efforts become a political statement against the current state of affairs in which those who do challenge existing research ideologies are often met with pushback (e.g. missed grant opportunities, promotion and tenure failures, etc.) from later-career, long-celebrated scholars perpetuating existing and accepted methodologies in linguistic research.

However, while the inclusion of researchers’ unique positionalities and the academy’s efforts to incorporate diverse and collaborative perspectives from scholars whose voices have been historically marginalized are significant steps taken toward our goal of racial justice in linguistics, we also wish to emphasize that these changes alone are not enough in altering the existing practices involved in scholarship on language and race. Rather, resisting the status quo will also involve a shift in the ways that scholars present their research questions surrounding these topics. It is crucial that our questions take into account variables not only that are relevant to advancing the field, but that also keep the nuanced and individually varied experiences of those being studied in mind.
Since the onset of the field of sociolinguistics, the concept of race has been systematically relegated to a neatly categorized variable carrying no additional relevance or interactions. The work of the scholars cited in this paper, as well as that of the authors themselves, seeks to demonstrate the colossal fallacy of this approach. Through our interdisciplinary, qualitative-methods approach to our research, we reveal how race and language are inextricably linked, and that the use of language to characterize concepts of race presents powerful consequences for the lived experiences of marginalized individuals. Within our own work, it is seen how educational institutions shape ideologies on race through literacy and language instruction early in socialization. This information could not be revealed without methodologies and questions that grant those negatively affected by these institutions a voice in our research. As scholars of linguistics, we have the potential to improve not only our field but also our society through research that challenges existing social injustices; however, we will not see these changes until the methods revealing these injustices become more widely accepted in the academy.
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