

Fall 12-2021

Anti-Racist Pedagogy: A Practical Means of Building Bonds Between Marginalized Students and Instructors in the Composition Classroom

Santa-Victoria Pérez
Chapman University, sanperez@chapman.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/english_theses



Part of the [Creative Writing Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), and the [Other Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pérez, Santa-Victoria. *Anti-Racist Pedagogy: A Practical Means of Building Bonds Between Marginalized Students and Instructors in the Composition Classroom*. 2021. Chapman University, MA Thesis. *Chapman University Digital Commons*, <https://doi.org/10.36837/chapman.000323>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in English (MA) Theses by an authorized administrator of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact laughtin@chapman.edu.

Anti-Racist Pedagogy: A Practical Means of Building Bonds
Between Marginalized Students and Instructors in the
Composition Classroom

A Thesis by

Santa-Victoria Pérez

Chapman University

Orange, CA

Wilkinson College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in English

December 2021

Committee in charge:

Morgan Read-Davidson, M.F.A., Chair

Nora Rivera, Ph.D.

Jan Osborn, Ph.D.

The thesis of Santa-Victoria Pérez is approved.

Morgan Read-Davidson

Morgan Read-Davidson, Chair

Nora K. Rivera

Nora Rivera, Ph.D.

Jan M. Osborn

Jan Osborn, Ph.D.

December 2021

Anti-Racist Pedagogy: A Practical Means of Building Bonds Between
Marginalized Students and Instructors in the Composition Classroom

Copyright © 2021

by Santa-Victoria Pérez

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee—Dr. Nora Rivera and Dr. Jan Osborn for their support, feedback, and affirmation of the value of this topic. I would also like to thank Dr. Ian Barnard, who encouraged me to pursue my interest in anti-racist teaching practices and whose wisdom inspired me. I express my most profound appreciation for my thesis chair, Morgan Read-Davidson, for his support of my work and encouragement throughout the process of completing this thesis. His enthusiasm in the classroom and willingness to share his experience gave me the desire to become the kind of teacher he was to me. Your mentorship is invaluable. Thank you.

I am beyond grateful for my English 103: Writing Heritage and English 103: Heritage Rhetorics students from the 2020-2021 school year who taught me more than I could have ever hoped to teach them.

I would also like to thank my mom, Sandra, and my Abuelo, Felipe, for answering my endless questions, for teaching me to love our language, for choosing to continue the celebration of our heritage, and for being my greatest source of support.

And to my Abuelita, gracias, esto es para ti, te quiero con toda mi alma.

ABSTRACT

Anti-Racist Pedagogy: A Practical Means of Building Bonds Between Marginalized Students
and Instructors in the Composition Classroom

by Santa-Victoria Pérez

Framed by the existing scholarship in anti-racist pedagogy, this thesis is inspired by Charise Pimentel and Octavio Pimentel's dream of building coalitions with marginalized students, Steven Alvarez's framework for academic biliteracy, and Marcos del Hierro's advocacy for incorporating discussions about contentious social issues in the classroom. This research draws mainly from works by rhetoricians and compositionists of color who report that working through and pushing past the discomfort and tensions of politically charged topics in the classroom are crucial for an anti-racist writing program (Prendergast, 1998; Villanueva, 1999; Clary-Lemon, 2009; Inoue, 2015; García de Müeller and Ruiz, 2017). By reflecting on this scholarship, I aimed to find a practical means of incorporating anti-racist pedagogy into the first-year composition classroom. I attempted to answer how instructors create an anti-racist classroom, how students react to a cultural studies class where marginalized identities are the focus, and how the identity or perceived identity of the instructor changes the dynamics of the classroom in the design of my first-year composition syllabus. I sought to create a classroom that challenges the imposed hegemony of Western imperial writing practices by implementing three main components of anti-racist teaching practices: assigning multilingual writing projects that break Western conventions, centering social issues that impact those with marginalized identities, and building coalitions with marginalized students, but especially students of color. This thesis examines how constructing an actively anti-racist classroom works to dismantle imposed hegemonic norms that often exclude marginalized students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
ABSTRACT	V
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 FOUNDATIONS OF MY ANTI-RACIST PEDAGOGY	5
3 COMPONENTS OF MY ANTI-RACIST PEDAGOGY:	12
3.1 Multilingual Projects	12
3.2 Centering Social Issues.....	18
3.3 Coalition Pedagogy	22
4 INSTRUCTOR VOICES	30
4.1 Instructor Reflection	30
4.2 Self-Reflection.....	34
WORKS CITED	36
APPENDICES	39

1 Introduction

In my second year of teaching first-year composition, I recognize that my initial fears about teaching have not dissipated. My fears aren't that I will realize I don't actually want to teach or that I will be a bad teacher; rather, I fear that students will hear me say that English isn't my first language and wonder what I am doing teaching an English class. I worry that the readings and topics in my classroom will create a division between my students and me. I worry that the marginalized voices represented in my course readings will clash with the voices of privileged students. But these fears only started after my class began, and I saw the reaction on my students' faces when we reviewed the syllabus. I immediately worried that my students would drop my course in favor of one where the instructor's identity as a woman of color wouldn't "get in the way" of their General Education credit.

When creating my topic-based first-year composition (FYC) syllabus for Heritage Rhetorics, I was adamant about developing a course that included subject matter that reflected my passions and areas of interest. I hoped my high regard for the writers I assigned would manifest as students seeing the value in discussing heritage which—for the purposes of this course—centers on race and identity. I didn't think about the response students would have to my opinions or the assigned readings. I didn't expect significant pushback on border rhetoric readings from students who disagreed with my politics. I didn't anticipate students of color feeling uncomfortable when their white peers challenged the projects I assigned. I didn't think about how anxious I would feel before each class when I'd have to not only present ideas but present ideas that were deeply tied to my identity.

During the first week of classes, a fellow instructor wrote in a group chat that in their classroom, their students would “watch a video about Trump rhetoric versus Obama rhetoric.” I thought there was no way I could be comfortable enough to teach something like that. But I’d already finished my syllabus, shared it with my students, and knew that in a few weeks, my students would be reading about the experiences of Black individuals in the U.S., how white historians had rewritten the history of Hawaii, and how border policies are racist. If anything, what I’d elected to teach was deeper than watching and dissecting campaign speeches.

I was confronted with how uncomfortable I felt talking about race and identity to a classroom full of mostly white students. I wondered if I needed to revise my syllabus to include topics that would be less controversial, but I didn’t want to censor myself while other instructors discussed provocative issues such as politics, performative advocacy, and police brutality. I worried there would be some level of resistance or even disingenuity from my students if they modified their assignments or words to fit my views. The white instructors, and very few instructors of color, shared how open they were about their thoughts and ideas; yet I, a Mexican-American woman who never shied away from being political, could not bring myself to be as open with my students—because of the omnipresent threat of hegemonic whiteness that permeates academia.

I felt a high level of discomfort in discussing social issues in the classroom, but I recognized the importance of discussing the intersection of race and politics with students; it was why I designed my class to be a place where students could explore and learn about those topics. I found that I was not alone in my hesitancy; Marcos Del Hierro describes this fear as the struggle or tension Latinxs in academia face as we move to “survive and succeed.” Like Gloria

Anzaldúa, Del Hierro sees academia as a constructed borderland we navigate where our legitimacy is questioned because of our gender, ethnicity, and race.

To better understand if my fears were founded, I conducted an IRB-approved study in the Fall 2020 and Spring 2020 semesters of my first-year rhetoric and composition course at Chapman University. That study aimed to understand the relationship between the level of comfort a student experienced when discussing race and politics and their reported identity. I examined students' comfort level in discussing race, the ways that students grappled with tensions, and the changes I observed in the comfort level of expression of political ideas in class meetings. By reviewing my findings, I recognized that my pedagogical choices created an attempt at an anti-racist classroom that challenges the imposed hegemony of Western imperial writing practices. I experienced this imposition as a student in FYC in multiple ways: adherence to readings by mostly white writers, acceptance of standard English-only academic writing, and a bias toward students who participated most often in class, usually white men.

As a FYC student, the only reading by a nonwhite person listed on the reading list was Martin Luther King Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail." It made me angry, and it was frustrating for me as a student. Because of this, I made an effort to select readings from marginalized people as much as possible in my class. I tried to avoid assigning texts from writers with privileged identities as much as possible because I had not seen a focus on Black and brown writers and theorists. As someone who didn't speak English until I went to school, I was also frustrated with the idea that academic writing is only done in English. I was never given the opportunity to write in a language other than English at school, and I didn't want that to be the experience of my students. Breaking that tradition meant expecting my students to engage in another language so they could be exposed to writing they wouldn't normally be exposed to simply because of the

idea that standard English should be the dominant academic language. In my experience as a student, I also saw instructors focus their attention on the students who spoke the most in class, and often that meant white men who felt confident in expressing views typically in-line with hegemonic white, patriarchal culture. By focusing on students of color, I wanted to challenge what I'd seen as the norm in the classroom.

Though my choices weren't any more radical than the choices other instructors at the university were making, I was on constant high alert for pushback from students. My classroom was the one place where I did not feel comfortable talking about race or politics, even though those discussions encompassed a large portion of my pedagogy. Now, as I reflect on the findings of that study, I aim to examine what changes need to occur in my classroom to continue decolonizing my teaching by determining the benefits and downfalls of the three main components of my anti-racist pedagogy: multilingual projects, centering relevant social issues, and building coalitions with my students.

In examining these experiences, new questions came to the forefront: In an anti-racist classroom, is it anti-racist or is it problematic to say that simply the act of doing something outside of the norm is enough to qualify as anti-racist? How does the identity or perceived identity of the instructor change the dynamics of the classroom? By asking these questions, I aim to explore how my attempts at creating an anti-racist classroom fit into the framework of rhetoric and how it can support the relationship between student and instructor.

2 Foundations of my Anti-Racist Pedagogy

My research is framed by the existing scholarship in anti-racist pedagogy. By putting Charise Pimentel and Octavio Pimentel's dream of building coalitions with marginalized students in relation to Steven Alvarez's framework for academic biliteracy, I propose how building an actively anti-racist classroom within the framework of rhetoric offers an affective potentiality for creating more genuine relationships between students and instructors.

When I began my research, I assumed that a first-year composition course that brought issues of race and politics to the forefront would seem as though it were designed to divide. As I explored works by rhetoricians and compositionists of color, I realized that discourse about race and politics in the classroom was more broadly accepted and even sought after than I initially perceived. I found that few studies consider how students engage with each other and their instructor when political discussions increased classroom tension. Scholars report that working through and pushing past the discomfort and tensions of politically charged topics in the classroom is crucial for an anti-racist writing program (Prendergast, 1998; Villanueva, 1999; Clary-Lemon, 2009; Inoue, 2015; García de Müeller and Ruiz, 2017).

Though compositionists of color agree that these topics are essential to include in the classroom, the journals many of these compositionists rely on and write for, such as *College Composition and Communication* and *College English*, do not use the words "race" or "racism." Instead, these journals use vague metaphors such as "diversity, inclusion, and social justice" (Clary-Lemon 21). In "The Racialization of Composition Studies: Scholarly Rhetoric of Race since 1990," Jennifer Clary-Lemon contends that this discrepancy is revealing of the problem in the field of rhetoric and composition: that, even in these journals, we don't talk about the ways

we fail as a field to bring these conversations forward. We're complacent in allowing these conversations to go without focus. Rather than praise journals for including this discourse at all, we need to "look at what we've explicitly said—how and when we've said it, how we haven't said it, how often we've said it, and what our language is really saying about race and racism" (Clary-Lemon W5). Clary-Lemon exposes the reality of journal publication—that though these journals represent the field of rhetoric and composition, few scholars are granted access to publication, and many are excluded. Rather than use language that is comfortable or less ostracizing, we should seek to use language that accurately reflects and represents matters concerning race.

In "Race, Silence, and Writing Program Administration: A Qualitative Study of U.S. College Writing Programs," Iris Ruiz and Genevieve García de Müller contend that "race discourse, although perceived as discomfoting, can inform and improve critical pedagogy" (22). Their 2017 study examines the lack of discourse about race in writing programs and concludes that this lack derives from the white-centered nature of most programs. Though "writing instructors and WPAs (Writing Program Administrators) affirm that race is an important factor directly affecting student success," writing programs largely do not consider race when developing their writing programs, "resulting in an ironic silencing of race as a generative subject for writing program administration" (Ruiz and García de Müller 20). I found this especially informative of my own experience creating my syllabus. Though my superiors were incredibly supportive of the work I was trying to achieve in my classroom, it felt like the "real work" rested primarily on instructors and compositionists of color at the university. Ruiz and García de Müller describe this real work as the necessary anti-racist work done in the classroom, bringing attention to the problem of underrepresentation in the field of Writing

Studies. When race is discussed, it often isolates composition instructors of color because there is a “lack of attention to race in Writing Studies journals, conference spaces, and professional organizational policy” (Ruiz and García de Müller 21). Their study found that white participants were more likely to respond that “their institution, writing program, and personal strategies were very or extremely effective in addressing issues of race and ethnicity” (Ruiz and García de Müller 25). In contrast, POC participants overwhelmingly responded that these strategies were “slightly or not effective at all” (Ruiz and García de Müller 25). In instances where POC participants responded that a strategy was moderate or very effective, the “narrative justification for the rating tended to explain the effectiveness as being a result of POC work on the strategy” (Ruiz and García de Müller 27).

After reading Ruiz and García de Müller’s assessment, I had to consider why I often felt the need to ask for permission when doing something outside of the “norm” to address race, such as having a community organizer give a guest lecture on the BLM protests they’d organized over the summer, or after a class, asking fellow instructors if something I’d said during class was too much, like addressing issues of privilege within our classroom dynamics. García de Müller and Ruiz noted that POC respondents reported that, though their teaching strategies about race weren’t any more radical than white professors, their identities made them seem more radical. Their observations led me to conclude that people who come from a privileged identity tend to be more comfortable discussing race and politics in their classrooms.

In her book, *Teaching Racial Literacy: Reflective Practices for Critical Writing*, Mara Lee Grayson notes that students are eager to discuss race, but most aren’t sure where to begin or even what language to use. She asserts that what instructors fail to discuss in the classroom informs students more than what they do say, and “what is unsaid is just as important as what is

said, if not more” (Grayson 103). Grayson focuses on race discourse as an essential topic in the classroom as she contends that “instructors must take care to ensure that traditionally underrepresented students have a voice in the classroom without also being given the responsibility of tending to their White classmates” (105). I saw Grayson’s assertions reflected in the advice I’d been given from one of the Latinx professors at Chapman who told me that I needed to stop caring about the way white students saw me and instead tend to the students of color in the classroom, not because I didn’t care about white students, but because students of color so rarely have the opportunity to be taken care of, to be heard, or to have their experiences valued and centered in the classroom.

To focus on instructors of color and their experiences as educators, I turned to Marcos Del Hierro’s work, titled “*Mojado*,” in which he examines the experience of POC, specifically Latinxs, in academia. Del Hierro highlights that discussing social issues are essential in the composition classroom, yet

professors of color are thus in a dilemma because their options are limited. They could avoid teaching and discussing race, but that would be teaching to the evaluations, compromising many professors’ ethics. They could teach sensitive topics and plan frequent activities that allow for students to release tension and process their individual conflicts; however, this would be another form of teaching to the evaluations (177).

This was my fear. I could avoid teaching about contentious social issues only to appease students, but this would mean forsaking what I consider is most important in a classroom and ignoring the research I’d done about the value of teaching about race. Del Hierro describes the alternative, teaching what we deem valuable and accepting the bad evaluations. This tension is what Del Hierro considers a reminder that we, Latinxs in academia, are not considered legitimate bodies, and instead “appear to be ‘uncontrollable’ [and] often find [our]selves excluded from it no matter how talented and exceptional [we] may prove to be” (178). This resonated with me; I

often questioned my qualifications for teaching about race when other instructors often asked for the readings I was using and my opinions on their assignments. I felt the need to ask for permission or overthink what I knew would be valuable to students because I didn't want to be "uncontrollable" and therefore excluded.

My desire to focus on students of color came from my research on coalition pedagogy. According to Charise Pimentel and Octavio Pimentel, coalition pedagogy is a "theoretical and practical means of creating an antiracist classroom, which is ultimately thought to contribute to the success of students of color in higher education" (115). In this approach, an instructor incorporates readings from writers of diverse backgrounds that address issues of oppression. This welcomes students' culture into the classroom and supports student-centered pedagogy. In coalition pedagogy, "instructors are encouraged to make both their identities and viewpoints evident," building relationships between instructor and students so that students—especially students of color—feel safe to share their opinions and become more vocal in the classroom (C. Pimentel and O. Pimentel 116). Pimentel and Pimentel report that many students of color do not feel entirely confident in sharing their views since white students might reject their opinions. However, by incorporating coalition pedagogy into our teaching strategies, we advocate for students of color in the class. They determine that coalition building begins on the first day when "instructors voice our political viewpoints through the readings themselves and verbally in class discussions. By voicing our political viewpoints, we begin to identify and build coalitions with students who experience oppression on an ongoing basis, many of whom are students of color (C. Pimentel and O. Pimentel 116). Like Mara Lee Grayson, they argue that the texts an instructor chooses are as telling as what instructors say. A clear expression of viewpoint in the form of text selection and in class discussions is necessary for the anti-racist classroom, as

students need to trust their instructor so they can feel safe to voice their points of view. Pimentel and Pimentel acknowledge that by actively building coalitions with marginalized students, they “are not creating openings for white and/or conservative students in [their] class” (116). However, they reject the idea that this pedagogy ignores white students or impedes their ability to learn from and engage in class discussions since verbal participation or lack of verbal participation does not necessarily demonstrate whether a student is learning. Instead, Pimentel and Pimentel report that in presenting critical perspectives in class, they do not find that white and/or conservative students “shut down or hold grudges” (116). Furthermore, students are not impeded or ignored since “[they] are not fed information without being able to respond to it” (117). If students are not given openings during class, it is still possible for them to respond through written assignments and reading responses since they do not “provide space for students to write uncritical essays” (116). I will address this again in section 3.3 Coalition Pedagogy, with specific examples.

Prior to reading *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory and Pedagogy*, I assumed that the desire to learn and write about race would directly relate to student demographics at a university. Because I teach at a predominantly white institution, where, in the Fall of 2020, white students accounted for 50.4% of the undergraduate student population, I assumed that students would be less willing to discuss race than they would at a Hispanic serving institution. However, in her chapter “Race,” Iris D. Ruiz writes about her experience with student interest in discussing race. She reports that even at institutions with a student population greater than 45% “Hispanic or Latino,” students do not always show interest in discussing or writing about race. Though Ruiz acknowledges that student demographics affect pedagogy, she contends that they do “not automatically correlate with whether or not students

welcome the opportunity to engage in the topic of race—no matter where their hometown is, how they look, sound, or write” (4). Her experience opposes my initial assumption that instructors at Hispanic-serving institutions have an “easier” time addressing race in the classroom.

Although my research focused on race, I recognize that it is crucial to address the other differences and similarities of identity in the classroom. Susan C. Jarratt contends that “differences of gender, race, and class among students and teachers provide situations in which conflict does arise, and we need more than the ideal of the harmonious, nurturing composition class in our repertory of teaching practices to deal with these problems” (270-271). As Jarratt explains, the various identities that make us who we are complicate the dynamics of a classroom.

Though anti-racist pedagogy focuses on the role race occupies within the classroom, a crucial aspect of this teaching practice comes from engaging students to think critically about their identities. Leading students through metacognitive practices, where they write about how their identities intersect, how the world sees them, and how they see themselves, allows them to gain awareness of their resistance or openness to learning in a classroom where decentering white hegemonic norms is a priority and race discourse is a core focus.

3 Components of my Anti-Racist Pedagogy:

I designed my course to be a space where students of different backgrounds, such as race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, ability, and religion, could explore multiple identities and intersections. As the semester progressed, it became apparent to me how important it is to lead by example and share my identity with students—regardless of how daunting that felt. Part of my fears came from feeling as though my identity complicated things for my students. I am a first-generation Mexican-American. I am a woman. I am a native speaker of Spanish. I am from a working-class family. I was raised in a charismatic church with liberal politics. Over the course of multiple semesters, I have realized that the earlier in the semester I open up to students about my own identity, the more open they are in the classroom. I desired to build coalitions with students of color, but in sharing other aspects of my identity, I was also able to build coalitions with other marginalized students. In doing so, I found that the components of my teaching that subverted traditional pedagogical conventions—multilingual projects, centering social issues, and coalition pedagogy—fostered student learning and developed a relationship of trust between my students and me.

3.1 Multilingual Projects

One way I sought to enact anti-racist practices in my classroom is by dedicating a unit to “Multilanguage Rhetorics” that culminated in students composing a paper multilingually. In “Decolonial Potential in a Multilingual FYC,” Cruz Medina asserts that “multilingual students experience monolingual ideology in their education, which undermines their abilities to communicate, make meaning, and be effective writers” (73). Because I believe in creating opportunities for multilingual students to see their heritage as valued in higher education, I chose

to include a project where students are asked to write using multiple languages regardless of linguistic ability. Though it may not seem apparent, our existence in a multilingual culture and society shows us that multilinguality is necessarily part of monolingual students' heritage. In his essay "Literacy," Steven Alvarez argues that it is imperative to "probe" monolingual students to understand "their languages and identities as members of communities that are mythologized as monolingual in name only" (26). Writing multilingually is an aspect of exploring heritage, which means investigating background, familial history, customs—and of course—language.

The idea for this unit came from a panel I attended at the 2020 AWP conference titled "Living Beyond the Border: Global Perspectives on Family and Migration," where writers spoke on the importance of celebrating immigrant perspectives on heritage and culture through stories. The panelists, Natalia Sylvester, Devi S. Laskar, and Kirsten Chen, emphasized not only the idea of multilingual writing but the importance of it. Laska highlighted that multilingual people cannot be asked to write monolingually purely for the purpose of catering to the white gaze. I was inspired by this panel to include multilingual readings in my syllabus but worried about how I'd go about implementing a practical pedagogical approach when I wasn't sure how to navigate a multilingual writing practice for students in FYC.

Within the scholarship that advocates for multilingual writing practices, Steven Fraigberg proposes including multilingual readings as the norm and dismisses the idea that these multilingual literacy practices are outside of the traditional notions of rhetorical framework for FYC. Fraigberg argues that a multilingual-multimodal framework is essential for moving research and teaching into the twenty-first century (498). Though the field of composition is growing in diversity, Fraigberg finds "the field has yet to embrace multilingualism because of a tacit monolingual policy" (498). Fraigberg associates monolingual ideals with the onset of

globalization; he argues that the binds of what is considered the “dominant language” should be removed as we move to bridge the gap of this disciplinary divide (500). Mixing languages in composition is a “strategy for writers to mesh their own native language with the dominant discourse” (Fraigberg 498). Incorporating multilingual work is key to a student-centered classroom since many students come from homes where the second language—in my case, the first—does not fit neatly in academia. For those students who are “in-between worlds,” a classroom where multilingualism is encouraged calls for an expanded definition of writing itself—one where cultural and linguistic identities should be expressed.

While in the initial stages of planning a multilingual rhetoric unit, I was concerned about student perceptions of traditional writing conventions. In their introduction to “Included in English Studies: Learning Climates That Cultivate Racial and Ethnic Diversity,” Shelli B. Fowler and Victor Villanueva ask readers to think about how they can effectively teach writing without the focus on convention, which is linked to the white hegemony of academia, while also acknowledging that writing within conventions is required of students to succeed in higher education. I had to consider this as I included projects that didn’t seem to be geared towards preparing students to write in future classes. Still, I remained adamant that teaching an English-only perspective of rhetoric and writing was more harmful to students than incorporating multiple languages into the reading and writing we did in the classroom, which would disrupt academic norms.

Given the extensive scholarship on multilingual rhetorical practices, I felt comfortable eliminating a strict adherence to English-only writing practices in my course. For their multilingual projects, I asked monolingual students to find at least one word in their projects that they repeated often and then translate that word into a second language. Monolingual students

often chose words such as identity, politics, film, and representation. However, few monolingual students attempted more ambitious ways of incorporating a second language. In contrast, many multilingual students attempted to write one sentence in every paragraph in a second language or even attempted to switch back and forth between languages.

While I hoped students would be inspired by our multilingual readings, my emphasis on rejecting the prevalent monolingual ideology also received pushback from students. Some monolingual students asked for exemptions from assignments that required them to engage with another language. They expected to be catered to and reasoned they couldn't use a translating service to help them write in another language. They asked why I would give them this assignment when "we are studying in the U.S." and English dominates higher education. Monolingual students couldn't fathom needing to rely on free translating services, such as Reverso, to change at least one word in their writing to fulfill the assignment.

While monolingual students struggled, multilingual students thrived. They proposed writing more than half of their projects in another language, and I understood, to a small degree, the difficulty of using a translating service when I needed to grade their projects. The experience of reading papers written in languages I have no fluency in reminded me of a conversation I had with a professor who emphasized the importance of assigning students projects where the instructor is not the only audience. I aimed to model this by giving my students assignments where I was not the sole member of their audience.

Through working with students on their multilingual projects, I found that multilingual students who usually turned in the best work were turning in subpar work when they incorporated a second language. One student who is fluent in Arabic asked to write 50% of their project in Arabic. When translating this project, I found that their writing made very little sense

and didn't match the level of sophistication that the other 50% of their project did. When I asked them about this, they expressed how difficult they found writing in a language they aren't used to using for anything other than speaking to their family or friends. In "Code Switching," José Cano notes that as much as we long for "mixing of languages, code-switching also requires a form of bilingual literacy in English and Spanish" or, in this case, any language a student chose to write in (64). This bilingual literacy is what was missing when students attempted to write academic papers in a second language. Cano's analysis allowed me to examine my bilingual literacy; though Spanish is my first language, I do not think I could write a strong academic paper in Spanish because my academic fluency is strictly in English. In the midst of this realization, I noticed that multilingual students who attempted more challenging methods of code-switching ended up turning in far simpler projects that made weak claims to avoid using a more critical lens. While students were graded on the practice of code-switching rather than the strength of their argument, I had to rethink the way I taught this unit. Is it enough to ask that students simply engage with another language? Or should instructors aim to use multilingual projects to promote biliteracy and critical thinking skills in another language? How does this differ when a student is monolingual? Is there an underlying assumption that bilingual students can't think or write critically in their first language?

As I looked for answers, I realized that investigating student attitudes toward native languages was crucial to understanding how they expressed their perspectives rhetorically through their writing. In class discussions, I asked if their families emphasized the importance of their native tongue or if their family assimilated into the U.S.'s dominant culture and language. When we discussed "Aria" by Richard Rodriguez, multilingual students found comfort in Rodriguez's idea of a public language and a private language. I advocated against that and asked

them to consider what we lose when we only speak English outside of the home and never practice our native language outside of the home. Steven Alvarez, in his chapter “Literacy,” describes this loss of language as a consequence that leaves us with language standardization. He argues for a classroom that incorporates translingual literacy studies as a “necessary shift in literacy studies by treating heterogeneity in contact zones as the norm rather than the exception” (Alvarez 19). By treating multilingual readings as the norm, we “disrupt networks of power imbalances, which almost always favor the colonial center” (Alvarez 20). I have since shifted the way I introduce multilingual projects. I’ve noticed that when I have assigned this project without a disclaimer about the work we will read or how much help I’ll offer them and instead explain the project as if it were the norm, students rise to the challenge and find creative ways to incorporate second languages. For example, some students reach out to other students for correct translations. Yet, others created multimodal projects where multilingual students code-switch; students even venture into more complicated ways of incorporating a second language, like using the Hebrew alphabet rather than the English Latin alphabet.

Though most multilingual students have loved this project, there have been multilingual students who feel incredibly uncomfortable writing in a second language within the context of higher education. Alvarez describes the discomfort multilingual students may experience as a “collision of contact zones in such an unwelcoming climate to bilingual education” (26). Like Richard Rodriguez, multilingual students often see the language they speak at home as a private language, one they are not comfortable sharing in front of their English-only peers. However, I believe that multilingual projects “honor, explore, and extend the strengths of [our] communities” (Alvarez 27). By writing in multiple languages, students then share their writing with their peers and create communities where discourse in languages other than English is part

of their college education which connects—and extends—their home communities with their academic community.

3.2 Centering Social Issues

I also challenged the composition traditions I was exposed to as a student by centering conversations on contentious social issues revolving around the theme of heritage in my classroom. My syllabus is designed with readings and projects that aim to engage students with a focus on their identity and the identity of their classmates. My anti-racist pedagogy necessitates course texts written or produced by marginalized people as a core element (Appendix A). On the first day of class, I was straightforward with my students by making my stance on the topics we'd be covering clear—cultural identity, border politics, confederate monuments, BLM, minority writers, the upcoming election. I told my students that I wasn't going to pretend that I was not biased because the topics we'd be covering were, in my opinion, too important to feign being unbiased or academic detachment. This was an intentional choice to begin building coalitions with marginalized students early on.

After that first class, I worried that my openness about my identity and viewpoints would lead students to drop my class. I refreshed my student roster sporadically until the end of the day when my class went from seventeen students to sixteen, where it stayed for the remainder of the semester. During the term, I emphasized the need for race and politics discourse. I urged students to research social issues that are pertinent today to center students of color and disrupt traditional learning power dynamics. Still, I was concerned with finding a practical means of centering students of color without excluding white students—who were in the precarious position that students of color usually occupy. White students are often the center of the conversation, they

know how to write the thesis-driven, five-paragraph essay, but it is students of color who often have the most to say about race and politics discourse because it affects them the most.

I hoped to find a way to navigate the tension of discussing topics such as the U.S.-Mexico border, multilingualism, confederate monuments, and police brutality but found that there wasn't an easy way to do so while avoiding conflict in a predominantly white classroom. During the unit on border rhetoric, conservative students shared their opinions about the border without knowing, or perhaps without caring, that there might be people with undocumented loved ones in the classroom. Though they attempted neutrality in expressing their political positions, I felt I had to brace myself anytime white, conservative students spoke. I noticed the silence of marginalized students and feared that the viewpoints of privileged students would overshadow the value found in our readings.

At the end of each class during our unit on border rhetoric, I found myself exhausted. I didn't understand how students who had grown up an hour away from the border couldn't fathom that the border policies we discussed exhibited racism. In "*Mojado*," Marcos Del Hierro describes the process of defining borders: "Part of understanding how borders function, within the context of the United States, is realizing that they are informed by colonialism and systemic white supremacy" (173). By asking students to confront the underlying prejudice of border policies, I was asking students to unlearn years of education in a matter of weeks. Students had been groomed by United States ideology that defined "whiteness, the English language, and a superior attitude over Mexico" (Del Hierro 173). I assigned students an excerpt of Del Hierro's work along with excerpts from Gloria Anzaldúa's *Borderlands/La Frontera*. The week we covered these in class, my students disputed the significance of Anzaldúa's theories about the border in light of our reading by Del Hierro. We hadn't finished the reading from Anzaldúa, and

students were unsure about how to engage with the idea that those who live in border towns might feel like outsiders. Immediately after class, I took ten minutes to write about how the class discussion went; I wrote: “Students had a hard time comprehending why it was wrong for the U.S. to distinguish itself from Mexico.” Our class discussion centered mainly on “if” there is harm in the language used in border policies rather than “why” there is harm in the language.

Early in our border rhetoric unit, students discussed an image Del Hierro incorporates into his chapter in groups (Appendix B). I wasn’t there for this conversation, but a student later privately shared that someone in their group asked a Latinx student if it was rude to ask if that image was how their family entered the U.S. I’d worked to build a relationship with this Latinx student, and hearing about this from another student made me question the potential harm I indirectly inflicted because I opened the gate for this student to be harmed by the ignorance and dominance of white experience. I felt like I needed to protect her from the racist conservatives in my class, and I worried I was doing more harm than good by giving my students this reading as part of my anti-racist work.

During this unit, we discussed how border rhetoric has a strong basis in predominantly white groups in the formation of the Other. This dehumanizing discourse is partially due to the failure to differentiate between South American, Central American, Indigenous, and Spanish cultures, which all become “Mexican” in otherism discourse. The objective of this unit was to have students critically examine the rhetoric surrounding the border, to interpret border rhetoric, and how it influences modern society, our ideas of history, and our position in its future. Our conversations were an opportunity for students to focus on rhetorical analysis that makes them think critically about social issues and their opinions.

For their project on border rhetoric, students worked in teams to compose a multimodal project that examined the rhetoric revolving around the U.S.-Mexico border. I expected students to have opposing views on this topic, and because of that, we read about using rhetorically inclusive language. Though not all students in my class are from Southern California, they were living in Southern California at this time. Therefore, these conversations about the border were an opportunity for students to study rhetoric and the historical dynamics of “whiteness” in relation to the border. Through a rhetorical analysis of border discourse, students were compelled to understand the importance of engaging with social issues that do not necessarily affect them.

When introducing them to the project they’d complete in this unit, I referred them to our earlier reading on rhetorically inclusive language. One of the most crucial turning points in the semester occurred when students who often spoke up during class started leaving their cameras off, but three new voices emerged. Students who had never spoken before found the unit on border rhetoric compelling. They were learning, they wanted to share documentaries about the border with the class, they wanted to share personal experiences, and they had questions about the readings and critiques. Those conversations were what I’d hoped for—minus the silence from the rest of the class. Once a white student asked me why I didn’t include the “Republican side of border politics” in our readings. Without thinking, I said, “Because I don’t want to give space to racist rhetoric in my class.” I didn’t think much of that interaction until I saw those words written in my student evaluations. But I still stand by those words because they represent my commitment to creating an anti-racist classroom.

Some students did push back on the ideas and voices I presented during this unit. Reading their unit reflections and essays felt like I was absorbing the rage of students who didn’t want what I was teaching to be true. I didn’t want the facts and figures presented about border politics

to be true either, but I was the safe target for their anger. If they couldn't tell their peers how they felt, they could tell me how "biased against white people" the course texts were. When I was preparing for the next semester, I cut the unit on border rhetoric. I haven't included a unit or any reading on border politics in my class because of the experiences I had during my first semester. I centered discussions about social issues as a cultural lens to help students understand rhetoric and to include anti-racist practices in my class. Still, I worried about the ethical ramifications since these practices negatively affected my students and me. The following semester, I modified the unit to broaden the scope of the social issues students could research and write about beyond border rhetoric. I provided students with a list of social issues that affect marginalized groups and asked them to pick from it or propose a different subject.

3.3 Coalition Pedagogy

In constructing a classroom where students can explore the multifaceted intersectionalities of their identities, I made the core effort to implement anti-racist practices by building coalitions with marginalized students. Following Charise Pimentel and Octavio Pimentel's framework, my efforts included an openness about my own marginalized identity to generate visibility, a wide diversity of identities represented in my chosen course texts, and open-ended assignment prompts that allowed students to explore their identities and intersectionalities through self-developed compositional projects. Before learning about coalition pedagogy, I expressed my fear about sharing aspects of my identity with my students to one of my professors. They asked me to reflect on my experience as a marginalized student at a predominantly white institution and challenged me to think of what it would have meant to me to be taught by someone who shared my identity. They illustrated the importance of representation in academia for marginalized students, validated my apprehension, and urged me to consider the

value of sharing my identity. When I introduced myself to my students, I opted to disclose my marginalized identity, which included telling them I am a first-generation Mexican-American woman from a working-class family and that my first language is Spanish. My research of coalition pedagogy later underscored this decision. To illustrate the efficacy of coalition pedagogy, this section shares my experience in using this anti-racist practice in the classroom.

During the second week of our border rhetoric unit, I led a discussion that defined the border as a system of exploitation and oppression. In this class session, I made it very clear that I believed that the current family separation policy at the border is racist and inhumane. Earlier in the semester, I shared that I am a product of immigration. To make my bias clear during this unit, I reminded students that I am Mexican-American. However, I avoided discussing my relationship to the border and immigration explicitly. I wanted to be as open as possible, but I also wanted to protect myself and other students with precarious relationships to the border.

After showing the class an excerpt from the reading, I asked them to discuss the questions I'd posted in our discussion forum in groups. After calling the class back, I noticed that white students who consistently spoke in class were silent. A few of them turned their cameras off. Though I initially felt discouraged by their silence, I later realized that in my construction of an anti-racist classroom, I intentionally selected readings about contentious social issues that "white and/or conservative students may be unaware" of and "as a result may remain quiet or voice uncritical perspective in class" (C. Pimentel and O. Pimentel 116). Their silence did not mean that I failed; instead, it created an opening for marginalized students. The silence went on for longer than was comfortable, but a Dominican student took the lead just before I moved on. She shared an example she'd shared with her group. It was an article about the way young people are engaging with the border through advocacy in various forms of media, namely social media. A

Chicana student then shared a documentary about the injustices migrants face when they are held at the border. One of the white students who had turned his camera off turned it on to cut her off and say, “Well, what are we supposed to do with those people?” At that point, I intervened and asked the class whether they could think of other political practices that were racist. I chose my words carefully. I didn’t ask *if* the conditions that migrants are held at the border are racist, but what other policies *are* racist. A few students pointed out manifestations of racism, then the Chicana student who was cut off scrutinized the rhetorical labeling surrounding immigration issues, such as “aliens.” An Albanian student then explained her identity as a European looking at how the U.S. deals with border “problems,” noting that Europe deals with similar issues without dehumanizing rhetoric, “for the most part.”

Over the remaining two weeks of our border rhetoric unit, those three students of color became increasingly vocal during our discussions. They each, unprompted, set up a time to speak with me during student hours. I encouraged their participation and told them that I appreciated their boldness. During our meetings, each of them shared that validating their experiences, sharing my identity, and making a space for them to discuss made them more comfortable bringing their experiences to class discussions despite the threat of pushback from other students. These three students, joined by a fourth student of color, formed a group to present their research on border politics. Their presentation was, by far, the most well-researched. It took risks in terms of their “radical” (a word a peer used after their presentation) approach to the project—which went beyond summarizing and instead theorized methods of dismantling racist immigration policies. Despite the resistance from conservative students, these students felt comfortable sharing their political stance because of the coalitions I built with them through my openness about my identity and views demonstrated in my course texts.

While this experience affirmed the importance of building coalitions with marginalized students through centering social issues, I worried about the perception of this pedagogical practice from non-marginalized students. As I mentioned in the previous section, the following semester I gave students a list of social issues that concern marginalized groups and asked them to choose from it or suggest a different subject. During our first workshop day, I overheard a conversation between a white male student and three female students, two of which are women of color. I opened my white student's draft and realized that when he selected writing about the Black Lives Matter movement, he didn't mean writing in favor of the movement, but instead writing an open letter to "BLM rioters." I listened while the white woman in his group told him his project was "tone-deaf" and while he tried to reason with the group about this topic choice. He was noticeably absent from our second workshop day, and I took that opportunity to approach the other members of the group. They each expressed their desire to make him see the "underlying racist tones" in his letter but said he refused their suggestions to shift the topic of his letter.

On our final workshop day, my white male student approached me after class and asked me a question about his draft, "Do you grade on whether you agree with what we're writing?" "No," I told him. I later found out that a friend of his, who was in another group, overheard my conversation with the women in my white student's group and reported back to my white student. A few weeks later, when a first-generation student spoke in class about how much he appreciated having "a good group of first-gen students" in my class, my white student and his friend joked that I must prefer marginalized students. They framed their accusation as a joke, but I thought about it for weeks. Is there a possibility that I am pushing out all other students by making an active choice to build coalitions with marginalized students? The exclusion of non-

marginalized students exemplifies a downfall in this component of my anti-racist pedagogy. As stated in section 2 Foundation of my Anti-Racist Pedagogy, Charise Pimentel and Octavio Pimentel contend that by “making our critical viewpoints evident through our readings and verbal stances we make in our classes, we are not creating openings for white and or conservative students” (116). However, by interviewing white and/or conservative students, they have found that “although initially verbally inactive in class, [students] are learning from the critical perspectives being presented” (C. Pimentel and O. Pimentel 116). In reflecting on Pimentel and Pimentel’s analysis, I understood that, though it may not be explicitly apparent, these two students who “joked” about my focus on marginalized students are learning without being the sole focus in the classroom. Consequently, when I later asked these students if they felt they better understood the importance of learning about other identities and cultures, both said their “perspectives changed to empathize and understand” and that they think they “have grown by reading about identities” different from their own even if they didn’t feel entirely comfortable talking about “sensitive subjects.”

Though not every experience sharing my identity to build coalitions was positive, I found that by disclosing my experiences, I validated or made a space for my students to bring their experiences to the classroom, even when it directly conflicted with the dominant hegemonic norm. For example, though my first semester of teaching was full of uncertainty and fears regarding my hopes of building an actively anti-racist classroom, I had a student who made me feel like I was looking at a mirror. She was a young woman, a language broker, a first-generation Mexican-American with family who lives in the same state in Mexico where my Abuela was born. She longed for Mexico the way I long for Mexico. Listening to her speak was the first time I heard someone use the words I often use to describe where I sit between these two cultures. In

class discussions she was quiet, but her written assignments were full of thoughtful questions. I wished I had better answers for her. She made a profound impact on me, and her presence in my classroom taught me who I want to be as a teacher.

After a conversation with her during student hours, I told a colleague how much she reminded me of who I was when I first started learning about our identity. He said, “teach her what you wish you would’ve been taught at that age.” In that semester, I tried to give her everything I’ve learned, everything I had been deprived of at the predominately white institution I attended as an undergraduate.

Building coalitions with marginalized students includes an openness about my identity and a wide diversity of identities represented in my chosen course texts. I have my students read José Antonio Burciaga. Burciaga was the writer who was the most formative in my understanding of my identity, and his words speak value into what I do as a person and as an educator. I hoped his essays would speak to my students as much as they speak to me. My students’ reading reflection on Burciaga’s essay regarding the damaging silence of our culture and language included so many of the words I used to describe his work when I read him for the first time that I wondered if I’d shared all those things with the class before they read it. Then I realized: we all feel like this.

I spent that semester hoping I’d give my students what I wished I had learned in FYC and throughout my undergraduate experience by assigning them readings by marginalized writers. Near the end of the semester, I interviewed this student as a part of my research. She told me all her teachers had been white and that being taught by someone who shared her identity for the first time allowed her to see how important that was to her. I asked how she would describe her comfort level when discussing race and political issues in the classroom. She said she felt very

comfortable since she went to a predominantly white high school, but my class made her feel more comfortable and helped her be bold, despite resistance from peers. When I asked what experiences in the classroom made her more or less comfortable, she confirmed my pedagogical approach for this class:

The first day of class, when we learned about you, I was like, wow, this is so cool. I've never had a professor who is Mexican, or who shares my identity. So that's what made me more comfortable, because in high school, all my teachers were white. So, you being the professor made me the most comfortable. After the first day of class, I told my mom and dad about you and that you had roots from Guanajuato, where my family is from.

This conversation with this student made me incredibly glad to have taught this course. In the aforementioned pedagogical approach, coalition pedagogy is something I found important to include in my teaching philosophy. This student's response to my question confirmed the importance of incorporating coalition building into a class focusing on race, politics, and identity. Before ending our conversation, I asked the student if she had any experiences in the class that made her feel less comfortable. She shared her experience with microaggressions in the breakout rooms. Since this was an online class, I was not present for the majority of the breakout rooms. This student told me that when she heard someone share an opinion that hurt her or her fellow marginalized peers, she felt she could no longer be vulnerable or open in front of that person.

In speaking to other students with marginalized identities, I found that they had built their own community within the classroom. They protected themselves, and each other, by taking note of microaggressions and responding to them despite the temptation to ignore them when I wasn't there to notice or say something.

The experiences I had in the classroom as a result of incorporating coalition pedagogy into my teaching strategy led me to conclude that the benefits of making both my identity and

viewpoint evident outweigh potential risks. Students can gain more academic knowledge from professors who have taught for years and know more than I do, but is that most important? White professors can validate students of color, but they cannot relate to their experiences. Students of color need to gain an awareness of how valuable their experiences are, but this is something that requires facilitation in the classroom from someone who relates and understands the ramifications of being multilingual, feeling stuck between two worlds, and existing in spaces that traditionally exclude marginalized people. By implementing coalition pedagogy into my classroom, I found a practical means of emphasizing the legitimacy of students' realities and lived experiences, particularly marginalized students.

4 Instructor Voices

While there is value in the individual experiences of instructors of color, I recognize that my experiences do not reflect the realities of all instructors of color. Because of this, I found it essential to speak with other instructors of color who are either part-time faculty or graduate student instructors at my university.

4.1 Instructor Reflection

ET is a lecturer who teaches Latinx Rhetorics and Queer Rhetorics. When we spoke, I asked him about how his themed courses informed his pedagogical practices. He told me that in selecting themes that center marginalized identities within the course title, he's had to make the conscious effort to speak in collective terms. "I use 'us' and 'we,'" he said, "so marginalized identities become the norm and students who don't subscribe to those identities experience, perhaps for the first time, what it's like to be a minority within this space." ET shared that students who are not queer or Latinx experience themselves as a "white disturbance in a brown space or a straight disturbance in a queer space." ET also explained that he was one of the few FYC instructors at our university who explicitly named marginalized identities in their course title and said that this was an intentional choice to further center marginalized identities.

When ET and I spoke about a practical means of centering marginalized students, ET shared an experience in his classroom when he realized a student he had perceived as straight and white wrote about his queer and brown identity. I asked if he thought this was one of the downfalls of our pedagogical approach since we might push aside students who aren't open up about their identity. ET rejected that notion and said he "believe(s) that even if students don't feel they are being centered, the bond is still there because we are creating an opening, regardless

of whether or not they use it.” Carving out spaces for marginalized students is essential even if students aren’t conventionally participating. ET explained that he doesn’t “think it’s an accurate assumption to say that those who participate in class are getting the most out of it.” Often marginalized students are apprehensive about participating because they “feel weighed down by the hegemonizing nature of white supremacy.”

ET and I also discussed feeling unqualified to teach students about race. We both expressed not feeling brown enough, “Latinx enough or queer enough” to teach on these topics. “There was a very long time where I did not feel connected to my Latinidad,” ET said. We also discussed the differences in our upbringing and “measures of Latinidad” that he doesn’t necessarily subscribe to—being second-generation versus being first-generation, not speaking Spanish, and growing up in a middle-class family. Our conversation allowed me to reflect on how intersections within marginalized identities affect pedagogical approaches. This observation made me consider how I might expand my research to include identity markers, such as gender, race, class, ability, and sexuality, for students and instructors.

While ET employs direct methods of anti-racist pedagogy, AB takes an indirect approach. AB is a lecturer who teaches Rhetoric of Prejudice and Rhetoric of Memories. In his classroom, he makes an effort to shift the balance of power dynamics. He said he seeks to empower students by “giving them agency in leading discussions and speaking from their own experiences.” Our discussion mainly focused on our identities, how students perceive us, and how they react to our identities. “I don’t say, ‘I’m brown,’” he said, “but they can tell by looking at me. And sometimes it’s a Persian student who will ask if I’m Persian, and they bond with me as a result of it.” AB told me he thinks his students are motivated by connections they make to his chosen course texts, which include *The Diary of Anne Frank* and works by Audre Lorde.

“I’ve noticed that students feel emotional connections to texts that align with their race or identity, and that makes them more open to engaging in class discussion, but that doesn’t always mean verbally participating,” he said. AB considers a student’s body language, such as eye contact and nodding along, as a physical demonstration of their connection to a text.

When I told AB about my commitment to being as open about my identity as possible with my students, he told me that while he doesn’t “go around the subject,” his identity isn’t something he shares explicitly. “Sometimes my accent slips up, and students who don’t have any knowledge of Farsi can’t tell, but students who know Farsi hear it,” he said. He also shared that when students share their experiences or reflections about a reading, he will say something like, “This reminds me of the experience my parents went through as immigrants from Iran,” as a means of being open without making his identity a central part of the conversation.

AB did not say that he is actively using coalition pedagogy in his teaching methods. Still, his comments about how marginalized students express emotional connections to course texts in ways beyond verbal participation echo what Charise Pimentel and Octavio Pimentel address in their research. However, they additionally argue that the work of instructors is also to “create entries into class discussions for students of color who are overwhelmingly silent in the classroom” (119). While AB offers space for marginalized students to see themselves represented in his chosen course texts, our discussion made me contemplate if that choice is sufficient, or if, like Charise Pimentel and Octavio Pimentel claim, we must also do the work of providing entry points for students of color who are apprehensive about speaking.

As I prepared for my final conversation, I noted that ET and AB said they do not assign “unconventional” writing projects. I decided to ask MG this question first. MG is a graduate student instructor who teaches *Rhetoric of the Self: Ideology and Individualism*. When we

discussed assigning unconventional writing projects, such as my multilingual rhetoric project, she realized that her unconventional assigned readings are “motivated by (her) identity.” For instance, she assigns a photo essay by Diana Markosian on the Armenian genocide because of her exposure to works that discuss Armenian issues but said she assigns this text for reasons beyond Marosian’s identity. “When I assigned that as a text, I told students that we are using an expanded definition of ‘text’ beyond just the written word,” she said. MG explained that she assigns multimedia, multimodal texts and asks students to consider how this composition might tell a story better than words alone. She reported that most of her students weren’t aware of the Armenian genocide and that this project helped them learn about this history. “With one text (students) understood the value of multimedia storytelling,” they analyzed how the text was composed, and then had a model to create their multimodal compositions.

MG and I also spoke about how we measure student success and how it differs from traditional conventions of success. “In my opinion, minorities are motivated by grades more so than white students,” she said, “because there’s more pressure to make something of yourself, to use college as an opportunity that requires substantial risk by your parents or family.” Our conversation reminded me of Octavio Pimentel and Nancy Wilson’s chapter “*Éxito* (Success),” where they describe traditional measures of success being a core conflict between Western ideology where individual success is valued and Eastern ideology where the success of the community is most important. Pimentel and Wilson describe their research on marginalized students’ measures of success in which they found students wrote, autobiographically, of “*ganas*, a deeply held desire to achieve academically fueled by parental struggle and sacrifice” (126). MG’s report of “substantial risk” goes beyond monetary support; it aligns with the concept of

ganas Pimentel and Wilson describe where marginalized students strive for excellence because of sacrifices—mainly immigration—their families have made.

Finally, MG and I discussed what centering students of color looks like in practice, and she had a different perspective. “Because my course centers on ideology and cultural traditions, minority students come to conferences knowing what they want to write about,” she said. “I don’t feel the need to give them as much feedback, and the energy I do give them is spent talking about how they’ll write about their ideas, whereas white students usually don’t know where to begin.” MG expressed that she often has to spend more time working with white students since they usually need help coming up with a topic. In contrast, I frequently spend more time with marginalized students to help them focus their projects since they typically have many topics they are interested in. This approach to the attention we give students based on identity opposes my own, as I tend to focus the most on students of color.

In my conversations with my friends and colleagues, I noticed that they didn’t describe their pedagogy explicitly as anti-racist. I asked if they viewed their pedagogy as anti-racist. All three said that while they would say they apply anti-racist practices in their classrooms, they don’t see their teaching as explicitly anti-racist. However, based on my conversations with them, they do include anti-racist practices in their teaching methods—unconventional measures of success, course texts written by writers and scholars with marginalized identities, and openness about their marginalized identities.

4.2 Self-Reflection

In this research, I have reflected on what has happened in my classroom due to my pedagogical choices, and I see what I want to avoid and what I want to happen more often. I find both consequences and benefits of incorporating anti-racist pedagogy in a FYC cultural studies

course. The benefits, however, far outweigh the consequences. The experiences I have outlined solidify my dedication to implementing anti-racist pedagogy in my teaching strategy.

My focus on anti-racist teaching methods manifests in my construction of a classroom that challenges traditional pedagogical conventions by incorporating unconventional writing practices, centering social issues, and building coalitions with marginalized students. These practices encompass my commitment to an anti-racist approach that actively aims to dismantle imposed hegemonic norms. My experiences demonstrate the praxis of this pedagogical approach, which emphasizes a student's experiences and identities while still fulfilling expected curricular outcomes. Through my implementation of anti-racist pedagogy, I aim to continue creating space in the classroom for marginalized students as I have determined that building an actively anti-racist classroom within the framework of rhetoric offers an affective potentiality for creating more genuine relationships between students and instructors.

Works Cited

- Alvarez, Steven. "Literacy." *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory*, edited by Iris D. Ruiz and Raul Sanchez, Palgrave MacMillan, 2017, pp. 17-29.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands: La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. Aunt Lute Books, 1999.
- B.A.L. "The Hidden Costs of Serving Our Community: Women Faculty of Color, Racist Sexism, and False Security in a Hispanic-Serving Institution." *Feminist Teacher*, vol. 27, no. 2-3, University of Illinois Press, 2017, pp. 176-95, <https://doi.org/10.5406/femteacher.27.2-3.0176>.
- Burciaga, José Antonio. *Drink Cultura: Chicanismo*. Joshua Odell Editions, Capra Press, 1993.
- Cano, José. "Code Switching." *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory*, edited by Iris D. Ruiz and Raul Sanchez, Palgrave MacMillan, 2017, pp. 63-75.
- Clary-Lemon, Jennifer. "The Racialization of Composition Studies: Scholarly Rhetoric of Race since 1990." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 61, no. 2, 2009, pp. W1-W17.
- Del Hierro, Marco. "Mojado." *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory*, edited by Iris D. Ruiz and Raul Sanchez, Palgrave MacMillan, 2017, pp. 169-197.
- Fowler, Shelli B., and Victor Villanueva. *Included in English Studies: Learning Climates That Cultivate Racial and Ethnic Diversity*. American Association for Higher Education, 2002.

- Fraigberg, Steven. "Composition 2.0: Toward a Multilingual and Multimodal Framework." *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014, pp. 497–516.
- García de Müller, Genevieve, & Ruiz, Iris. "Race, Silence, and Writing Program Administration: A Qualitative Study of U.S. College Writing Programs." *WPA Journal*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2017.
- Grayson, Mara L. *Teaching Racial Literacy: Reflective Practices for Critical Writing*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2018.
- Inoue, Asao B. *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future*. Perspectives on Writing. The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press, 2015.
- Jarratt, Susan C. "Feminism and Composition: The Case for Conflict." *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*, edited by Gesa E. Kirsch, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003, pp. 263-277.
- Medina, Cruz. "Decolonial Potential in a Multilingual FYC." *Composition Studies*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2019, pp. 73–94.
- Pimentel, Charise, and Pimentel, Octavio. "Coalition Pedagogy: Building Bonds between Instructors and Students of Color." *Included in English Studies: Learning Climates that Cultivate Racial and Ethnic Diversity*. Eds. Shelli B. Fowler and Victor Villanueva. VA; Stylus Publishing, 2002. 115-124.
- Pimentel, Octavio, and Wilson, Nancy. "Éxito (Success)." *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory*, edited by Iris D. Ruiz and Raul Sanchez, Palgrave MacMillan, 2017, pp. 125-136.

- Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession*, Modern Language Association, 1991, pp. 33–40, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25595469>.
- Prendergast, Catherine. "Race: The Absent Presence in Composition Studies." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 50, no. 1, National Council of Teachers of English, 1998, pp. 36–53, <https://doi.org/10.2307/358351>.
- Rodriguez, Richard. *Hunger for Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez: An Autobiography*. Bantam Books, 1983.
- Ruiz, Iris D. "Race." *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory*, edited by Iris D. Ruiz and Raul Sanchez, Palgrave MacMillan, 2017, pp. 125–136.
- Ruiz, Iris D. *Reclaiming Composition for Chicano/as and Other Ethnic Minorities: A Critical History and Pedagogy*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2016.
- Villanueva, Victor. "On the Rhetoric and Precedents of Racism." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 50, no. 4, National Council of Teachers of English, 1999, pp. 645–61, <https://doi.org/10.2307/358485>.

Appendix A: Syllabus—Required Texts and Materials

- Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi. *TEDx: The Danger of a Single Story*. YouTube, 7 Oct. 2009, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D9Ihs241zeg>.
- Baldwin, James. *Notes of a Native Son*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.
- Bickham Mendez, Jennifer, and Naples, Nancy A. *Border Politics: Social Movements, Collective Identities, and Globalization*. New York: New York University Press, 2014.
- Blanco, Richard. "My Father in English." *The New Yorker*, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2019/02/11/my-father-in-english>.
- Burciaga, José Antonio. *Drink Cultura: Chicanismo*. Santa Barbara: Joshua Odell Editions, Capra Press, 1993.
- Cisneros, Sandra. "Little Miracles, Kept Promises." *Grand Street*, no. 36, 1990, p. 10. doi:10.2307/25007394.
- Del Hierro, Marco. "Mojado." *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory*, edited by Iris D. Ruiz and Raul Sanchez, Palgrave MacMillan, 2017, pp. 169-197.
- Duggins, Katelynn. *TEDx. To Code-Switch or Not to Code-Switch? That Is the Question*. YouTube, 9 Feb. 2018, www.youtube.com/watch?v=sncGGjaYJ.
- Espinosa-Aguilar, Amanda. "Illegal." *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory*, edited by Iris D. Ruiz and Raul Sanchez, Palgrave MacMillan, 2017, pp. 155-167.
- Lamott, Anne. "Shitty First Drafts," *Bird By Bird: Some Instructions On Writing and Life*. Pantheon Books, 1994.
- Losh, Elizabeth, et al. *Understanding Rhetoric: A Graphic Guide to Writing*. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2017.
- Mehra, Nishta J. *Brown White Black: An American Family at the Intersection of Race, Gender, Sexuality, and Religion*. Picador, 2020.
- Tan, Amy. "Mother Tongue." *Dreams and Inward Journeys: A Rhetoric and Reader for Writers*, edited by Marjorie Ford and Jon Ford, 7th ed., Pearson, 2010, pp. 34-44.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. "From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i," University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.
- Wallace III, Harold. *TEDx. Everyday Struggle: Switching Codes for Survival*. YouTube, 6 Apr. 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NJy5yeBSQ7o>.

Appendix B. Image Del Hierro Uses in “*Mojado*”

