Received: 5 April 2019 | Revised: 7 May 2019 | Accepted: 12 May 2019

DOI: 10.1111/lnc3.12329

ARTICLE

WILEY

Accompanying as accomplices: Pedagogies for community engaged learning in sociocultural linguistics

Lynnette Arnold

Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Anthropology, Brown University

Correspondence
Lynnette Arnold, Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 217 Machmer Hall, 240 Hicks Way, Amherst MA 01003.
Email: larnold@anthro.umass.edu

Abstract

As a field, sociocultural linguistics has a long legacy of public scholarship that has worked to counter linguistic prejudices and inequalities perpetuated through language. Today, current community engagement within sociocultural linguistics increasingly takes a collaborative approach that includes students. In this article, I therefore explore how the field prepares both students and faculty for this work. In particular, I focus on courses with a service learning component, suggesting that these constitute key spaces for developing the commitments and capacities necessary for engaged work that advances sociolinguistic justice. I highlight the insights of existing scholarship on service learning in linguistics before turning to a more detailed discussion of pedagogical practice, drawing on current critical pedagogy literature that emphasize the importance of language and culture. Synthesizing two social movement perspectives, I propose a pedagogical framework that supports faculty and students in learning to accompany as an accomplice. I demonstrate the application of this model by discussing specific pedagogical strategies enacted in a community engaged course I taught on Language and Migration at a university in the United States. Ultimately, I suggest that developing social justice pedagogies is a crucial endeavor if we are to counter the ways that language has been used to justify inequalities

and motivate violence towards racialized communities, both in the past and in the present.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Sociocultural linguistics, or the broad interdisciplinary field dedicated to the study of language and social life (Bucholtz & Hall, 2008), has a long history of scholarship that engages with communities of speakers outside the academy to advance social change (Charity Hudley, 2008, 2013). While many efforts utilize sociolinguistic expertise to combat widespread negative attitudes towards minoritized language practices and speakers (e.g., Alim, 2005; Dunstan, Wolfram, Jaeger, & Crandall, 2015; Wolfram, 2011), others have taken a more expansive approach that addresses a range of pressing injustices from a sociocultural linguistic perspective (see contributions to Avineri, Graham, Johnson, Conley Riner, & Rosa, 2019).[1] These efforts emerge from a concern with social justice, understood as "a contested concept and existential problem that remains to be realized rather than a pragmatic challenge that can be reconciled in any straightforward way" (Avineri et al., 2019, p. 2). In this work, critical efforts are no longer focused primarily on valorizing the language practices of minoritized communities but rather on challenging the institutions, ideologies, and practices that use language as a form of subjugation. Crucially, given the deep history of racialized inequalities, such efforts must call attention to what Rosa and Flores (2017) call the *white listening subject*, "an ideological position and mode of perception" that perpetuates white supremacy, enacted through the practices of institutions and biographical individuals (p. 177). Such efforts take up Zentella's consistent calls (1995, 2018) for an anthropolitical linguistics in which scholars "participate in communities' challenges of the policies and institutions that circumscribe the linguistic and cultural capital of their members" (Zentella, 1995, p. 13).

As a result, current community engagement efforts within the field are increasingly taking a collaborative approach in which scholars work closely with communities, deploying their institutional and intellectual resources to meet community goals (Bucholtz, Casillas, & Lee, 2015; Mallinson & Charity Hudley, 2010; Mallinson, Hudley, Strickling, & Figa, 2011). Moreover, such work often goes beyond faculty involvement to include undergraduate and graduate students, raising questions about how to prepare students for this type of work, especially when faculty themselves often have no formal training for community engaged teaching and learning aimed towards social justice. Scholarship on academic engagement with communities has repeatedly shown that inadequate preparation can result in efforts that are at best ineffective and at worst actively perpetuate inequalities in ways that countermand social justice goals (Dolgon, Mitchell, & Eatman, 2017). As sociocultural linguistics takes up more collaborative approaches to community engagement and social justice, it is thus imperative to consider how we learn and teach the skills necessary for this work. In this article, I therefore explore how sociocultural linguistics courses take learning beyond the classroom through student involvement with organizations outside of the university.[2] Building on the work of scholars of liberatory education (Freire, 2000; Hooks, 1994), I contend that pedagogy is an important tool for advancing social justice. Through our classroom practices, we can learn and teach an approach to social justice that is attuned to how institutions and ideologies use language to perpetuate racialized inequalities, while also critically attending to our own place as individuals within these larger structures. I begin by exploring previous work on service learning in linguistics before offering a new

pedagogical framework that builds on current perspectives from social movements and then discussing its implementation in a community engaged course I taught in Spring 2018 at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island.

2 | SERVICE LEARNING IN LINGUISTICS

Historically, the field of linguistics has paid very little attention to pedagogy (Petray, 2004), but applied linguistics has been at the forefront of developing and implementing service learning models (Wurr & Hellebrandt, 2007). Whether in foreign language courses (Garvida & Martel, 2015; Hellebrandt & Jorge, 2013; O'Connor, 2012), classes with heritage language speakers (Leeman, 2018; Leeman, Rabin, & Roman-Mendoza, 2011; Llombart-Huesca & Pulido, 2017), or English language courses for international students (Chao, 2016; Miller, Berkey, & Griffin, 2014), taking learning beyond the classroom into the community supports student acquisition of communicative competence in the target language. While students in linguistics courses are not learning a language, they are acquiring new ways of thinking and speaking about language, and community engagement can support this metalinguistic learning as well (Charity Hudley, Harris, Hayes, Ikeler, & Squires, 2008; Fitzgerald, 2010).

As Charity Hudley et al. (2008) suggest, "service learning as a pedagogical strategy brings linguistics to life" (p. 248). Participating in community engagement helps students make connections between lived experience and the academic concepts of linguistics, while revealing the relevance and importance of linguistic knowledge for work in a range of fields (Fitzgerald, 2010). Service learning can therefore also support students' career development by giving them practical and professional experience or preparing them for future graduate work (Charity Hudley et al., 2008). Beyond its benefits for students, service learning can also be advantageous for the discipline as a whole. In offering service learning courses, linguistics departments can build connections to related disciplines such as anthropology, education, sociology, government, law, and public policy by creating community engagement opportunities for students in these majors (Charity Hudley et al., 2008). Moreover, because it makes clear the importance of linguistics to real world concerns, service learning can serve to recruit more diverse students into the field (Fitzgerald, 2010). While traditional introductory courses in the field, which are purely analytical and technical in nature, tend to privilege students motivated by intellectual curiosity (Milambiling, 2001; Spring et al., 2000), community engagement attracts students motivated by social justice concerns and thus may be a crucial tool for enlisting and training the future generations of scholars who will keep the discipline relevant in the long term.

While previous work on service learning in linguistics makes clear the benefits of such an approach both for students and for the field as a whole, these calls do not articulate clearly how such pedagogies can advance the broader goals of social justice. However, important pedagogical insights can be drawn from the work of education scholars who have developed transformative approaches that place language at the center of struggles against inequality, particularly racialized injustice (Alim, 2005, 2007; Alim & Baugh, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995). This scholarship has built an understanding of how pedagogy may sustain culture by seeking to "perpetuate and foster linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of schooling for positive social transformation" (Paris & Alim, 2017, p. 1). Such pedagogies are premised on the understanding that language and culture are forms of sustenance for marginalized communities (Bucholtz, Casillas, & Lee, 2017), thus highlighting the crucial role of linguistically informed work beyond our campuses.

Community engaged courses in sociocultural linguistics can better advance social justice by taking up critical pedagogies through which students and faculty can learn to attend carefully to racialized structures of inequality, while also considering their own place within them. To prepare for such critical community engagement, I suggest that sociocultural linguistics courses adopt pedagogies that develop the capacity to *accompany as accomplices*. Because both of these perspectives—accompaniment and accompliceship—emphasize the ongoing nature of learning in social change work, this approach allows faculty to learn alongside students. This pedagogical framework brings together social movement perspectives that I learned about during the 4 years I spent living and working with women and youth in rural Salvadoran communities, as well as through more than a decade of involvement with immigrant rights organizing in the United States. This work has been a space of ongoing learning in which I am often uncomfortably confronted by my own complicity in injustice as a White, English-speaking U.S. citizen whose ideological positions and modes of perception (to borrow Rosa and Flores' terms) have been inevitably shaped by white supremacy.

3 | ACCOMPANIMENT AS ACCOMPLICES

Accompaniment is an approach to collective social transformation that involves individuals from different backgrounds working together as equals; through accompaniment, participants strive to enact the social relations they envision, living them out even as they struggle for change. This approach is rooted in the work of Salvadoran Archbishop Óscar Romero during the country's civil war. He accompanied poor communities in their daily lives, learning from them about the torture and disappearances that constituted their realities under the military repression of the oligarchic regime. What he learned, he shared, speaking out against these injustices in his weekly radio broadcast and his homilies (López Vigil, 2000). As a consequence, he himself was assassinated on March 24, 1981, and yet his legacy of accompaniment lives on today, as I learned during the time that I spent in El Salvador. The community organizations that I worked with took accompaniment as the *sine qua non* of their efforts for gender equality and youth participation. From these women and youth, I learned how change emerges by working together across difference; as in music, different voices and individual strengths augment, accent, or counter one another, offering "an opportunity to build on both the dynamics of difference and the solidarities of sameness" that recognizes and reinforces the dignity of all participants (Tomlinson & Lipsitz, 2013, p. 11). Through such collective efforts of working together, participants engage in the often slow process of learning from one another. Accompaniment, then, is a practice-based approach that emphasizes the processual nature of social change work and the importance of social relations in these journeys.

As such, accompaniment is an approach that is well suited to community engagement in sociolinguistics. Bucholtz, Casillas, and Lee (2016) suggest that "researchers of language, culture, and society are especially well positioned to participate in a relationship of accompaniment, given such scholars' commitment to recognizing and valuing diverse linguistic and interactional practices" (p. 27). In other words, our disciplinary propensity to attend to linguistic variation and cultural diversity is an asset for the work of accompaniment; our predisposition to recognize the significance of even the smallest of actions prepares us for accompaniment in which "some of our biggest achievements will come from small acts" (Fischlin, Heble, & Lipsitz, 2013, p. 236). Bucholtz and colleagues pioneered this accompaniment approach in their work with SKILLS (School Kids Investigating Language in Life and Society), an ongoing community

engagement effort in which faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates at U.C. Santa Barbara teach sociocultural linguistics in local schools.[3] This work has led to important insights about community engagement through accompaniment in sociocultural linguistics. Firstly, accompaniment is best understood as multilayered, involving different relationships between the program participants, whether faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, or community members. This dynamic produces multidirectional learning that has the potential to destabilize the ways that power hierarchies are often reproduced in academic community engagement work (Bucholtz et al., 2015). Secondly, participants in the SKILLS program emphasize the importance of emotion to the work of accompaniment (Bucholtz, Casillas, & Lee, 2018). Because of the centrality of social relationships to the work of accompaniment, this model requires moving beyond normative understandings of educational spaces as purely cognitive, to recognize the ways that learning involves heart as well (Orellana, 2016).

Accompaniment as a model for community engagement can be strengthened by combining it with recent calls from social movements for more committed forms of participation as accomplices (Indigenous Action, 2014; Jackson, 2016). Drawing on Martin Luther King, Jr.'s letter from Birmingham City Jail (1963), the call for accomplices in social justice struggles "urges progressives to avoid the deceptive comfort of allyship, and, instead, to pursue complicity with criminalized communities" (Gomberg-Muñoz, 2018, p. 36), in particular indigenous communities and other communities of color whose lives and well-being are increasingly threatened by white supremacy. Accompliceship begins with recognizing the ways in which we are all already complicit with unjust laws and instead moves us towards "becoming complicit in a struggle towards liberation" (Indigenous Action, 2014, p. 2). Accompliceship is premised on recognizing our shared stakes in the creation of new ways of interacting (Jackson, 2016) and thus presumes accompaniment as the mode of work. An accompliceship model can thus refine an accompaniment approach by clarifying how to best conduct this work to advance social justice.

Firstly, accompanying as accomplices means not avoiding discomfort but rather seeing it as a productive starting point. This welcoming of discomfort involves a critical understanding of individuals' different positionalities with regard to oppressive structures, which means that racialized and other minoritized communities face inherent risks in our society that White individuals do not (Powell & Kelly, 2017). Such awareness of positionality allows accomplices to "find creative ways to weaponize their privilege" (Indigenous Action, 2014, p. 6). Moreover, accomplices understand the urgency of action, a crucial point for scholarly community engagement, which can reinforce academic models that favor research and study over action. "An accomplice as academic would seek ways to leverage resources and material support and/or betray their institution to further liberation struggles. An intellectual accomplice would strategize with, not for and not be afraid to pick up a hammer" (Indigenous Action, 2014, p. 5). In other words, being an accomplice requires active co-labor to dismantle oppressive systems. However, accomplices balance this sense of urgency with careful attention to relationships by cultivating mutual accountability and responsibility. As they develop these relationships of trust, accomplices "listen with respect for the range of cultural practices and dynamics that exist within indigenous communities" (Indigenous Action, 2014, p. 8). As sociocultural linguists, we can betray our discipline and teach our students to do so as well, turning our expertise into a tool for building relationships through which we can accompany struggles for social justice as accomplices.

Accompanying as accomplices is not an inherent skill; rather, it is "a commitment and a capacity to be developed" (Tomlinson & Lipsitz, 2013, p. 9). Community engaged courses on language and social life can allow both faculty and students to develop these capacities and commitments. Based on my experiences in El Salvador and with the SKILLS program, I have

seen that accompanying as accomplices is something best learned by participating in journeys of mutual learning and social justice struggle. In community engaged sociocultural linguistic courses, the capacities of accomplices in accompaniment can be developed both in community work and within the classroom. Recognizing that students will learn from how we accompany them in their learning journeys, we can implement accompaniment as accomplices not only as framework for community engagement but also a pedagogical strategy for social justice education. In the following section, I sketch how I implemented this approach in teaching a community engaged course, with the hope that this sharing will encourage other sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists to explore social justice pedagogies in their teaching.

4 | ACCOMPANYING AS ACCOMPLICES IN THE CLASSROOM

In Spring 2018, I offered a community engaged course on Language and Migration at Brown University (see Appendix A for the course syllabus). The course was supported by a grant from the Swearer Center, which coordinates the University's engagement with the surrounding community in Providence, Rhode Island. During the semester, all students in the course spent a minimum of 3 hr per week working with a range of different community organizations. Much of this work was linguistically focused: students taught English as a second language to adult immigrants, provided academic tutoring for refugee children, or worked with recently arrived migrant youth in an afterschool English conversation program. However, this final partnership was expanded when the partner high school teacher asked us to help provide the immigrant students at the school with information about their legal rights in the current moment of rapidly changing policy. In response, I worked with a local immigrant-led community organization to set up Know Your Rights workshops at the high school; these sessions discussed not only federal immigration law but also a local sanctuary ordinance that had recently gone into effect, largely thanks to the efforts of this community organization. The workshops were made possible through the Swearer Center grant, which was intended to support the learning activities of this type of engaged course. By incorporating the Know Your Rights workshops into the course, I worked to leverage the resources of my elite institution, putting them at the service of community struggles for social justice.

Demographically, half of the students in my class were White, while the remainder identified as students of color; most of this second group were the children of immigrants themselves and some were multilingual. The students thus approached our study of language and migration from radically different life experiences, creating a rich but challenging environment in which to implement accompaniment as accomplices. Thus, even as I sought to center our analytical efforts and community work on the institutions and ideologies that weaponize language to reproduce inequality, I also wanted to create spaces for students to critically consider their own varied positionalities vis-à-vis these oppressive structures. In what follows, I discuss three pedagogical strategies that students highlighted as particularly crucial for developing their capacities and commitment to this way of working.[4] It is important to note that while I initiated these pedagogical practices with particular goals in mind, their impact was ultimately due to the way that the students took up and engaged in these strategies.

The first pedagogical practice involved the framing of the course. To start the semester by encouraging students to think critically about community engagement, readings about accompliceship were the first assignment (Indigenous Action, 2014; Jackson, 2016). On the

second day of class, I facilitated a discussion on being accomplices in a learning community with one another (see Appendix B for the handout I created for this discussion). I used the "brave space" model to describe the course, a framework which suggests that because dialogs about social justice are inherently challenging, they can only be fruitful when approached with bravery rather than fear (Arao & Clemens, 2013). In developing a brave space for learning, accountability is crucial, as participants must accept responsibility for their actions and the repercussions of these actions, be willing to name and challenge oppressive ideas, and recognize how their positionality impacts group dynamics. Such forms of accountability require a commitment to being present in the learning environment not only intellectually but also affectively, resonating with the emphasis that accompaniment places on emotional and relational work. As part of our discussion, students revisited traditional participation ground rules, exploring how norms that are meant to ensure equality often end up reproducing societal hierarchies. In small groups, students worked to develop alternative guidelines that would allow us to collectively build a brave space; these suggestions were then debated and refined in the large group (see Table 1). Students spontaneously named these guidelines a "living list," adapting participation ground rules into a more comprehensive approach that would guide all aspects of our work together as a learning community over the semester.

The importance of this moment for both framing and enacting accompaniment as accomplices was evident in student comments. One reported "I think the creation of a 'living list' at the beginning of the semester was really good and helped the discussions moving forward" (2), while another suggested that this conversation "really helped us build a classroom community and think deeply about our material" (1). This activity thus supported the development of a learning community that could collaboratively work to deepen conversations throughout the semester by allowing us to accompany one another's learning as accomplices. The living list served as a touchstone for the rest of the semester and made possible the two additional pedagogical practices that I will discuss below.

While the formulation of the living list set the tone for a learning community, the second pedagogical practice sought to implement accompaniment as accomplices through regular reflections, which have long been understood as a crucial practice for helping students make connections between community work and classroom learning (Fitzgerald, 2009; Norris, Siemers, Clayton, Weiss, & Edwards, 2017). I had students write weekly journal entries in which they could reflect honestly and openly on their experiences with their community partner. They posted these reflections to our online course management system, but posts were only visible to myself and one other classmate who was their designated learning partner. Students were partnered with classmates working with the same community organization, so that they could mutually support one another in deeper and more critical learning. Each week, they would read one another's journals and offer comments, questions, and encouragement. The student partners shared this

TABLE 1 Living list

Traditional ground rules	Alternatives formulated by students
Agree to disagree	Agree to hear difference
No personal attacks	Challenge ideas not identities
Do not take things personally	Name the impact of intentions
Assume the best intentions of people in the space	Care and check-in
Respect others	Preserve the brave space

reflection space for the entire semester in order to build the deeper relationships necessary for accompaniment as accomplices.

At the end of the semester, these reflection journals were the pedagogical strategy that students pointed to most consistently as enriching their learning experience. One student wrote: "the reflections did a great job of helping us integrate in-class work with work with my community partner" (2) while another reflected "I found the reflection journals to be a space where I forced myself to more critically engage with my work and positionality" (2). The journals offered a venue in which students could explore how their community engagement work may have been disempowering to communities. Through these reflections, students connected readings about linguistic hierarchies and the dominance of English to their own ways of speaking in community work, recognizing how their default reliance on English in multilingual environments may have unintentionally reproduced the marginalization of other languages and their speakers. These explorations led students to take concrete actions to change their community engagement practices. For instance, students who were teaching ESL to adult immigrants weaponized their privilege as volunteers from an elite institution to hold off the weight of the community organizations' English-only teaching methods: they developed pedagogies that drew on learners' first languages to support their acquisition of English, creating a more welcoming classroom environment that contributed to improved attendance and participation.

However, the peer review component of the journals met with uneven responses: although a few students reported benefitting from this format ("having another student engaged in a similar community engagement also was extremely helpful in my ability to tie what we were learning with class" (2)), the majority indicated that it made them uncomfortable or that it was unhelpful ("I didn't find the peer comments useful or necessary" (2)). These negative reactions reveal an understanding of learning as internal rather than a social process, a result of students' socialization into an educational system that valorizes individual accomplishments. In this context, the collaborative work of accompaniment as accomplices, which in this case I aimed to implement through the peer review of reflection journals, represents a radical break with dominant pedagogical practices. To be more successful, this pedagogical strategy needed greater scaffolding, including, as one student suggested, "stressing the socio-political importance" (2) of this aspect of the course. In addition, using some class time each week for reflections could help provide structure that would support students as they learned how to accompany one another as accomplices in this way. The Center for Community-Engaged Learning at the University of Minnesota has an excellent list of reflection prompts that can be used to prompt small-group discussions in class (http://www.servicelearning.umn.edu/info/reflection.html), which can then be expanded into deeper questions that tie into course concepts for students to explore in their reflection journals.

The final pedagogical strategy that I implemented was to accompany the students as an accomplice by being open about how I myself was learning throughout the semester. In particular, many students commented on an open reflection I shared with them in response to the failure of our second Know Your Rights workshop at the local high school. The first workshop, held during the school day, was attended by over 100 students, but no one attended the subsequent evening workshop we organized for students' families. My students present at the event were upset and confused, and for my part, I was deeply shaken. Our community partners at the immigrant rights organization that we worked with, however, were unsurprised by the lack of attendance and reflected on the climate of fear that immigrant communities experience in an era of increasingly widespread enforcement.

The next day in the class, I shared with students what this event had taught me about my own complicity in systems of oppression. I reminded students of our previous conversations

about how schooling has long been an experience of exclusion for communities of color, a place of violence where culture and language are stripped away. For immigrant communities, this violence is palpable in the threat of deportation, with immigration officials regularly lying in wait at schools to pick up undocumented parents who are taking their children to school (Castillo, 2017). Although I knew this all on an intellectual level, I still went ahead with planning the Know Your Rights workshop for parents at the school. In doing so, I failed to accompany as an accomplice, instead operating from assumptions based on my own lived experience of schools as safe community spaces. These beliefs—fundamentally shaped by my positionality—ultimately produced a form of engagement that, while perhaps not directly disempowering, certainly did not contribute productively to community struggles for social justice. These entrenched assumptions deafened me to the indirect but repeated concerns of community partners about the feasibility of holding the workshop at the school. I ultimately missed an opportunity to betray my discipline by failing to turn my sociolinguistic skills of close listening on myself and my own perspectives.

In sharing my reflection with students, I emphasized that such moments of realizing our complicity in inequality can serve as calls to reorient our efforts towards the work of accompanying as accomplices in struggles for justice. Moreover, while such realization of complicity can feel paralyzing, it should not lead to inaction but rather to reflection and greater self-awareness in future action: "you wouldn't find an accomplice resigning their agency or capabilities as an act of 'support'" (Indigenous Action, 2014, p. 6). Throughout the semester in their own reflections, students had shared their own moments of such realization, and in sharing my own learning with them, I sought to accompany them on this journey. The consequences of this moment went deep, as one student wrote "Until Prof. Arnold's open reflection, I failed to examine or even recognize my white gaze and how it has obscured all of my assumptions and explanations for the failure of the event. Her going through her own analysis was a game changer for me, and really helped me to recognize how much deeper I have to work at examining my own positionality" (3).

The significance of this moment for the course was shown in an activity on the final day of class in which students reflected on what they had learned in the course. Much like the comment above, several students emphasized the importance of reflexive self-awareness to the practice of accompanying as accomplices. "You can never stop examining your own positionality; it affects every one of your choices (by shaping your experiences, assumptions and theories)" (3). These comments suggest that students learned through experience about the processual nature of accompaniment, which involves continual reflexivity and growth. At the same time, the comments also reflected students' understandings of the long-term nature of working as accomplices. Through their own work with community organizations, in conjunction with the pedagogical practices of the course, they had come to see that accompanying as an accomplice requires investing in sustained relationships. While it may not be possible to achieve such relations over a single semester, the course was at least successful in helping students to develop the awareness and commitments that accompanying as an accomplice requires.

5 | CONCLUSION

While sociocultural linguistics has a rich legacy of community engagement that works towards social justice, the disciplines and institutions in which we work have long been complicit in the perpetuation of inequality. Scholars have highlighted the role of linguistics and anthropology in supporting the projects that produce a divide between a White "we" who belong and racialized

others, a division that justified colonization and the slave trade and that today makes possible the continued mistreatment of communities of color (Irvine & Gal, 2000; Rosa & Bonilla, 2017; Trouillot, 1991). Moreover, as Rickford (1997) and Zentella (2018) have pointed out, sociocultural linguistics as a discipline has benefitted a great deal from work with Black and Latinx communities, while at the same time systematically excluding members of these communities from full participation in the discipline. If the community engaged work of sociocultural linguistics is to truly advance social justice goals, such efforts must grapple with this legacy of disciplinary complicity; we must work "to leverage and sacrifice relative protection, access, and prestige in service to the subversion of oppressive systems" (Gomberg-Muñoz, 2018, p. 36).

In this paper, I have suggested that community engaged sociocultural linguistics courses offer an important venue to advance this work, particularly when we attend more closely to our pedagogical practices. Bringing together two social movement perspectives, I have suggested that we use such courses as opportunities for developing the capacities of accompanying as accomplices; by implementing particular learning strategies within the classroom, students and faculty alike can cultivate the commitments and skills that allow our community engaged work to advance social justice aims. While this discussion has focused on the implementation of an accompaniment as accomplices model in community engaged courses, this discussion has implications for pedagogy within sociocultural linguistics in general. Although not all of our courses will require students to work with community organizations, teaching in sociocultural linguistics is most successful when learning about language extends beyond the classroom, into students' everyday encounters with language in the world. The pedagogical strategies that develop capacities for accompanying as accomplices can thus advance sociocultural linguistics teaching in general. By pushing both faculty and students towards a more critical and engaged way of thinking about language and social life, these social justice pedagogies are thus a crucial resource for combatting the historical legacies and contemporary institutional realities of our field.

ENDNOTES

[1]This volume emerged from the collective efforts of the Language and Social Justice Committee, a standing committee of the Society for Linguistic Anthropology (http://linguisticanthropology.org/socialjustice/). I am deeply indebted to this group as well, since my ongoing engagement with their efforts has shaped my own approach to this work.

[2]Such courses have taken several names historically, generally tied to shifts in approach, which are beyond the scope of this paper to review (for an overview, see Hollander, Lapping, Rice, & Cruz, 2017). In this paper, I will generally use the current term *community engagement*, but will also use *service learning* when referring to previous scholarship that uses this approach.

[3]I worked for 2 years with SKILLS as a graduate teaching fellow, and my discussion of the program thus draws on my experience as well as the published materials cited here.

[4]In assessing the effectiveness of course pedagogy, I draw on student reflections from (1) anonymous university course evaluations (2) an anonymous unofficial evaluation that asked more in-depth questions and was administered through google forms, and (3) an end-of-semester reflection in which students wrote about what they had learned in the course. I will indicate the source of each student quote given with this numbering system throughout. Consulting with community members about their experiences of working with my students would of course provide an alternate means of assessing pedagogical effectiveness, and while I have indeed conducted such ongoing conversations with community partners, reporting on them is beyond the scope of this paper.

ORCID

Lynnette Arnold https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1143-0490

REFERENCES

Alim, H. S. (2005). Critical language awareness in the United States: Revisiting issues and revising pedagogies in a resegretated society. *Educational Research*, *34*, 24–31. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034007024

Alim, H. S. (2007). Critical hip-hop language pedagogies: Combat, consciousness, and the cultural politics of communication. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *6*(2), 161–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348450701341378

Alim, H. S., & Baugh, J. (2010). Ethnosensitivity in time and space: Critical hip hop language pedagogies and black language in the U.S. In M. Farr, L. Seloni, & J. Song (Eds.), *Ethnolinguistic diversity and education: Language, literacy, and culture* (pp. 150–166). New York: Routledge.

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe spaces to brave spaces. In *The art of effective facilitation* (pp. 135–150). Sterling, VA, Stylus Publishing.

Avineri, N., Graham, L. R., Johnson, E. J., Conley Riner, R., & Rosa, J. (Eds.) (2019). *Language and social justice in practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bucholtz, M., Casillas, D. I., & Lee, J. S. (2015). Team collaboration and educational partnerships in sociocultural linguistics. *American Speech*, *90*(2), 230–245. https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-3130346

Bucholtz, M., Casillas, D. I., & Lee, J. S. (2016). Beyond empowerment: Accompaniment and sociolinguistic justice in a youth research program. In R. Lawson, & D. Sayers (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic research: Application and impact* (pp. 25–44). New York: Routledge.

Bucholtz, M., Casillas, D. I., & Lee, J. S. (2017). Language and culture as sustenance. In D. Paris, & H. S. Alim (Eds.), *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 43–60). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bucholtz, M., Casillas, D. I., & Lee, J.-S. (Eds.) (2018). *Feeling it: Language, race, and affect in Latinx youth learning*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315099729

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2008). All of the above: New coalitions in sociocultural linguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *12*, 401–431. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00382.x

Castillo, A. (2017, March 3). Immigrant arrested by ICE after dropping daughter off at school, sending shockwaves through neighborhood. Retrieved December 17, 2018, from latimes.com website: https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-immigration-school-20170303-story.html

Chao, X. (2016). Community service learning as critical curriculum: Promoting international students' second language practices. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *13*(4), 289–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2016.1173513

Charity Hudley, A. H. (2008). Linguists as agents for social change. *Lang & Ling Compass*, *2*(5), 923–939. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00081.x

Charity Hudley, A. H. (2013). Sociolinguistics and social activism. In R. Bayley, R. Cameron, & C. Lucas (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 812–832). New York: Oxford University Press.

Charity Hudley, A. H., Harris, J., Hayes, J., Ikeler, K., & Squires, A. (2008). Service-learning as an introduction to sociolinguistics and linguistic equality. *American Speech*, *83*(2), 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-2008-016

Dolgon, C., Mitchell, T. D., & Eatman, T. K. (Eds.) (2017). *The Cambridge handbook of service learning and community engagement*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316650011

Dunstan, S. B., Wolfram, W., Jaeger, A. J., & Crandall, R. E. (2015). Educating the educated: Language diversity in the university backyard. *American Speech*, *90*(2), 266–280. https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-3130368

Fischlin, D., Heble, A., & Lipsitz, G. (2013). *The fierce urgency of now: Improvisation, rights, and the ethics of cocreation*. Durham: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822378358

Fitzgerald, C. M. (2009). Language and community: Using service learning to reconfigure the multicultural classroom. *Language and Education*, *23*(3), 217–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802510159

Fitzgerald, C. M. (2010). Developing a service-learning curriculum for linguistics. *Lang & Ling Compass*, *4*(4), 204–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2010.00196.x

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30thanniversary ed) ed.). New York: Continuum.

Garvida, M., & Martel, M. (2015). Aprender a aprender: La adquisición de competencias cultural, intercultural y sociolingüísticas a través del aprendizaje-servicio del español como lengua extranjera. 10. Granada, Spain.

Gomberg-Muñoz, R. (2018). The complicit anthropologist. *Journal for the Anthropology of North America*, *21*(1), 36–37. https://doi.org/10.1002/nad.12070

Hellebrandt, J., & Jorge, E. (2013). The scholarship of community engagement: Advancing partnerships in Spanish and Portuguese. *Hispania*, *96*(2), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2013.0058

Hollander, E. L., Lapping, M., Rice, R. E., & Cruz, N. (2017). Talking about origins: Four stories of engagement. In C. Dolgon, T. D. Mitchell, & T. K. Eatman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of service learning and community engagement* (pp. 20–41). New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316650011.004

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Indigenous Action (2014). Accomplices not allies: Abolishing the ally industrial complex. Retrieved from http://www.indigenousaction.org/accomplices-not-allies-abolishing-the-ally-industrial-complex/

Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities* (pp. 35–84). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Jackson, R. (2016, July 14). Accomplices versus allies. *The Seattle Globalist*. Retrieved from http://www.seattleglobalist.com/2016/07/14/accomplices-vs-allies/53654

Rosa, J., & Bonilla, Y. (2017). Deprovincializing Trump, decolonizing diversity, and unsettling anthropology. *American Ethnologist*, *44*(2), 201–208. https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12468

King, M. L., Jr. (1963). Letter from Birmingham Jail. Retrieved from https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/king-papers/documents/letter-birmingham-jail

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relvant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465–491. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465

Leeman, J. (2018). Critical language awareness and Spanish as a heritage language: Challenging the linguistic subordination of US Latinxs. In K. Potowski (Ed.), *Handbook of Spanish as a Minority/Heritage Language* (pp. 345–358). New York: Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/33685436/Leeman_J._2018_._Critical_language_awareness_and_Spanish_as_a_heritage_language_Challenging_the_linguistic_subordination_of_US_Latinxs._In_K._Potowski_Ed._Handbook_of_Spanish_as_a_Minority_Heritage_Language._New_York_Routledge._345-358

Leeman, J., Rabin, L., & Roman-Mendoza, E. (2011). Critical pedagogy beyond the classroom walls: Community service-learning and Spanish heritage language education. *Heritage Language Journal*, *8*(3), 1–22.

Llombart-Huesca, A., & Pulido, A. (2017). Who needs linguistics? Service-learning and linguistics for Spanish heritage language learners. *Hispania*, *100*(3), 348–360. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2017.0063

López Vigil, M. (2000). *Oscar Romero: Memories in mosaic*. Washington, D.C. : London, England: London, England: EPICA; CAFOD; Darton, Longman and Todd.

Mallinson, C., & Charity Hudley, A. H. (2010). Communicating about communication: Multidisciplinary approaches to educating educators about language variation. *Lang & Ling Compass*, *4*(4), 245–257. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2010.00190.x

Mallinson, C., Hudley, A. C., Strickling, L. R., & Figa, M. (2011). A conceptual framework for promoting linguistic and educational change. *Lang&Ling Compass*, *5*(7), 441–453. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2011.00289.x

Milambiling, J. (2001). Opening minds or changing them? Some observations on teaching introductory linguistics. *Theory Into Practice*, *40*(4), 249–254. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4004_6

Miller, J., Berkey, B., & Griffin, F. (2014). International students in American pathway programs: Learning English and culture through service-learning. *Journal of International Students*, *5*(4), 334–352.

Norris, K. E., Siemers, C. K., Clayton, P. H., Weiss, H. A., & Edwards, K. E. (2017). Critical reflection and civic mindedness: Expanding conceptualizations and practices. In C. Dolgon, T. D. Mitchell, & T. K. Eatman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of service learning and community engagement* (pp. 168–182). New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316650011.017

O'Connor, A. (2012). Beyond the four walls: Community-based learning and languages. *The Language Learning Journal*, *40*(3), 307–320. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2011.585402

Orellana, M. F. (2016). *Immigrant children in transcultural spaces: Language learning and love*. New York; London: Routledge.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Petray, M. J. (2004). Changing linguistic pedagogy: A case study of five introductory linguistics textbooks. *Theses and Dissertations Available from ProQuest*, 1–306.

Powell, J., & Kelly, A. (2017). Accomplices in the academy in the age of Black Lives Matter. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.31274/jctp-180810-73

Rickford, J. R. (1997). Unequal partnership: Sociolinguistics and the African American speech community. *Language in Society*, *26*(2), 161–197. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020893

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Do you hear what i hear? Raciolinguistic ideologies and culturally sustaining pedagogies. In D. Paris, & H. S. Alim (Eds.), *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 175–190). Retrieved from). New York, NY. https://www.academia.edu/32941112/Do_You_Hear_What_I_Hear_Raciolinguistic_Ideologies_and_Culturally_Sustaining_Pedagogies

Spring, C. L., Moses, R., Flynn, M., Steele, S., Joseph, B. D., & Webb, C. (2000). The successful introductory course: Bridging the gap for the nonmajor. *Language*, *76*(1), 110–122. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2000.0124

Tomlinson, B., & Lipsitz, G. (2013). American studies as accompaniment. *American Quarterly*, *65*(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2013.0009

Trouillot, M.-R. (1991). Anthropology and the savage slot: The poetics and politics of otherness. In R. G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present* (pp. 17–44). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Wolfram, W. (2011). Changing misconceptions about dialect diversity: The role of public education. *CAL Digest*, 6.

Wurr, A. J., & Hellebrandt, J. (Eds.) (2007). *Learning the language of global citizenship: Service-learning in applied linguistics*. Bolton, Mass: Anker Pub.

Zentella, A. C. (1995). The "Chiquitafication" of US Latinos and their languages, OR why we need an anthropolitical linguistics.

Zentella, A. C. (2018). LatinUs and linguistics: Complaints, conflicts, and contradictions—The anthro-political linguistics solution. In N. L. Shin, & D. Erker (Eds.), *Questioning theoretical primitives in linguistic inquiry: Papers in honor of Ricardo Otheguy* (pp. 189–207). Amsterdam, Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.76

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

This article was written during the time that Lynnette Arnold was a Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow in the Department of Anthropology at Brown University. She received her PhD in sociocultural linguistics from the University of California at Santa Barbara in 2016. Her research focuses oncross-border communication within the Salvadoran diaspora, and through her teaching, research, and community engagement, she seeks to advance justice for immigrant communities in the United States. She currently serves as co-chair of the Language and Social Justice committee, a standing committee of the Society for Linguistic Anthropology. In Fall of 2019, she will be moving to the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology.

How to cite this article: Arnold L. Accompanying as accomplices: Pedagogies for community engaged learning in sociocultural linguistics. *Lang Linguist Compass*. 2019;13: e12329. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12329

APPENDIX A

SYLLABUS

Language and Migration Spring 2018 Dr. Lynnette Arnold

Course Description

This course provides a forum to explore the interconnections between language and migration. We will examine talk about migration—in the form of immigration policy and media representations—as well as talk in contexts of migration including experiences such as border crossing, settlement, and schooling. Given the current context of increasing anti-immigrant rhetoric and an escalation of immigration enforcement, this course raises the timely and important question of how experiences of migration and the politics of mobility are shaped by language. Our investigation will combine engaged anthropological approaches with linguistic anthropological theories and methods. Through this exploration, we will seek to understand language both as socially embedded, that is, as influenced by sociocultural phenomena such as mobility, and as constitutive of sociocultural life, that is, as a force that actively shapes sociocultural realities such as experiences of migration. By the end of the course, students will have gained a deeper understanding of the dialectic relationship between language and human movement in order to develop nuanced analytical perspectives on current debates about migration and refugee crises around the world.

Course Goals

- Students will be able to define and use fundamental concepts from linguistic anthropology to understand the relationship between language and human movement.
- Students will develop a critical awareness of the politics of representation in media coverage of and policy debates about migration.
- Students will become familiar with the ways language helps make and mark people as different from one another, especially along national, race, and class lines.
- Students will be able to utilize academic concepts to deepen their understanding of contemporary experiences of migration in the greater Providence area.

Course Assignments and Grading

Attendance and participation 25%

This is a small seminar-style course whose success depends on the active participation of all class members. Students are expected to arrive to class prepared to participate in discussions, small-group work, and other activities. In addition to attending class, you are also responsible for spending two hours per week working with your community organization, as well as for attending mandatory training sessions. This grade will be calculated by multiplying your participation grade by the percentage of classes, site visits, and trainings that you attend.

Reading responses 25%

Each week, you will write a 500-word response to readings assigned for that week. These responses should highlight key insights from the readings and explore their connections to other

course materials. Completing this assignment will allow you to prepare for class discussion, so you should bring a copy of your reading response and be prepared to talk about it. Responses are due by 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday.

Reflection journal 25%

After each visit to your community organization, you will write a reflective journal entry of approximately 500 words. You should include notes about things you observed during your visit, thoughts about your own positionality, and connections to the materials covered in course readings and discussions. You will also be assigned to read one other students' journal and offer them feedback on each submission. Journal entries are due by 8:00 am on Friday, and comments are due by 8:00 a.m. the following Monday.

Final paper 25%

Each student will write a 10-page final paper that brings concepts and theories from the course to bear in reflecting on language and migration as they emerged in working with their community partner organization. Papers are due on May 9th.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1: Language and migration

Piller, Ingrid. (2016) Introduction. In *Language and Migration: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, edited by Ingrid Piller. New York: Routledge. 1–20.

Wilce, James. (2017). Society, Culture, and Communication. In Culture and Communication. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1–27.

Week 2: Engaged anthropology

Keene, Arthur S. and Sumi Colligan. 2004. Service-Learning and Anthropology. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. 5–15.

Low, Setha M. and Sally Engle Merry. 2010. Engaged anthropology: Diversity and dilemmas. *Current Anthropology* 51(S2): p. S203-S226.

Jackson, Reagan. 2016. Accomplices vs. allies. The Seattle Globalist. http://www.seattleglobalist.com/2016/07/14/accomplices-vs-allies/53654

Indigenous Action. 2014. Accomplices not Allies: Abolishing the Ally Industrial Complex. http://www.indigenousaction.org/accomplices-not-allies-abolishing-the-ally-industrial-complex/

Week 3: Creating difference

Mehan, H. 1997. "The Discourse of the Illegal Immigration Debate: A Case Study in the Politics of Representation." *Discourse & Society* 8(2):249–270.

Irvine, J. T., and S. Gal. 2000. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Edited by P. V. Kroskrity. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press. ONLY READ PP. 35–39.

Caldwell, Beth. 2016. The demonization of criminal aliens. http://crimmigration.com/2016/10/25/the-demonization-of-criminal-aliens/

De Fina, Ana. 2017. What is your dream? Fashioning the migrant self. *Language and Communication*.

(Continued)

Week 4: Producing illegality

Dick, Hilary Parsons. 2011. "Making Mexicans Illegal in Small Town USA." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 21(s1): 35–55.

Kendall A. King, Gemma Punti, On the margins: Undocumented students' narrated experiences of (il)legality, In Linguistics and Education, Volume 23, Issue 3, 2012, Pages 235–249.

Hallett, Miranda Cady. 2014. "Temporary Protection, Enduring Contradiction: The Contested and Contradictory Meanings of Temporary Immigration Status." *Law & Social Inquiry*.

Week 5: Reinforcing and challenging national borders

Blommaert, Jan. 2009. Language, Asylum, and the National Order, *Current Anthropology,* 50(4): 415–441.

Arnold, Lynnette. 2012. "'Como Que Era Mexicano': Cross-Dialectal Passing in Transnational Migration." In *Texas Linguistics Forum*, 55:1–9.

Dick, Hilary Parsons, and Lynnette Arnold. 2017. From South to North and Back Again: Making and Blurring Boundaries in Conversations across Borders. Language & Communication.

Week 6: Making the nation through English only

Pavlenko, Aneta. 2002. 'We have room for but one language here': Language and national identity in the US at the turn of the 20th century. *Multilingua* 21:163–196.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 1990. Voting Rights, Liberal Voters, and the Official English Movement. In *Perspectives on Official English*. Adams, K. L., and D. T. Brink, eds. New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 125–138.

Lawton, Rachele. 2013. Speak English or Go Home: The Anti-Immigrant Discourse of the American 'English Only' Movement. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* 7(1):100–122.

Week 7: Language education policy

J. Collins. 2012. Migration, Sociolinguistic Scale, and Educational Reproduction, *Anthropology & Education Quarterly,* 43, 2, 192–213.

Bartlett, Lesley and Ofelia Garcia. 2011. Chapter 1: Schooling Immigrant Youth. In *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights*. Vanderbilt University Press. ONLY READ PP. 1–22.

Bartlett, Lesley and Ofelia Garcia. 2011. Chapter 3: Education Policy as Social Context. In *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights*. Vanderbilt University Press. ONLY READ PP. 51–58.

Hornberger, Nancy. 2006. Chapter 11: Nichols to NCLB: Local and Global Perspectives on US Language Education Policy. In *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Glocalization*, eds. Ofelia Garcia, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas & Maria E. Torres-Guzman. Buffalo NY: Multilingual Matters. 223–237.

Week 8: Bilingual education

García, Ofelia. 2009. Chaper 6: Bilingual Education Frameworks and Types. In *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century*. Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 111–136.

Flores, Nelson & Ofelia García. 2017. A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: from basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 37:14–29.

Wright, W.E. 2005. "The Political Spectacle of Arizona's Proposition 203." *Education Policy* 19(5): 662–700.

Read or Listen: http://wnpr.org/post/providence-schools-face-shortage-teachers-english-language-learners

(Continued)

Week 9: Translanguaging

Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94: 103–115.

Orellana, Marjorie Faulstich. 2015. Chapter 9: Translanguaging. In *Immigrant Children in Transcultural Spaces: Language, Learning, and Love*. Routledge. 103–116.

Bartlett, Lesley and Ofelia Garcia. 2011. Chapter 5: Languaging at Luperón. In *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights*. Vanderbilt University Press. 115–150.

Week 10: Culturally sustaining pedagogies

Lee, Stacey J. & Daniel Walsh. 2017. Socially Just, Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy for Diverse Immigrant Youth. In *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*, eds. Django Paris and H. Samy Alim. 191–206.

Rosa, Jonathan & Nelson Flores. 2017. Do you hear what I hear? Raciolinguistic ideologies and culturally sustaining pedagogies. In *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*, eds. Django Paris and H. Samy Alim. 175–190.

Flores, Nelson & Sofia Chaparro. 2017. What counts as language education policy? Developing a materialist Anti-racist approach to language activism. *Language Policy*.

Week 11: Case study of deficit discourses: The "language gap"

Johnson, Eric J. 2015. Debunking the "language gap". *Journal for Multicultural Education*. 9(1):42–50.

Avineri, Netta et al. 2015. Invited Forum: Bridging the "Language Gap". *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 25(1): 66–86.

Adair, Jennifer Keys, Kiyomi Sánchez-Suzuki Colegrove, and Molly E. McManus. 2017. How the Word Gap Argument Negatively Impacts Young Children of Latinx Immigrants' Conceptualizations of Learning. *Harvard Educational Review* 87 (3): 309–334.

Week 12: Practices of resistance

Villenas, Sofia. 2001. Latina Mothers and Small-Town Racisms: Creating Narratives of Dignity and Moral Education in North Carolina. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*. 32 (1):3–28.

García-Sanchez, Inmaculada M. 2013. The everyday politics of "cultural citizenship" among North African immigrant school children in Spain. *Language and Communication*. 33:481–499.

Reynolds, Jennifer and Orellana, Marjorie Faulstich. 2009. "New Immigrant Youth Interpreting in White Public Space." *American Anthropologist* 111(2): 211–223.

Week 13: Sociolinguistic justice for immigrant youth

Bucholtz, Mary, Dolores Inés Casillas, and Jin Sook Lee. 2016. Beyond Empowerment: Accompaniment and Sociolinguistic Justice in a Youth Research Program. In Sociolinguistic research: Application and impact, eds. Robert Lawson and Dave Sayers. New York: Routledge. 25–44.

Orellana, Marjorie Faulstich. 2015. Policy, Practice, and possibilities: Imagining Teaching and Learning for a New World. In *Immigrant Children in Transcultural Spaces: Language, Learning, and Love*. Routledge. 129–136.

Bartlett, Lesley and Ofelia Garcia. 2011. Educating Immigrant Youth: Lessons Learned. In *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights*. Vanderbilt University Press. 231–246

APPENDIX B

BEING ACCOMPLICES IN A BRAVE SPACE

MY INTENTIONS

- For us to take the challenge of this moment in history to heart. The world needs us.
- To recognize who is in the room, who is not, and why—here, and in other rooms we are in this semester.
- For us to take risks. Be vulnerable. Be uncomfortable. Bring curiosity. Laugh at ourselves. Ask difficult questions. Be loving.
- To challenge ourselves and others to grow and change. To give ourselves and others room to grow and change.

BRAVE SPACES:

Reworking common participation ground rules
(from Brian Arao & Kristi Clemens. 2013. *From safe spaces to brave spaces*.)

- Traditional Safe Space guidelines support and protect those with the most privilege in the space and are based on dominant cultural norms.
  These same guidelines often silence and marginalize those in the space with the least privilege.

- Dialogues about diversity and social justice are challenging and are most fruitful when approached with bravery rather than fear.
- Accountability is essential to brave spaces, including
  Accepting responsibility for one's actions & the repercussions
  Willingness to name and challenge oppressive ideas
  Recognizing how one's identity impacts group dynamics

For each of the following common safe space guidelines, consider: (1) what is the intent, (2) what is the unintended outcome, and (3) what might be a brave space alternative.

Common safe space guidelines

1. Agree to disagree
2. No personal attacks
3. Do not take things personally
4. Assume the best intentions of people in the space
5. Respect others

What is an ACCOMPLICE?
(adapted from a workshop in the Swearer Center's Co-Curriculum)

ACCOMPLICE, noun: a person a who helps another person commit a crime.

WHY THIS LANGUAGE?

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr: Letter from Birmingham City Jail, April 1963

We should never forget that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Even so, I am sure that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers. If today I lived in a Communist country where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I would openly advocate disobeying that country's antireligious laws ...

I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in his stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen's Counciler or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate, who is more devoted to "order" than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says: "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I cannot agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically believes he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by a mythical concept of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait for a "more convenient season." Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.

Teaching Tolerance Magazine, Ally or Accomplice, the Language of Social Justice, June 2017

For social justice advocates who use the term accomplice, they often see the site of focus as the main difference between the work of an ally and that of an accomplice. An ally will mostly engage in activism by standing with an individual or group in a marginalized community. An accomplice will focus more on dismantling the structures that oppress that individual or group—and such work will be directed by the stakeholders in the marginalized group. Simply, ally work focuses on individuals, and accomplice work focuses on the structures of decision-making agency.

Ricardo Levins Morales, White Solidarity, Showing up for Racial Justice, January 2015

"White people are taught that racism is a personal attribute, an attitude, maybe a set of habits. Anti-racist whites invest too much energy worrying about getting it right; about not slipping up and revealing their racial socialization; about saying the right things and knowing when to say nothing. It's not about that. It's about putting your shoulder to the wheel of history; about undermining the structural supports of a system of control that grinds us under, that keeps us divided even against ourselves and that extracts wealth, power and life from our communities like an oil company sucks it from the earth ..."

From the Indigenous Action Network, "Accomplices not Allies," March 2014

"The risks of an ally who provides support or solidarity (usually on a temporary basis) in a fight are much different than that of an accomplice. When we fight back or forward, together, becoming complicit in a struggle towards liberation, we are accomplices."

- "Accomplices listen with respect for the range of cultural practices and dynamics that exist within various indigenous communities.
- Accomplices aren't motivated by personal guilt or shame, they may have their own agenda but they are explicit.
- Accomplices are realized through mutual consent and build trust. They do not just have our backs, they are at our side, or in their own spaces confronting and unsettling colonialism. As accomplices we are compelled to become accountable and responsible to each other, that is the nature of trust.
- Do not wait around for anyone to proclaim you to be an accomplice, you certainly cannot proclaim it yourself. You just are or you are not. The lines of oppression are already drawn."