

CHAPTER 9.

CONNECTING RACIAL AND  
LINGUISTIC IN/JUSTICE  
IN WRITING ACROSS THE  
CURRICULUM: TOWARD A  
RACIOLINGUISTIC APPROACH

Keli Tucker

Texas A&M University

*Abstract.* In WAC scholarship, relatively little attention has been paid to the mutually constitutive relationship between the two goals of achieving racial justice and linguistic justice. This chapter responds to this exigency by proposing the adoption of a raciolinguistic perspective in the teaching of writing across the curriculum, and in the design and implementation of WAC programming.

At a moment when attacks on DEI are having a chilling effect on institutional support for inclusive teaching, WAC programs must not only reaffirm their commitments to racial and linguistic justice, but also model policies and pedagogical practices across disciplines that actively support diverse student voices. Recent scholarship has addressed racial justice in writing across the curriculum (Condon & Young, 2016; Inoue & Poe, 2012) as well as linguistic justice in WAC (Matsuda, 2012; Zawacki & Cox, 2014), but less attention has been paid to the mutually constitutive relationship between racial and linguistic justice. Understanding this relationship through the lens of raciolinguistic ideologies—a theoretical framework from educational linguistics—highlights the fact that meaningful change requires treating racial and linguistic justice as interconnected goals, neither of which can be fully realized in isolation. By foregrounding a raciolinguistic approach, WAC programs can both address inequities in the present and imagine a new path forward, one in which WAC programs can play a key role in affirming and supporting the languaging practices of all students in writing classrooms across disciplines.

This chapter discusses why it is so critical to understand the social and ideological constructions of race and language as interrelated phenomena, drawing

on a historical analysis of how deficit perspectives have shaped writing pedagogy to first address how raciolinguistic ideologies show up in the values that sit at the heart of WAC work and then describe how the raciolinguistic theoretical lens offers a way to understand the harm that instructors teaching writing may unintentionally be enacting on students through linguistic racism. It will conclude by offering some ideas for operationalizing a raciolinguistically informed approach to WAC and reflecting on how this framework can help us envision a more inclusive future for both writing across the curriculum and higher education more broadly.

## **THE AFFORDANCES OF A RACIOLINGUISTIC IDEOLOGIES FRAMEWORK**

The term “raciolinguistic ideologies” stems from a theoretical framework developed by Nelson Flores and Jonathan Rosa (2015) to describe and uncover the mutual co-construction of ideas about race and language, or in other words, the way that language ideologies—the beliefs and attitudes people hold about language and language users—are shaped by racial hierarchies that determine whose languages hold power and privilege. Here, Rosa and Flores (2017) outline five components of a raciolinguistic theoretical perspective:

- Historical and contemporary colonial conaturalizations of race and language,
- Perceptions of race and linguistic difference,
- Regimentations of racial and linguistic categories,
- Racial and linguistic intersections and assemblages, and
- Contestations of racial and linguistic power formations (p. 3)

The raciolinguistic perspective offers a way of analyzing race and language together, rather than as discrete and disconnected social processes, in order to uncover how race and language function as proxies for one another (Alim, 2016; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017). In this way, the raciolinguistic theoretical framework helps make visible the consequential ways in which the linguistic production of people racialized as non-white is perceived through the white gaze, referred to by Rosa and Flores (2015) as the “white listening subject.” The white listening subject describes an ideological position that “is not always just listening, nor is it only white. [Rather, it] refers to those who inhabit positions of institutionalized power that are produced and maintained, on the one hand, through structures of white supremacy, and on the other hand, through modes of perceiving and apprehending language, including but not limited to listening” (García et al., 2021, p. 8). The raciolinguistic theoretical perspective,

then, can be used to reveal how the language production of people who are linguistically and racially minoritized, when perceived from the ideological position of the white listening subject, is ideologically constructed as inferior and inappropriate in formal settings, and to uncover the raciolinguistic ideologies responsible for this perception.

While the raciolinguistic theoretical perspective has been taken up in educational research and K12 pedagogy related to resisting deficit discourses and linguistic racism, particularly in bilingual education programs and world language instruction, it has not yet been widely applied in writing studies or in WAC. However, the framework of raciolinguistic ideologies has significant potential for productively building on the work of scholars who have long been attending to the interconnections between language and race in how we teach writing and administrate writing programs, including Geneva Smitherman (1986), Victor Villanueva (1993), Vershawn Ashanti Young (2010), Keith Gilyard (2011), Carmen Kynard (2014), Staci Perryman-Clark (2014), Asao B. Inoue (2015), April Baker-Bell (2020) and many others. Moreover, while multiple frameworks intended to work toward racial and linguistic justice have emerged out of or been taken up in writing studies—such as theories of translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2016; Horner et al., 2011) that position difference in linguistic practices as an asset and a resource, and critical language awareness pedagogies (Britton & Lorimer Leonard, 2020; Shapiro, 2022; Wood & Shapiro, 2026) that promote students' agency to make their own choices about how to deploy their linguistic resources—the literature shows a need for pedagogical strategies that attend to the enmeshed problem of linguistic racism through multiple interconnected methods. A raciolinguistic ideologies framework can extend other methods by addressing how the perceptions of our linguistic practices are inextricably linked to the ways in which we are racialized and draws specific attention to the fact that these processes must be attended to simultaneously. Moreover, this framework helps to build on and extend on prior work taking a critical perspective and racialized lens towards WAC programming and practices, such as Donna LeCourt's (1996) argument for a less hegemonic and more critical reimagining of WAC; Michelle Hall Kells' (2007) promotion of a conceptualization of WAC that accounts for community knowledge-making practices; Villanueva's (2011) criticisms of assimilationist policies in writing instruction; Jamila M. Kareem's (2020) advocacy for culturally sustaining pedagogies in WAC; and Perryman-Clark's (2023) call for prioritizing diversity and inclusion in faculty development. In particular, a raciolinguistic theoretical approach to WAC helps address Mya Poe's (2013) argument for "mak[ing] race a meaningful part of our discussions about teaching writing across the curriculum" (p. 3) through attending to racial and linguistic in/justice as interconnected, as well as acknowledging

how the assumptions and expectations we bring to the writing classroom are shaped by raciolinguistic ideologies. Thus, rather than supplanting previous theoretical frameworks and critical work in WAC, a raciolinguistic ideologies theoretical perspective approach to the work of teaching writing and administering writing programs like WAC initiatives can work in concert with them.

## **LINGUISTIC RACISM AND ITS IMPACT ON STUDENTS WITH MINORITIZED RACIAL IDENTITIES AND LINGUISTIC BACKGROUNDS**

Specifically, a raciolinguistic ideologies framework can help call attention to the ideologies at work in the operationalization of linguistic racism in the teaching of writing, as well as the harm linguistic racism enacts on students. Linguistic racism is racism based on one's linguistic practices, resulting from raciolinguistic ideologies that frame standardized English rooted in white-centric linguistic norms as legitimate while viewing other linguistic practices—usually those of people racialized as non-white—as illegitimate. It occurs as a consequence of the raciolinguistic ideologies that, according to Flores and Rosa (2015), “conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices ... even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects” (p. 150). Linguistic racism highlights the fact that the consequences of language use are starkly different for different students according to their linguistic and racial identities: Writers whose ways of languaging already adhere closely to standardized English experience clear linguistic privileges in U.S. writing classrooms, while writers whose ways of languaging do not will often experience devastating consequences. As a result of linguistic racism, students who bring diverse linguistic repertoires to the writing classroom must frequently confront stereotypes, racial scripts and categories, labeling, and other deficit discourses and narratives of inferiority, which occur in the form of powerful myths and norms surrounding language use and writing that constrain learning and work to disenfranchise these students. In the writing classroom, linguistic racism can result in students from marginalized linguistic backgrounds feeling fearful and inadequate, and experiencing a lack of belonging as a result of their “limited possibilities for engagement, involvement, and inclusion” (Zamel, 1995, p. 512). In addition to impacting learning and academic success, linguistic racism also negatively affects students' socioemotional well-being, causing shame, insecurity, low self-esteem, depression, social anxiety, and even suicidal ideation (De Costa, 2020; Dovchin, 2020). To mitigate these harmful effects, students who experience linguistic racism often must engage in sociolinguistic labor, which is “the physical, emotional,

and psychological effort put into deploying sociolinguistic resources in a way that is meant to satisfy others” (Holliday & Squire, 2021, p. 4). This labor may look like code-switching (i.e., switching to a different, more accepted way of languaging for a particular context) or other forms of self-monitoring (Holliday & Squires, 2021). Students might also safeguard against negative instructor feedback tied to their linguistic choices by turning to AI writing technologies like ChatGPT to modify their writing to fit dominant norms (Barrot, 2023).

## LINGUISTIC RACISM IN WRITING INSTRUCTION AND WAC

As a result of their far-reaching societal influence, raciolinguistic ideologies have played a fundamental role in the development of deficit discourses in U.S. educational spaces, from K-12 through higher education. When taking a historical perspective on the development of writing studies as a discipline and in WAC specifically, the influence of raciolinguistic ideologies is evident. Writing studies emerged as a site of research and pedagogy against a backdrop of social change and political events which made higher education available to many groups who had not previously had the opportunity to attend: Women were admitted following a social movement to redefine women’s education more broadly; working class men were admitted as a consequence of WWI and WWII casualties; non-traditional students were able to enroll because of the G.I. Bill; international students enrolled in U.S. universities as Germany became a less attractive destination for higher education after WWII; and the civil rights movement of the 1960s led to open admissions policies that made higher education available to students of color. These gradual steps toward increasing diversity in higher education were generally not predicated on the value of inclusivity; rather, they were largely the result of economic decisions intended to increase enrollment in response to decreasing numbers of “ideal” college applicants: upper class white men. While many students with linguistically and racially minoritized identities still benefited from increased access to higher education, their presence in the writing classroom was accompanied by deficit discourses positioning their writing as unacademic, and composition as a discipline was largely borne out of the goal of remediating their linguistic practices (Matsuda, 2012). At the same time, the writing across the curriculum movement, too, began as a way to increase equity and access, yet had a similar goal of assimilation through remediation (Russell, 2002).

In 1974, the adoption of the Students’ Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) resolution by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) marked a disciplinary move towards greater acceptance of

these linguistic practices. This resolution resulted in part from a social turn in writing studies as a whole, influenced largely by scholarship in sociolinguistics, which saw writing and meaning-making coming to be regarded as social and cultural—rather than merely cognitive—processes (Coxwell-Teague & Lunsford, 2014). Smitherman (1999), one of the authors of SRTOL, attributes its writing primarily to a growing movement toward more disciplinary attention to race, which culminated in the formation of a committee to draft a policy document related to students' dialects. The resulting resolution argued that:

the idea of an objective, standard American dialect is a myth; the labeling of particular language varieties as unacceptable amounts to political dominance; the national disposition should bend toward pride in cultural diversity and preservation of the dialects representative thereof; and teachers need appropriate preparation to execute properly a teaching mandate driven by descriptive language study rather than by linguistic prescriptivism. (Gilyard, 2011, p. 94)

While responses to SRTOL were mixed (Gilyard, 2011), a central legacy of SRTOL is that from the point of its adoption, it was clear that racially and linguistically minoritized students—and by extension the raciolinguistic ideologies that shape how we teach students to write—could no longer be ignored.

Since then, the assumption of difference as deficit in writing pedagogy is not as overt as it once was. Significant strides have been made toward racial and linguistic inclusion in writing studies as a discipline, particularly in recent years through the work of scholars such as Inoue, Kynard, Baker Bell, and many others. However, despite a growing shift toward support of students' own languages in the writing classroom, the legacy of remediation remains "ideological in its pervasiveness" (Jordan, 2012, p. 26). Today, SRTOL is largely viewed as a promise unfulfilled—its possibilities "always imagined, and yet never fully achieved" (Kynard, 2014, p. 230)—and despite a growing shift toward recognition and support of students' own languages in WAC and writing studies, individual instructors often still struggle to ensure students' right to their own ways of languaging and resist the reproduction of raciolinguistic ideologies in their teaching. As a result of tacit policies that have tended to position adherence to standardized English as the definition of effective writing, college writing courses—both within writing programs and across disciplines—continue to act as racial and linguistic gatekeepers as well as ideological checkpoints through the ways in which they work to bring students' ways of languaging into alignment with raciolinguistic ideals (Horner & Trimbur, 2002; Jordan, 2012; Sanchez & Branson, 2016).

## THE ENACTMENT OF LINGUISTIC RACISM IN THE WRITING CLASSROOM

As a result of this ongoing pressure to conform to linguistic norms that they experience in the writing classroom, students from marginalized racial and linguistic backgrounds must constantly navigate these ongoing tensions as they negotiate their linguistic practices in ways that linguistically privileged students are rarely required to do (Bou Ayash, 2016, 2020). These expectations can have detrimental effects on the writing experiences of students with minoritized racial and linguistic identities, exerting influence over how they see themselves as writers, complicating their experiences with language and writing, and reducing their sense of ownership over their own linguistic practices. However, honoring students' own ways of languaging continues to be a site of struggle for many instructors teaching writing, whether in writing programs or across disciplines. Here, I theorize some ways in which the deep entrenchment of raciolinguistic ideologies in the teaching of writing provides avenues for the enactment of linguistic racism through values and beliefs as well as embodied habits of mind, even by instructors who have good intentions.

First, even for instructors who work to enact an antiracist writing pedagogy, the linguistic racism that they anticipate students will experience in other courses or later on in professional contexts often presents a paradox, one which has perhaps been most accurately described by Poe and Inoue (2016), who ask: "How can we engage in fostering a more just society within our classrooms or programs ... when we know that most outside our programs and classrooms will assess our students' writing in vastly different ways, often to our students' detriment, often in contradiction to the lessons we offer them about language and its valuing?" (p. 125). However, in attempting to ensure that students are prepared for "the real world" in which they will encounter linguistic racism, instructors are often instead active participants in the social and ideological construction of that world. Instructors' desire to ensure that students are prepared for the linguistic racism they will encounter elsewhere has been conceptualized by Lisa Delpit (1988) as teaching students the "codes of power," which holds that acquisition of standardized English provides students—particularly students with minoritized identities—with upward mobility and societal success. Even instructors who advocate for the acceptance of non-standardized forms of languaging in academic and professional spaces often believe that standardized English should still be taught because of its perceived power and cultural capital (Inoue, 2015; Perryman-Clark, 2014). However, these arguments are based on the belief that only the use of standardized English counts as linguistic legitimacy and can lead to academic and professional success, and that other Englishes are less communicative

and therefore less useful or valid in academic or professional contexts (Inoue, 2015; Young, 2013). Moreover, they presuppose that linguistically and racially minoritized individuals can easily circumvent linguistic racism by adopting standardized English, a perspective which not only buys into the myth that positions standardized English as an ideal (Lippi-Green, 2011), but also ignores the ideological nature of standardized English and the reality that adherence to it will not prevent them from being perceived through the exclusionary lens of the white listening subject (Flores & Rosa, 2015). In this way, writing instruction that is predicated on providing students with minoritized identities with the codes of power is “not empowering ... but rather a mechanism for ... support[ing] the raciolinguistic status quo” (Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 22).

Another way of enacting linguistic racism—one which is both common and deceptively benign—is the result of the concept of appropriateness, which functions as a racializing discourse through which standardized English is conceptualized as a neutral and objective linguistic practice, one which stands alone as the accepted and appropriate norm for academic settings, while non-standardized linguistic practices are perceived as inappropriate and unacademic. Appropriateness reifies racial inequality through supposedly neutral and normative standards which, in reality, burden racially and linguistically minoritized students with the task of performing whiteness in their language use. Again, the concept of appropriateness rests on the false assumption that individuals racialized as non-white need only modify their linguistic practices to match standardized English in order to be read as appropriate, and that by doing so, they can control how they are perceived and interpreted; however, “linguistic stigmatization should be understood less as a reflection of objective linguistic practices than of perceptions that construe appropriateness based on speakers’ racial positions” (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 152). When initially proposing the raciolinguistic theoretical perspective, Rosa and Flores (2015) intended to critique such appropriateness-based approaches to language education, which they argue are “implicated in the reproduction of racial normativity by expecting language-minoritized students to model their linguistic practices after the white speaking subject despite the fact that the white listening subject continues to perceive these students’ language use in racialized ways” (p. 151). In working covertly to delegitimize non-standardized Englishes, discourses of appropriateness convey to linguistically and racially minoritized students that the way they communicate in their own communities does not carry equal weight in academic, professional, and other formal writing contexts, and that they must assimilate to white western upper class notions of appropriateness in order to be successful.

One final way in which linguistic racism is often enacted in writing instruction is through the raciolinguistic ideologies that are embodied in one’s habitus

as an instructor—that is, the ways in which our beliefs, judgements, and dispositions are mediated through raciolinguistic ideologies, and how we embody these ideologies in our pedagogies and practices. Kathryn A. Woolard (2020) notes that language ideologies “occur not only as mental constructs ... but also in embodied practices and dispositions ... [They] inhere in what Pierre Bourdieu called the *habitus*, that is the implicit knowledge and ingrained sensibilities that are inscribed in the body through repeated social experience” (2). Inoue (2015) has discussed this phenomenon as it relates to writing pedagogy in his concept of the “white racial habitus,” a term he uses to make visible the ways in which whiteness is entrenched in the embodied subjectivity of pedagogical practices and to foreground the dominant hegemonic discourses underlying writing instruction and assessment. Like the white listening subject, the white habitus is not an identity category but rather a power construct, one which functions as a set of dispositions that are embodied and performed by individuals through actions, languages, practices, judgements, expectations, and discourses. The white racial habitus is a significant factor in how raciolinguistic ideologies come to be reproduced in writing instruction because, as Gilyard (2011) points out, teachers teach tradition—that is, they teach what they have learned and have come to believe to be appropriate and acceptable. Thus, when instructors promote standardized English as the traditionally appropriate norm to which students should aspire, they are enacting linguistic racism and tacitly reifying whiteness through standardized English’s historic connection to privilege and power through whiteness (Inoue, 2015). However, while raciolinguistic ideologies as enacted and embodied through the pedagogical habitus may constitute a less visible form of linguistic racism, it is all the more insidious for that reason. As Hilary Janks (2010) notes, the pedagogical habitus is difficult to change—to do so requires “changing who we are and where we have come from ... [because] our embodied practices are bound up with ingrained beliefs about education and what we value in students” (p. 201)—and as a result, raciolinguistic ideologies as manifested through one’s habitus are particularly deep-rooted.

## **MAKING RACIOLINGUISTIC JUSTICE ACTIONABLE IN WAC**

In writing across the curriculum programs, a raciolinguistic theoretical framework can help to address these enactments of linguistic racism through first prompting us to uncover and confront the tensions resulting from the taken-for-grantedness in the assumptions, beliefs, and values that sit at the heart of writing instruction and writing program administration. For example, Chris M. Anson (2015) describes the concept that writing is a social and rhetorical

activity—that, in other words, students make informed choices when composing in response to a particular audience and rhetorical situation—as one of the core concepts in WAC. However, the reality of the writing classroom is that it exists as a “conditional rhetorical space” (Anson & Dannels, 2004), one in which “students must navigate complex sets of expectations, writing simultaneously ‘through’ a teacher to an imagined or sometimes real external audience, yet ‘to’ the teacher as evaluator of their success in reaching that audience” (Anson, 2015, p. 207). Raciolinguistic ideologies can cause tension in this conditional rhetorical space because many faculty members teaching writing in disciplines across the curriculum have never critically reflected on the implicit norms that inform their expectations and assumptions about writing (Sheriff, 2021). As a result of raciolinguistic ideological paradigms, these expectations and assumptions can retain vestiges of deficit perspective toward linguistically and racially minoritized students that position them as being responsible for their own academic struggles when they deviate from the supposedly neutral norms of standardized English. Thus, in evaluating students’ writing, faculty risk equating linguistic variation in their work with deficiency rather than recognizing it as a reflection of their diverse rhetorical resources, and may unintentionally position students’ linguistic identities as barriers to success rather than as assets.

Taking a raciolinguistic theoretical approach to such tensions would allow WAC programs to make raciolinguistic justice actionable through prompting instructors to interrogate how raciolinguistic ideologies might be shaping their pedagogies, as well as supporting them in working to value students’ diverse linguistic strengths, rather than requiring students with minoritized identities to perform white, middle-class linguistic norms in their writing. Faculty development initiatives can operationalize this approach by inviting instructors to reflect on their own language ideologies, examine how these beliefs shape their expectations for student writing, and engage in critical dialogue about linguistic diversity across disciplines. WAC programs can also advance this work by creating ongoing structures for faculty engagement and reflection, such as interdisciplinary faculty learning communities or working groups that allow instructors to collaboratively identify and challenge the raciolinguistic ideologies shaping their expectations for student writing, and develop inclusive pedagogical approaches that affirm students’ linguistic identities. WAC programs could further rethink the support offered to faculty in curricular design, assignment development, and assessment practices to ensure that writing classrooms across disciplines encourage students to not only draw on their full linguistic repertoires, but also develop greater rhetorical awareness through practicing code-meshing, translanguaging, and other inclusive linguistic strategies. One way such raciolinguistic justice initiatives could be advanced is by engaging faculty in collaboratively

designing writing assignments and activities that help students practice adapting their language choices to diverse rhetorical contexts while maintaining ownership of their voices. Faculty can also be supported in incorporating readings that feature diverse voices, normalize linguistic variation, and attend to how identity and power dynamics shape writers' choices across contexts. To accompany these curricular changes, WAC programs could provide models of alternative assessment approaches such as labor-based grading or reflective self-assessment that more closely align with the goals of raciolinguistic justice. Embedding linguistic justice into faculty development in these and other ways can ensure that writing faculty across disciplines are not only supported in teaching writing more equitably, but also accountable to a shared commitment to enacting practices that resist deficit perspectives and linguistic assimilation.

To support these efforts, WAC programs must further envision the design of their own programs in ways that take a theoretical lens to every level of its work in order to ensure that the support offered to faculty is grounded in program design that reinforces inclusive pedagogical practices across disciplines. For example, revising mission statements to include commitments to raciolinguistic justice or revising program learning outcomes to include goals related to linguistic awareness and linguistic flexibility can ensure that commitments to linguistic and racial justice are not just performative, but also embedded in the structures that guide decision-making and programmatic evaluation. By positioning linguistic diversity as a strength rather than a challenge, WAC programs can become both a site for support in teaching writing across disciplines as well as a catalyst for shifting broader institutional cultures toward valuing a wider range of rhetorical and linguistic practices as legitimate forms of academic communication.

While raciolinguistic justice will necessarily be put into practice in different ways in different institutional and departmental contexts, together these efforts could move WAC programs toward enacting raciolinguistic justice in both pedagogy and program design. However, raciolinguistic ideologies are pervasive and deeply ingrained in the way we think about, talk about, and teach writing, and resisting them will require interrupting the ways in which they are enacted through every part of writing instruction and writing program administration. As Baker-Bell (2020) argues, the process of transforming our programmatic missions, policies, and practices must begin by first challenging ourselves to recognize that “linguistic hierarchies and racial hierarchies are interconnected [and to acknowledge that] ... people’s language experiences are not separate from their racial experiences” (p. 2). Once we begin this process, we can then begin the work of challenging and resisting raciolinguistic ideologies in teaching practices and creating more inclusive and equitable writing instruction across disciplines that values all students’ linguistic practices.

## REIMAGINING WAC THROUGH THE LENS OF RACIOLINGUISTIC JUSTICE

It is important to acknowledge that the barriers to putting raciolinguistic justice into practice in WAC programs are increasing amid anti-DEI measures that are not only constraining our ability to promote racial and linguistic justice in academic spaces, but also threatening the progress that has already been made. However, such resistance only heightens the urgency of this work by reminding us that justice-oriented teaching is not optional, but essential to an inclusive vision for the future of higher education. When instructors who teach writing—regardless of discipline—view the writing of students with minoritized racial and linguistic identities through the lens of appropriateness or require them to adhere to standardized English under the guise of helping them succeed, we are not only complicit in enforcing standards that are linguistically racist, but also failing to recognize and support students' full linguistic and communicative potential and in some cases even doing harm. Put plainly, we cannot be effective or equitable writing instructors without understanding the raciolinguistic ideologies that shape our pedagogies and practices and divesting from raciolinguistic ideologies in our teaching. As WAC stakeholders consider its future directions, it is imperative to trouble the foundations of WAC and the ways we are engaging in working toward equity and inclusion by supporting instructors in understanding the role of raciolinguistic ideologies in fostering deficit beliefs about student writing, critically examining how their assumptions about language and race are impacting their pedagogies and practices, and taking action to resist raciolinguistic ideologies in their teaching in order to affirm and hold space for all students' linguistic practices. Vestiges of colonial perspectives on language and race continue to linger in the way writing is taught and assessed, and enacting a shift in perspective among instructors teaching writing in courses across multiple disciplines, not just within writing programs, will be a critical task if we want to accomplish a more just and inclusive vision of higher education more broadly and to bolster WAC efforts as part of a broader movement toward systemic change (Craig, et al., 2023). By embedding a raciolinguistic theoretical perspective into WAC programming and pedagogy, we can move toward a more just and inclusive vision of writing instruction that truly empowers all students to learn and engage through writing.

## REFERENCES

- Alim, H. S. (2016). Introducing raciolinguistics: Racing language and languaging race in hyperracial times. In H. S. Alim (Ed.), *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race* (pp. 1–32). Oxford University Press.

- Anson, C. M. (2015). Crossing thresholds: What's to know about writing across the curriculum. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 203–219). Utah State University Press.
- Anson, C. M., & Dannels, D.P. (2004). Writing and speaking in conditional rhetorical space. In E. Nagelhout & C. Rutz (Eds.), *Classroom space(s) and writing instruction* (pp. 55–70). Hampton Press.
- Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, 57(7), Article 100745.
- Bou Ayash, N. (2016). Conditions of (im)possibility: Postmonolingual language representations in academic literacies. *College English*, 78(6), 555–577.
- Bou Ayash, N. (2020). Developing translingual language representations: Implications for writing pedagogy. In A. Frost, J. Kierman, & S. B. Malley (Eds.), *Translingual dispositions: Globalized approaches to the teaching of writing* (pp. 13–32). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2020.0438.2.01>
- Britton, E. R., & Lorimer Leonard, R. (2020). The social justice potential of critical reflection and critical language awareness pedagogies for L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50, 1–12.
- Canagarajah, S. (2016). Translingual writing and teacher development in composition. *College English*, 78(3), 265–273.
- Condon, F., & Young, V. A. (Eds.). (2016). *Performing antiracist pedagogy in rhetoric, writing, and communication*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2016.0933>
- Coxwell-Teague, D., & Lunsford, R. F. (Eds.). (2014). *First-year composition: From theory to practice*. Parlor Press.
- Craig, S., Barrios, B., & Galin, J. (2023). Toward more sustainable antiracist practices. *The WAC Journal*, 34(1), 40–63. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2023.34.1.04>
- De Costa, P. I. (2020). Linguistic racism: Its negative effects and why we need to contest it. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(7) 833–837.
- Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280–298. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.58.3.c43481778r528qw4>
- Dovchin, S. (2020). The psychological damages of linguistic racism and international students in Australia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(7), 804–818. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1759504>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171.
- García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R., & Rosa, J. (2021). Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 18(3), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2021.1935957>
- Gilyard, K. (2011). *True to the language game: African American discourse, cultural politics, and pedagogy*. Routledge.

- Holliday, N. R., & Squires, L. (2021). Sociolinguistic labor, linguistic climate, and race(ism) on campus: Black college students' experiences with language at predominantly white institutions. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 25(6), 418–437.
- Horner, B., Lu, M.-Z., Royster, J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translanguaging approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303–321.
- Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 53(4), 594–630.
- Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0698>
- Inoue, A. B., & Poe, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Race and writing assessment*. Peter Lang.
- Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. Routledge.
- Jordan, J. (2012). *Redesigning composition for multilingual realities*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Kareem, J. M. (2020). Sustained communities for sustained learning: Connecting culturally sustaining pedagogy to WAC outcomes. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R. Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25* (pp. 293–308). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.0360.2.16>
- Kells, M. (2007). Writing across communities: Deliberation and the discursive possibilities of WAC. *Reflections: A Journal of Writing, Service-Learning, and Community Literacy*, 6(1), 87–109.
- Kynard, C. (2014). *Vernacular insurrections: Race, Black protest, and the new century in composition-literacies studies*. SUNY Press.
- LeCourt, D. (1996). WAC as critical pedagogy: The third stage? *JAC*, 16(3), 389–405.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2011). *English with an accent*. Routledge.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2012). Teaching composition in the multilingual world: Second language writing in composition studies. In K. Ritter & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Exploring composition: Sites, issues, and perspectives* (pp. 36–51). Utah State University Press.
- Perryman-Clark, S. M. (2023). *The new work of writing across the curriculum: Diversity and inclusion, collaborative partnerships, and faculty development*. Utah State University Press.
- Perryman-Clark, S., Kirkland, D. E., & Jackson, A. (2014). *Students' right to their own language: A critical sourcebook*. Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Poe, M. (2013). Re-framing race in teaching writing across the curriculum. *Across the Disciplines*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2013.10.3.06>
- Poe, M., & Inoue, A. (2016). Toward writing assessment as social justice: An idea whose time has come. *College English*, 79(2), 119–126.
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46(5), 621–647.
- Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.): *A curricular history*. Southern Illinois University Press.

- Sanchez, J., & Branson, T. S. (2016). The role of composition programs in de-normalizing whiteness in the university: Programmatic Approaches to anti-racist pedagogies. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 39(2), 47–52.
- Shapiro, S. (2022). *Cultivating critical language awareness in the writing classroom*. Routledge.
- Sheriff, S. (2021). Beyond “I know it when I see it”: WEC and the process of unearthing faculty expertise. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation* (pp. 145–165). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2021.1299.2.06>
- Smitherman, G. (1999). CCCC’s role in the struggle for language rights. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(3), 349–376.
- Smitherman, G. (1986). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America*. Wayne State University Press.
- Wood, J., & Shapiro, S. (2026). Beyond the binary: Using critical language awareness to navigate conventions for antiracist WAC. In C. Basgier, T. M. Zawacki, M. Gustafsson, S. Hum, & M. Mathison (Eds.), *Writing Worldviews: Extended Scholarly Conversations from IWAC 2023*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2026.2845.2.08>
- Woolard, K. A. (2020). Language ideology. In J. Stanlaw (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of linguistic anthropology*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0217>
- Villanueva, V. (1993). *Bootstraps: From an American academic of color*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Villanueva, V. (2011). The politics of literacy across the curriculum. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 165–178). The WAC Clearinghouse. <https://wacclearinghouse.org/books/landmarks/millennium/> (Original work published 2001 by National Council of Teachers of English)
- Young, V. A. (2010). Should writers use they own English? *Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies*, 12(1), 110–118.
- Young, V. A. (2013). Keep code-meshing. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 26–38). Routledge.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506–521.
- Zawacki, T. M., & Cox, M. (2014). *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551>