

Annotation One: “Language Diversity, Non-native Accents, and Their Consequences at the Workplace: Recommendations for Individuals, Teams, and Organizations”

From the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, researchers Regina Kim, Loriann Roberson, Mercello Russo, and Paolo Briganti stress why global leaders and managers should embrace multilingual backgrounds more as a way to leverage diversity in our increasingly globalized society. Their article, “Language Diversity, Non-native Accents, and Their Consequences at the Workplace” addresses the type of challenges native and nonnative speakers face, how a lack of linguistic diversity can negatively affect intraorganizational dynamics, and why it has been overlooked these past few decades. Their research design and data collection approach involved inquiring 99 respondents’ experiences through semi-structured interviews and open-ended survey question formats. Many studies in the past have shown how speakers, particularly those with nonnative accents, can be stigmatized and in turn create negative perceptions of the speaker. Kim et al. attest that these studies only ever examined how nonnative speakers are or were evaluated from the perspective of native speaker. As a response, their work specifically analyzes the experiences between *both* native and nonnative speakers in an organizational workplace setting offering critical insight of individuals whose voice is rarely included.

What makes this study more unique is that each interviewee gives detailed and humane reports prompting the reader to reflect on their own actions. Its inclusivity and ability to hear from various perspectives serve better in empathizing the gist behind the study especially to those who may be unaware of the subject at large. For this reason, I’d use this article as a means of introducing audiences whom I think should listen to what’s being said. It would serve as staple for my research where one could engage in discussions that evaluate the subtly and potential consequences this form of discrimination could elicit, the undervaluation of foreign employees, and the opportunities in creating a better behavioral approach with nonnative speakers. The aim here would be to expand who and what we consider when discussing diversity at a deeper level.

Kim, Regina, et al. “Language Diversity, Nonnative Accents, and Their Consequences at the Workplace:

Recommendations for Individuals, Teams, and Organizations.” *The Journal of Applied Behavioral*

Science, vol. 55, no. 1, SAGE Publications Inc, Mar. 2019, pp. 73–95. *SAGE Journals*,

doi:[10.1177/0021886318800997](https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886318800997).

Annotation Two: “Linguistic diversity in the international workplace: Language ideologies and processes of exclusion”

Dorte Lonsmann, academic professor and Department Chairman from the International Business Communication and Business School of Copenhagen, draws on a study of language choice and language ideologies in an international company in Denmark. His article, “Linguistic Diversity in the International Workplace” focuses on the linguistic and social implications many employees experience by analyzing the day to day operations of a pharmaceutical chain. In surveying an array of employees from blue-collar workers to international experts, Lonsmann’s work reaches all organizational levels extending his support to include voices and perspectives not commonly discussed. As the title begins to suggest, Lonsmann article is also used to explain what language ideologies are and the issues multilingualism can have such as creating socioexclusive working environments and a misperceived conception of one another’s language competence. Whilst similar to Kim et. al study on accented individuals, Lonsmann adds further insight into linguistic diversity through an international and multi-organizational approach. It presents a more globalized view of how language is perceived and applied in different workplace settings.

Lonsmann’s research overlaps with many class readings we’ve had in the past that have discussed topics of implicit bias and systematic organizational culture. I see myself using this article as supporting evidence to connect big ideas such as those discussed by Kaplan and Donovan where they call for a better levels of system framework in D&I efforts. The ideologies Lonsmann discusses also adds background for understanding individual behaviors behind insider-outsider group relations, status perceptions, and social identity issues. Lastly, the article is good reinforcement in proving the significance between language and individuals where a failure in recognizing so can inadvertently have consequential effects. What makes this study unique is that Lonsmann identifies the gaps of research there are and addresses them by tailoring and designing his study to better address the areas that need to be heard.

Lønsmann, Dorte. “Linguistic Diversity in the International Workplace: Language Ideologies and

Processes of Exclusion.” *Multilingua*, vol. 33, no. 1–2, Jan. 2014. *DOI.org (Crossref)*,

doi:[10.1515/multi-2014-0005](https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0005).

Annotation Three: “Resolution on the Arizona Teachers' English Fluency Initiative; Linguistic Society of America”

In 2010 the Department of Linguistics at the University of Arizona gathered to cosign a public document that responded to an educational policy that removed teachers whose heavily accented or ungrammatical speech were too strong from classes where students were learning English. In their response statement, linguistics professors and academic researchers argued that ungrammatical speech did not mean the same thing as unintelligible. Similarly, based on decades of scientific investigation, they claimed that such a policy undermines the effectiveness in teaching and learning English by nonnative speakers which in turn, may lead to additional harmful socioeconomical effects. The authors list key takeaways in their opening statement where they open the platform to discuss logistics and reason their argument in the later pages of the document. As an outsider reading into the issue, the collected data and evidence is compelling having substantial research been backed by accredited professionals. Likewise, because the statement is open to the public its legibility and appeal to logos helps further communicate and gather support against this policy.

Many valuable points are addressed throughout the document tracing issues back to their origin of thought. Therefore one way I plan to use this statement is in translating effective and efficient text which easily grabs the reader’s attention and sees through their oppositional position. Also since the context is set in Arizona, the document is valuable in serving as an in-depth case study for seeing how language plays out in local communities. Furthermore, the statements citations also helped me uncover new articles and terminology such as explaining what and where language bias comes from. It also alludes to the discriminatory practices characterized by linguistic profiling which connects to another one of my annotated sources from Dr. John Baugh.

Resolution on the Arizona Teachers’ English Fluency Initiative | Linguistic Society of America.

[https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/resolution-arizona-teachers-english-fluency-initiative.](https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/resolution-arizona-teachers-english-fluency-initiative)

Accessed 10 July 2020.

Annotation Four: “The Significance of Linguistic Profiling”

John Baugh, renowned linguistics expert and academic professor at Stanford University, delivered a TEDTalk in 2019 explaining the significance of linguistic profiling. In his talk Baugh connects to the audience in a variety of ways through narrative vignettes and experiences he’s had in the field of language. Beginning with relevant background and terminology, Baugh starts with his definition of linguistics to later describe what he calls linguistic profiling—a term he coined almost twenty years back. He mentions the specific study that led him to define this form of discrimination which is an act of judgement that denies certain groups of people from equal opportunities based solely on the sound of their voice. Baugh illustrates the influences his findings have had with videos and other forms of media and propaganda that sparked up following his research where certain individuals were denied educational opportunities, fair housing, and equal access to basic services. By establishing this sense of familiarity with the audience, Baugh is successfully able to have them listen, engage and reflect on the experiences they’ve had with language in the past. In doing so, he places the onus and ultimately the ‘cure’ to this form of discrimination onto ourselves as conscious individuals.

The value I see this video bring is in illustrating a topic that may not be as easily understood or proven by others. Backed by years of data and evidence, Baugh’s research also helps show the significance language has on our societies since the original study was replicated outside the US in countries such as Brazil, France, and Portugal. Therefore, one way I plan to connect this with other readings is by adding context and a more globalized perspective similar to was Lonsmann does in his study of linguistic diversity. Another way I can use this source is in demonstrating alternative consequences a lack of or misunderstanding of language diversity can have on the perception of others (connecting to Kim et al. study on native and nonnative speakers). In sum, Baugh’s talk is unique because even after two decades, these issues are still critical in addressing ways to overcome discrimination. They become extremely relevant to related conversation of racial profiling, implicit and explicit bias, and stereotyping.

The Significance of Linguistic Profiling | John Baugh | TEDxEmory - YouTube.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GjFtlg-nLAA>. Accessed 11 July 2020.

Annotation Five: “Linguistic Diversity as a Problem and a Resource — Multilingualism in European and Finnish Policy Documents”

From the University of Jyväskylä in Finland, researchers Tarja Nikula, Taina Saarinen, Sari Poyhonen and Teija Kangasiervi discuss the potential issues surrounding linguistic diversity and multilingualism in Finland and the European Union. In their article, “Linguistic Diversity as a Problem and a Resource” Nikula et al. analyze public policy documents to see how these institutions have governed and communicated their efforts in handling a rise in problems and disadvantages brought by language diversity. The authors noted that such policies tend to reflect social realities which influence our perception in constructing, ordering, and structuring language narratives. As a result, they concluded that these documents in fact describe different types of multilingualism which can be both ‘good’ and ‘bad’. While most policy documents publicly attributed language as an asset, their interpretation of these documents looked at how language was also being described in an indirect manner. Nikula et al. pointed to the invisible difficulties multiple languages can present when having to preserve traditional (heritage) culture and immigrant languages. Moreover, their research found these policy descriptions on superdiverse areas view language as a potential threat to the ‘social cohesion’ of many local communities due to the management and conformity needed to balance societies. They added that individuals who were more multilingually gifted could view themselves superiorly (as a resource i.e. benefit for society) reinforcing an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ mentality against those from more monolingual backgrounds. This study offers a critical perspective in its analysis to jump and speak between many platforms. Additionally, it adds an oppositional voice in discussions of language diversity that normally are not communicated openly.

This article has played a major role in developing my project thus far. For one, the authors illuminate an alternative perspective with how language is evaluated at the complexities of both a continental and national level. I plan to use this article as oppositional research as it is one of the few sources to present credible data about linguistic diversity. While the article reinforces the cognitive and social benefits this diversity can bring to society, it also recognizes the potential and even harmful challenges it can create. Thus its value is unique in its obligation to agree/ disagree with both sides of the subject. Furthermore, its helpful in adding knowledge on the issues of globalization. I would also add that this source opens us to question societal trends and conventional wisdom around languages making us more consciously aware of its scalar implications then before.

Nikula, Tarja, et al. “Linguistic Diversity as a Problem and a Resource — Multilingualism in European and Finnish Policy Documents.” *Dangerous Multilingualism: Northern Perspectives on Order, Purity and Normality*, edited by Jan Blommaert et al., Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2012, pp. 41–66. *Springer Link*, doi:[10.1057/9781137283566_3](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137283566_3).

Annotation Six: “Embracing Language Diversity in Your Classroom”

From the European School Education Gateway, coordinator Naír Carrera introduces an online web course for teachers to embrace language diversity in their classrooms. Presented in four modules, Carrera uses this platform to describe multiple interdisciplinary approaches for teachers to better engage with their students. The first module serves to raise language awareness as a dimensional tool for helping teachers become conscious about the different languages spoken in their classes. The second gives a glimpse of the benefits brought by embracing linguistic diversity and bilingualism in educational fields. Here, the author suggests that teachers adopt a different role than the standard monolingual platform presented in most classrooms in order to change the learning perspective of their pupils. In module three Carrera presents new educational concepts situated around integrated learning where an additional language is used as a medium of instruction for the learning and teaching of both content and language. A series of multilingual classroom projects are developed in module four to give teachers and pupils ideas for working together to promote a multilinguistic environment with projects such as a ‘Language Passport’ and multilingual classroom dictionaries. Overall this course feeds into the topic of linguistic diversity by creatively pooling together a wide range of participants and platforms in mixed-use environments. It is especially valuable considering it helps children develop their perspective of language and the ways it can influence them at such a young age.

Like Nikula et. al research on linguistic diversity as a problem and resource, this source highlights the possible challenges and opportunities brought by language with the students in an educational setting. Although it serves better in support of language diversity, acknowledging these challenges is valuable for its ability to add meeting grounds on the issue and prevent potential issues from developing. This was one of the few sources outside scholarly and academic journals which I decided to keep in order to round out my argument credentials. Its approach towards language diversity in this module setting is structured completely different than the detailed and controlled studies many of the previous annotations spoke about. Thus, I see this source solidify my selection of sources offering a variety of support.

Embracing Language Diversity in Your Classroom - Teachers Academy.

<https://academy.schooleducationgateway.eu/web/embracing-language-diversity-in-your-classroom>. Accessed 10 July 2020.