An Action-Based Roadmap for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Teaching Linguistics

Nathan Sanders (he/him), Lex Konnelly (they/them), and Pocholo Umbal (he/him)

University of Toronto

Abstract: In this chapter, we discuss a three-year pedagogical initiative at the University of Toronto to bring more equity, diversity, and inclusion into the linguistics classroom and to address linguistic injustice more generally in teaching beyond linguistics courses. In an effort to provide a model for anyone interested in doing similar work in their own departments, we focus on implementational details, concrete steps, outcomes, and generalizable action-based advice on how individual pieces of our project can be adapted in different contexts. We provide an overview of the initiative and details of a number of its resulting products, including a variety of materials that we developed and collected into a publicly accessible online repository. We also discuss numerous connections and collaborations that helped expand the scope of the initiative, and we conclude by offering helpful suggestions and further reflections on why this work is important and why linguists must prioritize it.

Introduction

In this chapter, we describe aspects of a three-year pedagogical initiative at the University of Toronto to bring more equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) into the linguistics classroom and to address linguistic injustice more generally in teaching beyond linguistics. This initiative follows a larger trend of rapid momentum in EDI work in Canadian universities, which are increasingly prioritizing EDI policies at a range of different levels, from departmental and university-wide programming to recruitment of diverse talent among faculty, staff, and students (Tamtik and Guenter 2019), with 77 percent of Canada's universities explicitly referencing EDI in their strategic planning or long-term planning documents, and 70 percent either already having or currently developing an EDI action plan (Universities Canada 2019).

At our own institution, the Faculty of Arts & Science has placed emphasis on EDI as part of the University's fundamental institutional values (University of Toronto Faculty of Arts & Science 2020). Universities in Canada and elsewhere are coming to recognize that initiatives that address EDI issues are crucial to advancing higher education and are intentionally working to establish campus communities as affirming places to foster intellectual and epistemological innovation. In a best-case scenario, these initiatives may even help to disrupt the extractive, ivory tower relationship between universities and the wider communities in which they are embedded. Of course, universities are still inherently conservative institutions, so there are limits to what can

be done from an EDI perspective within the confines of university structures (Shin and Sterzuk 2019, Stein 2020).

We present our work on this initiative in an effort to provide a model for anyone interested in doing similar EDI work in their own departments and courses (see chapters in this volume by Arnold, Schwarz, and Thomas for other models with different approaches and scope). We know from our own experience that it can be overwhelming to know where to start, so our focus in this chapter is on implementational details, concrete steps, and outcomes. Throughout, we offer generalizable action-based advice on how individual pieces of our project can be adapted in different contexts.

We begin with an overview of our initiative, including its history, motivation, structure, and logistics, as well as our own positionality. We then discuss several products that resulted from this initiative, including a variety of materials that we developed and collected into a publicly accessible online repository, as well as numerous connections and collaborations that we built with colleagues in our own department, at other departments within our university, at other institutions, and with the public at large. We conclude with a summary of our primary suggestions and limitations based on our experiences, as well as further reflections on why this work is important and why linguists must prioritize it.

We must briefly note that there is great variation among scholars pursuing EDI-based pedagogy with respect to the terms and acronyms used, so it is important to make choices that reflect your own goals and strategies. Our use of the term *EDI* matches the language in various policies and initiatives at the University of Toronto. This helps situate our project within larger institutional frameworks, which makes it easier to talk about this work with colleagues, to get engagement from various people and units, and to receive grant funding. That said, *EDI* is not just a strategic terminological choice for our project. It also accurately captures aspects of the scope of our work. We align with the principle of *equity* in endeavouring to mitigate biases in our course materials and, wherever possible, to challenge prevailing assumptions in linguistics, especially when it comes to (re)imagining our pedagogical practices in ways that leverage students' diverse linguistic backgrounds and eliminate the hidden curricula of language-related inequities. *Diversity* is also a central pillar of our content generation: throughout our collaborations with instructors within our own department and elsewhere, we have sought to diversify the kinds of materials that students are exposed to (whether through data sets on under-documented languages or the Diverse

Names Database, each of which we devote greater discussion to below). Finally, we recognize the importance of *inclusion* for ensuring that our linguistics classrooms are spaces where our students' diverse backgrounds are respected and valued, so that students see themselves reflected in course content. In recognizing themselves in linguistics, we hope that students can in turn recognize linguistics as a place for them to thrive and to make meaningful contributions in their own right.

Though this has been the language that works for us, others may use a different order of the acronym elements depending on their institution-specific conventions (for example, *DEI* seems to be more common in the United States), or they may adopt new terms entirely depending on what is most authentic to their mission. For example, the expanded acronym *JEDI* has become popular due to the inclusion of *J* for *justice* to highlight active dismantling of unjust structures (while also evoking the heroic Jedi of the *Star Wars* franchise, though this association is not without its problems; see Hammond et al. 2021), while many Canadian institutions sometimes use an extra *D* and/or *I* (as in *EDID* at the University of Alberta and *EDII* at the University of Waterloo) for *decolonization* and *Indigeneity*, to place focus on efforts needed to specifically address Canada's colonial history and its devastating effects on Indigenous peoples. We encourage our readers to reflect on what terminology best encompasses their own visions for creating change in their departments and what may be most effective or advantageous for securing funding or other forms of administrative support.

Project overview

Various forms of systemic harm and injustice, many of which often manifest in relation to language, permeate society, especially in education (see Fletcher 1983, Charity Hudley and Mallinson 2011, Kohli and Solórzano 2012, Lippi-Green 2012, Flores and Rosa 2015, Blundon 2016, Bucholtz 2016, Russell et al. 2018, Cochran 2019, Zhang and Noels 2021, inter alia). Like many academic fields, linguistics is not immune to these forms of injustice, and linguists have increasingly issued calls to action for linguists to address these issues, not just in society at large, but in our own field (for example, Rickford and King 2016, Leonard 2018, Conrod 2019, Charity Hudley 2020, and Mallinson forthcoming).

Of particular concern for both linguists and the field of linguistics more generally is that these issues are often not discussed in core content in linguistics courses (Spring et al. 2000, Hercula 2020). Undergraduate students form the next generation of linguists, and they therefore

need to know early on how linguistic injustice persists in society and what linguists can do to combat it. It is also necessary for students from racialized and other minoritized groups to feel included and validated as they study linguistics: when students see themselves represented in course material, they may be more likely to see the discipline as a place for them, which may in turn contribute to increased representation of underrepresented groups in linguistics (cf. Rickford 1997 and Charity Hudley et al. 2020). We therefore see introductory courses as optimal sites of intervention to revise existing curricula, in order to engage students in these conversations (see Arnold, this volume, and Calhoun et al. 2021). Further, as Sarah Hercula (2020: 13) argues, introductory linguistics courses also have many students who will not go on to become linguists, but who nevertheless "have the potential to impact language-related policy and practice in fields outside linguistics and academia, such as engineering and business." In short, whether or not our students continue on to become linguists like us, it is our responsibility to impart to them the significance of linguistic injustice, so that they may take this knowledge forward beyond linguistics and the academy, in whatever way they so choose.

Addressing injustice in linguistics more generally is a collective effort, and there is increasing demand within the field for conversations on these issues, such as in the teaching sections of flagship journals such as *Language* and *American Speech*, where pedagogical linguistic scholarship can be published and circulated more widely. Linguists therefore have a responsibility to the field in sharing their work and experiences, so that other educators can realize that this work can and should be done. Informed by this backdrop and by long-standing discussions in our linguistics department at the University of Toronto, we put together a proposal for a three-year initiative to help bring an increased focus on EDI to the linguistics classroom. In Sanders et al. 2020, we provide an initial introduction to this project, titled "Innovations in Linguistic Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the Linguistics Curriculum and Beyond". In this chapter, we summarize key aspects of our proposal and elaborate further on more recent developments in the two years since that initial report.

In the summer of 2019, working with Naomi Nagy and Keren Rice, Nathan applied for a grant through the Learning & Education Advancement Fund (LEAF) at the University of Toronto, totaling almost CAD$45,000, spread out over three years. There may be similar institutional gran at your own institution, depending on the funding situation and your status (for example, tenure-track faculty will generally have greater access to funding opportunities than contingent faculty or

students). You may need to search around and be creative in finding the right grant to apply for. Our original grant proposal included relevant background and bibliography on linguistic injustice, a detailed plan of action for all three years showing expansion of the project from department-internal to other institutions and fields, and description of specific deliverables and plans for sustainability. Here, we highlight three key aspects of our proposal: budget, strategic writing, and consultation.

First, appropriate compensation for student labour is crucial, especially given the spirit of the project itself, so the majority of the grant was earmarked to pay for the labour of two Lead EDI Teaching Assistants (Lex and Pocholo), working a combined 245 hours per year during the academic year.

Second, write for your audience and your future self. For most institutional grants, the background justification requires careful attention, since the committee adjudicating grant proposals will likely not contain any linguists. Thus, technical terminology from within linguistics needs to be avoided and replaced with phrasing that would be more transparent to non-linguists. In addition, find aspects of your proposal that can be highlighted as connecting to larger issues of broad concern to the institution, such as interdisciplinarity, Indigeneity, social justice, and public outreach. Extracting quotes from the institution's mission statement is a good way to make it clear that the proposal is grounded in institutional values, which will increase its chances of being approved.

In addition, giving as many specifics in the proposal as possible helps on two fronts. It gives the funding entity a better idea of what they are funding and more security in knowing that the project will actually be successfully carried out. Moreover, it gives the team a plan to follow. With this outline in place, we were able to start working on the first day knowing what we needed to do, so that less time was needed for initial organization and planning. Putting that work in early in the proposal stage left more time during the project itself for working on the project's goals directly. Of course, no plan is infallible, and we shifted as necessary, but having some basic structure in place greatly facilitated our ability to do the work we wanted to do.

Finally, getting advance support from the department and administration is also crucial. Before submitting the proposal, we workshopped it with faculty and graduate students in the department, the department chair, and members of the relevant decanal office. Rather than submitting the proposal in a vacuum, we worked months in advance to get broad advice and input

from multiple perspectives, which helped better shape the proposal into something that would be useful to as many people as possible, and again, would give it greater likelihood to be approved.

Positionality

Our commitment to promoting EDI in linguistics is fueled in large part by our own lived experiences. Because language is so deeply and unavoidably personal (Thomas, this volume), each member of our team is informed by their own unique relationship to language. Nathan is a white, cisgender, queer hearing American-Canadian linguist who has worked on signed languages. He grew up in the rural southern United States speaking a highly stigmatized variety of English, and as a result of significant dialect discrimination in his early adulthood, he shifted to a more mainstream variety and lost fluent access to his original dialect. This experience fueled a feeling of loss of connection to his family and has long informed his views on language ideologies and discrimination. Lex, a white, queer, transmasculine, non-binary Canadian linguist, is especially attuned to the relationship between language and gender, both the ways in which language creates and reinforces oppression for transgender communities, as well as the immense linguistic innovation and advocacy that gender-diverse people are constantly engaged in. Pocholo, a queer, Filipino-Canadian linguist, is acutely aware of how nonnormative or nonmainstream language varieties can be barriers to both economic and academic success among racialized communities. Thus, our personal experiences with our own marginalized identities help ground this work. That said, we are mindful about our own limitations, and how these are reflected in what we have been able to accomplish. For example, while our own research before and during this project has focused on foregrounding issues related to gender, sexuality, and immigrant and deaf communities, we have been cautious in approaching issues related to other minoritized communities outside our own experiences and research. Recognizing our limitations is the first step to forging meaningful partnerships with other educators and students, whose lived experiences and expertise complement ours.

The Linguistics Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Repository

Many fields have robust literatures and pedagogical resources concerning EDI issues in teaching and learning. The fields of education and curriculum and instruction studies more broadly have been highly productive in cultivating a rich canon of anti-oppressive scholarship meant to inform

pedagogies across disciplines (such as hooks 1994, Hobbel 2010, and Bettez 2011), reverberating throughout other fields such as mathematics (Brantlinger 2013, Wagner and Stintson 2013, Bond and Chirnoff 2015, Yusun and Gagné 2021), social work (Nicotera 2019), sociology (Alexander 2005, Rudy and Konefal 2007), and health and physical education (Gerdin et al. 2021), among others. Closer to linguistics, the field of language education has also grappled with these issues. One particular area that has gained attention and is currently being challenged is the rampant heteronormativity in pedagogical materials and classroom practices (Gray 2013, Paiz 2019). For example, most language education textbooks inadvertently foreground heterosexism by containing examples with female and male characters with stereotypical gender roles and heterosexual relationships (see also LSA 2022). In the classroom, questions about gender identity and expression are often not discussed (Neto 2018). These practices reinforce the hegemony of heterosexual relationships and effectively erase lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, and Two-Spirit (LGBTQI2S+) identities and experiences, which in turn often have serious ramifications, especially for queer and/or questioning students (Vandrick 1997). In response, researchers have made calls to action to queer the field of language teaching (Nelson 2007, Neto 2018, Paiz 2019).

In linguistics, EDI issues often already organically arise in some subfields, such as sociolinguistics and language revitalization and reclamation, where the relationship between language and society plays a crucial role in research. However, many course instructors in other subfields are also equally keen to incorporate EDI principles into their classrooms, but they may not see how these topics fit into their subfields, or they may feel that they do not have the time or expertise to do this work properly (cf. Bowern and Dockum, this volume; Gibson et al., this volume). To address these concerns, we used this project as an opportunity to consult with these kinds of interested instructors to find ways that EDI could be incorporated into their courses and to develop relevant course materials tailored to their goals and their courses' learning outcomes.

Of course, many instructors around the world are already implementing many of the principles outlined here, but within the field of linguistics specifically, these materials are often not published (and thus, not widely accessible), or their existence is not widely known (with a few notable exceptions, such as the initiative described in Charity Hudley 2020). This problem is common in linguistics pedagogy more broadly, because the scholarship of teaching and learning in the discipline is not yet as robust as in many other fields (Hercula 2020: 15). For example, even

though there are teaching sections of some linguistics journals, there are currently no standalone journals dedicated to the scholarship of teaching and learning in linguistics as there are in other fields (e.g. *Teaching Sociology*, *Teaching Anthropology*, *Physics Education*, among others). As a result, pedagogical materials in linguistics, especially those that specifically integrate a social justice component, are less widely available and may be more challenging to come by. To address this issue, we built the Linguistics Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Repository (LEDIR) (available at https://ledir.ling.utoronto.ca, citable as Sanders et al. 2021–2022), which contains the materials we created for this project, including lecture notes, data sets, the Diverse Names Database, and the *Handbook for Inclusive Linguistics Teaching*. We describe each of these resources in more detail in the following sections.

Lecture notes

We created lecture notes (short readings for students) to bring EDI content as course material into a standard phonetics course, where these issues are not traditionally treated as material to be learned. This course is a requirement for our major and was taught by Nathan in the first year of the project, making it an ideal course to work on. The lecture notes we designed are short readings, no more than two pages each, that can be used to supplement any phonetics course with explicit discussion of EDI issues relevant to phonetics. The text and references of these lecture notes are available on LEDIR and in Sanders et al. 2020.

We designed these lecture notes following a few guiding principles. First, the content should be directly relevant to phonetics and fully integrated into the course, so that the material would matter to the students and not appear to be tacked on or optional, which would undermine the effectiveness of the pedagogical effort. Second, the lecture notes should be small enough to not detract from the main course content. Finally, the content should cover a range of different topics. We ended up with three new sets of lecture notes: (i) two pages (written primarily by Lex) on gender and the vocal tract, challenging gendered assumptions about vocal tract length, especially the 17.5 cm length traditionally used in linguistics as a default (male) vocal tract length (as in Gobl and Ní Chasaide 2010, Behrman 2018, and Howard and Angus 2017), and bringing up issues of body and gender diversity, including trans identities and the phonetic effects of hormone replacement therapy; (ii) one page (written primarily by Pocholo) on the effect of social biases on speech perception, highlighting the role of race in the perception of intelligibility; and (iii) half a

page (written primarily by Nathan) on the status of signed languages in phonetics and linguistics more broadly, focusing on the problematic ways that signed languages, deafness, and deaf people are often minimized or ignored in linguistics, with spoken languages and hearing people treated as implicit defaults.

Similar lecture notes in this vein can be created for a variety of courses. A basic strategy we recommend is to pick a general topic within EDI (such as gender diversity, racism, or signed languages) and find a unit of the course material where that topic could be inserted in a small way as an extension of the existing content. This approach means that the instructor does not have to do extensive revision of the planned material, minimizing their workload and not disrupting their original course plan. Even just a few of these small changes to the course content can have a large impact on student experience. For example, in anonymous course evaluations for Nathan's phonetics course where these lecture notes were used, students lauded the inclusion of these topics and the expanded view of phonetics presented in the course.

Not only do lecture notes provide students with content that may be more directly applicable to their life outside the linguistics classroom, but for those students with marginalized identities and backgrounds, this increased representation can make them feel more included in the larger conversation about language and linguistics in ways they traditionally have not been. It also helps students with more socially privileged identities better understand how these issues are relevant in ways they may not have thought of before. An important next step is developing a means to assess whether students have recognized the importance of these issues, and to receive other types of feedback. Questions that elicit relevant feedback can be integrated into course evaluation surveys that instructors invite student responses at the end of the semester.

Diverse data sets

We also worked with instructors in several courses to expand representation of minoritized languages in their course material and problem sets, with an eye toward intentional, purpose-driven diversity of data. In creating your own data sets, we recommend taking into account the sociocultural context of your institution. Because we are at a Canadian university, we focused on underrepresented languages that also reflect the linguistic diversity of Canada, in particular, Indigenous languages and heritage languages of immigrant communities. Again, this approach is a way to better represent the backgrounds of the students in the classroom and help them feel more

included as part of the field (cf. Calhoun et al. 2021). Further, in introducing minoritized languages, it is important to go beyond the usual background information (language family, number of users, etc.). For example, when presenting data for Stoney Nakoda for a phonology course, we also include resources pointing to documentation and revitalization efforts underway, such as the Stoney Mobile Dictionary (https://www.stoneyeducation.ca/stoney-dictionary-app), created by community members and used in Stoney language classes in secondary schools at the Alexis Nakota Sioux Nation in Alberta (Bell 2019). This kind of extra information helps show students that languages are not just data to be analyzed, but that they are used by real human beings in real communities with real concerns. This information can provide an opportunity to reflect on broader social and cultural issues, such as the role of Canada's colonial history in the severe decline of Indigenous languages.

The Diverse Names Database

Our third resource emerged from our concern that, while constructed linguistic example sentences are a core vehicle for linguists in teaching a wide range of phenomena to our students, it is well-established that these examples, particularly in syntax textbooks and journals, systematically under-represent women and perpetuate harmful gender stereotypes. For example, feminine-gendered arguments are often presented as non-subjects, more likely to be unnamed, and more often referred to in kinship terms in relation to masculine-gendered referents (Macaulay and Brice 1994, 1997; Bergvall 1996; Pabst et al. 2018, published as Cépeda et al. 2021; Richy and Burnett 2019; Kotek et al. 2020, 2021). In the classroom, linguists may not realize that they are relying on their own biases in creating examples, particularly when coming up with examples spontaneously in the midst of class discussion. As an intervention on the inequity of names chosen in example sentences for linguistic course content, we developed the Diverse Names Database (DND; Sanders et al. 2020, Konnelly et al. 2021, Sanders 2021a, Konnelly et al. forthcoming), a database of names from 78 languages, categorized three ways by gender (all-gender, feminine-leaning, and masculine-leaning), confirmed with native speakers and/or academic experts on these languages. An excerpt from the DND appears in Figure 1.

	all-gender		feminine-leaning		masculine-leaning
Amal	Arabic	Anahera	Māori	Aimo	Finnish
Bounmy	Lao	Boróka	Hungarian	Baber	Urdu
Cahyo	Javanese	Chana	Hebrew	Carlu	Corsican
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
Xquenda	Zapotec	Xulia	Galician	Xuan	Asturian
Yunuen	Purépecha	Yolotl	Nahuatl	Yama	Pashto
Zhyrgal	Kirghiz	Zuriñe	Basque	Zaharia	Romanian

Figure 1. Excerpt from the Diverse Names Database

Our goal was to create an easily accessible spreadsheet with names for three gender groups for each of the 26 letters of the English alphabet. Although using the English alphabet as a base structure reinforces the hegemony of English, English is the language of instruction at our institution, and the English alphabet makes the DND more suited to typical situations in linguistics instruction, where it is common to abbreviate names to a single letter (as in predicate logic, where sentences like *Amal is happy* may be represented as *H*(*a*)). Because of this dependence on the English alphabet, a subset of the DND or an entirely different version would be warranted in situations where the language of instruction is not English. An underlying design principle was fundamental simplicity: we wanted to create a tool that could be consulted quickly and easily. To find names for the DND, we largely employed a scavenger methodology, trawling as many sources as possible (grammars, journal articles, baby name databases, professional and personal contacts, etc.), prioritizing understudied languages and a broad range of language families. We also included phonetic transcriptions from native speaker consultants wherever possible. The resulting database represents over 30 language families from over 110 countries. This resource has been one of the more successful products of our project, with at least a dozen linguists reporting to us that they have used names from it.

Though it can be greatly useful, the DND also comes with potential drawbacks that must be carefully weighed. While it presents opportunities for greater inclusiveness and affirmation with respect to both gender and cultural representation, applications of the DND may raise additional issues that linguists should be mindful of, and names from the DND should not be unthinkingly inserted into examples. For example, English is often the default language of instruction in North American universities, as well as within many other academic contexts around the world. In an Anglophone classroom, using names that do not conform to English phonotactics can thus be an

important tool for unsettling the social power of English. However, the inclusion of names that are not easily assimilated to English pronunciations may risk exoticization or may elicit microagressive commentary or mispronunciations from students that can be distressing for their minoritized peers to overhear. There is a careful balance to be struck, and instructors need to be prepared to respond when the balance tips one way or the other: either fitting names to English phonotactics and reinforcing English as a hierarchical standard, or not fitting English phonotactics but inadvertently othering communities whose names are treated as marked by Anglophones. Similar principles apply where English is not a dominant language or the language of instruction. There is not a single right answer, and incorporating greater cultural representations will necessarily involve being prepared to deal with issues as they arise, and importantly, advocating for why it matters to get people's names correct.

Put simply, the DND must be integrated with intention and with regard for classroom dynamics and a commitment to anti-racist teaching more generally. Our hope is that the DND will be a supportive resource for both instructors and students in constructing more diverse, inclusive, and affirming examples in assignments and other course materials. This tool is one possible step forward in increasing gender and cultural diversity and representation in linguistics example sentences and thus providing a more equitable and inclusive experience for linguistics students and the field. Moving forward, we plan to keep the DND updated and respond to feedback from its use to thoughtfully expand it for different contexts and purposes.

The Handbook for Inclusive Linguistics Teaching

The final LEDIR resource we discuss here is the *Handbook for Inclusive Linguistics Teaching*, which is designed to help fill a gap in linguistics training. As in many fields, linguists often do not receive extensive, if any, discipline-specific pedagogical training as part of their graduate education; they are typically expected to just pick it up as needed from observing what has worked or not worked in their own education. As new instructors, they may feel uncertain about teaching in general, and even experienced linguistics instructors may not have a strong grasp of inclusive teaching practices or the principles underlying them. Again, although there has been a shift in recent years, particularly in the creation and expansion of teaching-focused faculty positions and venues for publication of linguistics pedagogy research, our field still has a long way to go in prioritizing how we teach linguistics.

The handbook, which is geared towards both instructors and teaching assistants in linguistics and related fields, contains practical recommendations that can be easily integrated into many aspects of a course. These recommendations come from our years of experience as instructors and teaching assistants in many linguistics courses at the University of Toronto, where the usual course setup consists of large lectures (upwards of 250 students, led by the instructor) with smaller associated tutorial sessions (around 35 students, led by graduate student teaching assistants). As a living document, development of the handbook is ongoing, especially with increasing connections to the robust literature on pedagogy in order to better create stronger links between scholarship on teaching and learning as well as our own teaching practices.

The full handbook is available on LEDIR. We offer a brief summary here. A major goal of the handbook is to help foster an inclusive space for all students in the classroom. Inclusivity involves acknowledging, recognizing, and working towards combating structural violence and injustice, so that all people feel welcomed and respected. Further, inclusivity normalizes differences; that is, it recognizes that differences are "natural, acceptable, and ordinary" (Baglieri and Knopf 2004: 525). Inclusive teaching for us, then, is conceptualized as a set of pedagogical practices aimed at creating a learning environment where all students are treated equitably and are provided with genuinely equal access to opportunities and resources. There are multiple ways to work towards building a more inclusive classroom.

First, course syllabi should contain explicit language about valuing diversity and inclusion. Research has found that "when teachers model positive language and attitudes toward difference, students also are affirmed in the development of their peer relationship" (Baglieri and Knopf 2004: 527). We therefore believe that it is imperative that we begin our classes by being explicit about our commitment to diversity and inclusion. In particular, we should remind students that all languages and language varieties are valid (Martinez et al. 2017). This reminder includes affirming that non-standardized as well as standardized varieties of the language of instruction are equally valid resources that students can use to facilitate their learning in class discussions and in writing.

Second, as linguists, we also have a discipline-specific opportunity to empower students as language experts by letting them know that their linguistic backgrounds and experiences are valued and can be an advantage in their learning of linguistics concepts. This message can be part of a larger effort towards diversification of linguistic examples. For example, data volunteered by

students is more humanized than a decontextualized data set. Thus, when teaching syntactic concepts like question formation, instructors could ask students to translate a question like *What did Yama eat?* into languages and varieties that they know and examine how the process of question formation in the language of instruction patterns similarly or differently from their examples. Drawing from students' own languages allows them to make stronger connections between the more abstract concepts they are learning and how those concepts manifest in real language use. In this way, we echo Lisa Delpit (2006: 226) in viewing teachers as "cultural brokers who have the opportunity to connect the familiar to the unknown".

It is also important for instructors to practice self-awareness by reflecting about our own positionalities in order to better understand those of our students and ultimately connect with them (Dewsbury and Brame 2019). By acknowledging certain assumptions that we bring to the classroom, we are able to be more critical of what and how we teach our students. This perspective can also help us to remember to use inclusive language to avoid common linguistic microaggressions (Bucholtz 2016), such as mispronouncing students' names (Kohli and Solórzano 2012) or using the wrong pronouns or a previous name for transgender or non-binary students (Cochran 2019).

In summary, the handbook provides instructors with multiple ways to think about adopting curriculum design, assessment, and teaching practices that make students of all background and lived experiences feel that they are supported, respected, and valued. The handbook in combination with the other resources on LEDIR described above provide many tools that can help address a variety of EDI issues in linguistics classrooms.

Workshops, Outreach, and Collaboration

It is important for a project like the one we have described here to foster connections, to build and share expertise, to receive feedback for improvement, and to distribute the work so that others may benefit. In this section, we provide an overview of the types of relationships we established over the course of our LEDIR initiative, and how these relationships have both supported and informed the goals and values of our efforts thus far.

Over the course of the project, we held multiple workshops with different subsets of our teaching community in the department. One workshop was led by Lex and Pocholo with a team of teaching assistants from a large introduction to linguistics lecture course in a discussion of

classroom practices that foster inclusion and representation. The content if this workshop ultimately evolved into the handbook described above. In this workshop, we highlighted common situations where language-related biases can easily come in (for example, names, example sentences, and relying on native speakers in discussions).

In addition, in collaboration with the Writing-Integrated Teaching program in the Faculty of Arts & Science at the University of Toronto, we designed and jointly led a workshop on making linguistics writing more affirming, geared towards supporting instructors and teaching assistants on how to guide their students to write about communities in affirming ways, especially when they are not members of those communities themselves. In this workshop, we considered the kind of language typically or historically used to describe marginalized identities and people (specifically, trans and non-binary, immigrant, deaf, and Indigenous), with a focus on harmful terms, descriptors, discourses, and ideologies that readings, instructors, and students often use. We then discussed numerous ways to mitigate these biases, including suggestions of specific alternative and more affirming language which does not undermine the linguistic knowledge and scientific rigour being created and shared. The workshop was positively received by both faculty and graduate students in attendance (both informally and in a follow-up survey), and their constructive comments will help shape and improve the future iterations of the workshop. These kinds of small-scale workshops are a great way to plant transformative seeds in a department, especially for inexperienced instructors and teaching assistants.

A fundamental part of this work is engaging with departments and communities outside of our own immediate institutional space. Getting inclusive teaching strategies in linguistics out there, known, and recognized is crucial to having it adopted elsewhere. We quickly realized that there was an immense appetite for conversations on EDI in pedagogy, both within linguistics and outside of our discipline. Of course, it is important to take advantage of the many opportunities we as linguists have to publicize our work to our colleagues in the discipline and solicit their feedback. We presented portions of this project at two annual meetings of the Canadian Linguistic Association (Sanders et al. 2020, Konnelly et al. 2021), in a webinar on racial justice in linguistics teaching hosted by the Linguistic Society of America (Namboodiripad and Sanders 2020), and at an invited talk for a workshop on inclusive teaching at the Semantics and Linguistic Theory conference (Sanders 2021a).

But the work that we are engaging in also has value outside of our own discipline, and to this end, going beyond our field is likewise important. In Fall 2020, we were invited to present our work at an interdisciplinary teaching and learning symposium in the Faculty of Arts & Science at the University of Toronto. We gave a short presentation similar in scope and purpose to this chapter, to show our colleagues from other departments how to undertake similar initiatives and to highlight the various funding and general support pathways that enabled us to do this work. It also gave us the opportunity to talk about the importance of linguistic injustice to a wider audience, doing double duty as both a how-to guide on EDI-based pedagogy and an educational talk to non-linguists on the relationship between language and social justice.

As a result of this talk, a faculty member in the Department of English reuqested that a member of our team come visit her second-year undergraduate course on the history of English and facilitate a discussion on any aspect of our project that would expand her students' understanding of the relevant EDI issues. The presenter, Lex, discussed prescriptivism, language attitudes, and linguistic injustice, a conversation that students were eager to engage with. As a discipline that focuses on the study of language, English is in many ways a natural fit for such a discussion. We recommend that colleagues who are interested in building connections outside of their home department consider looking to these academically related communities first, since we found that making our work accessible to those who already had some baseline familiarity with the close analysis of language was an ideal stepping stone to moving to more distant fields.

Due to word of mouth about our project, Pocholo was also invited to present on our project at an inclusive pedagogy panel discussion at the University of Toronto Mississauga. The panel discussion centred around representation of LGBTQI2S+ issues in many different departments, including linguistics, situations that show clear gaps in inclusion in curriculum and pedagogy, and initiatives that instructors and teaching assistants have developed to centre LGBTQI2S+ perspectives. As one of our project goals is to make our materials portable to other interested departments and fields of study, Pocholo took this opportunity to invite educators to think about ways in which they can integrate discussion of social justice issues within their courses. For example, he highlighted the ways in which the linguistic concepts we teach are often imbued with assumptions that perpetuate heteronormativity (such as binary gender constructions when studying language variation) and how harmful these assumptions can be for our LGBTQI2S+ students. He therefore urged instructors to be mindful about underlying assumptions and assumed defaults in

their courses: Where do these constructs come from? Who established them? Who benefits from them? One of the key messages of this presentation was that these considerations are applicable regardless of the academic field, and so we must create classroom environments where students have opportunities to reflect about these issues in an effort to create more affirming spaces for all.

Our project also drew the attention of ezCPD.ca, a professional development organization for legal professionals, which invited Nathan to give a webinar on linguistic injustice in legal settings (Sanders 2021b). This kind of public outreach is crucial for projects like this, to highlight real-world applications for non-specialists outside the academy, and it demonstrates how a project nominally focused on pedagogy can have broader impact outside academia.

Importantly, in all of these cases, the work essentially promoted itself. People heard about the project through word of mouth and internet searches, and they wanted to know more. Presentations led to more presentations, and connections led to more connections. Starting outreach as soon as possible, even in just one venue, can pay off down the road in more opportunities to distribute the work. A key factor is that all of our materials are publicly available on LEDIR. This was a decision we made early on in the project: anyone who wants access to our project materials should have access. Having these resources locked away in secret, distributed only to a select few, goes against the very principles of inclusion and equity that our work is based upon. We encourage other linguists to also make their materials publicly accessible wherever possible, so that we can collectively normalize an open-sourced, accessible, and critical pedagogical approach in the discipline (but for the complexities of open access, see Villarreal and Collister, this volume).

This work has also led to in-depth collaborations with instructors in other departments and at other institutions. A few examples include a presentation and ongoing research with a colleague in the Department of Mathematics at the University of Toronto on the effects of linguistic biases on the assessment of writing in math (Konnelly et al. 2022); ongoing research with a colleague at another university in Canada on the effects of marginalized identities in online learning in linguistics courses throughout the country; and collaboration with a colleague at a university in the United States to expand the DND into a mobile app for ease of use while teaching. Each of these collaborations were completely unforeseen in the original conception of the initiative, a fact that highlights the importance of leaving space for flexibility in a large multifaceted project with broad appeal. Many people are interested in EDI issues, which touch on so many different aspects of our

lives, so we expect that there will be plenty of opportunities to make further connections and expand this work.

Conclusion

Throughout this project, we have been guided by Anne Charity Hudley and Christine Mallinson's (2018: 514) questions about "what linguistics is, who it is for, and who it benefits". Adopting more inclusive teaching practices and materials in linguistics involves more than showcasing linguistics as a scientific field that is deeply embedded in the social world; it requires actively participating in the process of making that inclusion a reality. Our hope is that the proliferation of initiatives like this one and others described in this volume will drive a shift towards increased engagement and retention of students who have been historically underrepresented in the field. We also hope that these initiatives will give all students who come out of our courses a deeper understanding of how language perpetuates power imbalance and inequality in society.

Our intention for this chapter is not only to highlight how pedagogical interventions like this project can be adopted by others, but also why it is necessary for linguists to prioritize work toward social justice in our discipline. We hope our model will inspire other linguists to answer our call to action to confront linguistic injustice in their teaching, but we recognize that there are many other ways to address these issues, and a broad range of tactics are necessary. Our model contains only some of the many different tools that can be used to help change the underlying structures of our teaching as part of a larger process of deconstructing how linguistics is taught. We linguists must view this deconstruction as part of our scholarly and pedagogical practice, because if we do not actively work to challenge linguistic discrimination, we are helping to perpetuate it. We encourage our readers to leverage the tools that work for them and to respond to the many different manifestations of linguistic injustice in linguistics classrooms and elsewhere with innovative solutions that make sense in their unique context. We do not have all the answers, and no one group or individual can do this kind of work perfectly. Social justice is a communal effort, and we must all contribute and support each other.

References

Alexander, Susan M. 2005. 'Social Justice and the Teaching of Sociology'. *Sociological Focus* 38(3): 171–179. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20832266

Baglieri, Susan, and Janice H. Knopf. 2004. 'Normalizing Difference in Inclusive Teaching'. *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 37(6): 525–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194040370060701

Behrman, Alison. 2018. *Speech and Voice Science*. San Diego: Plural Publishing, 3rd ed.

Bell, Roberta. 2019. 'Stoney Language App Connects Elders, Youth at Alexis Nakota Sioux Nation'. CBC News. 5 December 2019. https://www.cbc.ca/originalvoices/language/nakoda/

Bergvall, Victoria L. 1996. 'Humpty Dumpty Does Syntax: Through the Looking-Glass, and What Alice Found There'. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 14(2): 433–443. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4047856

Bettez, Silvia Cristina. 2011. 'Building Critical Communities Amid the Uncertainty of Social Justice Pedagogy in the Graduate Classroom'. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 33(1): 76–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2011.550191

Blundon, Patricia Hart. 2016. 'Nonstandard Dialect and Educational Achievement: Potential Implications for First Nations Students'. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology* 40(3): 218–231. https://cjslpa.ca/files/2016_CJSLPA_Vol_40/No_03/CJSLPA_2016_Vol_40_No_3_Blundon_218-231.pdf

Bond, Gareth, and Egan J. Chernoff. 2015. 'Mathematics and Social Justice: A Symbiotic Pedagogy'. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education* 8(1): 24–30. https://doi.org/10.21423/jume-v8i1a256

Brantlinger, Andrew. 2013. 'Between Politics and Equations: Teaching Critical Mathematics in a Remedial Secondary Classroom'. *American Educational Research Journal* 50(5): 1050–1080. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213487195

Bucholtz, Mary. 2016. 'On Being Called Out of One's Name: Indexical Bleaching as a Technique of Deracialization'. In *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes Our Ideas About Race*, edited by H. Samy Alim, John R. Rickford, and Arnetha F. Ball, 273–289. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190625696.003.0016

Calhoun, Kendra, Anne H. Charity Hudley, Mary Bucholtz, Jazmine Exford, and Brittney Johnson. 2021. 'Attracting Black Students to Linguistics Through a Black-Centered Introduction to Linguistics Course'. *Language* 97(1): e12–e38. http://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0007

Cépeda, Paola, Hadas Kotek, Katharina Pabst, and Krysten Syrett. 2021. 'Gender Bias in Linguistics Textbooks: Has Anything Changed Since Macaulay & Brice 1997?'. *Language* 97(4): 678–702. https://doi:10.1353/lan.2021.0061

Charity Hudley, Anne H. 2020. 'Fostering a Culture of Racial Inclusion in Linguistics: For the Children of the 9th Ward Circa 2005'. Plenary address at the 94th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PSyvCJHLJvw

Charity Hudley, Anne H. and Christine Mallinson. 2011. *Understanding English Language Variation in U.S. Schools*, New York: Teachers College Press. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.611418

Charity Hudley, Anne H., Christine Mallinson, and Mary Bucholtz. 2020. 'Toward Racial Justice in Linguistics: Interdisciplinary Insights into Theorizing Race in the Discipline and Diversifying the Profession'. *Language* 96(4): e200–e235. http://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2020.0074

Cochran, Katharine. 2019. *Trans in Higher Ed: Understanding the Experiences of Transgender and Nonbinary College Students*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. https://dc.uwm.edu/etd/2168

Conrod, Kirby. 2019. 'Doing Gender and Linguistics'. Keynote talk given at They, Hirself, Em, and You: Nonbinary Pronouns in Research and Practice.

Delpit, Lisa. 2006. 'Lessons from Teachers'. *Journal of Teacher Education* 57(3): 220–231. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105285966

Dewsbury, Bryan, and Cynthia J. Brame. 2019. 'Inclusive Teaching'. *CBE–Life Sciences Education* 18(2): 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.18-11-0226

Fletcher, John D. 1983. 'What Problems do American Indians Have with English?' *Journal of American Indian Education* 23(1): 1–14. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED247051

Flores, Nelson, and Jonathan Rosa. 2015. 'Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education'. *Harvard Educational Review* 85(2): 149–171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149

Gerdin, Göran, Wayne Smith, Rod Philpot, Katarina Schenker, Kjersti Mordal Moen, Susanne Linnér, Knut Westlie, and Lena Larsson. 2021. *Social Justice Pedagogies in Health and Physical Education,* New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003003953

Gobl, Christer, and Ailbhe Ní Chasaide. 2010. 'Voice Source Bariation and its Communicative Functions'. In *The Handbook of Phonetic Sciences*, edited by William J. Hardcastle, John Laver, and Fiona E. Gibbon, 378–423. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2nd ed. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444317251

Gray, John. 2013. 'LGBT Invisibility and Heteronormativity in ELT Materials'. In *Critical Perspectives on Language Teaching Materials*, edited by John Gray, 40–63. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. http://doi.org/10.1057/9781137384263_3

Hammond, J. W., Sara E. Brownell, Nita A. Kedharnath, Susan J. Cheng, W. Carson Byrd. 2021. 'Why the Term "JEDI" is Problematic for Describing Programs that Promote Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion'. *Scientific American Inequality*. 23 September 2021. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/why-the-term-jedi-is-problematic-for-describing-programs-that-promote-justice-equity-diversity-and-inclusion/

Hercula, Sarah E. 2020. *Fostering Linguistic Equality: The SISE Approach to the Introductory Linguistics Course*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41690-4

Hobbel, Nikkola. 2010. *Social Justice Pedagogy Across the Curriculum: The Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203854488

hooks, bell. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203700280

Howard, David M., and Jamie A. S. Angus. 2017. *Acoustics and Psychoacoustics*. New York: Routledge, 5th ed.

Kohli, Rita, and Daniel G. Solórzano. 2012. 'Teachers, Please Learn Our Names!: Racial Microaggressions and the K–12 Classroom'. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 15(4): 441–462. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.674026

Konnelly, Lex, Nathan Sanders, Jason Siefken, and Pocholo Umbal. 2022. 'Are Writing Questions in Math Fair?' Talk presented at the 6th Northeastern Conference on Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education.

Konnelly, Lex, Pocholo Umbal, and Nathan Sanders. 2021. 'The Diverse Names Database: A Tool for Creating More Equitable, Diverse, and Inclusive Linguistic Example Sentences'. Poster presentation in the Special Session on Pedagogy at the Congrès annuel de l'Association canadienne de linguistique 2021 | 2021 annual meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association.

Konnelly, Lex, Pocholo Umbal, and Nathan Sanders. forthcoming. 'On the Use of Names and Example Sentences in the Linguistics Classroom'. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*.

Kotek, Hadas, Sarah Babinski, Rikker Dockum, and Christopher Geissler. 2020. 'Gender Representation in Linguistic Example Sentences'. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 5(1): 514–528. https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v5i1.4723

Kotek, Hadas, Sarah Babinski, Rikker Dockum, and Christopher Geissler. 2021. 'Gender Bias and Stereotypes in Linguistic Example Sentences'. *Language* 97(4): 653–677. http://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0060

Leonard, Wesley Y. 2018. 'Reflections on (De)colonialism in Language Documentation'. In *Reflections on Language Documentation 20 Years After Himmelmann 1998*, edited by Bradley McDonnell, Andrea L. Berez-Kroeker, and Gary Holton, 55–65. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24808

Lippi-Green, Rosina. 2012. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203348802

LSA [Linguistic Society of America]. 2022. 'Gender Bias and Stereotypes in Linguistics Research and Teaching'. Webinar. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LFGeB1r3u9s

Macaulay, Monica, and Colleen Brice. 1994. 'Gentlemen Prefer Blondes: A Study of Gender Bias in Example Sentences'. In *Cultural Performances: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women*

and Language Conference, edited by Mary Bucholtz, A.C. Liang, Laurel A. Sutton, and Caitlin Hines, 449–461. Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group.

Macaulay, Monica, and Colleen Brice. 1997. 'Don't Touch My Projectile: Gender Bias and Stereotyping in Syntactic Examples'. *Language* 73(4): 798–825. https://doi.org/10.2307/417327

Mallinson, Christine. forthcoming. 'Linguistic Variation and Linguistic Inclusion in Education'. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 9.

Martinez, Danny C., P. Zitlali Morales, and Ursula S. Aldana. 2017. 'Leveraging Students' Communicative Repertoires as a Tool for Equitable Learning'. *Review of Research in Education* 41(1): 477–499. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X17691741

Namboodiripad, Savithry, and Nathan Sanders. 2020. 'Centering Linguistic Diversity and Justice in Course Design'. Racial Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in the Linguistics Curriculum webinar series, Linguistic Society of America. https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/webinar-centering-linguistic-diversity-and-justice-course-design

Nelson, Cynthia D. 2007. 'Queer Thinking About Language Teaching: An Overview of Published Work'. In *Gender Studies in Foreign Language Teaching*, edited by Helene Decke-Cornill and Laurenz Volkmann, 63–76. Tübingen, Germany: Guter Narr. http://hdl.handle.net/10453/7961

Neto, Joáo Nemi. 2018. 'Queer Pedagogy: Approaches to Inclusive Teaching'. *Policy Futures in Education* 15(5): 589–604. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210317751273

Nicotera, Anthony. 2019. 'Social Justice and Social Work, A Fierce Urgency: Recommendations for Social Work Social Justice Pedagogy'. *Journal of Social Work Education* 55(3): 460–475. https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2019.1600443

Pabst, Katharina, Paola Cépeda, Hadas Kotek, Krysten Syrett, Katharine Donelson, and Miranda McCarvel. 2018. 'Gender Bias in Linguistics Textbooks: Has Anything Changed Since Macaulay & Brice (1997)?' Paper presented at the 92nd annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America.

Paiz, Joshua M. 2019. 'Queering Practice: LGBTQ+ Diversity and Inclusion in English Language Teaching'. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 18(4): 266–275. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1629933

Richy, Célia, and Heather Burnett. 2019. 'Jean Does the Dishes While Marie Fixes the Car: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study of Social Gender in French Syntax Articles'. *Journal of French Language Studie*s 30(1): 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269519000280

Rickford, John R. 1997. 'Unequal Partnership: Sociolinguistics and the African American Speech Community'. *Language in Society* 26(2): 161–197. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4168760

Rickford, John R., and Sharese King. 2016. 'Language and Linguistics on Trial: Hearing Rachel Jeantel (and Other Vernacular Speakers) in the Courtroom and Beyond'. *Language* 92(4): 948–988. http://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2016.0078

Rudy, Alan P., and Konefal, Jason. 2007. 'Nature, Sociology, and Social Justice: Environmental Sociology, Pedagogy, and the Curriculum'. *American Behavioral Scientist* 51(4): 495–515. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207307739

Russell, Stephen T., Amanda M. Pollitt, Gu Li, and Arnold H. Grossman. 2018. 'Chosen Name Use is Linked to Reduced Depressive Symptoms, Suicidal Ideation, and Suicidal Behavior Among Transgender Youth'. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 63(4): 503–505. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.02.003

Sanders, Nathan. 2021a. 'Teaching Semantics from a JEDI Perspective: Some Considerations'. Invited presentation in the Workshop on Inclusive Teaching in Semantics at the 31st Semantics and Linguistic Theory conference. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6jzTtXxqUkU

Sanders, Nathan. 2021b. 'Language-Based Biases in Legal Contexts'. ezCPD.ca webinar. http://sanders.phonologist.org/Papers/sanders-lg-biases-legal.pdf

Sanders, Nathan, Pocholo Umbal, and Lex Konnelly. 2020. 'Methods for Increasing Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Linguistics Pedagogy'. *Actes du congrès annuel de l'Association canadienne de linguistique 2020 | Proceedings of the 2020 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*. https://cla-acl.artsci.utoronto.ca/actes-2020-proceedings/

Sanders, Nathan, Pocholo Umbal, and Lex Konnelly. 2021–2022. The Linguistics Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Repository. https://ledir.ling.utoronto.ca/

Shin, Hyunjung, and Andrea Sterzuk. 2019. 'Discourses, Practices, and Realities of Multilingualism in Higher Education'. *TESL Canada Journal 36*(1): 147–159. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v36i1.1307

Spring, Cari L., Rae Moses, Michael Flynn, Susan Steele, Brian D. Joseph, and Charlotte Webb. 2000. 'The Successful Introductory Course: Bridging the Gap for the Nonmajor'. *Language* 76(1): 110–122. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2000.0124

Stein, Sharon. 2020. '"Truth Before Reconciliation": The Difficulties of Transforming Higher Education in Settler Colonial Contexts'. *Higher Education Research & Development* 39(1): 156–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1666255

Tamtik, Merli, and Melissa Guenter. 2019. 'Policy Analysis of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Strategies in Canadian Universities – How Far Have We Come?'. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 49(3): 41–56. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v49i3.188529

Universities Canada. 2019. *Equity, Diversity and Inclusion at Canadian Universities: Report on the 2019 Survey*. https://www.univcan.ca/media-room/publications/equity-diversity-and-inclusion-at-canadian-universities-report-on-the-2019-survey/

University of Toronto Faculty of Arts & Science. 2020. *Academic Plan 2020–2025: Leveraging Our Strengths*. https://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/about/strategic-overview/academic-plan-2020-2025/academic-plan-pdf

Vandrick, Stephanie. 1997. 'The Role of Hidden Identities in the Postsecondary ESL Classroom'. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(1): 153–157. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587980

Wagner, Anita A., and David W. Stinson. 2013. *Teaching Mathematics for Social Justice: Conversations with Educators*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Yusun, Timothy, and Ann Gagné. 2021. 'Towards a Supportive Math Pedagogy: Power Dynamics and Academic Integrity Considerations'. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity* 4(1): 70–90. https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v4i1.71341

Zhang, Ying Shan Doris, and Kimberly Noels. 2021. 'The Frequency and Importance of Accurate Heritage Name Pronunciation for Post-Secondary International Students in Canada'. *Journal of International Students* 11(3): 608–627. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v11i3.2232