Practicing a Linguistic Justice Mindset with Large Language Models

Antonio Byrd
Assistant Professor of English
University of Missouri-Kansas City

[Slide 1: Title]

Good afternoon, everyone! Thank you Erin for that delightful introduction, and thanks to the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Discourse, and DePaul University for inviting me to give a talk about large language models and linguistic racism. Two things on the slide. First, if you want to access copies of my presentation, you can use your phone camera to scan the QR code on the slide. Second, you'll notice the title for my talk has changed since it was first advertised. In my thinking about the topic, I started to twist and turn into new directions until I realized the center of this talk is practicing linguistic justice in an age of large language models: "Practicing Linguistic Justice with Large Language Models." I speak from the position of a literacy studies scholar focused on race and technology. Although my expertise is not in multilingual writing practices, I think there's a shared concern among Black students, multilingual students, and international students about linguistic racism as large language models mediate their writing practices and challenge how we teach in writing classrooms.

[Slide 2: Audre Lorde quote]

In the words of Audre Lorde, speaking about the feminist movement, "I am not free while any woman is unfree, even when her shackles are very different from my own. And I am not free as long as one person of colour remains chained. Nor is any one of you." Large language models may have a tight grip on both native English speakers

with varieties of dialects and multilingual students; they may influence how students understand writing and what tool counts as resources for knowledge and learning.

[Slide 3: Permission to get comfortable!]

First, permissions. You have permission to get comfortable during this lecture. Both online and in-person, you can come and go as needed for food, drink, care-taking, breaks, or anything else. If you're on Zoom, you can use direct message or chat anytime to express access needs, suggestions for discussion, questions, or concerns.

[Slide 4: About the Presentation]

This presentation won't veer too far from my original call to you. My argument is split between two parts: I show how LLMs rely on raciolinguistic ideologies and emotional-pleasure design to be successful capitalist technologies. Then I suggest that despite LLMs' sophistication, our students are best positioned to use their linguistic styles in writing while drawing on LLMs to access English, interrogate conventional academic writing, and assist in their writing process overall.

[Slide 5: What's Happening Today?]

First, I'll discuss what it means to have a linguistic justice mindset in writing classrooms. Then I'll argue how large language models and their design challenge this mindset for our teaching practice. Finally, I suggest the limitations of LLMs to produce different linguistic styles, which only highlights that these tools best assist students in their thinking and composing. Rather than replacement, as we sometimes fear, literacy practice changes with us becoming closer to the tools of writing production yet we still have agency over what we do with the output. And then we'll leave time for questions, answers, and comments.

[Slide 6: There is no such thing . . .]

Here's a quote that anchors our conversion today. Ammon Shea has written many books about the English language, and this quote from a podcast has always stuck with me since I was a graduate student: “There is no such thing as correct English so it’s a little bit problematic to assume that we can ever achieve it.” Realizing this fact of the history of the English language is actually the starting point for a linguistic diversity mindset.

[Slide 7: ChatGPT often . . .]

And here’s another quote to anchor our conversation: “ChatGPT often generates text that reads like an outright caricature of the people who use dialects . . . Perhaps these discursive styles of marginalized groups are under- or mis-represented in an LLM’s training data?”

[Slide 8: What is a Linguistic Justice Mindset?]

Let’s start with the linguistic justice mindset and then fold that into large language models.

[Slide 9: Which variety of English pleases you?]

To kick things off, I want to pose a question to you: Which variety of English pleases you? The next slide will show the first bit of dialogue from Zora Neal Hurston’s *Their Eyes Were Watching God* juxtapose to artificial intelligence’s translation of that same dialogue into Standard American English. Be honest with yourself when you look at the dialogue. Why would something think the opposite of your answer?

[Slide 11: Dialogue in *Their Eyes Were Watching God* (1937)]

On the left is the original text, and on the right is the translated version. I'll read both:

> "Humph! Y'all let her worry yuh. You ain't like me. Ah ain't got her to study 'bout. If she ain't got manners enough to stop and let folks know how she been makin' out, let her g'wan!"
>
> "She ain't even worth talkin' after," Lulu Moss drawled through her nose. "She sits high, but she looks low. Dat's what Ah say 'bout dese ole women runnin' after young boys."

And the translation:

> "Humph! You all let her worry you. You're not like me. I don't have her to worry about. If she doesn't have the manners to stop and let people know how she's been doing, let her go on!"
>
> "She's not even worth talking about," Lulu Moss said in a drawn-out manner. "She acts as if she's important, but in reality, she's not. That's what I think about these older women chasing after young boys."

Hurston was an anthropologist who sought to capture the essence of Black cultures, Black folklore, and Black linguistic practices. For example, her posthumously published nonfiction book *Barracoon: The Story of the Last Black Cargo* records verbatim the Black linguistic expressions of Oluale Kossola, the last survivor of the Middle Passage. Her academic work spilled over into her fiction.

[Slide 12: Critique of Hurston's Dialogue (1937)]

Hurston's contemporary Richard Wright, best known for *Native Son*, was not amused. In a review of her book *Their Eyes Were Watching God*, Wright wrote, "Her

dialogue manages to catch the psychological movements of the Negro folk-mind in their pure simplicity, but that's as far as it goes. . . . Miss Hurston voluntarily continues in her novel the tradition which was forced upon the Negro in the theatre, that is, the minstrel technique that makes the ‘white folks’ laugh.” Richard Wright suggests that Hurston appeals to White readers' expectations of how Black people speak for entertainment, not furthering the linguistic practices of Black people. Hurston’s attempt at representing the realities of language got misread as a hindrance to Black advancement in White America. The debate on the uses and representations of Black English has continued for decades before this sample critique.

[Slide 13: Ebonics Resolution of 1997]

Fast forward sixty years to 1997: the Oakland, California school board passed a resolution that recognized “Ebonics” or African American Vernacular English as a real language, based on existing research from linguists. The backlash to the resolution was intense. Setting aside the school board’s argument that Ebonics was genetically based (which was later revised), many well known Black celebrities feared students would be taught AAVE at the expense of learning Standard American English. The woefully disgraced Bill Cosby wrote an op ed piece in the Wall Street Journal decrying Oakland for recognizing an English with bad grammar as legitimate and on the same pedestal as Standard American English. He wrote cynically: Imagine an Ebonics-speaking Oakland teenager being stopped on the freeway by a non-Ebonics-speaking California Highway Patrol officer. The teenager, posing that same question Ebonically, would begin by saying: ‘‘Lemme ax you . . .’’ The patrolman, fearing he is about to be hacked to death, could charge the kid with threatening a police officer. Thus, to avoid misunderstanding,

notices would have to be added to driver's licenses warning: ‘‘This driver speaks Ebonics only.’’ Cosby suggests Black people have armor if they speak “proper English,” as if driving while Black reduces your chances of being shot by the police. It does not.

[Slide 14: Black Students' Attitudes on Black English]

In her book published in 2020, Dr. April Baker Bell describes a study on Black high school students' perceptions of Black linguistic practice. She presented two different Englishes – White Mainstream English and Black English. For this activity, Baker-Bell called them Language A and Language B. She then asked the students to draw and describe what each speaker might look like. One Black student wrote, “For language A [Black Language], I said I think this someone with little education or someone who is just trying to be cool. He has his beater on and sagging pants. Maybe it is what he like or even all he know. I think he knows better but just don't do it. He looks like a thug because he look like he does not care. He have no car but nice clothes, and he loves to talk about others.” Meanwhile, the Black students gave Language B – White Mainstream English – a more favorable review: they were college educated, was trying to fit in, had a house, a family . . . they had it all. Just because they spoke “correct” English.

[Slide 15: Anti-Black Linguistic Racism]

This sample of opinions on Black English reveals raciolinguistic ideology at play – beliefs about racialized people based on their speech and vice versa.These vies of Black English demonstrate that this, and other varieties of English are offensive. They do not bring pleasure in schools or the workplace. This is not how people communicate;

it makes you look bad. Standard American English makes you look good. You fit in. You belong here.

[Slide 16: What makes . . . ?]

What makes Standard American English so attractive to us? Of course, Standard American English is a colonial project, an effort to create unity across different cultures and people, but it's also a weapon for flattening out the unique qualities of marginalized people, keeping them in their place under white hegemonic power structures.

[Slide 17: Attractiveness of Standard American English]

Writing assessment scholar Asao Inoue explains that Standard American English embodies several expectations of students and teachers in higher education. Inoue calls them habits of white languaging or HOWL. There are six characteristics, but for this lecture I focus on just three: Stance of neutrality, objectivity, and apoliticality, individualized, rational, controlled self, and clarity, order, and control. These principles juxtapose to what some may consider the chaos of linguistic diversity. Too difficult to track, to follow, to settle into. There's nothing wrong with a standard way of writing and speaking; however, as Inuoe explains, we as writing teachers run afoul when we use Standard American English as the sole basis for judging the intellectual capabilities of our Black, multilingual, and international students. Our writing classrooms, not just English, but across disciplines, can support white supremacist projects to flatten out the cultures and identities of our students.

[Slide 18: So what has been the answer?]

So what has been the answer to the instructional practices that emphasize the offensiveness of any variety of English other than Standard American English?

[Slide 19: Offer new instructional . . .]

Over 50 years ago, an illustrious group of Black writing scholars gathered to make a firm statement on behalf of and toward my professional organization College Composition and Communication. But this statement also extends a call to all writing teachers across disciplines in science and social sciences and business. It reads in part: “We affirm the students' right to their own patterns and varieties of language -- the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style. . . . A nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language.” This statement is just an example of what we call – linguistic justice.

[Slide 20: CCCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Multilingual Writers]

In addition, Cs has supported second language writing and multilingual writers since 2001. Their updated language from 2020 reads in part, “We understand languages as integrated, so that multilingual writers have the ability to draw on their full linguistic repertoire for communication and meaning-making. We also recognize that language use takes place within material spaces, using diverse resources such as gestures, images, and physical objects. Even as writers develop their competence and confidence in English, they may (intentionally or unintentionally) employ features of multiple languages and literacies in their English writing as they begin to participate as members of their fields through upper-division and/or graduate courses, and beyond.”

[Slide 21: Linguistic Justice]

Linguistic justice includes two features: First, call out the myth that “there is a homogenous, standard, one-size- fits-all language.” Remember that quote from Ammon Shea? “There is no such thing as correct English.” In recognizing this myth, linguistic justice teachers acknowledge that multiple languages and dialects are a resource and a valuable rhetorical choice for student writers. You don’t need to speak their language; you make space for their language in your writing classrooms, you press on the rhetorical decision making students make, ask them articulate why they do what they do and what they achieve for their purpose and audience.

[Slide 22: We Struggle With Linguistic Justice]

But linguistic justice is hard. We struggle with doing this work. Some of you may practice this justice now; others may not know where to begin, but I think it’s worth the effort. But just as we try to do this work –

[Slide 23: Here Come the Machines]

These damn machines show up. Now granted, if you teach languages, you know these machines have been around for a long time. Google Translate wasn’t invented yesterday. To my language learners and language teachers, y’all know a thing or two about artificial intelligence and translation. Now the writing teachers are in the same boat as you.

[Slide 24: 2: LLMs as Linguistic Pleasure Tools]

In this next section, I think about how technology design appeals to our investment in the pleasures of Standard American English. I call them linguistic pleasure tools.

[Slide 25: Which car brings you more pleasure?]

First a demonstration: I'm going to show you two cars and some information about their gas mileage and carbon emissions. Share with us which car brings you more pleasure?

[Slide 26: Which car do you find "attractive" for your dollar in 2024?]

On the left is a white 2012 Tesla Model S. It emits 0.93kg CO_2e for every 6 miles driven and the mileage you get is 405 miles. On the right is a blast from the past, a red 2007 Hummer H3 which emits 3,552 grams every 6 miles and its mileage comes at just 345 miles. Let's hear from a couple people and why you made your pick. **[Wait for conversation and ask for responses]**

[Slide 27: Technology designers create . . .]

Technology designers create usable products and services that appeal to users' perceptions, motivations, and emotions. In other words, the classic, eternal rhetorical concept *pathos*.

[Slide 28: Design According to Attitude]

Attitudes are the users' feelings and opinions about a product: Technology designers want to create what people will love, combine aesthetics with simplicity, build your affinity with the product and become attached to it, and even become loyal. Lead to brand loyalty. There's a reason I've been an Apple user for almost 6 years. It appeals to my attitudes and emotions and my sense of social status. Tesla, and other electric vehicle manufacturers, appeal to your responsibilities to be environmentally friendly. Academic designers have already created frameworks that guide efforts to appeal to our attitudes and perceptions. There are two types of frameworks I'll share here and I'll focus on the principles that relate to our ideologies and cultural knowledge.

[Slide 29: Frameworks for Design for Pleasure]

First, Lionel Tiger developed the pleasure model in 1992. Two principles most important for my argument is the Socio-pleasure principle: this means the products and services should facilitate the pleasure of social interaction, such as through text messaging, email, and social media platforms. Second, the ideo-pleasure is the appeal to users' values which increases aesthetic pleasure in the product. Products function in ways that represent what we care about, such as electric vehicles representing our belief in climate change and the need to take action against it.

[Slide 30: Emotional Design]

Don Norman is a well-known user experience designer, and a little problematic for reasons I don't have time to describe here. But most of his thoughts about technology design are useful, such as emotional design. Among the three principles, reflective design is the most important and powerful. The technological designs we encounter and use hold cultural symbols and meanings; the Apple smartwatch, for example, looks useful yet also serves as a status symbol. It appeals to our desire or need to exercise while also offering some non-functional benefits, like how people will perceive us when we walk into a room with the watch. In this design, you feel like the product completes you. You can tell stories about yourself and technology.

[Slide 30: Overlapping the Frameworks]

Louis Frankel, writer of the open access book *Sense-It!: Insights into Multisensory Desig*n (2023), argues that ideo- and socio-pleasure are closely related to the Reflective design model, where product interactions support subjective points of

view because each one is influenced by attitudes related to values, culture, society, or other meaningful experiences.

[Slide 31: 2.1: How LLMs Appeal to Our Linguistic Ideologies]

How LLMS Appeal to Our Linguistic Ideologies. In this section, I analyze how LLMs amplify raciolinguistic ideologies with pleasure-emotional design. In other words, students use LLMs not just because it's efficient and fast, but also because it’s language variety looks and feels like it belongs in our linguistic ideologies in higher education.

[Slide 32: Three Features of LLMs]

LLMs wrap our language ideologies into a neat pleasurable and familiar interface that we know from text messages or even, to get old school with you, online chat rooms in the 1990s. The language output is accessible to use by relying on Standard American English; to keep SAE pleasureable, humans pre-train generative AI to filter out language that may cause harm, yet in doing so they constrain the full creative power of expressive language.

[Slide 33: Pleasurable Interface: GPT-3]

First, if you’re going on a date, you want to look good. LLMs have been around for years. GPT-3 got some attention in 2021 for its text completion features but, as I note on the left hand side, the interface wasn’t attractive. When you use GPT-3, you type in a sentence and the LLM will continue the sentence. You could have a back and forth interaction, building on each other’s sentences but there was no meta-communication about the production of text happening. No social interaction. Since 2021, GPT-3 Playground has better features and design including a chat version but it wasn’t the original design.

[Slide 34: Pleasurable Interface: ChatGPT]

ChatGPT attracted 100 million users in record time compared to other social media platforms when they first released; the new interface design gave that illusion of social interaction with a human being – friendly, kind, certain with its answer, patient, responsive, invested in us – everything we want from a human being but don't often get. The interface gives us socio-pleasure.

[Slide 35: An Attractive Intellectual Dopamine Hit]

The socio-pleasure of the chatbot design sharpens through its language output: by default, LLMs like ChatGPT reads back to use the Habits of White Language I mentioned a little while ago. This gives an attractive dopamine hit – not an emotional response, but certainly an academic satisfaction with generative AI's three HOWL characteristics: "Stance of neutrality, objectivity, and apoliticality; Individualized, rational, controlled self; Clarity, order, and control." This language output leaves us unoffended because it appeals to what we most of us know about writing and reading from our education and even the workplace: that standardized English is the correct English.

[Slide 36: Productive, efficient language at what cost?]

That's what we get on the interface but underneath the artificial intelligence, deep in its training data is an equal amount of linguistic violence that makes the standardized English output possible. Preliminary research on the training data suggests two characteristics: first researchers finds that LLMs had dialect prejudice, which "has the potential for harmful consequences by asking language models to make hypothetical decisions about people, based only on how they speak." Second, although LLMs can translate world languages, they rely on a representation of English to make those

translations possible. Researchers have found that artificial intelligence translates say Spanish into French using English as the basis for constructing the output, so the grammatical structure and meaning may not be accurate.

[Slide 37: Profit Making Tools]

To be successful technologies must appeal to the most users possible and make profit. Any other language would not reach the most users possible; other dialects would render the generative AI inaccessible to many people. Standard American English remains attractive to students because it's recognizable as academic writing. With careful editing, students can access academic writing and present language that shows they belong in higher education.

[Slide 38: Large language models challenge . . .]

The use of large language models in higher education for the purpose of composing challenges Students' Right to Their Own Language effort, a fifty-plus year call for writing classrooms in K12 and in college to affirm the dialects students bring to the classrooms.

[Slide 39: Competing Philosophies on Language]

As writing instructors across disciplines called to affirm diversity, we're caught in this tension between two philosophies on language. To invite large language models into our writing process, we adopt the philosophy of extraction on one hand. That philosophy transforms language into patterns and possibilities; they filter out "offensive" linguistic patterns and possibilities for our safety and pleasure. Despite their vast training data, LLMs have no access to the interior lives of humans, which is always shifting and changing in our world. On the other hand, we're asked to make judgment

based on ideas, not the linguistic practice use; multiple languages and dialects are a resource, discourse in English intermixes and evolves in social context, and creative and critical expression of interior human life. We're not eliding SAE or avoiding its teaching but we are approaching teaching writing with a translingual mindset, prepared to support and affirm multiple ways of expressing what matters most: not language, but the truth of the content.

[Slide 40: Using LLMs with Linguistic Justice]

So how do we use LLMs with linguistic justice? I know that's a weird shift. You would think the answer would be, don't use them. But I think there's enough effort to make large language models representative of world languages that we have good options.

[Slide 41: Describe AI Assignments!]

I came to this talk thinking I would give some theory, and then launch into practical lessons on AI.

[Slide 42: Lots of Teaching Resources Already]

But I realized there are lots of resources and lessons on bringing AI into your classrooms. TextGenEd, Teaching Reflections, and even more colleague Anna Mills have run that marathon of imagining new uses for generative AI. But as I was planning this presentation I asked myself, "When would anyone ever try these new activities? How do your ideas fit in their curriculum? How do they fit in your own? I was honest with myself: Never. Second, although I could add more activities for you to consider, I realized that few of the many activities online and in books show how to affirm linguistic diversity in an age of artificial intelligence. At least from what I can tell, trolling the

Internet. I've read great ideas on how to use generative AI in formal publication and on Twitter but all of them can perpetuate Standard American English or leave uninterrogated the language output students receive from these activities. I'm guilty of this with my own peer review assignment in *TextGenEd*.

[Slide 43 :How do we keep a translingual mindset . . . ?]

How do we live in both worlds? How do we keep a linguist justice mindset in an age of linguistic pleasure tools?

[Slide 44: Keeping a Linguistic Diversity Mindset]

As LLMs continue to produce and reproduce Standard American English for us and its future training data sets and as their creators continue to argue these tools make writing convenient, productive, and efficient, we should still keep a linguistic justice mindset that ensures students have rich creative and intellectual output. First, you can borrow elements of the first half of my talk as a lesson for your students. Second, breakout of the typical academic writing and encourage play and experimentation with genre, content, and form still grounded in the content of your courses. Third, experiment with lesser known LLMs designed to represent world languages, such as the free BLOOM, which you can find on Hugging Face. I'll focus on just the last two activities

[Slide 45: Experiment and Play with Genre Forms]

First, we can rethink the major assignments students write by considering what other kinds of genres students can write that might be more suggestive of what they'll write after graduating from college.

[Slide 46: Banks quote]

In 2016, Adam J. Banks declared the essay “dominant genre emeritus.” He thanked the essay for being a crucial genre for critical thinking and cultural consciousness but in an age of multimodality, and now I would say, generative AI, we must take the opportunity to re-imagine composing and linguistic practice. Banks writes, “Cultural relevance, the speed of technological change and the impact of technological change on communication practices, and the narrow bandwidth of what the essay enables us to do in this expanded communication landscape demand that we bring a richer array of writing and communication practices to use in its place—or at the very least, include with the essay and its related forms.”

[Slide 47: Composed knowledge and learning . . .]

What that means is letting go of genres and forms we associate with academic writing. An instructor with a linguistic justice mindset knows that composed knowledge and learning is demonstrated through language expression alone, not through a particular genre or variety of language.

[Slide 48: What Will Students Write?]

Students can share their best content knowledge, problem solving, and critical inquiry through academic genres including ones often scholarly-oriented in our specific disciplines. That includes lab reports, research proposals, research articles, cover letters and resumes. But not all students will write as scholars: many will write in their profession, yes, but they will also write as advocates for their communities and for political life. By experimenting with other genres that invite linguistic practice, we can image our classrooms as sites for exploring concepts and theories in our specific disciplines but then turn that knowledge into public communication to their families,

friends, neighbors, countries – audiences who expect not Standard American English, but the multiplicity of linguistic variation and translation.

[Slide 49: 2.2. “I Can Write My Title Clear”]

This subtitle for the second activity comes from a well-known book called When I Can Read My Title Clear: Literacy, Slavery, and Religion in the Antebellum South by Janet Cornelius. The quote is from a slave who was determined to learn how to read and write. When I can read my title clearly asserts agency and control. I title this section to make the same argument that we follow a few principles about using LLMs with linguistic justice in mind. Can our multilingual students, our Black students, our Brown students, use their linguistic diversity to jailbreak linguistic pleasure tools?

[Slide 50: LLMs with Linguistic Variety in Mind]

Popular large language models like ChatGPT, Claude, or Gemini are trained heavily on English, as I explained earlier. But there are smaller lesser known large language models that are designed with linguistic variety in mind from the start. Instead of ChatGPT, have students use Latimer or Le Chat Mistral AI. So like I said before there’s a lot of sources out there that have lesson plans related to writing. I think it’s the biggest task of many writing teachers across disciplines, so they will keep coming. What we need are linguistic justice-informed options. But with a linguistic justice commitment we can take any assignment example and modify it so students can use their dialects and world languages as a rhetorical resource in their writing.

[Slide 51: When Introducing LLMs to Students]

When adopting LLMs in our writing classrooms, we must set foundations that honor our agency. These principles come from Hiedi McKee and her research with undergraduates on generative AI and writing. Design opportunities for human-machine teaming throughout the writing process; emphasize human agency and decision making throughout the process, and center human writer's experiences and needs.

[Slide 52: LLMs and Linguistic Styles]

I wanted to experiment with LLMs and their using linguist varieties, even those intentionally trained on multiple languages. I found that they still give stereotypical caricatures of some language varieties. Here's one example of a questionable Black dialect. Second, I tried teaching Mistral AI to code switch using English and Spanish, and initially the LLM gave me full translations of English. Only after I asked to switch some words from Spanish to English, did I get something that looked like Gloria's writing. But there wasn't a clear rhetorical choice; the switching felt random.

[Slide 53: Leave Linguistic Styles to Our Students]

Do not give linguistic style responsibilities to LLMs. LLMs intentionally trained in other languages work best in one language. Using a full repertoire of linguistic resources requires intentionality and rhetorical purpose, which LLMs don't have. Finally, the pre-training, or filtering language in training datasets and calculating patterns of language, limit linguistic styles in outputs.

[Slide 54: An Assistant At Best]

An assistant at best: Access English through difficult text, vocabulary and diction but continue to explore AIs potential usag for the writing process: Invention, drafting, revising, and copy editing. I find that Lex.Page is the best word processor

infused with AI. Here's a brief demonstration of supporting my writing using my teaching statement, which I just revised last week.

[Slide 55: Don't believe the hype]

A year ago I think higher education, and writing teachers especially, worried about generative AI because it was new, but also because we didn't have control over the technology. The first section of this talk demonstrates a little bit that higher education preserves a certain type of literacy, one that's exclusive even as it espouses problem solving, critical inquiry, and openness to new possibilities in the world. It's a contradiction. The conversation is different: higher education will join these technology companies. University of Arizona, for example, has partnered with OpenAI so they can control how AI is used on campus. Some universities that are "Google" campuses order subscriptions to students using the most powerful and well-known LLM systems so they can control how learning and literacy happens. If LLMs rely on our pleasure with Standard American English we will get more SAE, and their standards may put enormous burdens on teachers who want to practice linguistic justice and drive students struggles with linguistic diversity even as they try to belong in academic and public life in the United States. If there is no room for us and our students does this partnership between a university and a private company truly prompt equity? Does it make education better? If we're talking about retention, what kinds of students do we retain and which ones do we leave out? We must demand more of our universities and these tech companies looking to make a profit.

[Slide 54]

Now let's have Q&A!