Empowering Voices: A Graduate Student Instructor's Introduction to Linguistic Justice

Lacey Hamilton

Introduction

My professor put on a brave face as I practically interrogated her. The class was composition pedagogy, and the topic was anti-racist pedagogy. To say I had some questions is an understatement; I had a lot of questions about students' right to their own language, which has later been described as linguistic justice. My instructor answered every successive question with patience and fairness while balancing my interrogation with the needs of the other students in our seminar. Even if she and I had been one-on-one for the full 75 minutes, it wouldn't have been enough. I felt a sense of urgency to understand how this fit into the traditional idea of correctness and preparing students for a world outside the classroom. What does anti-racist pedagogy look like in different classrooms? Was there a middle ground that was both affirming and inclusive while preparing them for less progressive contexts? Every new answer brought another question, and I fell down the linguistic justice rabbit hole. I knew it mattered and wanted to do my part, but I had no idea where to begin, especially as a graduate student instructor (GSI). As a fellow GSI, or potentially a WPA or instructor of GSIs, I know you can relate to the challenge of navigating these complex topics. I sought people's opinions, watched YouTube videos, read academic articles and chapters, and even resorted to exploring TikTok, trying to see every angle and option. I needed answers, and hallelujah, I found them.

It didn't take long to discover that linguistic justice has become a central topic in composition pedagogy, and has been for a long time. While conversations about diversity in education existed as far back as the era of slavery, the momentum of the Civil Rights Movement in the 50s and 60s and the landmark Brown v. Board of Education ruling that forced desegregation of schools forced educators to face the diversity of language head-on. Over the course of decades, influential bodies like the NCTE have published landmark statements advocating for students' right to their own language, prompting leaders in the field, such as Suresh Canagarajah, Bruce Horner, April Baker-Bell, and Vershawn Ashanti Young, to name a few, to speak out and advocate for options like code-switching, code-meshing, and translingualism as solutions to language diversity in writing classrooms. However, what is lacking from these key conversations is an accessibility point for new teachers, especially graduate student instructors (GSIs), who don't have time to do the deep research necessary to understand the nuanced topic, let alone figure out how to decide the best option for

them. I have prepared a guide for GSIs on linguistic justice in response to that need. The guide begins with a historical overview of language in academia, specifically tracing the evolution of linguistic justice and antiracist pedagogy in composition studies. Key approaches follow, including code-switching, code-meshing, and translingualism, highlighting their benefits and downfalls and potential actionable steps to take in your classroom. The final section offers practical steps for GSIs, guiding them to align their teaching practices with their values, university goals, and the needs of the students.

History

While the history of anti-racist pedagogy spans decades and includes a wide range of voices and events, this overview focuses on a few key moments and movements that felt most foundational and informative to me as I began to understand the topic.

Historically, academic life was primarily accessible to privileged white men (Bonilla-Silva and Peoples 2-3). Scholars like Mary Bucholtz, Kira Hall, and James Gee highlight that identity and language are closely linked. In fact, the word identity comes from the Latin noun "identitas," which refers to sameness (*Identity - etymology, origin & meaning*). Historically, people developed identity by interacting with people who communicated similarly to them and separated themselves from those they perceived to be different (Bucholtz and Hall 369-370). Academia is one of the key places where language plays a role in shaping identity (Norton and Morgan). Scholars and intellectuals created and shared ideas through specific language styles acquired during their schooling, eventually creating Standard Academic English (SAE), the norm for academic communication (Ashamarri 150). This communication style set them apart from those who didn't have access to higher education and never learned SAE. With time, academia began prioritizing how a person said something over what they said, turning school into a "sorting mechanism" (McLaren 160), marginalizing students from linguistically diverse backgrounds (Monzo and Soohoo 150). Many now refer to SAE as the dialect of social and political power, also calling it Dominant American English (DAE) to reflect the sociopolitical implications (Paris).

Following the Civil Rights Movement of the '60s, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) commissioned a statement called "Resolution on Student Right to Their Own Language" (SRTOL). This statement affirms that students' home and community dialects are instrumental in identity creation, among other things. SRTOL was reaffirmed in 2003 and again in 2014, but the broader educational climate had shifted. With Ronald Reagan's 1980 election, American politics and education took a conservative turn. As Geneva Smitherman observed in 1995, the era's optimism gave way to "stagnation and dreams deferred" (24).

Despite the good intentions and many instructors fully supporting SRTOL, controversies and flaws still arose. For example, there was a moderately successful transition to a

more process-centered pedagogy, moving away from rigid standards of correctness toward a broader acceptance of linguistic diversity as expression and viewing writing as an ongoing process rather than just a finished product. However, the foreseen improvements in student writing never came. Instructors outside the composition field claim writing became "entirely inadequate for both serious academic inquiry and the communication needs of an advanced society" (Ellwanger). Many critics associate this with the lack of pedagogical tools in SRTOL. To the rest of the academic and professional world, SRTOL was a moral and political sentiment rather than guidance on empowering students and fighting injustice, paired with adequate writing skills.

During the late 80s, composition studies began to move away from the "individualistic, cognitive models" that dominated the 70s and early 80s, and moved toward "more socially and politically conscious frameworks" that responded to the broader world. (Killingsworth, 1999). The move to process-centered pedagogy gained momentum, emphasizing writing as a recursive, student-centered activity rather than a product to be perfected.

In the 2000s, scholars like Canagarajah A. Matsuda and P.K. Matsuda, advocated for the inclusion of World Englishes in composition, arguing for a pluralized understanding of English (Canagarajah, The Place of World Englishes in Composition; A. Matsuda and P.K. Matsuda, World Englishes and the Teaching of Writing). Vershawn Ashanti Young popularized the concept of code-meshing, encouraging students to blend dialects and languages in their writing rather than switching between dialects based on context ("Nah, We Straight"; *Other People's English*). During that same time, Horner et al. proposed a translingual approach to writing, emphasizing language difference as a resource rather than a barrier ("Defining Translinguality"). The field also began to embrace multimodal literacy, recognizing that students communicate through a variety of modes beyond just words on paper (Self; Lynch and Wysocki). All of these changes occurred at a time of rising racial tensions in the US and higher education, aiming to improve pedagogical practices and shed light on the importance of linguistic justice, providing tools and frameworks that make the writing classroom a more just place for students with diverse linguistic backgrounds.

The most recent progress in linguistic justice in composition studies was already in motion as the field was responding to the national rise in tensions surrounding race and minorities during the first Trump administration and the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the fight for Black justice was reignited on a national and global level following the murders of Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, Ahmaud Arbery, and Tony McDade, which sparked the boom of the Black Lives Matter Movement in 2020 (*This Ain't Another Statement! This is a Demand for Black Linguistic Justice!*). Adding their voice to the movement, Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) published, "This Ain't Another Statement, It's a Demand for Black Linguistic Justice." The authors of this demand argued that we cannot claim that Black lives matter if we aren't willing to profess that Black language matters and demand linguistic justice in writing classrooms.

That brings us to where the field is today. With all this history to build on, it can be daunting for a graduate student instructor (GSI) to know where to begin researching and implementing principles in their own classrooms. While there are many who have explored different views on linguistic justice, below, I outline the mainstream theories of the field today: code-switching, code-meshing, and translingualism. In each section, you'll find compilations from the forefront academics in the field, covering the praises and hesitations, and ending with practical steps forward to teaching linguistic diversity and ensuring linguistic justice in the composition classroom.

Code Switching

Knestrict and Schoenstead define code-switching as a "shift in language guided by a shift in context" (177). Nilep similarly describes it as "a practice of parties in discourse to signal changes in context by using alternate grammatical systems or subsystems, or codes" (17). More simply, code-switching occurs when individuals consciously switch from one way of speaking or communicating to another, based on the situation. In the writing classroom, the conversation about code-switching centers on encouraging students to shift from their natural spoken language to another. The central rhetorical consideration in code-switching is the audience, meaning that students often code-switch to fit into specific communities and avoid implicit biases. Typically, this refers to students from minority and second-language backgrounds who have been required to code-switch to standard academic English in writing classrooms.

Writing teachers may encourage code-switching because they believe it enables students to adapt to various settings. For example, some writing instructors teach code-switching to equip students to write in "The Language of Wider Communication" (Smitherman vii), in other words, to write for a global audience. In their minds, students writing to a worldwide audience may benefit from code-switching because international audiences use SAE to bridge the language barrier.

One teacher noted that code-switching could be seen as a "survival skill" and could be the difference between acceptance and rejection, especially in academia. Baker-Bell argued that black students in particular are often encouraged to code-switch so that they can navigate the academic or professional worlds later on. To this same point, Lisa Delpit explains that when students enter the professional world, they are judged based on what they create. In order to enter this "culture of power," people need to speak the language of that culture. For this reason, she notes that teaching code-switching gives students access to positions of power and influence (282). To many, enabling students of all backgrounds to speak the language of power opens the door to overcoming oppression.

On the other hand, many critics argue that code-switching perpetuates inequality by devaluing other language variations and the associated identities that come with them

(VA Young; Casmir). Critics claim that advocates of code-switching ask more of their students than to change their language. Instead, they press students to strip themselves of their background and individuality as writers to prove their assimilation (Grote et al.; Morton; Santiago, Nwokoma, and Crentsil). As mentioned earlier, language and identity are intertwined. If teachers imply that a student's language is inferior or inadequate, students may perceive themselves as inferior or insufficient in the academic world. Vershawn Ashanti Young boldly states that "code-switching is all about race; how it is steeped in a segregationist, racist logic that contradicts our best efforts and hopes for our students" (Young, "Nah, We Straight," 51). If the goal is to celebrate and empower our students' language and identities, code-switching could do more harm than good.

Possible Applications

Should you decide to implement code-switching into your classroom, the simplest way to teach code-switching that I found comes from Rebecca S. Wheeler's article "Becoming Adept at Code-Switching." While her article is intended for K-12 teachers, I found the process accessible to any group, including college writers. A key step in teaching code-switching is to help students compare and contrast their natural code with the same message in SAE, analyzing how language choices impact their audience's reception of the message. Once students learn the impact, Wheeler recommends helping students analyze the "time, place, audience, and communicative purpose" of their messages and then use that analysis to "intentionally choose" their language choices for that scenario (Wheeler 56-57). Rather than letting language choices happen by chance, this process teaches students when to use their various language variations to achieve a specific purpose.

Code-Meshing and Translingualism

In code-meshing and translanguaging, communicators treat all their language variations and codes as one integrated code (Canagarajah 403) and can use non-standard spoken dialects in their writing (Schrieber 1). Code-meshing refers to different English registers being used together, whereas translanguaging or translingualism refers to multiple languages being used together. Both function the same, one focusing on codes and one focusing on languages, which is why I have paired them together.

Code-meshing is described as a strategy that helps students view all their varieties of English as one integrated code (Canagarajah 403), then allowing their repertoires to be "spliced together" to meet the author's needs (Lee 317). This means that writers can use non-standard spoken dialects in their writing (Schrieber 1) or incorporate both written and verbal codes within a single utterance. In this method, students are not concerned with following any prescriptive boundaries that may exist in one specific language, but rather have the freedom to mix them together.

Near identical to code-meshing is translanguaging, which is most popular for multilingual students. Like code-meshing, a translingualism orientation allows multilingual communicators to view all their languages as one big repertoire rather than separate pieces (Garcia and Wei; Zapata and Leman 367). In code-meshing and translingualism, teachers understand that students use all their language variations all the time: the way they think, speak, and write. To that point, teachers acknowledge that students unknowingly already make decisions about when and how to use each. The shift in perspective happens by showing students that their language varieties can all coexist to make communication more powerful, even if they don't have mastery over them all. By honing in on that perspective, students can learn that each dialect or variation in their background can and should inform how they communicate holistically, not separately and exclusively.

Both methods, code-meshing and translingualism, can build students' confidence in their identity. They are no longer viewed as insufficient or labeled as outsiders just because of their language codes and variations, but are validated and celebrated. More specifically, in our case, they don't have to change how they perform their identity to be accepted in academia.

Vershawn Ashanti Young, who coined the term code-meshing, has repeatedly stated that code-meshing is his preferred application of linguistic justice. He appreciates the way it "allow[s] minoritized language users to blend their cultural and heritage languages within academic, professional and public writing and speaking" (Vershawn Young, "English Language and Literature"). Likewise, translingualism empowers students to make language decisions by considering the demands of the text, audience, purpose, and setting, while also integrating their linguistic diversity and goals as the author. This is all to say that language varieties don't have to be turned "on and off," but they can coexist and work together.

Shreiber quickly counters this emphasis with a potential difficulty in emphasizing code-meshing in the composition classroom, saying that most writing instructors don't explicitly teach students how to code-mesh effectively. As a result, students' use of code-meshing, and I would argue translanguaging as well, may appear as a "free-for-all" (Shreiber 2). Jay Hardee comments on this challenge, saying, "Instead of matching code to context, students use all their linguistic resources within a single rhetorical context" (n.p.). This means that students often use code-meshing too freely, without considering the rhetorical context to inform when and how they should mesh their codes.

Possible Applications

For code-meshing to be a rhetorically sound option for students, they must be taught how to use it in a way that both validates their identity and effectively communicates their message to their audience. Many scholars offer instructions on how to teach code

6

meshing effectively, but the most comprehensive and easily accessible lessons I found come from Brennah Hutchinson and Angela Morris' program, called "Mesh It Y'all!" They suggest introducing students to the statements "Student's Right to their Own Language" and "This Ain't Another Statement" before showing them code-meshed works like Vershawn Ashanti Young's CCCCs Welcome Note from 2019 and his 2004 article "Your Average Nigga." They also compiled this information into a video that is available on YouTube as a multimodal option. Other examples of powerful code-meshing are the novels *The Hate You Give* by Angie Thomas and Lisa Linn Kanae's *Sista Tongue*, as well as Marvel's *Black Panther*.

Following the introduction to code-meshing, students break down their own language, which is easily done with slang. Students in Hutchinson and Morris's research used words and phrases such as "bougie," "shook," "salam," and "throw shade," then analyze and explain the words' origin, modern use, relatability, and power or persuasiveness. The final step asks students to convince an academic audience to use this word in a formal setting (Hutchinson and Morris). By asking students to dive deeper into a single word, students get the opportunity to see how language evolves and has different impacts and meanings over time. This activity also shows them how and when someone might consciously use language diversity to serve a rhetorical purpose.

Translingualism takes more effort from the instructor because it requires a complete shift of perspective on language that must be taught explicitly. For this approach to work in a classroom, students must see language practices as continuous works in progress rather than exclusive and solidified systems (Horner and Alvarez 22). To effectively shift the classroom perspective towards translingualism, an entire unit on language must be taught early on or referenced repeatedly throughout the semester. Rachel Shapiro and Missy Watson suggest that to teach translingualism successfully, instructors must teach students the background of language, how to analyze their language repertoires and choices, show language variations in the world around them and academic settings comparatively, and finally let students set goals for their language choices and give them ample practice opportunities (Shapiro and Watson). Each step is necessary for success in translingualism because it teaches students about the powers and limitations of blending languages, preparing students to use variations as a conscious and purposeful tool.

This begins with students reflecting on what qualities their home languages and registers have. How have these qualities been accepted or rejected, and by whom? What other factors may have caused that reception? This conversation can be an emotionally heavy activity for some, so creating a safe environment for these discussions is vital. Still, instructors shouldn't shy away from discussing how language prejudice is often rooted in racism and classism. Instructors should use that contention to emphasize why things have and should continue to change.

Shapiro and Watson also recommend drawing on historical examples of language repression, such as the Carlisle Indian School when young native children were forced

to abandon their native languages and names "to kill the Indian in him and save the man" (Pratt 260). Likewise, Richard Rodriguez retells in his autobiography the experience he had in school, learning "the public language," English, and losing his "private language" of Spanish. Despite viewing it as a formative experience that positively impacted his future, Rodriguez couldn't deny how much it also negatively impacted his ability to communicate and connect with his family (Rodriguez). After covering such heavy topics, it's essential for teachers to confront the weight of this conversation. It can get uncomfortable, but it is critical for students to see how racially motivated and discriminatory language has been historically to understand the value of linguistic justice.

Shapiro and Watson also note that if students share similar linguistic backgrounds, instructors can turn to pop culture for analysis. Consider using something like the musical In the Heights, which is a phenomenal example of purposeful dialect mixing. Instruct students to investigate their use of language, where they came from, and how that may have impacted their language choices, finally thinking about how their language is received and why.

Finally, teachers should shift to academic works and show examples where language variations are used. Popular academic articles where this is presented well are Gloria Anzaldúa's "Borderlands/ La Frontera: The New Frontier," Clarice Blanco's "My Name is /KLA-ris/: The Bordered Name of an American Latina," and Vershawn Ashanti Young's "Should Writers Use They Own Language?"

Before moving on to making the decisions for your class, let's do a brief recap of each linguistic justice method discussed above. Code-switching teaches students to change the way they communicate based on the context they are in. Some believe this is a necessary skill that helps students communicate and integrate into professional and academic settings, thereby preventing the implicit bias of the audience from negatively impacting the writer. Young voices his concern that by teaching code-switching, students may feel that academia believes their home-spoken dialects are inferior to SAE, which can imply that their diverse identities are inferior as well ("Nah, We Straight).

Code-Meshing and Transligualism teach students that all of their language varieties can be used as one whole that informs the way they communicate. This also emphasizes that their varieties can actually strengthen their communications rather than weaken them. These methods are praised for how they teach students to value their linguistic diversity and, as was stated earlier, their diverse identities. The major drawback is the amount of time and effort it takes to change students' perspectives on language and teach skills sufficient for them to implement the varieties to fulfill a rhetorical purpose, on top of all other required course content.

Considerations in Feedback

Once students understand what their switching, meshing, and blending can do rhetorically, we must help them set goals for their future writing. Some students may feel more overwhelmed than empowered at moments, or potentially ambivalent. It's our job to help them first see the value of linguistic diversity. Then we can help them decide if, when, and how they want to execute their linguistic freedoms. Those who want to experiment should make conscious decisions based on the demands of the situation. For resistant students, we cannot force them to practice linguistic variety. We can hope, however, that the lessons will help them see and appreciate others' use of language when they encounter it.

Feedback on writing with language variations can be stressful for a teacher who may feel unprepared. Horner et al. offer thoughtful questions that we can ask our students and increase understanding: "What might this difference do? How might it function expressively, rhetorically, and communicatively? For whom, under what conditions, and how?" Horner et al. follow up by encouraging teachers to "[read] with patience, respect… perceived differences within and across languages, and [convey] an attitude of deliberative inquiry" (304). When students are brave enough to practice these new skills, be sure to give feedback based on meaning-making and clear communication. The University of Connecticut instructs its First Year Writing teachers to give feedback based on "correctness in the context of meaning, rather than as a discrete set of skills or intrinsic knowledge" (Translingual Teaching). Rosa and Flores likewise note that "appropriateness" based pedagogy is often actually a "reproduction of racial normativity" of the past (Flores and Rosa 151). Concerns like this urge instructors to look at why they believe something is or is not correct– is it because of what they have been taught in school to be correct, or is it correct because the intended meaning is being conveyed? When in doubt, instructors' best move would be to sit down with the student and ask more questions about the author's decisions. Providing thoughtful feedback rooted in understanding and context is the key to success in translingual writing instruction.

How I Advocate for Linguistic Justice

I would like to preface this by saying I am still a GSI with some experience under my belt and a lot of progress to make going forward. As a white woman, I recognize that my perspective is shaped by privilege and positionality. My goal through this research and going forward has been to listen, learn, and do my part to amplify student voices, challenge linguistic biases, and foster a space where all forms of expression are valued. I do not view myself as an authority on linguist justice. Rather, I see my role as one of allyship and accountability. I don't claim to have nailed it on the head just yet, but I do have enough experience to confidently share what I've done so far, or plan to do in my next semester teaching. I'll offer a few moves that have worked for me, but first, I want to explain the main factors that impacted my decision and implementation.

9

The context of where I have been teaching has played a huge role in my decision, with 60+ % of students speaking a second language as of Fall 2024. Another deciding factor for me was how much I wanted to change the course content and assignments from the content given to me when I started teaching. As a GSI with limited time and experience, I ultimately decided to sprinkle a bit of linguistic diversity throughout the semester rather than hitting it hard and changing the overall course. Similarly, I haven't entirely picked one method or another, but blend bits and pieces of each, usually leaning toward translingualism based on our student body.

The first thing I have done to set the tone for the class is explain my research interests and my "get-to-know-me" presentation on the first day. I spend a little time talking about other things, but highlight linguistic diversity, explaining that this is one topic I will advocate for in this class. Because so many students speak other languages at my university, their ears are usually perked.

A few days after that introduction, the class dives into the first major project, a personal narrative. In this assignment, I ask students to write in the first person about a story that taught them a life lesson. I emphasize that I want to hear their voices and see dialogue that matches the setting and people involved. They can choose to code-mesh or, blend languages, or even stick to SAE if that's the honest representation. This assignment not only helps me get to know them and hear their voices, but also proves to them that using authentic language can be really powerful in conveying stories and making their messages stand out in a crowd. The students in my class start the semester by learning how to represent themselves and their ideas as true to reality as they would like.

I am often shocked to see the difficulty students go through when trying to leave the boundaries of the Standard Academic English (SAE) that has dominated their education up to this point. It showed me that education, as it is now, has been preparing them for standardization rather than individualization. More than once, students have commented that this is the first time they have ever been allowed to write the way they sound. This personal narrative assignment has been a class favorite every semester for numerous reasons, including the linguistic freedom it affords to students.

As the semester progresses, the department requires research-style papers and advocacy papers. While language often comes secondary to teaching information literacy, I use these opportunities to show my students how to write for real audiences, using their identity as ethos builders, and using their language to their advantage, no matter the genre. It's all about teaching them the tools and giving them the power and safety to play and experiment, reflecting along the way. Despite talking about language as a tool, I have yet to have a student break the bounds of SAE for the research paper, although they will experiment more with the follow-up advocacy paper. The roots of this could be that they are overwhelmed with the research genre itself and are more concerned with completion rather than style (which is my guess) or that they don't feel confident applying linguistic diversity for any number of reasons. While I can't do much

10

to negate the first concern, the second concern suggests that I may need to work harder to demonstrate how language variety can successfully appear in academic genres. The third application is one I recently learned about at CCCC 2025, and I can't wait to apply in the future: how AI uses SAE. By showing students how AI takes away individualized style and replaces it with the most straightforward synonym, teachers can also exemplify how voice and diversity disappear. Even when AI is asked to take on the voice of a certain linguistic variety, it usually creates some stereotypical response rather than an authentic replication of that language style. Because teaching ethical AI use is a cornerstone of my class, this will be a natural way for me to implement linguistic diversity into something I already use.

Your Move

Well, now you have a basic grasp of the prevailing options presented in the field regarding linguistic justice. You've got the on-and-off mode with code-switching, the blending of vernaculars and languages in code-meshing, and translingualism. They all have pros and cons, and I've only briefly introduced them. It's your turn to decide your next move, but let me suggest a few variables you should consider while making a decision.

1. Evaluate Your Values and Experiences: What do you want to prioritize in your classroom? What do you believe about the world's expectations with language, and how might that impact your lessons? The Ogunniyi and O'Neil study places first-year writing instructors into three camps based on how they viewed the world's readiness to accept language variations and how they teach their students according to that readiness. This study demonstrates that not everyone likes code-switching or is ready to fully accept code-meshing, while others are fully committed to linguistic diversity. Seeing where your predecessors have landed can help narrow down your final decision.

2. Align with Institutional Goals: Outside of your preferences, don't forget your university's mission, goals, and standards. Likewise, what are the department's expected outcomes for students in your class? Do they already have a diversity and inclusion statement that mentions linguistic justice? What policies are already in place? Difficulties may arise, however, if you discover that your department has a policy you disagree with or find unjust. If this does happen, and before you panic, check to see how old it is. It could be something that could be updated to reflect the current department's standards. On the other hand, if you find their policy is up to date and you disagree with it, you'll need to take a deeper look and find what is negotiable or in your circle of influence. Along with that, what are you willing to take a stand for, and at what cost? Combating

systems of oppression has never been a fearless job, but it takes one person at a time to make a difference.

3. Seek Guidance and Collaboration: If you have more specific questions, I highly recommend going to another instructor you trust and bouncing some ideas off them. Your university may also have a committee or staff member specifically dedicated to these matters who can sit down with you. While doing my research, talking to my advisor, who knew me and our student body well, helped more than any article alone could.

4. Center Your Students: Finally, and in my opinion, most importantly, look to your students and find their needs. You may not see it initially, but getting to know your students, where they come from, and where they want to go can become a north star for figuring out how you advocate for linguistic justice.

When students learn the value of their voices, they begin to recognize the power of language in shaping their worlds and identities. As instructors, we can inspire them to embrace their linguistic diversity as an asset. If they don't feel they have much linguistic diversity, our pedagogical shifts can hopefully help them appreciate others' varieties when they encounter them in the world. No matter our rank, how far we are into our degrees, or how many times we've taught writing, we will always have the power to make a difference for our students. Meaningful change can start in your classroom. Hopefully, this guide is just the beginning of your impactful and promising future advocating for your students' authentic voices.

Works Cited

Alshammari, Sultan Hammad. "The Relationship Between Language, Identity, and Cultural Differences: A Critical Review." *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 4, 2018, pp. 98–101.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Crystal E. Peoples. "Historically White Colleges and universities: The unbearable whiteness of (MOST) colleges and Universities in America." *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 66, no. 11, 2022, pp. 1490–1504, https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642211066047.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. "Language and Identity." *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, Blackwell, 2004, pp. 369–394.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms.* Routledge, 2013.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued." *College Composition & Communication*, vol. 57, no. 4, 2006, pp. 586–619, https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc20065061.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued." *College Composition & Communication*, vol. 57, no. 4, 2006, pp. 586–619, https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc20065061.

Delpit, Lisa D. "The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children." *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 58, no. 3, 1988, pp. 280.

Ellwanger, Adam. "Fifty Years of 'Students' Right to Their Own Language." *Academic Questions*, 2024, https://doi.org/10.51845/37.3.1.

Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Language Awareness*. Routledge, 2014.

Flores, Nelson, and Jonathan Rosa. "Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in Education." *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 85, no. 2, 2015, pp. 149–171, https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149.

Garcia, O., and L. Wei. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, 2013.

Gee, James Paul. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge, 2011.

13

Hardee, Jay. "Code Meshing and Code Switching." Code Meshing and Code Switching – Antiracist Praxis - Subject Guides at American University, American University, Washington D.C., subjectguides.library.american.edu/c.php?g=1025915&p=7749939.

Grote, Ellen, et al. "Code-switching and Indigenous Workplace Learning: Cross-cultural competence training or cultural assimilation?" *Multilingual Education*, 2014, pp. 101–117, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06185-6_6.

Horner, Bruce, and Sara Alvarez. "Defining translinguality." Literacy in Composition Studies, vol. 7, no. 2, 6 Dec. 2019, pp. 1–30, https://doi.org/10.21623/1.7.2.2.

Hutchinson, Brennah, and Angela Morris. "Mesh It, Y'all: Promoting Code-Meshing "Identity - Etymology, Origin & Meaning." Etymonline, www.etymonline.com/word/identity.

Knestrict, Thomas, and Linda Schoensteadt. "Teaching Social Register and Code Switching in the Classroom." Journal of Children and Poverty, vol. 11, no. 2, Sept. 2005, pp. 177–185, https://doi.org/10.1080/10796120500195774.

Lee, Melissa E. "Shifting to the World Englishes Paradigm by way of the translingual approach: Code-meshing as a necessary means of transforming composition pedagogy." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2013, pp. 312–329, https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.121.

Lynch, Dennis A, and Anne Francis Wysocki. "From First-Year Composition to Second-Year Multiliteracies: Integrating Instruction in Oral, Written, and Visual Communication at a Technological University." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2003, pp. 149–170.

Matsuda, Aya, and Paul Kei Matsuda. "World Englishes and the Teaching of Writing." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2010, pp. 369–74.

McLaren, Peter. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. Longman, 1989.

Morton, Jennifer M. "Cultural code-switching: Straddling the achievement gap." *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 22, no. 3, 31 July 2013, pp. 259–281, https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12019.

Nilep, Chad. "'Code Switching' in Sociocultural Linguistics." *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, vol. 19, 2006, pp. 1-22. https://doi.org/10.25810/hnq4-jv62

Norton, Bonny, and Brian Morgan. "Poststructuralism." *The Encyclopedia of Applied*

14

Linguistics, 5 Nov. 2012, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0924.

Ogunniyi, Victoria, and Kim O'Neil. "'We Can Do This in Our Classes, but What About Students in Other Classes and Out in the World?': How Educators Imagine Code-Meshers and Their Audiences." *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, vol. 52, no. 4, 2 Oct. 2022, pp. 321–351, https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2022.2116127.

Paris, Django. *Language across Difference: Ethnicity, Communication, and Youth Identities in Changing Urban Schools*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Pratt, Richard. "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites." Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880–1900, edited by Prucha Francis Paul, Harvard UP, 1973, pp. 260–71.

Rodriguez, Robert. *Hunger of Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez*. Tandem Library, 1983.

Santiago, Rawn, Nchopia Nwokoma, and Jasmin Crentsil. "Investigating the Implications of Code-Switching and Assimilating at Work for African American Professionals." The Journal of Business Diversity, vol. 21, no. 4, 2021, pp. 72-81.

Selfe, Cynthia L. *Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers*. Hampton Press, Inc, 2007.

Shapiro, Rachael, and Missy Watson. "Translingual Praxis: From Theorizing Language to Antiracist and Decolonial Pedagogy." *College Composition & Communication*, vol. 74, no. 2, 2022, pp. 292–321, https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc202232276.

Shreiber, Brooke R, and Missy Watson. "Translingualism ≠ Code-Meshing: A Response to Gevers' 'Translingualism Revisited.'" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 42, 2018, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.10.007

Smitherman, Geneva. ""students' right to their own language": A retrospective." *English Journal*, vol. 84, no. 1, 1995, pp. 21–28, https://doi.org/10.58680/ej19957258.

"Students' Right to Their Own Language (with Bibliography)." *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/srtolsummary.

"Statement! This Is a Demand for Black Linguistic Justice!" *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, 25 Aug. 2021, cccc.ncte.org/cccc/demand-for-black-linguistic-justice.

15

"Vershawn Young: English Language and Literature: University of Waterloo." English Language and Literature | University of Waterloo, 21 May 2024, uwaterloo.ca/english/profiles/vershawn-young.

Young, Vershawn Ashanti. "'Nah, We Straight': An Argument Against Code Switching." *JAC*, vol. 29, no. 1/2, 2009, pp. 49–76.

Zapata, Angie, and Tasha Tropp Laman. "'I write to show how beautiful my languages are': Translingual writing instruction in English-dominant classrooms." *Language Arts*, vol. 93, no. 5, 1 May 2016, pp. 366–378, https://doi.org/10.58680/la201628590.