Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations                    Office of Graduate Studies

8-2022

# LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN FIRST YEAR COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS

Joanna Clevenger

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN FIRST YEAR

COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

English Composition:

Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language

and

English Composition

_____

by

Joanna Clevenger

August 2022

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN FIRST YEAR

COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

by

Joanna Clevenger

August 2022

Approved by:


Dr. Karen Rowan, Committee Chair, English

Dr. Parastou Feiz, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines how standard language ideologies are perpetuated in the five most frequently assigned first year composition textbooks from four higher education institutions in Southern California's Inland Empire. Standard language ideologies position one variation of a language as superior, correct, appropriate and the normal variation of a language which everyone should be able to speak. Using Critical Discourse Analysis, the five textbooks were analyzed in order to uncover the embedded power and hegemony over women, people of color, and those from a lower socioeconomic status which are prevalent throughout society because they are unchallenged and widely accepted as the status quo. Linguistic discrimination, which is perpetuated within all of academia and throughout society, creates institutions which privilege those who use Standard English and labels speakers of nonstandard dialects as not belonging in academia because non-standard variations of English are considered inferior, incorrect and inappropriate. Although three of the texts analyzed did acknowledge linguistic diversity, all five texts positioned Standard English as the norm, correct, appropriate and superior to other dialects because it is associated with education, competence and clarity which show that Composition's pedagogical materials are falling short.

*Keywords:* Standard Language Ideologies, Standard English, Composition Textbooks, Critical Discourse Analysis, Linguistics Diversity

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis wouldn't exist if it wasn't for the people in my life who supported me on this journey.

Thank you to the entire CSUSB English department. I have been fortunate to be part of such a fantastic program. I want to give a special thanks to Professor Joel Harris, Dr. Caroline Vickers, Dr. Wendy Smith, Dr. Sunny Hyon, Dr. Alexandra Cavallaro, Dr. Jessica Luck, Dottie Cartwright, Dr. David Carlson, and former CSUSB professors Dr. Jackie Rhodes and Dr. Mary Boland.

Thank you so much to my two amazing readers, Dr. Karen Rowan and Dr. Parastou Feiz. Thank you both for your patience and support throughout this long journey and for being kind and caring individuals. I have learned so much from the both of you, and this project couldn't have been done without both of you.

Thank you to everyone at the CSUSB Writing Centers, I will miss you all! A special thank you to Karina, Joseph, Fabian, Jeffrey, Heather and Ryan for reading and rereading my proposal and my thesis like a million times, and encouraging me whenever I felt overwhelmed. I also want to thank my wonderful bosses at my two jobs. Thank you so much to my boss at CSUSB, Nathan Jones. Thank you to my boss at the SBVC writing center, Dr. Dirkson Lee.

I want to thank all of my friends who have supported me. I want to give a special thanks to Daiana Rodriguez, Erika Guillen, Fabian Torres, Jeffrey Hinkle, Lupe Rincon, Eddie and Jessica Shea, Josephine Tello, Carlee Franklin, Heather Seals, Katie Chavez, Shelby Reinsch, Kevin Cordova, Xochilt Trujillo, and the

Herrera family. You are all amazing and I am grateful for the support, friendship, and the wonderful memories we have made throughout the years.

Thank you to mi amor, Joseph Honnold. Thank you for staying up with me until 4 am while I finished my draft, for always being ready and willing to give feedback, and for offering an endless supply of support, motivation, and love. I love you.

Thank you to the two people who I wouldn't have survived CSUSB without. Thank you so much for always being there Karina Garcia and Gabriela Ibarra Leon. I appreciate you both for laughing with me, crying with me, and pulling all-nighters with me. I love you both so much.

Thank you to my tios, tias, and cousins for the unconditional love and support you have given me throughout my life. I love you all.

Muchas gracias a mi Nana. Eres el corazón de la familia y eres la razón por la que soy la chingona que soy. Te quiero mucho.

Thank you to my little sister and baby brother, Dianna and Michael. Boog, thanks for finding a way to lighten the mood and getting me to laugh when I needed it. . Di, thanks for listening to me, comforting me, and reminding me that I can do anything I put my mind to, even when I felt like I couldn't. I love you both. And thank you to the best puppies ever, Diego and Delilah.

And finally thank you to my amazing parents. I am where I am today because of you, and I am who I am today because of you. I am so grateful for you both and I couldn't have asked for better parents. I love you both so much.

DEDICATION

This is for my parents, Isabel and Michael Clevenger.

You spent my entire life encouraging me to do what makes me happy, teaching me to work hard, and instilling in me to never give up even if it takes forever. Without your guidance, I wouldn't have made it this far. I love you Mom and Dad.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Introduction

In 1974 the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) adopted the "Students' Right to their Own Language" (SRTOL), a resolution that a composition classroom would be a space which would "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." This resolution intended to validate linguistic variation found in academia by challenging Standard English which has been held in high esteem and served as a gatekeeping tool which normalized linguistic discrimination in the institutional setting (Wodak & Meyer, 2016; Lippi-Green 1997; Davila, 2016). Standardized language, which serves as a variation of language adopted from the wealthy and powerful, encapsulates identity, can empower and validate those who adopt it, and can oppress and invalidate those who don't (Davila, 2016; Matsuda, 2006; Lippi-Green 1997).

In the decades following the CCCC's resolution, composition scholarship, backed by linguistic research, continuously reaffirmed that linguistic diversity needs to be respected so students will not feel othered. Both composition and linguistics believed that by having composition instructors teach students that the "rules" or "standards" are arbitrary and are ideological, students would gain a

metacognitive awareness which would lead to their understanding that one language or dialect is not objectively superior to others. Both fields have further explored the need to highlight the value of language diversity in the composition classroom, and have based this argument on the knowledge that (1) language is always ideological and (2) that the gatekeeping composition classroom should push against the idea of Standard English as the only acceptable form of language in a class (Davila, 2016; Matsuda, 2006; Canagarajah, 2006; Lippi-Green, 1997). As this scholarship highlights the need for instructors to respect diversity of language/dialect in the classroom, there have been theoretical methods which have been applied by scholars from both fields which have shown the benefits of adopting these various methods. Theoretical methods, such as translanguaging, code meshing, and World Englishes, (discussed further in Ch. 4) are some of the most recent ideas being pushed into the scholarship which have theoretical applications that respect linguistic diversity and have been shown to work successfully in the composition classroom (Canagarajah, 2006; Davila, 2016). These and other theories promote language inclusivity as they theoretically create a space in academia that is welcoming to all students.

Despite the foot in the door that SRTOL provided linguistically, the fact remains that standardized language is so ingrained in the institution, it survives because it is constantly perpetuated even by those who appear to challenge it. One way instructors unintentionally perpetuate standard language ideologies is through the language used in the textbooks in their classroom. Textbooks, which

are important tools that are used in the majority of composition classrooms, are widely accepted as beacons of standardization and are positioned as neutral material in the classroom. But, like spoken discourse, the written discourse in textbooks is constituted as a social practice that is dialectical in nature which means that it will, "help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people" (Wodak & Meyer, 2016, pp. 6-7). The textbooks used in First Year Composition (FYC) classes can sometimes act as a guide as textbooks have been known to influence course themes, provide prompts for course assignments and provide instructors, who may or may not have had experience in the classroom, the language they use to teach composition (Welch 1987; Knoblauch, 2011). In some academic institutions, textbooks are chosen by the department, so some professors may find themselves forced to adopt a textbook that can contradict their pedagogical values. The use of the ideologically laden language within FYC textbooks creates pedagogical contradictions which are an issue because they contradict the emphasis placed on linguistic diversity that the scholarship has stressed for so long (Russell, 2018; Welch 1987; Knoblauch, 2011).

In this thesis, I have examined the language ideologies in the language from textbooks assigned in FYC classrooms at some of the two-year and four-year higher education institutions in the Inland Empire (IE). The IE is a region in Southern California that consists of both Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

It is one of the most diverse regions in the nation which also extends to its

linguistic diversity.  According to the *2016-2020 American Community Survey*

*(ACS) 5-Year Estimates*, 41.7% of the residents from San Bernardino County

spoke a language other than English at home, and 41.1% of the residents from

Riverside County spoke a language other than English at home.  When looking

at these two counties, these numbers are almost double that of the entire United

States where only 21.5% of residents spoke a language other than English at

home (U.S Census Bureau, 2020).

Table 1. Comparison of Languages Other Than English Spoken at Home

|  | United States | San Bernardino County | Riverside County |
|---|---|---|---|
| Languages other than English spoken at home | 21.5% | 41.7% | 41.1% |

The linguistic diversity displayed in the ACS survey indicates that the

higher education institutions in the IE are located in a region that would

especially benefit from pedagogical practices which highlight the value of

linguistic diversity that was emphasized in the SRTOL resolution and which

continues to be emphasized in the current composition and linguistic scholarship.

Through a critical analysis of the discourse found within FYC textbooks, I have looked at the Standard Language Ideologies being perpetuated by the language in the texts which can influence the pedagogical practices of instructors from those four IE higher education institutions. Because standard language ideologies are seen as neutral and normalized in both written and spoken discourse practices, they are often difficult to acknowledge, let alone challenge. By examining the, "power, dominance, and hegemony, and its collaborative and mutual reconstruction by both the dominant and dominated groups" (Strauss & Feiz, 2014) with a critical discourse analysis, I closely examined how instructors may maintain these power structures and in turn, how they are able to challenge the same ideologies which they perpetuate. Critical discourse studies (CDS) is "a multidisciplinary and multi-methodical approach" that is used to identify ideologies through a critical analysis of discourse (Wodak & Meyer, 2016, p.4). Unfortunately, if professors do not openly acknowledge and then challenge ideologies then their inaction "justifies and perpetuates linguistic imperialism" (Liu, 2010).  CDS will be used to deconstruct discourse to better understand the ideologies and power dynamics at play and theoretically can assist instructors to acknowledge and confront the ideological underpinnings of their assigned texts (Fairclough, 2001). By identifying and analyzing the ideologies that are present in these textbooks, I have been able to identify and assess any gaps which exist between the linguistic pluralism that composition and linguistic scholarship push for and the ideologies that most textbooks, and some instructors, may

perpetuate. In the rest of Chapter 1, I look at the literature surrounding Standard Language Ideologies, Academic Diversity and Composition textbooks. In Chapter 2, I discuss my data collecting process and my data. In Chapter 3, I discuss my methodology and analyze my data. And finally, in Chapter 4, I discuss the implications from my analysis and possible future research.

<div align="center">1.2 Literature Review</div>

<u>1.2.1-Standard Language Ideology</u>

Language is a powerful entity that, "like desire…disrupts, [and] refuses to be contained within boundaries. It speaks itself against our will, in words and thoughts that intrude, even violate the most private spaces of our body" (hooks, 1994, p. 167). Not only do words have the ability to wound, wage war and bring down empires, even the meaning embedded within the language can be impactful.  In its use, language serves as a form of identity, a means to empower, and a way to oppress. The power of language includes its ability to work "not only as a means of social exclusion, but also as a kind of wall which must carefully be scaled in the process of conscientizacao [awareness]" (Busnardo & Braga, 2001, p.644). According to Freire (2005), the "conscientizacao" is a critical awareness. Language is a means to achieving that critical awareness because it "is centrally involved in power and struggles for power" so it is used as a means to control the thoughts and actions of others (Fairclough, 1989, p. 17).Those in control use language as a way to exclude and control because, "they confuse freedom with the maintenance of the status quo; so that if conscientizacao threatens to place

<div align="center">6</div>

that status quo in question, it thereby seems to constitute a threat to freedom itself" (Freire, 2005, p.36). Those in power use language to retain that power, by limiting language that develops conscientizacao and demonstrating an ideological preference for language that reinforces the status quo.

In its all-encompassing act as a form of identity and empowerment, language is socially constructed and thus, ideological. Ideologies are not just social representations of reality, they are processes which perpetuate specific representations of reality and specific constructions of identity (Fairclough et al., 2011). The power which ideologies perpetuate do so through "the promotion of the needs and interests of a dominant group or class at the expense of marginalized groups, by means of disinformation and misrepresentation of those non-dominant groups" (Lippi-Green, 1997). But ideologies do have limitations due to a "unidirectional flow of power" so it is through, "hegemonic power [which] works to convince individuals and social classes to subscribe to the social values and norms of an inherently exploitative system" that ideologies have the ability to shape institutions with hidden power embedded in language (Stoddart, 2007). The social construction of a linguistic hierarchy and the other ideologies which are embedded within a specific variation of language promote "truths" which are ultimately prejudicial to the identities of those who do not adhere to the beliefs of the dominant and ruling classes whose needs and interests are promoted through the use and perpetuation of the standardization of a language.

7

Throughout academia in the United States, other English speaking countries, and in English as a second language classrooms in countries where English is not the L1 of its citizens, there is one particular variation of English that is positioned as the "standard" and is portrayed as a normal and neutral linguistic entity. This variation of English, which is sometimes known as Standard English (SE), perpetuates the belief that this linguistic variant, with no intrinsic value, is in fact, a superior dialect that is accessible to all, is natural and normal and is needed to succeed in school, work and public settings (Davila, 2016).

The ideological "truths" that are promoted as natural occurrences in language in actuality counter the linguistic principles which are part of the core knowledge that make up what Lippi-Green (1997) refers to as the "linguistic facts of life." These "truths," which are "supportable by fact," are generally agreed upon throughout the field of linguistics because they are viewed as indisputable and are applicable to any language (Lippi-Green, 1997; Davila, 2016). These non-debatable facts are: language is fluid and changes all the time; language is flexible and can adapt by either borrowing or creating new ways to describe something; grammar and content are distinct and different issues; written and spoken language are different; variation (phonological, lexical and grammatical variation) is intrinsic to all spoken languages at every level; and all language is equal (Lippi-Green, 1997). In addition to these facts, "a resolution adopted unanimously by the Linguistic Society of America at its annual meeting in 1997 asserted that 'all human language systems – spoken, signed, and written – are

8

fundamentally regular' and that characterizations of socially disfavored varieties as 'slang, mutant, defective, ungrammatical, or broken English are incorrect and demeaning'" (Wolfram and Schilling, 2016, p. 7). These ideas are counter to the idea of a standard and highlight that any value that is placed upon a particular dialect is not a natural occurrence.

The standardization of Standard English promotes standard language ideology (SLI). SLI, which is "defined as a bias toward an abstracted, idealized homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class" (Lippi-Green, 1997, p.64) embraces monolingualism and serves as a means to separate those who belong from those whose linguistic differences will mark them as not belonging. Standard language ideology positions Standard English as a linguistic ability that everyone can and needs to possess while the power structure that places this linguistic variant and those who uphold it in its position of power remains invisible as "discourse (re)produces social domination, that is mainly understood as power abuse of one group over others, and how dominated groups may discursively resist such abuse" (Wodak & Meyer, 2016, p.9). Standard English is a tool which can seemingly validate one group of people and also invalidate others as linguistic minorities, those whose spoken dialect of English is not the standard, who are forced to adopt the language of those that marginalize them or they face linguistic discrimination. The SLIs which place SE

in this position of power does so because SE appears to be "available, accessible and attainable in order to be fully endorsed and hide power relations" (Davila, 2016, 129).

The idea that learning a particular dialect and following arbitrary rules is needed to succeed is actually socially constructed and contrary to the "linguistic facts of life" as it allows for standard language ideology to promote, "the needs and interests of a dominant group or class at the expense of marginalized groups by means of disinformation and misrepresentation of those non-dominant groups" (Lippi-Green, 1997, p.64). This means that language is never neutral and in fact, perpetuates the myth that the standard must be adopted because there is a hierarchy within languages which implicates that one variation of a language is correct and must be adhered to while the others are incorrect (Liu, 2010; Busnardo & Braga, 2001; Davila, 2016; Matsuda, 2006; Canagarajah, 2006; Lippi-Green 1997). Language, which is positioned as a neutral entity in society, promotes concealed ideologies which allow for those in power to use it as a weapon and reifies a hegemonic power structure which is accepted by all as a practice that all must adopt in order to succeed, even by those who are marginalized because of it.

The perpetuation of ideologically laden language creates a hierarchy which places one language or dialect above others which allows hegemony and power to remain unchallenged. Unchecked ideologies such as, "English language ideology, standard language ideology, native speaker ideology, and

10

white prestige ideology," are viewed as dominant forms of language use that "perpetuates the dominance and superiority of English in global contexts," which associates specific speakers with the socioeconomic status and race of those in power (Liu, 2010). The hegemony which positions one particular dialect above others is essentially positioning one variation of language, which does not contain any intrinsic value, as a standard while other variations are then categorized as non-standard. These non-standard linguistic variations are then portrayed as having a lower social and economic value and its speakers are deemed as lacking in their linguistic ability (Lippi-Green, 1997). Unfortunately, the discrimination perpetuated by SLIs in society is consistently reinforced in one of society's largest institutions, academia.

As society maintains the belief that education can lead to upward social mobility and that the acquiring of Standard English from academic discourse can lead to financial success, the commodification of one dialect over others leads to the commodification of certain identities over others. The identities of those who use SE are also viewed as both neutral and normalized which then puts those "normal" speakers' identities in a position of often unchallenged and unchecked privilege and power. Since SE is taught in schools and students are expected to acquire it, it is meant to act as a great equalizer that is, "perceived as widely available, accessible and attainable in order to be fully indorsed and hide power relations- so the failure to obtain or use SAE is seen as a failure on the individual who is then deemed as lacking" (Silverstein, 1996 as cited in Davila, 2016,

11

p.129). Accessibility of SE, "encourages an acceptance of the myth of meritocracy- which positions all success in this country because of individual effort-not unearned privilege- and therefore as fair" (Davila, 2016, p.142). The myth of meritocracy leads to the blaming of those who use other dialects/languages within institutions as wrong. These speakers are then categorized as an "other" or "outsider" because of their ability to adapt to a dialect that is not natural despite the ideologies which are insistent that Standard English is natural and easy for all to obtain.

As students who are designated as "others" or "outsiders" navigate academia, they are forced to do so with the idea that their linguistics abilities are not up to standard as they are categorized as deficient speakers and because of the inextricable link between language and identity, as deficient learners. This happens because, "When the dialects of socially disfavored groups become subordinated to the language forms preferred by the 'right' people, non-mainstream dialects are trivialized or marginalized, and their speakers considered quaintly odd at best and willfully ignorant at worst" (Wolfram and Schilling, 2016, p. 7). Students can unfortunately internalize the disconnect between their home language/dialects and the standard can perpetuate the idea that if their linguistic ability does not belong in academics, then their identity does not belong in academia. Because of the myth of accessibility in conjunction with the idea of meritocracy which is believed to be a linguistic truth due to Standard English ideologies, these students are led to believe that their inability to adhere

to a standard means that they are failing themselves. The reason for this is because they have access to a natural linguistic variant that is supposed to give them an equal shot in society as it is needed to be successful and by not adhering then they are not attempting to be successful in their life because, "linguistic subordination comes with explicit promises and threats; opportunities will arise when we use a "standard" variety and doors will close when we speak a socially disfavored one (Wolfram and Schilling, 2016, p. 7). These same students then "suffer from the drawback of not having opportunities to acquire the secondary discourse, which is the societal dominant discourse by power, due to their parents' lack of access to the same secondary discourse" (Pinhasi-Vittorio, 2009, p.24). This allows those in power stay in power while others are depicted as not working hard enough and the hegemony embedded in the perpetuation of Standard English continues as, "Individuals acting for a larger social group take it upon themselves to control and limit spoken language variation, the most basic and fundamental of human socialization tools" (Lippi-Green, 1997, p.59).

Because a standard leads to the view of anything other than itself as being, "in opposition, non-standard or substandard" (Lippi-Green, 1997, p.59) which carries negative connotations for other variations, it is important to examine the ideologies, the implications of why they need to be considered, and the way they work so those in academia can work to counter the effects that they promote. Without challenging the ideologies in place, then people in academia risk "promoting and accepting dominant language ideologies without critically

examining the ramifications legitimate and reproduce language prejudice and unequal power relations" (Liu, 2010, p.40). And because schools have been and continue to be sites of reproductions for these power relations and sites of socialization as they teach other to perpetuate the hegemony attached to the standard's ideologies, the move to embrace linguistic diversity in academia in spite of SE is an ongoing process that continues to strive for the embracing of linguistic variation and the diversity of the identities of students in classrooms.

## 1.2.2 Linguistic Diversity in Academia

The current U.S educational system, which has been touted as a great equalizer, is an institution which has historically and continuously served as a space where societal expectations and norms are reinforced on behalf of those in power as a means to retain that power. Access to higher education was historically only available to white males from upper-middle and upper class backgrounds whose linguistic ability was deemed appropriate and as belonging to the institution (Smitherman, 2003). The linguistic expectations found in these institutions were modeled for this particular demographic by those from this same demographic (wealthy, white, monolingual men) as a means to reinforce hegemony over women, people of color, and those from a lower socioeconomic status who could not pursue an education. Eventually, academia began a shift to "level the playing field" as it attempted to become an inclusive institution as it opened its door to a wider sector of its population, specifically the marginalized who did not have access to a higher education (Matsuda, 2006; Smitherman,

14

2003). This new influx of students that entered the institution came from a combination of open enrollment and also from the growing admissions of international students, meaning that the student body that once attended the hallowed halls of academia was changing (Matsuda, 2006). This should have meant that the expectations of who a college student is/how they speak should have also changed due to the fact that, "Most of these students, however bright, did not have command of the grammar and conventions of academic discourse/'standardized English'" (Smitherman, 2003, p.29). Unfortunately, this was not the case as the expectations of students' ability did not shift, and instead students were expected to conform to the standards set forth by the institution in order to homogenize the linguistic performance of the newly diverse student body. These expectations consisted of the ability to meet specific linguistic standards which served as gatekeeping instruments and which were used as a way to measure a student's ability to succeed in academia. This standard, also known as Standard English, was considered a linguistic ability that was associated with monolingualism and was seen as being neutral, natural, and easy to access.

Since the late nineteenth century, the composition classroom became a space which was used to ensure students could adhere to a standardized linguistic variation (Matsuda, 2006). It became a space that would contain linguistic differences and attempt to erase those differences as students adopted this dialect and embraced the ideological underpinnings of said standard which

15

created a linguistic hierarchy that set the one dialect of Standard English as the one correct dialect while all other dialects were viewed as wrong, substandard and thus incorrect. Despite academia seeming to be more of an open and accepting place which granted everyone the opportunity for equality through an education, the composition classroom still acted as a gatekeeper of academic spaces. The composition classroom quickly shifted to a place which invalidated certain student's language practices and because of the inherent connection between identity and language, it also became a space which invalidated their identities. In response to the invalidation of students' linguistic practices and their identities due to "a crisis in college composition classrooms…caused by the cultural and linguistic mismatch between higher education ante nontraditional (by virtue of Color and class) students who were making their imprint upon the academic landscape for the first time in history" the CCCC adopted the SRTOL (Smitherman, 2003, p.19).

According to the CCCC, the composition classroom was responsible for the prevailing attitudes in society in regards to the need for the teaching of standardized English. But the power that composition gave to Standard English also made the composition classroom a place that could change attitudes when it came to linguistic variation. Yet the field of composition had to reflect on, "whether our rejection of students who do not adapt the dialect most familiar to use is based on any real merit in our dialect" and "whether our rejection toward 'educated English' are based on some inherent superiority of the dialect itself or

on the social prestige of those who use it" (CCCC, 1974). As linguistic research

had in fact brought to light, the many beliefs about English which were

perpetuated in the composition classroom, specifically, the standardization of one

variation of English over others, was both harmful and detrimental to the identity

of students. And in order to counter these implications, the CCCC's resolution

called for the acceptance of linguistic variation in the composition classroom:

> 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. Language scholars long ago denied that
>
> the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. The claim that
>
> any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group
>
> to exert its dominance over another. Such a claim leads to false advice for
>
> speakers and writers, and immoral advice for humans. 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. (CCCC, 1974)

This resolution continued to explain important concepts such as understanding

language dialects, how and why variation exists and that the dialectical variations

found in English had no intrinsic value (CCCC, 1974). This information highlights

that the valuing of one dialect is based on ambiguous socially derived

practices/ideas which gave prestige to a particular dialect that was then considered the standard by which all others would be compared to over others.

In addition to this, the CCCC's (1974) resolution also noted that "All English teachers should, as a minimum, know the principles of modern linguistics and something about the history and nature of the English Language in its social and cultural context." By doing this, educational policies and teaching practices could become more inclusive and could open up a new understanding of the materials being taught in the classroom. The implications of shifting linguistic attitudes in the classroom due to this resolution could potentially be far reaching as these attitudes could affect employers who may have a narrow view on a potential employee's linguistic ability because, "English teachers have been in large part responsible for the narrow attitudes of today's employers, changing attitudes toward dialect variations does not seem unreasonable goal, for today's students will be tomorrow employers" (CCCC, 1974). The attitudes which are perpetuated in the classroom will find their way continuing to be perpetuated in the classroom, which is why the CCCC's resolution was viewed as not only attempting to create a more inclusive space in the classroom, it was also attempting to change the attitude toward linguistic variation on a much larger scale.

The SRTOL resolution was received with open arms but also with ire and skepticism as it became part of a contentious debate which brought the issue of linguistic diversity to the forefront of educational discussions. Although some trail

blazers attempted various pedagogical practices which incorporated SRTOL in their class, unfortunately, many struggled and didn't know how to implement the changes needed in the classroom. So, despite having the knowledge that linguistic diversity should be valued, the praxis fell short. As the CCCC's resolution continued to fall short of its goal, in the 1980's, "the United States moved to a more conservative climate on the social, political and educational fronts- a move solidified… by the election of Ronald Reagan" (Smitherman, 2003, p.28) and so a standardized dialect remained in place as the standard and other dialects would continue to be relegated as substandard variants that had its place in home, among their non-academic communities, and outside of both academic and professional settings.

Despite the shift to conservatism in the 1980s, many in the composition field still understood the benefit of SRTOL and the need for linguistic diversity in the composition classroom. Students' diverse dialects/language backgrounds which differs from the standard, is widely understood to be a strength that enriches the classroom environment rather than a weakness that inhibits a student from participating in the institution (Lippi- Green, 1997; Matsuda, 2006; Canagarajah, 2011). Various linguistic studies and pedagogical movements have found the ability to include linguistic diversity in the classroom and have made strides to continue highlighting the need for that linguistic diversity in the classroom. In the classroom, the movement towards highlighting the value of linguistic diversity and challenging the idea of a Standard English has taken

shape in the forms of World Englishes, Translanguaging, Code Meshing, and Critical pedagogy (Kubota, 2001; Canagarajah, 2011, Young, 2010; Pennycook, 1999). Many instructors, or those training to be instructors, may find it difficult to toe the line between teaching the standard while promoting the importance of linguistic diversity while working in a field which has continuously perpetuated the importance of that standard (Ball et al., 2003). As instructors attempt to challenge the standard using these methods, they are constantly challenging socially ingrained beliefs within an institution which promotes that standard which can appear to be an uphill battle.

One recent battle which reflects the pervasive gap within composition, involved the Council of Writing Program Administrators' (CWPA) "Writing Program Administrators (WPA) Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" which was adopted in 2014 and the CWPA Outcomes Statement Revision Task Force which was put together in 2020 in order to revise the current WPA outcomes. The current WPA statement focuses on rhetorical knowledge, critical thinking, reading and composing and writing process outcomes in the FYC classroom which are meant to shape "the writing knowledge, practices, and attitudes that undergraduate students develop in first-year composition" (CWPA, 2019). These outcomes, which are said to reflect current composition scholarship, are meant to serve as a means to regularize the goals of First-Year Composition textbooks. When discussing writing, the WPA's outcomes do not reflect the linguistic diversity which has been discussed by scholars because it

does not acknowledge language variation. The section on writing processes does not explicitly address linguistic diversity and does not incorporate the STROL resolution because it instead focuses on writing conventions that students must adhere to. The task force, whose goal was to revise the WPA outcomes "with the intent of guiding writing programs toward a more equitable, antiracist approach to teaching writing at the postsecondary level," was comprised of various composition scholars who acknowledged the current WPA outcomes as falling short in regards to linguistic diversity through the exclusion of a conversation about language which in turn, reiterated the use of standard which they mention, "reproduce white language supremacy" which they mention are linked to what Matsuda (2006) calls, "the myth of linguistic homogeneity" (Beavers et al., 2021). This task force created the document, "Toward Anti-Racist First-Year Composition Goals" (2021), which , "acknowledged that any learning goals should be designed with the locally diverse students, their languages, and their material circumstances in mind" and that the composition classroom must be space which consistently challenged white supremacy, is anti-racist and which values the linguistic practices of the marginalized voices which are pushed aside to adhere to the standard which values the language practices of, "White, middle and upper class, monolingual" speakers (Beavers et al, 2021). Unfortunately, the revisions to the WPA Outcomes by Beavers et al. (2021) was rejected by the WPA's Executive Board, and the scholars who worked on said document created the Institute of Race, Rhetoric, and Literacy which has published its own FYC

goals that would, "allow FYC administrators and teachers to engage in antiracist work immediately" (Inoue, 2021). Ultimately, the CWPA's move to not adopt the revised WPA outcomes, continues to perpetuate the idea of a standard which positions one variation of English as the norm which belongs in the classroom because it is correct, appropriate and superior.

In spite of  "Students' Right to their Own Language" and all of the evidence that language is fluid, equal, and must change, society steadfastly continues to believe that a homogenous, standardized, one size fits-all language is not only desirable, it is truly needed for success. And these attitudes which are being seen challenged within present day academia, maintains its hold in an important place within academia: in composition textbooks

### 1.2.3 Composition Textbooks

Textbooks are pedagogical tools which have been used to relay information to the masses. Both past and current composition texts are rooted in traditional ideas of composition which focus on a limited number of genres, rhetoric, and grammar instruction that are relayed in a specific dialect of English which students are supposed to adopt and utilize in their own writing. In addition to acting as a guide for instructors to teach and for students to learn, these texts also serve an important purpose in academia as their content "play[s] a powerful role in shaping learner identity and socializing learners into certain ways of acting, doing and valuing" (Curdt-Christiansen, 2017). As Composition scholarship has grown and changed over the years, the changes in FYC

textbooks have been slow and small despite the plethora of accessible composition theory (Welch, 1987). The FYC textbooks which are consistently produced and reproduced, via their newest editions, relay knowledge that is disconnected from the scholarship as they "discourage intellectual, social, and political independence of students and prospective teachers" and "promote the social values of hierarchy" (Bleich, 1999, pp. 19-20). Unfortunately, these same textbooks are idealized and viewed as tomes of knowledge that contain the information that everyone must learn in order to succeed because of the prestige they carry (Welch, 1987). Often the limitations of textbooks are ignored or those who utilize them are unaware of such limitations. But, because of the demand for these texts, they remain a hot commodity and a tool which instructors may rely on in their own instruction (Knoblauch, 2011).

FYC textbooks are some of the most popular texts in the textbook industry. This popularity, as Knoblauch (2011) states, can be seen with a "survey of the Bedford/St. Martin's, Pearson Higher Education's and W.W Norton's composition catalog [which] reveals a glut of textbooks geared specifically toward introductory composition classes" (p.246). New and inexperienced writing teachers in the 19th century were the reason that FYC textbooks were originally in high demand (Connors, 1986, as cited in Knoblauch, 2011, p. 246). Unfortunately, there are still many English programs which lack instructor preparation to teach FYC, so there are  inexperienced teachers who lack the necessary knowledge of writing pedagogy and current composition scholarship

are still being hired to teach FYC classes. This means that the need for a FYC

textbook as a training tool for new instructors still remains even despite the

knowledge that "[r]eliance on writing textbooks helps to promulgate authoritarian

values through writing instruction" (Bleich, 1999, p. 18). Past and current

textbook publication is and has been shaped by the demand of instructors, so

most textbooks published are created to meet the need of the instructors

assigning the texts rather than the students who are purchasing said books.

Because these texts are created to meet the needs of instructors rather than

reflect composition theory, "the discrepancy between composition textbooks and

composition theory arises from a shared system of belief between the textbooks

sellers- the publishers- and the textbook buyers- the writing instructors" (Welch,

1987, p. 270). And the product which is created because of this system is a

textbook which is used as a guide for both experienced and inexperienced

teachers, and a training manual for inexperienced teachers (Welch, 1987).

Textbook publication practices unfortunately dismiss students' needs, as

students are simply expected to embrace the knowledge from a book which they

may feel disconnected from due to the fact that it wasn't created for them. In

addition to this, another reason why this disconnect may exist between students

and their textbooks may stem from the fact that these textbooks typically, "do not

ask students to relate their own knowledge, experience, hopes, and wishes to the

problem of writing and language use. They tell students what to do, assuming

that students come to college naïve and without understanding of this subject"

(Bleich, 1999, p. 32). The assumption that students are a living blank slate discounts their culture, experiences and identity. Because language is intrinsic to culture and is a fundamental aspect of identity, the presenting of one type of language as the correct one, and the discounting of multifaceted identities, experiences and culture has led scholars to examine the type of culture which is being presented, how it is being presented and the ideologies which are being perpetuated because of this (Curdt-Christiansen, 2017). The information included in textbooks "invoke interpretations and misinterpretations of what are considered the 'right' ways to think, feel, and behave" (Curdt-Christiansen, 2017).  And because textbooks are positioned as sources of universal knowledge that is both natural and neutral and which must be accepted, learned and adopted, students are expected to purchase and learn this one type of English, Standard Academic English, and specific writing conventions in order to succeed.

    As students adopt and accept the idea that Standard Academic English is the norm and they must learn it to succeed, they are also adopting particular cultural values, and ideologies which are hidden, but are still attached to the use of this dialect. The ideologies in textbooks are often unexamined because of its positioning as pedagogical material that is neutral, and natural because ideologies are always positioned in such a way and because "the language in which it is presented sounds authoritarian- it does not seem to allow for counter or alternative knowledge on the same issue, and it does not invite the textbook readers to reconsider the knowledge, add to it, or change it" (Bleich, 1999, p. 17).

Textbooks' ability to appear as natural and neutral sources of information allows it to impart particular ideological beliefs which perpetuates a hierarchy and reaffirms this one dialect as being correct and normal while it also discourages those using the texts from, "examining their own history of language use and writing for the purpose of freeing themselves from constrictive rules, rituals, habits or rigid beliefs about the use of language"(Bleich, year, p.19). And with little to no implementation of composition scholarship which highlights the need for a more linguistically diverse and inclusive classroom being included in the textbooks, the idea that all dialects and thus identities belong in academia remains removed. Instead the Standard Academic English ideologies that the text and the writing teacher is perpetuating, "are antagonistic to those of us who take the view that language use in every context, oral and written, is critical to the functioning of society" (Bleich, 1999, p.30). Until the push for linguistic diversity is seen in our texts, unfortunately these texts will be pedagogical tools which exclude a large majority of students in the composition classroom.

CHAPTER TWO:

METHODS

2.1 Data Collection

For my analysis, I chose the most frequently assigned textbooks for the Fall 2021 quarter/semester in FYC classes from 4 higher education institutions in the Inland Empire. The list of textbooks was compiled after a thorough examination of each school's bookstore website. Each bookstore' website offered the listing of assigned books for each section of their FYC courses. The schools I chose to focus on included two schools from San Bernardino County: Community College 1 and University 1 and two schools from Riverside County: Community College 2 and University 2. These particular schools were chosen because they are all public colleges and just as I hoped to find a text that was accessible to all, I wanted to focus on the most accessible higher education institutions in the Inland Empire. The numbers of frequency of each text's assignment can be found in the table below.

## Table 2. List of Textbooks Assigned for the Fall 2021 Semester

| Text Name | Author | Edition | Community College 1 | Community College 2 | University 1 | University 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| St. Martin's Guide to writing | Axlerod | 12th | 1 | 3 | | 48 |
| They Say/I Say | Graff | 4th | | 19 | 1 | |
| They Say/I Say | Graff | 5th | | 6 | 4 | |
| Reading Critically, Writing Well | Axlerod | 12th | 10 | 7 | | |
| Squeeze the Sponge | Janzen | looseleaf | 4 | | 2 | |
| Everythings an argument with readings | Lunsford | 8th | | 6 | | |
| Critical Thinking, Reading and Writing | Barnet | 9th | | 4 | | |
| Compact Reader | Aaron | 11th | 4 | | | |
| Bedford guide to college writing | Kennedy | 10th | | 4 | | |
| College Writing | Vandermey | 5th | | 3 | | |
| Little Seagull Handbook | Bullock | 4th | | 3 | | |
| Elements of argument | Rottenburg | 12th | | 3 | | |
| Everythings an argument | Lunsford | 7th | | 3 | | |
| Current Issues and Enduring Questions | Barnet | 11th | | 3 | | |
| Little Brown Handbook | Fowler | 13th | 3 | | | |
| Rules for Writers | Hacker | 9th | 2 | | | |
| Concise St. Martin's | Axlerod | 8th | 2 | | | |
| MLA Handbook | MLA | 9th | 2 | | | |
| Argument Today | Johnson-Sheeh | 2nd | 2 | | | |
| Steps to writing well | Wyrick | 9th | 2 | | | |
| Achieve for a pocket style manual | Hacker | 9th | 2 | | | |
| Steps to writing well | Wyrick | 13th | | 2 | | |
| Ways of reading | Bartholmae | 12th | 1 | | 1 | |
| They Say/I Say with MLA | Graff | 3rd | | 1 | 1 | |
| Real Essays Essentials | Moore | | 1 | | | |
| Ways of reading | Bartholmae | 11th | 1 | | | |
| Norton Reader w/MLA update | Goldwaithe | 14th | 1 | | | |
| Norton Field Guide to Writing | Bullock | 5th | 1 | | | |
| St. Martin's Guide to writing | Axlerod | 9th | 1 | | | |
| Bedford Researcher | Palmquist | 6th | 1 | | | |
| Bedford Guide to College Writers with Reade | Kennedy | 10th | 1 | | | |
| Bedford Guide to College Writers with Reade | Kennedy | 12th | 1 | | | |
| Reading the World | Austin | 4th | | 1 | | |
| Easy Writer | Lunsford | 7th | | 1 | | |
| Practical Argument | Kirzner | 4th | | 1 | | |
| Grammar and Usage, Naturally | Barkley | | | 1 | | |
| Everyone's an author | Lunsford | 3rd | | | 1 | |
| Rewriting | Harris | 2nd | | | 1 | |

## 2.2 Data

For my first text, I analyzed the 12th edition of *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing* written by Axelrod and Cooper (2019). According to the textbook's publisher, Bedford/St. Martin's, "Whether you have years of teaching experience or are new to the classroom, you and your students can count on The St. Martin's Guide to Writing to provide the thoroughly class-tested support you need for first-year composition" ("The St. Martin's," n.d.). In the preface of the text, Axelrod and Cooper, (2019) state that they, "continue in our mission to serve a diverse audience of schools and students" and refer to their text as, "a complete first year composition course in a single book." This text book was assigned by quite a few classes at Community College 1 and 2, and it was assigned for every section of FYC at University 2.

For my second text, I analyzed the 11th edition of *Reading Critically, Writing Well*: *A Reader and Guide* by Axelrod et al., (2014). According to the authors, this textbook, "is designed for today's student, many of whom have limited close reading experience and often find dense academic texts daunting," so to assist with students' understanding of texts, Axelrod et al. (2014) designed the text to, "give students practice in a range of reading and writing strategies-strategies that enhance comprehension, inspire thoughtful response, stimulate critical inquiry, and foster rhetorical analysis" (iii)  Axelrod et al.'s (2014) text was tied with Graff and Birkenstein's (2018)  as the most assigned textbooks at

Community College 1. This text was also found to be frequently assigned at Community College 2.

For my third text, I analyzed the 4th edition of the textbook *They Say/I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing* which was written by Graff and Birkenstein (2018). According to the Graff and Birkenstein (2018), their textbook's "goal is to demystify academic writing by isolating its basic moves, explaining them clearly and representing them in the form of templates and that "these templates might have the potential to open up and clarify academic conversation." This text was the most frequently assigned text at Community College 2 and was tied as one the most assigned books at Community College 1. The 5th edition of this text was the most assigned at University 1.

For my fourth text, I analyzed *Squeeze the Sponge: A No Yawn Guide to College Writing* which was written by Janzen (2018). According to the book's publisher, Flip Learning, "this indispensable English Composition textbook is replete with hands-on activities, links to exemplary rhetorical and literary texts, and memorable tips to help students craft and refine their writing—in other words, 'squeeze the sponge'" ("squeeze," n.d.). According to Janzen (2018), her textbook is a, "nontraditional textbook" where her, "idea is to talk about college-level expectations of writing plainly." This textbooks was the 2nd most assigned at University 1 and was frequently assigned at Community College 1.

For my fifth and last text, I analyzed the 8th edition of *Everything's an argument* by Lunsford et al. (2018). According to the publisher, this text, "helps

students understand and analyze the arguments around them and raise their own unique voices in response" ("Everything's an," n.d.).  According to the authors, "focusing on the teaching of argument, this new introduction gives experienced and first-time instructors a strong pedagogical foundation. Sample syllabi for both semester and quarter courses provide help for pacing all types of courses" (Lunsford et al., 2018).This text was the second most text assigned at Community College 2 and was frequently assigned at Community College 1.

Each of these textbooks has multiple volumes being used at almost every institution with the exception of Janzen's (2018) *Squeeze the Sponge*. For 3 of the textbooks, I did not analyze the newest edition and instead, I used older editions that were being assigned more frequently than the newest one. But, since University 2 only assigned the newest edition of *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing*, that textbook was the only textbook that I used that was the latest edition.

<div align="center">2.3 Methods</div>

For 4 of my texts, I decided to focus on the preface from each textbook. The only textbook which did not have a preface was Janzen's (2018) *Squeeze the Sponge: A No Yawn Guide to College Writing*. The reason I chose to examine the preface of each textbook is because the preface typically is a space where the authors are conveying the purpose of their text to the professor. The preface includes the reasoning for the content, formatting, language, structure and organization of the text.

After the preface, I chose to focus on the introductory chapters of each textbook. The introductory chapter typically serves as the section where the authors introduce themselves to the students and is a space where the tone of the text in relation to the students is conveyed. All 5 of the texts contained introductions so I was able to examine them for all texts.

And finally, the chapter(s) or section(s) which discuss grammar and language focus on concepts in grammar and language that the authors feel are important enough to emphasize in the text. These portions of the text most frequently convey and/or reiterate the attitude of the authors toward grammar, prescriptivism, and ultimately, language ideologies. For this section, one text, Axelrod et al.'s (2014) *Reading Critically, Writing Well: A Reader and Guide* did not have chapters or sections which discussed grammar. For the other texts, Axelrod and Cooper's (2019) *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing* had a section called the "Handbook" which explicitly taught different grammatical rules. In the text, *They Say/I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing,* I focused on chapter 9, "'You Mean I Can Just Say It That Way?' Academic Writing Doesn't Mean Setting Aside Your Own Voice" because while it does not contain a section that explicitly focuses on grammar, this chapter discusses language and does talk about using particular verbs and adverbial conjunctions for rhetorical purposes. The focus on academic writing in this chapter will allow for insight on the author's understanding of conforming to Standard English and whether they put an emphasis on the need to conform.  For the *Squeeze the Sponge: A No*

*Yawn Guide to College Writing* textbook, I focused on chapters which focused on grammar. As previously mentioned, this text lacked a preface which is why I decided to focus only on specific chapters in addition to the introduction. The chapters which focus on language and grammar in the text are where Janzen articulates their stance on the idea of following language and grammatical rules, and as readers, we can see what they prioritize and why they do so. And for the final text, Lunsford et al. (2018) *everything's an argument,* I examined Chapter 13, "Styles in Argument" because of the focus on language.

## 2.4 Methodological Approach

Critical discourse studies (CDS,) which is more commonly referred to as a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), is a perspective that critically identifies and analyzes ideologies in language as it "encourage[s] resistance against such dominance or ideologies and to effect social change" so that it can identify instances of embedded power and hegemony in seemingly neutral discourse (Strauss & Feiz, 2014). Unlike other branches of linguistics, CDA is seen as a "problem-oriented interdisciplinary research movement, subsuming a variety of approaches, each with different theoretical models, research methods and agenda" (Fairclough et al., 2011, 357). Despite the differences in the approaches to CDA, all of the differing approaches have a shared interest in "power, injustice, abuse and political-economic or cultural change in society" (Fairclough et al., 2011, 357). CDA views language, both written and spoken, as a social practice

that is shaped by events, institutions, and social structures which shape objects

of knowledge to be taught/learned, individual's social identities, and even the

relationships between people.  But, because of its dialectical nature, in addition

to reflecting society, it also constructs the social world as it influences the same

events, institutions, and social structures which "is constitutive both in the sense

that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that

it contributes to transforming it" (Wodak & Meyer, 2016, p.6).

Language, in any context, isn't used to just reinforce hierarchies, instead it

is used to create and reinforce them as "dominance is jointly produced; it is

condoned, ignored, rationalized; hence, taken for granted. Power and

powerlessness are collaboratively perpetuated and institutionalized" (Strauss &

Feiz, 2014, p. 321). This power and powerlessness which underlies language are

the "institutional, political, academic, and even personal ideologies whereby

inequity, injustice, and abuse are normalized and presented as common-sense

assumptions- as given, as natural, and the taken-for-granted norms of society"

(Strauss & Feiz, 2014, p. 321). And given that all language is ideological, "There

are for instance certain key discourse types which embody ideologies which

legitimize, more or less directly, existing societal relations, and which are so

salient in modern society that they have 'colonized' many institutional orders of

discourse" (Fairclough, 2001, p. 36). One institution in which ideologies remain

embedded throughout, is in academia.

Since institutional ideologies, which are perpetuated in every facet of academia, extend to the classroom and affect the students whom the institution is meant to serve, it is important to acknowledge how these ideologies work in favor of the institution and unfortunately against the student body who may be marginalized due to these ideologies. Standard language ideology, which creates a hierarchy among languages and dialects, is embraced by the institution as it is used as a gatekeeping device and is often associated with success in school and in any future professional endeavors by appearing to be, "'neutral', linked to assumptions that remain largely unchallenged" because it leads to people to "forget that there are alternatives to the status quo" (Wodak & Meyer, 2016, p. 9). Ideologies act as a way for those in power to remain in power, so perspectives like CDA "can and will be used to, "uncover those ideologies and the discursive means through which they are formed, and to the extent possible, effect 'change through critical understanding'" (Strauss & Feiz, 2014). Unlike other approaches to research, CDA, "without compromising its social scientific objectivity and rigor… explicitly positions itself on the side of dominated and oppressed groups" (Fairclough et al., 2011, p. 358). In addition to this, "CDA is different from other discourse analysis methods because it includes not only a description and interpretation of discourse in context but also offers an explanation of why and how discourse works" (Rogers, 2004, p. 2).

As a broad and interdisciplinary approach, CDA looks at macro-level and recurring micro-level linguistic features in order to uncover the embedded

ideologies within discourse (Strauss & Feiz, 2014). CDA is a "micro-macro based analysis" of what is in the text, but also what is not said in the text, as it looks to uncover "the processes by which ideologies of power abuse, control, hegemony, dominance, exclusion, injustice, and inequity are created, re-created, and perpetuated in social life- processes which are often "naturalized" and taken for granted as common-sense notions" (Strauss & Feiz, 2014, p. 312-313). The micro level linguistic features that CDA can sometimes focus on includes, "types of individual lexical items such as adverbs, verbs of knowing and understanding, logical connectors, pronouns of inclusion, pronouns of exclusion, metaphor and figurative language, euphemisms and dysphemisms, and other linguistically central stance-marking elements" (Strauss & Feiz, 2014, p. 316). These features are examined and analyzed in order to uncover, "macro-level messages or power, control, racism hegemony and dominance and discrimination" which are perpetuated throughout institutions and which are treated as normal and neutral allowing them to go unnoticed and unchecked making the widely accepted and treated as the one correct way to be (Strauss & Feiz, 2014, p. 316).

Discourse which is normalized within one institution is found to influence other institutions which means that the idea that this is the correct way to speak or be becomes widely accepted and thus begins to act as a marker of belonging even when, "labels such as 'standard English' and popular terms such as 'correct English,' 'proper English,' or 'good English' are commonly used but not without some ambiguity" (Wolfram and Schilling, 2016, p. 10). For example, if standard

36

language is treated as the only correct way to speak within academia leaving no room for linguistic diversity, then those who don't conform to this standard are categorized as being wrong because they are someone who cannot use 'proper' English. If a workplace is influenced by academia's perpetuation of Standard English as normal, then those voices that differ from the standard aren't accepted because they aren't seen as being valid. In addition to this, Standard English being associated with academia leads to others making the assumption that those who adopt this dialect of English as being educated which leads to the categorization of those who don't use Standard English as being uneducated, which is far from the truth. The effect that ideologies have on individuals is the reason why CDA researchers find it imperative to examine:

> How people participate in the language and power of policy has effects on their surrounding social structures, social relations and agendas. Often this is an invisible process that strengthens the language, power and participation processes. This is particularly problematic when participating in this way continues to push select populations to the margin and silence them from the conversation.  Such hegemonic processes must be not only brought to light, but aggressively pushed against and restructured.
> (Rogers, 2004, p. 202)

As academia and those within academia attempt to perpetuate neutrality in the face of politicism and inequity it is with CDA that I can identify language which can allow me to uncover the, "hidden dimensions of power, control, injustice, and

inequity, all of which typically go unseen and unnoticed because they are

couched in what appear to be common-sense assumptions of social reality and

'truth'" (Strauss & Feiz, 2014). And it is with CDA, that I hope to uncover the

embedded ideologies in textbooks so that the classroom can be a space which is

accepting of the linguistic diversity it claims to be accepting of.

CHAPTER THREE:

ANALYSIS


3.1 Framework

This chapter will present a critical discourse analysis of my data. Since I looked to examine how standard language ideologies are being perpetuated, I looked at how academic English is positioned as the norm, the superior dialect, correct and appropriate. Positioning one variety of language as the norm, superior, and correct positions all other varieties and abnormal, inferior and wrong. And since appropriateness teaches that this variety of language is the best chance a student has to succeed in society, it is positioning other variations of language as not being appropriate and that an individual cannot succeed in society without adopting Academic English.

Because CDA has a diverse approach to research, it's important to note that its process begins with a research topic before it draws on "various linguistic analytic techniques and theories" which will, "involve some form of close textual (and/or multi-modal) analysis" (Fairclough et al., 2011, p. 359). In the case of this thesis, the research topic that I am focusing on is language in first year composition textbooks. Typically, "textbooks necessarily do not question the tradition" (Bleich, 1999, p.28) as "the construction of textbooks is a process of ideological selection where the dominant class decides what knowledge and cultural values should be transmitted to successive generations of school

children" (Williams, 1989, as cited in Curdt-Christiansen, 2017).  But, it is with

CDA where I can examine how, "Power and powerlessness are collaboratively

perpetuated and institutionalized" and how my data continues to perpetuate it by

normalizing ideologies under the guise of progressiveness while, "Controlling the

minds of others for the purpose of perpetuating such ideologies of power"

(Strauss & Feiz, 2014).


## 3.2 Data Analysis

Using CDA, I analyzed several examples from my data which helped me

establish that all of the textbooks that make up my data do reinforce standardized

language ideology, but several of the textbooks also challenge standard

language ideologies while reinforcing them. Rather than organize my analysis

thematically or by micro-level elements, I am looking at each text in its entirety to

examine instances of Academic English being positioned as (1)The Norm,

(2)Superior to other dialects, (3)Correct and (4)Appropriate which was discussed

in Chapter 1.

### 3.2.1 The St. Martin's Guide to Writing

The *St. Martin's Guide to Writing* includes a preface, an introduction and a

handbook on grammar, all which were part of my analysis.

### 3.2.1.1 Preface

The preface from the first textbook discusses the various sections

throughout the text and the reasoning behind their inclusion, but it omits an

explanation about the handbook. By omitting an explanation why a handbook is needed, it is situating this section, which explicitly teaches grammar rules, as if it requires no explanation. A lack of acknowledgement and explanation regarding the inclusion of the handbook is an example of how the content within the handbook is being presented as information that is both normal and correct and doesn't require explaining which positions Standard English as a variation of language that is mandatory to learn.

The only rationalization regarding the handbook in the preface isn't from the authors explaining it, it comes courtesy of the addition of the CWPA outcomes at the end of their preface. As mentioned in chapter 1, CWPA outcomes focus on the idea of adhering to conventions and lack any acknowledgement of language variation. The CWPA outcomes reinforce the idea of a standard, because it positions Standard English as a variation of language which must be learned because it is correct, appropriate and superior to other variations of language. The CWPA outcome this text includes is the only explicit conversation the authors have with readers in the preface section of the book about language, and it isn't even from their own rationalization.

(1) Developing <u>knowledge of linguistic structures</u>- including grammar, punctuation, and spelling- through practice in composing and revising (p.xxxi).

(2) **Editing** and **proofreading** <u>advice </u>for the most common issues students face appears at the end of the textbook (p.xxxi).

These two entries relay the authors' attitude toward language considering that the preface is typically the location where the authors convey their reasoning for the inclusion of particular material in the text. Similar to the WPA outcomes, neither example 1 or 2 discuss language variations, so it is assumed that the language structures and issues they mention are based on the conventions of Standard English, which is positioning that particular variation of language as the norm.

3.2.1.2 Introduction

The introduction of the text is primarily focused on rhetoric, genre and literacy narratives.  It does acknowledge that writing conventions are flexible but the major idea in this chapter is that success in writing means to understand rhetorical situations. Even when discussing the basic features of a text, the author doesn't include language and instead focused on genre conventions.

3.2.1.3 Handbook

The *St. Martin's Guide to Writing* contains a section which is referred to as the "Handbook." This entire section of the text is designated to explicitly teach grammatical concepts. Despite teaching grammar, this section doesn't offer any explanation about why certain rules need to be learned or anything about acknowledging other types of dialect.  Instead, standard language is treated as the norm, and the rules, without an explanation as to the why, are positioned as correct because they are something everyone needs to learn.

In example 3, the purpose of the handbook is explained. According to the authors, the handbook is a space for students to rely on to correct their errors:

> (3) You may use the Handbook on your own when you edit your essays, or your instructor may refer you to specific sections <u>to correct errors</u> in your writing (p.H-2).

In addition to this, the authors mention that correcting the errors will not only help students to be correct, but their writing will be better.

> (4) When you locate the section that will help you <u>correct an error</u> or make a sentence more <u>concise or graceful</u>, you will find a brief explanation and example of <u>correct usage</u>, along with one or more hand-corrected sentences that demonstrate how to edit a sentence (p.H-2).

These two excerpts are focused on the idea of error correction, yet the definition of what is an error is not included in the text.  Instead, the CWPA's outcomes which the authors highlighted in the preface implies that the errors that are being corrected are instances of language not adhering to the Standard English. These corrections reinforce Standard English as a variation of English which is the norm because all students should know it. The CWPA ultimately positions SE as correct since students must correct their errors using the guide, appropriate because it is appropriate for academia and superior because it will make a sentence "more concise and graceful" than the way the student may originally explain a concept using their own language practices. The positioning of

Standard English in the handbook is implying that the student's writing, without the use of a guide or when not adhering to the rules of Standard English are inferior and also incorrect.

In the next excerpt, the authors rationalize the content they included by detailing how the handbook was created.

> (5) When developing this Handbook, <u>ten college writing instructors</u> and <u>four professional editors</u> worked together to identify the twenty-five <u>most common errors</u> in more than five hundred student essays written in first-year composition courses (p.H-2).

The inclusion of <u>ten college writing instructors and four professional editors</u> being consulted in the creation of this handbook is included to establish credibility of the material and to reassure the professors assigning these texts that the <u>most common errors</u> being addressed are errors which they may also come across in their classroom. The identification of who, the instructors and editors, and the identification of the what, the common errors, both reinforce Standard English as the variation of English which must be adhered to. The positioning of Standard English as superior and correct happens because Standard English is portrayed as coming from people in positions of power who are educated individuals and know what is right, it is seen as appropriate because its editors and professors who know what successful writing is that were consulted, and it's the norm because the content is agreed upon, so the rules that are taught in the text are rules that need to be adhered to in order for students to succeed.

After the introduction of the handbook, there are various rules which correlate with the twenty-five most common errors mentioned in the previous example, that are discussed. Even though the errors are identified and there is an explanation as to how to fix these errors, there are no explanations on why these rules exist, why they are even needed and the authors don't explain whether the meaning changes and if it does, how the meaning changes when applying these rules.

For instance, in the section labeled, "Grammatical Sentences," the authors mentioned that writers should,

(6) Eliminate vague uses of they, it, or you (p.H-10).

With the rule, and the section which follows it, there is no further explanation on this topic. The lack of explanation can make this rule seem as if it is common sense. The reason why a pronoun may be considered vague is not explained, and their explanation seems vague itself. The lack of a reason after grammatical rules are relayed, make it appear that this knowledge should be known by all because it is the norm.

While discussing grammar rules, the authors discuss language variation in the sense of positioning language as being either formal or informal.

(7) Consider the level of formality of your writing. Friends in a casual conversation may not mind if an indefinite pronoun and its antecedent do not agree, but such errors are not acceptable in formal writing (p.H-13).

The binary of formal and informal perpetuates the idea that there is appropriate language which is formal and language which is casual and thus, inappropriate. Ultimately, both informal and formal language are technically the same language with some grammatical rules which work differently. Adherence to those rules positions a student's writing as formal because the language is deemed as being correct and appropriate for academia; otherwise, the student's writing is considered informal meaning that it is incorrect and inappropriate. This positions formal language which is Standard English as appropriate in academia while nonstandard is okay to use with friends outside the classroom, but not within academia.

Axelrod and Cooper (2019) reiterate this point in examples 8 and 9 as they consistently reinforce that formal writing is different from informal/casual and as they position formal writing as superior to informal. The explicit teaching of rules throughout the handbook lacks, as I mentioned earlier, the reason why these rules are necessary but they are stated as rules that must be adhered to.

(8) Avoid using he/she in all but the <u>most informal</u> writing situations (p.H-14).

(9) Adjective forms that are<u> common in informal</u>, spoken conversation should be changed to adverb forms in <u>more formal writing</u> (p.H-25).

Example 8 once again highlights that there is a place for certain language practices, and that this particular rule is an example of language which is not only inappropriate for formal writing but when being used in the informal, it is only

appropriate for the <u>most informal</u> contexts. This positions formal writing, also known as Standard English, as superior to informal writing. Example 9 positions formal language as the norm for academia, as correct, appropriate for formal writing situations and as superior to common informal writing. Informal writing, on the other hand, is delegated as being related to spoken conversation.

Considering that grammar rules are arbitrarily created and enforced through the positioning of Standard English as something everyone must learn, the question of why students need to learn Standard English conventions and why something language that is common in informal conversation does not work for the formal writing remains unanswered for students. The informal and formal binary presents that language varieties are not equal and it is the formal writing which maintains its place in academia. Ultimately this text reinforces that students are taught to just learn the rules, and apply them to make sure that their writing is appropriate for academia.

<u>3.2.2 Reading Critically, Writing Well: A Reader and a Guide</u>

The textbook, *Reading Critically, Writing Well* does not contain a section which explicitly discusses grammar, so for this analysis, I only focused on the preface, and the introduction. Axelrod et al. (2014) focused on a reading-writing connection which includes writing analytically, and writing rhetorically.

<u>3.2.2.1 Preface</u>

In the preface, the authors first discuss writing when talking about how students' writing would develop.

(1) Scaffolded through _example and modeling_, the guides teach students _to employ in their own writing_ the genre features and rhetorical strategies they studied in their reading. These guides provide a set of _flexible activities designed_ to help students learn to read _a specific kind of writing_ with a critical eye and to write with a clear purpose for their own readers (pp.vi-vii).

In the example above, the authors mention that student writing will develop through the use of examples and modeling. Since the focus is on the idea of both genre conventions and rhetorical strategies, an explicit discussion focused on writing conventions is not included. Instead, other than comments like _a specific kind of writing_ and _their own writing_, there is no instruction regarding the language students are supposed to use. But, the lack of instruction does not mean that any linguistic variation can be used.  Rather, the use of examples as a way for students to develop and model their own writing after positions that language as the language which students are expected to use. Because the examples throughout the text are written in Standard English, the lack of discussion surrounding language choice normalizes that variation of language. In addition to this, the idea that the guides will guide students to writing that will be clear and correct, reiterates the idea that this variation of language used in the guides, is correct, and appropriate for academic writing.

Ultimately, the goal of the text which pertains to writing appears to be more focused on content, which means that the language variation which student

should be using can be assumed to be Standard English because of a lack of discussion surrounding other varieties and because it is the variations of English used throughout the text. When language is discussed, the primary importance of writing and language is tied to content and clarity.

> (2) In short, the guides to writing help students make their writing thoughtful, clear organized and compelling-in a word, effective for the rhetorical situation (p.vii).

The importance placed on writing is that it is appropriate for situations, thoughtful, clear and organized. The lack of acknowledgement about language is what positions Standard English as an English that the students should know how to write because it is normal and looking back to example 2, should be common sense. The positioning of this as normal, connects to the lack of a conversation regarding language. According to Beavers et al. (2021) this lack of conversation surrounding language practices ultimately works to "reproduce white language supremacy" because the linguistic variant which is considered to be the default is Standard English.

### 3.2.2.2 Introduction

The idea that students should already have an understanding of the language which is appropriate and correct for their academic writing, continues throughout the introduction.

In the following excerpt, once again rhetoric and content are foregrounded, but when writing is discussed, the idea of appropriateness is positioned as the focus.

> (3) The understanding of the purposes motivating writers and readers, the expectations, of the audience, and the constraints of the genre and medium, including the ability to recognize different genres, or types, of writing (such as laboratory reports and movie reviews) and media (print or digital, visual or audio) and know when to use them, as well as to recognize and <u>use vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and spelling</u> <u>that is appropriate</u> to the purpose, audience, genre, and medium in which you are writing (p.2).

According to the text, students should be able to recognize appropriate vocabulary, grammar and punctuation conventions based on Standard English, and the lack of explanation in regard to those conventions of language, reveals that students should be aware of the type of language conventions that they must adhere to. In addition to the assumption that students are aware of Standard English conventions because it is the norm throughout academia, the idea that the language is also appropriate highlights how anything other than Standard English, would be inappropriate for academic writing.

When discussing the writing examples they provide in their text, Axelrod et al.'s (2014) include examples from professional writers which, as mentioned in

50

the preface, students are expected to model their own writing after. In the following example, the authors deconstruct what the writer in their example does.

> (4) Their sentence reflects <u>careful word choices</u> that will not offend the professional writers with whom they disagree or any members of their audience who might share their beliefs. They hedge their statements with qualifying terms such as, "a certain amount" and "potentially" to avoid making a stronger claim than they can prove given the evidence. A stronger claim may put off their readers. The hedges also demonstrate the writers' willingness to engage in conversation about the subject (p.9).

This example discusses language, but in relation to the content that the professional writer includes. The actual language of the piece they are critiquing still manages to position Standard English as the correct way to perform academic writing because it does not explicitly talk about the type of language being used other than the tone and the message that is conveyed in the piece they examined. Ultimately, the variety of English used is perpetuating the idea of Standard English as the norm, and appropriate because of the lack of acknowledgement regarding that there are other varieties of English. By closing off the possibility of other variations of English potentially being used, Standard English therefore becomes the default.

When discussing academic writing later in the chapter, appropriateness is the focus of writing instruction as language is relegated to the traditional formal/informal binary which the authors describe in the next example.

(5) Authors of academic discourse try to keep their tone objective and courteous, so they will be taken seriously and not provoke an emotional (and perhaps unreasonable) reaction in the reader. Less formal authors may allow passion into their writing or they may write in a chatty tone with informal language and direct addresses to the reader (p.10).

In example 5, Axelrod et al. (2014) defined academic writing in regard to more binaries such as subjectivity and objectivity, formality and informality, and emotionless and emotional. The conversation about academic writing is situated away from a discussion about types of language which means that Standard English is assumed to be known as the type of English which is being used. The description of writing in this example is that it is either objective and courteous which is how it is taken seriously, or emotional and unreasonable. These two descriptions position the language used as writing which is formal, thus academic, or informal, thus chatty.

At the end of Chapter 1, Axelrod et al. (2014) includes a table with different writing strategies which the student should be able to quickly access. At the end of the table in the section labeled "Editing and Proofreading," there are

instructions for the students so that they can successfully edit and proofread their own essay.

> (6) To <u>edit and proofread effectively</u>, you need to read your essay through the eyes of your reader. This <u>care and attention to detail</u> yield <u>writing that deserves the careful consideration</u> of those reading it- whether they be specialists, members of the general public, or, in the case of student writing, professors. <u>Rigorously check</u> sentences and paragraphs to make sure your writing includes the following:
>
> ○ A clear thesis in a prominent place
>
> ○ <u>Vocabulary appropriate</u> to the subject and audience's needs
>
> ○ <u>Correct grammar and punctuation</u> so you can <u>communicate effectively</u> and not confuse or annoy your reader
>
> ○ Sentence construction that helps your reader understand your points
>
> ○ An <u>appropriate</u> tone given your approach to your subject and your audience (p.15).

In this example, the authors do not establish the variety of language used because the assumption that Standard English is the default, or rather the norm, continues to be perpetuated throughout the text. The only emphasis placed on language is the idea of adhering to the conventions of Standard English so that the students' writing will be both appropriate and correct. The equating of correct grammar and punctuation leading to communication which will be effective, and

reiterates that Standard English is a necessity for others to be able to access information from the writer. Despite the fact that other variations of a language are equal, and also allow people to effectively communicate, is never addressed, the idea that Standard English is necessary continues to be perpetuated.

3.2.3 They Say/I Say

Although the focus of this text is on teaching students how to join an academic conversation through the use of templates, this text does touch on language variation in the preface and the introduction, but the topic of language is the focus of their Chapter titled, "'you mean i can just say it that way?'- Academic Writing Doesn't Mean Setting Aside Your Own Voice" (p.117).

3.2.3.1 Preface

In the Preface of this text, the authors discuss the role that they believe language plays in their text.

In the two following examples, the writers discuss how writing is perplexing which is why there is a need to learn how to demystify academic writing.

(1) Yet despite this growing consensus that writing is a social, conversational act, helping student writers actually participate in these conversations remains a formidable challenge (p.xiii).

(2) Its goal is to demystify academic writing by isolating its basic moves, explaining them clearly, and representing them in the form of templates (p.xiii).

The authors position academic writing as a challenge for students early in the textbook. In example 1, participating in the academic conversation, which they establish is their goal in the text, is described as a <u>formidable challenge</u>. And in example 2, this idea is once again emphasized with the use of the word <u>demystify</u>. Both of these examples situate academic writing as not natural because it takes work to learn and to utilize, but they also are adamant that it is work that must be done because students need to know how to navigate academic conversation and writing because that type of writing is correct and appropriate for academia.

In the next example, the authors once again bring up the phrasing <u>demystify academic writing.</u> The idea of the need to demystify  particular writing for students positions this writing as needing deciphering because it's writing which only a few have access to..

(3) <u>Demystifies</u> academic writing, showing students "the moves that matter" <u>in language they can readily apply</u> (p.xiv).

This idea of needing to demystify writing to show students how to write  positions those who have knowledge of academic writing as superior and even positions those with this knowledge as gatekeepers. But even though demystifying is an important idea which has been mentioned twice within the preface, the language variety being used appears not to need demystification because the focus on how to write is being emphasized which means the language used can be assumed to be Standard English (at least until otherwise stated).

Since the focus of these texts is on templates as a way to guide students through academic writing, the authors do spend time in the preface acknowledging how these templates may be challenged. Templates are a concern for composition professors because they can be viewed as a way to take away student agency since it provides such a hand-on approach.

> (4) We are aware, of course, that some instructors may have reservations about templates. Some, for instance, may object that such <u>formulaic devices</u> represent a return to <u>prescriptive forms</u> of instruction that encourage <u>passive learning</u> or lead students to put their <u>writing on automatic pilot</u> (p.xix).

Some of the main arguments the authors note are that templates are <u>formulaic</u> and <u>prescriptive</u> because they provide students with the form that the argument will take, but it also provides the language students will use in their arguments. While academic writing in regard to content is the focus of these concerns, the language being used within the text is still a part of the prescriptive forms because the language used with these templates is Standard English which students are forced to match their own writing with if the templates are going to be successful. In addition to this, when responding to reservations about their templates and text being too prescriptive, the authors note that the need to have templates lies in the students inability to be able to learn these moves without that guidance in the next example.

(5) The trouble is that <u>many students will never learn on their own</u> to make the key intellectual moves that our templates represent. While seasoned writers pick up these moves unconsciously through their reading, many students do not. Consequently, we believe, <u>students need to see these moves represented</u> in the explicit ways that the templates provide (p.xix).

3.2.3.2 Introduction

In the introduction, the authors introduce the purpose of the text (to students), which is focused on students learning to participate in academic conversations. In the following example, they discuss language in relation to the larger purpose, which is learning to create and respond to arguments.

(6)  But these deeper habits of thought cannot be put into practice unless you <u>have a language for expressing them in clear, organized ways</u> (p.2).

In example 6, the authors discuss how language must function. Because they do not discuss language variation or even have examples of templates written in anything but Standard English, it appears that the language conventions which must be learned and applied in order to have information clearly expressed would be with the adherence to Standard English conventions.

As the authors continue to touch a bit on language, in the next example, they discuss the idea of using language from others rather than having the students use their own language.

(7) We are, after all, asking you to <u>use language in your writing that isn't</u>

<u>your own—language that you 'borrow' or, to put it less delicately, steal</u>

from other writers (p.12-13).

In example 7, the authors focus on the idea of using language which doesn't

belong to the student, but belong to other writers. The idea that students must

<u>steal</u> writing from authors as a way to express themselves places the language

they must borrow as superior and appropriate because the language they must

borrow is what they can use in order to clearly express their ideas. The

superiority and appropriateness of the author's "voice" or rather their writing,

positions the language variation which they write in as the language variation

which must be adopted because it's the correct language needed for academia.

<u>3.2.3.4 Chapter 9: "you mean i can just say it that way?"- Academic Writing</u>

<u>Doesn't Mean Setting Aside Your Own Voice</u>

In chapter 9, the authors begin to explicitly discuss language and begin to

establish that there are variations of English. The idea of Standard English is

challenged throughout the chapter, which is a departure from the earlier chapter

which discussed academic writing but did not discuss the language variation

since the templates provided throughout the text were written in Standard English

which implies that is the variation of English students are expected to adhere to.

But as first stated, when discussing the purpose of the chapter, the

authors begin first challenging the adherence of the Standard.

(8) The goal of this chapter is to counteract this common misconception:
that relying in college on the straightforward, down-to-earth language
you use every day will make you sound stupid; that to impress your
teachers you need to set aside your everyday voice and write in a way
that nobody can understand (p.118).

(9) In our view, then, mastering academic writing does not mean
completely abandoning your normal voice for one that's stiff,
convoluted, or pompous, as students often assume. Instead, it means
creating a new voice that draws on the voice you already have (p.118).

These examples do many different things in addressing Standard English. They
push against the idea of there being one appropriate or correct variation of
language for academic purposes through the idea that the variation of language
the students has access to is acceptable because not using Standard English
does not make an individual, sound stupid which is highlighted in example 8.
This implies that the student's voice can belong in academia and that Standard
English is not the only variation which works, therefore it is not superior to other
variations. In addition to this, the authors also mention that an everyday voice,
which is the language variation a student walks in with, is more accessible than
the voice a student may think they need to use in their academic writing. This
also positions the student's everyday voice as appropriate in addition to not being
inferior to Standard English, which the authors note in example 9, can sound stiff,
convoluted, or pompous.  And finally, in example 9, the authors the highlight the

idea of <u>creating a new voice that draws on the voice you already have</u> which is a departure from the idea of adhering to Standard English because it draws on the linguistic practices that the students enter academia with and once again, positions them as appropriate but with the addendum that it be used to create <u>a new voice</u> which is elaborated on as the text progresses.

As the chapter progresses, the idea of appropriateness comes into play once again but this time it takes a step back from the idea of creating a new voice that draws from the voice the students have.

> (10)    This is <u>not to suggest that any language you use among friends has</u> <u>a place in academic writing</u>. Nor is it to suggest that you may fall back on your <u>everyday voice</u> as an excuse to remain in your comfort zone and avoid learning the rigorous forms and habits that characterize academic culture. After all, learning <u>new words and forms</u>—moves or templates, as we call them in this book—is <u>a major part of getting an</u> <u>education</u> (pp.118-119).

Shifting from the previous statements in examples 8 and 9, example 10 positions language that is not Standard English as inappropriate and incorrect by establishing that a<u>ny language you use among friends,</u> which is a students' <u>everyday voice,</u> does not belong in academia. This idea establishes that the voice which is the norm for students, is not the norm for academic writing. In addition to this, the idea that <u>learning new words and forms</u> is being equated with the idea of being educated, also positions the language the student comes in

60

with as inferior to the language they will learn in academia. So, despite the idea that the authors made earlier, about students' everyday language being brought into the classroom, this point that they make is actually establishing that voice does not belong in the classroom.

The authors continue to make a distinction between academic language and everyday language and do so by positioning these two variations of English as the binary of: "everydayspeak" and "academicspeak."

(11)    it is a mistake to assume that the academic and everyday are completely separate languages that can never be used together. Ultimately, we suggest, academic writing is often at its best when it combines what we call "everydayspeak" and "academicspeak" (p.119).

While there isn't an establishing of one variation of language as superior to the other, there is a positioning of academicspeak as being appropriate and correct in the classroom because it is language which is accepted in academia. This also positions academicspeak as the normal variation of language in academia so it establishes Standard English as the language which must be learned and used for students to communicate appropriately in academia.

In the following excerpt, the authors describe places where Standard English would be prioritized and the limitations which exist in those places for everyday language.

(12)    But what if your everyday language— the one you use when you're most relaxed, with family and friends—is filled with slang and

questionable grammar? And what if your <u>everyday language is an</u>

<u>ethnic or regional dialect</u>— or <u>a different language</u> altogether? <u>Is there</u>

<u>really a place for such language in academic, professional, or public</u>

<u>writing? Yes and no</u>. On the one hand, there are many situations— like

when you're applying for a job or submitting a proposal to be read by

an official screening body—in which it's probably <u>safest to write in</u>

<u>"standard" English</u> (pp.127-128).

In this example, the authors place an emphasis on appropriateness, which is tied

to superiority and correctness. The everyday language which the authors have

emphasized throughout the text, is now positioned as questionable and not

belonging due to it being  <u>filled with slang and questionable grammar</u> and

because the language may be  <u>an ethnic or regional dialect— or a different</u>

<u>language.</u> These differences which do not conform to a standard situate these

language practices as abnormal in academia, as well as inappropriate and

incorrect. In addition to this, the note that in certain situations it is <u>safest to write</u>

<u>in "standard" English</u> is perpetuating that Standard English is superior because of

its association with success as can be seen in the idea that it is the language

which should be used when, "applying for a job or submitting a proposal to be

read by an official screening body."

    After the authors established that Standard English should be adhered to

in order to succeed because it is appropriate, the authors subvert these ideas by

bringing in scholarship which focuses on linguistic variation, and these ideas are

contradictory to everything they had previously stated about language variation

belonging in academic writing in examples 10-12, but it does align more with their

earlier points in example 8 and 9.

> (13)   <u>Many prominent writers</u> mix standard written English with other
>
>       dialect or languages, employing a practice that cultural and linguistic
>
>       theorists Vershawn Ashanti Young and Suresh Canagarajah call
>
>       "<u>code-meshing (p.</u>128).

> (14)   Some might object to these <u>unconventional practices,</u> but this is
>
>       precisely Smitherman's point: that <u>our habitual language practices</u>
>
>       <u>need to be opened up</u>, and that the number of participants in the
>
>       academic conversation needs to be expanded (p.129).

The three scholars included in these two excerpts are all authors who are

renowned in the field of composition and/or linguistics and their inclusion in the

text act as a source of credibility for textbooks' authors. By including these

<u>prominent writers</u> with these ideas that focus on <u>unconventional practices</u> which

have been accepted by some in the field, they are trying to position that

composition is more flexible despite the earlier ideas that Standard English is a

necessity. These examples convey that there is room in academia for <u>our</u>

<u>habitual language practices</u>…<u>to be opened up</u>. This counters the idea of a

Standard being the norm as it acknowledges that the idea of what the norm is

needs to be expanded on.

In the last excerpt from this text, the authors make a final statement on language practices within academia.

(15)    We hope you agree with us, then, that to succeed as a college writer, you need not always set aside your everyday voice, even when that voice may initially seem unwelcome in the academic world. It is by blending everyday language with standard written English that what counts as "standard" changes and the range of possibilities open to academic writers continues to grow (p.130).

In this final example, the authors do acknowledge that linguistic variation that is not the standard is not typically welcome in the academic world. But, they reiterate despite not being welcomed, students need not always set aside your everyday voice. In addition to that, the authors recommend that the binary they presented earlier on in the chapter, everydayspeak and academicspeak, can be used together as a way to change what the norm is in academia. Of course, this acknowledging the Standard English is the norm, but they believe that it can be challenged and changed. The authors did perpetuate the idea of Standard English being appropriate and correct for certain spaces throughout the text and their templates use Standard English which positions it as the norm, but they also reiterate that the composition classroom has the potential to be a space where language practices can be challenged, but only to an extent.

3.2.4 Squeeze the Sponge

In Janzen's (2018) *Squeeze the Sponge: A No Yawn Guide to College Writing,* the author does not include a preface, so my analysis was focused on the introduction and the chapters which discuss language.

3.2.4.1 Introduction- "Matcha and Meatballs"

The introduction of the text doesn't discuss language in depth, but does explicitly acknowledge and discuss hegemony and power dynamics within academia which is usually embedded and therefore hidden (2018).

Janzen (2018) begins their text with an anecdote about a Professor she had in college. This professor made the students in the class feel like they didn't belong and created an environment in which students were positioned as lacking. This example explicitly establishes that there is power embedded within the academic institution that may not often be acknowledged or even addressed, but which still impacts students (Janzen, 2018, p.3). Within the introduction, Janzen (2018) also begins to establish that linguistic variation exists, as they mention their own linguistic practices in the textbook.

> (1) The plan is to show you how to improve what you have. At my end, I promise to talk <u>in a normal voice, not in a professorish tone</u> that makes you want to skip to the end of the chapter to see if there's a helpful summary (p.5).

The juxtaposition between the binaries of a <u>normal voice</u> and<u> a professorish tone</u> already establishes that there are differences within English. And, the acknowledgement of these very different types of language variation also paints

the idea of a normal, non <u>professorish tone</u> as being appropriate for the author to

utilize within the text.  Because of the use of <u>professorish</u> to describe a tone, the

word <u>professorish</u> situates this type of tone or language as both formal, and

inaccessible which the author appears to be pushing back against.

<u>3.2.4.2 Chapter 18- Top Three Worst Usage Errors for a College Student</u>

Chapter 18 is the first in a series of chapters which discuss language variation as

Janzen (2018) begins to explicitly focus on language and grammar.

 Despite the chapter focusing on errors, Janzen (2018) begins the chapter

by once again acknowledging the hegemony and power embedded within the

need to learn and adhere to Standard English conventions.

> (2) Please consider the thought <u>that grammar may be the last</u>
>
>  <u>bastion of unexamined privilege</u> in America. It's the sleeping kind
>
>  of <u>privilege</u>, which is often harder to detect (p. 295).
>
> (3) They <u>perpetuate the success</u> of those in the know even as they
>
>  <u>punish</u> those who don't have access to the <u>"rules"</u> (p.295).

In examples 2 and 3, Janzen (2018) discusses how Standard English's

conventions position Standard English as a variation of English which is used to

perpetuate a linguistic hierarchy which allows for linguistic discrimination. Janzen

also acknowledges that Standard English is positioned as a dialect of English

which is treated as if it is the norm, correct, appropriate, and superior to other

dialects by acknowledging the power embedded in this positioning and how

those who <u>don't have access to the "rules"</u> are punished and those who do, are

deemed successful. In these examples, Janzen (2018) is pushing back against the idea of Standard English by discussing how standard language ideologies work.

Despite the early acknowledgement of hegemonic power embedded within the use of Standard English, the message being perpetuated throughout the rest of the chapters on language is that Standard English must be adopted. Throughout chapters 18-20, Janzen (2018) repeatedly positions Standard English as the norm, superior to other dialects, correct and appropriate.

In the following examples, Standard English is discussed in regard to the idea of success and how its correct use will be a marker of that success for an individual.

> (4) "I am sorry to report that the very people who will be in charge of evaluating, hiring and promoting you may be using your grammar <u>as a measure of your professional competence</u> (pp.295-296).
>
> (5) So sure, you can get your writing out there. But can you <u>gain access to the highest cultural echelons without good grammar</u>? (p.297).

In example 4, the author first positions Standard English as both appropriate and correct by commodifying this variety of English. In this example, Janzen (2018) appears to view Standard English as a key to success given that adherence to it can lead to being hired or even promoted.

In this example, the use of competence in regard to adherence to Standard English, marks its usage as superior, the norm, appropriate and correct which is perpetuating standard language ideologies despite the earlier acknowledgement that adherence to the rules is the "last bastion of unexamined privilege" (Janzen, 2018, p. 295). And in example 5, the positioning of Standard English as superior comes in play with the idea of accessing Standard English as a means to gain access to the highest cultural echelons which means that Standard English is a language used by those who are in a superior position socially.

Following the discussion about why Standard English conventions must be learned and adhered to, Janzen (2018) then shifts to explaining the top 3 most frequently seen errors in academic writing

(6) Of all usage errors you can make in college these are the most cringeworthy (p.298).

(7) Since these usage errors occur in writing submitted for a college grade, they say, "I value and pursue the goals of higher education.' But they simultaneously say something incompatible with the first thing. "Too bad I don't know what a sentence is!" (p.298).

When describing errors, Janzen (2018) makes the decision to describe said errors as cringeworthy and that not adhering to Standard English conventions promotes the idea that an individual does not know what a sentence is. These descriptions position the language user as inferior to those who adhere to

68

Standard English because not using that standard which is the norm, correct and appropriate conveys the idea that, "Too bad I don't know what a sentence is!"

In the next example, Janzen (2018) describes the three most common errors in academic writing.

(8) So without further ado, I give you the Trifecta of Shame (298). Using the word shame to describe errors is positioning those who do not adhere to Standard English as inferior, incorrect, inappropriate and outside the norm because their language use is connected to the idea of shame. So, this would also mean that anyone who essentially commits an error, is committing an act to be ashamed of. This taps in to the idea that Standard English is the language of the educated, which is problematic because if students come into a classroom and are told their errors are part of the Trifecta of Shame, then this can impact their identity as both a writer and as a person

In the next excerpt, Janzen (2018) continues with the describing of errors in a derogatory way through an arbitrary ranking of errors based on their uh-oh factor (302).

(9) I'm presenting these three maximum-impact usage errors in order of the uh-oh factor, from least to most. Fragments are slightly more appalling than comma splices. This is because they send the signal that you can't even articulate a complete thought (p.302).

In this example, Janzen (2018) once again reiterates that committing errors positions the writer as a person who <u>can't even articulate a complete thought</u>. In addition to this, the author also uses words like <u>uh-oh factor</u> and <u>slightly more appalling</u> to describe language variation which does not adhere to Standard English conventions. This unfortunately once again, positions a person not adhering to a standard as inferior, incorrect, inappropriate and outside the norm because they are not following the conventions.

In the final example from this chapter, Janzen (2018) rationalizes why grammar rules are needed and why Standard English conventions need to be learned.

> (10)    If <u>grammar rule</u>s have any one redeeming thing going  for them, it's that they can help us <u>express ourselves with clarity</u> (p.305).

According to Janzen, (2018) grammar rules allow an individual to express themselves in a way that is clear to its reader. But by claiming that Standard English needs to be used to be clear implies that not following these rules will make an individual unclear. A grammatical sentence does not always equate to a clear sentence, but since this isn't acknowledged, Janzen (2018) is perpetuating the idea that the standard is always clear so it is always correct.

<u>3.2.4.3 Chapter 19: The Orator's Dilemma</u>

Similar to earlier claims that the use of Standard English is connected to academic success, Janzen (2018) once again uses career and financial success

to reiterate how important adhering to a standard is. Janzen does this in the following examples as the author highlights that using the incorrect pronoun, or overall language, will make you lose out on lucrative opportunities.

> (11) If you confidently utter the wrong pronoun, people wil<u>l (a) judge you</u> and (b) have a concrete reason <u>to move on to the next applicant</u> (p.312).

> (12) We all know, of course, that it is illegal to discriminate based on race, age-sexual orientation, or ethnicity. But <u>discriminating on the basis of bad grammar is perfectly legal, and many employers do it</u> (p.312).

Both of these examples position Standard English as appropriate for the work force which means other varieties of English are categorized as inappropriate. By positioning one variety of English as correct through the idea that an individual will be judged and passed up for a job, Janzen (2018) is saying that despite the intelligence, knowledge and training a person may have, they will be categorized as lacking because they can't use a pronoun correctly. In example 12, Janzen (2018) acknowledges that linguistic discrimination is legal which can be viewed as acknowledging the power structure embedded within Standard English which keeps it in a position power. But, because Janzen (2018) is stating this to remind people that they need to adhere to a standard, the author is perpetuating the idea that the standard is appropriate and superior and how disregarding that would

71

position a person who doesn't adhere to Standard English as being inappropriate and inferior.

Janzen (2018) doubles down on this stance when acknowledging that even if an argument is "eloquent," an individual still be judged if their argument doesn't adhere to Standard English.

> (13)    Objecting to grammar issues **doesn't make them go away**. What I'm saying is you can make an eloquent, insightful argument about the sexist/classist/racist implications of traditional grammar rules, and you will find people like me to nod and give you an intellectual thumbs up…But at the end of the day the clarity of you communication will still be judged by bosses, supervisors, professor, editors, proofers (p.314).

In example 10, Janzen (2018) equates clarity with the adherence to Standard English, which is reiterated in this example as the author states that not adhering to the standard will result in an individual being judged. In addition to this idea, even when discussing the idea of pushing against Standard English, Janzen (2018) makes it a point to state that, "Objecting to grammar issues **doesn't make them go away**" which means that even if you have an eloquent, insightful argument, which may be applauded by academics who may reference the importance of linguistic diversity in the classroom, it doesn't matter because Standard English is the norm, correct, appropriate and superior to other dialects so it would still be considered wrong. Ultimately, according to Janzen (2018)

adhering to Standard English won't get you judged regardless of the content of your argument.

Chapter 20: Why People Make Such a Big Deal About Pronouns

In the Chapter 20, Janzen (2018) explains the repercussions on the identity of the language user due to not adhering to Standard English's grammatical conventions.

First, Janzen (2018) acknowledges that the grammar rules are <u>obscure</u> because all grammatical rules are arbitrary.

(14)     Knowing this <u>seemingly obscure grammar distinction</u> is one of the best things you can do to <u>boost your wow factor</u>, both in speaking and in writing (pp.317-318).

According to Janzen (2018), adhering to Standard English is still one of the "best things" a person can do because of its ability to <u>boost your wow factor,</u> which implies an individual is impressive because of their ability to learn and use arbitrarily derived rules correctly. This perpetuates Standard English as a variation of language which is superior to other dialects because adhering to its arbitrary rules positions a speaker as more than, appropriate or correct, and it gives them a <u>wow factor</u>.

Janzen (2018) continues to elaborate on the impression an individual gives through the adherence of Standard English.

(15)     But wouldn't you rather she be impressed by it? <u>A breezy, confident whom is like a firm handshake</u>. It adverts to brisk

preparation and professional force. Like the firm handshake, <u>a confidently uttered object pronoun</u> says, "I may wear the occasional reindeer sweater in the privacy of my own home, but <u>I will never embarrass this company </u>(p.318).

The use of the word <u>whom </u>is likened to a professional state of being as the idea of a firm handshake is used to describe how using this word correctly and appropriately raises the value of an individual. According to this textbook, an individual who uses object pronouns correctly is positioned as superior, at least to a potential employer because using language correctly and appropriately is emphasized through the idea that an employee is conveying that they <u>will never embarrass the company</u>, which of course makes them a superior candidate which should be hired.

    After establishing how adhering to Standard English conventions can position an individual in a positive position, Janzen (2018) then explains how not adhering to these conventions positions an individual in a negative light.

      (16)     It's time for me to alert you to a usage error that often <u>makes educated folks wince</u> (p.326).

      (17)     This is a particular kind of plebiscite. By plebiscite, I refer not to the familiar definition but to a common social practice that <u>signals a lack of education</u> (p.326).

      (18)     A plebian is a commoner, someone<u> lacking in refinement or class awareness</u>. Personally, I find the term a bit offensive. But if

you think that's offensive, wait'll you see this. <u>The plebiscite I want to bring to your attention is the most common form of what grammarians call hypercorrection</u> (pp.326-327).

These three examples use education and class to devalue the language of the individual using that "incorrect" language because of grammar/usage mistakes. Although Janzen (2018) states that hypercorrection is the plebiscite, <u>The plebiscite I want to bring to your attention is the most common form of what grammarians call hypercorrection,</u> the inextricable link between language and identity means that the description of an individual's language practice extends to an individual's identity. The idea that hypercorrection will make <u>educated folks wince,</u> <u>signals a lack of education,</u> and signifies that an individual is <u>lacking in refinement or class awareness</u> perpetuates that using Standard English and adhering to its conventions is correct, appropriate, superior, and the norm because otherwise, nonadherence is a marker of being lower class in terms of language practice and the language user.

As Janzen (2018) continues to discuss hypercorrection, the author continues to position this "error" as something that continues to be a marker which can be used to position an individual as lacking or lesser than someone who does not make the mistake of hypercorrection.

(19)    Here is the most <u>embarrassing</u> form of hypercorrection (p.322).

(20)     There is no situation in which hypercorrection does not smell

like <u>desperation</u> (pp.332-333).

(21)     We can use reflexive pronouns in two ways without giving

folks the <u>heebie-jeebies</u> (p.333).

Following the labeling of hypercorrection as <u>embarrassing</u> and as a practice

which is <u>desperate</u> and causes the<u> heebie-jeebies </u>Janzen (2018) continues

labeling this in a way which positions an individual as abnormal, inferior, incorrect

and inappropriate because of the effect the error has on the perception of the

individual.

Despite the acknowledgement of language and power and arbitrary rules,

ultimately Janzen's (2018) conclusion still reiterates that the rules for the

standard must be learned and adhered to.

(22)     Meanwhile our day-to-day writing got <u>more and more casual</u>

with the advent of social media. Few readers of casual writing

noticed and even fewer cared.<u> And now it sounds familiar</u>

<u>enough to seem correct. It isn't</u>. This is why, in your shoes, <u>I</u>

<u>would learn the difference between who and whom</u> (pp.337-338).

In this example, Janzen (2018) discusses how even though language has

changed because all languages change, that doesn't mean that Standard English

should not be adhered to. As Janzen (2018) notes, although language that does

not follow English conventions <u>sounds familiar enough to seem correct. It isn't.</u>

This is an important point because it establishes that correct and appropriate

76

language isn't correct and appropriate because it is accessible, instead the idea

of correct, appropriate, superior and the norm actually come from the following

arbitrary rules which have hegemony and power embedded within which

positions it as a standard which must be followed.

The overall message of this text emphasizes that the failure to follow the

standard puts an individual at risk for being labeled as sounding desperate, a

plebiscite and many other derogatory phrases used when describing errors.

### 3.2.5 everything's an argument

In my analysis of this text, the introduction was excluded as part of the

analysis because of the lack of conversation regarding language. And although I

have previously mentioned that the lack of conversation about language typically

equates to the positioning of Standard English as the norm, since this text

included conversation about language in the other two chapters, I chose to focus

on the examples in the preface and chapter rather than on the lack of a

conversation in the introduction.

### 3.2.5.1 Preface

Lunsford et al. (2018) conversation about language first comes from their

inclusion of the CWPA outcomes. As previously discussed, given that the only

acknowledgement of language practice is connected to the CWPA outcome in

the preface, the text is thus positioning Standard English as the variation of

English which students must learn the conventions of in order to be successful.

(1) *Everything's an Argument with Readings* works with the Council of Writing Program Administrators' Outcomes Statement for first-year composition courses (p.xii).

(2) Knowledge of Conventions: Develop knowledge of linguistic structures, including grammar, punctuation, and spelling through practice in composing and revising (p.xv).

In example 1, the authors make it clear that their text goals are aligned with the CWPA's outcomes. Example 2 directly comes from the outcomes and discusses the importance of learning conventions, which in this case, are the conventions of Standard English. This of course, perpetuates that Standard English must be learned in order to succeed, which is positioning this variation of English as the correct variation of language, which is the norm for all college classes which then gets perpetuated beyond academia because it becomes associated with the idea of being educated.

3.2.5.2 Chapter 13- Styles in Argument

Although the authors did state that their goals for the students outcome is based on CWPA outcomes, thus, its focus is on Standard English, this chapter discusses language, and does so in a progressive way which is more aligned with the scholarship than the other textbooks in this study.

In this chapter, the text shifts the way it discusses language. Standard English is explicitly talked about as a separate variation from other variations of language. This important to note because explicitly talking about a standard and

other varieties of English establishes that differences in the language exists. But, this positions one type of English as the norm, and others as abnormal or nonstandard.

    (3) These examples use different style but are written in <u>standard English</u> with a <u>bit of slang</u> mixed into the blog post (p.322).

In example 3, Standard English is still referred to as the standard which places it as the norm in academia, especially as the norm in relation to the "bit of slang" the authors mention which is therefore positioned as nonstandard or abnormal. Although Standard English is still the norm, the acknowledgement of different variations of English in this example is the beginning of a larger conversation about linguistic variation.

    An important shift to note in Chapter 13 is when Lunsford et al. (2018) begin to talk more in depth about language as they begin to explore linguistic variation. In the next few examples, the authors utilize a technical approach as they use linguistic terms, and various authors as a way to establish that the language is varied and complex.

    (4) In the <u>multilingual, polyglot world</u> we live in today, however, writers are also <u>mixing languages</u> (as Gloria Anzaldúa does when she shifts from English to Spanish to Spanglish in her *Borderlands: La Frontera*) as well as <u>mixing dialects and languages</u> (p.322).

In example 4, the authors recognize that linguistic variation is the norm, which is a contrast from the positioning of Standard English as the norm which they did

throughout the text. Through the description of the world as both <u>multilingual</u> and

<u>polyglot,</u> the authors are establishing that monolingualism is not the norm even

though it may be positioned as such in academia and in American society.  In

addition to the acknowledgment that the world is <u>multilingual</u> and <u>polyglot</u>, the

authors also bring up the concepts of <u>mixing dialects and languages</u>. While

bringing up these concepts, the authors mention established author Gloria

Anzaldúa and her text as a way to establish that <u>mixing dialects and languages</u> is

acceptable because a writer who did it is an established published author, then

obviously this is something that can be done, albeit is still not the norm.

> (5) This <u>trilingual turn</u> recognized that <u>English itself exists in many forms</u>
>
> (Singaporean English, Canadian English, New Zealand English, and so
>
> on), that many writers of English speak and write a <u>variety of other</u>
>
> <u>languages</u>, and that many if not most writers '<u>code mesh,'</u> a term scholar
>
> Suresh Canagarajah defines as 'a strategy for merging l<u>ocal varieties with</u>
>
> <u>standard written Englishes </u>in a move toward more gradually <u>pluralizing</u>
>
> <u>academic writing</u> and developing <u>multilingual competence </u>for transnational
>
> relationships' (p.323).

In example 5, the authors continue discussing linguistic variation as they bring up

the terms <u>code mesh, trilingual, multilingual competence</u>, and <u>pluralizing</u>

<u>academic writing</u>. In addition to these terms, the authors also acknowledge

linguistic variation as they state that <u>English itself exists in many forms</u> and that

many people use a <u>variety of other languages</u>. Similar to the previous example,

the authors cite linguist Suresh Canagarajah as a source to back up their claims. The use of linguistic terms, and similar to the previous example, the name of an established author in this section establishes credibility which may be needed because the information they are sharing isn't universally agreed upon due to the strong hold that standard language ideologies have on academia and American society.

Despite the push against Standard English that can be seen in examples 4 and 5, the authors do eventually return to the reiteration for the need to adhere to a standard.

(6) <u>In spite</u> of the <u>extensive work</u> on translingualism and code meshing, many academic arguments today still <u>call for a formal or professional style using standard written English</u> (p.324).

Although the authors acknowledge that the information on translingualism and code meshing isn't widely accepted, they do reiterate the importance of using Standard English because of the demands of academia. This means that Standard English's position as the standard which must be adhered to is due to the demands of academia which solidifies its position as being the norm and superior, and at the same time reinforces the idea that Standard English is still considered correct and appropriate for academic writing.

Even while reinforcing Standard English, the authors acknowledge the embedded hegemonic power structure involved in the positioning of Standard English as the standard.

(7) But what may be most remarkable about the style is how little it draws

attention to itself-and that's usually deliberate (p.324).

The idea of how the style doesn't draw attention to itself and how the ability to do

so is deliberate is acknowledging the fact that Standard English and standard

language ideologies have a power which allows it to remain unmarked and

unacknowledged. The inclusion of this idea in the text reveals that Standard

English is the norm, and it remains in place as the norm because it goes

unchecked despite the fact that variations which the authors say are backed by

extensive research exist.

In the final example, the use of the term everyday language is establishing

that Standard English, which has been positioned as the norm because of the

CWPA outcomes at the beginning of the text, is different than the other variations

of language that people use on a daily basis. So although everyday language is

used every day and is meant to make your readers connect with you, it still is not

the norm because it is not the standard.

(8) When you use everyday language in arguments, readers are more likely

to identify with you personally and, possibly with the ideas you represent

or advocate. In effect, such vocabulary choices lessen the distance

between you and the readers (p.325).

This example shows that accessibility isn't the key to academic writing. Instead,

learning and adhering to Standard English is positioned as the primary goal when

it comes to the language used in writing, especially because it is one of the

82

expected outcomes included in the preface of the textbook. Ultimately, this example reveals that Standard English which is treated as the norm, and positioned as correct, appropriate and superior takes precedence over language which is accessible to more readers.

# CHAPTER FOUR:

# IMPLICATIONS OF MY RESULTS

## 4.1 Implications

The textbooks in this study primarily worked as pedagogical materials which perpetuated standard language ideology through the ideas of superiority of language, correctness, appropriateness and the normalization of the standard. Although it is the institution which reinforces ideology, it is important to note, as Strauss and Feiz (2014) do, that, "Dominance is jointly produced" so the textbooks, with the power of the institutions, reinforce the idea of how language should be produced. Textbook's positioning in the classroom "with their legitimized knowledge, facilitate the processes of socialization in schooling to confirm and conserve existing social roles, norms, and values and thus perpetuate existing social structures" (Curdt-Christiansen, 2017). Textbooks are also positioned as pedagogical materials which can empower students by teaching the dominant discourse, but in fact, work to disempower students because it reiterates that their linguistic practices don't belong in academia. The binaries of standard and non-standard, formal and informal, which the multiple textbooks included reinforce the idea that there are some people who belong in academia and some who don't belong in academia and this is decided through an individual's linguistic abilities.

The scholarship discussed in chapter one and the textbook content shows us that there is still a pervasive gap between the scholarship and pedagogical materials. But, because some of the texts do discuss linguistic diversity and talk about language variation, it appears that there is some progress moving forward despite the fact that all of the textbooks still replicate the idea that Standard English is required. Specifically, *Squeeze the Sponge*, *They Say, I Say* and *everything's an argument*, all discuss language diversity. *Squeeze the Sponge* includes a discussion on power and linguistic discrimination. *They Say, I Say*, cites scholars who discuss the idea of opening up the idea of language variation in academia and even mention the idea of bringing the student's voice into the classroom. And finally, in *everything's an argument*, the most progressive of the texts, the authors talk about multilingualism, linguistic variation, challenging Standard English in academia. Unfortunately, these three texts still come to the conclusion that Standard English is still the standard and its conventions must be learned for success in academia and in the workplace. All three texts still position Standard English as the norm, correct, appropriate and superior to other dialects because it is associated with education, competence and clarity.

While the scholarship is doing the right thing, our pedagogical materials are still falling short. Given the importance placed on textbooks, especially when they are used to guide instruction in some classrooms, having materials which perpetuate standard language ideologies assigned frequently because they are

not being examined in a way which undercovers embedded ideologies or which compare the scholarship to the materials is an issue which must be addressed. In order to ensure that our pedagogical materials align with the scholarship, textbooks are going to have to do several things including being "radically" revised because of the profound effect they have on instructors, their teaching practices and students' identity (Welch, 1987). When textbooks open up the idea of language variation in academia and acknowledge that "writing is an element in each person's language capability and should be taught with this idea in mind" (Bleich, 1999, p. 21), then the textbooks can be viewed as being aligned with composition and linguistic scholarship.

Some of the textbooks tried to do this by discussing code meshing which is "multidialectalism and plurilingualism in one speech act" that "blends dialects, international languages, local idioms, chat-room ling, and the rhetorical styles of various ethnic and cultural groups in both formal and informal speech acts" so the inclusion of code meshing can be viewed as a step forward (Young, 2010, p.67). Unfortunately, despite any of the steps forward that some of the texts took, they were all created with the idea of monoglossic language ideologies which "position[s] idealized monolingualism in a standardized national language as the norm to which all national subjects should aspire'' (Flores & Rosa, 2015, 151). These monoglossic ideologies are upheld as the norm, as opposed to heteroglossic language ideologies. Heteroglossic language ideologies favor multilingualism and embraces concepts  like code meshing or even

translanguaging which is "The ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system" (Canagarajah, 2011). And textbooks can also take a note of critical pedagogy which "asks how and why knowledge gets constructed the way it does, and how and why some constructions of reality are legitimated and celebrated by dominant culture while others clearly are not" (McLaren, 2002, pp.133-14) in order to reveal to students that ideologies exist, how they work, and for them to also have the knowledge needed to challenge standards which leads to the possibility of change. In addition to all of this, in order for textbooks to be more linguistically diverse, they can't just acknowledge the scholarship or incorporate information like code-meshing or that ideologies exists, instead they have to "move beyond the idea that establishing the legitimacy of all linguistic practices will somehow lead to the eradication of linguistic stigmatization" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p162) and be more active in the push back against standard language ideologies and any ideas which don't perform the anti-racist, anti-white supremacist work which Beavers et al. (2021) stated is missing from pedagogical materials and even from notable documents such as the CWPA's passive acceptance of Standard English in their outcomes.

While the textbooks which were the most frequently assigned from the four higher education institutions in the Inland Empire fell short of reflecting the need for linguistically diverse materials, there is still push back happening within these institutions. In many FYC classrooms at California State University, San

Bernardino for example, textbooks in general are being assigned less frequently because materials like readers, individual journal articles and essays are assigned in the classroom. Through the construction of pedagogical materials like readers, instructors have the ability to choose the themes of their readings and can ensure that their pedagogical materials reflect their pedagogy and the scholarship which is missing from textbooks. In addition to the construction of their own readings, many professors incorporate their past student's writing as examples for other students which according to Welch (1987) conveys that language has the "inherent ability" to change which is a key idea in composition and linguistic scholarship. The acknowledgement that language does change contradicts the idea of Standard English as the standard and pushes against the reliance on "predetermined, singular, habits of White language (HOWL)" (Beavers et al., 2021). An important strategy which reflects linguistic diversity and which can be implemented in textbooks and course readers is, "beginning with the writing students' own idiolects and the linguistic communities they come from" because "this kind of freshman writing course persuades students of how they know language and how they are already experts at it" (Welch, 1987, p. 277). By valuing the various dialects which come in the classroom, and highlighting how clarity can come from language other than the standard and that language can be accessible and appropriate are ways in which professors can perpetuate the ideas which exist in scholarship rather than perpetuate standard language ideologies.

As I previously stated, there is some progress which has been made with some textbooks as seen in the acknowledgement of scholarship that highlighted the importance of linguistic diversity and language variation which has existed for so long. But again, when examining how Standard English is positioned as the norm, not only in texts but in important documents like the CWPA's outcomes, it is obvious that an overhaul must be done if institutions and materials are going to reflect what the scholarship has long been saying. Given the unique position that FYC classes maintain in academia, the composition classroom has an opportunity to be a space which is truly inclusive of different language practices which can potentially have a profound effect on a student's language attitudes and practices. But it won't be until we see the scholarship reflected throughout the field, when all FYC classes can become the space that so many believe it can be.

REFERENCES

Axelrod, R.B. & Cooper, C. (2019) *The St. Martin's guide to writing.* (12th ed.).

    Bedford/St. Martin's.

Axelrod, R.B., Cooper, C., & Warriner, A.M. (2017). *Reading critically, writing*

    *well: A reader and a guide.* (11th ed.). Bedford/St. Martin's.

Beavers M., Brunk-Chavez, B.L., Greene, N.-L., Inoue, A.B., Ruiz, I., Saenkhum,

    T., & Young, V.A. (2021, June 11). *Abbreviated statement toward first-*

    *year composition goals* [Google Doc] Institute of Race, Rhetoric, and

    Literacy. Retrieved from

    https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A0YO3K4IVIJLJTNSBGl5HJKOddd

    AK73spe2GbOmJn1w/edit

Beavers M., Brunk-Chavez, B.L., Greene, N.-L., Inoue, A.B., Ruiz, I., Saenkhum,

    T., & Young, V.A. (2021, September 3rd). *Toward antiracist first-year*

    *composition goals* [Google Doc]. Retrieved from

    https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xFhdJOIC8Lh4pZRKFIjPeWiUd2dw

    oRJ16tfiVxJAIDs/edit#

Bleich, D. (1999). In case of fire, throw in (What to do with textbooks once you

    switch to sourcebooks). In F.G. Gale & X.L. Gale (Eds.), *(Re)Visioning*

    *Composition Textbooks: Conflicts of Culture, Ideology, and Pedagogy* (pp

    15-42). State University of New York Press.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition:

    Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication, 57*(4),

    pp.586-619. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20456910

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable

    strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401–417.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2019). *WPA outcomes statement for*

    *first-year composition.* WPA Council.

    https://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/243055/_PARENT/la

    yout_details/false

Conference on College Composition & Communication. (1974). Student's right to

    their own language. *College Composition and Communication 25*(3), pp.1-

    32.

Curdt-Christiansen, X.L. (2017). Language socialization through textbooks. In

    Duff, P., & May S. (Eds.) *Language socialization Encyclopedia of*

    *language and education* (3rd ed.). (pp. 195-210). Springer

Davila, B. (2016). The inevitability of "standard" English; Discursive constructions

    of standard language ideologies. *Written Communications, 32*(2), pp. 127-

    148. http://doi.org/10.1177/0741088316632186

*Everything's an argument.* (n.d.). Macmillan Learning. Retrieved April 20, 2022,

    https://www.macmillanlearning.com/college/us/product/Everythings-An-

    Argument-with-2020-APA-Update/p/1319362389

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power.* Longman Inc.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific
     research. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse
     analysis*, pp.121-138. Sage Publications.

Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak. R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In
     Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed.,
     pp. 357-378). Sage.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J., (2015).  Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic
     ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational
     Review, 85*(2), 149-171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Bergman Ramos, Trans).
     Continuum International Publishing Group. (Original work published 1968)

Graff, G. & Birkenstein, C. (2018). *They say/I say* (4th ed.)*.* W.W Norton &
     Company.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.*
     Routledge.

Inoue, A. (2021, April 18). Why I left the CWPA council of writing [Blog Post].
     Retrieved from http://asaobinoue.blogspot.com/2021/04/why-i-left-cwpa-
     council-of-writing.html

Inoue, A. (2021, June 11). First-year composition goals statement [Blog Post].
     Retrieved from http://asaobinoue.blogspot.com/2021/06/first-year-
     composition-goals-statement.html

Janzen, R. (2018). *Squeeze the sponge: A no-yawn guide to college writing.* Flip

    Learning.

Knoblauch, A.A. (2011). A textbook argument: Definitions of argument in leading

    composition textbooks. *College Composition and Communication, 63*(2),

    p.244-268.  https://www.jstor.org/stable/23131584

Lippi-Green, R (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and*

    *discrimination in the United States*. Routledge.

Liu, P. (2010). White prestige ideology, identity, and investment: ESL

    composition class as a site of resistance and accommodation for

    Taiwanese students [Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University of

    Pennsylvania]. Knowledge Repository @IUP

Lunsford, A.A., Ruszkiewicz, J.J., & Walters, K. (2019). *Everything's an argument*

    *with readings.* (8th ed.). Bedford/St. Martin's.

Matsuda, P.K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college

    composition. *College English, 68*(6). pp. 637-651.

    https://doi.org/10.2307/25472180

McLaren, P. Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In Antonia Darder

    et al. (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 69-96). Routlege/Falmer.

Rogers, R. (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education.*

    Routledge.

Russell, A. L. (2018). The politics of academic language: Towards a framework

    for analyzing language representations in FYC textbooks. *Composition*

    *Forum, 38*. http://compositionforum.com/issue/38/language.php

*The St. Martin's guide to writing.* (n.d.). Macmillan Learning. Retrieved April 20,

    2022, https://www.macmillanlearning.com/college/us/product/The-St.-

    Martins-Guide-to-Writing/p/1319104371

Smitherman, G. (2003). The historical struggle for language rights in CCCC. In

    Smitherman, G. & Villanueva, V. (Eds.), *Language diversity in the*

    *classroom: From intention to practice* (pp. 7-39). Southern Illinois

    University Press.

Stoddart, M. C. J. (2007). Ideology, hegemony, discourse: A critical review of

    theories of knowledge and power. *Social Thought and Research, 38,* pp.

    191-225. http://dx.doi.org/10.17161/STR.1808.5226

Strauss, S & Feiz, P. (2014). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.)*.* Routledge

*Squeeze the sponge: A no-yawn guide to college writing.* (n.d.). Flip Learning.

    Retrieved April 20, 2022, from https://fliplearning.com/book/squeeze-the-

    sponge-a-no-yawn-guide-to-college-writing/

United States Census Bureau. (2020). *2016-2020 American community survey 5-*

    *year estimates: Language spoken at home* [SAS Data file]. Retrieved from

    https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?t=Language%20Spoken%20at%20H

    ome&g=0100000US_0400000US06_0500000US06065,06071&y=2020&ti

    d=ACSST5Y2020.S1601&moe=false

Welch, K. (1987). Ideology and freshman textbook production: The place of

   theory in writing pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication,*

   *38*(3). pp. 269-282. https://doi.org/10.2307/357747

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2016). Critical discourse studies: History, agenda,

   theory and methodology. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (Eds.), *Methods of*

   *critical discourse studies* (3rd ed., pp.1-22). Sage Publications Ltd.

Wolfram, W. & Schilling, N. (2016). *American English: Dialects and variation* (3rd

   ed.). John Wiley & Sons Incorporated

Young, V.A. (2010).  Should writers use they own English? *Iowa Journal of*

   *Cultural Studies 12*(1), pp.110-118. https://doi.org/10.17077/2168-

   569X.1095