The Path to *Translingual*: A History of the Globalization of English in Composition Studies

Elizabeth Marie Anthony

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Rhetoric and Writing

Paul V. Heilker
Clare J. Dannenberg
Kelly E. Pender
Katrina M. Powell
Christine M. Tardy

April 30, 2013
Blacksburg, VA

Keywords: Composition, ESL, Language, Multilingual, Translingual

The Path to *Translingual*: A History of the Globalization of English in Composition Studies

Elizabeth Marie Anthony

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a history of the representations of linguistically diverse international students within composition studies. The project highlights some of the many terms that have been used to represent linguistically diverse writers, such as *ESL*, *EFL*, *multilingual*, and *nonnative*, tracing the path to the concept of translingualism currently used by composition scholars. This research responds to Paul Matsuda's argument in "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor" that "[u]ntil fairly recently, discussions of English as a Second Language (ESL) issues in composition studies have been few and far between" (699). This dissertation contends that Matsuda overstates his claim when he argues that composition, as a field, has not been overly concerned with the topic of second language speakers. Indeed, this topic has been emphasized throughout the field's scholarship and has even contributed to the formation of the field itself.

Specifically, the dissertation analyzes the journals *College English* between 1939-1950 and *College Composition and Communication* between 1950-2013 to examine the conversations about multilingual writers and students in the field of composition. Through an analysis of these journals, it becomes apparent that discussions about international students in U.S. classrooms today have strong antecedents in the conversations of our past. And these conversations about international, linguistically diverse writers have been a continuous force in the creation and evolution of mainstream thinking in the field. By tracing these evolving conversations, the project demonstrates how the field of composition has reached the translingual moment currently researched by composition scholars. The dissertation concludes that translingualism, as a developing theory, still calls for more research that emphasizes pedagogical techniques that use a translingual approach to language.

Acknowledgments

I have been lucky throughout this process to have the help of many mentors, colleagues, and friends along the way. I want to thank Paul Heilker for his enthusiasm, encouragement, close reading of my work, and mostly, for being a wonderful mentor. My committee members—Clare Dannenberg, Kelly Pender, Katrina Powell, and Christine Tardy—have provided invaluable advice and feedback, and I am fortunate to have so many wonderful role models for both my career and my life.

Thank you, too, to Diana George and Carlos Evia, who have provided morale boosts, mentorship, and friendship. To my excellent cohort and all the graduate students in the Rhetoric and Writing program at Virginia Tech, I am proud to be your colleague, and I look forward to seeing the amazing work you do in the future. Heidi Lawrence has been there for me during every step of the process: brainstorming, writing, revisions, complaints, and celebrations. I couldn't ask for a better officemate or friend. And Tim Lockridge—my source of strength, my calming influence, and my companion—thank you for your profound and unwavering faith in me. Every day, you inspire me to be a better scholar, human being, and friend.

And finally, thank you to my wonderful parents and my loving family for offering "mortal" (and moral) support throughout not only this process but for my whole life. You have always encouraged me to do what I love, and this labor of love would not have been possible without your support, love, and enthusiasm. Thank you for teaching me the arts of discernment, hard work, and optimism.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

During the fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters, a group of Virginia Tech Rhetoric and Writing faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate tutors from the Virginia Tech Writing Center have been meeting as a reading group to discuss topics related to working with international, multilingual students in the classroom and writing center. This group, of which I am a part, has talked about the changing role of the field of composition as the English language continues to globalize. We have asked questions regarding the role of a standard English, and we have questioned the existence of one standard variety of the language. We have wondered if we should allow students to compose and speak in multiple languages in the composition classroom. And if we do encourage this translingual approach to writing, we have wondered what this might say about the role of compositionists.

The questions this Rewriting Language(s), Composition, and Error group have identified and tried to work through are ones that compositionists have been having, to some extent, since even before composition's instantiation as a field in the 1960s. Today, scholars in the field who discuss linguistic diversity, including Min-Zhan Lu, Bruce Horner, Paul Matsuda, and Suresh Canagarajah, push to broaden the scope of how writing is taught in the U.S. to individuals who speak English as something in addition to or other than their first language(s). Their emphasis on incorporating linguistic diversity in the classroom, which includes concepts such as translingualism and codemeshing, seems to go against traditional notions of what is supposed to happen in writing classrooms, such as the teaching of standard English rules and academic expectations. And, beyond the classroom, these scholars have begun to encourage not just students but professionals in and outside the field to embrace multilingualism as the linguistic

norm of all individuals.

In recent years, compositionists have become increasingly interested in the topic of linguistic diversity. A 2006 special issue of *College English*, the Thomas R. Watson conference in 2010, the 2011 Penn State Rhetoric and Writing Across Language Boundaries conference, and various Richard Braddock award winning articles over the past decade have responded to issues of language diversity in the field, showing that the field has, at least in recent years, recognized the importance of working through and researching this topic (Braddock Award Winners: Anne-Marie Pedersen, "Negotiating Cultural Identities through Language: Academic English in Jordan," December 2010; A. Suresh Canagarajah, "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued," June 2006; Min-Zhan Lu, "An Essay on the Work of Composition: Composing English against the Order of Fast Capitalism," September 2004; Bruce Horner and John Trimbur, "English Only and U.S. College Composition," June 2002). Other threads of this conversation in recent years have included debates about code switching versus code meshing, the concept of World Englishes, and the evolution and use of English for non-capitalist purposes (see Vershawn Ashanti Young's "'Nah, We Straight': An Argument Against Code Switching," A. Suresh Canagarajah's "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued," and Min-Zhan Lu's "Living-English Work").

This dissertation responds to Paul Matsuda's exhortation: "What I want to call into question is why the issue of language difference has not become a central concern for *everyone* who is involved in composition instruction, research, assessment, and administration" ("The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. Composition" 82). If language difference is not a "central concern" to all compositionists, this project examines how it has, at the very least, been

a recurring topic examined by core groups of compositionists over time. While we know that linguistically diverse writers are part of our collective conversations in the field of composition today, what we do not know is how they have actually been discussed, represented, and imagined throughout the field's history. It is imperative that we study this history of the representations of linguistically diverse writers in order both to see the antecedents of our contemporary discussions about multilingualism and to better understand how these discussions have led compositionists to reexamine their pedagogical and public purposes and goals. By remaining ignorant of this history, we impede our ability to engage and intervene as a discipline with ethical, professional, pedagogical, and political conversations about globalization, diversity, and internationalism.

Therefore, my research seeks to uncover the conversations composition scholars have had about linguistically diverse writers throughout the history of the field. By examining these conversations, I also explore how compositionists concerned with linguistic diversity might encourage others to examine their discursive practices—how they name, describe, label, categorize, render, invoke, imagine—the individuals they are discussing in order to better understand, embrace, and implement possibilities of translingualism. My work highlights some of the many terms that have been used to represent linguistically diverse writers, such as *ESL*, *EFL*, and *nonnative*, tracing the path to the concept of translingualism currently extolled by scholars today. As linguistically diverse international students continue to enroll in U.S. universities, it is essential for academics to examine our embedded assumptions and practices regarding these students and how best to teach them.

This dissertation is in the same tradition of other histories in the field, such as James

Berlin's *Rhetoric and Reality*. Yet while Berlin's book explores the history of writing instruction more generally, my research emphasizes specifically a history of how linguistic diversity has been represented in the field, examining the trajectory from viewing multilingual writers as "problems" to viewing their diverse linguistic skills as resources and even models for composition scholars themselves. Further, it examines the populations of linguistically diverse writers that have been represented in our history and how they have been imagined, represented, and conceptualized by writing scholars and teachers. Finally, my project discusses how composition has begun to expand the conversation to the public sphere, and it elucidates areas of further research. I situate my project within research in composition studies, looking at this body of texts through both historical and keywords analysis lenses.

Doing History

In uncovering conversations within the field regarding representations of linguistically diverse writers, a group that has not often been written about exclusively in histories of composition, per se, I see this project as a history. While I do not necessarily see this as a counter-history to the field of composition studies—in that it does not push against traditional histories of the evolution of the field itself—I agree with David Gold that "we cannot make broad claims about the development of rhetorical education without examining the diverse range of student bodies and institutions that participated in such education, including those previously underrepresented or neglected by earlier scholarship" (7). This project examines a group of writers that is not traditionally in the field's histories but is now coming to dominate our scholarly and professional interests.

According to Robert Connors, there are "three elements—present awareness, archival retrieval, and realization of prejudice…that the historian brings to the attempted solution of the historical problem facing her" ("Dreams and Play" 15-16). Historiography is then, by nature, situated, dependent on one's available resources, and reflexive. In my history, I bring a "present awareness" of the contemporary conversations within composition regarding linguistic diversity, but at the same time, I make an effort to not make judgments regarding how "correct" or "incorrect" the practices of the past may have been regarding pedagogies and research regarding international multilingual students. My "archival retrieval" is based on flagship journals in composition, and my own experiences as a compositionist, writing teacher, and writing center professional inform my subjectivities regarding the teaching and researching of international students.

In "Revisionary History: The Dialectical Method," Berlin further encourages us to tease apart the ideologies underlying our commonly proliferated histories stating, "[i]t is my confidence that the more keen our awareness of the conflicting ideologies, the better will be our judgment in regarding both the past and present" (57-58). I note this awareness of conflicting ideologies to acknowledge my own situatedness as a composition researcher as well as the historically situated, conflicting, and rhetorically motivated uses of the different discourses and terms surrounding linguistically diverse writers. Over time, different cultural and academic ideological perspectives, such as nationalism, internationalism, and multiculturalism, have affected the field's views regarding the teaching of linguistically diverse individuals from other countries. By exploring some of the different ideologies that have contributed to our conversations in the field, we can gain a better understanding of our contemporary perspectives,

such as translingualism.

History helps us contextualize the work we do in the present. In Robert Connors' "Rhetorical History as a Component of Composition Studies," he argues for "what history can do for us: situate us. 'By studying history I learn what I am,' as one of my students put it. And the knowledge of what has been done can tell us what we may do—our options and limitations, and how they are like and unlike the options and limitations people have faced before. Without such knowledge, we are cut off from context" (239). Without knowledge of our history regarding international, linguistically diverse students, then, we do not fully know where we are situated or what we are as contemporary compositionists. Without a better knowledge of options and limitations this history can offer, we cannot effectively project where we might go or who we might become.

Beyond contextualizing the work we do today, Glenn and Enoch, in "Invigorating Historiographic Practices in Rhetoric and Composition Studies," note that complicating our traditional histories of composition studies and studies that flesh out these histories results in three things:

> First, of course, is that the results comprise a variety of versions of what the history of rhetoric and composition is and should be, implicitly arguing that there is no one history but instead many histories. Second, such studies stimulate our thinking in terms of which historical moments, people, and places merit our scholarly attention. And, third, these studies reflect the ways historiographic practice shifts in relation to the questions and imperatives of the present moment. (12)

Thus, examining our past is a way to see how the stories of linguistically diverse writers have been written in composition studies. This dissertation is one version of what the history of the field is and should be. It aims to stimulate our collective timeline on moments, people, and places that are commanding our collective attention. And it seeks to heighten our attention to the ways we have framed international, linguistically diverse students' identities in the past so we may better engage with the metadiscussion of how we are framing these students in the present.

As I began this project, I had to consider at which point I would begin trying to unearth this history. When writing a history of linguistically diverse writers in composition studies, it would seem to make sense to take 1966 as a starting point since The Dartmouth conference that year is traditionally taken as the ostensible beginning of the field of composition (Trimbur, "The Dartmouth Conference"). However, in this project, I demonstrate that the globalization of English and considerations of linguistically diverse writers are not new concerns and that they actually date back to the very first issues of *College English* in 1939. Indeed, as these conversations were present during the establishment of the field, I suggest that these conversations themselves were foundational to the field's development.

As Steven North notes in *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*:

> Any date chosen to mark the beginning of "modern" Composition is bound to be arbitrary. One might, for example, consider 1873, the year Harvard first added an English composition requirement to its list of admissions standards. Even more promising, perhaps, would be 1949, the year that the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the group which has come to assume the power

center of the new field, was constituted. And yet events in education, generally,

and English specifically, were such that the early 1960s call the most attention to

themselves….In a sense, there could be no Composition—academic field, capital

"C"—before, say, 1958. (9)

Yet, even if the field of capital "C" composition might not have existed before the 1960s,

conversations about international multilingual writers did exist. And generally speaking, these

are conversations we have forgotten—or not been aware of—at both our and our students' peril.

Keywords Analysis

Throughout this history, I will explore what and how linguistically diverse writers have

come to mean to professionals in the field over time, locate the conflicts in these representations,

and examine the implications the conflicting representations have for teachers and researchers in

rhetoric and composition. Thus, this project is very much in line with Paul Heilker and Peter

Vandenberg's 1996 *Keywords in Composition Studies* as well as their forthcoming 2014

collection *Keywords in Writing Studies*. In *Keywords in Composition Studies*, Heilker and

Vandenberg set out to examine "the multiple layers of meaning inhabiting the words writing

teachers and theorists have and continue to depend upon most" (1). With the increasing

globalization of English and with the entrance of more international writers into composition

classrooms, I believe that now, more than ever, we need to examine the "multiple layers" of the

terms we use to describe and imagine these writers. I, along with Vandenberg and Heilker, notice

that "while many have valorized the post-disciplinary nature of composition studies, one

recognizable result of fewer constraints has been a decreasing confidence in our ability to

understand each other" (3). In the case of this project, discussions about linguistically diverse writers have occurred throughout the field's history, yet these conversations have been complex, using fragmented language and terms to describe the linguistically diverse writers in composition classrooms. Therefore, it is this desire for understanding that drives my work, and my goals are similar to Heilker and Vandenberg, who aim "to demonstrate the shifting and conflicted relationship between meaning and cultural/disciplinary values, to trace the assimilation and omission of different strands of meaning in the historical evolution of a term (however discontinuous and jarring that evolution may be) through an examination of the texts that constitute our field" (5).

Other scholars in composition and rhetoric have also conducted keywords work in the field. For example, in 1997's *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*, Joseph Harris discusses five key terms in composition—growth, voice, process, error, and community—by "tracking their meanings and revisions" in order to "trace…how the teaching of college writing has been theorized and imagined since 1966" (ix). And in Bruce Horner's 2000 book, *Terms of Work for Composition: A Materialist Critique*, he identifies six key terms—work, students, politics, academic, traditional, and writing—"by which we understand and engage in the work of composition" (xv). Each chapter of his book "traces the ways in which a specific term operates as a site for competing constructions of Composition's identity" (xv). Horner identifies these key terms as points around which to build a discussion about the construction of the field of composition's identity.

Similarly, a digital project, Derek Mueller's 2012 *Kairos* piece, "Views from a Distance: A Nephological Model of the CCCC Chairs' Addresses, 1977-2011," maps thirty-five chairs'

addresses into word clouds in order to highlight the evolution of key terms in the field. In the "Opening" of his project, Mueller states:

> As the scholarly record grows there is an escalating value in realizing connections. This is exceedingly important for newcomers to the field who must make inroads however they can, by conversation and conventional reading and writing, of course, but also by pattern-finding, by nomadically exploring conceptual interplay across abstracts and abstractive variations, and by finding and tracing linkages among materials and ideas, new and old.

Mueller emphasizes the importance of discovering and analyzing terms and patterns of discourse to understand and connect the past of the field to the present and its future. His project serves as a gateway to those new to the field as well as an archive and touchstone for those who have been in the field for longer periods of time.

I see my project as continuing in the traditions of Heilker and Vandenberg, Harris, Horner, and Mueller. In this dissertation, I analyze terms and patterns of discourse in order to lay bare the values and assumptions connected to them. I seek to uncover how linguistically diverse international students have been imagined in the context of college composition and examine how this shapes our understanding of the work composition does and should do. By tracing the historical antecedents of many of the contemporary conversation the field has today regarding these writers, I hope this project will act as a resource for both those who are new to the field as well as those who have been part of the field for a while but do not know this part of the field's history.

As English continues to globalize and universities continue to enroll increasing numbers

of speakers of World Englishes and other languages, the topic of linguistically diverse students in the composition classroom will no doubt increase in our publications and our collective and collaborative conversations. Indeed, this is a topic of conversation that is not unique to composition, and various other fields, such as second language writing and applied linguistics are also engaged and invested in linguistic diversity and the globalization of English. And it is only by exploring how we have been involved in this conversation, what we have said and how and why we have said it, that we can learn how we can best participate in this broader conversation in the present and the future. This project also contends that it is the responsibility of compositionists to know our history in order to more effectively intervene in the public sphere regarding issues of politics and public policy as they affect linguistic diversity.

A Note on My Terminology

As I am about to explore the complexities inherent in the use of different terms and labels, I would be remiss if I did not discuss some of my own choices and assumptions behind key terms I have used in this project. For the most part, unless otherwise noted, the group of students I discuss in this dissertation are international multilingual students and writers. I have chosen to focus on this group in particular (as opposed to other linguistically diverse writers such as dialect speakers of English or domestic second language speakers) because these are the linguistically diverse students that compositionists seem to have been most concerned with in the past as well as in many current conversations in the field. At Virginia Tech, specifically, the population of international students, particularly Chinese students, has grown over the past few years. And many conversations among graduate teaching assistants, instructors, and faculty,

within the aforementioned Rewriting Language(s), Composition, and Error group, and in the Virginia Tech Writing Center, focus on how to best work with and serve these particular populations. From what I have read and what I have witnessed, I find conversations about international linguistically diverse writers to be the most prominent and the most pressing. That is not to say, however, that conversations about other linguistically diverse populations do not occur at all in this dissertation, and I do mention, at times, some individuals who grew up in the U.S. speaking English along with other languages at home. However, for the most part, the analysis I provide here is one that describes how the field has imagined international writers.

Throughout this project, I use many different terms including, but not limited to, *linguistically diverse, multilingual*, *translingual*, *English speakers/writers/users*, *international students* (sometimes even combining some of them), and, to a lesser extent, *ESL* and *nonnative speakers/writers/students*. I use all of these terms to describe speakers of English as something in addition to or other than their first language(s), primarily those who are from countries where English is not a dominant language.I note my use of terms here so as not to cause confusion as I employ them throughout the document. For example, the term *linguistically diverse* might also be used by some to describe speakers of vernaculars of English, such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) or Appalachian English. These are not the populations about whom I am speaking unless I explicitly state that it is within the context of the analysis. Rather, my use of all the aforementioned terms applies to speakers from outside English-dominant countries for whom English is something other than or in addition to their first language(s). And often, when I analyze a particular article, I use the terminology present in the article itself. For example, if an author relies heavily on the use of *ESL*, I often use that term myself.

After conducting this research, I find it even more difficult to narrow down or create my own terms to use when discussing linguistically diverse writers, and I recognize that there could be issue taken with any or all of the terms I use in this document. For example, as Suresh Canagarajah points out in his Introduction to *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*, "[e]xisting terms like *multilingual* or *plurilingual* keep languages somewhat separated even as they address the co-existence of multiple languages. From their point of view, competence involves distinct compartments for each language one uses" (1). Further, terms like *linguistically diverse* and *international student* could be seen as too vague or amorphous to really describe specific groups of individuals. And so I employ many different terms throughout my discussion as a way to acknowledge the difficulty in using any one term to label groups of people. Because I do not seek to provide absolute definitions of terms nor suggest that there is only one narrative that should be emphasized in the teaching and tutoring of writing to multilingual writers, I, myself, use myriad terms in telling this history. And, throughout my research, I have become increasingly convinced of the importance of continuing and supporting the metadiscussion among scholars in the field regarding how we talk about, represent, label, and imagine the diverse writers, both inside and outside our classrooms. Therefore, I opt to use multiple terms throughout my analysis as a nod to the complex and dynamic identities, histories, cultures, and backgrounds of the students, writers, speakers, and users of English that my research investigates.

Methods

My corpus for this project includes all issues of the journal *College English* (*CE*) from its

start date in 1939 through 1950 as well as *College Composition and Communication* (*CCC*) from

its inception in 1950 through February 2013. Chiefly, I obtained the journal issues electronically

through the JSTOR and National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) databases. Access to

the digital archives of both *CE* and *CCC* was also provided to me by Kurt Austin, Publications

Director at NCTE.

I chose *CE* and *CCC* as my data set because they are the two oldest major academic

journals in the field of composition within the context of the U.S. While I acknowledge that other

countries have their own traditions of teaching and researching writing, I am concerned primarily

in this project with the traditions of U.S. college composition. I have specifically chosen these

two journals because they provide—if not a comprehensive account of the conversations about

this topic over time—the most widely-read accounts in the field at any given point in time. They

represent mainstream thinking and writing about linguistically diverse individuals by the general

population of composition scholars.

With the selection of any data set, there are limitations in what can be understood about

any given topic. Archival research has its own particular limitations, one of which is its exclusion

of other data sets, such as lived experiences. This archival work could be supplemented, for

example, by interviews with scholars as well as international, linguistically diverse students. I

recognize that in selecting this data set and by conducting archival research, I am telling a history

through a very particular lens, one that does not include other documents such as other journals,

books, collections, interviews, or conference presentations.

And with the choice of the specific journals *College English* and *College Composition*

and Communication, I have chosen to represent the mainstream voices in the field. I recognize

that this selection might not always take into account non-mainstream and underrepresented voices. And, indeed, this project could have been very different if I chose to tell the story through other journals such as the *Community Literacy Journal*, which emphasizes the relationship between literacy and society, an online journal like *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric Technology, and Pedagogy*, which looks at topics from a technological point of view, or the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, which has contributors from not only composition but also linguists. In the future, I do hope to flesh out this work with other data sources.

For the purposes of this project, however, I focus on articles with *College English* and *College Composition and Communication*. For the most part, I analyze articles within the journals, although I also include a few intermittent book reviews and advertisements in my analysis. The data examined here is drawn from over five hundred (500) separate issues of the journals. To analyze the data, I began by reading the titles of the articles chronologically. As I did so, I also conducted an electronic search via the Spotlight tool in the PDFs for terms such as *nativ* (which would return results such as *native, nonnative,* and *nativity*), *mother* (for *mother tongue* or *mother language*), foreign (for *foreigner* or *English as a Foreign Language*), *second* (*English as a Second Language* or *second language speaker*), *ESL, EFL,* and *lingu* (for *linguistics, lingua franca, bilingual, multilingual,* and *translingual*). These terms are based on the titles of the articles I found as well as my preliminary reading of articles and books within composition and second language writing, both contemporary scholarship and work from previous decades. Usually, if one term was present in an article, multiple other terms on the list were also present. Rather than only using these terms as an end point, I used these terms as the way to lead myself to appropriate articles to read in more depth. This list of terms was dynamic

and the results of these search terms shifted as the project progressed, which is hardly surprising, given the evolving nature of the field. For example, in the early years of *CE* in the 1940s through 1950, search terms such as *mother* were more apt to return results while terms like *lingu* were more fruitful during later decades of *CCC*.

Within the search results, I took a closer look at the conversations surrounding these usages of the search terms. For the most part, I disregarded articles that mentioned the search terms only in passing or not in reference to linguistically diverse writers. For example, the term *foreign* returned many results that referred to things like literature taught "in foreign lands" or topics or concepts "foreign" to students. I zeroed in on articles that used the search terms in reference to international, linguistically diverse writers. I acknowledge that there are likely some articles that I have missed throughout this process. However, based on the sheer quantity of articles that I have included in this study—approximately one hundred and fifty (150)—and the others that I skimmed and/or read but did not deem germane to this study—well over one thousand (1,000+)—I am confident that the articles I have chosen to analyze represent the general tenor of the conversations in the field at any given point in time.

Chapter Outline

Chapter 2. The Conversation from 1939-1950: College English in a Post-War World

In my first data analysis chapter, I look at articles published in *CE* volumes 1-11 (1939-1950). During this period, World War II led to calls for an increasing cultural awareness among English teachers and an acknowledgement of the importance of engaging with the rest of the world while at the same time celebrating post-war patriotism. Teachers were starting to

explore ideas related to what it meant to be a speaker of English, and linguistically diverse writers were often represented as a "problem" in classrooms in the U.S. and other countries where English was the dominant language. During this time, there is also an emphasis on the relationship between language nativeness and mother tongues, and native English speakers were seen as "natural" and international learners of English as "unnatural." Thus, linguistically diverse writers were often invoked as deficient, ill, and a problem to be solved by English teachers.

Chapter 3. The Emergence of *CCC* through Students' Right to Their Own Language

This chapter changes focus from *CE* to *CCC*, which began in 1950 as a way to chronicle the happenings at the national conferences on composition. In this chapter, I chart conversations about linguistically diverse international writers from the start of *CCC* up through the debates regarding the Students' Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) resolution, a resolution on language diversity in the classroom, which was approved in 1974. Compositionists during this time continued the conversation about how to deal with the problem of linguistically diverse writers, and this time period marks an increase in discussions related to pedagogy and debates about the responsibilities of teachers of composition. By representing linguistically diverse students as "sub"-English learners, compositionists portrayed these writers as beneath the mainstream, and these students were often viewed to be lazy, incompetent, and apathetic. Sometimes these students were grouped with other marginalized writers, while at other times, international students were shuttled sideways into their own sections of composition classes. During this time, scholars often argued that the only way to engage successfully in academia and the public sphere was through standard American English. However, over time, many scholars

also began to realize the importance of embracing linguistic diversity, and some even began to give students a chance to express themselves through their various linguistic and cultural associations. This point of view led to the SRTOL resolution, which encouraged students from linguistic minority backgrounds to express their own linguistic diversity in the composition classroom.

Chapter 4. From SRTOL to Translingualism: Assumptions, Policies, and the Public Sphere

Conversations regarding linguistic diversity have evolved significantly during the period between 1974 and the present. While conversations in the field still often revolve around the teaching of international students, following resolutions like SRTOL and the National Language Policy, compositionists have begun to move toward more inclusive approaches to language, such as concepts like translingualism, which contends that teachers should encourage students to see the value in making linguistic choices and to examine what these choices gain and lose for particular pieces of writing. The scope of discussions has also started to extend in recent years beyond the classroom and beyond a U.S-centric stance, with compositionists arguing for more involvement in the public sphere and global communities. Precursors to the translingualism movement of today can be seen in some of the field's early language policies, including SRTOL and the National Language Policy. Discussions about the ways the field has labeled and represented linguistically diverse writers have begun to come to the forefront, with compositionists beginning to see the unique contributions linguistically diverse writers make as collaborators and co-researchers in the composition classroom.

Chapter 5. ESL/EFL: Uses of Terms Over Time

Following this large-scale analysis of discussions about linguistically diverse writers from 1939 through the present, in my final data analysis chapter, I focus in on two specific terms that have been used frequently throughout the field's history: *ESL* (English as a Second Language) and *EFL* (English as a Foreign Language). The two terms have been used in different ways at different points in time throughout the history of composition, but they have not always been used to mean the same things that they mean today. This chapter examines some of the ways that the terms have been used and discusses some possible assumptions behind the uses of these terms when they are used to represent, label, and categorize linguistically diverse writers.

Chapter 6. Translingualism Beyond the Composition Context

In recent decades, compositionists have begun to argue that we still have much work to do outside the classroom in bringing awareness to the public about issues and policies related to international speakers of English. This final chapter revisits the arc regarding the representations of multilingual writers in the composition classroom and uses it as a jumping off point to examine areas of further research, including sites for collaboration with other fields, further engaging multilingual writers themselves in the conversation, and extending the conversation outside academia, relating the discussions happening in writing classrooms today to those in the public sphere regarding the globalization of English.

Conclusion: Arcs of the Conversation and Translingualism as a Lens

From 1939 to the present day, discussions about linguistically diverse writers have

evolved in complex and interesting ways, and there are two major arcs in which the conversation has developed over time. The first arc follows conversations about these writers as they transition from foreigners or outsiders to parallel or equivalent to other traditionally marginalized populations in the university. Eventually, compositionists began to recognize that *all* students in composition classrooms needed assistance, and teaching methods used with linguistically diverse writers were soon applied to both nonnative and native speakers, alike. This allowed compositionists to begin to see linguistically diverse writers as co-collaborators in classroom and research activities, and eventually, linguistically diverse writers came to be seen as a model for the work of compositionists themselves. Woven throughout this arc is a secondary arc that shows how linguistically diverse students have evolved from being represented as a homogenous group to being seen as unique and dynamic individuals with the ability to make important contributions to the way the field of composition conducts its scholarship.

As I see it, the culmination of both arcs of the conversation have led us to this current moment of translingualism. Translingualism, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Five, is an orientation toward language that acknowledges that "languages always come into contact in actual use and shape each other" (Canagarajah, *Literacy as Translingual Practice* 1). Canagarajah continues, "the term translingual enables a consideration of communicative competence as not restricted to predefined meanings of individual languages, but the ability to merge different language resources in situated interactions for new meaning construction" (1-2). That is, translingualism encourages us to move away from imagining languages as distinct and always separate silos, to push against the hegemony of monolingual English education, and to emphasize the movement across and through languages and language barriers in our teaching

and in our own writing and research.

Anyone can take a translingual orientation toward language, Canagarajah argues, even if they are monolingual English speakers (2). Instead of focusing on the act of using multiple languages, translingualism has to do with making the choice to have an open attitude toward linguistic diversity and to always acknowledge what is gained and lost by making linguistic choices among the languages, registers and dialects available in communicative acts. Translingualism is theory borne of practice. As Canagarajah notes, "[t]he urgency for scholars to address translingual practices in literacy derives from the fact that they are widely practiced in communities and everyday communicative contexts, though ignored or suppressed in classrooms" (2). Thus, translingualism is already present in the public sphere, and it is the responsibility of compositionists to call attention to it and to encourage the public to examine their assumptions about linguistic diversity and their own orientations toward language. In order to do so, it is imperative then, that compositionists know our own history of how we have represented linguistically diverse writers—most of whom have worked through issues of translingualism on a daily basis—in order to find more translingual ways to conduct our own scholarship and teaching in the future.

Chapter Two: The Conversation from 1939-1950: *College English* in a Post-War World

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the conversations about internationalism and linguistically diverse writers that occurred in *College English* before the entrance of a journal dedicated specifically to composition, *College Composition and Communication* (*CCC*). The years between 1939 and March 1950 are the only time period when *College English* (*CE*) existed without its sister journal, *CCC*. Thus, in this chapter, I examine *CE* volumes 1-11 (October 1939-May 1950). The announcement of the formation of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) and its companion journal, *CCC*, occurred in the May 1950 (11.8) issue of *CE*. So, while there is a brief overlap of three months (March-May) of the two journals during this time period, I have chosen to include in this section the full volume of *CE* volume 11.

In this chapter, I explore the emergent themes related to internationalism and international students during this time period. During and following World War II, teachers and scholars in English studies were beginning to question what it meant to speak English, and they tried to expand our ideas of cultural awareness and internationalization. We also see teachers working through how to deal with the "problem" of non-English-speaking students in what they saw as previously homogenous classrooms. It is important to examine the conversations happening among teachers of English before what is traditionally thought of as the beginning of the composition field in 1966 in order to acknowledge the fact that international writers were part of U.S. classrooms and English teachers' conversations before an arbitrary start date of a field. Linguistically diverse students have been a regular topic in our mainstream disciplinary conversation since before composition was a discipline. In fact, in part, our proto-conversations

about these writers helped to shape composition itself as a discipline since these early

conversations occurred as the discipline formed.

In his 2006 article "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition,"

originally published in a special issue of *College English* in 2006 and reprinted in the 2010

collection *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, Paul Kei Matsuda focuses his historical

documentation of international ESL students in the U.S. classroom primarily on the decades

"before the 1960s because it was the period when a number of significant changes took

place" (*Cross-Language* 87). For example, Matsuda notes that it was "during this period…

language differences in the composition classroom became an issue because of the presence of a

growing number of international students, and many of the placement options for second

language writers were created" (87).

Interestingly, a few years prior to that article, in "Composition Studies and ESL Writing:

A Disciplinary Division of Labor" (*CCC* 59.4 1999), Matsuda also claimed, "[u]ntil fairly

recently, discussions of English as a Second Language (ESL) issues in composition studies have

been few and far between" (699). As I examined the conversations in *CE* between 1939 and

1950, however, I was struck by how many conversations compositionists *have* had throughout

the history of the field, especially during the formative years in which composition began to

develop. In fact, many conversations during that time were similar to those of today regarding

the globalization of English and international users of the language. For example, conversations

about English language standards, the viability of varieties of the language, and the role of

English in an increasingly globalizing world emerge during this time period and continue in our

collective conversations today. Thus, through the evidence that I have found in my research, I

contend that Matsuda overstates his claim when he argues that composition, as a field, has not been overly concerned with the topic of second language speakers. Indeed, this topic has been emphasized throughout the field's scholarship, and even contributes to the formation of the field itself. By examining *CE* from 1939-1950, it becomes apparent that discussions about international students in U.S. classrooms today have strong antecedents in the conversations of our past. And these conversations about international, linguistically diverse writers have been a continuous force in the creation and evolution of mainstream thinking in the field.

American English as a Foreign Language

In the 1930s and 1940s, the field of English was heavily focused on the teaching of literature, the differences between American English and British English, and their corresponding literatures. Many articles explored the differences between American and British pronunciation, and some even positioned American English as its own language, separate from its British ancestor. While today, standard American English is often considered to be the target language of international speakers learning English in countries that do not use it as a primary language, in the early- to mid-twentieth century, American English was sometimes seen as just a corrupted version of British English. In a way, this positions speakers of American English as linguistic others and nonstandard users of the English language.

The concept of American English as a foreign language (in comparison to British English) occurs in the first issue of the first volume of *CE* in 1939. In its announcement of the intention to include a "Current English Forum" article in each issue which would be a "discussion of such problems of current English usage," the article includes a question from an

English teacher comparing American English and British English usage (78). The question

quotes Fowler and Fowler's *King's English*, an early 20th century British grammar and usage

book, which notes, "Americanisms are *foreign* words and should be so treated" (emphasis added,

79). And in *CE* 1.4's "Current English Forum" (1940), a questioner asks whether we ought to

call American speech *American English* or *The American Language*, suggesting with the term

The American Language that American English is an altogether different language than British

English (358). Even though the journal suggests that we maintain the term *American English*

because the differences between American and British English are negligible, already, in the very

first issue of the new journal, we see discussion regarding the positioning of American English as

a "foreign" language, even to other speakers of English.

Questions about the legitimacy of American English are threaded throughout the early

volumes of *CE*. The journal includes lengthy discussions regarding the teaching of American and

British Literature, both in the U.S. and abroad. For example, in *CE* 1.6 (1940) "American

Literature in American Colleges" John Flanagan notes, "[t]he study of American literature has

not always been considered a respectable part of a college curriculum" (513). In his article,

Flanagan chronicles the "signs of change" regarding the legitimacy of American Literature (513),

and this topic is also addressed in the same issue by Justin O'Brien's "American Books and

French Readers" and *CE* 2.7's "English as You Teach it in America" (1941) by J.A.W. Bennett.

The former is an article written in the form of a letter to an American colleague by a New

Zealander who earned his doctorate from Oxford. In it, Bennett describes some preliminary

observations about some of the differences between the ways that Americans and teachers in

England teach English literature, and he highlights the "greater variety in American standards

and achievements than you would find in the same number of colleges in England" and the inconsistencies in the way(s) English is taught in the U.S. (676). So, from the early days of one of our field's flagship journals, the field has grappled with what it even means to speak, teach, study, and write in American English. In fact, from the outset, American English itself is noted for its linguistic diversity, its "variety" of "standards," which, in turn, seemed to lead to its lack of respectability. This discussion becomes even more complicated in later years when conversations about multilingual writers are brought into the mix.

World War II and Engagement with the World

In addition to these discussions that valorize British English and show a lack of respect for the linguistic diversity of American English, we see conversations about linguistic pride in the American language occur. The period following World War II was an important time in U.S. international relations, and the war and its aftermath affected many of the conversations in *CE*. During this time period, English studies teachers and scholars both acknowledged the importance of engaging with the rest of the world, while at the same time they celebrated post-war patriotism, which included a sometimes nationalistic pride in the American English they spoke.

In 1945's "Some Unexpected Results of College Military Programs" (*CE* 6.8 1945), Richard Miller notes this increasing nationalism, especially toward the "American language," that followed World War II (445). He states that "[i]t was the practice of the twenties and thirties to scoff at everything American—from Rotary to the American language itself" (445). Yet following the war, there came a new appreciation for the American language, and Miller argues, "[o]ne of the first steps in the growth of a spirit of nationalism is that the people become aware

of the beauty, vigor, and elasticity of their mother-tongue" (445). Thus, at this time a nationalistic

pride in the "American language" began to take hold, and the connection of the "mother-tongue"

to this nationalism suggests that American English nurtured this feeing of pride.

At the same time, scholars were beginning to see the importance of increased cultural and

linguistic awareness and engagement with the world. While pride in the American language was

helpful for those teaching English, learning about other cultures and languages was becoming

increasingly integral to success as an American student. In "Graduate Study in English after the

War" (*CE* 6.1 1944), Tom Burns Haber hypothesizes about the future of graduate study in the

humanities, specifically English, arguing, "[t]here is no doubt that the study of languages,

particularly, will increase enormously in the future. Contact with new races, new tongues, is

breaking down many a barrier in the minds of our American youth abroad" (44). Evident in

Haber's argument are both the assertion that English will continue toward internationalization as

well as the recommendation that English-speaking students expand their own linguistic and

cultural awareness. Haber's article shows an early example of the desire for Americans to

become more aware of international cultures and languages. Haber's promotion of "new tongues"

for Americans foreshadows conversations that would occur in later decades in the field. For

instance, in the same journal sixty-two years later (originally in *CE* 68.6 2006, reprinted—and

cited here—in 2010's *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*), John Trimbur argues for "the

status planning of languages and an additive language policy where all students as a matter of

course speak, write, and learn in more than one language and all residents of the United States

thereby become capable of communicating with each other in a number of languages" (39).

Perhaps nowhere is this need for cross-cultural citizenship and international

understanding more strongly expressed than Falk's "International Understanding: An Experiment in Freshman English" (*CE* 8.4 1947). The opening paragraph reads:

> Now more than ever the world is very much with us, and more than ever have we the need for a greater understanding and a greater knowledge of other peoples, other ways of living, and ways of thinking different from ours. During the war years our horizons have widened immeasurably, so that many strange place names have become familiar. And yet in many cases the people who live in these foreign parts are still as strange to us as the names were when we first began hearing them. Most of us realize that we have insufficient information from which we can judge a distant people and that, before we can know how to live and work with them, we must have an elementary acquaintance with their problems and aspirations. (196)

Falk credits the war for broadening the cultural horizons of the American people, and while it is unfortunate that something as extreme as war is the reason for teaching people about the world, it seems significant that, at the very least, the war helped Americans to see that there was more to learn about and from other nations and speakers of other languages. While it embraces the importance of reaching beyond American borders, this quotation also invokes individuals from other countries as something strange, different, foreign and other. This suggests that it was difficult for teachers at this time to reconcile the otherness of individuals from outside the U.S., yet they also understood the importance of trying to learn more about individuals from other cultures.

In this article, Falk argues that the Freshman English course is the appropriate place in

which instructors can encourage students to explore news and information from different

countries and cultures as well as the people who come from those countries. Falk notes that

"[s]ince this is an English class," the literature of different countries can provide insight to their

cultural and political heritages (197). While one could argue that literature is not necessarily the

most direct way of learning about other countries, Falk uses literature in his courses because he

argues that other types of written texts have not been the most useful ways to study other

cultures: "[w]e have guarded against spending too much time on the wealth of travel observation

and valuable journalistic reporting….[T]here [also] has been a constant attempt to search for

basic issues and permanent national qualities" (198). So Falk urges his students to find common

cultural themes or "qualities" across the different pieces of literature rather than journalistic

writing or travel writing. While this is a step toward acknowledging the importance of embracing

learning about "the people who live in these foreign parts," there is a mixed message here that

seeks to understand people by identifying basic, "permanent" qualities or stereotypes. Falk's

suggestion that there are "permanent" national qualities seems a reductive approach to studying

nations and understanding people, and this approach is not about diversity, but rather it suggests

that individuals, particularly those from other countries, can be defined primarily by national

stereotypes.

English in the World

English teachers and researchers during the early 1940s and 1950s discussed and

researched how English was being taught, used, and studied in countries that did not use it as a

dominant language. In these discussions, the presumption is often that citizens of other countries

should learn English in order to communicate with individuals from English-dominant countries, especially the U.S. However, in opposition to the article by Haber mentioned in the previous section, the idea that Americans would learn the languages of other countries was often seen as counter-intuitive and against the natural linguistic abilities of Americans. Throughout this discussion, there is the underlying assumption that the English language was—and should be—the dominant language of communication in the world and the suggestion those who did not speak English were linguistically handicapped. This representation of speakers of languages other than English fails to grant legitimacy to these speakers, denies them power on the global stage, and positions English as the only language worth knowing.

In *CE* 5.8's "English Studies in the Universities of the Other American Republics" (1944), for example, Ben Carruthers examines the prominence English gained as it increasingly was taught as a foreign language in Latin American schools, or, as Carruthers says, the "*other Americas*" (emphasis added, 439). He examines the English language and literature courses taught at various universities and secondary schools in many Latin American countries, noting "the most remarkable language trend in the other American republics is toward establishing English on a basis of equality with other languages for the first time" (439). He sees the teaching of English in Latin American schools as a point of connection among all American countries, calling the English language "a most valuable aid to inter-American solidarity" (443). Carruthers' emphasis on the strong hold that English was beginning to take in primarily non-English-speaking countries shows that U.S. researchers were starting to examine English as a common language, or lingua franca, that could increase global communication, even as they continued to render linguistically diverse individuals as "others" as defined by their relative

proximity to English.

In Latin America, centers were established to teach not only the English language but also U.S. cultural ideals to students and citizens in Latin American countries. Through this teaching of American cultural expectations, it becomes clear that knowing the English language at that time represented not only linguistic capital, but also cultural capital. It also demonstrates that language and culture are intrinsically tied together. In *CE* 6.3's "United States Cultural Institutes in Other American Republics" (1944), William Griffith notes, "[t]he teaching of English is probably the most important as well as the most characteristic single activity of the centers. The intense interest among the nationals of the host countries in learning English is reflected in an amazing demand for class instruction" (167). The first section of *CE* 6.6's "Summary and Report" (1945)—a brief bulletin included in the early days of *CE* to provide announcements and resources for teachers—discusses these cultural centers and the need for "native English teachers" to teach the language in "foreign countries" (348). The article highlights another article by James Paul Stoakes in *School Review* (now the *American Journal of Education)* that argues for the need for American English-speaking teachers and materials to teach English abroad. There are further undertones of the militaristic and imperialistic driving force of English—likely a sign of the time and context in which he was writing—in Stoakes' argument as he says, "an army of teachers must be mobilized from the profession at large to serve for two years or three, if no more, in teaching English as a foreign language to the millions who want to learn it from Monterrey....to Chungking" (qtd. in "Summary and Report" 348). While Stoakes might have the best intentions to help further the global spread of English, his language reflects the underlying militaristic, political, and ultimately imperialistic, driving force behind its spread. These

militaristic expressions suggest that the globalization of English had more to do with political

power than with the expanding of cultural horizons and cross-cultural communication. While

Stokes does suggest that international, linguistically diverse individuals want to learn English,

the military rhetoric here clearly suggests that it can, will, and should be forced upon those who

might not choose it.

There is further evidence of these imperialist undertones in other locations. In Hawaii,

while it was not officially an American state at the time, a discussion of the use and spread of the

English language was also occurring. In "English in Island Democracy" (*CE* 7.1 1945),

Katherine Lackey discusses the language situation in Hawaii where many languages and cultural

heritages and histories came together in Hawaiian culture. She says:

> the young people of the islands have so many languages that they are children
>
> without a language! They know enough Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, Hawaiian, or
>
> enough of the all-too-familiar hodgepodge known as pidgin to converse with the
>
> grandparents, but they often do not command sufficient knowledge of English,
>
> especially spoken English, to be at ease. This handicap is deeply affecting their
>
> lack of confidence. (44)

Lackey does not illuminate in what settings the children's confidence is affected, but we can

assume she is talking about the English classroom because she goes on to discuss the common

grammatical errors that are made by the students at the University of Hawaii, which suggests that

these children have low confidence in their language abilities due to their limited English

speaking proficiency. Indeed, she refers to this low proficiency in English as a "handicap,"

implying that these children are impaired in some way, despite the fact that they speak multiple

other languages. Furthermore, it seems contradictory to say that because a student speaks *multiple* languages, this causes them to be without a language at all. Lackey's statement denies power to the students who speak many additional languages and exhibits her English-centric stance, thereby delegitimizing these students' languages and claiming that, without English, these students do not have a language.

Writing at the same time as Lackey, Raoul Pérez, a member of the U.S. Office of Information and Education in Japan and microphone interpreter at the U.N. Headquarters, discusses the ups and downs of the popularity of English in Japan before, during, and after the war in "The Most Popular Foreign Language" (*CE* 8.4 1947). He notes that the popularity of English in Japan has not come from an influx of immigrants from English-speaking countries bringing the language to the country. Rather, its prominence has been gained through the need for the Japanese to use English for international relations. He says, "[t]he great popularity of English just before Pearl Harbor was achieved in Japan during the short space of less than a century and without the stimulus that foreign languages have received in the United States from large minority groups who have brought their native tongues across the seas and continue to cultivate them at home and in the schools of the country of their adoption" (192). The Japanese had an active and very real exigence for learning English as a foreign language. Pérez credits Commodore Perry's visit to Tokyo in 1853 as the moment in which English began to replace Dutch as the most common foreign language in Japan, noting, "The American soldier has made English the most popular foreign language in the world. To a sailor [Perry], however, must go the credit of first showing the power of English in commerce and international relations" (193). Along with trade, Perry also brought with him the English language. In the middle of the Allied

occupation of Japan following World War II, Pérez notes, "[t]oday, of course, English is considered absolutely essential to the very survival of the nation" (193). Pérez doesn't say why, exactly, learning English is such an important goal of the Japanese at this time, but we can assume he is referring directly to the Allied occupation of the country. Evident here is another example of the use of English for communication purposes. These purposes, however, did not exclude militaristic undercurrents, suggesting that it was not necessarily the choice of the Japanese to learn English for solely recreational or educational purposes. This further suggests that, at least for these Japanese multilinguals, the desire to learn English is driven by international politics and commerce.

Interestingly, Pérez also highlights the extreme disparity in language learning occurring between the Japanese and the Allied occupiers. He notes, "The American soldier...is making no effort to learn Japanese, for not only has he a *natural apathy* toward foreign languages, but he has made the rather pleasant discovery that the people with whom he has to come in contact know or make it their business to learn enough English to understand him" (emphasis added, 194). It is difficult to tell how Pérez views this situation, whether he finds it problematic that American soldiers barely try to learn Japanese or if he really does consider it a "pleasant discovery" that American soldiers can rely on the Japanese being able to speak English. However, he avoids judging whether this is problematic or acceptable. What Pérez's observation does show, however, is the extreme imperiousness American soldiers seemed to feel regarding their own language. The American soldiers' "natural apathy toward foreign languages" seems to echo the sentiment that English is the only language worth knowing, and individuals from other countries should learn English rather than English-speakers learning other languages. And

indeed, the insinuation is made that it is even *unnatural* for Americans to learn other languages. Thus, it would be going against nature for English-speakers to speak languages other than English.

This sentiment is echoed by Herbert Goodrich in "Education for World Outlook" (*CE* 8.7 1947). He notes, "[s]urely by now it is demonstrated in both public school and private school that the exposure of American students to foreign languages is not one that takes" (381). And again, the rationale is given that Americans (and, in this case, Britons) are not inherently inclined to learn other languages. Goodrich, like Pérez, who cites a "natural apathy" toward learning other languages, seems to argue that Americans are fundamentally disinclined to expand their linguistic skills, stating, "Americans and Britons are not *natural* linguists" (emphasis added, 381). This focus on what is natural and what is unnatural regarding linguistic aptitude seems to draw a line between *us* and *them*, with *us* being native English speakers and *them* being foreign-born speakers. *We* aren't naturally adept at learning languages, so *they* should learn ours. This presents a problem for speakers of languages other than English: if it is *unnatural* for English-speakers to learn other languages, then it must be considered *natural*, essential, and even necessary for speakers of other languages to learn English. This suggests that English is a primary—even primal and instinctual—language to be learned by all individuals, and it positions all other languages as somehow artificial.

Basic English and the Globalization of "Normal" English

In line with this suggestion that speakers of other languages should learn English (rather than English speakers learning other languages), during this time, the concept of Basic English

(not to be confused with basic writing or developmental writing), championed by I.A. Richards, was beginning to take hold. In essence, "Basic English is English made simple by limiting the number of its words to 850, and by cutting down the rules for using them to the smallest number necessary for the clear statement of ideas" (17). In the 1940s, this "English made simple" was seen as a way to globalize the English language since Basic English was, in theory, easy, or at least easier, to learn and implement due to its limited, concise nature. In his book review of I.A. Richards' *Basic English and Its Uses*, Sanford Meech notes, "English speakers are in a geographically strategic position to spread their language. And they are superior in numbers to any other linguistic group with the possible exception of the northern Chinese" (234). Here, Meech's imagery strongly suggests a military campaign used to spread the language. Furthermore, he argues that Basic English's framework of simple words and sentence structures "makes the process of learning it really easier for those not birthright English speakers [and] will, of course, be a distinct contribution to international understanding" (234). So Basic English was promoted as a way to encourage communication among nations in the 1940s. But it was also seen as a "birthright" for some, which suggests that English was a special privilege afforded to some but denied to others. Basic English was seen as a way to bridge this gap between "birthright" speakers and those to whom this right was denied.

In *CE* 6.5 (1945) "Double Benefit of Basic English," Harley Usill, a scholar in England, points to the many benefits of Basic English, arguing that Basic English could help globalize the English language, aiding in it becoming a lingua franca and the chief language used economically and politically. He notes:

> In a country like India...where twenty major languages are spoken, an additional

and important value of English is that it is able to provide a ground of unity, since

it can function as a lingua franca or medium of communication among those who

otherwise would lack a common tongue. In Africa, too, English has an important

value, for although such languages as Arabic, Swahili, Hausa, Yoruba, and many

others serve the immediate needs of groups of peoples, the absence of a real

lingua franca which would serve the dual purpose of facilitating internal

communication and contact with foreign powers must retard the progress of a

continent which is destined to play an important part in world affairs. (289)

Usill sees a future in which the English language will increase global communications both

within and among countries, and he believes Basic English is the "first step to the mastery of

normal English" (290). Embedded in this notion is the idea that English is the language that

speakers of other languages should learn in order to communicate globally, and Basic English

was a means to achieving those ends. Thus English itself was viewed as a unifying language,

regardless of cultural differences, and a step toward participating in world affairs.

Yet Basic English was not necessarily intended as a replacement for other languages.

Winston Churchill himself was an advocate of Basic English who pushed for its use as a lingua

franca. In a speech at Harvard University in 1944, he noted this potential of Basic English, and

following his speech, American newspapers and magazines "urged it as the solution to the

world's obvious need for an international auxiliary language" (Walsh 453). The use of the term

auxiliary is interesting because it positions Basic English as a *supplement* to other languages.

That is, it is not necessarily intended to replace other languages; rather, it was promoted as a

language to be used for communication purposes *in addition to* other languages. So we see here

the desire to use Basic English as a language to enhance communication and, as Usill says "a first step to the mastery of normal English."

However, in his article discussing Churchill's statements about Basic English ("Basic English: World Language or World Philosophy?" *CE* 6.8 1945), Chad Walsh calls into question whether or not Basic English is actually as utilitarian as its advocates claim it to be, and he questions the motives behind the spread of Basic English. Walsh suggests the following possibilities for the future if Basic English were to take hold:

> Book publishers could make much more money by publishing everything in Basic English, so as the edge into foreign markets without the expense of a translation. Radio stations would more and more make their broadcasts in Basic English, as part of a vague policy of international good will—and cultural imperialism. The movie companies would see the chance for enormous markets by making their films in the international language. In time, ordinary English might sound provincial, and Basic English would be the everyday speech of America and the British Empire. (459)

Evident in Walsh's proposal for the future is both a warning and a possibility. He hints at the global communication potential that would come with using Basic English as what he calls an "international language." But, at the same time, he seems to be concerned with the political and economic repercussions of the globalization of Basic English, and indicates that Basic English could potentially water down the potency of the more standard British and American Englishes. It also seems significant that Walsh highlights the "cultural imperialism" that would accompany the spread of Basic English. As David Crystal indicates in *English as a Global Language*, "[a]

language has traditionally become an international language for one chief reason: the power of its people—especially their political and military power" and "[w]ithout a strong power-base, of whatever kind, no language can make progress as an international medium of communication" (9, 7). Yet, we know now, of course, that Basic English did not take hold of the world as an international language through the means that Walsh suggests. Rather, English itself (or, as Usill refers to it, "normal English")—in all its various dialects and contexts and with all its political and militaristic power—has become a common language for global communication through the political, economic, and technological advancements and power of its speakers. Still, through this seventy-year-old conversation regarding Basic English, we see composition scholars wrestling with the political and linguistic implications of the globalization of the English language and multilingualism, issues that continue to drive the field today. In the next sections, I will examine how this conversation relates to the actual international learners of English as something other than or in addition to their first language(s).

Language Nativeness, Mother Tongues, Naturalness, and Foreigners

In the early days of *CE* as English globalized and the field discussed ways in which English was and should be taught to speakers of other languages, scholars grappled with issues of language nativeness and English as a foreign and second language. At that time, there was no consensus on how to represent these linguistically diverse writers through different labels (*ESL*, *EFL*, *nonnative*, etc.). But these writers—and the budding globalization they represented—were becoming an increasingly important part of the field's conversations.

In order to understand the expectations placed upon international learners of English, it is

necessary to take a look at the assumptions in the field about *native* speakers of the language. In these early volumes, for instance, there is an expectation that "native born" speakers of a language should have a high command of a language and its grammar, spelling, vocabulary, and punctuation. In "An Open Letter to the Educational Experts on Teaching Composition" in *CE* 1.2 (1939), George Wykoff includes a student's essay, rife with spelling and grammatical errors, to examine how and how much grammar should be taught in the composition classroom, asking what the role of the composition teacher should be. He notes, "[t]he writer of this theme is a *native-born American*, of American parents" (emphasis added, 141), and therefore he should be expected to have fewer mechanical issues in his writing. By calling attention to the nativeness of the student writer, Wykoff seems to be suggesting that the student should have strong mastery of English based, it would seem, purely on his status as a "native-born American."

In addition to discussing English language *nativeness*, the term *mother tongue* is also used to lament students' poor command of the language. Cecilia Hennel Hendricks begins "Exemption from Required Composition" in *CE* 1.7 (1940) by asking "[h]ow well can first- and second-year university students write their mother-tongue?" (604). Through the concept of mother tongue and nativity/nativeness, we see an emphasis on the biological and natural aspects of first language learning. With nativity comes the connection to the mother (tongue) and being born into, nurtured by, comforted by, and identifying with a first language. And with this connection to the mother tongue comes the assumption that speakers will have a more "natural" ability to speak it, and it also places a primacy on the value of the first language in identity formation.

In addition to the naturalness of nativity, researchers during this time also emphasized the *un*naturalness—or otherness—of speakers of English as something other than their mother

tongue. Rather than juxtaposing native speakers with nonnative speakers (native/nonnative), writers in *CE* more frequently discussed the *foreignness* of international students during this time period (native/foreign), which highlighted their difference or otherness. By revisiting the Basic English conversation, we can see some discussion of this idea of foreignness. Despite the possible advantages the globalization of Basic English offers, Walsh questions the potential ease with which international learners of English could learn the basic form of the language. In fact, the concept of "foreigners" learning the language is woven throughout his utilitarian examination of Basic English. Walsh asks, "Is Basic English easy for a foreigner to learn?" (453). Walsh attempts to group "foreigners" as a homogeneous group and fails to take into account the many dynamics and idiosyncrasies that come with learning languages; not just cultures vary, but all speakers learn languages differently, in different ways and at different rates.

The idea of the "foreigner" learning English also appears in a quip following the end of Walsh's article. It is separated into a different section of the page, so it is unclear if Walsh himself wrote the quip or if it came from someone else, such as the journal editor. It reads, "The cocktail lounge of the Mayflower, in the nation's capital, continues to be a fertile source of memorable cracks, the latest of which is the following: 'The trouble with foreigners is most of 'em speak English too.' - *New Yorker*" (459). Through this supposed joke, the person who made this quip in the cocktail lounge of the Mayflower Hotel indicates how the English language is globalizing and becoming an international language; even foreigners speak it! By labeling it as "problem" that "foreigners" are learning the language, however, the speaker also indicates a sense of nationalism and a desire to claim ownership of a language by preventing others access to it. Indeed, this seems even more apparent since the exchange took place in a hotel in "the

nation's capital." Perhaps the "problem" here is that if "foreigners" have access to *our* language, then we won't be able to identify them as foreigners. The need to name and label "foreigners" as other seems prevalent here, as does the native/foreigner binary.

In addition to Walsh's article on the learning of English by "foreigners," *CE* 7.8's (1946) "Current English Forum" by J.B. McM. discusses the Kenyon-Knott *Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* and its treatment of foreign names, noting that the book Anglicizes proper names to make them more easily pronounceable by English speakers. McM. says, "[t]he dictionary indicates an anglicized pronunciation as preferable for every word that has any currency in American English, no matter what the origin" (478). That is, if a non-English word or name is used frequently in American English, one should *not* try to mimic the pronunciation of the original language. McM. acknowledges that English teachers will have to use foreign names of people and places in their classrooms, so he advocates, "[t]he English instructor who is expected to tell people how to pronounce names from Aachen to Zurich, from Abdiel to Zwingli, will find the Kenyon-Knott dictionary a source of both principles and facts on the subject" (478). This article seems to indicate a desire and/or a need to discuss international issues in the English classroom. Yet, by advocating the Anglicizing of all non-Anglican names, the book privileges English above other languages rather than embracing the pronunciations and cultural nuances from which the original language(s) the names came. This move echoes the "natural apathy" (Pérez) Americans seemed to have regarding the learning of other languages (and non-English pronunciations). And, further, it exemplifies the dichotomy of "native" vs. "foreign," privileging English/Anglicized pronunciations over foreign ones.

Linguistically Diverse Students in the English Classroom

In "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition" (originally published in 2006), Paul Matsuda notes, "[o]ne of the persisting elements of the dominant image of students in English studies is the assumption that students are by default native speakers of a privileged variety of English from the United States" (83). This assumption denies legitimacy to the many forms of English spoken by the linguistically diverse international students matriculating into composition courses. This myth, Matsuda argues, "is seriously out of sync with the sociolinguistic reality of today's U.S. higher education as well as the U.S. society at large" (85). Not only does this myth incorrectly reflect the face of higher education today, it also fails to take into account the linguistically diverse students in composition courses as far back as the 1940s and 1950s; during this time, the field was beginning to contend with how to work with learners of English who spoke the language as something other than or in addition to their first language(s). Writing teachers of the time had no firmly established traditions or resources to draw on that would help them teach a non-homogeneous group of students, and they sorted through these issues in the pages of *CE*.

The first discussion that I found in *CE* that specifically addresses the presence of linguistically diverse students in the English classroom occurs in *CE* 2.2 (1940) with Kathleen Dexter's "The Use of Examination Papers in Linguistic Study." In this article, Dexter, a teacher at the University College of the South West in Exeter, England, studies approximately seven hundred examination papers of sixteen- to eighteen-year-old students to compare the similarities and differences between the students' writing patterns and speaking patterns. She chooses to study examination papers because, as she notes, "in the case of examination papers, which are

generally written under pressure of time with (sometimes considerable) excitement, the 'rules' of

grammar and spelling are apt to loose their hold, and we frequently find records of what is

happening to the structure and pronunciation of English, and these confirm for the most part the

results of speech observation" (161). Dexter seems mostly to be concerned with the ways that

English is used and how these differ from the standard ways the written language is taught.

Excluded from her analysis, however, are the exams of students in her classes from other

countries because they would, ostensibly, skew the results of her linguistic study. She says:

> I have deliberately excluded a mass of extremely interesting material from Welsh
>
> children for whom English is a second, or even a foreign, language, and another
>
> from Scotland, which has its own linguistic genius. I have confined myself to
>
> schools in which the "standard" is presumably spoken and certainly taught. I have
>
> ignored the occasional dialect word, and the far from occasional use of slang, both
>
> English and American. (162)

Dexter confines her study to the students who have been taught the "standard." This assumes, of

course, that standard English is not taught in Welsh, Scottish, and possibly not even American

schools, or, at least, it assumes that American slang is too far afield from the standard that is

taught in schools in England.

Dexter's exclusion of these outlier points remains a common practice when contemporary

scholars attempt to represent a "standard" academic English. In 2010's "Why Don't We Speak

with an Accent? Practicing Interdependence-in-Difference," LuMing Mao addresses the

detrimental effects of trying to codify standard English and denying legitimacy to nonstandard

Englishes, stating, "[s]uch efforts not only help to maintain the status quo but also serve to create

a social and discursive divide….A corollary to this divide is a persistent tendency to trivialize or dismiss altogether occasions of use that are considered 'outside of the mainstream' or simply 'non-representative'" (191). In Dexter's case, Dexter believes her "outside of the mainstream" Welsh, Scottish, and American students would not be considered legitimate speakers of standard English. Again, we can see here how research and discursive practices about linguistically diverse students from before composition was a field continue to drive current practices.

However, while Dexter excludes these students as contributors to her study, one does appreciate the nod Dexter gives to the "genius" of these other language speakers (162). While she only briefly indicates the presence of these students, it is significant that Dexter mentions them at all. She could have easily skipped over them, suggesting to her audience that her data set was a homogeneous group. Dexter's inclusion of these students in her description (if not her data set) indicates the linguistically heterogenous nature of the students in her English courses.

As opposed to Dexter's exclusion of students in her data set, Hugh Farley does include a student from a different country in his study the following year (*CE* 3.2 1941 "Words and Meanings: An Experimental Study of a Linguistic Principle"). His study argues that words and their associated meanings are fluid and changeable, and his data set includes the perceptions of fifteen students, fourteen of whom are from various states in the U.S. and one who is from Japan. Farley notes, "[t]he student from Japan was the son of an American missionary" (185). This statement, likely intended to clarify the background of the Japanese student, instead serves to create more questions. If one of the student's parents was American, was the other parent Japanese? Is the student considered Japanese because he was born and/or raised in Japan? If the student was born to an American, why isn't he considered to be American? How long had he

been in the U.S.? How long had the student spoken English? Did he grow up in a bi/multilingual

household? And does Farley include this information about the student's American missionary

parent to add legitimacy to the inclusion of the Japanese student in the study? That is, by saying

that the student was born to an American missionary, does this suggest that the student was

similar enough to the other students to warrant inclusion in the study? While on the surface it

might seem as if Farley's study is inclusionary, his failure to provide more details about the

Japanese student suggests that the field did not yet have a robust vocabulary with which to

contend or even discuss international, linguistically diverse students. It is possible that the

questions I have asked were not even considered by Farley. Yet, while neither Farley or Dexter

provide lengthy discussions of these linguistically diverse speakers of English, Dexter's and

Farley's articles allow us to see that an acknowledgement of linguistically diverse English

speakers and writers occurred in the field's mainstream conversations as far back as the late

1930s and early 1940s.

Further inklings of this conversation are evident in *CE* 2.5 (1941) as Harold Scudder and

Robert Webster also note that their students are not a homogeneous, monolingual entity. In "The

New Hampshire Plan for Freshman English," they highlight the changes that their school, the

University of New Hampshire, made to its freshman English procedure. One of the key

underlying factors for the need to change freshman English was the varied social, cultural, and

linguistic backgrounds of their students. They state:

> Our students are a heterogeneous group deriving from families in every stage of
>
> social progress. Their parents vary from nearly illiterate and newly arrived
>
> European immigrants to others whose forbears for generations have earned

distinction in the history of the state. Some of the students who come to us write

easily and well upon arrival, whereas others of foreign origin or of uneducated

and illiterate parents have the greatest difficulty. (493)

The authors highlight the struggle that students of "foreign origin" have in freshman English classrooms, and they equate this struggle to the difficulties that children of illiterate parents have, tying together the ideas of illiteracy, low education, and foreignness. This idea of foreignness as a potential detriment to learning is discussed in further detail later in this section.

We see further evidence of the non-homogeneity of students in English classrooms in Hargis Westerfield's *CE* 10.1 (1948) "Limiting Research-Paper Subjects." In this brief article, Westerfield laments that, by allowing students to choose to research any topic of interest to them in their writing assignments, he has received multiple research papers, semester after semester, on the same "hackneyed" topics (41). To combat this problem, he narrowed down the topics his students could study to "a racial or national minority in the United States or of a foreign population problem" (42). His argument for having students choose topics that would explore issues related to minorities was that "all students should be interested because they were all members of minorities or interested in some neighboring minority" (42). That is, Westerfield suggests that all students belong to or come into contact with linguistic and/or cultural minorities. With this statement, Westerfield acknowledges the complex composition of his student population, noting that just because most of them were likely American by birth, all Americans are not a homogeneous group. Furthermore, Westerfield's passage is significant because it suggests that all of his students, whether they were members of minority groups or not, were equivalent in many ways when it came to choosing research paper topics and their

abilities to research these topics, regardless of the first language(s) the spoke. In the next semester, Westerfield had his students branch out and explore topics related to Latin America, further displaying Westerfield's acknowledgement of the importance of studying international issues.

Interestingly, Westerfield is also at least somewhat self-reflexive about his own use of terminology, which furthers the conversation about how compositionists viewed nonnative speakers of English at the time, despite the fact that he still represented these writers as problems to be solved. For example, not only does he instruct his students to write about cultural minorities, but he also discusses with them what the idea of "minority" means. He notes, "I had to rescue the term 'minority' from Sociology; for many did not realize that Scotch-Irish, English, and Huguenot French are also minority terms. The students had seen how Germany's failure to solve her minority problem had led to Hitler and war; they could see that our own failure might result in dictatorship, also" (42). While there seems to be a lot packed into the highly charged phrase "solve [the] minority problem," Westerfield is attempting to encourage his students to explore the roles that minority populations play in the U.S., and he urges them to see that they are not part of a homogeneous society, either within the classroom or outside it. It is, however, unclear how Westerfield encouraged his students to think and write through things like "foreign population problem[s]." Yet it is significant that Westerfield at least attempted to bring this conversation to the forefront of his class discussions and research.

The topic of linguistically and culturally diverse students in English classrooms also appears in *CE* 7.1's "Summary and Report" (1945). The report notes, "[s]ome six hundred Chinese soldiers have been enrolled in classes at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. This

is the largest contingent of its kind ever to come from a foreign shore to live on one campus" (49). The unnamed authors of the report acknowledge the concerns they had about how to teach these matriculating students, so they sought the advice of Paul P. Eaton, director of the Technical Orientation Division of the International Training Administration "to ask if there were need for special techniques to help them [the Chinese soldiers] and what ones were being used" (49). Eaton responds to this request and quells the concerns of the report writers, noting that most of the Chinese students have been taught English since elementary school and "many have received their technical instruction from American or English professors resident in mission schools or Chinese universities" (49). Evident in Eaton's response is the confidence that is placed in the ability of native English speakers in teaching the language to international learners (rather than nonnative speakers teaching the language to other nonnative learners). Eaton ends his response with the statement, "[t]he Chinese are linguists" (49). Eaton's response pushes against the assumptions the report writers have regarding the "English language problem and the international exchange of students" (49). By preemptively labeling this a "problem," the report writers automatically assumed that the students from a "foreign shore" would not speak English well and that they are, we can surmise, surprised that the Chinese soldiers know the language as well as they do. This suggests that the report writers presumed skills and abilities—or lack thereof—of these multilingual students before even starting to work with them.

This viewing of linguistically diverse students as a "problem" reappears in Pauline Rojas' "The Teaching of English as a Modern Foreign Language" (*CE* 9.6 1948). Rojas notes that part of the issue stems from the lack of training of teachers of these students, explaining, "[u]p to the present time teachers of 'bilingual' children have not been required to have special preparation.

Nor have specially prepared materials generally been considered essential. We have assumed that any teacher who is a native speaker of English can teach English and that materials prepared for native English-speaking children are adequate for 'bilingual' children as well" (323). Yet Rojas notes that this assumption was problematic because the approaches taken with native English speakers were inadequate when teaching multilingual students. Rojas goes on to discuss some of the language programs and institutes that have been established to train teachers who work with "bilingual" students, including the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan, the Bucknell English Language Institute (later renamed Bucknell Institute for Foreign Students), the program at Teachers College in Columbia University, and a proposed program at New York University expected to begin in 1948. In "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition," Matsuda notes the historical moment in which these programs were established: "[f]ollowing the announcement of the Good Neighbor Policy in 1933, the State Department began to bring international students from Latin America to provide scientific and technical training. This development led to the creation, in 1941, of the English Language Institute (ELI) at the University of Michigan" (90-91).

Rojas points to the need for more programs and more institutional support to work with international students, clearly labeling the situation as a "problem" to be dealt with. She claims:

> As has already been pointed out, teachers of non-English-speaking groups need to be trained not only in the teaching of *English as a foreign language* but also in how to deal with *the whole educational problem* of language minorities. Children from such groups as the Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking groups in New York are not only handicapped linguistically; they are also handicapped socially

and economically. A teacher who does not understand the child's cultural

background and his socioeconomic limitations is likely to misjudge him.

(emphasis added, 324-325)

Significantly, Rojas ties together the learning of languages with issues of socioeconomic access,

culture, and resources, acknowledging the need to examine cultural nuance in the teaching of

English. Yet Rojas' statement also is problematic in that it sets up a paradigm of need, where *they*

(disenfranchised foreigners) need *us* (majority speakers of English) to help them, further reifying

the hegemonic enterprise of the teaching of English to what Rojas labels "non-English" speakers.

In trying to sort through this "problem," we also see Rojas grappling with ways to discuss

and label these students (although she does not actively acknowledge this negotiation). In the

previous excerpt, Rojas uses the label "non-English-speaking groups" (324). She also highlights

the otherness of the primary languages these students speak when discussing night classes that

are taught to "foreign-language-speaking adults" (323). But Rojas' most frequently used term is

bilingual. This is one of the earliest appearances of the term in *CE* to label student learners of

English who speak a language other than English as their first language. The term occurs thirteen

times in the five-page article, most frequently used in the phrases *bilingual child* or *bilingual*

children, with one occurrence each of *bilingual adult* and *bilingual problem*. Of the thirteen

occurrences, eleven of the uses of *bilingual* are placed in quotation marks. For example, Rojas

notes "the neglect of the educational needs of both the 'bilingual' child and the 'bilingual'

adult" (322). The only two instances in which quotation marks are not used are the last two uses

of the label in the article. This move of placing the term in quotations seems to indicate that the

label is set apart in some way, perhaps because of its relative newness or perhaps because the

author was uncertain about its use. Regardless of Rojas' motivations for using the term, the quotation marks surrounding it serve to highlight the otherness of these students of the English language, setting them apart from the norm, or "monolingual" speakers of English.

In Alma Payne's "An International Little Red Schoolhouse" (*CE* 11.1 1949), Payne offers another way to work with international students in the English classroom, or what she calls "[o]ne of the vital *problems* of the modern educator…the promotion of greater understanding among the nationality groups which may come under his guidance" (emphasis added, 37). She chronicles how Bowling Green State University has worked to engage each of their diverse students on an individual level in their composition classes. The process begins with an interview of each student to assess the "linguistic difficulties and accomplishments of the individual" (37). If the students are found in need of additional support, they enter the English for Foreign Students course with the goal of the "speedy removal of language handicaps" (37). This course is based on an immersion model, and "the student is urged to think as well as to speak in English at all times," and serves to mark English itself as a foreign language, one to be learned exclusively through immersion (37). Payne stereotypes some students as she discusses a reading program in which students can choose their own reading material ("There a German girl may find her beloved fairy tales, a Greek boy may read the myths of other countries as he rediscovers his own"), but it is significant that Payne acknowledges that students learn in different ways, and not all linguistically diverse students are the same, even if she seems to think that nationality nonetheless plays a strong role in creating personal interests (38).

Finally, in one of the last issues of *CE* before *CCC* made its appearance in March 1950, in "Subfreshman Composition—A New Solution" (*CE* 11.6 1950), Frank McCloskey and Lillian

Herlands Hornstein discuss the way that Washington Square College chose to work with students who matriculated into the college but were not quite ready for freshman English. The English Department at Washington Square College developed what they labeled a "Booster System" that helps "boost" the morale (and, ideally, the writing) of students through small group instruction. McCloskey and Herlands Hornstein note that some of the students enrolled in these booster sections include those whose parents speak a language other than English. They note, "[i]t is carefully explained to them that their *deficiency* may come from lack of opportunity in the past to read and hear and learn the necessary fundamentals…or from the circumstance that a foreign tongue or a local dialect is spoken in the home" (emphasis added, 337-8). In the post-war era, then, speaking a different language at home is seen only as a detriment (or "deficiency") to writing in English and not as a benefit in any way. While these students were seen as lacking, they were still grouped into classes with remedial native-speaking students and dialect speakers of English. Thus, as they tried to find solutions to the "problem" of international students, scholars began to group them with other marginalized groups in the academy.

Conclusion

The idea of language diversity as a problem to be solved is far from the translingual possibilities being offered by scholars in the field of composition today, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four. Scholars like LuMing Mao encourage us to "begin to view 'speaking with an accent' not as a liability but as an asset, as a contact-zone experience that deserves not censure but celebration" (194), and Bruce Horner takes "[m]ultilingualism, rather than monolingualism…as both the historical and ideal norm" (2). However, even though much of

the field has come to embrace the idea of integrating language diversity into the writing classroom, compositionists often still struggle with the teaching of composition, just as our predecessors did. We discuss how much grammar we should teach. We wonder about the teaching of English abroad and the best techniques for working with international and generation 1.5 writers here in the U.S. We wonder how much we should emphasize standard English, and there is often resistance from both teachers and administrators to the idea of integrating non-"standard" Englishes and other languages in the composition classroom.

From the early days of *CE*, it is apparent that most of these concerns have historical antecedents in the field. Indeed, as we begin to see in the following chapters, these early conversations in many ways help to create the field of composition. English educators discussed and wrote through the role of English in the world, the binary of native vs. foreign writers, and linguistically diverse students in the classroom for almost thirty years before the ostensible start of composition studies as a field in 1966. Scholars between 1939 and 1950 examined the potential roles of English as a lingua franca through concepts like I.A. Richards' Basic English, viewing English as a key language for international politics and commerce, and defining speakers of other languages according to their distance or proximity to English. Through a connection between language nativeness and mother tongues, native English speakers were seen as natural and international learners of English as unnatural. Thus, linguistically diverse writers were often invoked as deficient, ill, or having (and constituting) a problem to be remedied by the English language and English teachers. As scholars continued these conversations, they began to outwardly examine their own practices when discussing and imagining linguistically diverse writers. The next chapter will discuss how these conversation shifted and evolved following the

establishment in 1950 of the field's first journal dedicated specifically to the teaching of writing,

College Composition and Communication.

Chapter Three: The Emergence of *CCC* through Students' Right to Their Own Language

Introduction

Throughout the history of composition studies, indeed, even before it became defined as a field of study, compositionists have talked about and represented the identities of international, linguistically diverse writers through various conflicting and vexed lenses. These different views are borne, in part, of teachers' preconceived ideas and perceptions of students' linguistic abilities. In "The Historical Struggle for Language Rights in CCCC" (2003), Geneva Smitherman explores the relationship between teachers' attitudes regarding language and language attitudes in society by assessing how language policies and position statements are responses to cultural and societal movements. As a committee member of both the CCCC resolution on Students' Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) and the National Language Policy, Smitherman provides a firsthand account of the struggles behind the creation of these two position statements.

During the tumultuous political and social movements and events of the 1960s and 1970s, many members of CCCC felt a need to develop an organizational position regarding the academic value of all languages and dialects. A particularly salient event during this period was the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Following Dr. King's assassination, "it was clear that the charge to intellectual activists was to struggle for the wider social legitimacy of all languages and dialects and to struggle, whether one had a shot at being effective, to bring about mainstream recognition and acceptance of the culture, history, and language of those on the margins" (Smitherman 18). Thus, in 1972, a small committee within CCCC drafted and presented a policy position on dialects, and in 1974, the Students' Right to Their Own Language resolution became organizational policy. With the policy, CCCC "sought to accomplish three

broad goals: to heighten consciousness of language attitudes; to promote the value of linguistic diversity; and to convey facts and information about language and language variation that would enable instructors to teach nontraditional students—and ultimately all students—more effectively" (20).

But what were some of the conversations in the field regarding multilingual writers, and how did those lead to the SRTOL resolution? This chapter continues with an analysis of how teachers were working with international students in the English classroom. It shifts from the analysis of *College English* in the previous chapter to the journal *College Composition and Communication* (*CCC*), which made its entrance in March, 1950. *CCC* announces its arrival as the official bulletin of the Conference on College Composition and Communication in its first issue in March 1950. Chas Roberts, the journal's first editor, notes that the bulletin was created as a means "to preserve and disseminate to wider audiences the valuable papers and reports given at the fall and spring meetings" (13). One of the "major activities" of the publication was its focus on a particular set of concerns, namely the teaching and researching of college composition, and in this way, "is designed for a highly specialized group [and…] does not overlap in purpose or material with *College English*. The two journals complement each other to the advantage of both" (Gerber 12). So we see that at the outset, *CCC* saw itself as a companion journal to *CE*, but one with a different emphasis and a different audience.

Five years after its inception, the journal revisits its primary emphases in "CCCC Bulletin Board" (*CCC* 6.4 1955). It states that its purpose has been "to publish materials considered by the Editor and the six members of the Editorial Board to be of interest to college teachers of composition and communication: such as material dealing with traditional problems, linguistics,

specific courses, English as a foreign language, and the like" (224). From its very inception, then, the journal concerned itself with issues of language difference, and it highlights this topic as one of the primary concerns of the field of composition.

An Evolving "Problem"

During the 1950s, 60s, and 70s, it was common to discuss the teaching of linguistically diverse writers as a problem that needed solutions. Evidence of this topic can be seen in reports from many of the early issues of *CCC*, which were used as bulletins to chronicle the happenings at the national conferences, especially the Conference on College Composition and Communication. For example, "The Freshman Whose Native Language is Not English" notes, "The Chairman opened the meeting by stating that although the problem of teaching freshman English to foreign students is not a new one, it is becoming more obvious and challenging" (*CCC* 12.3 1961 p. 155). As today, the conference held workshops to discuss various topics of concern to composition teachers, and *CCC* printed the reports that came about from each of these workshops. One such workshop held at the 1952 convention was titled "Special Problems in the Communication Course for Groups Selected on the Basis of the Ability or Professional Objective" (*CCC* 3.4). One of the "problems" discussed during this workshop had to do with teaching both liberal arts-minded students and professionally-oriented students in the same composition course. According to the report, the workshop participants were highly concerned with the writing and speaking issues presented by "foreign" students, noting that "[f]oreign students seem to present special problems, which will increase as the number of foreign students increases in American colleges and universities" (27). To deal with this concern, the report

recommends that composition courses should be established just for "foreign students" and that the courses be taught by instructors who have been trained in "linguistics and the teaching of English to foreigners, with a good command of several foreign languages, and, if possible, with experience abroad" (27). This is one of the first proposals that nonnative English speakers should be taught in a separate and different way than mainstream native-English-speaking students, presenting nonnative speakers as those with special needs requiring teachers with specialized training. Because educators could not figure out how to work with students of different linguistic abilities when they were grouped together in the classroom, they proposed that students of different abilities should only be kept with other students of the same ability level.

The report also notes that this is a sensitive topic to discuss, stating "[i]t was pointed out, too, that many foreign students resent being set apart because of their language inadequacies, and great tact was necessary not only in teaching the course set up specially for them *but also in naming it*" (emphasis added, 27). We see in this statement the complicated nature of categorizing students based on linguistic ability (although it seems understandable that anyone might resent being called "inadequate" on any level). The workshop attendees seem to know that they *should* discuss how to teach nonnative speakers of English, but they don't know *how* to do so. Yet while they acknowledge that they should be careful about the language they use to label these groups of students and the classes they assign them to, at the same time, they *do* make choices in how to label them by pointing out their "inadequacies," referring to them as "foreigners" and "poorer" students," and by labeling them as "sub-freshman" students as opposed to the more mainstream "superior" and "average" students (27). These terms mark these students as deficient and symbolically beneath or below ("sub") the average freshman.

Further evidence of the "problem" of international writers is seen a few years later in Viola Rivenburgh's "A Why and How for Remedial English" (*CCC* 7.4 1956). In the article, Rivenburgh discusses some ways to work with students in remedial English classes who may be resistant to being placed in a remedial class. She discusses the typical class makeup of a remedial course: "One or two well-dressed girls fight back tears as they covertly take note of their classmates and perhaps find themselves without the comforting presence of others of their own sex. The class may be boys patently from small towns, two or more students much older than the rest, a sprinkling of Japanese or Chinese students, one or more Negro boys" (218). We see in this course a highly heterogenous group of students who are varied in terms of sex, age, nationality, socioeconomic background, and race. But Rivenburgh sees these students as all similar in one way: they all need a little extra help in reaching the target language of standard academic English. In this passage, diverse students of all types (international students, dialect speakers of English) are linked together, representing linguistically diverse writers from other countries not necessarily as special students with special needs, but as students who are more *similar* to native English speakers (just those who might need a bit of extra help) than they are *dissimilar*.

Rivenburgh advocates a first day of class discussion with students to "dispel in large part the feeling of shame at being put in 'bonehead' or 'zero' English" (219). Yet the language she uses to dispel these negative feelings varies according to the groups of students in the class. For example, when working with the older students in the class, Rivenburgh suggests telling these students that the class will act as a "refresher course" (219). This suggests that the students are capable of succeeded in a class for written and spoken English, but due to being away from school for a while, they just need to brush up on their skills. Yet the "foreign" and

"indifferent" students are grouped together and told that their "language difficulties" and "dialect problems" can be overcome with hard work (219). Furthermore, by grouping together international students with those who are apathetic, and by labeling them as students with "difficulties" and "problems," Rivenburgh assesses both groups of students as problematic and lazy. While returning adult students just need to brush up on their skills, and they are not seen as having "problems," international students and apathetic students are inherently seen in a more negative light, with "difficulties" that need to be worked through. There seem to be assumptions at work here that suggest that "foreign" students were automatically considered to be lazy and not hard workers.

The "problem" of international students continued to be a sticking point of the era, with Paul Sullivan noting in 1957, "[a]t CCCC conventions during the last three years, it has become increasingly evident that many teachers are finding themselves faced with the problem of teaching English as a second language" ("English as a Second Language: Potential Applications to Teaching the Freshman Course" *CCC* 8.1, 10). And the following year, a report from CCCC discusses how, even in workshops dedicated to other concerns, the conversation often turned to working with linguistically diverse writers. In "Special Problems of the Freshman Course in Liberal Arts Colleges," the report from a meeting of CCCC (*CCC* 9.3 1958) discusses how the workshop was established to discuss various topics, including the objectives of freshman English, the types of writing assignments in freshman English, the types of reading assigned to the course, and how to select teaching staff. Yet the meeting quickly moved toward a discussion of teaching international students in freshman English. The report notes, "The session finally found itself so absorbed in discussion of the particular needs of the foreign student as to *threaten*

the balance of the workshop's program, and therefore voted unanimously that the Executive

Committee of the CCCC be requested to include a two-panel workshop on college English for

foreign students in the program of the next spring conference" (emphasis added, 162-3). This

was a topic that was starting to take over discussions about not just linguistically diverse writers,

but also the ways, in general, that freshman English was taught since it affected monolingual

English-speaking students in freshman English classes, too. And, with the negative connotations

of phrases like "threaten the balance," this report suggests that the topic of linguistically diverse

writers was evidently such a dominating topic at the time that it almost did not leave room for

other conversations happening in the field. It also paints linguistically diverse writers in a

negative—and even intimidating—light since these students' "particular needs" were a "threat" to

the field's larger collective conversations.

As the 1950s and 1960s progressed, teachers expressed their frustrations in the lack of

training and materials and a desire for answers of how best to work with linguistically diverse

writers. A report from the annual CCCC meeting ("Composition for Foreign Students" *CCC* 15.3

1964) also acknowledges the frustration that many teachers felt at not being prepared to teach

international speakers of English. The report ends, "[e]ach of us involved in this difficult,

frustrating task can have the consolation that everyone else involved in it has just as many

problems as he does" (192). This way of looking at the situation invokes a negative space around

teaching linguistically diverse students with the use of words like "difficult," "frustrating," and

"problems," and teachers who need "consolation." Yet it does show a camaraderie that was

developing during this time among teachers who worked with linguistically diverse writers and

the need for these teachers to have some place to turn for advice, training, and resources.

Complex, Diverse, Nuanced Writers

As teachers were realizing, working with linguistically diverse writers was complex and dynamic. Linguistically diverse students brought unique cultural and linguistic backgrounds and skill sets, and suggestions for ways to work with these writers varied according to the institution, teacher, and each individual writer. In "Help for the Foreign Student" (*CCC* 4.4 1953), Sumner Ives discusses the program at Tulane University that was established to work with multilingual writers, many of whom were international students on student visas. He notes the proliferation of these students in U.S. classes, beginning his article by stating, "[t]here are probably a few students whose native language is not English in practically every well known college and university in the country" (141). Indeed, the "CCCC Bulletin Board" in this same issue contains an editorial note to Ives' article that references a passage from *School and Society* (14 Nov. 1953) claiming that 33,671 students from 128 different countries studied in the U.S. in the previous year (149).

Ives notes that while many institutions have a large number of these international students enrolled (and, thus, institutional support in the form of additional staff is often provided to meet needs), and that while some schools have a very small population of these students (and, thus, "little institutional responsibility is felt"), Tulane fell somewhere in the middle, with "enough [international students] so that they create problems throughout the college unless some provision is made for them" (141). Hence, the school was faced with devising a way to work with these students to keep them from failing their courses.

Ives points out an interesting issue in working with these students, noting that all of them

have different linguistic abilities, and thus, different academic needs. He states:

> those who really need a relatively complete description of English are expected to
> compete with those who may have spent two or three years in a secondary school
> in the country. Obviously no perfect solution can be found which is
> administratively feasible and yet will give each student exactly what he needs.
> Any program, therefore, will be a compromise whose details will largely be
> determined by local conditions. (142)

Until this time, much of the discussion about students of different writing and speaking abilities in composition classes treated nonnative-English-speaking students as a homogeneous (and problematic) group. Writing classes were often made up of students of differing abilities, and international students were often placed into the lower ability group. However, with Ives' description of these international students, we see him acknowledge the nuanced and different abilities of these writers. This seems to mark the beginning of a shift in viewing international, linguistically diverse writers as a homogeneous group to heterogeneous, dynamic, and nuanced individuals.

Yet at the same time, Ives acknowledges how tricky it can be to determine and work with the individual needs of different students. Ives notes that international students (like many native-born American students) may have learned certain work-arounds to deal with their differing linguistic abilities. He argues that in the past,

> They may have been given special consideration because of their language
> difficulties, and they expect this consideration to continue. But the school wishes
> to keep down its load of problem students, the student is tempted to lean on this

consideration and use his language handicap as an excuse for general

incompetence or neglect of his studies, and the individual members of a large staff

will hardly be uniform in the amount of consideration they will give. For these

reasons, neither a frankly non-credit course for all, nor their segregation into

separate but parallel courses, nor their distribution throughout the regular courses

is completely satisfactory. (142)

Ives acknowledges the institutional complexities involved in the matriculation of international students. In this passage, he considers many of the different possible points of concern and issues to work through when international students matriculate into U.S. institutions, and he argues for better teacher training, more resources, and ways to motivate and best assist writers who need different types of assistance than native-English-speaking students.

At the same time, Ives' representation of linguistically diverse students is somewhat negative; while he he acknowledges the need for resources to teach these students, he also labels them as having a "language handicap" and refers to them as "problem students." He suggests that these students are disabled and a drain on the system, arguing that they might expect special accommodations because they have been given them in the past, and inferring that these international students are perhaps generally incompetent if not lazy and irresponsible.

Alexander Karanikas also discusses the institutional and personal complexities introduced by Ives, further emphasizing the need for teacher training, resources, and discussions about placement of linguistically diverse writers. In "An Approach to Freshman Writers" (*CCC* 11.1 1960), Karanikas discusses the apprehension students often have when they enter freshman English. In a sentiment that is still common today, Karanikas begins, "[w]hen a college freshman

first enters his composition class, he may be suffering from inhibitions that can seriously hamper

his ability to write and, quite often, his general capacity to learn" (50). Karanikas argues that it is

important to give students all an equal amount of attention throughout the semester because

students do not like to be treated as special or different. He believes that traditionally

marginalized groups may have some of the largest concerns when entering freshman English

classes, and he places international students in this group. He says:

> Many students from groups that often suffer from social prejudice, like the
>
> "hillbillies," Negroes, Jews, and the foreign-born, arrive in a college composition
>
> class emotionally scarred by their past experience in and out of school. They are
>
> alert to any repetition of subtle slurs based on race or religion. Giving them less of
>
> your time and friendship may be taken as a sign of your inner feelings. Before
>
> long, it will be recognized by those whom you are quietly and perhaps
>
> unconsciously victimizing. These students also resent any overindulgence which
>
> in its own way makes them feel *different*. (53)

Thus, Karanikas argues that diverse students (in all the various cultural and linguistic definitions

of the term) should be treated exactly the same as more mainstream (white, middle and upper

class students) students. Conversely, however, by representing these linguistically diverse

students as "emotionally scarred," Karanikas' language suggests that these students *are* different

from mainstream English speakers who are, at least ostensibly, *not* emotionally scarred by their

previous classroom experiences.

Karanikas continues:

> The foreign-born student wants above all to be accepted as an American. He tends

in his thought to be more patriotic than anyone else, but the patriotic cliches

which may seem original to him, and which he is often eager to express, are

cliches nevertheless. He may or may not have an accent which he feels is an

obstacle to his being accepted. For him to write themes about his life in Latvia or

Poland, say, especially if they might be read and discussed, would only increase

his personal difficulties—and so he, like the girl from Kentucky, rejects the real

for the pretended, and fails to do work of excellence. (53)

As these students reject the authenticity of their own cultural backgrounds, Karanikas represents

international students as always reaching toward (but never achieving) a more American ideal in

linguistic ability, identity, and culture. According to Karanikas, as these students can never

achieve the "excellence" of their American peers, they are always imagined as deficient or

lacking.

Placement of Linguistically Diverse Writers

One of the topics of concern often discussed by teachers during this time was the

placement of international and linguistically diverse writers in freshman English classes. For

example, "Orientation Programs in Freshman English—A Symposium" (*CCC* 6.2 1955)

discusses the placement of all students in freshman English classes and provides examples of

how different schools orient and place their students. One of these examples comes from

Clarence Derrick at the University of Florida. In a brief passage, Derrick notes, "[f]oreign

students are assigned to sections taught by an instructor who has specialized in the teaching of

English to foreign students" (65). Hence, the University of Florida has begun to address the

placement of international students by creating specific sections taught by for teachers with specializations in teaching international, nonnative speakers. However, Derrick's passage is the only mention of international students in the article, which suggests that the other schools in the article either did not have a method with which to place international students or that it did not seem an important enough topic to mention in their discussions.

Yet the conversation about placement of international students ramped up over the next few years. In the next issue of *CCC*, another report, this one from the 1955 convention, also mentions the topic of international students in freshman classes and how to help them adjust to college. "The Foreign Student in the Freshman Course" (*CCC* 6.3) highlights some strategies for how best to assist these students, but rather than emphasizing how to teach international students and how to work with them linguistically, it mostly focuses on administrative details and issues of placement. The report notes that, "satisfactory handling of the foreign student's problems with English involved more than materials and methods of classroom instruction" (138). For example, the workshop participants continued to grapple with how to place these students. The report says, "[n]o satisfactory method exists at present for finding out in advance whether the student is sufficiently competent in English to do college work in this country" (139). The TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) was created in the 1960s to address this concern. In addition to this administrative concern, the report also gives conflicting suggestions on expectations for and grading of international students. The workshop participants argue that international students should be expected to reach the same standards as native English speakers, stating, "ideally he [the international student] should be worked into the regular program for all students as quickly as possible; moreover, he should be held to the same general standards as other students" (139).

Nonetheless, they also acknowledge that certain accommodations might need to be made. The report notes, "He [the teacher] will need to do more tutorial work than when teaching native students, and he should handle his grading in such a way that the student does not become discouraged through fear that a series of failing grades will prevent him from reaching a passing average by the end of the semester" (140). It is not exactly clear what this "handling" of the grading entails, suggesting that the workshop participants were not really sure how to give advice on this topic, likely because working with international students depends on the individual needs of the student. This is reiterated in the report's acknowledgement that "[t]he extent to which special provision can be made for the foreign student will vary greatly, depending on the local resources and needs" (139). The conflicting expectations that linguistically diverse international students should both be able to reach the standards of their native-English-speaking peers but that they are, in fact, different from native speakers because they will require more work from the faculty who teach them—potentially putting a drain on faculty and institutional resources—suggests that compositionists did not know quite how to treat these students. Furthermore, the view that international students should nonetheless "be held to the same general standards" as native English speakers implies that these writers were supposed to assimilate to American English.

In addition to their discussions on placement and administration, the workshop participants also discussed extracurricular ways to help international students become successful students. They suggest, "The importance of the student's life outside the classroom to his learning English should be made clear to him. He should be advised to live with native students and cultivate them socially" (139). From these administrative and extracurricular suggestions, it

is evident that the workshop participants were working through ideas of how to best help international students fit in on a larger, university-wide scale rather than only contending with how to teach these students in composition classrooms. Further, there was also the expectation that, along with American English, international students would also assimilate to American cultural norms.

The next issue of *CCC* also discusses the placement of international students. In "Administration of the Freshman English Program" (*CCC* 6.4 1955), Emerson Shuck discusses his survey of various freshman English programs in the U.S. In the survey, Shuck examines topics related to organizing these programs, such as class size, teaching load, course content, and administrative tasks and responsibilities. One of his major discussions centers on placement and remedial programs, of which international students tend to be a part. He notes that only two of the seventy schools surveyed have established programs to work with international students. Thus, while placement was starting to be discussed during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, English teachers and universities were still sorting through the best ways to place students in freshman English courses. And while there was a noticeable amount of discussion regarding these concerns, there was little structural and institutional response.

Testing and Credit

Testing of international students and credit given for courses they take is related to the topic of placement of international students. In "English for Foreign Students" (*CCC* 14.3 1963) a report from a 1963 CCCC meeting, the topic of testing as a way to place international students is discussed. The report notes that international students all have different levels of proficiency

with English and "[t]o meet the needs of students with widely varying proficiencies, a variety of courses and rather elaborate diagnostic tests must be provided" (187). This need for a diagnosis sounds rather clinical and suggests a desire to categorize and quantify, through diagnostic testing and screening processes, the linguistic abilities of international students. Two years later, a report from the annual CCCC meeting ("ESL Programs: Composition and Literature" *CCC* 16.3 1965) also discusses testing by noting that a test has been established in order to assess English ability by international speakers of the language. The report says, "[a]s a matter of general information for persons screening and admitting foreign students, attention is called to the existence of a new test of English as a Foreign Language administered through ETS three times a year on an international basis" (203). This is one of the earliest mentions of the TOEFL test that I saw in *CCC*. According to a pamphlet by ETS, the assessment company that distributes the test:

> The TOEFL® test, formerly known as the "Test of English as a Foreign Language" was developed in the early 1960's to assess the English proficiency of nonnative speakers of the language who intend to study in institutions where English is the language of instruction. The TOEFL test was developed under the auspices of the National Council on the Testing of English as a Foreign Language. The Council was formed through the cooperative effort of more than 30 public and private institutions concerned with the English proficiency of nonnative speakers, especially those applying to English-medium academic institutions. (ETS 3)

In addition to testing as a way to place linguistically diverse students in classes, the subject of credit within those classes was also discussed. In "Has English Zero Seen Its Day?: A

Symposium," (*CCC* 8.2 1957), a number of representatives from different colleges and universities discuss the courses their schools have developed to work with students who need extra assistance in writing before matriculating into freshman English, and most often, this group included international students. These courses are variously identified as "English Zero (Rhetoric 100, English A, L, X, Remedial English, etc.)" and Subfreshman English, among other names (72). The article's authors debate the many questions related to these developmental courses, such as "Full credit? no credit? some credit? Full range of grades or nothing higher than a C? What should be taught-grammar drill? paragraph writing? remedial reading? how to study? The same class hours as Freshman Composition? more? less? The most experienced instructors? or the least?" (72). Often, the students taking these classes were students from other countries. For example, at Texas A&M, the school developed a number of special sections devoted to "students of foreign birth" (90). Through the range of questions asked during this symposium, it is apparent that the teaching of international students was somewhat of a mystery that prompted questions but not necessarily many answers. The language used to refer to the classes offered to these groups of students is also significant. By labeling courses with descriptors like "zero," "remedial," and "subfreshman," by denying credit to students in some of these classes, and by using these classes to contain students, this suggests that the work being done by these students to learn the English language does not have value, and it denies legitimacy to the work that *is* being done by these students in a new country with a new language.

A report from a 1963 CCCC meeting, "English for Foreign Students" (*CCC* 14.3 1963), also mentions the lack of credit given to international students in remedial English courses. It notes, "[u]sually no unit credit is granted at graduate level, and none at undergraduate except for

courses paralleling regular courses" (187) which could refer to ESL sections of freshman English courses. However, the report suggests that there might be changes to this policy: "Subject credit for English as a foreign language is a possibility being explored by several schools" (187). The existence of these parallel courses is interesting because it contains linguistically diverse international students and excludes them from mainstream classes, which seems to go against the assimilationist views of the same era in which students were expected to integrate into American cultural norms and U.S. English.

Teacher Training

Beyond placement, credit, and testing issues, teachers were also highly concerned with how to actually teach linguistically diverse writers in the classroom. Teachers discussed their desire to have training in the best ways to work with international writers as well as the lack of resources available for working with these writers. TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) began during this time in the 1960s as a response to the demand for professionals who would focus exclusively on teaching English to nonnative speakers. Many conversations occurred at national composition conferences regarding how best to work with these linguistically diverse writers. "The Freshman Whose Native Language is Not English," a report from the twelfth annual convention issue (*CCC* 12.3 1961), highlights the discussions held during the conference about the best ways to work with international speakers of English in the freshman English classroom. One of the suggestions that came out of the discussion was the need for professionals to take on the teaching of English to international speakers as their main area of teaching and research. The report notes, "the teaching of English as a second language is a

perfectly respectable academic field which offers immense opportunities for serious research. This discipline needs more practitioners who will devote their entire career to it and not regard it as a temporary way of winning one's bread while preparing to teach courses in linguistic or literature" (156). This suggests that the teaching of English to international speakers was becoming a serious site for study, teaching, and research even though little support was provided for teachers focusing in on the area as their primary area of study. However, the existence of such a statement insinuates that some in the field did *not* see this as a valuable career choice, and some scholars were working to change this perception.

A report from the 1956 convention workshop ("The Foreign Student in the Freshman Course" *CCC* 7.3) further highlights the lack of resources and training for teachers of English, discussing the lack of programs to assist the matriculation of international students in U.S. schools. The workshop participants determined that, while they shared concerns regarding teaching international students, one of the biggest problems many of them faced was the lack of programmatic support at their universities. Yet at the same time, some schools were more fully equipped to work with international students. The report notes the disparity, stating:

> At one extreme were institutions especially staffed and equipped, physically and administratively, to offer intensive English language training on the pre-college and freshman levels; at the other, those in which foreign college freshmen are either assimilated into regular composition sections, put into remedial classes, or grouped in separate sections under the direction of a teacher who works out a program as best he can independently. (122)

In order to combat this lack of support in many cases, the workshop participants advise

that English teachers should take responsibility for advising international students in order to help them succeed, stating, "English teachers can serve (and, indeed, must) as unofficial and supplementary advisers to foreign students, placing their unique understanding of a foreign student's capacity in English at his service" (122). The report goes on the innumerate various strategies for working with international students in the classroom. The notion in this report that English teachers should advocate for international students suggests that English teachers have always, in some way, taken personal responsibility for international students in their classrooms regardless of the additional institutional support that might or might not have been provided. It also indicates that international students will need additional support and that English teachers are the appropriate people to take responsibility for these students.

This feeling of responsibility is evident in the debate during this time regarding the differences in teaching spoken English versus written English and the best ways to help students learn to both write in and speak the language. In "Composition and the Course in English for Foreign Students," (*CCC* 7.1 1956), William Marquardt contends that there has been a decline in the teaching of English as a language to international speakers through written means because a belief had developed "that written language is derivative and that hence spoken language must take precedence over written in teaching [the language]" (30). This "aural-oral approach" was beginning to become the preferred method of teaching language rather than the "reading, writing, and translation approach" (30). However, Marquardt notes that this new aural-oral approach to language teaching was only common in the U.S., not in countries abroad. Of the aural-oral approach, he says, "[i]n English language teaching abroad especially it was too slow and indirect a method for the multitudes who, because of the increasing importance of English in politics,

business, science, and technology, had to learn above all to read and write it in order to succeed

in their fields" (30). Thus, international individuals were professionally motivated to learn

English in a timely manner. Marquardt acknowledges that different methods/modes of language

teaching could be and were used for different purposes and in different contexts. Marquardt

argues that, in order to best help international students learn the English language, a combination

of both written and aural-oral skills must be brought to the forefront of their education. By

combining these methods, teachers will be able to help international students learn how to speak

and use English in various modes of communication.

In 1965, Richard Spencer and Paul Holtzman further debate different ways to teach

English to international speakers. In "It's Composition: But is it Reliable?" (*CCC* 16.2 1965), the

authors discuss their project in analyzing the English language proficiency levels of graduate

students at Pennsylvania State University and the way(s) these students are taught English at the

university. They conclude that grammar and vocabulary drills used to teach international students

must be placed into context, and teachers also should acknowledge that "[c]omposition...is *not*

disassociated from listening, speaking or reading…[and] writing ability cannot be tested

independently from these other three aspects of language" (117). The authors note that

international students should not be taught English in a vacuum free of context and rhetorical

situation:

> An understanding must be developed between the verbal situation and the real
>
> situation for there to be adequate usable language learning. Therefore, the
>
> teaching of language cannot be chopped up into the teaching of grammar or the
>
> teaching of patterns or the teaching of listening. It must teach what the language

represents. The language does not represent a body with four appendages. It

represents a solid sphere, a culture, a way of defining the universe, and a way of

manipulating and using the universe for our own benefit. We suspect that when a

teacher accepts this and understands this concept, he can teach the *language*

effectively. (121)

This view insinuates that language is inherently linked to culture and ways of being in and

viewing the world. If this is the case, then international linguistically diverse writers are faced

with the potential obstacle of not only learning a language, but changing their cultures and world

views to match new linguistic paradigms.

In "Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication" from 1956

(*CCC* 7.1), there is further evidence that the field was grappling with the ways to best teach

English to international students, whether it was abroad or in the U.S. Discussions related to

materials and resources for teachers were provided to readers of *CCC*. This article mentions a

series of books that were developed for the use of international students in the U.S. who were

struggling with learning English. These books were written in various languages other than

English with the intention of the student using a book in his or her first language in order to learn

English. The books had a companion instructor's manual that would help teachers plan lessons

for their students. While it is interesting that these books were developed to better help students

learn English, the rationale behind their development is somewhat negative: "The repair of their

[international students] English usually falls to the lot of an English instructor, or perhaps to a

graduate assistant, for whom it is a chore even worse than marking freshman themes" (54). This

language suggests that these books were borne from the frustrations of the teachers rather than

the needs of the students. By calling the teaching of these students a "chore," and suggesting that their English can be "repair[ed]," this article insinuates that international students are broken and need to be fixed.

A few years later, a book review by Sumner Ives of Lois McIntosh's *English as a Second Language* (*CCC* 11.2 1960) notes, "[t]he book is designed for learning patterns through oral drill rather than for learning the system through definitions" (125). Thus, resources for how to work with international writers in the classroom were beginning to make an appearance at this time. A report from a meeting of CCCC ("Composition/Communication Programs for the Foreign Student" *CCC* 10.3 1959) notes that research was being done both on the practical side (in the classroom) and the more theoretical side. The report says that George Motherwell, the chair of the session, said, "the teaching of English as a second language was divided into practical and theoretical problems, saying that some ideally constructed teaching materials require modifications in the practical situation" (192). That is, the methods and materials used to teach the English language should change, depending on the context in which the language is being taught. The report notes, "[i]t was generally agreed that the proper textbook is one which suits the purpose of the class; that is to say, no particular text (or method of teaching, so far as that is concerned) can be considered as a panacea for the teaching of English as a second language" (193). This view reflects the opinion that international learners of English were not a homogeneous group, and teachers who worked with these students were beginning to understand that a one-size-fits-all approach would not work. So, while teachers were striving to find answers to the "problem" of international students, they were beginning to realize that materials for teaching these students might not be the answers they were searching for.

Suggestions for Moving Forward

Various scholars during this time were starting to make suggestions for working with linguistically diverse writers that focused on something other than grammatical and mechanical compliance with the target language. For example, a report from the 1965 CCCC meeting ("ESL Programs: Composition and Literature" *CCC* 16.3 1965) suggests that the NCTE and CCCC establish workshops for teachers and establish connections with federal agencies to discuss creating centers where English could be taught to international speakers planning to attend universities where there was no support provided for such students (203), thus presenting the teaching of international students as an extra-institutional and national issue. The report also suggests that a bibliography of resources and training materials be compiled for teachers (203).

Patience/Let it Pass: Another suggestion made during this time is that more patience be taken when working with international speakers. This is a movement away from the sense of frustration that is evident in many articles and reports during this era. "Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication" (*CCC* 5.1 1954) briefly mentions a number of scholarly works that have been published in the previous year outside of *CCC*. One of these pieces is C.K. Thomas' "The Foreigner's English" from *The Speech Teacher* (1953). From the synopsis, it seems as if the piece mostly focuses on pronunciation and how international speakers pronounce words differently than U.S.-born speakers. According to the compilers of "Some of the Year's Work," one of the major takeaways of Thomas' article is that "[m]utual patience, therefore, is necessary between people speaking different languages" (48). Interestingly, this seems to echo the "let it pass" principle discussed by contemporary second language writing

scholars. The "let it pass" principle is described by contemporary scholars as the negotiation among speakers of other languages when speaking in a common tongue such as English. In these scenarios, if one speaker does not understand the specific terms used by the other but understands the main concept, the two speakers will negotiate the meaning of the ideas or concepts in question. In other words, if there is something that is not precisely correct in standard American English, the speakers will "let it pass" (see Canagarajah's "Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language Acquisition," citing Firth). This approach advocates time and tolerance when working with international users of English rather than resistance or a "fix it" approach. The suggestion that patience and acceptance be used when working with international speakers is a shift in tone away from the idea of the international speaker being a "problem."

This concept of letting things like errors and mistakes "pass" is also reiterated in a report from the 1955 convention, "The Foreign Student in the Freshman Course" (*CCC* 6.2). The report reflects:

> Most participants seemed to think that students who will return to their native countries after graduation should learn English well enough so that their work in other courses will not be materially handicapped by language difficulties and that those who expect to remain in this country should meet the standards in English required for native students—so far, at least, as their reading and writing are concerned. (139)

This passage separates international users of English into two groups and suggest that students who plan to return to their home countries following college should not be held to the same

standards as international students intending to remain in the U.S. as long as their writing is adequate for communication purposes in their other courses. Of course, what it means to be "materially handicapped by language difficulties" will be subjective and dependent on the teachers of those other courses mentioned.

Emphasize Content: Another related suggestion made during this time is that emphasis should be placed on content rather than mechanics when teaching international students. An English Language Institute established during this time at the University of Hawaii was also conducting research to best determine ways to teach international writers and speakers of English. In "A Survey of University Writing Assignments" (*CCC* 22.2 1971), Nancy Arapoff-Cramer describes a survey of faculty across the university that she conducted in order to understand the writing assignments assigned to students "which concerned either all four linguistic skills (understanding, speaking, reading, and writing or writing in particular" (161). Arapoff-Cramer notes the importance of stressing content issues in teaching international students rather than focusing on sentence-level concerns. Her survey results suggest "that low English proficiency does not necessarily lead to failure in a given course" (162) and "our job—in teaching writing at least—must be to train foreign students to communicate to their teachers somehow that *they understand the content* which they are expected to understand, even if they do so in imperfect English" (162). This view that even "imperfect English" can be acceptable in some circumstances is different than the view during this era that the only English that should be used in classrooms was the standard English of native users.

Resource and Culture: In addition to patience and a focus on content, another strategy some scholars embraced during the time emphasized seeing the student's first language and

cultural background as resources rather than deficits. That is, some teachers began to focus on what these students could *add* to the community rather than how they *detracted* from it. One of the workshops at the 1953 convention was "Use of Community Resources in Teaching Freshman English" (*CCC* 4.3). The report from this workshop highlights some of the specific ways teachers can and have used community resources in teaching composition. The report mentions the "value in dependence on personal observation of live language situations to increase awareness of the significance of language in human affairs" (89). Hence, evident here is the workshop attendees' belief in the usefulness of field work—in talking to and observing people in local community groups—in understanding and studying how language works. The end of the report also mentions the benefit of observing individuals who may be outside of mainstream local communities: "Beyond these community resources several members reported a new kind of resource for the study for language in the form of students in the campus community who do not speak English as a native language—visiting fellows and children of displaced families" (89). In this passage, linguistically diverse students are seen as outreach providers to the community. This is one of the first times we see compositionists discussing multilinguals as valuable contributors to the public sphere. While this topic is not discussed in much depth, and it is not clear if it was addressed in more detail during the workshop itself, it is significant that the workshop attendees saw the potential benefits in learning from and about multilingual speakers of English who are part of the campus community. Rather than viewing these groups as outside the mainstream and, thus, insignificant, this statement suggests that the workshop attendees acknowledged that there was something to be learned from linguistic minorities, even if it was just learning how these speakers adapted to the learning of English.

Another way that students from other countries are highlighted as a resource to the community appears in "Contributions of Anthropology to Communication Theory" (*CCC* 8.3 1957). This report from a meeting of CCCC briefly notes that in conducting ethnographic research, particularly case studies, students from other countries can be helpful resources in reflecting on the different cultural value systems they have been a part of (182). In this way, linguistically diverse individuals were seen not merely as outreach providers, but as a type of research collaborator in the classroom. Both of these views are significant shifts away from seeing multilinguals as problems to be managed and instead suggest that students from other countries were starting to be seen as useful in understanding communicative practices from different cultures.

In addition to seeing the cultural background of the international students as a resource, some teachers also emphasized the importance of teaching international students about U.S. culture as a way to help them negotiate their transition into U.S. institutions. One of the panel sessions at a 1962 CCCC meeting notes that it is important for international speakers of English who have come to the U.S. to learn both cultural aspects of the language use in addition to the language itself. In the panel "English for Foreigners in the U.S.A" (*CCC* 13.3 1962), Benjamin Hickok suggests "an intensive course in linguistic and cultural orientation before the student undertakes any other study; a special course on American political and social thought; informal discussions over coffee; a brother or sister relationship with an American student; housing of the foreign student with two or three American students who speak English well" (65). Two other speakers on the panel, Professors Brennan and Paratore, note these cultural aspects as well, arguing, "that teachers of English who are teaching students from a foreign background should

stress American usage rather than grammatical correctness" (65). While some of these suggestions continue the assimilationist undertones suggested by other researchers, they also indicate that the learning of the English language was seen, at least by some individuals, as not just a grammatical, mechanical act, but also one steeped in cultural nuance and communicative practice.

The importance of understanding cultural aspects of a community is also noted in "English for Foreign Students" (*CCC* 14.3 1963) a report from a 1963 CCCC meeting. The report warns that while culture should not be the only thing emphasized for international students learning English, it is still an important aspect of learning a language. It says, "[a]ny indoctrination in 'the American way of life' should be unobstrusive [sic] but foreign students often need instruction in the fundamental procedures of the American academic and social system" (187). Again, the assimilationist undertone is present, suggesting that international speakers of English must learn both the language *and* the culture in order to function in the U.S. academy. Underlying this view is also the suggestion that, since the "American way of life" is necessary, any other nationality's "way of life" would be detrimental in trying to live a life in the U.S.

William Marquardt ("Composition in English as a Second Language: Cross Cultural Communication" *CCC* 17.1 1966) further points out the cultural complexities in learning English as an international speaker of the language, particularly highlighting the different cultural nuances one must learn when using English in different countries. He notes:

> Students of English as a foreign language…have a considerable number of
>
> different English-speaking cultures they might be expected to communicate in. In

addition, there are hundreds of millions of non-native speakers of English in

important positions in every city of importance in the world they might

conceivably want to communicate with. Learning to write effectively in English,

then, requires for the non-native speaker training of the highest order in sensitivity

to differences in cultural patterns. (31)

Thus, in learning English, nonnative international speakers of the language also have to take into

consideration the many different cultures of the English speakers with which they might need to

communicate.

Marquardt's statement also brings to light the global use of English, highlighting its use

as a language of communication throughout the world. He further notes five reasons that

nonnative speakers of English might want to learn to read English: "(1) to extend his mastery of

English beyond the forms of market-place speech, (2) to provide him opportunities for personal

intellectual growth, (3) to extend his social opportunities and effectiveness, (4) to extend his

political awareness and effectiveness, and (5) to increase his professional opportunities and

competence" (31). Marquardt suggests that the abilities to speak, read, and write in English will

lead to opportunities for professional, political, and personal growth. Underlying this suggestion

are the ideas that a) international students both want and need these values that English will give

them and b) international students do not get a sufficient degree of these opportunities from their

home cultures or languages. Thus, English is set up as a superior language, the ideal toward

which everyone should strive.

Assumptions: During this time period—and, indeed still today—assumptions were made

about the abilities and skill levels of international learners of English. For example, in "Some of

the Year's Work in Composition and Communication (*CCC* 6.1 1955), there is evidence that

different assumptions are made about speakers of different languages, and these assumptions are

often based on the individual's first language spoken. This study conducted by Irving Lorge and

Lorraine Kruglov (originally published in "The English Proficiency of Foreign Students, Judged

by the Records of Students with Different Linguistic Backgrounds" in the *Journal of Higher*

Education) examines how well international students performed on vocabulary tests, and the

authors determine that students who spoke languages more similar to English tended to perform

better on the tests (although it does not discuss on what grounds different languages were

compared to find their similarities or differences to English) (58). Thus, it would seem that

international speakers of English continued to be placed on a spectrum of foreignness or

otherness and constructed according to their proximity to English.

Assumptions about international students are also present in "Why Do Freshmen Write

Poorly?" (*CCC* 9.1 1958). In the article, Ferdinand Ward discusses the study that was conducted

at DePaul University of 360 freshman English students. In the study, the students were asked

about their perceptions regarding their abilities to speak and write in English. The participants

were broken into two groups: group A had "regular freshmen who had achieved at least a 'C' in

their mid-term examination" and group B had "subfreshman English students" (31). Both groups

had students who came from homes where multiple languages were spoken, yet Ward makes a

point of noting that group B had fifty-one of these students, and forty-five of them spoke their

parents' language, while group A had sixty-five of these students, but only twenty of them spoke

their parents' language. Ward attempts here to draw a connection between the language(s) spoken

by the students and their ability to perform in freshman English classes. Multilingual students (or

at least students who came from homes where more than one language was spoken) are portrayed here as two distinct populations: those who pass for "regular freshmen" and those who are "subfreshman" or below the standard.

At the end of the study, Ward notes, "It is *surprising* to conclude that a foreign language spoken by a student or heard at home has *no deleterious effect* upon his English. Both groups hold that no harm has ever been experienced in their writing from hearing or speaking a foreign language. Neither group likewise seems to be affected seriously by the English heard on TV and radio or from their associates" (emphasis added, 31). Ward's "surprise" seems to come from his unacknowledged assumption that students who come from homes where multiple languages are spoken will find these multiple languages detrimental to (or will have a "deleterious effect" on) their ability to speak and write in English. Instead, Ward notes that the "harm" done to students comes from lack of practice in composition and "the remedial student at DePaul University is in his present state because he received little or no training in composition during his high school days" (31). Thus, Ward concludes that the struggles that the "subfreshman" students often have with English have more to do with their previous educational experiences than their linguistic diversity, which puts multilingual international students on par with underprepared native English speakers.

Ward's assumption is related to notions of first language interference and the ways that multiple language affect language learning (the inability to do/learn additional languages). This sentiment is also echoed in the report from a workshop at a 1962 CCCC meeting. The report, "Teaching English with Reference to Other Languages," notes that teachers of foreign languages can help English teachers when teaching international students because the foreign language

teachers can offer "significant comparative observations about English and the foreign language and can isolate 'interference' areas, which makes for more efficient language teaching" (*CCC* 13.3 1962 p. 46). Linguistic diversity is again seen here as a problem rather than an asset and as something that gets in the way rather than something that boosts creativity and communicative capacity. Both Ward and the workshop report suggest that, for speakers of English as something in addition to or other than their first language, the first language(s) of these speakers will in some way "interfere" with their learning of English.

In addition to assumptions based on linguistic and cultural background, Marian Musgrave contends with assumptions and issues of bias related to racially diverse students in "Failing Minority Students: Class, Caste, and Racial Bias in American Colleges" (*CCC* 22.1 1971). She argues that assumptions are made about students' abilities based on a variety of racial and ethnic markers. She says:

> America's at times hysterical nationalism discourages the learning of foreign languages and encourages contempt of those who speak a foreign language or who speak English with a foreign accent. America enforces overtly or covertly an almost total segregation of various darker-skinned groups from other lighter-skinned ethnic groups, thus preventing all but the most perfunctory contacts between persons speaking dialectal variants of English, and then penalizes the dark-skinned speakers of English for not speaking another variety. America wishes to be considered a democracy and a champion of democracy, but her educational system presupposes superior and inferior groups and has enforced unequal treatment. (24)

Musgrave ties together discrimination based on race as well as linguistic diversity. She makes a connection between varieties of English and race and ethnicity, noting that some varieties of English are considered inferior to others.

Like Musgrave, Johnnie Sharpe also ties together issues of access and discrimination based on language, social class, and race. In "The Disadvantaged Student Trapped Behind the Verb 'To Teach'" (*CCC* 23.3 1972), he notes, "[w]hat English teachers must understand is that what disadvantaged students encounter in the classroom is language interference. Generally, this is conceded to for non-English speakers, but it is equally true of nonstandard English speakers" (272). Thus, Sharpe sees all speakers of non-mainstream Englishes (both international and domestic alike) as disadvantaged when it comes to writing in standard academic English. Further, Sharpe even argues that international linguistically diverse students have a slightly easier time in U.S. classrooms because teachers expect to make allowances for them as opposed to nonstandard U.S. English speakers, who face more bias in the classroom.

Students Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL)

As the previous examples suggest, in the 1970s, conversations about diversity of all types —linguistic, cultural, racial—were often linked when scholars discussed the teaching of English to diverse students. This continues to be the case today as compositionists discuss the concept of translingualism and the advantages of using all available languages (including nonstandard Englishes) in communicative acts. In fact, many roots of the concept of translingualism can be seen in the Students Right to Their Own Language resolution (SRTOL), such as the equality of languages and dialects outside standard English.

While SRTOL focused chiefly on nonstandard varieties of English and did not actively acknowledge international students or the translingual approach to language, I bring in the discussions surrounding the resolution here to examine ways that linguistic diversity can be conceptualized through many different lenses. Moreover, by the early 1970s, scholars like Sharpe, for instance, had begun to understand and talk about multilinguals as being a very similar, if not equivalent, population to native speakers of nonstandard English dialects. For example, discourses about racial and cultural diversity often lead back to questions about standard English(es).

Jacqueline Berke's 1971 article "A Defense of Craft: One Response to the Cincinnati Conference" (*CCC* 22.3) is one example of the conversation about standard English. In the article, Berke reflects on panels and workshops she attended at the CCCC meeting in Cincinnati. She argues for the importance of standard English in teaching writing, and she cautions against the acceptance of nonstandard varieties. She says:

> Certainly a responsible teacher will not delude a student into thinking that blatant departures from standard usage ("It weren't nothing that I done") will be accepted in a serious and respected manner by the larger community of readers, as was maintained at still another conference workshop—a very unprofessional and appallingly unrealistic position, I would think. After reading Fries and Gove and every other hallowed name in language study, we all know there is nothing linguistically wrong with foreign accents or regional dialects, i.e., nothing intrinsically wrong. As teachers of expository writing we should also know, and make known to our students, that unless they want to be regarded patronizingly as

"quaint" or "colorful" they had better stick to standard usage. Accents and dialects may have a special charm in speech, but in written expository discourse directed to a general audience they have no place. The reader is put off by them and will not trust what the writer is saying. (255)

Berke has multiple arguments in this section. First, she argues that it is, in fact, irresponsible to allow students to use vernaculars and accented language in their writing. She allows that, at least linguistically, there is nothing "wrong" with students who speak with an accent. Yet this statement suggests that there is something "wrong" on another level, perhaps socially or academically. And in noting that "[a]ccents and dialects may have a special charm in speech," this seems to represent speakers who have accents as amusing, but not academically astute. Divorcing accents and dialects from written English also suggests that there is not a holistic connection among language, culture, identity, writing and "voice" in writing. Finally, she contends that accented or vernacular writing ruins a writer's ethos by making the writer seem untrustworthy and off-putting.

Berke further argues that standard English must be taught to minority students as a way of providing them with access to academic and professional opportunities. She says:

It is no sign of disrespect, then, to any regional or minority group to make available to them the level of language that is currently operative in the larger community. On the contrary, I would say that as teachers of writing we are obliged to make this level known so that minorities can—if they wish and when they wish—enter into the mainstream of discourse, expressing themselves with confidence and authority, attracting no untoward attention. (255)

Thus, Berke argues it is the responsibility of the composition teacher to help diverse students assimilate because without standard English, students will not succeed in society.

Johnnie Sharpe, however, takes issue with this sentiment, noting that access to the standard does not always mean equal opportunity. He says:

> What we have done in the past, are presently doing, but must not do in the future is to create the false assumption that competence in Standard English is the most valuable tool in assimilating the new culture and that all doors to success automatically open. The idea that mastery of English will solve all problems prompts many immigrants to immediately embark on learning the new language, eliminating their foreign accents in order to earn their fortunes in this capitalistic society. For a few of the lucky ones, it works; for others who are forced to join the ranks of the disadvantaged, success does not come as easy. (275)

Sharpe argues against the assimilationist view that conforming to standard English will automatically create opportunity for international speakers of English. Yet his argument is contradictory in that he still notes that "a few of the lucky ones" will gain advantage by learning the language, which suggests that all the others who do not gain proficiency are *un*lucky. Thus, Sharpe calls attention to the complexities involved in learning English and attempting to assimilate into U.S. culture.

Sharpe's views on vernacular and the problems with standard varieties of English appeared in the same issue of *CCC* that first announced suggestions for the Student's Right to His Own Language resolution (later amended to Students' Right to *Their* Own Language or SRTOL). In this same issue of *CCC,* the "Secretary's Reports" (*CCC* 23.3 1972) contains a draft

of SRTOL and plans to create a task force that would draft a document explaining the background of the resolution as well as suggestions for its implementation. The report notes:

> Lloyd-Jones distributed the statement formulated by the sub-committee: "The Student's Right to His Own Language." In a lengthy discussion, it was pointed out that this is not an abandonment of standards and that a larger document was desirable so that a complete background statement and suggestions for implementation (including training of teachers) could be included. The final statement, achieved after discussion and some changes in wording, reads:

>> We affirm the student's right to his own language—the dialect of his nurture in which he finds his identity and style. Any claim that only one dialect is acceptable should be viewed as attempts of one social group to exert its dominance over another, not as either true or sound advice to speakers and writers, nor as moral advice to human beings. A nation which is proud of its diverse heritage and of its cultural and racial variety ought to preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly the need for teachers to have such training as will enable them to support this goal of diversity and this right of the student to his own language.

> […]Davis moved that McPherson appoint a sub-committee of the Executive Committee to submit names of people to be appointed to a Task Force or ad hoc committee of approximately ten people knowledgable in the necessary fields for the purpose of working on an explanation and methods of implementing this statement. (325-6)

Evident in this statement is the notion that cultural and linguistic diversity are positive and even productive things. The statement suggests that linguistic diversity is related to identity. With the argument, "[a]ny claim that only one dialect is acceptable should be viewed as attempts of one social group to exert its dominance over another," the statement also suggests that it is the responsibility of composition teachers to battle against linguistic hegemony and encourage their students to express their diversity and identities through language.

Yet even at these early stages of the resolution before it was formally adopted, SRTOL was controversial. In the same issue (*CCC* 23.3), responses to the resolution were included, and these give a sense of how some members of the profession responded to it, even before it was officially declared as a resolution two years later in 1974. The first response claims the resolution to be "unsound" for various reasons (299). First, the respondent, William Pixton, takes issue with the suggestion that allowing students to use the "dialect of his nurture" is "an acceptable substitute for the standard English" in academic settings. However, the suggestion made by STROL is not that the students' own dialect be a substitute for standard English. Rather, as it is stated in the Secretary's Report, "this is not an abandonment of standards" (325). Pixton claims, "[t]eachers of English who allow this dialect to be so used are insuring that their students will have severe difficulties when they encounter the world of everyday affairs, a world which demands intelligible English from the individual, not the 'dialect of his nurture'" (299). Pixton assumes here that the "dialect of [students'] nurture" would *not* be "intelligible" to other speakers of Englishes, and thus he constructs multilinguals in such a way that they are considered to be incapable of communication. He also imagines a public sphere that is based on standard English rather than a multitude of dialects and registers.

Pixton goes on to argue, "teachers who believe that a meaningful 'identity and style' can be found in or can emerge from such dialects are suffering from ignorance or delusion" and "if [students] are taught that the dialect of their provincial nurture is *as good as* standard English, then surely English teachers are slighting their obligations" (emphasis added, 299). Pixton's argument not only denies legitimacy to the students' own dialects as linguistic resources, but it also suggests that identity is *not* tied to language. Pixton's argument further suggests that standard English is the *only* language through which one can develop a "meaningful 'identity and style.'" Thus, Pixton places languages and varieties of English on a hierarchical scale, where vernacular Englishes and other languages are not "as good as" standard English (299).

Pixton claims, "Standard English is used by the majority of persons in the English-speaking world, not so they may dominate, but so they may communicate. *And those who expect to live in this world would do well to learn its language*" (emphasis added, 299). Again, Pixton seems to imagine a public sphere in which only standard English predominates. In this way, international multilingual writers are imagined almost as alien and not of "this world." And thus, the only way to function in this English-speaking world is to assimilate to standard English.

The second response to SRTOL in this issue comes from John Hendrickson. In it, Hendrickson writes in a vernacular that he claims to be from his Tibetan-American heritage. It seems to mock the writing that students might actually do if they were allowed to write in their own dialects. He says:

> [t]hat dominent power strukshur type riting aint nowheres and that goes for spelin and punchuashn to from now on its everthing goes or you a dam fashist wid no morals. What I meen. Why shud us tibetan-amuricans, bolgarian-amuricans,

eyetalian-amuricans, afrikan-amuricans, metsican-amuricans, gringo-americans,

amurican-amurican and etc. haff to lern to rite like G. Washington and all of them

other anglo-imperilist mothers wich they aint none of our heringtage and neether

is all this here gramerand punchuashun and etc. that was stuff down our throt

befor we foun out ho the hell is runnin things. (301-2)

Hendrickson's argument seems to be similar to Pixton's. That is, if we allow students to write in

their various dialects, that will mean the end of standard English and the culture that is associated

with it. Hendrickson portrays linguistically diverse writers as arrogant, unwilling to compromise,

and almost anti-American.

Another response to SRTOL appears in *CCC* 23.5 (1972). Robert Saalbach suggests a

middle ground between striving for standard English and the inclusion of various dialects. He

says, "It is my considered opinion, therefore, that we reject both the extreme of 'anything goes' in

language and the extreme of a mystical 'Standard English' which seems, according to its

supporters, to have a life of its own divorced from the social conditions under which we all carry

on our business" (416). Thus, Saalbach falls in between those arguing for SRTOL and the critics

who argue against it. Further, he calls into question the idea of a public sphere that only functions

through the use of standard English.

In *CCC* 24.2 (1973), Adam Casmier wrote a response to Pixton, Hendrickson, and

Saalbach. He notes, "[t]he articles in the October, 1972, issue, written by William H. Pixton and

John R. Hendrickson, seem to me so naive as to be almost harmless….But Mr. Robert P.

Saalbach's 'considered opinion' in the December issue is another, and more dangerous

matter" (226). He argues that Saalbach's contention that the SRTOL resolution suggests an

"anything goes" approach to language is harmful and incorrect, and he notes, "[t]he whole thrust of the resolution, in fact, is to turn our attention from a superficial concentration on minor differences in syntax and usage to what should be the real business of every writing teacher: helping all students, whatever their dialect, to express themselves precisely and exactly" (226). By noting that it is the responsibility of teachers to help *all* students become more clear in their writing, Casmier suggests that linguistically diverse writers are no different than any other kind of writing student, that all students are imprecise and inexact in their writing.

Garland Cannon follows up on this debate in "Multidialects: The Student's Right to His Own Language" (*CCC* 24.5 1973), arguing that standard English is an unrealistic concept. He argues, "[t]he country is too large and complex to have one such standard. So there can't be a single standard for any given classroom" (383). However, he argues that more linguistic research must be done to determine what, exactly, the SRTOL is referring to when it says "standard English" (383) in order to understand how teachers can push against this supposed norm. He also calls for more linguistic research related to different cultural dialects in the U.S. He says, "[i]n short, although the teacher requires basic linguistic information about his students' dialects, it is not yet available. So he must function in considerable dialectal ignorance" (384). Thus, multilinguals and their languages use are represented as both mysteries and subjects for more research.

In 1974, the year SRTOL was officially adopted, a special issue of *CCC* (*CCC* 25.3) was dedicated to the SRTOL resolution, a background statement regarding its need and its goals, and a bibliography that highlights resources for teachers who want to know more about the background of SRTOL. In "Committee on CCCC Language: Background Statement," the

committee acknowledges the need for the resolution, noting, "[d]ifferences in language have always existed, and the schools have always wrestled with them, but the social upheavals of the 1960's, and the insistence of submerged minorities on a greater share in American society, have posed the question more insistently" (1). Thus, minorities in the 1960s and 1970s, linguistically diverse writers among them, were seen as a political and social force demanding more attention from the composition field. The statement goes on to explain some of the assumptions and terms behind the resolution in anticipation of some of the concerns and questions the resolution might raise for its readers.

The committee members take up the claim argued by Pixton that the public has certain expectations about the English that should be learned and used by students. They note that, as Garland Cannon suggested, little was known at that point about the acquisition of language and the reliability of a standard English:

> And if teachers are often uninformed, or misinformed, on the subject of language, the general public is even more ignorant. Lack of reliable information, however, seldom prevents people from discussing language questions with an air of absolute authority….The English profession, then, faces a dilemma: until public attitudes can be changed—and it is worth remembering that the past teaching in English classes has been largely responsible for those attitudes—shall we place our emphasis on what the vocal elements of the public think it wants or on what the actual available linguistic evidence indicates we should emphasize? Shall we blame the business world by saying, "Well, we realize that human beings use language in a wide variety of ways, but employers demand a single variety"? (1)

In this passage, the committee members acknowledge that, because English teachers have been complicit in the public's opinions and attitudes about standard English, it is the responsibility of these teachers to challenge and change these perceptions. In a way, this represents multilinguals as victims of the general public and the business world, and the passage suggests that it is the responsibility of composition teachers to protect these individuals. At its essence then, the SRTOL resolution was a way for teachers to claim authority over what they were teaching, and not be beholden to the public's perception of what an English teacher should do.

And one of the things that the SRTOL resolution stressed was the right for every student to express her own individuality and diversity through language. The committee members note, "many of us have taught as though the function of schools and colleges were to erase differences. Should we, on the one hand, urge creativity and individuality in the arts and the sciences, take pride in the diversity of our historical development, and, on the other hand, try to obliterate all the differences in the way Americans speak and write?" (2). They base this emphasis on individuality and diversity on the fact that the U.S. population already is diverse and complex and that there is no one standard way of communicating. They note, "[w]e know that American English is pluralistic. We know that our students can and do function in a growing multiplicity of language situations which require different dialects, changing interconnections of dialects, and dynamic uses of language" (10). Thus, linguistically diverse writers are represented here as adept at always already operating effectively through and with their various languages in the public sphere, and it is the responsibility of English teachers to help students express themselves and communicate through these varied and "dynamic uses of language."

Conclusion

Overall, in the decades between the launch of *CCC* and the SRTOL resolution, compositionists were beginning to contend with the highly complex and nuanced ways of understanding and representing international, linguistically diverse writers and how these representations affected the day-to-day classroom situation. By representing international students as "sub"-English learners, they were seen as below the mainstream, and they were often viewed to be lazy, incompetent, and apathetic. At various points, scholars shifted from viewing these students as problems that needed to be separated into their own sections of English classes to grouping these students with other basic English writers and dialect speakers of English. Scholars often represented the ability to speak (standard) English as the only way to engage successfully with the public sphere, and they perceived international students as striving to become American in terms of language and culture, but never being able to reach these goals.

Over time, many scholars began to realize the importance of both embracing linguistic diversity and giving students a chance to express themselves through their various linguistic and cultural associations. Some researchers even started to see the value in treating these international students as co-collaborators and co-researchers in the composition classroom. But all scholars at this time agreed on one point: that international multilinguals created sites for further research. Some of this research is evident in the next chapter, which continues to explore this stretching of linguistic barriers through the turn of the century up until the present day.

Chapter Four: From SRTOL to Translingualism: Assumptions, Policies, and the Public Sphere

> "The more people engage in language learning, the less likely they
>
> may be to demand linguistic perfection and 'native-speaker'
>
> fluency of themselves or others."
>
> —Bruce Horner, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane
>
> Donahue, from "Toward a Multilingual Composition
>
> Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm"

Introduction

This chapter will focus on the discussions regarding multilingualism in the field of composition following the SRTOL debate and leading up to the translingualism movement of today. In the almost four decades between SRTOL and the present, the field of composition's discussions related to international users of English have expanded beyond their previous focus on pedagogical and material concerns. This era marks a movement toward a discussion of the global use of English in the public sphere. In keeping with SRTOL, discussions often favor the positive aspects of multilingualism rather than focusing on the difficulties these users have with learning the language. Indeed, the field has begun a shift toward embracing and celebrating the contributions made not just by international students but also writers from linguistically diverse communities within the U.S. For example, a special issue of *CCC* in 2011 (*CCC* 63.1) focused on ethnic and indigenous rhetorics such as Hawaiian rhetorics and Native American rhetorics.

Additionally, compositionists of this time period have begun moving toward a redefinition of the language used to categorize and label linguistically diverse writers as well as

examining the assumptions behind such labels. While these discussions often occur in footnotes and not the body of the texts, the inclusion of reflective moments regarding naming/labeling practice at all suggests that the field is beginning to examine its own language when portraying users of multiple languages.

Continued Reactions to SRTOL, Resolutions, and Policies

Initially the reaction to the shift to a student-centered approach that SRTOL advocated was largely negative; teachers feared the drastic changes that SRTOL proposed. These concerns mirrored the reaction to the increasing number of nontraditional students in schools. As Geneva Smitherman notes in "The Historical Struggle for Language Rights in CCCC" in 2003, "'The Students' Right to Their Own Language' was a policy formulated to address the contradictions developed in the midst of a major paradigm shift in higher education, itself the result of a major paradigm shift in the social order" (26). These shifts had to do with the ways linguistically diverse individuals from other countries as well as other minorities in the U.S. were portrayed in both classrooms and the public. And, at least in higher education, scholars were beginning to recognize the importance of engaging more thoroughly with issues of linguistic diversity.

Looking back at SRTOL three decades after its emergence, Valerie Felita Kinloch, in "Revisiting the Promise of 'Students' Right to Their Own Language': Pedagogical Strategies" (*CCC* 57.1 2005), addresses the historical significance of SRTOL and reiterates its call for compositionists to embrace linguistic diversity. She notes, "[e]ven before the adoption of the Students' Right resolution thirty-one years ago and since the inception of the organization some fifty-five years ago, composition and communication scholars have sought forums in

which to discuss issues of language diversity, language rights, and teaching strategies" (86). Indeed, these discussions have occurred not just *since* the establishment of the organization but even *before* its beginning, and these early conversations were a formative force in the field, let alone the organization. Previous chapters have examined this history before SRTOL, and this chapter seeks to further elucidate this history following SRTOL's creation.

Even after the passing of SRTOL, the struggle for minority language rights continued. In the 1980s, a task force, the Language Policy Committee (LPC), formed within CCCC to organize against the English Only movement. The committee drafted a resolution, and CCCC passed the National Language Policy in March, 1988. This policy marked an explicit engagement with language issues in the public sphere, representing linguistically diverse individuals as not simply problems that should be fixed by teachers in the classroom, but rather important contributors to a diverse society. The background statement of the National Language Policy on the NCTE website states, "[t]his policy recognizes the historical reality that, even though English has become the language of wider communication, we are a multilingual society," and it "enable[s] everyone to participate in the life of this multicultural nation by ensuring continued respect both for English, our common language, and for the many other languages that contribute to our rich cultural heritage" ("CCCC Guideline on the National Language Policy"). Thus, in a move that sounds similar to today's translingual approach to language, the National Language Policy represents linguistic diversity as already the norm in American society. Further, it stresses that individuals should be encouraged to explore their linguistic (and multilingual) roots because they are a key part of the U.S.'s cultural heritage.

The National Language Policy was not met with as much animosity in the field as the

SRTOL resolution. Thus, educators, particularly those at higher-education institutions, recognize the importance of multilingual classrooms. By laying out the sociopolitical need for and reactions to SRTOL and the National Language Policy in her 2003 piece, Smitherman shows how CCCC's actions were grounded in social situations and "affected by the social movements, political events, and assassinations in the world beyond academe" (17-18). These societal and cultural situations prompted compositionists to try to find ways to intervene in issues of diversity and language policy, and SRTOL and the National Language Policy were results of this desire to engage in the public sphere.

In 2001, another such statement, the CCCC Statement on Second-Language Writing and Writers, was issued by CCCC that continued to advocate for the rights of second language writers (*CCC* 52.4 2001). The statement argues for the importance of acknowledging second language writing concerns in the composition classroom as well as taking up the call (as mentioned in Chapter Three) for more discussions regarding student placement, credit, teacher preparation, and resources for teachers of linguistically diverse writers.

In the statement, the members of the CCCC Committee on Second Language Writing (Paul Kei Matsuda, Akua Duku Anokye, Christine Pearson Casanave, Helen Fox, Tony Silva, Guadalupe Valdés, and Bob Weissberg) argue that teachers of writing should acknowledge that second language writers will continue to be integrated into classes across the university, especially first year writing courses. Because of this, they "urge writing teachers and writing program administrators to recognize the regular presence of second-language writers in writing classes, to understand their characteristics, and to develop instructional and administrative practices that are sensitive to their linguistic and cultural needs" (670). Just like in the National

Language Policy, linguistically diverse writers are seen here as already the norm in composition classrooms (a major principle of translingualism), and they are represented as an important part of U.S. higher education.

Further, the Committee on Second Language Writing argues that second language writing and writers should be woven into the fabric of the work of all compositionists. That is, while some scholars have addressed multilingual concerns in the past, the committee argues that all compositionists should acknowledge the presence of these students when discussing pedagogy and other scholarship, thus invoking linguistically diverse writers as an integrated aspect of the field rather than as a supplemental subfield that only some scholars are concerned with. The committee notes:

> We also stress the need for further investigations into issues surrounding second-language writing and writers in the context of writing programs. Since those issues permeate all aspects of writing theory, research, and instruction—from textual features and composing processes to collaborative strategies and writing assessment, we encourage scholars and researchers of writing to include second-language perspectives in developing theories, designing studies, analyzing data, and discussing implications. (670)

Thus, the committee suggest that, while some scholars dedicate their work to studying second language writing and writers, this is really a topic that the entire field of composition has a stake in. To a certain extent, this idea was also expressed in earlier decades as scholars debated about how to work with second-language writers in their classes. However, the approach of scholars in the formative years of the field emphasized the problems presented by second-language students

while the Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers encourages the field to embrace and learn from working with second-language writers.

The statement's authors note that the concept of "second language writers" encompasses a large, diverse population. They state:

> Second-language writers include international visa students, refugees, and permanent residents as well as naturalized and native-born citizens of the United States and Canada. Many of them have grown up speaking languages other than English at home, in their communities, and in schools; others began to acquire English at a very young age and have used it alongside their native language. To many, English may be the third, fourth or fifth language. Many second language writers are highly literate in their first language, while others have never learned to write in their mother tongue. Some are even native speakers of languages without a written form. (669-670)

They note that these individuals come from a variety of political and language-learning contexts, and they will all have different relationships with literacy. Thus, the statement portrays linguistically diverse writers as complex and difficult to define. It is also a move toward recognizing the individuality of each writer, pushing against previous efforts to homogenize these writers with one-size-fits all assumptions and pedagogical approaches.

Shifting the Pedagogical Focus: Changes in What and How We Teach

While discussions during this time period regarding multilingual writing and writers did not focus as highly on teaching concerns as did other time periods in the field's history, some

pedagogical conversations did still exist. During the 1980s, for example, there were various announcements regarding workshops and conferences that held sessions about teaching linguistically diverse writers. In 1984, there was an announcement in *CCC* 35.2 regarding a "Young Rhetoricians' Conference" that was to be held at San Jose State University (195). One of the sessions at the workshop was "Monolingual Teacher/Bilingual Student" (195). Another issue the same year (*CCC* 35.4 1984) was devoted to "contentious" issues that were sure to "leave… readers a little out of breath" ("Editor's Note" 399). One of these "recognizably controversial issues" is the continuing debate about how to teach international and "nonstandard" speakers of English in composition classrooms (399). By positioning this as a "contentious" issue, the editors of the journal continue to represent the multilingual students who make up the issue as problems in need of a solution. By using the words "contentious" and "controversial," this also suggests that linguistically diverse students are a source of discord and strife within the profession and that they drive a wedge into the field's sense of community.

In this "contentious" issue of *CCC*, in "Alliance for Literacy: Teaching Non-native Speakers and Speakers of Nonstandard English Together" (*CCC* 35.4), Alice Myers Roy argues that nonnative English speakers and those who speak other vernaculars and dialects of English as their first languages should be taught in classes together. She argues for placing both groups of students in classes together because the groups have similar goals, strategies for learning standard English, and because the groups have likely faced similar issues of lack of access to the target language (439). Roy notes that "evidence from the fields of second language acquisition and sociolinguistics supports the combining of these groups for instruction in basic writing and beginning composition" (439). Roy also points out that many international learners of English

may be introduced to nonstandard varieties of English based on the Englishes of the communities

they have been exposed to in the U.S. She says, "[i]n fact, many non-native speakers, particularly

permanent residents in urban areas, have already acquired some competence in nonstandard

English, either their own linguistic community's variety or a local prestige variety such as Black

English" (443). Therefore, Roy assumes that international multilinguals and speakers of U.S.

vernaculars may have actually had the same exposure to nonstandard forms, and thus, Roy

proposes that they be taught together. Indeed, she suggests that international speakers of English

are equivalent to speakers of diverse varieties of English within the U.S. This portrays

international English speakers as more alike some U.S. English users rather than dissimilar,

drawing attention to similarities rather than differences and shrinking the gap between native and

nonnative English speakers.

Three years after Roy's piece, Edward P.J. Corbett discusses the evolution of the field of

composition and the field's major concerns between the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s ("Teaching

Composition: Where We've Been and Where We're Going" *CCC* 38.4 1987). In a paragraph

under the section "Changes in What We Teach in the Composition Classroom," Corbett notes:

> The TESOL program has become a bigger and bigger enterprise in many of our
>
> schools because of the great influx of foreign students. It remains to be seen
>
> whether this program will continue to grow or whether it will slow down and
>
> become a permanent but small operation in our curriculum. That question has
>
> been complicated by the whole issue of bilingualism. One of the facts that makes
>
> this development such a crucial matter is that right now, in some states in this
>
> country, such as California, over fifty percent of the students come from foreign-

born families. (450)

Corbett points out that while over half of the students in many classrooms likely spoke multiple

languages in addition to English, the institutional enthusiasm and support for TESOL programs

seems to be waning. Given limited resources, linguistically diverse writers are seen as a drain,

perhaps taking money away from other areas of writing instruction. Bilingualism is represented

here as a potential disruption to the teaching of composition rather than an acceptable and useful

part of the curriculum.

During this time, compositionists were also continuing to acknowledge the importance of

culture in the teaching of linguistically diverse writers. In "ESL Composition: The Linear

Product of American Thought" (*CCC* 35.4 1984), Joy Reid notes that international students who

are learning to write in and speak English have to learn not only the language but also the

cultural expectations of, in this case, American audiences. For example, American audiences are

accustomed to a certain linearity and detailed examples in writing that is not necessarily present

in the writing of other cultures outside the U.S. She notes that Arabic writing, for example, uses

fewer examples and details than American writing (449). Reid further argues that American

teachers should be aware of the differences not only in the languages of their international

students but also the different rhetorical strategies of writers from outside the U.S. She says,

"[a]n understanding of the approaches used in different cultures to present written material and a

knowledge of other writing strategies will help ESL writing teachers, and an understanding of the

preferred and acceptable formats will help ESL composition students" (449). The home cultures

and rhetorical traditions of international students (and mostly their differences from American

rhetorical traditions and culture) are seen as a challenge for both these students and their

teachers, but certainly not an insurmountable one. Basically what Reid suggests is a background

in contrastive rhetoric for composition teachers who are working with international students.

Reid seems to suggest that teachers cannot expect international students to be solely responsible

for their own learning, and teachers must learn where to meet students in their linguistic and

cultural education in order to help them be successful in U.S. classes. And, for that matter,

teachers can learn about these different rhetorical and cultural traditions from these students, an

idea we first started to see in the previous chapter as compositionists began to see linguistically

diverse writers as co-researchers in the classroom.

In "Multicultural Classrooms, Monocultural Teachers" (*CCC* 40.1 1989), Terry Dean

further examines the link between one's home culture and learning the culture of the university.

He notes, "I have a hunch that how students handle the cultural transitions that occur in the

acquisition of academic discourse affects how successfully they acquire that discourse" (23).

Dean argues that it is the responsibility of teachers of multicultural, multilingual writers to

acknowledge the diversity of cultures, experiences, and languages of their students and to

provide students with an opportunity to work through these transitions among cultures through

assignments and course activities. He argues:

> These topics and assignments not only help students mediate between school and
>
> home cultures, they provide windows for the teacher into the diversity within each
>
> of the cultures that students bring with them. They can serve as a base for ongoing
>
> teacher research into the ways in which home and university cultures interact.
>
> There simply is no training program for teachers, and can be no definitive
>
> research study that will ever account for the realities our students bring with them.

Change is constant. Each generation is different. Given the lack of homogeneity

in our classes, given the incredible diversity of cultures we are being exposed to,

who better to learn from than our students? (36)

Dean represents students as co-collaborators and as creators of meaning and knowledge in the

classroom. He also views the home cultures of international students as resources rather than

problems or limitations.

This confluence of cultures is further examined by Fan Shen in "The Classroom and the

Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition" (*CCC* 40.4 1989). In this

article, Shen discusses the experience of shifting from a Chinese culture and identity (and writing

within that culture) to writing in English in the U.S. Shen notes that this negotiation is inherently

tied to identity as a writer and an individual. She states, "[l]ooking back, I realize that the process

of learning to write in English is in fact a process of creating and defining a new identity and

balancing it with the old identity" (466). Shen's goal is

to describe and explore this experience of reconciling my Chinese identity with an

English identity dictated by the rules of English composition. I want to show how

my cultural background shaped—and shapes—my approaches to my writing in

English and how writing in English redefined—and redefines—my *ideological*

and *logical* identities….Becoming aware of the process of redefinition of these

different identities is a mode of learning that has helped me in my efforts to write

in English, and, I hope, will be of help to teachers of English composition in this

country. (459)

Thus, Shen furthers Dean's claim that linguistically diverse students can contribute rich resources

to conversations about culture, language, and identity in the composition classroom. Shen's article is also significant because it shows the contributions linguistically diverse teachers can make in the classroom community (even though Shen is not by any means the first linguistically diverse teacher to publish an article in *CCC*). Additionally, Shen's article demonstrates that, by including the voices of linguistically diverse writers in the field's major journals, the field of composition was starting to examine how these linguistically diverse writers represent *themselves* (as opposed to only being represented by others). And Shen's analysis of her own experiences also suggests the multiple identities that some linguistically diverse writers feel they have that correspond to different situations. This builds on the evolution of linguistically diverse writers as moving from a homogenous group to unique individuals who have multiple literacies and identities as writers.

Writing Centers Enter the Conversation

During this era, writing centers also entered the conversation about working with linguistically diverse writers. As sites where writers can talk about writing with less fear of assessment or judgment, writing centers were and are sites in which multilingual writers often feel comfortable discussing and negotiating their learning of the English language. Muriel Harris, in "Centering in on Professional Choices" (*CCC* 52.3 2001), discusses writing centers as sites of learning that are useful to linguistically diverse writers. She notes that "they offer unique, nontraditional, alternative learning environments; and…they often provide the only assistance available for populations of students that institutions want to retain—students who are non-native speakers of English, learning disabled, disadvantaged, nontraditional, and part-time" (438). In

this passage, Harris notes that institutions want to retain these groups of students, likely for diversity initiatives. Once again, "non-native speakers of English" are grouped with other sometimes disenfranchised, marginalized groups on campus ("learning disabled," "disadvantaged," etc.), with Harris suggesting that the writing center is the most appropriate place to help all these non-mainstream individuals and that these students need the type of services the writing center can offer.

In "Tutoring ESL Students: Issues and Options" (*CCC* 44.4 1993) Muriel Harris and Tony Silva discuss the need to train tutors of English (specifically those working in writing centers) to prepare them to work with linguistically diverse writers. Harris and Silva note that linguistically diverse writers, just as monolingual English speakers, benefit from the one-on-one attention that writing centers can offer. They state:

> We should recognize that along with different linguistic backgrounds, ESL students have a diversity of concerns that can only be dealt with in the one-to-one setting where the focus of attention is on that particular student and his or her questions, concerns, cultural presuppositions, writing processes, language learning experiences, and conceptions of what writing in English is all about. Typically, the tutorial assistance available for these students is provided by writing centers, and m*uch of the personal help available there is precisely the same as for any native speaker of English*: the goal of tutors who work in the center is to attend to the individual concerns of every writer who walks in the door—writing process questions, reader feedback, planning conversations, and so on. (emphasis added, 525)

Here, Muriel and Silva represent linguistically diverse writers as needing the same types of attention that native English writers need. This suggests, in a way, that all writers are the same and have many of the same concerns in their writing, just in different proportions; all writers demand a lot of time and resources, not just international students. And, as we have seen, this is an idea that goes back to before the establishment of the field.

Harris and Silva also point out the usefulness of cross-disciplinary collaborations in working with linguistically diverse writers and position these writers as providing opportunities for collaborative interdisciplinary research and scholarship. Because many disciplines focus on the teaching of linguistically diverse writers, Harris and Silva also note the benefits of collaborating across disciplinary boundaries to develop pedagogies to work with these writers. They state, "[b]ecause the need to learn more about how to work with ESL writers in tutorials is immediate and real, one of the authors of this essay, a writing center director [Harris], asked the other author, the coordinator of ESL writing courses at our university, for help [Silva]" (526). Further noting the benefits of the collaboration, they state, "ESL instructors and writing center people need to keep interacting with and learning from each other" (537). This was an article in a journal devoted to composition that was written by a scholar in writing center studies and an ESL scholar. This cross-disciplinary collaboration shows that compositionists twenty years ago saw the value in learning from colleagues from different disciplines since linguistically diverse writers are studied by many different fields in the academy. This simply underscores how much compositionists should know their own, unique history regarding the teaching of international students in order to better collaborate with other disciplines.

Composition and TESOL and the Study of Language

One thread of the conversation during this time period relates to the shifting role of

composition after the emergence of TESOL/TESL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other

Languages/Teaching English as a Second Language) in the 1960s. In "Composition Studies and

ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor" (*CCC* 59.4 1999), Paul Kei Matsuda argues that

since the establishment TESL as a field, the field of composition has become less concerned with

the teaching of second language speakers of English. He argues, "the lack of second-language

elements in the history of composition studies, and therefore in our sense of professional identity,

continues to reinscribe the view that the sole responsibility of teaching writing to ESL students

falls upon professionals in another intellectual formation: second-language studies, or more

specifically, Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL)" (700). While my study suggests

there *is*, in fact, a considerable history of second language elements in the history of composition

—indeed, that the elements pre-date and even helped form the field—I do agree that "the

presence of ESL students should be an important consideration for all teachers and scholars of

writing because ESL students can be found in many writing courses across the United

States" (699). And, along with Harris and Silva's argument, I believe that this should be a topic

of concern not just to teachers of writing but all educators since it is not the "sole

responsibility" (as Matsuda says) of any one discipline.

Nonetheless, ten years after Matsuda's 1999 piece, in "Second Language Users and

Emerging English Designs" (*CCC* 61.2 2009), Jay Jordan notes that the disciplinary division of

labor continues. Jordan argues that beyond the challenges faced by second language users,

compositionists must also consider how these students can inform compositionists'

understanding of literacy. He notes:

> In this country, the Census Bureau reports that 51 million residents use languages other than English at home. The story of English's inevitability as a lingua franca is thus complicated by the various uses to which English is put and the various places where it is used. If English is evolving largely through the mouths and fingers of people conventionally identified as language learners worldwide, L2 students may not only have much to learn but also much to *teach*—a statement that implies a need for new ways to attend to competence. (W311)

Jordan portrays these linguistically diverse writers as uniquely qualified individuals in the shaping of literacy education, repositioning them from needy students to teachers and even experts in pragmatic and real world uses of English(es). Further, Jordan points to a view of multilingualism in the public sphere as the norm rather than the exception.

Yet Jordan's emphasis on "what these language users already do well" has not always seen as a positive thing by compositionists. Related to Matsuda's and Jordan's arguments, Susan Peck MacDonald also notes that conversations about the English language itself have lessened over the past thirty years in English studies ("The Erasure of Language" *CCC* 58.4 2007), perhaps because TESOL took up the reins of the discussion about language diversity. MacDonald argues that there should be more of an emphasis on the study of the English language woven throughout all English studies. She notes that, when topics of language do appear in CCCC sessions, they tend to have a negative connotations. She says:

> we tend to perceive *language* as primarily of concern when students are in some way struggling and not when students are ordinary or proficient writers. These

struggling writers might be ESL students, students using "nondominant" or

"nonmainstream" dialects, graduate students in over their heads as they face new

challenges in academic writing, or students whose "identities" are believed to be

problematic within academic settings. However what *language* does **not** appear to

include is anything more positive or enjoyable and less indicative of struggle and

difficulty. (emphasis in original, 595)

Thus, MacDonald notes the negative connotations with which discussions of language are often

infused; students trying to achieve proficiency in academic English, including students from

other countries, have been connected with—and even seen as a source of—the negative and

painful associations English faculty in general have about "language."

She continues, "[i]t is understandable that many members of the profession might want to

avoid this apparently troubled area in favor of greener pastures with more apparent rewards,

easier work, or greater prestige" (595). This invokes international, linguistically diverse writers

as a source of a loss of prestige and even as harmful to a teacher's or scholar's career.

MacDonald's argument also suggests that English studies professionals have ignored discussions

of language and linguistic diversity because these conversations are too difficult to contend with.

While it is misleading to argue that the field has completely avoided discussions about language

diversity, it *is* evident that, in past decades, compositionists have sometimes seen working with

multilingual writers as a loss of stature and a drain on departmental and institutional resources.

Reconceptualizing Error

One of the shifting discussions regarding language in the field of composition is related

to conceptualizations of what "error" means. In "Error Analysis and the Teaching of Composition" (*CCC* 29.3 1978), Barry Kroll and John Schafer discuss their experiences teaching English in Asia and Africa and how they have come to see the idea of "error" differently based on their experiences with the "ESL field" (242). They note that in the ESL field, the approach to studying error has shifted from focusing on the error itself ("product") to the reasons behind the error ("process") (242). This focus on process is aided by structural linguistics, which allows researchers to find patterns in errors (242). Kroll and Schafer propose that this approach can be used not just in working with English as a second language writers but also in working with *all* student writers (243).

Their way of looking at error suggests that error is not necessarily a cause of inability or "ignorance" on the part of the learner of English (242). Rather, errors often occur when learning a new language because the learner is working with different grammatical structures than those to which they are accustomed. Therefore, errors should be seen as a sign of growth rather than a problem with the speakers or writer's ability (or inability) to learn a language. This suggests that linguistically diverse writers can be seen as a source of pedagogical knowledge and wisdom that is of use to all writing teachers and students, thus situating them as powerful contributors to the classroom.

The concepts of error and first language interference also come up in David Bartholomae's "The Study of Error" (*CCC* 31.3 1980). Bartholomae notes that one of the three categories in which errors commonly occur is "dialect interference, where in the attempt to produce the target language, the writer intrudes forms from the 'first' or 'native' language rather than inventing some intermediate form. For writers, this intrusion most often comes from a

spoken dialect" (258). Bartholomae suggests a relationship between spoken dialect and the communicating of thoughts through writing. Like Kroll and Schafer, he suggests that multilingual writers are not incapable of speaking or writing without errors, but instead they are dealing with complex negotiations among multiple spoken and written languages. At the same time, the language used here ("intrudes," "intrusion," "interference") demonstrates that negative associations still often come with this negotiation of languages and presence of "errors."

In "ReMembering the Sentence" (*CCC* 54.4 2002), Sharon Myers suggests that, for international students, the concern with writing is often focused on mechanical issues of error because these students are intelligent, and the content of their writing is not problematic. She says, "[m]ost university ESL students are graduates, people who already think critically, have plenty to say, and may even have a good idea of how to organize what they have to say. Their thoughts founder on sentences much more often than on content or organization" (611). While Myers acknowledges that international students might sometimes struggle with communicating their ideas in English, she still sees them as intelligent. Further, Myers draws a connection between ESL writers and native English speakers, noting that many first-language writers often have the same concerns. She says, "[o]bviously the need to become fluent in composing sentences is an obstacle to many first-language students as well, and I think for the same reasons: restricted vocabulary in general, unfamiliarity with the vocabulary most specific to writing in particular, and a lack of 'feel' or 'sense' for how written sentences should 'sound' as well as how connections between them should 'sound'" (611). Thus, from Myers' perspective, as international students learn to express themselves in academic English, they are not so different from native English speakers because it is difficult for all writers to transition from a spoken language to a

more formalized written version of the language.

These differences between spoken and written English are also highlighted by various compositionists over the years. King Kok Cheung continues the discussion in "Drawing out the Silent Minority" (*CCC* 35.4 1984). He discusses the relationship among speaking, writing, and reading as it pertains to international students. He "focus[es] on how to draw out minority students, drawing on [his] experience as an Asian student who has known the pains and frustrations of being silent and [his] experience as an instructor of minority students" (452). He notes that many of these minority students are uncomfortable about speaking in class, and this hesitancy corresponds to their difficulties in expressing themselves in writing, too. Cheung ends the article with suggestions for working with minority students, including taking "advantage of the opportunity to listen when a minority student speaks. It takes tremendous courage for some minority students to speak up, so the instructor should let them speak immediately even if she sees only the ghost of a hand," and he suggests that patience is a key virtue in working with students who are reticent to speak up in class (453). This represents international minority language students as "courageous" but also silent, ghostly sufferers who are pained and silenced, which is not always the case.

For example, a few years later, Terry Dean actually argues against the contention that minority students are hesitant to speak in class. Dean discusses his experience using peer groups in class, noting that in many cases, his ESL writers in these classes are very vocal: "I have never heard complaints from teachers using peer groups about how difficult it is to get ESL students to participate" (32-33). Thus, Dean portrays ESL writers as vocal and outgoing, much the opposite of how King Kok Cheung sees them. These two examples from teachers working with

multilingual, multicultural students demonstrate the difficulties inherent in trying to classify groups of students based on cultural or linguistic backgrounds. These two different opinions also stereotype international students into two polarly opposed groups: silent and vocal.

Assumptions and Marginalization

While many assumptions are (and have always been) made about linguistically and culturally diverse writers, compositionists in recent decades have actively begun to examine and, in many cases, push against these assumptions. For example, in "Transference and Resistance in the Basic Writing Classroom: Problematics and Praxis" (*CCC* 40.2 1989), Ann Murphy calls attention to the common view that nonnative English speakers have presented problems in the classroom (as is evident in my analysis dating back to the earliest issues of *College English* in the 1940s), and she argues that students carry this judgment with them into future classroom interactions. In a similar move to previous scholars, Murphy groups together nonnative English speakers with students who have emotional or psychological deficits. She says, "the writing student returns to and re-enacts an ancient drama of initial wonder at the brave new world of language and ideas, and then subsequent, painful humiliation and defeat by teachers, institutions, and cultural/political forces which define the dyslexic student as a discipline problem, the non-native speaker as an annoyance, indeed an intruder, and the unmotivated child as stupid" (184). Our characterizing nonnative speakers as outsiders, Murphy suggests, makes them see themselves as such.

This danger of making assumptions about and categorizing students is further noted in "The Interaction of Public and Private Literacies" by Richard Courage (*CCC* 44.4 1993).

Courage discusses two case studies in which students negotiated their home and academic literacies. One student is Ethel, "a New York-born Puerto Rican woman in her middle twenties, bilingual but English-dominant, divorced, the mother of two young children, and a homemaker living on public assistance" (486). Even though Ethel spoke English as her primary language, her Puerto Rican ethnicity heavily influenced her accent. Courage notes:

> Her past teachers had made her embarrassed about her "Spanish accent," even though English was her dominant language. She also believed that she could not write and had to learn from scratch. She was obsessed with the most basic aspects of grammar and mechanics, especially handwriting. Her teachers and even her correspondents had frequently made fun of her handwriting, and she was very anxious when she first showed her work to her new teacher. (488)

Ethel's past experiences in school have caused her to doubt her ability to write well in English, even though it is her dominant language. Indeed, Courage argues that her previous teachers have made Ethel "embarrassed" which caused her to be "anxious" and made her "obsessed" with learning English mechanics, thus painting a picture of Ethel's emotional instability as a result of her previous teachers' responses to her linguistic diversity.

Jean Chandler notes the frustration many linguistically diverse students feel when they receive feedback from instructors that seems confusing or contradictory. For example, in "Positive Control" (*CCC* 48.2 1997), Chandler says, "several Asian female students have come to me in tears because an English teacher wrote on their papers that they should read their papers aloud and correct their grammatical and lexical errors; their response was, 'If I could correct the mistakes, I wouldn't have made them; I need help'" (273). Therefore, Chandler argues that

teachers of linguistically diverse writers need to take into account not just what they say to these writers, but also how they handle their interactions with them. She argues, "[w]hat matters instead are the attitudes and relationship of teacher and student and whether there is a supportive constructive dialogue between them" (273). Chandler notes that many of the responses linguistically diverse writers have to their teachers comments is not very far removed from their native English-speaking counterparts, stating, "[t]he same misunderstandings can occur between native English-speaking students and teachers" (273). Thus, it is the responsibility of the teacher to offer better feedback to *all* students and not necessarily treat international students differently. This echoes the suggestion made by writing center professionals and compositionists researching error that linguistically diverse writers and those traditionally considered monolingual-English speakers have, in many ways, overlapping concerns and needs.

In "Strangers in Academia: The Experiences of Faculty and ESL Students Across the Curriculum" (*CCC* 46.4 1995), Vivian Zamel discusses a survey she conducted in which she asked faculty across the curriculum about their "issues and concerns…about their experiences working with non-native speakers of English" (507). She notes, "by far, the greatest concern had to do with students' writing and language, which faculty saw as deficient and inadequate for undertaking the work in their courses. I got the clear sense from these responses that language use was confounded with intellectual ability" (507). Thus, these international students' "deficient and inadequate" linguistic abilities are being linked to a cognitive inability from the perspective of these teachers. From the results of her survey, Zamel concludes that it is difficult for many faculty not to make assumptions about students' intelligence based on their linguistic abilities.

Furthermore, she notes that faculty do not always have a homogenous view of "ESL"

students. That is, different faculty make different assumptions about "ESL" writers. To support

this argument, she includes responses from faculty that reveal starkly "divergent views on

language, language development, and the role that faculty see themselves as playing in this

development" (508). The responses she received ranged from teachers discussing linguistic

diversity as a resource to seeing it as a hindrance to learning the material of the course. Zamel

argues that it is important for researchers to take into account all these divergent views because it

helps composition scholars to assess their own assumptions and pedagogies (507). The students

she interviewed called attention to how faculty see them. Zamel notes that these ESL writers

have various responses to the ways they have been represented and the assumptions made about

them by their teachers. However, she does note, "the majority of students' responses described

classrooms that silenced them, that made them feel fearful and inadequate, that limited

possibilities for engagement, involvement, inclusion" (512). Thus, these students are reflectively,

acutely aware of their marginalized status in the university. Zamel goes on to say, "it is not

surprising that ESL and other writing-based courses have a marginalized position, that these

courses are thought to have no authentic content, that the work that goes on in these courses is

not considered to be the 'real' work of the academy" (515). Zamel suggests, then, that ESL

writers, faculty that teach ESL courses, and ESL courses themselves have been categorized in

such a way as to deny them legitimacy.

Problems with Labels and Assumptions: Charles Coleman discusses the complexity of

trying to use labels to classify diverse groups of students. In "Our Students Write with Accents:

Oral Paradigms for ESD Students" (*CCC* 48.4 1997), he discusses teaching students who speak

varieties of English as their first language but are often left out of traditional "ESL"

classifications. Coleman wants to "broaden the context of our literacy instruction to take into account oral language paradigms and practices that shape the writing of some ESD [English as a Second Dialect] students" (487). Coleman gives two examples of ESD students: African American Vernacular English (AAVE) speakers and Creole-based English-speaking Caribbean students. Coleman's suggestion demonstrates the complexity of labels and the complex linguistic diversity in our classrooms. It also shows that compositionists are, indeed, becoming more aware of how the language used to discuss linguistically diverse writers is fraught with tension and difficulties, and his use of a different term (ESD) shows his own negotiation of how to represent linguistically diverse writers.

In the abstract of "An Essay on the Work of Composition: Composing English against the Order of Fast Capitalism" (*CCC* 56.1 2004) Min-Zhan Lu calls attention to the importance of examining the labels used to represent students and the effects those labels have on both the writers as well as teachers assumptions about them. She notes, "I pose a set of alternative assumptions that might help us develop more responsible and responsive approaches to the relation between English and its users (both those labeled Native-Speaking, White or Middle Class, and those Othered by these labels)" (16). By giving all people who speak English the label of "user," Lu levels the playing field, showing that everyone who uses English can have agency with the language, to a certain extent.

Footnotes: Often, this conversation about the labels scholars choose to represent linguistically diverse writers occurs in footnotes of articles, and it is significant that scholars sometimes choose to place information regarding their naming practices in footnotes or in prefaces rather than within the body of the text itself. By relegating these points to the periphery

of the main discussion, it seems as if the epistemological assumptions that undergird them are considered supplementary rather than a driving force behind our research and scholarship, and crucial discussions regarding the representations of linguistically diverse writers are being downplayed as if they are peripheral to our teaching and our researching these writers, or as if these writers are not already a major force in our collective conversations. Conversely, however, I do believe that it is significant that these discussions of labeling choices exist at all, despite their relegation to the periphery. Any explanation of the usage of terms to label linguistically diverse writers—and the assumptions behind them—demonstrates a scholar's engagement with the complex issues inherent in using such labels. Any discussion of this topic is useful; there just needs to be more of it.

One example of the discussion of labeling occurs in Suresh Canagarajah's "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued" (*CCC* 57.4 2006). In the article, Canagarajah examines some of the ways that linguistically diverse writers are discussed in the field of composition, and he also includes various footnotes to explain his own rationale for using certain terms. His first footnote is an explanation of his use of the terms "World Englishes" ("traditional 'native' varieties") and "Metropolitan Englishes" ("emergent varieties that differ from the traditional"), and his second footnote explains his use of the terms "native" and "nonnative" speaker (613-14). In his description of his uses of "native" and "nonnative," Canagarajah notes, "[t]hough I go on to argue that we have to adopt more proficiency-based categories like expert/novice to distinguish speakers, and abandon categories based on birth or blood, I retain the use of 'native' and 'nonnative' when I discuss the work of scholars who use that framework" (614). Here, Canagarajah explains his choice to remain consistent by using

particular terminology in the specific instances when scholars he engages with use that terminology. This choice suggests how difficult it is to group and discuss linguistically diverse writers according to divergent paradigms.

In her article "'Internationalization' and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse" (*CCC* 61.2 2009) Christiane Donahue points out the need for compositionists in the U.S. to learn about and understand the practices and traditions of writing teachers in other countries, and her article deals primarily with the concept of internationalizing the higher education curriculum and what that means for composition studies. She spends the bulk of her article unpacking what "internationalization" means for compositionists, thus showing the importance of examining what we mean when we use certain terminology to engage within and beyond our discourse communities. But she also brings up her own use of terms to describe other phenomena, such as the relationships between individuals and the languages they speak. For example, a conversation about nativity to a language occurs in a footnote to her article. She states, "I use 'mother tongue' or 'home' language throughout this article with an acknowledgment of its vexed status" (237). Like Canagarajah, she notes that she often uses these terms because they are the most frequently used terms in the sources she cites (237).

In this same issue of *CCC* (*CCC* 61.2 2009), Jay Jordan also uses a footnote to explain his use of terms. In "Second Language Users and Emerging English Designs" (*CCC* 61.2 2009), he says, "I employ the term *second language user* rather than *speaker* or *writer* to wear away at the distinctions among reading, writing, and other instances of language—distinctions that my students, among many other language users, flout daily as they speak, write, read, text, email, and chat" (W326). Jordan's use of *users* echoes Min-Zhan Lu's choice of the term, emphasizing

linguistically diverse individuals as employing the English language in ways they see fit in various rhetorical situations. Jordan's use of *users* represents these individuals as adaptive, rhetorically savvy, and co-constructors of the English language.

And in "Enacting and Transforming Local Language Policies" (*CCC* 62.4 2011), Christine Tardy calls attention to her usage of terms to describe linguistically diverse writers in a footnote as well:

> A broad range of students fall under the term *multilingual students*, including international students and late-arriving and early-arriving U.S. residents, terms used by Dana Ferris in her recent book *Teaching College Writing to Diverse Student Populations*. In this article, I generally use the term *multilingual students* when referring to this population broadly; at times, I use the term *second language writers* to refer to students who may struggle more with certain elements of English language proficiency (often, but not always, international students or late-arriving resident students). (657)

Thus, Tardy demonstrates the difficulty in choosing just one or two terms to represent these writers and the need to explain the choice. Her use of *second language writers* is nested within the larger term *multilingual students*.

Much like Donahue's use of particular terms based on their use by others, and Jordan's adoption of Lu's second language *users*, Tardy's use of *multilingual students* is based on another scholar's use of the term. As my study shows, this recycling, updating, and redefining of labels and terminology evolves over time and builds on previous uses of and assumptions behind the different terms, a process that has been at work for the last seventy-five years.

Translingualism and Multilingual Classrooms

This reflective act of examining one's labeling and naming practices suggests that the field is broadening the discussion of what terms like *multilingual* mean. Inevitably, a discussion of terms leads to re-appropriations of terms and to neologisms to better describe the populations second language scholars study and discuss. In the past few years, the concept of translingualism has begun to take hold in composition circles. While the term *translingual* only started to make an appearance in composition journals within the last few years, the principles behind it were being discussed by compositionists for decades before.

Demonstrating the importance of reflecting on our choices of terminology and on the assumptions behind those choices, the term *translingual* itself was discussed at the 2011 Conference on College Composition and Communication during the panel "(Re)Defining Translingual Writing" with Min-Zhan Lu Bruce Horner, Paul Kei Matsuda, and Suresh Canagarajah. During their presentations, the presenters both struggled with their need to try to place characteristics on what *translingual* means and cautioned against being too hasty to define it. In their review of the panel, Rebecca Lorimer and Andrea Olinger note, "the common theme of this CCCC panel was one of a general delay regarding labeling: The talks were tinged with ever-so-slight exasperation at the rush to apply the term 'translingual' before it has been fully explored" ("L.4: (Re)Defining Translingual Writing").

In 2011, two articles were published regarding translingualism, one in *CE* ("Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach" *CE* 73.3 2011 by Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur) and the other in *CCC* ("Toward a

Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm" *CCC* 63.2

2011 by Bruce Horner, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane Donahue). With the overlap in some

of the authors, we see that this concept was starting to be examined by a vocal minority of

scholars in composition and second language studies. In the *CCC* article, Horner, NeCamp, and

Donahue emphasize a translingual approach to language that "involves negotiation for

communication and mutual intelligibility rather than a focus on fluency" (287). They argue,

compositionists should take this approach to "not only their teaching but also their scholarship,

changing what we recognize as normal and desirable in the preparation, scholarly practice, and

publications of compositionists" (270). Thus, a translingual approach to language pushes against

monolingualist assumptions in both pedagogy and research. This translingual orientation, they

suggest, could broaden the field of composition beyond a U.S. context. The authors argue that

"these efforts would push composition from its parochial status as a U.S.-centric, English

monolingual enterprise to a discipline directly confronting, investigating, and experimenting

with, rather than simply correcting, language practices on the ground" (291).

Translingualism thus also marks a major shift in composition scholarship, invoking

linguistic diversity as a basis for composition research as a whole. The movement toward

translingualism shows how the field has shifted from viewing linguistically diverse writers as

outsiders to seeing their similarities to native English speakers to, with translingualism, seeing

linguistic diversity as an ideal model for both students and scholars and how we should approach

our work. Indeed, translingualism is an approach to and attitude regarding language that

monolingual English speakers can take in their teaching and research. While the path to

translingualism has not necessarily been a direct route from scholars viewing linguistic diversity

as a problem to seeing it as a resource, over this seventy-five year history, it become apparent

that linguistically diverse writers have become a model for the way compositionists could and

should approach language.

Min-Zhan Lu in particular has explored concepts of translingualism in her work. In

"Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone" (*CCC* 45.4 1994), Lu

discusses bringing in multiculturalism to the composition classroom. She advocates

> asking students to explore the full range of choices and options, including those
>
> excluded by the conventions of academic discourses….These aspects in the
>
> classroom I envision inevitably distance it from classrooms influenced by one
>
> belief prevalent in ESL courses or courses in 'BasicWriting': namely, that a
>
> monolingual environment is the most conducive to the learning of 'beginners' or
>
> 'outsiders.' (447-448)

Thus, through a translingual lens (even though she does not name it as such at this point),

linguistically diverse writers are constructed as contributing, in powerful ways, to the richness of

the classroom environment.

Ten years later, in "An Essay on the Work of Composition: Composing English against

the Order of Fast Capitalism" (*CCC* 56.1 2004), Lu argues that compositionists should examine:

> users whose englishes have been systematically pushed to the periphery by the
>
> english we have committed ourselves to study, users of English not only in
>
> countries like Australia, Britain, Canada, New Zealand, or the U.S. but also
>
> countries like Barbados, India, Malaysia, South Africa, or Nigeria and countries
>
> like Indonesia, China, Mexico, North Korea, Poland, Slovenia, or Vietnam where

English is increasingly becoming the primary language of the market, the media,

and the streets. (18-19)

Here, Lu pushes against the English spoken by majority students in the classroom and continues

her argument that the Englishes used by students from all over the world are valuable and merit

study. Lu sometimes chooses not the capitalize the first letter of "English," often when she

discusses the various Englishes that are spoken in the world, and this seems to be a move to strip

some of the power and the hegemonic function away from the language, which is in keeping

with her translingual orientation toward language.

Suresh Canagarajah is also an advocate of bringing varieties of English as well as other

languages into the composition classroom. In "The Place of World Englishes in Composition:

Pluralization Continued" (*CCC* 57.4 2006), Canagarajah presents the classroom as a site to enact

the policy changes that Horner and Trimbur call for in their "English Only and U.S. College

Composition" article (587). He "outline[s] some ways of accommodating in academic writing

diverse varieties of English. This project can accompany, inspire, and even facilitate the more

radical project (for which Horner and Trimbur call) of engaging with multiple languages in

English composition" (587).

In this article, Canagarajah argues for the inclusion of various varieties of local Englishes

in composition classrooms. In doing so, he conceptualizes speakers of diverse varieties of

English as well as the Englishes that are spoken in various ways. Perhaps the foremost

distinction he makes is between what he sees as two of the major types of English that are

spoken around the world: World Englishes and what he calls Metropolitan Englishes. In

Canagarajah's definition, Metropolitan Englishes are those spoken by citizens of England,

Australia, the US, Canada, New Zealand. In other words, Metropolitan Englishes are more commonly known as the "native" varieties, and they are juxtaposed with World Englishes, which include all of the Englishes spoken outside those contexts. He chooses to use the terms "Metropolitan Englishes" and "World Englishes" because he finds problematic the notion of one being a "native" speaker of a language. He gives his own background as a Tamil and English speaker as an example, stating that he acquired both English and Tamil simultaneously. He argues that "only the color of [his] skin would influence someone to call [him] a non-native speaker of English—not [his] level of competence, process of acquisition, or time of learning" (589-590). And he also uses terms such as "privileged" and "target" to describe Metropolitan Englishes (588). So in this description, we see that the types of Englishes most commonly found in composition classrooms are those of Metropolitan Englishes, and this leaves little room for World Englishes in the first-year curriculum. This has traditionally meant that World Englishes speakers have been marginalized in the classroom, always reaching for (but never quite achieving) the "target" language of Metropolitan English.

In addition to his descriptions of the multiple Englishes that are spoken globally, Canagarajah also uses a variety of patterns and terms to describe the actions of the many speakers of English. He uses terms such as "negotiate" (590) and "accommodate" (597) when discussing the linguistic actions of linguistically diverse writers, suggesting that these writers can and do adapt their language(s) to their various rhetorical needs. And he says, "[r]ather than simply *joining* a speech community, students should learn to *shuttle* between communities in contextually relevant ways. To meet these objectives, rather than focusing on correctness, we should perceive 'error' as the learner's active negotiation and exploration of choices and

possibilities" (593). Canagarajah's approach emphasizes that students are co-constructors of the languages they use and speech communities they shuttle among, and that teachers should broaden their views of what they perceived to be errors in student writing, seeing them instead as a result of the action of moving among languages. This approach suggests that teachers have valuable things to learn from linguistically diverse writers regarding the negotiation of languages.

In all of Canagarajah's terms and descriptions, there is a desire for communication and for what he calls "plurality"—that is, the bringing in of multiple languages and varieties of languages to academic writing. Through this act of pluralization, which is a highly translingual approach, speakers of World Englishes can bring to the composition classroom a dynamic and hybrid way of composing texts that can act as models for monolingual English speakers to likewise include their own various literacies in their writing.

By demonstrating the advantages that multilingual writers can bring to their writing, Canagarajah subverts the traditional hegemony of monolingualism in the composition classroom. We see through his terms that emphasize plurality and his subversion of the paradigm of monolingualism that teachers of writing have much to learn from the international students in their classrooms. It is only through pluralism and a translingual approach to language that composition teachers will help all students become what Canagarajah calls "postmodern global citizens" and engage in the public sphere (591).

There are, however, some arguments against this push for multilingual and translingual classrooms. For example, Phillip Marzluf ("Diversity Writing: Natural Languages, Authentic Voices" *CCC* 57.3 2006) discusses the relationship between composition and the inclusion of

diverse voices in the classroom. Marzluf highlights the dangers of fetishizing students' vernaculars, arguing

> the valorization of the "authenticity" of students' voices is counterproductive to the antiracist agenda of diversity writing. This focus on authenticity proliferates stereotyped binaries of "whiteness" and "otherness," reifying these differences, making them "natural" for students and teachers, and finally, possibly leading instructors to exoticize the linguistic performances of marginalized students….Although concentrating upon the authenticity of students' vernaculars and expression is a seductive strategy in the diversity-writing classroom, especially as a means to counter student resistance, I believe that it reveals a "salvationist" desire in composition: the hope, in this case, of saving the natural selves of students by demonstrating a commitment to the power of language. (505)

Marzluf notes that, according to the eighteenth-century Natural Language Theory, language is a means through which differences among human beings are identified and reified (505). Thus, language calls attention to difference, causing non-dominant language users to be further othered from their dominant-language-using counterparts. Marzluf's argument suggests that writing about diversity in the classroom could actually have negative effects on learners of English because it encourages stereotypes regarding issues of diversity.

But a few years before Marzluf's piece was published, Bruce Horner and John Trimbur challenge the assumption that a privileged white English (and even English *itself*) is a natural choice for composition instruction in the U.S. in "English Only and U.S. College

Composition" (*CCC* 53.4 2002). Their article begins: "The fact that U.S. writing instruction is

conducted in English seems commonsensical. After all, though English is not the official

language of the U.S., this is an English-speaking nation" (594). Yet English was not always the

primary language of writing instruction in the U.S.

A history of the relationship of English and modern languages in the university

illuminates this complicated debate regarding multilingual language policies. Horner and

Trimbur's article traces how English came to be privileged in the institution and how a

monolingual language policy, with English as the only acceptable language, came to be seen as

unavoidable. They state, "we are not quarreling with the fact that writing instruction in college

composition courses takes place in English. Instead we want to examine the sense of inevitability

that makes it so difficult to imagine writing instruction in any language other than

English" (595). Horner and Trimbur assess the shift in focus that occurred in the university as the

importance of oral and performative, classical traditions, as represented by Greek and Latin,

were pushed to the sidelines as a focus on written English took priority. This shift from oral to

written speech communication was part of a larger movement within universities during "the

late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries as part of a larger modernizing initiative to replace

the classical curriculum of the old-time pietistic college with a secular education in the

vernacular" (595). During this time, "the relationships among languages were rearranged.

English was separated altogether from Greek and Latin as the vehicle of writing instruction, and

the modern languages settled into their respective departments as national literatures" (599). This

refocusing of the curriculum did not allow for languages other than English in writing

instruction. The "territorialization of the modern languages as reading courses assigned the status

of a living language to English only, making it alone the primary vehicle of instruction in writing

and speaking" (602-3). English was thus established as the primary language of writing

instruction in the university. Having challenged the underlying assumptions regarding English as

the best (and only) language of instruction, the authors ultimately contend that writing instruction

in the U.S. should push against traditional hegemonic monolingualist ideals and encourage a

translingual approach to language, even though they do not yet name it as such.

In "Enacting and Transforming Local Language Policies" (*CCC* 62.4 2011), Christine

Tardy examines how a multilingual language policy might manifest at the local programmatic

level. In order to explore this, Tardy "turn[s] to the perspectives of writing teachers and, to a

lesser extent, students" (635). This is because, she argues, a local emphasis is necessary before

considering a larger, more systemic change in "mov[ing] toward the kind of reimagined

multilingual classroom space envisioned by such scholars as Paul Kei Matsuda, Bruce Horner,

John Trimbur, Suresh Canagarajah, and others" (635). Thus, in a way, Tardy argues that the ways

teachers and scholars conceptualize of and represent multilingual students is a local

phenomenon.

In her localized study, Tardy finds many commonly held beliefs among teachers and

students in composition:

> Common concerns that both teachers and students had regarding the use of
>
> multilingual instructional practices demonstrated prominent myths regarding
>
> language, literacy, and language learning. For instance, both teachers and students
>
> expressed concerns about how writing that drew on multiple languages might be
>
> graded (assuming that it would have to be graded), questions about how writing in

forms other than Standard English would be appropriate to a writing class, and

beliefs that an English Only environment is most beneficial to second language

development. Research in writing and language studies, however, problematizes

or counters all of these views. (653)

Thus, Tardy acknowledges that the teachers in her localized study continue to be concerned

about historical issues related to multilingual students. Her study shows how composition

professionals enact assumptions about multilingual students that have very long traditions in

mainstream composition scholarship, some of which actually pre-date the creation of the field

itself. Tardy goes on to highlight the complexity in trying to reconcile policies and classroom

practice, noting "[a]s a professional organization, CCCC should continue to engage actively in

discussions that help to erase monolingual assumptions through resolutions, modifications to

teacher development programs, and increased attention to language-related issues in journals and

conference sessions" (654). Tardy then provides some suggestions where writing program

administrators can start working toward or improving multilingual classrooms at the local level.

Tardy's project suggests that compositionists, generally speaking, need a much better grasp of

our localized ways of understanding linguistically diverse writers so that we can begin to

productively engage with other, larger conversations going on in other disciplines, both

nationally and internationally.

Linguistic Diversity, Composition, and the Public Sphere

Beyond discussions about multilingualism in the classroom, discussions about

multilingualism in the public sphere have also continued to develop in the field over the past

decade. In her 2003 CCCC chair's address (reprinted in *CCC* 55.2 2003), Shirley Wilson Logan

discusses the mission (and mission statement) of CCCC ("Changing Missions, Shifting Positions,

and Breaking Silences"). She notes that "[w]e have some clearly articulate—some might even

say radical—statements on two of the major issues in college composition and communication

today—teachers' professional standards and students' linguistic rights" (332). Thus, Logan

identifies the linguistic rights of students as one of the primary issues of concern to

compositionists in the twenty-first century.

Summarizing an editorial ("Bilingual Education is a Human and Civil Right"), Logan

argues, "CCCC needs to play an active role in overturning such legislation as that passed by the

ESEA [Elementary and Secondary Education Act], requiring English language learners to take

standardized tests in English within three years of entering the school system" (334). Indeed, she

argues that it is the responsibility of writing teachers to intervene in issues of policy regarding

language use in the U.S. In a rallying cry, she argues, "As language arts educators, we ought to

be at the center of all policy decisions that affect the teaching and learning of communication

skills. Somebody needs to ask us the next time decisions are made about how facility with

language will be assessed. Somebody needs to ask us before proclaiming a national crisis in the

quality of college student writing. And we need to have ready answers when they do" (335).

Thus, Logan argues that compositionists should be the go-to source for issues on language

policy. And linguistically diverse writers, then, stand as a symbol for the entire profession's

ethical and political obligations.

Logan's argument is not that standard English should never be used. Rather, she notes, "I

strongly believe that we can respect linguistic differences and teach our students various dialect

options, particularly the option of edited American English (EAE)—the dialect of power and privilege—at the same time" (340). That is, language is inherently tied to complex issues of power, class, privilege, and democracy. And it is the responsibility of language educators to teach students when and how to use their different dialects to communicate in different situations. She argues, "[w]e must strengthen the links between language and democracy, text and street" (335). Thus, research on language should move beyond the composition classroom and into the public sphere.

John Duffy responds to this assertion in "Letters from the Fair City: A Rhetorical Conception of Literacy" (*CCC* 56.2 2004). In the article, Duffy discusses a debate that occurred in a Midwestern newspaper between anti-immigrant individuals and a group of Asian Hmong refugees between 1985 and 1995. Duffy notes that the anti-immigration letters "are harshly critical, accusing the Hmong of abusing the welfare system, having too many children, refusing to learn English, and eating local dogs" (224). The Hmong refugees responded by trying to describe the Hmong community to their critics (224). In the article, Duffy teases apart the arguments of the two sides, analyzing the rhetorical appeals through the lens of the U.S. immigration debates and literacy practices. Evident here is a representation of international individuals in the public sphere. Even though the Hmong have an opportunity to refute the claims made against them, this way of rendering these individuals in the public is actively negative, suggesting that, as compositionists move their work beyond the classroom, they will continue to confront some of the same biases and assumptions that have been present in composition studies for years. Indeed, as composition has evolved from seeing seeing English learners from other countries as outsiders and others to viewing them as models for our own

work, it seems as if compositionists are in an ideal position to educate the public on these matters.

In the "CCCC Secretary's Report, 2006-2007" from the Annual Business Meeting in 2007 (*CCC* 59.2 2007), Carol Rutz also demonstrates an engagement with the public sphere and public policy. At the meeting, a resolution was passed regarding questions asked by the Census Bureau regarding the linguistic abilities of its respondents. The resolution reads as follows:

> Be it therefore resolved that the Conference on College Composition and Communication join the American Anthropological Association and other professional organizations in urging the Census Bureau to include on the long-form questionnaire a question about proficiency in languages other than English. Further, we urge that the Census Bureau discontinue classifying those who speak English less than "very well"—and all members of their household—as "linguistically isolated" because the term is inaccurate and discriminatory, and the classification promotes an ideology of linguistic superiority that foments linguistic intolerance and conflict. (334)

This resolution demonstrates a desire for active engagement in the public sphere by writing specialists. Whether or not compositionists are consulted in conversations regarding linguistic diversity in the public sphere (as Logan desired in her 2003 chair's address), compositionists seem increasingly resolved to speak out about these activities outside of academia. This situates compositionists' work regarding linguistically diverse individuals as a springboard for greater action by composition professionals in the public sphere. As a profession that still enacts echoes of linguistic superiority from longstanding conversations in its scholarly discourse, composition

and compositionists are uniquely qualified to advocate for linguistically diverse individuals both within and outside the academy.

Discussions about World Englishes also occur in conversations about both the classroom and public spheres. In "Negotiating Cultural Identities Through Language: Academic English in Jordan" (*CCC* 62.2 2010), Anne-Marie Pedersen takes this conversation outside the context of the U.S. by "formulat[ing] a study about English's role in the lives of multilingual speakers, especially those outside the United States" (286). Pedersen notes that compositionists have recently started to become interested in World Englishes and speakers and users of English outside traditionally monolingual-speaking countries (like the U.S.) (283). She notes, "[t]his recent move in composition studies to explore linguistic diversity stands in contrast to the long history of privileging English-only instruction and the monolingual writer" (284). Pedersen notes one of the problems with monolingualist assumptions about English: scholars who use English as something in addition to their mother tongue often have to publish in English to gain purchase in academic circles (285). With research like Pedersen's, however, that demonstrates the problem with monolingualist assumptions, we see that scholarship is beginning to occur that situates multilingualism as the ideal norm.

Furthermore, in her research in Amman, Jordan, Pedersen was surprised to find that, "although English is the language of science and the predominant language of many academic disciplines due to the legacy of British colonialism and current U.S. neocolonialism, the participants often saw themselves as the users and shapers of certain types of English, not as non-native outsiders passively colonized" (287). In Pedersen's case, the users of English that she worked with outside the U.S. did not view English as something possessed or owned by inner

circle speakers; that is, English was not a language from outside that they appropriated for their own uses. Rather, English was their own, and they used it and shaped it for their own needs. Pedersen's research allows the these linguistically diverse writers to represent themselves, and it is apparent that they see themselves as co-creators of the language rather than passive recipients upon whom the language was placed by hegemonic forces.

Finally, Pedersen's characterization of multilingual English speakers outside the U.S. demonstrates a shift in recent years in composition studies that takes second language research outside of the classroom and into the world. She also uses the term *EAL* (English as an Additional Language) rather than *ESL*, which suggests that instead of being viewed as a language learned after one's first language (and thus one has less ownership of it), English is seen by these writers in Jordan as one of many (or additional) languages with which to communicate. By situating English as an *additional* language (rather than a *second* language, for example), Pedersen's research suggests that English can be just one of many linguistic tools used by linguistically diverse writers to communicate, thus stripping English of its hegemonic force and enacting the ideals of translingualism.

Conclusion

The period between 1974 and the present has seen the conversations regarding international, linguistically diverse students evolve significantly. While these students are still often represented in conflicting ways—for example, as highly vocal or highly silent in classes—compositionists were beginning to examine the powerful contributions made these writers to the composition classroom and the discipline. Antecedents to the translingualism movement of today

can be seen in some of the field's early language policies including SRTOL and the National Language Policy. For example, compositionists begin to see the contributions linguistically diverse writers make as collaborators and co-researchers within the composition classroom, and the embracing and use of multiple languages becomes an ever-increasing thread of the conversation as a translingual orientation toward language becomes not only the ideal model for students but also composition scholars themselves in their research and scholarship. Active discussions about the ways the field has labeled and represented linguistically diverse writers begin to occur, and other conversations move compositionists' pedagogical, political, and ethical commitments into the public sphere.

Thus, during this time period, linguistically diverse writers helped the field of composition begin to reexamine its pedagogical and public goals and purposes. Following the history I have laid out in this and the preceding two chapters, the next chapter will explore some of the terms that have been used most frequently to describe international, linguistically diverse writers, English as a Second Language (*ESL*) and English as a Foreign Language (*EFL*), in order to explicate how these specific terms have represented these writers over time and what those representations might suggest about the field's knowledge of and assumptions about the linguistic diversity of speakers of English as something other than or in addition to their first language(s).

Chapter Five: *ESL/EFL*: Uses of Terms Over Time

ESL (English as a Second Language) Today

In the previous chapters, I have explored a variety of conversations regarding international and domestic multilingual speakers of English and the different ways that composition scholars have represented and imagined these linguistically diverse writers. After looking at the history of the field as represented by the two journals *College English* and *College Composition and Communication*, one particular term—*ESL* (English as a second language)—emerges as the most frequently used term to label these writers. In this chapter, I will take a closer look at the ways that this term has been used over time and how it has constructed linguistically diverse writers to whom it has been applied.

In order to deeply explore this term, it is useful to have an understanding of how the term has been used in more recent scholarship. Up until this point in my analysis, it has made sense to work through the issues of *CE* and *CCC* chronologically to see how patterns emerged in the collective conversations of the field. However, at this point, an understanding of the contemporary uses of the term *ESL* is useful in framing the discussion of the past. That is not to say that I seek to make a judgment regarding how "right" or "wrong" the past uses of the term might have been. Rather, I think we need to understand where we are today in order to make sense of the confusion that has happened (and can continue to occur) when we don't know our history regarding the terms we have used when representing international multilingual writers. Paul Kei Matsuda notes in "Teaching Composition in the Multilingual World: Second Language Writing in Composition Studies" in 2011's collection *Exploring Composition Studies: Sites, Issues, and Perspectives* that "[t]eachers and researchers often used the term [*ESL*] in referring to

a particular group of students without detailed descriptions of the characteristics of the population, and the lack of clear definition has led to confusion and sometimes even conflicts among teachers and researchers" (38). In this chapter, I seek to bring to light some of these conflicting uses in order to provide a resource for teachers and researchers regarding the term *ESL*.

Today, *ESL* is used to describe the English that is learned and the individuals who use it as the language they need to know in order to function in society in English-dominant countries like the U.S. and England (see Jenkins). Thus, use of the term is highly place-based, with its use occurring in English-dominant countries. *ESL* is most commonly applied to international speakers of English within English-dominant countries, but it can also be used to describe *resident* English users who might have been raised to speak a different language in the home but use English outside the home (see Ortmeier-Hooper).

Often in institutional settings, the term *ESL* has particular connotations and is used for reasons other than just describing individuals who speak English as something in addition to their first language(s); the term is often used by institutions to assess and place students. Christina Ortmeier-Hooper notes, "[t]he term 'ESL' is not only a descriptor, it is also an institutional marker, pointing to a need for additional services and also to the status of someone still marked as a novice in the English language" ("'English May Be My Second Language, But I'm Not "ESL"'" *CCC* 59.3 2008 p. 390). Thus, she notes that *ESL* often represents students in such a way that calls attention to their difference, and they are seen as inexperienced and lacking in linguistic ability. Indeed, the very use of the term *second* signifies that the speaker can never and will never be *first*, establishing a hierarchy between *first* language speakers and *second*

language speakers.

Ortmeier-Hooper notes that compositionists should think beyond the institutional uses of the term and consider the personal, individualized responses of students in being identified as *ESL*. She says, "I would argue that the terms 'ESL' and 'ELL' and even 'Generation 1.5' are fraught with all kinds of complications for resident students and for us as compositionists….For students, these complications are emotional as well as tactical. Because what exactly does it mean for a student to be 'ESL'? And when, if ever, does a student stop being an 'ESL' student?" (390). Ortmeier-Hooper's representation of *ESL* students here suggests that these students are, in a way, trapped by the *ESL* marker and that it has implications for their psychological well-being and senses of identity.

And, indeed, when three of Ortmeier-Hooper's students are given the choice, they all reject the *ESL* label. These students are worried that identifying as *ESL* could create for their teachers and peers preconceived notions about their abilities as students and writers. These students were all, at some point, labeled as *ESL* by various institutions, such as their high schools and elementary schools. But when it came time to self-identify, they chose to reject the *ESL* label because they felt they had moved beyond what the term signified (409). Evident here is also a view, from the students's perspectives, that *ESL* has a stigma attached to it that suggests that *ESL* equates to a lack of linguistic ability.

Thus, Ortmeier-Hooper argues that compositionists should take into consideration the particular opinions of the individual student when considering applying the *ESL* marker. She says, "[w]hen students do share their identities as second language writers, we need to consider what that means to the particular student. We cannot assume that 'ESL' is this monolithic,

universal code word that explains everything we need to know about a student" (414). Therefore, the application of the term is complicated by the individual experiences of the student. Ortmeier-Hooper's study is significant in that it emphasizes the importance of seeing linguistically diverse writers as non-homogeneous individuals who have differing views regarding the ways they are represented and categorized.

As previously noted, the term *ESL* usually indicates the order in which one has learned English as well as the location in which one uses the language. However, this situation is further complicated when we take into consideration things like actual use of the language. For example, while *ESL* describes the order in which an individual learned English, it does not, however, take into account the individual's primary use of languages. If an individual lives in the U.S., he or she will likely speak English as their primary, or first, language in most communicative situations, at least outside the home. Should English still be considered the individual's *second* language in this scenario even though it is often the primary language they use?

As the complexities inherent to the term *ESL* have become more apparent and as the term has been problematized, there has been a general shift away from use of the term in recent years. For example, in K-12 settings, the term *ELL* (English language learner) has begun to gain purchase. Ortmeier-Hooper notes in a footnote:

> In recent years, the U.S. Department of Education has limited its use of the term "ESL" in favor of the term "English language learner" (ELL) in its descriptions of second language students. This is particularly apparent in policies and literature that surround the No Child Left Behind Act. As a result, the term "ELL" has seen increased usage in discussions on second language students in K-12 settings and

in some higher education settings. (415)

This shift to *ELL*, particularly in K-12 settings, suggests a movement away from the hierarchical *second* attribute and opens us the possibility that everyone who speaks the language is a learner of English, in some way. However, this term, along with *ESL*, creates questions like: At what point does one stop being a learner of a language? And, is this too broad a term to use because it describes such a wide variety of individuals (everyone is an English language learner, even those who speak it natively)?

Along with Ortmeier-Hooper's article, other scholars have continued to explore what the presence of international students has meant for compositionists, and they have begun to examine their use of terms used to label linguistically diverse writers to push against the *ESL* initialism. For example, in "'Mistakes are a Fact of Life': A National Comparative Study" (*CCC* 59.4 2008), Andrea Lunsford and Karen Lunsford discuss the results of a national survey of freshman writing courses and compare these results to a similar survey conducted twenty-two years previously by Andrea Lunsford and Robert Connors. In their comparison, Lunsford and Lunsford note, "[f]or the current study, determining which papers represented ESL writers seemed a harder task, and in any event, we very much wanted to include papers written by multilingual students in our study. The last twenty-two years have seen ESL students more thoroughly integrated into mainstream writing classrooms, and Generation 1.5 students are now recognized as a new group" (788). The *Generation 1.5* label adds further nuance to conversations about terminology because it is "a term that typically refers to English language learners who arrive in the U.S. at an early age, obtain much or all of their education in U.S. K-12 settings, and arrive in college with various patterns of language and literacy that don't fit the traditional,

'institutionally constructed' profiles of Developmental Writing, College ESL, or Freshman Composition" (Roberge, Siegal, and Harklau vii). Therefore, different expectations are often placed on *generation 1.5* writers than on *ESL* students, and by including the *generation 1.5* label in their discussion, Lunsford and Lunsford acknowledge the complexities involved in designating labels for groups of students. They also note that the writing of these linguistically diverse ESL students is becoming more difficult to differentiate from the writing of other student writers. Further, they embrace these second language writers as a welcome presence in composition research, and they see these students as more integrated into the mainstream of composition studies.

The language Lunsford and Lunsford use to discuss these writers is also worth noting. In this brief passage, Lunsford and Lunsford switch between the terms *ESL* and *multilingual*, and they note that *generation 1.5* students are often not categorized as *ESL* or *multilingual*, but something else altogether. This movement among terms suggests that compositionists acknowledge that the terms *ESL* or *multilingual* are not necessarily the best terms to use in all situations to describe linguistically diverse writers who use English as something in addition to or other than their first language. This slipperiness of terms also suggests that the field's conceptualizations of the identities of international, linguistically diverse students is evolving, and compositionists' uses of different labels to categorize them is shifting along with this new understanding.

EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Today

When examining the historical usage of the term *ESL*, it quickly becomes evident that an

exploration of *ESL* also necessitates an examination of the term *EFL* (English as a foreign language) because they have often been used in close proximity to one another. Today, *ESL* and *EFL* are used to signify different things. Like *ESL,* the use of *EFL* today is contextualized, place-based, and temporal, and it is used to describe the type of English learned and English learners who are in countries that do not use English as an official or primary language. Linguist Jennifer Jenkins notes, "[h]istorically, [EFL speakers] learnt the language in order to use it with its native speakers in the US and UK, though nowadays they are more likely to use it for communication with other non-native speakers" (15). In way, EFL can be thought of as similar to the modern languages taught in the U.S. today such as Spanish, French, and German. Schematically, then, while *ESL* applies to individuals who learn/speak English as something in addition to or other than their first language within an English-dominant country, *EFL* applies to individuals who learn/speak English in a country that does *not* use English as a primary language.

With these descriptions, we see that an individual can be both *EFL* and *ESL*, and the application of the terms is based on where the individual is located at a particular point in time. For instance, English language learners who learn English as a *foreign* language in another country are considered English as a *Second* Language speakers when they get to the U.S. Over a period of time—for example, the length of an airplane flight—these speakers shift from the classification *foreign* to *second*. Given how tightly these terms can be bound to students' psyches and identities, such a rapid shift in status can be rather jarring and confusing.

One example of the use of *EFL* in contemporary composition scholarship is Xiaoye You's "Ideology, Textbooks, and the Rhetoric of Production in China" (*CCC* 56.4 2005). His article examines the development of two editions of an EFL composition textbook used in China.

Writing or editing an EFL composition textbook can be understood as making multidimensional decisions about whether foreign language education should serve the dominant economic structure or not, and how. The textbook writers will have to answer some specific questions. Should writing in English by students, minorities, or feminists be use as samples in the textbook? Should the structure of the book be current-traditional, or be more progressive and theoretically grounded? Should EFL students be taught expository writing or creative writing? Should teacher-student conferences and peer review be suggested as part of the teaching methodology when the textbook is used? (650)

In this passage, You asks if EFL textbooks should take into consideration the local economic, cultural, and educational ideologies and which U.S. composition traditions they should emphasize. This representation of EFL students suggests that the learning of English where English is not the dominant language often blends together cultural and pedagogical approaches from multiple countries. Further, it asks what the teaching of English should look like in an international context.

However, since much of composition scholarship is U.S.-based, the term *ESL* has been used more frequently in recent composition scholarship than *EFL* because much of the field's focus up until this point has been on the teaching of composition within a context in which English is the dominant language used in the classroom. Thus, fewer examples exist of contemporary uses of *EFL* in *CCC*. There will likely be more talk about *EFL* as the field continues to discussion English as a globalized language and as compositionists continue to conduct more research about English and the public sphere.

Historical Uses of *ESL* and *EFL*

While *ESL* and *EFL* mean different things and are used differently today, historically, the terms were used more interchangeably in composition, with only slight differences between them (and those difference were not always clear). The remainder of this chapter will examine the uses of the two terms in *College English* in the late 1930s through 1950 and then *College Composition and Communication* from the 1950s through the dominance of the term *ESL* in the 1990s.

Early on, we often see the use of the term *EFL* to describe what we would today call *ESL* and vice versa, and the distinctions between the terms can be difficult to tease apart. The merging of these terms is evident in an article in an early issue of *CE*, Kathleen Dexter's "The Use of Examination Papers in Linguistic Study" (*CE* 2.2 1940). In her article, Dexter describes her data set and the exclusions to her set:

> I have deliberately excluded a mass of extremely interesting material from Welsh children for whom English is a second, or even a foreign, language, and another from Scotland, which has its own linguistic genius. I have confined myself to schools in which the "standard" is presumably spoken and certainly taught. I have ignored the occasional dialect word, and the far from occasional use of slang, both English and American. (162)

Dexter's brief paragraph on her Welsh and Scottish students is one of the first uses in *CE* to label students as *second* or *foreign* speakers of English. As first discussed in Chapter Two, Dexter portrays these linguistically diverse writers as not valuable to her study due to her focus

on the "standard" variety of English. In this passage, Dexter does not make a large distinction between the use of the terms *second* and *foreign*. However, with the phrase "for whom English is a second, or even a foreign language," she does seem to be suggesting that the term *foreign* is at a slighter greater remove from the language spoken by native English speakers than *second*. This situates these students on a spectrum of otherness, with some (*foreign*) being more *other* than other (*second*) students.

This spectrum is also present in Pauline Rojas' "The Teaching of English as a Modern Foreign Language" in which the thread of "foreigner as problem" is evident (*CE* 9.6 1948). In the article, Rojas discusses the need for teachers of English to consider how they teach English to individuals who do not speak the language as their first or primary language. To deal with the "problems of minority groups," Rojas notes that various "teacher-training programs in the teaching of English as a foreign language have appeared" such as the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan (322). Here, Rojas clearly represents *foreign* English-speaking students as a *problem* presented to teachers.

Significantly, the primary populations that Rojas highlights in her article as *foreigners* are Spanish-speaking immigrants of other countries who have come to the U.S. including "Spanish-speaking child[ren] in the Southwest" and "Puerto Ricans in…New York City" (322). Most of these English language learners are Spanish-speaking and from other countries. However, she also mentions the language minorities of "the 'Cajuns' of Louisiana,…the Pennsylvania Dutch, and…the large numbers of so-called Mexicans and New Mexicans of the Southwest, whose grandparents, and even great-grandparents, *were born under the American flag*" (emphasis added, 325-326). And then she refers to all these students—both those from countries outside the

U.S. and those from different linguistic groups within the U.S.—as "groups that need teachers specialized in teaching *English as a foreign language*" (323). Thus, all of these multilingual individuals, whether they are from a different country or even from the U.S., are represented by Rojas as *foreigners* due to their multilingualism, whereas today we would likely refer to them as *ESL* or *generation 1.5*.

Rojas' rendering of multilinguals is not entirely a negative thing, however. She brings up an interesting point about foreign language learning in the U.S. that is still common today:

> Some explanation for what would seem to be our rather widespread tendency to underestimate the linguistic difficulties of our foreign-language-speaking minorities may lie in our isolation from nations whose languages differ from our own. If more of us found it necessary really *to know* another language, we should perhaps have a better understanding of the problems that our language minorities face. As things are now, however, our contact with foreign languages and foreign-language learning is exceedingly limited. (322)

While Rojas has already deemed it a problem that linguistic minority groups have a difficult time learning English in the U.S., she places some of the blame on the U.S. public's (and English teachers') view that is not necessary to learn foreign languages, and thus, the country has become less understanding about language differences.

Rojas also notes that the concept of English as a foreign language had previously been considered an uncomfortable topic among native speakers of the language. She says, "there has been some hesitation on the part of those concerned to recognize openly that English is a foreign language for the non-English-speaking among us. It has seemed to some persons somehow

unpatriotic to speak of English, our native tongue and national language, as a *foreign*

language" (emphasis added, 323). This claim shows a proprietary, exclusionary, and nationalistic

claim on English, which could have been a product of a patriotic zeal following the second

World War. It also represents nonnative English speakers as somehow *othering* the language by

seizing ownership of the language away from its native-speaking American citizens.

The confusion between uses of the terms *ESL* and *EFL* is evident even in articles within

the same issue of *CCC*. "Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication"

chronicles some of the scholarly work that has been published in the previous year outside of

CCC (*CCC* 5.4 1954). One of the pieces it mentions is "English as a Foreign Language" from

Michigan State College's *The Basic College Newsletter* (named after Michigan State's Basic

College) from May 1954, which highlights the results of a survey conducted to determine how,

where, by whom, and in what ways English was being taught to nonnative, multilingual speakers

of the language within U.S. colleges and universities.

In this same issue (*CCC* 5.4 1954), in "Grammar in Freshman English" Donald Lloyd

also discusses the teaching of English to multilingual speakers. In his article, he begins to

examine how composition teachers in the U.S. can use linguistic grammar in their teaching. Yet

he does not refer to this as teaching English as a *foreign* language like the previous article.

Instead, he says, "[t]he linguists have made practical use of their science in the teaching of

English as a *second* language" (emphasis added, 163). Lloyd's use of *second* to describe

international English speakers within the U.S. (as opposed to *foreign*, which is used by the

previous article), suggests that Lloyd views these students as more similar to native English

speakers. His article examines ways in which teachers of English to native speakers can and

cannot benefit from teachers of English as a second language. This suggests that Lloyd does not necessarily see English as a *first* language and English as a *second* language as very far removed from each other.

Lloyd's close alignment notwithstanding, English as a foreign language and foreigners themselves still tended to be seen as a bit further removed from English as a first language. For example, in "Some of the Year's Work in Composition and Communication" (*CCC* 6.1 1955), an article from the *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* called "Ingles Vivo (Live English)" by Robert Whitehouse is brought up as a useful resource for "[t]hose who teach English as a *foreign* language" (emphasis added, 58). The synopsis cites Whitehouse's experiences teaching English in Cuba and Colombia, countries in which English was not the first language of the speakers. In Whitehouse's example, foreign is used to describe literal foreigners, or individuals from countries outside the U.S. (as opposed to the earlier example of Rojas, who viewed *all* multilinguals, even citizens of the U.S., as foreigners). This is the same general definition of *EFL* that we use today in that it is location-based and use to describe speakers of English in countries where English is not dominant.

Foreigners are represented in a different way in Clara Siggins' "The Bitter with the Better," in which the author discusses an African student in her class who "studied English as a foreign language in high school in Africa, just as we would study French or Spanish in this country" (*CCC* 10.4 1959 p.261). Siggins points out that her student learned English as a *foreign* language, and she uses him as an example to explore the use of slang and cultural nuance in student writing. Upon seeing the use of cliches and informal language in his writing, Siggins discusses her confusion about how English is taught as a foreign language and how international

students picked up certain turns of phrase in their writing. She asks "[d]oes a student learn so-called 'colloquial English' when he studies our language? Or—and I am inclined to believe that this is true—does he pick up as he goes along the cliches, the jargon, the stereotyped expressions, and, as Fowler calls them, the 'battered ornaments' from what he hears in the street, on the radio, in the school, among his new friends?" (261). Here, Siggins represents her *foreign*, African student (and, by proxy, other international students) as students whose formal textbook learning of the language in school is at odds with their learning of colloquial language elsewhere. Thus, Siggins notes that these *foreign* multilingual students are people who operate in multiple language communities, pointing the way toward more contemporary concerns about linguistically diverse writers in the public sphere.

The problems presented by these terms was further complicated when compositionists discussed countries, such as Puerto Rico, which were under U.S. annexation. Since the country's annexation, there has been much debate about the dominant languages in Puerto Rico. While Puerto Rico was annexed as an unincorporated territory of the U.S. in 1898, the majority language still spoken there today is Spanish, not English; English is spoken as an additional language. According to the Welcome to Puerto Rico website, today, "[b]oth Spanish and English are the official languages of Puerto Rico, but Spanish is without a doubt the dominant language, as the majority of the people in Puerto Rico are not proficient in English. Fewer than 20 percent of Puerto Ricans speak English fluently, according to the 1990 U.S. Census" (Rivera). Hence, there is a history of resistance against using and learning English as a majority language in the country. So, with the complicated background of English in Puerto Rico, what should the English that is spoken in Puerto Rico (and its speakers) be called: English as a *foreign* language or

English as a *second* language?

If so few Puerto Ricans speak English and use it in daily communicative acts, perhaps they should be considered *EFL* speakers. However, Puerto Rico is inherently tied to the U.S. through its annexation, and English *is* one of the official languages of the country, even though so few people speak it. So perhaps the English spoken there should be considered *ESL*. Yet this still seems contradictory since, if English is an official language, it would stand to reason that English should actually be a *native* or *first* language to Puerto Rican citizens. Thus, at least in the case of Puerto Rico, cultural opinion and usage of language has outweighed what is supposed to be "official."

The complex English language situation in Puerto Rico was explored by Minerva Desing in her 1947 *CE* article "English at the University of Puerto Rico." Writing from the University of Puerto Rico, Desing notes, "[h]ere, English is more than a second language; it is a vital tool subject" (91). Thus, Design represents Puerto Rican English users as people who use the language critically and instrumentally in their daily lives as way of accessing culture and political capital. She suggests that Puerto Ricans should learn English to understand entertainment sources like film and radio because "the full flavor of the original is lost in translation" (92). She also notes that Puerto Rico imports many American products with labels and instructions in English, that Puerto Ricans may wish to become civil servants (and to do so requires a small amount of English proficiency), and Puerto Ricans might like to take vacations in the U.S. or order things from American mail order catalogues (92-3). Desing's emphasis on the use of English for entertainment, art, shopping, and political purposes suggests that Puerto Ricans would be, in some ways, culturally impoverished and dangerously uninformed consumers

if they did not speak English.

"Foreigners" and *ESL*

One possible explanation for the slipperiness of the terms *ESL* and *EFL* in the past could have to do with the ways that compositionists discussed international speakers of English. In the past, it seems as if the choice to use *ESL* or *EFL* had more to do with the linguistic background of the person learning the language rather than the location or context in which the person spoke English. In the earlier decades of the field (between the 1940s and 1970s), it was common to use the term "foreigner" to describe anyone from outside the U.S. While today, we might see the term as derogatory, that was not always the case. For example, in Jewell Friend's 1973 *CCC* piece "College English for the Preprofessional or Graduate Student of EFL," she discusses "foreign students at the Southern Illinois University where [she had] supervised EFL writing programs" (211).

So, because of the common use of the word "foreign" during these times, the slippage between *EFL* and *ESL* might be more understandable. Compositionists used the term *EFL* because they were used to referring to these students as "foreigners." If this is the case, then it would also follow that the uses of the terms *EFL* and *ESL*, as used interchangeably, took into consideration the fact that these English language learners were in some way different from traditional monolingual, native-English-speaking U.S. college undergrads, but it did *not* take into consideration the *contexts* or *locations* in which the terms were used. That is, by today's standards, the students Friend refers to would be *ESL*, not *EFL*.

It is too reductive, however, to say that scholars in the past used these terms *correctly* or

they used them *incorrectly*. Rather, the field has been continually developing the language, the vocabulary with which to discuss and teach linguistically diverse writers. We are now working within a different framework—one based on place and the relative dominance of English use in that place.

ESL Approaches to Teaching First Language Speakers and Language Non-Nativeness

Another way to look at how *ESL* (and the assumptions that go with uses of the term) has evolved over the years is to examine the ways that ESL teaching techniques have been applied to teaching speakers of English as their first language. The report from the 1956 CCCC (*CCC* 7.3) convention discusses a panel that highlighted the teaching of English as a Second Language and "the potential application of these studies to the teaching of the freshman course in English" ("Studies in English as a Second Language" 163). This approach argues that something can be learned by *all* freshman from the ways that international students are taught, suggesting that, at least from the perspective of some language teachers, the learning of languages was not always so different for first and second language speakers. Indeed, composition scholars have often invoked ESL students as being equivalent to native-English-speaking students, whether on the basis of their need to learn "the basics" of a language, their common relationship with academic writing as a second language, or their common issues with error.

This idea of using the techniques used to teach English as a second or foreign language in improving the English spoken by native English speakers is taken up by Paul Sullivan in "English as a Second Language: Potential Applications to Teaching the Freshman Course" (*CCC* 8.1 1957). This is the first of five papers that were presented as a panel regarding this topic at the

CCCC 1956 spring meeting. Sullivan starts by claiming, "[i]t may seem strange to turn to

English as a second or foreign language for lessons to be applied in teaching the regular

Freshman English course" (10). Yet, he goes on to argue that these techniques can be useful in

teaching English to native speakers because "[t]he very nature of the problem of teaching

English to those who have no knowledge of English at all (or very little) requires insight to the

bare structure of language and presentation of its basic considerations and principles" (10). Thus,

Sullivan argues that it is by examining and understanding the basic structures of English that the

English language should be taught to anyone studying it. Further, it suggests that ESL students

and "regular Freshman English" students are very much alike and have the same needs in the

classroom.

Emphasizing structure and mechanics was a common approach to the teaching of English

to foreign and second language speakers at that time, and the other four papers from Sullivan's

panel in 1956 support this view of language teaching. In "Sentence Structure," Robert Lado

compares the structure of English and other languages. In "Punctuation and Sentence Rhythm,"

Garland Cannon discusses the relationship between punctuation and rhythm in the teaching of

language. Edith Trager, in "The Systematics of English Spelling," discusses spelling. And

MacCurdy Burnet, in "Vowel Contrasts in Student Speech," wraps up the panel by discussing

some particular techniques teachers can use to "assist…students to talk as educated and mature

men and women" (23). Burnet's comment suggests that the end of goal of learning a language

was not just to be able to communicate with others, but to do so in an "educated and mature"

way.

Sullivan describes Burnet's approach as a way to "teach…foreign English to a native

student" in order to have that native student understand his or her own native language more fully (11). This concept that "foreign English" is its own particular type of English, which is different than "native English" suggests that the English spoken by "foreign" students differs fundamentally from the English spoken by "native" speakers. This was perhaps an early way of describing the many World Englishes that are spoken globally as different varieties of English. This approach also suggests that "foreign" speakers of English (and the methods used to teach them) were valuable in helping native speakers learn their own language more fully.

Sullivan also seems to be playing with the idea that standard academic English, or the English that is used in school settings, is different than the English that is spoken in non-academic settings. He believes that written academic English is something akin to a foreign language, even to native speakers of English, claiming, "[m]any of our native students find written English in reality a kind of foreign language or at least a second one" (11). Through his description of written English as a foreign language, even to native English speakers, Sullivan begins to stretch the boundaries of what it means to be considered a *foreign* or *second* language speaker. If academic English is a foreign language, even to native speakers of English, then the concept of being a *foreigner* or *second* language speaker is equalized; if everyone is foreign, then no one is.

Twenty-two years later, compositionists continued to think through ways that the teaching of English as a second and foreign language could be applied to traditional freshman composition courses. In "Error Analysis and the Teaching of Composition" (*CCC* 29.3 1978), Barry Kroll and John Schafer look at perceptions of error based on a structural and applied linguistics model. In the article, they suggest that compositionists, especially those teaching basic

writing, can learn a lot from those teaching English abroad. They state:

> Our view of errors has been shaped by a particular aspect of our experience.
> Although we now teach composition, we have both taught English as a Second
> Language (hereafter ESL)—one of us in Europe, the other in Asia and Africa.
> While teaching English to non-native speakers, we listened to what a number of
> teachers and applied linguists were saying about how they approached the
> problem of error in language-learning. We would like to present insights from the
> current ESL approach to error because we believe that teachers of native speakers
> can gain a new perspective by considering the matter of error from the second-
> language point of view. (242)

Thus, Kroll and Schafer, along with Sullivan, Lado, Trager, and Burnet, suggest that in teaching
students writing techniques for standard academic English, similar techniques can be used for
both native and non-native English speakers, alike.

Choices in Nomenclature

In the passage above, Kroll and Schafer note that they have both taught English as a
second language abroad. Today, this would be referred to as teaching English as a *foreign*
language. One of the more interesting aspects of this passage in the use of the term *ESL* is that
they actively point out their usage of the initialism. This move is significant because it
demonstrates a choice in nomenclature; while they also use the term *non-native speakers* in this
passage, they have opted to more frequently use *ESL* as a way of identifying both the speakers
and the variety of English they taught. Yet this linkage of *ESL* and *non-native* is significant in

that it occurs frequently throughout composition research, and there seems to be some

relationship between the concepts of nativity to a language and birth or naturalness/natural

ability.

During the 1980s and 1990s, a shift occurred in which uses of *EFL* tapered off and *ESL*

became the dominantly-used term. It was dominant for about twenty years and, indeed, tends to

still be used frequently today. For example, in Vivian Zamel's 1995 article (*CCC* 46.4),

"Strangers in Academia: The Experiences of Faculty and ESL Students Across the Curriculum,"

Zamel discusses her use of the term *ESL* in an endnote. She says:

> The acronym ESL (English as a Second Language) is used here because it is the
>
> commonly used term to refer to students whose native language is not English.
>
> Given the inherently political nature of working with ESL learners, it is important
>
> to note that at urban institutions, such as the University of Massachusetts at
>
> Boston, most of these students are residents of the United States. Furthermore, in
>
> the case of a number of these students, English may be a third or fourth language.
>
> (520)

So here, *ESL* is used more in line with how we think of it today (learners of English within the

U.S.). Also, by calling attention to the fact that some of these students might have learned

English as something beyond even a second language, these speakers are represented as

linguistically complex, and their identities are construed as dynamic and complicated.

Furthermore, in this passage, Zamel links together the use of *native* and *ESL*, and

throughout the body of her text, Zamel also uses the term *non-native* seemingly interchangeably

with *ESL*. For example, at one point Zamel states, "[i]n the course of preparing to work with

faculty, and in order to get a sense of their issues and concerns, I surveyed instructors about their

experiences working with *non-native* speakers of English" (emphasis added, 507). And in the

next paragraph, Zamel states that the instructors responded to the survey and some of the faculty

"indicated that *ESL* students, because of their experience and motivation, were a positive

presence in their classes" (emphasis added, 507). Thus, Zamel seems to see the two terms as

interchangeable.

If we look at the concept of nativeness/nativity, there seem to be connections to birth/

mother tongue. In this way, a native speaker of a language can be seen as a natural speaker of a

language. Therefore, a non-native speaker is *un*natural. By collapsing the terms *ESL* and *non-

native*, it would seem as if Zamel is emphasizing *un*naturalness of these speakers. This suggests

that the relationship these students have with English is not natural and not nurturing. However,

it is this very disconnected nature, this active learning of the language rather than acquisition of

it, that the instructors Zamel surveyed pointed to as a positive attribute of these students. From

the perspective of some compositionists, it would seem that learning a language as a second (or

third, fourth, etc.) language actually gives the speaker an ability to reflect on the language and

one's language use that native speakers might not always have.

Conclusion

Ultimately, then, I believe it is particularly important for compositionists to acknowledge

the ways we represent linguistically diverse English speakers and writers in our classrooms and

our research because this will affect not only the ways we see our students and the ways they see

each other, but also the assignments we create for our students, the ways we assess their writing,

and the ways students choose to represent their own identities as writers. Would, for example, the students Ortmeier-Hooper studied have rejected the label of *ESL* so vehemently if they had had the opportunity to choose it for themselves before anyone else had placed the label upon them? Today, as compositionists increasingly examine the labels that are used institutionally to categorize groups of linguistically diverse writers, these writers are likewise increasingly individually discussing and defining their own identities as English language users.

Books like *Reinventing Identities in Second Language Writing* provide opportunities for second language writers to do this very thing by exploring between identity and second language writing (ix). In fact, in their Introduction, the collection editors—Michelle Cox, Jay Jordan, Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, and Gwen Gray Schwartz—call attention to the inherently difficult and problematic nature of assigning terms to individuals. They argue, "all of these terms mask the complexity of second language writers' identities" (xv). In order to negotiate this "masking" of identities, scholars today are beginning to have a metadiscussion that runs throughout their scholarship regarding linguistic diversity and the labeling of international users of English. By calling attention to their uses of terminology and the assumptions that are behind these uses, compositionists have started to bring these conversations about assumptions to the forefront. In order to sustain ourselves as a discipline in an increasingly globalizing world, it is necessary for compositionists to examine our own labeling practices regarding representations of multilingual writers' identities. By taking a translingual approach to language, we can explore how to best work with linguistically diverse writers in order to consider how their complex identity formation as students and English language learners plays out in the ways they define themselves as they contribute to our classrooms communities and our global publics.

Chapter Six: Translingualism Beyond the Composition Context

Where We've Been

Conversations about international linguistically diverse writers within the field of composition have come a long way over the past seventy-five years. Over this period of time, two major arcs occur that demonstrate how the field has begun to embrace a translingual orientation toward language. And, indeed, these arcs have been present throughout the creation of the field itself, acting as a foundational force in the shaping of composition's pedagogy and scholarship. In the first arc, linguistically diverse writers from other countries have moved from being seen as foreigners or others, to being viewed as similar to other marginalized and stereotyped groups within the university, to eventually being considered similar in many ways to native speakers of English due to their struggles to learn standard academic English. In more recent years, these linguistically diverse writers from non-English-dominant countries have been seen by compositionists as co-creators of knowledge both within the classroom and within composition research, and with the translingual movement of today, they are even seen as models for composition's own professional activities. Woven throughout this first arc is a secondary arc in which the field has also moved from viewing these writers at first as a homogenous group through a wide variety of sub-groupings to seeing the uniqueness of each individual.

As compositionists continue to acknowledge the dynamism of all writers in our classrooms, both native and non-native speakers of English alike, I believe it is imperative that we examine the history of the paths we have taken to get to this point. In the years during and following World War II, the field began to contend with what it might mean for English to become a global language, to work through issues of ownership of English, and to redefine what

English was. For example, debates about British vs. American English proliferated, and the concept of Basic English was proposed as a way to distill the language in order to help it spread as a lingua franca. The patriotic zeal following World War II caused Americans to take great pride in the English language, and English teachers at this time promoted the learning of English by citizens of other countries while excusing the supposed inability of Americans to learn other languages. Indeed, it was even considered to be unnatural for Americans to try to learn other languages, and English was promoted as the only language worth knowing. Conversely, however, English teachers were also beginning to stress the importance of trying to explore other cultural ideals as a way to engage with the rest of the world. Throughout this era in the field, linguistically diverse writers were represented in multiple ways, including as interlopers in the classroom and individuals without a worthwhile language.

In the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, conversations about linguistically diverse writers became more nuanced and complicated. Conversations about pedagogy proliferated during this time, and this era saw an increase in conversations about how these writers were "problems" to be dealt with by teachers and discussions about the resources and materials provided (or not, in many cases) by institutions. Linguistically diverse writers often were portrayed during this time as a drain on the resources of institutions and instructors, and teachers felt overwhelmed by having these students in their classes. Many of the articles from this period read like minutes from self-help groups, chronicling the anxieties and fears of teachers during workshop sessions at the CCCC national convention. Compositionists often viewed these writers as lazy, apathetic, and disruptive to the work that teachers were trying to do in the classroom.

At the same time, some compositionists were beginning to acknowledge the value that

linguistically diverse writers (including international students and also speakers of vernacular Englishes) brought to their writing and their classrooms. Another picture of international students began to emerge during this time that celebrated their linguistic diversity as well as the linguistic diversity of speakers of other dialects and vernaculars of English, such as AAVE. These voices led to the SRTOL resolution, which encouraged teachers to embrace the home dialects of students. While not expressly about international students, the SRTOL resolution demonstrated a shifting view in the field, one that emphasized the importance of linguistic diversity rather than viewing it as a deficit, interference, or problem to be fixed. Thus, less schematic, more nuanced, and more complex representations of linguistically diverse writers were beginning to emerge.

Yet the deficit view continued to appear in the decades following SRTOL. During this time, international students were often grouped with other marginalized groups in the academy, such as those with cognitive development issues. They were, and still sometimes are, treated as if they must be quarantined, and they are separated into separate classes for ESL students as a way to manage them. However, in more recent years, particularly since the turn of the century, compositionists have begun to move toward more of a translingual approach to language and language learning. This approach embraces linguistic diversity of all kinds, and it stresses the use of any and all available languages in communicative acts in order to be successful and effective. A translingual approach to language suggests that multilingualism should be the ideal norm toward which students, teachers, and researchers should all strive. It pushes against monolingualist assumptions that English is should be the only language of education in the U.S., and it embraces a translingual paradigm in which speakers communicate using various languages.

The translingual approach, the expectation that multilingualism is the norm, is a far cry from the early views that linguistically diverse students were lazy, apathetic problems to be dealt with and disciplined by teachers. As our conceptualizations of these students have changed, so too has the language we have used to talk about them. Recently, some scholars have begun to bring this conversation to the forefront, calling attention to their choices of terms to label these writers. The fact that researchers find a need to even have this conversation calls attention to the complex, dynamic identity markers of these students and demonstrates how difficult it is to choose just one label to represent them.

Yet the field still rehashes many of the same questions we have been asking ourselves for decades: What is standard English and how and why should we teach it (to both native and nonnative speakers, alike)? What is the role of composition within the undergraduate curriculum and the academy more broadly? And translingualism itself is a concept that still calls for more research. Scholars are just beginning to explore the pedagogical implications of translingualism and translingual literacy. As Suresh Canagarajah notes in *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*, "[p]edagogical implications deriving from such an orientation still need imaginative rethinking and creative design" (8). There is still a need for the development of pedagogical techniques for day-to-day classroom activities and assignments that could further explore what translingualism actually looks like in practice beyond its theoretical roots. Yet, while scholarship about translingualism tends to focus on the theory as opposed to the actual forms that translingual literacy takes in writing, Canagarajah states, "we cannot ignore the implications for form and micro-level language features in translingual literacy or pedagogy. The position that translingual literacy treats place and rhetorical practice as more primary shouldn't

be interpreted to mean that form is irrelevant. It is simply that form is shaped for meaning in

relations to these ecological, social, and contextual factors" (8). That is, as scholars continue to

think through what a translingual approach to language might entail, it will also be necessary for

them to take into consideration how a translingual approach might affect the forms that written

texts take. Translingualism, then, is a rhetorical approach to language that takes into

consideration context, form, and language. As compositionists work through these theoretical

and practical implementations and potential results of and issues with a translingual approach to

language in composition classrooms and beyond, this raises the questions: How might the

composition teacher's role in the academy speak to larger relationships of language, identity, and

society? And ultimately, what is our responsibility to our students? In the next section, I will

continue to explore some ways the field might work with other compositionists, other

disciplines, and the public sphere regarding the topic of linguistic diversity.

Where We're Going

This archival project has been fruitful in that it has allowed me to explore the

conversations that have occurred in composition's major and oldest journals over the past

seventy-five years regarding linguistically diverse writers in the composition classroom. Another

way to approach this project could have included examining the titles of presentations made at

national conventions, looking at books published by NCTE, or interviewing multilingual

scholars and students. There are many different ways that this history could have been brought to

light and many directions my work can go after conducting this research. In this final section of

my dissertation, I would like to suggest some sites of further research that I think this dissertation

points toward. When I began working on this project, I sought to provide a resource for researchers both new to composition and those who have been in the field for lengthier periods of time. I hope to use the archival work I have conducted in order both to propel my work forward and to encourage others to bring forth even more rich work regarding this ever-evolving topic.

Translingual Voices

As I concluded in Chapter Five, more work needs to be done to encourage international linguistically diverse writers to represent themselves in our journals and research. There are already many compositionists in the field who also speak multiple languages. As scholars like Min-Zhan Lu and Suresh Canagarajah research and write through their own experiences regarding linguistic diversity, they can act as models for students and other scholars to engage in this work as well. Christina Ortmeier-Hooper's article "'English May Be My Second Language, But I'm Not "ESL"'" begins to do some of this work of including the voices of these students and their opinions regarding the labels that have been applied to them. Work like that of Ortmeier-Hooper's can be expanded upon, extending the conversation beyond *ESL* to other terms that have been used frequently, such as *multilingual*, to see students' thoughts on terms like this that carry with them different institutional associations than *ESL*. The more work that is done to explore terms from a variety of linguistic perspectives, the more translingual the field will become.

Intersections with Other Fields

We also need to find places of intersection where this work overlaps with research in

other fields. For example, I have begun some preliminary research in writing center studies to see how that field has written the identities of international students. In a writing center context, discussions about revisions are supposed to be free from assessment. I wonder how the representations of these writers might be different in writing center scholarship than it is in composition scholarship if this need for placement and assessment is taken out of the conversation.

Additionally, I think there needs to be more work done regarding representations of international students' identities in composition. Some work has already been done in other fields, such as TESOL and applied linguistics, related to identity and language. However, there is not as much work within the specific context of composition related to these issues. Compositionists should examine the work of linguists and TESOL specialists in order to see points of intersection and what we have to learn from other fields and what we can contribute to them as well. Having explicated our own history within composition, we can begin to examine ways that our conversations mesh and clash with other conversations in the wider circle of writing studies.

Exploring Traditions

Beyond engaging with other disciplines, compositionists also should continue to explore literacy, writing, cultural, and linguistic traditions of other countries. In "Teaching Composition in the Multilingual World: Second Language Writing in Composition Studies" in *Exploring Composition Studies: Sites, Issues, and Perspectives*, Paul Kei Matsuda argues, "[t]o internationalize the field effectively and ethically, U.S. composition specialists need to learn

more about the sociolinguistic and institutional contexts of other countries. Before trying to reach out to others, however, U.S. composition studies many [sic] need to come to terms with the issues of globalization and multilingualism within its own institutional contexts" (51).

In the fall of 2011, I volunteered as a conversation partner with a Saudi Arabian woman through Virginia Tech's Language and Culture Institute. She wanted to improve her English speaking ability, but she also wanted to "get rid of her accent" and "sound more American." She was proud of her background, yet she still had concerns about wearing her hijab in public because she knew people made assumptions about her based on her appearance. She said she didn't want her language to mark her further. As a teacher and scholar who takes the tenets of translingualism to heart, I wanted to encourage her to embrace her accent. I wanted her to know that I found her way of speaking beautiful and valuable, and I wanted to encourage her to think through what she would gain and lose by trying to have a more "American" accent. But I also knew that what *I* wanted did not really matter in this situation. Some assumptions would be made about her appearance, and she could not control that. But she wanted to claim ownership of standard English as a way of expressing her autonomy and agency. My experiences with her made me think about my responsibility as an educator. Certainly, I could have tried to convince her that she might have more agency if she tried to make English her own without worrying about the standard, at least in every day communications, and if she used *all* her languages to express her thoughts and ideas. And that might be true for some individuals. However, it might not be true in every case.

Many scholars studying this topic see a future in which it will be the norm for multiple languages to be spoken by Americans in daily academic and nonacademic communicative acts.

In *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, Bruce Horner notes that there is a "wealth of scholarship in, and on, languages other than English on which composition can draw that the dominance of English Only ideology over all levels of U.S. education has rendered invisible to most compositionists. It is now long past time for composition scholars to break the English Only barrier in their writing, reading, and thinking as well as teaching" (12). And in the same collection, John Trimbur argues, "multilingualism signifies more than simply the tolerance of many languages in America. It also entails the status planning of languages and an additive language policy where all students as a matter of course speak, write, and learn in more than one language and all residents of the United States thereby become capable of communicating with each other in a number of languages" ("Linguistic Memory and the Uneasy Settlement of U.S. English" 39). Therefore, it is the responsibility of compositionists to act as a model for both our students and our colleagues, when it comes to discussions about language(s) and translingualism wherever they may take place.

Engaging with the Public Sphere

A final site of research for the field has to do with finding sites of intervention in the public sphere regarding issues of globalization and linguistic diversity. The field should move towards finding more ways to engage with the public regarding discussions of language diversity. Often, it seems that the American public has but one opinion about what English teachers should do: they should teach standard English (and all the grammatical and mechanical rules that accompany it). LuMing Mao examines the problematic results of such expectations, namely that this causes Americans to have certain notions about what constitutes proper English

and to judge individuals who do not speak or write in this particular way. Thus, when individuals

from other countries come to the U.S. and speak with an accent, Americans sometimes become

frustrated with them rather than accepting their differences.

In "Why Don't We Speak with an Accent?: Practicing Interdependence-in-Difference,"

Mao considers the story of Manuel Castillo, a truck driver from California and a U.S. resident. In

2008, on a trip from Georgia back to California, Castillo was pulled over in Alabama for a

routine inspection. He was "fined, with a maximum penalty of $500, for violating a federal law

requiring that anyone with a commercial driver's license speak English well enough to converse

with police. He wasn't speeding, and the inspection and computer check turned up no offenses.

Mr. Castillo, a truck driver of twenty years, was literally ticketed for 'speaking with an

accent'" (189). Mao asks, "[a]lthough it might be helpful to require truckers to be able to

communicate with state troopers in English, is it reasonable at all that they have to speak a

particular kind of English that is 'standard' and 'accent-free?'" (189). And, furthermore, how

might compositionists, as people concerned with languages and literacy, intervene in discussions

of such circumstances? Mao notes:

> One question kept coming back to me in the wake of Mr. Castillo's story: What
>
> exactly can we do as teachers of writing and rhetoric to combat this Standard
>
> English ideology and to confront this discursive and cultural divide? Or, what
>
> would it take to bring people to accept that no accent is more equal than others so
>
> that future Castillos will not be ticketed for speaking English "with an accent"?
>
> And, in a related issue, how can we fully mobilize this new transcultural and
>
> transnational contact zone in order to promote discursive copresences and to

cultivate interdependence-in-difference? In other words, how can we collectively

tear down this ideology and close up this divide? (192)

By pushing against the standard English ideology, Mao argues that compositionists can intervene

in the public sphere by broadening the perspectives of individuals outside composition studies

regarding literacy and English language expectations. Essentially, this is an argument that

compositionists should bring to the public sphere the agendas of the Students Right to their Own

Language resolution, the National Language Policy, and the Statement on Second Language

Writing and Writers.

As conversations about immigration reform and the globalization of English continue to

occur, it is important for U.S. citizens to realize how we perceive others and how we, ourselves

are perceived. Mao hopes that "[w]e can begin to view 'speaking with an accent' not as a liability

but as an asset, as a contact-zone experience that deserves not censure but celebration" (194).

The conversations mainstream composition has been having about linguistic diversity since

before we were even a field of study—the conversations that have helped create our own

discipline and invoke translingualism as a model of who we should be professionally—lead us to

next engage in public sphere education and advocacy. It is time for compositionists to begin

doing this work with the public, engaging communities beyond the classroom in discussions of

diversity related to language and literacy.

Works Cited

"1936-1945." *Bucknell Women's Resource Center History*, n.d. Web. 29 Aug. 2012.

Arapoff-Cramer, Nancy. "A Survey of University Writing Assignments." *College Composition and Communication* 22.2 (1971): 161-168. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Oct. 2012.

Barron, Nancy G. "Dear Saints, Dear Stella: Letters Examining the Messy Lines of Expectations, Stereotypes, and Identity in Higher Education." *College Composition and Communication* 55.1 (2003): 11-37. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Barry, Suzanne, and Janet Sewak. "A Study of the English Backgrounds of English 101 Students at Bradley University." *College Composition and Communication* 17.5 (1966): 252-255. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.

Bartholomae, David. "The Study of Error." *College Composition and Communication* 31.3 (1980): 253-269. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Dec. 2012.

Berke, Jacqueline. "A Defense of Craft: One Response to the Cincinnati Conference." *College Composition and Communication* 22.3 (1971): 251-255. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Oct. 2012.

Berthoff, Ann E., and William G. Clark. "The Students' Right to Their Own Language." *College Composition and Communication* 26.2 (1975): 216-217. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Dec. 2012.

Burnet, MacCurdy. "Vowel Contrasts in student Speech." *College Composition and Communication* 8.1 (1957): 22-25. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

Canagarajah, Suresh. "A Rhetoric of Shuttling Between Languages." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Eds. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. 158-179. Print.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language

Acquisition" *The Modern Language Journal* 91 (2007): 923-939. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Aug. 2011.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. Introduction. *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. New York: Routledge, 2013. 1-10. Print.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *College Composition and Communication* 57.4 (2006): 586-619. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Cannon, Garland. "Multidialects: The Student's Right to His Own Language." *College Composition and Communication* 24.5 (1973): 382-385. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Oct. 2012.

Cannon, Garland H. "Punctuation and Sentence Rhythm." *College Composition and Communication* 8.1 (1957): 16-22. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

Carruthers, Ben. "English Studies in the Universities of the Other American Republics." *College English* 5.8 (1944): 439-443. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Mar. 2012.

Casmier, Adam A. "Response to Counterstatement of Robert P. Saalbach." *College Composition and Communication* 24.2 (1973): 226-227. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Oct. 2012.

"CCCC Bulletin Board." *College Composition and Communication* 4.4 (1953): 146-149. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Sept. 2012.

"CCCC Bulletin Board." *College Composition and Communication* 6.4 (1955): 223-224. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sept. 2012.

"CCCC Guideline on the National Language Policy." *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, 2007. Web. 3 Apr. 2013.

"CCCC Secretary's Report." *College Composition and Communication* 39.3 (1988): 368-370.

JSTOR. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.

"CCCC Statement on Second-Language Writing and Writers." *College Composition and*

      Communication 52.4 (2001): 669-674. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Chandler, Jean. "Positive Control." *College Composition and Communication* 48.2 (1997):

      273-274. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013.

Cheung, King Kok. "Drawing out the Silent Minority." *College Composition and*

      Communication 35.4 (1984): 452-454. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Jan. 2013.

Coleman, Charles F. "Our Students Write with Accents: Oral Paradigms for ESD Students."

      College Composition and Communication 48.4 (1997): 486-500. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Jan.

      2013.

Connors, Robert. "Dreams and Play: Historical Method and Methodology." *Methods and*

      Methodology in Composition Research. Eds. Gesa Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan.

      Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1992. 15-36. Print.

Connors, Robert. "Rhetorical History as a Component of Composition Studies." *Rhetoric Review*

      7.2 (1989): 230-240. JSTOR. Web. 11 Jan. 2012.

Cook-Sather, Alison. "Education as Translation: Students Transforming Notions of Narrative and

      Self." *College Composition and Communication* 55.1 (2003): 91-114. *JSTOR*. Web. 5

      Feb. 2013.

"Committee on CCCC Language: Background Statement." *College Composition and*

      Communication 25.3 (1974): 1-18. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Oct. 2012.

"Composition/Communication Program for the Foreign Student." *College Composition and*

      Communication 10.3 (1959): 192-194. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Sept. 2012.

"Composition for Foreign Students." *College Composition and Communication* 15.3 (1964): 191-192. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Sept. 2012.

"Contributions of Anthropology to Communication Theory." *College Composition an Communication* 8.3 (1957): 181-183. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

Corbett, Edward P.J. Rev. of *Reading and Word Study*, by Kenneth Croft. *College Composition and Communication* 12.2 (1961): 121. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Sept. 2012.

Corbett, Edward P.J. "Teaching Composition: Where We've Been and Where We're Going." *College Composition and Communication* 38.4 (1987): 444-452. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.

Courage, Richard. "The Interaction of Public and Private Literacies." *College Composition and Communication* 44.4 (1993): 484-496. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 Jan. 2013.

Cox, Michelle, Jay Jordan, Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, and Gwen Gray Schwartz, eds. *Reinventing Identities in Second Language Writing*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2010. Print.

Crystal, David. *English as a Global Language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Dean, Terry. "Multicultural Classrooms, Monocultural Teachers." *College Composition and Communication* 40.1 (1989): 22-37. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.

Dexter, Kathleen. "The Use of Examination Papers in Linguistic Study." *College English* 2.2 (1940): 161-165. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Mar. 2012.

Donahue, Christiane. "'Internationalization' and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse." *College Composition and Communication* 61.2 (2009): 212-243. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Feb. 2013.

Dryer, Dylan B. "At a Mirror, Darkly: The Imagined Undergraduate Writers of Ten Novice

Composition Instructors." *College Composition and Communication* 63.3 (2012): 420-452. *NCTE*. Web. 24 Feb. 2013.

Duffy, John. "Letters from the Fair City: A Rhetorical Conception of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication* 56.2 (2004): 223-250. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Duke, Charles R. "The Bamboo Style of English." *College Composition and Communication* 21.2 (1970): 170-172. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Oct. 2012.

"Editor's Note." *College Composition and Communication* 35.4 (1984): 399. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Jan. 2013.

Educational Testing Service. "Insight: TOEFL Program History." *ETS TOEFL*, 2011. Web. 13 Feb. 2013.

"English for Foreigners in the U.S.A." *College Composition and Communication* 13.3 (1962): 65-66. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Sept. 2012.

"English for Foreign Students." *College Composition and Communication* 14.3 (1963): 187-188. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Sept. 2012.

Farley, Hugh. "Words and Meanings: An Experimental Study of a Linguistic Principle." *College English* 3.2 (1941): 183-189. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Mar. 2012.

Fraiberg, Steven. "Composition 2.0: Toward a Multilingual and Multimodal Framework." *College Composition and Communication* 62.1 (2010): 100-126. *NCTE*. Web. 7 Feb. 2013.

Freeman, Lawrence D. "The Students' Right to Their Own Language: Its Legal Bases." *College Composition and Communication* 26.1 (1975): 25-29. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Oct. 2012.

Friend, Jewell A. "College English for the Preprofessional or Graduate Student of EFL." College

Composition and Communication 24.2 (1973). JSTOR. Web. 09 Oct. 2012.

Gerber, John C. "The Conference on College Composition and Communication." *College*

   Composition and Communication 1.1 (1950): 12. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Sept. 2012.

Glenn, Cheryl, and Jessica Enoch. "Invigorating Historiographic Practices in Rhetoric and

   Composition Studies." *Working in the Archives: Practical Research Methods for Rhetoric*

   and Composition. Eds. Alexis E. Ramsey, Wendy B. Sharer, Barbara L'Eplattenier, and

   Lisa S. Mastrangelo. Carbondale, Southern Illinois UP, 2010. 11-27. Print.

Gold, David. *Rhetoric at the Margins: Revising the History of Writing Instruction in American*

   Colleges, 1873-1947. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2008. Print.

Goodrich, Herbert. "Education for World Outlook." *College English* 8.7 (1947): 381-382.

   JSTOR. Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

Griffith, William J. "United States Cultural Institutes in Other American Republics." *College*

   English 6.3 (1944): 166-168. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

Haber, Tom Burns. "Graduate Study in English after the War." *College English* 6.1 (1944):

   41-45. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Mar. 2012.

Harris, Joseph. *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: U of

   Prentice Hall, 1997. Print.

Harris, Muriel. "Center in on Professional Choices." *College Composition and Communication*

   52.3 (2001): 429-440. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Feb. 2013.

Harris, Muriel, and Tony Silva. "Tutoring ESL Students: Issues and Options." *College*

   Composition and Communication 44.4 (1993): 525-537. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 Jan. 2013.

"Has English Zero Seen Its Day?: A Symposium." *College Composition and Communication* 8.2

(1957): 72-95. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

Heilker, Paul, and Peter Vandenberg. Introduction. *Keywords in Composition Studies*.

   Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1996. 1-8. Print.

Heilker, Paul, and Peter Vandenberg. Introduction. *Keywords in Writing Studies*. Logan: Utah

   State UP, Forthcoming. MS 4-13. Print.

Hendricks, Cecilia Hennel. "Exemption from Required Composition." *College English* 1.7

   (1940): 604-616. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Mar. 2012.

Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College*

   Composition and Communication 53.4 (2002): 594-630. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Horner, Bruce. Introduction. *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Eds. Bruce Horner,

   Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. 1-17.

   Print.

Horner, Bruce, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane Donahue. "Toward a Multilingual

   Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm." *College*

   Composition and Communication 63.2 (2011): 269-300. *NCTE*. Web. 25 Feb. 2013.

Horner, Bruce. *Terms of Work for Composition: A Materialist Critique*. Albany: State U of New

   York P, 2000. Print.

Ives, Sumner. "Help for the Foreign Student." *College Composition and Communication* 4.4

   (1953): 141-144. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Sept. 2012.

Ives, Sumner. Rev. of *English as a Second Language*, by Lois McIntosh. *College Composition*

   and Communication 11.2 (1960): 125. JSTOR. Web. 25 Sept. 2012.

Jenkins, Jennifer. *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Print.

Jordan, Jay. "Second Language Users and Emerging English Designs." *College Composition and*

Communication 61.2 (2009): W310-W329. *NCTE*. Web. 25 Feb. 2013.

Karanikas, Alexander. "An Approach to Freshman Writers." *College Composition and*

Communication 11.1 (1960): 50-55. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Sept. 2012.

Kinloch, Valerie Felita. "Revisiting the Promise of 'Student' Right to Their Own Language.'"

College Composition and Communication 57.1 (2005): 83-113. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb.

2013.

Kroll, Barry M., and John C. Schafer. "Error-Analysis and the Teaching of Composition."

College Composition and Communication 29.3 (1978): 242-248. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Dec.

2012.

Lackey, Katherine. "English in Island Democracy." *College English* 7.1 (1945): 44-45. *JSTOR*.

Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

Lado, Robert. "Sentence Structure." *College Composition and Communication* 8.1 (1957):

12-16. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

Lyon, Arabella. "'You Fail': Plagiarism, the Ownership of Writing, and Transnational Conflicts."

College Composition and Communication 61.2 (2009): W222-W239. *NCTE*. Web. 25

Feb. 2013.

Lloyd, Donald J. "An English Composition Course Built around Linguistics." *College*

Composition and Communication 4.2 (1953): 40-43. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Sept. 2012.

Lloyd, Donald J. "Grammar in Freshman English." *College Composition and Communication*

5.4 (1954): 162-166. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2012.

Lloyd, Donald J. "Linguistics and Professional Publication on Language: A Reply to Professor

Steinman." *College Composition and Communication* 2.3 (1951): 7-10. *JSTOR*. Web. 13

Sept. 2012.

Logan, Shirley Wilson. "Changing Missions, Shifting Positions, and Breaking Silences." *College

Composition and Communication* 55.2 (2003): 330-342. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Lorimer, Rebecca, and Andrea Olinger. "L.4: (Re)Defining Translingual Writing." *KairosWikis*.

Web. 9 Nov. 2011.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "An Essay on the Work of Composition: Composing English against the Order of

Fast Capitalism." *College Composition and Communication* 56.1 (2004): 16-50. *JSTOR*.

Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "Living-English Work." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Eds. Bruce

Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010.

42-56. Print.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone." *College

Composition and Communication* 45.4 (1994): 442-458. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "Redefining the Literate Self: The Politics of Critical Affirmation." *College

Composition and Communication* 51.2 (1999): 172-194. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013.

Lunsford, Andrea A., and Karen J. Lunsford. "'Mistakes are a Fact of Life': A National

Comparative Study." *College Composition and Communication* 59.4 (2008): 781-806.

JSTOR. Web. 7 Feb. 2013.

MacDonald, Susan Peck. "The Erasure of Language." *College Composition and Communication*

58.4 (2007): 585-625. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Feb. 2013.

Mao, LuMing. "Why Don't We Speak with an Accent? Practicing Interdependence-in-

> Difference." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Eds. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan

> Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. 189-195. Print.

Marquardt, William F. "Composition and the Course in English for Foreign Students." *College

> Composition and Communication* 7.1 (1956): 29-33. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sept. 2012.

Marquardt, William F. "Composition in English as a Second Language: Cross Cultural

> Communication." *College Composition and Communication* 17.1 (1966): 29-33. *JSTOR*.

> Web. 28 Sept. 2012.

Marzluf, Phillip P. "Diversity Writing: Natural Languages, Authentic Voices." *College

> Composition and Communication* 57.3 (2006): 503-522. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Michelle Cox. "Reading an ESL Writer's Text." *ESL Writers: A Guide for

> Writing Center Tutors*. 2nd ed. Eds. Shanti Bruce, and Ben Rafoth. Portsmouth, NH:

> Heinemann, 2009. 42-50. Print.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor."

> *College Composition and Communication* 50.4 (1999): 699-721. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Jan.

> 2013.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Teaching Composition in the Multilingual World." *Exploring Composition

> Studies*. Eds. Kelly Ritter and Paul Kei Matsuda. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2012. 36-51.

> Print.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *Cross-

> Language Relations in Composition*. Eds. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei

> Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. 81-96. Print.

McCloskey, Frank, and Lillian Herlands Hornstein. "Subfreshman Composition—A New

    Solution." *College English* 11.6 (1950): 331-339. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 Mar. 2012.

McM., J.B. "Current English Forum." *College English* 7.8 (1946): 478. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Mar.

    2012.

Meech, Sanford. "Basic English." Rev. of Basic English and Its Uses, by I.A. Richards. *College*

    English 6.4 (1945): 234-236. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

Minkoff, Harvey, and Evelyn B. Melamed. "Response to Lawrence D. Freeman, 'The Students'

    Right to Their Own Language: Its Legal Bases.'" *College Composition and*

    Communication 26.3 (1975): 311-312. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Dec. 2012.

Moreno, Renee M. "'The Politics of Location': Text as Opposition." *College Composition and*

    Communication 54.2 (2002): 222-242. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 February 2013.

Mueller, Derek. "Views from a Distance: A Nephological Model of the CCCC Chairs' Addresses,

    1977-2011." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 16.2 (2012): n.

    pag. Web. 16 Jan. 2012.

Murphy, Ann. "Transference and Resistance in the Basic Writing Classroom: Problematics and

    Praxis." *College Composition and Communication* 40.2 (1989): 175-187. *JSTOR*. Web.

    22 Jan. 2013.

Musgrave, Marian E. "Failing Minority Students: Class, Caste, and Racial Bias in American

    Colleges." *College Composition and Communication* 22.1 (1971): 24-29. *JSTOR*. Web. 9

    Oct. 2012.

Myers, Sharon A. "ReMembering the Sentence." *College Composition and Communication* 54.4

    (2003): 610-628. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Feb. 2013.

North, Steven M. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*.

Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1987. Print.

"Orientation Programs in Freshman English: A Symposium." *College Composition and Communication* 6.2 (1955): 63-74. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2012.

Ortmeier-Hooper, Christina. "'English May Be My Second Language, But I'm Not "ESL."'"

College Composition and Communication 59.3 (2008): 389-419. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Feb. 2013.

Payne, Alma. "An International Little Red Schoolhouse." *College English* 11.1 (1949): 37-38.

JSTOR. Web. 29 Mar. 2012.

Pedersen, Anne-Marie. "Negotiating Cultural Identities through Language: Academic English in Jordan." *College Composition and Communication* 62.2 (2010): 283-310. *NCTE*. Web. 7 Feb. 2013.

Pérez, Raoul. "The Most Popular Foreign Language." *College English* 8.4 (1947): 192-195.

JSTOR. Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

Pixton, William H., and John R. Hendrickson. "Responses to the CCCC Committee's Resolution 'The Student's Right to His Own Language.'" *College Composition and Communication* 23.3 (1972): 298-301. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Oct. 2012.

Redford, Grant. "The Army Air Force English Program and the Schools of Tomorrow." *College English* 5.5 (1944): 276-280. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Mar. 2012.

Reid, Joy M. "ESL Composition: The Linear Product of American Thought." *College Composition and Communication* 35.4 (1984): 449-452. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Jan. 2013.

Richards, I.A. "What Basic English Is." *Readings in Contemporary Rhetoric*. Eds. Karen A.

Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Robert Trapp. Long Grove: Waveland, 2002. 17-34. Print.

Richardson, Elaine. "Race, Class(es), Gender, and Age: The Making of Knowledge about Language Diversity." *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2003. 40-66. Print.

Rivenburgh, Viola. "A Why and How for Remedial English." *College Composition and Communication* 7.4 (1956): 218-224. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sept. 2012.

Rivera, Magaly. "Beyond Language." *Welcome to Puerto Rico*, 2013. Web. 20 Aug. 2012.

Roberge, Mark, Meryl Siegal, and Linda Harklau. *Generation 1.5 in College Composition: Teaching Academic Writing to U.S.-Educated Learners of ESL*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Roberts, Chas W. "Editorial Comment." *College Composition and Communication* 1.1 (1950): 13. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Sept. 2012.

Rojas, Pauline M. "The Teaching of English as a Modern Foreign Language." *College English* 9.6 (1948): 322-326. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 Mar. 2012.

Roy, Alice Myers. "Alliance for Literacy: Teaching Non-Native Speakers and Speakers of Nonstandard English Together." *College Composition and Communication* 35.4 (1984): 439-448. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Jan. 2013.

Rutz, Carol. "CCCC Secretary's Report, 2006-2007." *College Composition and Communication* 59.2 (2007): 330-336. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Feb. 2013.

Saalbach, Robert P. "Response to CCCC Executive Committee's Resolution 'The Student's Right to His Own Language.'" *College Composition and Communication* 23.5 (1972): 416. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Oct. 2012.

Scudder, Harold, and Robert Webster. "The New Hampshire Plan for Freshman English."

    College English 2.5 (1941): 492-498. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Mar. 2012.

"Secretary's Reports." *College Composition and Communication* 23.3 (1972): 319-328. *JSTOR*.

    Web. 9 Oct. 2012.

Sharpe, Johnnie M. "The Disadvantaged Student Trapped behind the Verb 'To Teach.'" *College*

    Composition and Communication 23.3 (1972): 271-276. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Oct. 2012.

Shen, Fan. "The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English."

    College Composition and Communication 40.4 (1989): 459-466. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Jan.

    2013.

Shuck, Emerson C. "Administration of the Freshman English Program." *College Composition*

    and Communication 6.4 (1955): 205-210. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sept. 2012.

Siggins, Clara M. "'The Bitter with the Better.'" *College Composition and Communication* 10.4

    (1959): 261-262. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Sept. 2012.

Smitherman, Geneva. "The Historical Struggle for Language Rights in CCCC." *Language*

    Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice. Eds. Geneva Smitherman and

    Victor Villanueva. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2003. 7-39. Print.

"Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication." *College Composition*

    and Communication 5.1 (1954): 46-52. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2012.

"Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication." *College Composition*

    and Communication 5.4 (1954): 175-180. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2012.

"Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication." *College Composition*

    and Communication 6.1 (1955): 48-58. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2012.

"Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication." *College Composition and Communication* 6.2 (1955): 108-120. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Sept. 2012.

"Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication." *College Composition an Communication* 7.1 (1956): 51-56. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sept. 2012.

"Special Problems in the Communication Course for Groups Selected on the Basis of Ability or Professional Objective: The Report of Workshop No. 11." *College Composition and Communication* 3.4 (1952): 27-29. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Sept. 2012.

"Special Problems of the Freshman Course in Liberal Arts Colleges." *College Composition and Communication* 9.3 (1958): 162-164. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Sept. 2012.

Spencer, Richard E., and Paul D. Holtzman. "It's Composition—But Is It Reliable?" *College Composition and Communication* 16.2 (1965): 117-121. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 Sept. 2012.

"Studies in English as a Second Language." *College Composition and Communication* 7.3 (1956): 163-165. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

Sullivan, Patrick, Yufen Zhang, and Fenglan Zheng. "College Writing in China and America: A Modest and Humble Conversation, with Writing Samples." *College Composition and Communication* 64.2 (2012): 306-331. *NCTE*. Web. 14 Feb. 2013.

Sullivan, Paul R. "Introduction." *College Composition and Communication* 8.1 (1957): 10-12. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

"Summary and Report." *College English* 6.6 (1945): 348-352. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

"Summary and Report." *College English* 7.1 (1945): 49-50. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

Tardy, Christine M. "Enacting and Transforming Local Language Policies." *College Composition and Communication* 62.4 (2011): 634-661. *NCTE*. Web. 27 Feb. 2013.

"Teaching English with Reference to Other Languages." *College Composition and*

   Communication 13.3 (1962): 46-47. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Sept. 2012.

"Teaching the Foreign Student to Speak and Write: Materials and Methods." *College*

   Composition and Communication 8.3 (1957): 151-153. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

"The Foreign Student in the Freshman Course: The Report of Workshop No. 8." *College*

   Composition and Communication 6.3 (1955): 138-140. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sept. 2012.

"The Foreign Student in the Freshman Course." *College Composition and Communication* 7.3

   (1956): 122-124. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

"The Freshman Whose Native Language is not English." *College Composition and*

   Communication 12.3 (1961): 155-157. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Sept. 2012.

"To Readers of CCC: Resolution on Language." *College Composition and Communication* 25.3

   (1974): n.p. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Oct. 2012.

Trager, Edith Crowell. "The Systematics of English Spelling." *College Composition and*

   Communication 8.1 (1957): 26-32. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

Trimbur, John. "The Dartmouth Conference and the Geohistory of the Native Speaker." *College*

   English 71.2 (2008): 142-169. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Sept. 2012.

"Use of Community Resources in Teaching Freshman English: The Report of Workshop No. 7."

   College Composition and Communication 4.3 (1953): 88-89. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Sept.

   2012.

Usill, Harley. "Double Benefits of Basic English." *College English* 6.5 (1945): 289-290. *JSTOR*.

   Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

Walsh, Chad. "Basic English: World Language or World Philosophy?" *College English* 6.8

(1945): 453-459. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Mar. 2012.

Ward, Ferdinand J. "Why Do Freshmen Write Poorly?" *College Composition and Communication* 9.1 (1958): 30-31. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.

Weaver, Richard. "To Write the Truth." *College English* 10.1 (1948): 25-30. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 Mar. 2012.

Westerfield, Hargis. "Limiting Research-Paper Subjects." *College English* 10.1 (1948): 41-42. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 Mar. 2012.

Whipp, Leslie T. "Teaching English and the Social-Class Relationships." *College Composition and Communication* 30.2 (1979): 141-145. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Dec. 2012.

Wykoff, George. "An Open Letter to the Educational Experts on Teaching Composition." *College English* 1.2 (1939): 140-146. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Mar. 2012.

You, Xiaoye. "Ideology, Textbooks, and the Rhetoric of Production in China." *College Composition and Communication* 56.4 (2005): 632-653. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

Young, Vershawn Ashanti. "'Nah, We Straight': An Argument Against Code Switching." Journal of Advanced Composition 29.1-2 (2009): 49-76. Print.

Zamel, Vivian. "Strangers in Academia: The Experiences of Faculty and ESL Students Across the Curriculum." *College Composition and Communication* 46.4 (1995): 506-521. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013.