2023

Negotiating the Messiness of Teaching Linguistic Justice Online: Reflections of Multilingual Writing Instructors During COVID

Forster Kudjo Agama

Marcela Hebbard

Bernadette M. López-Fitzsimmons

AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF QUALITATIVE
RESEARCH

Negotiating the Messiness of Teaching Linguistic Justice Online: Reflections of Multilingual Writing Instructors During COVID[1]

Forster Kudjo Agama
Tallahassee Community College, FL, USA

Marcela Hebbard[2]
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, TX, USA

Bernadette M. López-Fitzsimmons
Manhattan College, the Bronx, New York, USA

ABSTRACT

This qualitative phenomenological study explores how multilingual writing instructors define linguistic justice and how they incorporate linguistic justice in their online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. The global health crisis officially declared in March 2020, pushed educators around the world to become online instructors overnight. This rapid move to an online environment magnified technology, language, race, and socioeconomic inequalities. In higher education, online environments are prone to linguistic inequalities and linguistic racism. For decades, scholars in the field of composition have argued that in order to dismantle elitist monolingual ideologies, writing instructors, multilingual and monolingual alike, should investigate their own positions and pedagogical practices regarding language (teaching) practices. Thus, through the use of reflexivity, the authors served as researcher-participants and collected four different sources of data. The findings demonstrate that while the authors implement linguistic justice in their courses, their translinguistic histories impact their pedagogies differently. Furthermore, the data suggest that reflexivity prompts them to monitor their own attitudes, ideas, and actions by putting them on pause and allowing them to become uncomfortable – even frightened at times – about their experiences at the intersection of teaching and practicing linguistic justice. An implication of this study is that through reflexive interactions, practitioners can begin to make sense of their nuanced positionalities and become more transparent about their teaching roles and responsibilities as well as their identities in other areas of life in relation to linguistic justice.

KEYWORDS: linguistic justice, online writing instruction, multilingual instructors, COVID-19 pandemic, qualitative research.

The global COVID-19 pandemic officially declared in March 2020, propelled educators around the world to become online instructors overnight (Hussein et al., 2020; Noor et al., 2020). This rapid move to an online environment magnified technology, language, race, and socioeconomic inequalities. A recent study published during the pandemic revealed that these inequalities had impacted educators' teaching approaches as well as students by hindering their

---

voices and lessening an appreciation of their cultures (Istenič, 2021). In the U.S., many multilingual families could not afford to purchase a computer, and their multilingual children experienced trouble keeping up with lessons delivered in English-dominant online instruction (Sayer & Braun 2020). In higher education, online environments are prone to linguistic inequalities and linguistic racism. This is because the default language of the learning management systems is English. Writing instruction is delivered using alphabetic texts, and more often than not, there is a neglect to consider students' linguistic backgrounds or alternative ways of language use (Mitchum et al., 2021; Warnock, 2009). Linguistic racism, according to De Costa (2020), is defined as "the ideologies and practices that are utilized to conform, normalize and reformulate an unequal and uneven linguistic power between language users" (p. 834). This unequal and uneven power can be explicit (e.g., a statement in the course syllabus that students must write the 'standard' variety of English) or implicit (e.g., the belief that multilingual students cannot write English well).

While linguistic racism can affect monolingual people, it usually impacts multilingual speakers when they shuttle between different languages and language varieties (De Costa, 2020) and can cause them real psychological harm (Dovchin, 2020). In order to combat linguistic racism, writing instructors - multilingual and monolingual - should investigate their own positions and pedagogical practices regarding language (teaching) practices (De Costa, 2020). However, because this type of investigation draws on participants' past knowledge and experiences, it requires precise, structured methods of investigation that provide a diversity of particular cognitions, behaviors, or trends among a small sample of a population (Jansen, 2010; Merleau-Ponty, 1962).

A qualitative phenomenological approach, hence, can aid the process of revisiting lived experiences "with a sense of 'newness' to elicit rich and descriptive data" (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 352). Thus, this qualitative phenomenological study explores how multilingual writing instructors define linguistic justice and how they incorporate linguistic justice in their online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. Privileging reflexivity as a methodological process and informed by scholarship from the fields of composition, applied linguistics, and related disciplines, the authors served as researcher-participants and collected four data sources as part of the study. Their findings revealed that while all three writing instructors implemented linguistic justice in their courses, their translinguistic histories impact their pedagogies differently (Motha et al., 2012). Moreover, data suggest that reflexivity causes them to monitor their own attitudes, ideas, and actions by putting them *on pause* and allowing them to become uncomfortable—even frightened at times—about their experiences at the intersection of teaching and practicing linguistic justice.

We have organized the chapter as follows. We first define linguistic racism and linguistic discrimination as they relate to language and cultural differences. To do this, we draw from composition and applied linguistics scholarship. Next, we call for the incorporation of linguistic justice in online writing instruction. Then, we describe the methodology and offer a selection of participants' insights, followed by a discussion of themes that emerged from analyzing the data. We conclude with implications and final reflections.

Literature Review

Since the 1960s, scholars in the field of composition have been raising awareness that English-only policies and practices marginalize and disenfranchise students from diverse linguistic and racial backgrounds (Canagarajah, 2010; Baker-Bell, 2020; Horner et al., 2011; Matsuda, 2006). In 1974, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) proposed the resolution, the Student's Right to their Own Language (SRTOL), which was adopted by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). SRTOL initiated conversations about linguistic justice in college composition courses, recognizing and valuing

all nonstandard varieties of English. The resolution emphasized the importance of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and other regional or local dialects used in education, particularly in the teaching of writing.

In the last two decades, linguistic justice has included issues related to cultural and ethnic English varieties, American-English-based hybrid idioms in creoles and pidgins, and languages other than English. De Costa (2020) posits that writing instructors should first investigate their own positions and pedagogies in order to disrupt "elitist monolingual ideologies" (p. 836). Both multilingual and monolingual writing instructors should develop a deep understanding of linguistic justice so they can practice inclusive and equitable language pedagogies.

In this paper, we draw on the seminal and current scholarship in composition, applied linguistics, TESOL, and related disciplines. First, we explain linguistic racism and linguistic discrimination, exploring their relationship to language and cultural differences in online writing courses. Second, we describe how linguistic invisibility and linguistic privilege have a rhizomatic impact on linguistic racism and discrimination. Then, we define linguistic justice and analyze why writing instructors need to adopt inclusive and equitable language practices in online composition courses.

Linguistic Racism and Discrimination

In sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and TESOL, linguistic racism refers to explicit and implicit ideologies and practices that oblige language users "to conform, normalize, and reformulate" (De Costa, 2020, p. 833) their nonstandard language varieties and replace them with standard American English varieties. Such practices create a biased and unbalanced distribution of linguistic power, privileging standard varieties in dominant positions above nonstandard dialects, sociolects, and idiolects, which remain hidden in the background.

Furthermore, linguistic racism can be overt (i.e., direct verbal assault) or covert (i.e., left-handed compliments, sarcasm, microaggressions). While it affects monolingual people, linguistic racism is "magnified" for multilinguals who alternate or "shuttle" among several languages and linguistic varieties (De Costa, 2020, p. 833). The concepts of linguistic invisibility and linguistic privilege expand linguistic racism (Dobinson & Mercieca, 2020) to include the peripheral. While peripheral languages remain unknown and hidden, dominant varieties are center-staged and highly visible. When this occurs, "linguistic invisibility" takes place, impeding minor languages and their varieties from being recognized, valued, and appreciated (Dobinson & Mercieca, 2020, p. 291). Thus, linguistic invisibility is intricately entangled with linguistic racism and discrimination.

To complicate linguistic racism and discrimination even more, speakers of majority languages and standard linguistic varieties "enjoy a status" that remains inaccessible and unattainable to those from diverse linguistic, racial and cultural backgrounds. This is called 'linguistic privilege' (Dobinson & Mercieca, 2020) and refers to speakers of certain majority languages and standard linguistic varieties that "enjoy a status," which excludes individuals who use minor languages and nonstandard varieties, including heritage and indigenous idioms.

Linguistic racism violates people's basic human rights based on the languages and linguistic varieties they use (Robinson et al., 2020). This reality speaks to how institutional and non-institutional settings deny these language users "entitlements" solely because of the English varieties (Dovchin, 2020). Even though speakers are intimately connected to their spoken languages, many minoritized language users still experience ethnic accent bullying and linguistic stereotyping. To illustrate that language is never judged in separation from the speakers, Dovchin's ethnographic study showed how the participants, international students in Australia, experienced ethnic accent bullying and linguistic stereotyping which are dimensions of linguistic racism. Ethnic accent bullying refers to "bullying towards English as a second

foreign language speakers based on their biographical English accent" (Dovchin, 2020, p. 807). This type of linguistic bullying can take the form of laughing and mocking linguistically different background speakers. Linguistic stereotyping refers to a pre-fixed negative assumption towards racially and ethnically different speakers. In other words, "people who are not expected to speak a particular language (well) may be heard not to speak that language (well) irrespective of their actual proficiency" (Dovchin, 2020, p. 208). There is serious psychological damage when speakers are subjected to linguistic racism such as social withdrawal, low self-esteem, fear and anxiety over speaking English. To fight and dismantle linguistic racism and discrimination in the teaching of writing, scholars have proposed to adopt a linguistic justice stance.

Linguistic Justice: What It Is and Why We Need It in OWI

Because writing instructors have been professionally trained to teach in a monolingual space under the assumption that all students are speakers of privileged varieties of English - often conceptualized as the "myth of linguistic homogeneity" (Matsuda, 2006, p. 637) - most composition instructors do not, and cannot, recognize the learning challenges of linguistically diverse students, both international and resident. They uncritically accept the "myth of linguistic homogeneity" (Matsuda, 2006, p. 637), teaching as though all students use the dominate privileged varieties of English.

In the current study, we define linguistic injustice and discrimination as denying students the right to engage in their own language practices. How, then, should English instructors promote linguistic justice in their virtual classrooms? We argue that the first step is to become aware of the inherently sophisticated "political, racial, and colonial underpinnings of the project of teaching English and of the desires and purposes that accompany the acquisition of English" (Motha, 2014, p.15). Teachers are theorizers who can meaningfully effect positive change from the inside out. Thus, we call upon multilingual teachers to become aware of and interrogate the complex issues of race, politics, colonial underpinnings, and language as a whole (Motha, 2014). It is our hope that by interrogating these issues, writing and English language teachers will build the capacity to disrupt the monolingual ideologies that suppress and/or withhold the literacy of their students' development (Brandt, 1998), thereby creating and supporting anti-racist learning environments in which all students can thrive.

In order to disrupt the assumption of linguistic homogeneity and challenge the policy of linguistic containment - which attempts to remove language variation by separating speakers into isolated courses based on their perceived linguistic abilities, Matsuda (2006) advocates for embracing "language difference as the new norm" (p. 648) in U.S. college composition classrooms. Instructors should be trained professionally to appreciate linguistic diversity so that they can teach writing in a multilingual space where the "presence of language differences is the default" (Matsuda, 2006, p. 649). We support Matsuda's claim and suggest that colleges and universities should open second language writing (SLW) sections rather than offer only traditional college composition designed for a small elite minority of privileged English writers. In this scenario, students would have the option to enroll in either section.

While we believe there is academic space for both types of courses, opening second language writing sections can also perpetuate linguistic discrimination, segregating students based on their linguistic backgrounds. It can also hinder monolingual speakers of English from acquiring cross-cultural and intercultural communication competencies that are needed in the current global ecosystem. An alternative to creating SLW sections -- which might not be economically possible at all higher education institutions -- would be to equip composition instructors with teaching tools suited for online multilingual learning spaces.

While the history of online learning dates back to the 1990s (Kukulska-Hulme & Pegrum, 2018), teaching writing online (OWI) is a recent phenomenon. In 2007, the CCCC Executive Committee constituted the CCCC Committee for Effective Practices in Online Writing Instruction (OWI). Originally, the committee received four charges. Charge 2 called on identifying and examining best practices for using online writing instruction specifically for English language learners and students with disabilities (CCCC Position). These responsibilities were updated in 2010 and again in 2013 when the CCCC Committee for Effective Practices in OWI published the book *Foundational Practices of Online Writing Instruction* (Hewett & DePew, 2013). The book summarizes the six-year research history behind the CCCC OWI Committee's work and provides a list of fifteen principles to guide OWI. The OWI Principle 1 is the overarching principle; it calls for "a universally inclusive and accessible instruction" (Hewett, 2015, p. 43). Although OWI Principle 1 still stands true today, as a whole, the principles delineated in the book offer a limited portrayal of linguistically diverse writers, a conceptualization of language diversity, and the need for linguistic justice in OWI.

Ten years have passed since the publication of the book, and the limited portrayal of linguistically diverse writers and the need for linguistic justice in OWI is still prevalent. In 2021, the CCCC-sponsored Online Writing Instruction Standing Group published its State of the Art of OWI Report based on 235 survey responses from writing instructors, administrators, and scholars with experience in digitally mediated teaching environments (CCCC Standing Group, 2021). Findings revealed that more attention is given to ensure students have access to technology and content, and less attention has been placed on language issues. Only a total of 37% of respondents said they offer "more text-based communication for ESL students" (CCCC Standing Group, p. 9), despite the fact that previous scholarship in OWI for multilingual students has indicated that, at minimum, OWI requires instructors to offer explicit instructions (Miller-Cochran, 2015; Hewett, 2015; Sánchez, 2013).

Because the scholarship that informed the creation of the OWI principles addressed activities between 1998 to 2008 (CCCC Committee, 2013), multilingual writers are conceptualized as students who need to master academic English and learn to navigate their institution's LMS (in English) to succeed in college. Thus, the OWI principles need to include explicit language issues that have emerged over the last 10 years, incorporating the theoretical and methodological perspectives about linguistic justice.

Method of Inquiry

Participants

Consistent with the protocol of the phenomenological investigations, a purposive group (Creswell & Poth, 2018) was formed, consisting of three multilingual researcher-participants (RPs) who teach writing online in different types of higher education institutions. At the time of this writing, all three RPs were second-year students in an internationally recognized interdisciplinary doctoral program at a public teaching institution in Western Pennsylvania.

Author A has been teaching in higher education for fewer than 15 years. He grew up in Ghana and migrated to the U.S. to attend graduate school. He has about 10 years of experience teaching online. He teaches courses on African American literature and first-year writing at a state community college in Florida. He is multiliterate and multilingual in British Ghanaian and American English varieties, as well as in several indigenous African languages. Author A identifies as Ghanaian American male educator-researcher.

Author B has been teaching in higher education for more than 16 years. She migrated from Mexico City to the U.S. to attend college. After graduating with her undergraduate degree, Author B returned to Mexico, where she worked for two years. She returned to the U.S. to

attend graduate school. With about 10 years of experience teaching online, Author B teaches sociolinguistics and first-year writing at a public research university located in the southernmost region of Texas on the Mexico/U.S. She is biliterate and bilingual in Spanish and English, and she identifies as Latina/Hispanic/Spanish female educator-researcher.

Author C has been teaching in higher education for more than 16 years; she has been teaching online for about three years. She teaches intercultural communication and an introduction to English composition to Spanish-speaking undergraduates in a language-advancement associate's degree program at a private four-year Catholic college in the Bronx, New York. Biliterate and bilingual in Spanish and English, Author C identifies as Latina/Hispanic/Spanish female educator-researcher. Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of each research-participant.

Table 1

Summary of Participants' Profiles

Researcher - Participant	Number of years in higher education	Number of years teaching online	Languages	Race/ Ethnicity	Gender	Type of college or university
Author A	< 15 years	About 10 years	British & American English; African indigenous languages	Black African American	Male	Two-year public community college in Florida
Author B	> 16 years	About 10 years	Spanish & American English	Latina/ Hispanic/ Spanish	Female	Public research institution in Texas
Author C	> 16 years	About 3 years	Spanish & English	Latina Hispanic Spanish	Female	Private, Catholic four-year college in New York

Rationale for Conducting Qualitative Phenomenological Inquiry

In a qualitative phenomenological study, researchers use past knowledge and experience to understand a phenomenon's complexities (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). According to Creswell and Poth (2018), investigating a phenomenon attempts to "approach a lived experience with a sense of 'newness' to elicit rich and descriptive data" (p. 352). Because it requires precise, structured methods of investigation, a phenomenological analysis extends beyond a narrative study's general analysis, applying deductive and inductive processes, and instead, it "aims to open up possibilities for creating formative relations between being and acting" theory and practice (van Manen, 2007, p. 13). In the current study, the RPs attempted to understand the big picture about linguistic justice (LJ) in online writing instruction (OWI) during the COVID-19 pandemic. First, they used a deductive process to formulate the research questions and to compose the

literature review based on seminal and current scholarship. Second, the RPs employed an inductive process to gather, analyze, and synthesize the meanings of the raw data collected from several data collection sources.

Research Questions

Colaizzi (1978) maintains that phenomenological research questions must address the participants' lived experiences rather than solely rely on theoretical interpretations. Following this perspective and based on their individual reflexivity narratives, the authors selected pedagogical artifacts and formulated two main research questions, which are:

1. How do multilingual writing instructors define linguistic justice? What constitutes linguistic justice?
2. What have been multilingual writing instructors' experiences incorporating linguistic justice in their online teaching during COVID-19?

Procedure

The researcher-participants (RPs) began with a deductive process, formulating the two main research questions that guided the study. After that the authors used four methods to collect data: a qualitative survey (QS) via Google forms; a collection of pedagogical artifacts each instructor used during COVID that incorporated, in their views, the concept of LJ accompanied by a written reflection; a collaborative group discussion (CGD) to talk about their selected pedagogical artifacts; and three individual interviews (Interview). The CGD and Interviews were conducted via the Zoom video conferencing platform.

Qualitative Survey

Because their study seeks to investigate diversity within a population and no distribution, they draw on Jansen's use of a qualitative survey (QS). According to Jansen (2010), a QS "does not aim at establishing frequencies, means or other parameters but at determining the diversity of some topic of interest within a given population" (para. 6). A QS allowed the RPs to design a pre-structured survey with defined dimensions and categories beforehand to determine the diversity of linguistic justice (LJ) in OWI with college students. Furthermore, QS afforded the RPs to employ what Jansen calls "one shot sample," which "involves only one empirical cycle (research question—data collection—analysis—report)" (para. 15). This is important, especially since RPs collected data during a month-long summer course.

Pedagogical Artifacts

For their second data collection method, the authors gathered pedagogical materials each instructor used during COVID that incorporated, in their views, the concept of LJ. Each RP needed to contribute three pieces and write a narrative explaining the rationale for the creation of the artifacts, how the artifacts were implemented in the classroom, and how the artifacts connected to the concept of LJ. In doing this, the authors drew on the notion of 'writing as a method of inquiry.' Mauree Legge (2014) notes that this qualitative method "tends to focus on the phenomenological and interactional dimensions of experiences because they allow the author to emphasize the lucidity and mutability of meanings and their context-dependency" (p. 118). Writing personal narratives allowed the RPs to explore differences and similarities in the meaning-making of the phenomenon under consideration.

Collaborative Group Discussion

After collecting and examining each author's pedagogical artifacts and personal narratives, the RPs engaged in a collaborative group discussion to further explore what LJ means to each of the RPs. To guide this step, the authors drew on the notion of "sensitizing concepts"' which in qualitative inquiry refers to leaving "terms purposefully undefined to find out what they mean to people in a setting" (Patton, 2015, p. 360). The goal of the CGD was to allow each RP involved to give their own interpretation, comment, or make changes to their understanding of LJ and, in that way, open a window into the group's worldview (Patton, 2015). Because the CGD did not put participants on the spot, it provided a safe, comfortable space to foster organic interactions. The CGD lasted 90 minutes and was recorded in zoom.

Interviews

On the following day, each RP interviewed one of the other two RPs. Each interview lasted 60 minutes. Creswell and Baez (2020) posit that sub-questions are an important part of interviews, allowing participants to talk about their personal perspectives. Interviews also afforded the RPs to use probes to access details (Creswell & Báez, 2020; Creswell & Poth, 2018; Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

Data Analysis

The research-participants (RPs) used Descript[3] to transcribe the Zoom audio recordings of the collaborative group discussion (CGD) and the interviews. After that, the RPs entered raw data into a Google spreadsheet using the information from the qualitative survey (QS), the written narratives about the pedagogical artifacts, the collaborative group discussion (CDG), and the transcriptions of the interviews. To do this, the RPs divided the spreadsheet into four sections, one for each data set. After that, the authors divided the data input by participant and entered it into the spreadsheet. Next, RPs, informed by Joffe and Yardley's (2004) protocol for coding, carefully analyzed the data to identify hierarchies of categories. According to Joffe and Yardley (2014), coding categories very often form a hierarchy with a small number of higher-level categories that can be progressively subdivided into lower-level sub-categories resulting in the "operationalization" of the themes' labels. These labels facilitate the creation of overlapping ideas.

In this work, three higher-level categories resulted from the first round of coding, which are: (1) multilingual, (2) linguistic justice, and (3) online teaching. During the second round of coding, the higher-level categories were subdivided into sub-categories. For example, under the high-level category of linguistic justice (LJ) some of the low-level categories data revealed included LJ as a messy work, LJ teaching strategies, LJ as a complex work, misconceptions of LJ, LJ as a liberatory tool, and LJ as a vehicle for student agency.

Throughout the process of analysis, the RPs engaged in dialogue with each other which allowed researchers the opportunity to examine raw data from different perspectives. In doing this, the authors' qualitative data analysis aligned with Creswell and Poth's (2018) claim that examining raw data from different perspectives facilitates reflexivity that can result in an "explicit structure of meaning" of the essence of the phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 202). After the main themes, sub-themes, and related themes which were not part of the original investigation were identified, and codes were entered into the master Google spreadsheet, three major recurring themes emerged. These themes include the following (1) linguistic justice work is messy, (2) linguistic justice can serve as a vehicle to foster student and instructor agency in

---

[3] Descript is online software that transcribes audio from video conferencing recordings into text for research projects.

OWI, and (3) reflexivity can be a helpful practice to combat linguistic racism. In the next section, we put in the conversation each of these three themes with scholarship. But first, we report on how each of the RPs defined LJ and how they each incorporated it into their online writing instructions.

Insights from the Researcher Participants

This section of the paper focuses on the researchers' definitions of LJ and how they each incorporated it into their online writing instructions.

Defining Linguistic Justice (LJ) and Incorporating LJ in OWI

Author A was born and raised in Ghana, West Africa. He grew up learning multiple languages, including Ewe, Akan, Arabic, and so forth. He obtained his bachelor's degree in English and General Linguistics from the University of Ghana, Legon. He also earned his master's in English Studies in the U.S. and taught ESOL and GED courses to international and non-traditional high school students. Currently, author A is a full-time English professor who teaches First Year Writing/Composition and African American Literature at a state community college in Florida. He has ten years of teaching experience online.

In defining LJ, Author A focuses primarily on the central theme of honoring students' language practices in the classroom as a way of fighting or disrupting white hegemonic norms evident in our classrooms. He pointed out that "Linguistic justice is a relatively new concept in composition studies which deals with an equitable acknowledgment and accommodation of diverse language practices of students in our classrooms." He further advised that "To engage in linguistic justice work, one has to be a fighter." By this declaration, Author A believed that the fight for equitable language practices based on one's cultural and linguistic backgrounds should be upheld against any larger societal pressures. This means that educators must endeavor to shy away from the monolingual or monocentric tendencies of perceiving language norms and move more towards a linguistic justice model which celebrates cultural diversity and multilingualism.

In the same vein, Author A maintained that educators who intend to get involved with the LJ work must be ready to engage in racial and linguistic wrestling with their programs, institutions, and/or other stakeholders within our communities. By doing so, positive outcomes could be reached for students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds who inhabit our writing classrooms. These students will feel linguistically included and empowered, knowing that their home language practices, their lived experiences, and identities are being honored. Indeed, by implementing the LJ pedagogy, students would view their home language practices not as deficits but as useful resources that they could fall on in order to construct new meaning. In closing, Author A indicated that engaging in LJ work can be a daunting and messy process; at the same token, it can be very rewarding for both educators and students alike as they challenge existing educational epistemologies regarding race and language (QS July 7, 2021).

Furthermore, Author B is from Mexico City. She is married to a white American man. Her English is more academic than her Spanish; her Spanish is formal and informal. She has difficulty writing in Spanish but loves Mexican culture and cuisine. She also values her adopted country--its education, her immediate family, and extended family. Her dual citizenship creates confusion when sociopolitical issues arise between the two countries, including immigration rights to water at the border. She has four master's degrees. Author B has eight to ten years of online instruction. Like the earlier researcher, Author B noted that the transition to remote learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic was not as challenging because her spring courses were hybrid already. However, her fall 2020 students found that online learning was difficult to navigate even though they were used to completing online activities. She stated, however,

that the two international collaborations she promoted in her online class created wonderful translingual/transnational learning experiences for her students. The collaborations enabled students to learn about other cultures, languages, and diverse rhetorical styles of composing.

While acknowledging some limitations of incorporating LJ into online writing instruction in particular, Author B believed that the main challenge is persuading other faculty members to develop a critical awareness of their own language and cultural practices in OWI. Without self-awareness, untrained faculty probably would not recognize the challenges of multilingual writers. She further defined LJ as "a process of making visible the implicit ideologies and practices, to myself and others, and explicitly formulate and devise strategies to combat those ideologies and practices." She stated that the conundrum with this concept is persuading others to accept it as all educators have their own biases. As a writing instructor, she has advocated for a translingual approach and sees translingualism as a tool for linguistic justice. Author B desired that her students become "cognizant of the local disparities and constraints our languages have depending upon the contexts and rhetorical situations" (QS July 7, 2021). Author B believed that helping students to feel more at ease with deploying their languages in writing while simultaneously guiding them to negotiate language varieties that conform to academic writing protocols is hugely critical and should be promoted more in our institutions.

Lastly, Author C grew up in a bilingual family. She speaks Spanish and English. No one in her household spoke the same variety of Spanish. She always had multilingual friends with a few monolingual acquaintances. She felt more comfortable in spaces where multiple languages were used. Like her multilingual colleagues above, Author C worked hard toward improving her English, albeit this has taken her many years. In responding to how she incorporated LJ in her online class during COVID-19, she indicated that she had 1-3 years of teaching experience online. She mentioned a recent classroom activity where she invited a guest speaker from Africa to talk to her students. They enjoyed the lesson from the guest speaker. This was partly because the speaker was multilingual, which most students in the class could identify with and relate to, given their various backgrounds. Besides that, the speaker was energetic and fun in relating to the students.

Author C's definition of LJ explored the central theme of language diversity. She stated that "Linguistic justice places equal importance on all languages and their varieties. It allows its users to express themselves using their entire linguistic repertoire freely." This methodology of teaching helps students to rediscover their identities throughout their lives. The author further stated that "Just as their language(s) change and evolve, so too do individuals' identities and cultures change and evolve depending on the social contexts." Indeed, the LJ framework plays an important role in teaching and learning. It also emphasizes that all languages and cultures have equal value (QS July 7, 2021). This notion supports the idea that language use among its speakers changes over time. The same can be said of individuals' identities and cultures which are constantly being influenced by many factors, including social, academic, and political contexts.

In retrospect, Author C indicated that it was much harder to execute LJ lessons with a guest speaker in an online environment. She felt that the students did not have as many online interactions with their peers as when they had had classes in-person and were physically in the classroom. Based on the students' experiences with her guest speaker, Author C noted that "They were quieter. They relied more on writing, and they always emailed her." Lastly, Author C mentioned that her class experienced some logistical limitations, such as students not using the video feature of the course and not having reliable internet connectivity.

Based on the above insights and definitions, LJ can be perceived as a multifaceted, equitable pedagogical practice that embraces the cultural, linguistic, and communicative diversities students bring into the classrooms. Both authors A and C acknowledged that implementing LJ in the classroom had some constraints both for teachers and students. They

stated that when their students expressed themselves in a written form, they were hesitant about using language varieties, including translanguaging, code-switching, code-mixing, and code-meshing in their essays. Even though they understood linguistic justice and its power in creating a liberatory learning environment for all learners, they did not feel comfortable using their language varieties. We believed this could be interpreted to mean that the students did not want their written work to be perceived as sub-par compared to their fellow monolingual classmates. This is a form of constraint in applying LJ in the classroom. Similarly, author B perceived LJ as a process of making apparent the implicit ideologies and practices in our classrooms. This is necessary for students to see the interconnectedness of race, racism, and language. By clearly naming the elephant in the room, we can devise strategies and practices that combat white hegemonic ideologies in our classrooms and programs.

Despite the ongoing scholarship on LJ and internal struggle or labor intensiveness with LJ work and drawing from Kate Vieira's (2019) article titled "What Happens When Text Fly," the researchers observed that students became aware that their language varieties, literacies, linguistic, and rhetorical repertoires can be used to reinforce power, to build power (for social change or against social oppression), and to negotiate power. According to the researchers, the LJ work can be sticky and convoluted. However, participants' analyses of the data suggest that there is a move away from uncritically adhering to the myth of linguistic homogeneity to a promising transition of accepting and valuing the reality of linguistic heterogeneity.

This qualitative phenomenological investigation indicated that we are making progress one step at a time in helping students develop a deeper appreciation for their home language practices as they learn to navigate the traditional linguistic protocols/academic writing standards that still prevail in our online classrooms. This development then raises some questions of the implementation of LJ in online writing classrooms. For example, what are multilingual writing instructors' experiences in incorporating linguistic justice in their online teaching during COVID-19? What affordances are there using the LJ methodology? What benefits do all students gain from the LJ approach to teaching? These questions can be answered in future research studies to illuminate the operations of LJ in our classrooms and academic programs.

Discussion of Themes

The following section breaks down the three major recurring themes emerging from the data and puts them in conversation with scholarship and examples offered by the participants.

Linguistic Justice Work: Messy and Convoluted

One important theme that emerged from our data set is that engaging in LJ work can be a messy undertaking. Gonzales Howell et al. (2020) declared, "Fighting racial and linguistic injustice is messy and inevitably incomplete work, particularly because, as one clever adage says, 'Racism isn't the shark in the ocean: it's the water'" (para. 3). If racism is the water, then multilingual and monolingual instructors should constantly check ~~be checking~~ how their language ideologies impact ~~are impacting~~ their identities, practices, and students. Lee and Canagarajah (2019) note that it is important to research our lived experiences, including our entire linguistic repertoire, not just in English, because this can help us develop translingual dispositions. Dispositions, according to the authors, are filters, actions, and indicators "that 'orient' all teachers in how they discuss, practice, and perform language and literacy regardless of their ethnolinguistic identity" (Lee & Canagarajah, 2019, p. 354).

For these authors, engaging with language differences and social diversity constitute a translingual disposition. Given our data set, we believe that all three authors have developed linguistic dispositions in their teaching of writing. However, it is important to emphasize that

having a multilingual identity and multicultural background does not automatically guarantee that one will embrace and enact translingual dispositions. These dispositions are cultivated, developed, and contested when critically examining issues related to power, privilege, and diversity. In short, they are labor-intensive, non-linear, and have limitations. Applying this idea to this project means there is no place for the assumption that multilingual instructors, by default, will embrace and enact linguistic justice in their teaching. All writing instructors should strive to develop an openness to language and cultural differences if they intend to impact their students' lives positively.

LJ as a Vehicle to Foster Student and Instructor Agency in OWI

The second theme that emerged from the data analysis is that linguistic justice can serve as a vehicle to foster student and instructor agency in OWI. In line with developing an openness to language differences and making a meaningful impact in the lives of students, writing instructors should strive to make LJ relevant as they foster their own and their students' agency. The three authors in this study incorporated LJ in their online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic at their various institutions. Being aware of their agencies as multilingual speakers and educators, they recognized that digital learning must transcend traditional boundaries between cultures and languages. In their unique ways, each author incorporated LJ in their online classroom using artifacts; Author A brought a poetry assignment and showed how it promoted linguistic diversity; Author B engaged students in transnational collaboration; and Author C invited a guest speaker to her class to reflect on his transnational identity in relation to education and life as a whole. In all of these examples, the researchers clearly opened up spaces for culturally and linguistically diverse educational experiences for their students (Kukulska-Hulme & Pegrum, 2018) in an attempt to prepare them for effective communication across a wide range of media. Using this approach to teaching writing created wonderful learning opportunities for students to utilize their unique linguistic repertoires in their writing freely.

However, as the three researchers pointed out earlier, incorporating LJ in teaching writing online, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic came with numerous unintended constraints ranging from logistics to linguistics. Prospective educators who are willing to try their hands on the LJ work in an online context, particularly during a pandemic, are advised to weigh the pros and cons before doing such work. Doing this homework early on may alleviate many of the difficulties and challenges that the research team faced in undertaking this study. In all, the LJ work is worth investing in as it creates linguistically rich learning environments for all students (whether physical or virtual learning contexts) to burgeon. The LJ work also invites future educators and researchers to invest in the act of reflexivity, which is critical to the successful development and implementation of language diversity in helping to combat linguistic racism and empower agency.

Reflexivity as a Helpful Practice to Combat Linguistic Racism

The third theme that resulted from data analysis suggests that reflexivity can be a helpful practice to combat linguistic racism. Qualitative researchers have defined the notion of reflexivity in different ways. Villegas Greene and Park (2021) defined reflexivity, in relation to teacher's identity, as a fluid process that requires the teacher-researcher to understand that "they are ultimately influenced by their positionalities, and in turn, they bring these nuanced positionalities into" the spaces they inhabit daily (p. 25). This fluid process is the result of an intentional "turning the lens on themselves" to make their positionalities, roles, and responsibilities visible to themselves first, then to those they work with, such as students, and colleagues (p. 24). Giampapa (2011), on the other hand, defines reflexivity as a delicate dance

between shifting identities, positionalities, and the research sites (p. 132). For Palaganas et al. (2017), reflexivity is a "journey of learning" (p. 426). This journey of learning entails a certain level of consciousness, self-awareness, and a recognition that the researcher is part of the social world they study. Reflexivity also demands that one becomes self-aware, scrutinize their own positionalities, and acts (Pillow, 2003).

In this work, we define reflexivity as an intellectual concept and process of knowledge and meaning-making that involves the researcher and participants engaging in critical self-awareness and critical self-evaluation of their roles in the research process. Reflexivity is, therefore, a transformative process that enables researchers and participants to learn, unlearn, discover, and impact the educational systems and society in which they operate.

Undoubtedly, reflexivity has impacted each of the RPs in different ways. Due to space constraints, we offer one example. Author C has discovered that continuous reflexivity—both comfortable and uncomfortable (Pillow, 2003)—has helped her to acknowledge, find, discuss, and challenge the limits of what acceptable research (and teaching) practices are through critical self-reflecting and self-monitoring. She explained that she first must critically examine how she defined linguistic justice as a concept and practice in the online writing class during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Moving Forward: Future Research Directions

Based on the analysis from this qualitative phenomenological study on how multilingual instructors define and incorporate LJ in OWI, the researchers have determined three main implications for further exploration in OWI, scholarship, and professional development. First, all writing instructors—both multilinguals and monolinguals—can enhance their writing lessons by incorporating LJ in the teaching of composition. They can help students sharpen and deploy their diverse language practices as they learn to negotiate and construct meaning based on their situated contexts. Online writing instructors can provide students with guidance on developing linguistic awareness about their own language practices and how they change depending on the context. Through these activities, students can acquire increased metalinguistic communication skills that they can (re-)apply in composing texts. Students can also include LJ in multimodal texts as well as non-alphabetic semantic constructions, creatively communicating across languages, cultures, and modalities. Diverse composing strategies can help students discuss LJ's functions in their lives as they discover their authentic voices. Although students' behaviors cannot be monitored outside of the classroom, writing instructors can introduce students to LJ concepts and practices through experiential learning activities. Engaging in these practices can have a more profound impact on how students practice LJ in their daily lives, including its application in disrupting hegemonic practices present in our classrooms and society as a whole.

Another implication is that online teaching is here to stay. The more prepared educators are in conforming to this mode of instruction, the better prepared they will be to help train and empower future generations of students. McKenzie (2021) reports that many students want online learning options post-pandemic. Author B shares that in her institutions, synchronous live, hybrid, and hi-flex modalities have been adopted. This reality raises new opportunities to continue investigating issues of LJ in writing courses. Some questions to consider are: what issues of power in online environments might impact students' linguistic and writing practices? How do we identify when a student's emotional state has been impacted due to language issues in OW courses? What logistical or accessibility issues do OW instructors and students experience? How are linguistic/ethnic bullying and linguistic stereotyping present in the OW classroom? Are there differences in how monolingual and multilingual instructors approach issues of LJ in online courses? What assessment practices reflect LJ in OW courses? By considering these issues about LJ and engaging in reflexivity, we can acknowledge, find,

discuss, and challenge the hegemonic practices that do not value language difference and cultural diversity and introduce research and OWI that support inclusivity across all languages and cultures.

Lastly, there's no denying the fact that LJ is an emerging concept in applied linguistics and compositional studies. As this concept gets talked about more in conferences and written about in books and journal articles, many educators and administrators will now become aware of the concept and how it can be used to challenge complex issues of race, politics, and language (Motha, 2014). Although some educators or administrators may initially express their reservations about the application of LJ in their institutions and feel that this will constitute an extra burden on their already heavy workloads, the end product is very beneficial to both students and institutions.

In order to receive favorable buy-ins from faculty and administration, therefore, more intentional, pragmatic work needs to be done about the LJ framework. First, administrators can invite experts who have dedicated their lives work to interrogating epistemological racism and systemic hegemonic practices to give presentations to faculty on the efficacy of using the LJ framework in teaching. By inviting these guest speakers or sending faculty to conferences dealing with LJ, institutions can begin the process of promoting awareness among faculty, designing aspects of LJ into their curriculums, and incentivizing faculty to implement this approach in their teaching. Indeed, facilitating LJ professional development programs for institutions and educators will not be an easy feat; however, the advantages of doing so far outweigh the disadvantages. This approach disrupts the monolingualists' ideologies of teaching writing, thereby creating anti-racist learning environments for all students to thrive in our institutions.

Concluding Remarks

Teaching and practicing LJ in the online classroom has helped us to remain grounded in our fields as we encourage our students to use their complex linguistic repertoires as learning tools rather than impose unfair (often inaccessible) language requirements on them. Reflexivity keeps us as educators and researchers in touch with reality—engaging in self-recognition and recognizing our students (*others*)—so that we can teach them with deep caring and empower them with hope (Greene & Park, 2021). More importantly, reflexivity helps us to focus our research and teaching lens on LJ with respect to our students (*others*) so that their voices can be authentically and truthfully presented, transcending any long-standing misconceptions about their abilities to be successful in college.

Ultimately, we as educators and researchers have to examine ourselves, the roles we play in teaching our various courses, and how we conduct research as co-authors and participants. Thus, we have to push ourselves to learn more about ourselves, each other, our professions, and our research team's empirical project. As Palaganas et al. (2017) stated in their group research "we are 'conscientized' and learn about ourselves as well as others" and that "reflexivity is indeed a journey of learning and unlearning" (p. 436). Agreeably, by engaging in reflexivity, we as educator-researchers are poised to make real, pragmatic differences in the lives of our culturally and linguistically students and the institutions in which we serve.

Acknowledgements

References

Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.

Brandt, D. (1998). Sponsors of literacy. *College Composition and Communication*, *49*(2), 165–185. http://www.jstor.org/stable/358929.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2010). A rhetoric of shuttling between languages. In B. Horner, M-Z Lu, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Cross-language relations in composition* (pp. 158–179). Southern Illinois University Press.

CCCC Online Writing Instruction Standing Group. (2021). *The 2021 state of the art of OWI report*. Conference on College Composition and Communication. https://sites.google.com/view/owistandinggroup/state-of-the-art-of-owi-2021

CCCC OWI Committee for Effective Practices in Online Writing Instruction. (2013). *A position statement of principles and effective practices for online writing instruction (OWI)*. http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples

Colaizzi, P.F. (1978). Psychological research as the phenomenologist views. In R. Vaile & M. King (Eds.), *Existential phenomenological alternatives for psychology* (pp. 48–71). Oxford University Press.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1974). Students' right to their own language [PDF]. In *Students' right to their own language*. https://prod-ncte-cdn.azureedge.net/nctefiles/groups/cccc/newsrtol.pdf

Creswell, J. W., & Báez, J. C. (2020). *30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher*. SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J.W., & Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.

De Costa, P. I. (2020) Linguistic racism: Its negative effects and why we need to contest it. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(7), 833–837. http//doi:10.1080/13670050.2020.1783638

Dobinson, T., & Mercieca, P. (2020). Seeing things as they are, not Just as we are: Investigating linguistic racism on an Australian university campus. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(7), 789–803. https//doi:10.1080/13670050.2020.1724074

Dovchin, S. (2020). The psychological damages of linguistic racism and international students in Australia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 23*(7), 804–818. http//doi:10.1080/13670050.2020.1759504

Giampapa, F. (2011). The politics of "Being and Becoming" a researcher: Identity, power, and negotiating the field. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 10,* (pp.132-144).

Gonzales Howell, N., Navickas, K., Shapiro, R., Shapiro, S. & Watson, M. (2020). Embracing the perpetual 'But' in raciolinguistic justice work: When idealism meets practice. *Composition Forum, 44.*

Greene, V.G., & Park G. (2021). Promoting reflexivity during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *American Journal of Qualitative Research, 5*(1), 23-29. https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/9717

Hewett, B. (2015). Grounding principles of OWI. In B. Hewett & K. DePew (Eds.), *Foundational practices of online writing instruction* (pp. 39–98). WAC Clearinghouse, Parlor Press.

Hewett, B., & DePew, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Foundational practices of online writing instruction*. WAC Clearinghouse, Parlor Press.

Horner, B., Lu, M. Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, *73*(3), 303–321.

Hussein, E., Daoud, S., Alrabaiah, H., & Badawi, R. (2020). Exploring undergraduate students' attitudes towards emergency online learning during COVID-19: A case from the UAE. *Children and Youth Services Review, 119*, Article 105699. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105699

Istenič, A. (2021). Online learning under COVID-19: re-examining the prominence of video-based and text-based feedback. *Education Tech Research Dev*, *69*, 117–121. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-09955-w

Jansen, H. (2010). The logic of qualitative survey research and its position in the field of social research methods. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 11*(2). ttps://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-11.2.1450

Joffe, H., & Yardley, L. (2004). Content and thematic analysis. In D. F. Marks & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Research methods for clinical and health psychology* (pp. 56–68). SAGE Publications.

Kukulska-Hulme, A. & Pregum, M. (2018). Linguistic diversity in online learning. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and superdiversity* (pp. 518-532).

Lee, E., & Canagarajah, S. A. (2019). Beyond native and nonnative: Translingual dispositions for more inclusive teacher identity in language and literacy education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *18*(6), 352–363. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1674148

Legge, M. F. (2014). Autoethnography and teacher education: Snapshot stories of cultural encounter. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(5). https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n5.1

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in US college composition. *College English*, *68*(6), 637–651. https://doi.org/10.2307/25472180

McKenzie, L. (2021, April 27). *Students want online learning options post-pandemic*. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/04/27/survey-reveals-positive-outlook-online-instruction-post-pandemic

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1945)

Miller-Cochran, S. (2015). Multilingual writers in OWI. In B. L. Hewett & K. E. DePew (Eds.), *Foundational practices of online writing instruction* (pp. 297–313). The WAC Clearinghouse, Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0650

Mitchum, C., Hebbard, M., & Morris, J. (2021). Expanding instructional contexts: Why student backgrounds matter to online teaching and learning. In W. P. Banks & S. Spangler (Eds.), *English studies online* (pp. 232–257). Parlor Press.

Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. Teachers College Press.

Motha, S., Jain, R., & Tecle, T. (2012). Translinguistic identity-as-pedagogy: Implications for language teacher education. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(1), 13–28.

Noor, S., Nasir Ali, M., Husnine, S.M. (2020.). Performance of online classes in Lahore, Pakistan during COVID-19. *Performance Improvement*, *59*(9), 33–41. https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21938

Palaganas, E. C., Sanchez, M. C., Molintas, M. P., & Caricativo, R. D. (2017). Reflexivity in qualitative research: A journey of learning. *The Qualitative Report, 22*(2), (pp.426-438).

Patton, M. Q. (2015). What to observe: Sensitizing concepts (Excerpt). In *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (pp. 358–363). SAGE Publications.

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(2), 175-196.

Robinson, H., Hall, J. & Navarro, N. (2020). *Translingual identities and transnational realities in the U.S. college classroom.* Routledge.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). Designing main questions and probes. In *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (pp. 131–147). SAGE Publications.

Sánchez, F. (2013). Creating accessible spaces for ESL students online. *Writing Program Administration*, *37*(1), 161–185.

Sayer, P., & Braun, D. (2020). The disparate impact of COVID-19 remote learning on English learners in the United States. *TESOL Journal*, *11*(3), Article e00546 [no pagination]. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.546

van Manen, M. (2007). Phenomenology of practice [PDF]. *Phenomenology & Practice*, *1*(1), 11–30. https://www.maxvanmanen.com/files/2011/04/2007-Phenomenology-of-Practice.pdf

Vieira. K. (2019). What happens when texts fly. *College English, 82*(1), 77–95. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/what-happens-when-texts-fly/docview/2305481826/se-2

Warnock, S. (2009). *Teaching writing online: How and why*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Notes on Contributors

Forster Kudjo Agama is a Professor of English at Tallahassee Community College where he teaches African American Literature, Rhetoric and Composition. His research interests include first year writing, composition theories, linguistic justice, antiracist pedagogies, digital rhetoric, translingualism, and second language acquisition. He was a recipient of the Exemplary Teaching of Literacy and Language Award for the 2021-2022 Academic Year from the Composition and Applied Linguistics Program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. He received his master's degree in English Studies at Illinois State University and his bachelor's degree in English and Linguistics at the University of Ghana, Legon. Currently, he is a PhD Candidate (ABD) in the Composition and Applied Linguistics Program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP).

Marcela Hebbard is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley where she teaches composition, linguistic and teacher preparedness courses. Her research interests include online writing pedagogy, language and identity, first-year writing, raciolinguistics, and writing across the curriculum. She has co-authored two book chapters and several articles in academic journals. She holds four master's degrees, one doctoral degree in Women's Studies, and is currently a PhD Candidate (ABD) in the Composition and Applied Linguistics Program at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Bernadette M. López-Fitzsimmons is a faculty member at Manhattan College, the Bronx, New York. She teaches introduction to English composition and intercultural communication in el programa Camino, a language-advancement associate's degree program for Spanish-speaking undergraduates. She has co-authored professional and scholarly articles and presented at conferences. She co-authored a chapter on the pronunciation practice of /f/ and /v/ sounds in *New Ways in Teaching Speaking* by TESOL Press. Her research interests include the impact of World Englishes on higher education, language education, writing pedagogy, educational mobility, multilingualism in education, and online instruction. She holds an MA in Applied Linguistics/TESOL, an MLS in Library & Information Science, and an MA in Spanish Literature and Linguistics from Queens College, CUNY. Currently, she is a PhD Candidate (ABD) in the Composition and Applied Linguistics Program at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

ORCID

Forster Kudjo Agama, http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8463-0944
Marcela Hebbard, http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1523-8957
Bernadette M. López-Fitzsimmons, http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9278-5102

Qualitative Survey via Google Forms

Multilingual Writing Instructors' Perspectives on Linguistic Justice During COVID

This project investigates multilingual writing instructors' perspectives regarding linguistic justice in the teaching of writing online during the COVID pandemic. Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Survey responses will be shared among all co-investigators and will be stored on a shareable Google folder for three years after the completion of the research study.

Findings from this study may be organized and presented at professional conferences. It may also be published in scholarly journals or other scholarly publications. The collected data will only be used for academic purposes.

By clicking on the "Accept to participate" option below, you indicate that:

1. you have read this document;
2. you do not have any questions about this research study;
3. you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.
   - Accept to participate
   - I don't accept to participate

Indicate years of teaching experience in higher education:

- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16 years or more

Indicate years of experience teaching online:

- 1-3 years
- 4-7 years
- 8-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16 years or more

Indicate the types of courses taught during COVID:

- First Year Writing (FYW)
- Second Language Writing
- Creative Writing
- Other: _____

Indicate the ethnicity/race that you identify with:

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian, including Asian Indian or Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- Latino/Hispanic/Spanish
- Two or more races
- White – Non-Latino/Hispanic/Spanish

- Prefer not to answer
- Other: _____

Please indicate your gender:

- Man
- Woman
- Non-binary
- Other: _____

Tell us about your linguistic and cultural background (language(s), place(s) you grew up, education, etc.).

How do you define linguistic justice? And how does your definition help you as a writing teacher connect linguistic justice to writing?

Collaborative Group Discussion (CGD) Prompt

Main Research Question:

- How do multilingual writing instructors define linguistic justice? In other words, what constitutes linguistic justice?
- How do multilingual writing instructors incorporate linguistic justice in their online teaching during COVID-19 pandemic?

Procedure:

Step 1: Read the artifacts every group participant submitted before zoom session
Step 2: Respond to the following prompts:

- Briefly share why you selected the artifact(s).
- Briefly share what the significance of the artifact selected is.
- Discuss how these artifacts incorporate linguistic justice.
- Discuss the affordances and constraints you have experienced using these artifacts in your teaching.

Individual Interview Questions

Themes 1	Interview Questions
- Immigration (colonialism, post-colonization) - Language varieties - Language loss, maintenance, preservation	How does your immigration experience impact the way you perceive your own language variety and that of others? In your opinion, do you think you have experienced language loss? If so, tell me more about what you have experienced. How does being multilingual impact the way you teach writing?
Themes 2	**Interview Questions**
Features of Language Purposes of Linguistic justice: - Authenticity - Identity Transformation - Meaning making - Negotiation of language & language varieties - Knowledge creation - Disrupt hegemony ideologies and practices institutional and societal Features of Linguistic Justice: - Involves struggle as an ongoing process - Involves continuous negotiation - Values cultural diversity Teacher as: - Fighter - Guide - Advocate - Activist	Referring to the list of purposes of linguistic justice our survey analysis revealed, which ones have been more relevant in your teaching during the COVID 19 pandemic? For each one you have selected, could you tell me more about the connection to your teaching during COVID? In your opinion, in what ways does linguistic justice approach to teaching writing disrupt monolingual practices in your classroom? What difficulties, if any, did you encounter while incorporating/teaching linguistic justice during the COVID 19 pandemic? Out of all the teacher's identities in connection to linguistic justice our survey analysis revealed, which ones resonate with you the most during the COVID 19 pandemic? Could you tell me more why you selected that option(s)?