

Language Diversity in the Classroom

From Intention to Practice

Edited by Geneva Smitherman
and Victor Villanueva

Foreword by Suresh Canagarajah

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY PRESS

Carbondale 2003

Introduction

Geneva Smitherman and Victor Villanueva

This monograph is about language and racism, about language and nationalism, about discussing and teaching the connections between language and racism and nationalism. Every essay in this collection asks us to think about how we enact our belief in the multiplicity of language, of English, in our classrooms.

Victor gets an e-mail question from a graduate student:

Why do you call yourself an "American" academic of Color in the title of your book? Why not a Puerto Rican in the U.S. academy? Or an American academic? Or something a little less . . . "American?"

A response:

This is not an unreasonable question from a Rican. And *Bootsstraps* [a book by Victor] does address this in any number of ways. But I'll answer it this way. I was born in Brooklyn. Raised there with Black kids and Asian kids and one Mexican kid and Boricuas. My first language was Spanish; my first English was the English of the neighborhood, Black and Spanglish, or even a Black Spanglish. When I was 15, the family moved to California. I've been in the West (except for two years in Kansas City and trips abroad) ever since—with Mexican kids, Chicano kids, vato kids, pachuco kids,¹ Indian kids, Asian kids, Black kids, and White kids. And the nonsense that Ricans have to endure in New York is the same nonsense that all the other kids of Color endure. And I wanted that understood ("ethno-nation" is

Ramon Grosfoguel's language). Or let me do a variation of Tato Laviera:

My tongue is Boricua

My ear is Boricua and Black

My being in this country is Color
even though

My skin is white.

I'm a Puerto Rican and a portorican (the way we say it in New York) but with all those crazy mixes of the ghetto, I can never be just simply American, even though Boriquen Arawak Taino is America. For here, this place where I have lived my life, I am a person of Color. And you are too while you're here, but you have a home to go to—Puerto Rico—and in a very real sense, I do not. My parents do—Río Piedras y Caguas. But I don't. I'm a Nuyorican. But to get the point across, an Academic Nuyorican wouldn't have drawn the same number of readers, and my last 53 years have been all of it but White—Color, Latino, Nuyorican with a mythic homeland I've visited but have never really known—Puerto Rico. How's that?
victor.

It's one conversation about the languages that reside with one man. But he's not alone. In fact, those like him are in our classrooms in unprecedented numbers. And we know we want to celebrate their linguistic deftness. Yet we tend to hold to the belief that there is but one tongue that must be mastered if those students before us are to succeed, the standardized American English, the conventions of an universalized Edited American English. It doesn't sit well, but there it is, we say. Folks in this monograph have us think again, even tell us what we might do in our classrooms.

Sociologists Eduardo Bonilla-Silva and Tyrone A. Forman question the many research studies performed since 1964 that demonstrate that racial attitudes in the United States are continually getting better, or are at the least "ambivalent" and "tolerant." They point to the

degree to which well-articulated, methodologically sound research questionnaires seem to demonstrate America's changing attitude away from the racism of yore. Bonilla-Silva and Forman then created their own questionnaire, distributing it to more than 400 White students at a Midwestern university. As predicted, the students demonstrated the kind of "Color-blind" ideology we would all hope for in the students (in our world, for that matter). The researchers then did in-depth interviews with a small sample, 10 percent, of those who had filled out the questionnaire. What the researchers discovered is that *appearing* racist is the taboo, not racism itself. Rather than being Color-blind, what arises is a Color-blind racism, a racism that, borrowing from Sartre, refuses to name itself (Sartre having called the bourgeoisie the class that refuses to name itself). The students interviewed "use a new *racetalk* to avoid appearing 'racist' (Bonilla-Silva and Forman 50). The new racism is a "competitive racism." "Equality" becomes "meritocracy." That folks of Color don't achieve the same status as Whites in equal numbers (or comparable ratios) becomes part of racial pathologies, replete with a list of "if only" statements ("if only they'd stop whining and get to work"). No one wants to appear racist. Too many refuse to acknowledge that the systemic problems of racism continue. The Bonilla-Silva and Forman article's title? "I Am Not a Racist but . . . : Mapping White College Students' Racial Ideology in the USA."

"I'm not racist, but if those kids want to get ahead, they need to learn proper English."

This monograph grew out of a concern that the Conference on College Composition and Communication's "Students' Right to Their Own Language" and the CCCC National Language Policy were no longer recognized. The history of both documents marks the opening chapter to the monograph, written by an active agent in their production, Geneva Smitherman. This sets the stage for a discussion of the Language Knowledge and Awareness Survey, conducted by the CCCC Language Policy Committee, also headed by Smitherman. As Elaine Richardson will detail in the second chapter, the overwhelming majority of those surveyed believe that the country's

dialects and languages are worthy of respect, that at least outside the schools, dialects and languages other than the American prestige—standardized American English and its written form, Edited American English—should be maintained and nurtured to the extent that that is possible. As would be expected, the greatest support for the maintenance of other-than-standard dialects and for languages other than English comes from those surveyed who self-identified as people of Color. Significantly, the majority of those surveyed, while believing in the need for training in linguistic diversity, were unaware of the published positions of their professional organizations along those lines.

Despite the general attitude reported in the survey, the attitudes concerning the specifics of teaching make it clear that the training of English teachers—at all levels—ought to include a course on language awareness and on American dialects. The commonly taken course on the history of the English language apparently doesn't go far enough. A simple knowledge of the diverse linguistic history of English does not appear to translate sufficiently into classroom practice with the kind of resonance suggested by those who had had training in American dialects or African American Language. For that matter, the very notion of a standardized English is itself worth reviewing. In chapter 3, Victoria Cliett takes us outside the confines of this country to discuss the nationalism implicit in a standard English, noting that a global English means that there are World Englishes, many standards. As English expands, so should our practices.

With chapter 4, we move into the classroom. Arnetia F. Ball and Rashidah Jaami' Muhammad discuss racetalk in a teacher preparation class, noting the emergence of a "zero tolerance" to linguistic diversity in the classroom in the discussion of a group of preservice teachers. Ball and Muhammad offer a solid suggestion for teacher preparation programs. Kim Brian Lovejoy, in chapter 5, provides some practical suggestions for discussing linguistic diversity in first-year college composition courses, suggestions that seem transportable to other grade levels.

Finally, Gail Y. Okawa offers the theoretical foundation for a

language course based on the autobiographical, asking that we ask our students to consider the experiences and writing of writers of Color. All this is followed by a bibliography compiled by C. Jan Swearingen and Dave Pruett so that we might learn more about language, languages, and language diversity.

Yet this isn't a book about the teaching of English as a foreign or a second language. We will read about Singapore English and Hawaiian "Pidgin," about *la Frontera* and New York City (at least three boroughs), even about a maple syrup farm and the dialect of the U.S. Northeast—Englishes all. We will of course discuss African American Language. We who teach English language arts really should know something about African American Language after so many decades, after all. We should. Yet the analyses presented throughout and the pedagogies discussed throughout will go beyond African American Language speakers to language variation more generally. The folks in these pages have thought some about the contradictions between our intentions and our practices (and the practical considerations that give rise to our practices). They deliver strong messages on how we might bring our intentions and practices into line, to work with and within linguistic variety.

Runa Pacha

The feeling grows for weeks
before I realize
what has happened.
I got lost in the white
of concrete and motors
where I hadn't heard a hint
of unaccented Spanish in days,
just guttural clipped tones,
news of lines drawn close,
news of laws to drive
the undocumented south.
An unexpected melody
from a bamboo flute,
a quena tuned to the key

of la, falls into the crack.
 My lips curl like a cat's
 better to taste the sound
 with my teeth. I round
 my tongue to say *mucho gusto*,
iguamente, but the flaccid muscles
 catch on oval tones.
 Panicked, I swear to grow
 my hair again, let that hank
 hang down my back.
 I swear to begin each day
 with songs sung in softer ooo's,
 rolling rrr's, lilting llil's, rub awake
 the parts I've learned to muffle
 in this inhospitable air.

—Diana García

Note

The poem "Ruma Pacha" is from *When Living Was a Labor Camp* by Diana García. © 2000 Diana García. Reprinted by permission of the University of Arizona Press.

1. *Pachico* and *vato* are Chicano self-references, the *pachuco* being a Chicano who wore zoot suits in the 1940s and now a reference to one who dresses "Chicano-style," and the *vato* being the Chicano equivalent to "homey" or "dude." Neither of these terms translate into the Puerto Rican ghetto cultures of my childhood.

Works Cited

- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Tyrone A. Forman. "I Am Not a Racist but . . . : Mapping White College Students' Racial Ideology in the USA." *Discourse and Society* 1 (2000): 50–85.
- CCCC. Language Policy Committee. *Language Knowledge and Awareness Survey Final Report* (corrected copy). Jan. 2000 <<http://www.ncte.org/cccc/langsurvey.pdf>>.

I / The Historical Struggle for Language Rights in CCCC

Geneva Smitherman

Among the language arts crowd, the Conference on College Composition and Communication has become famous (or infamous, depending on your vantage point) for its 1974 "Students' Right to Their Own Language" resolution. However, virtually since its inception, CCCC has served as the site of dialogues about language issues. Through its journal—initially called its "official bulletin"—publications, conferences, and annual conventions, CCCC has consistently provided a forum for discussion and debate about language controversies. The recent national membership survey conducted by the Language Policy Committee is thus situated within a fifty-year history of CCCC involvement in language rights struggles. In fact, although the organization has not always stepped decisively and swiftly to the challenge, its past record as advocate for those on the linguistic margins is, on balance, one in which CCCC can take pride. This chapter will discuss the historical and intellectual background of CCCC's role in language controversies and locate the organization's major language policies—"Students' Right" and National Language Policy—within a sociopolitical context.

Donald J. Lloyd and the "New Linguistics"

We begin this journey with the words of linguist Donald J. Lloyd:¹

The [article] is an expression at the very least of a frivolous obscurantism, or at the most of a vigorously cultivated ignorance. . . . Failure to know [the factual studies of language] and what they mean . . . is responsible for the fact that the educational heart of darkness . . . is the English

course. . . . Emphasis on "correctness"—at the expense. . . . of a fluid, knowledgeable command of our mother tongue—is responsible for the incompetence of our students in handling their language, for their embarrassment about their own rich. . . . dialects, for their anxiety when they are called upon to speak or write. . . . and for their feeling that the study of English is the study of trivialities which have no importance or meaning outside the English class. . . . In our day, to make statements about English and about language which do not square with linguistics is professionally reprehensible. Yet it is an indulgence arrogantly and willfully permitted themselves by many English teachers, not decently hidden in class, but in open publication in the journals of our field and in the concoction of the dreariest collection of ignorantly dogmatic textbooks that dominates any discipline in the schools. ("Darkness" 10–12)

Thus Lloyd launched the first debate in the pages of *College Composition and Communication* (CCC). It was February 1951, and CCCC was just two years old. Lloyd was replying to "The Freshman Is King; or, Who Teaches Who?," which had been published in the December 1950 issue of CCC by Kenneth L. Knickerbocker of the University of Tennessee-Knoxville. In his scathing critique, with its signifiy in title, "Darkness Is King," Lloyd took Knickerbocker to task for coming to conclusions about nineteen "controversial" expressions (for example, *Who did you meet?*) based on an opinion survey by a layperson published in *Harper's Magazine*. Lloyd argued that the "disputed expressions" had all been studied and "found to be in good use in this country," and he stated unequivocally that "the language of a person who uses none of these expressions is not superior to the language of one who uses some of them, or indeed, to that of one who uses all of them" (10). Not content with just knocking Knickerbocker upside the head, Lloyd also slammed the journal and the organization: "The appearance [of this article] in the bulletin of the CCCC is a little shocking," and "The assertion or implication that the language of a person who uses none of these

expressions is superior on that account is a professional error which no English teacher should commit in print, and no editor should permit him to make" (10).

Surprisingly, Knickerbocker seemed not to be offended and even gave Lloyd props for his rhetorical skills:

This is a highly literate reply to my "frivolous obscurantism." It indicates that somewhere along the line Mr. Lloyd has been concerned with correctness. (I should like to teach my students to write as well as he does.) It may be that my little paper did not deserve to reap such a fine whirlwind, but since it did, let it blow. (Lloyd, "Darkness" 10, footnote)

And blow it did! Although Knickerbocker was not heard from again on the subject, Martin Steinmann Jr. came into the fray, accusing Lloyd of lapses of logic that led him to "exhortations to action" (12). He and Lloyd did battle in three issues of CCCC. Steinmann's obtuse writing style makes his critique difficult to follow, but in the main he appears to be arguing that Lloyd has invoked linguistics as a science to tell us what people *should* say based on what they *do* say. Actually, Lloyd's argument does not take this route at all. Rather, he points out Knickerbocker's fundamental error in accepting what people *think* they say for what they *do* say. Steinmann's critique thus may be summed up as a "misguided foray into irrelevant tediousness and willful misconstruction of Lloyd's meaning" (Sheridan).

Clearly, from the jump, then, CCCC was a forum for linguistic debates and language issues of various kinds. To a great extent, this is attributable to the parallel development of composition/rhetoric and linguistics in the 1950s and 1960s as both fields sought to reinvent themselves and stake intellectual claim to distinct identities among the established disciplines of the academy. In those early years, linguistics was breaking away from anthropology and philology and formulating new grammars reflective of how English actually works (structural, transformational), grammars to replace the misfit Latinate-based models of old. At the time, there was a

good deal of excitement about the "New Grammar," and linguistics seemed to hold out great promise to resolve a host of problems in the human sciences: language teaching and learning, the mystery of the structure of human cognition—and the teaching of literacy. Thus the most frequently cited authors in CCC articles in this early period were linguists, for example, Fries, Lloyd, and Chomsky. The articles generally focused on the relevance, for composition studies, of the theories and research coming out of linguistics. Within this general concern, the focus was most often on the specific issue of usage and the teaching of writing to those students who used non-standard English forms and who did not (as Fries had put it back in 1940) "carry on the affairs of the English speaking people" (12-13). In this early period, those students were typically not students of Color but were rural and/or working-class Whites. Lloyd took up the cause of these White regional and social class dialects:

You discover . . . that dialects you have grown up to despise are rooted in respectable antiquity and still reflect the vicissitudes of pioneer life. If you respect American traditions, you find these traditions best embodied in the language of the illiterate back-country farm families, whether they still stand on their own land or congeal in uneasy clots in our industrial cities. You come therefore to describe with respect. You give information; you do not devise new decalogues. ("English Composition" 41)

Some scholars argued that composition courses should be built around linguistics, that the English language itself, when studied from the vantage point of the new grammatical paradigms, could well serve as the content of the composition curriculum (see, for example, Carroll, Fowler). Beginning with the proposition that "an English composition course around linguistics" would "take the English language as a social instrument expressing, conditioning, and . . . conditioned by the society that uses it," Lloyd even goes so far as to say that linguistics "is a promised land for the English teacher" ("English Composition" 40, 43). Linguist and longtime

CCCC leader Harold B. Allen, though espousing the value of linguistics, nonetheless issued a note of caution, arguing that

[i]t is my present conviction that power in the use of language, rather than mere skill, derives from sensitive awareness of the manifold resources of language, in structure as well as in vocabulary. This conviction rests on a priori grounds; but so does the belief of those who omit linguistic content and rely upon dogma. We need evidence that comes from research. ("Linguistic Research" 57)

Ralph B. Long was not only cautious but caustic in assessing the "New Linguistics" in the composition classroom. In "Grammarians Still Have Funerals," Long questions the usefulness of the "New Grammar" for composition instruction, indicts linguists for their "odd romantic primitivism" when it comes to speech and writing, and lambastes one linguist for having declared that "a person would just as soon call himself a con man or an alchemist as a grammarian." Long rebuts:

I have called myself a grammarian for many years. . . . Until Roberts' book came along, it would not have occurred to me to compare grammarians—or even New Linguists, in spite of the extravagant claims many of them make for their work—with con men and alchemists. . . . [T]he grammar Lloyd and Warfel and Roberts give at great length—at greater length than seems desirable for Freshman English—is about as vulnerable as the school grammar these men scorn. . . . It is unlikely that the New Linguists have really achieved immortality. (211-16)

The late linguist James Sledd, however, seems to have put the lie to Long's assertion. Often referred to as "the conscience of the field" (Olson 298), Sledd was a regular on CCCC and National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) conference programs over the decades, during which time he consistently challenged compo-

sitionists and other language arts theorists and practitioners on behalf of linguistically marginalized and economically disenfranchised voices. In 1956, in his first appearance in CCC, Sledd asserted that while subordinate clauses are grammatically subordinate, this should not be confused, as it often is even today, with being logically subordinate. Thus, some teachers' admonition to put the main idea in the main clause and the subordinate idea in the subordinate clause doesn't always work. While Sledd's essay doesn't deal directly with language rights issues—a theme that he would, in the coming decades, write about eloquently and powerfully—his “Coordination (Faulty) and Subordination (Upside-Down)” is still important in our historical narrative because it offered a precise and accurate linguistic description as a corrective for the misassumptions about language that many composition and language arts teachers held (and perhaps still hold?). Thus Sledd, a stalwart of the language rights struggle, here exemplifies the contributions of the New Linguists to the then-emerging field of composition studies.

Concerning standards of usage, Charles Hartung in 1957 echoed other progressive linguists in making a case for the value of linguistics in establishing usage norms for composition students. He argued that usage should be governed by “the doctrine of the linguistic norm,” a standard derived from balancing “the intention of the speaker, the nature of the language itself, and the probable effect on the audience” (62). However, while throughout the 1950s and 1960s linguists and other CCC scholars advocated the legitimacy and adequacy of all language variations, they also consistently called for teachers to toe the line in terms of teaching the social inadequacy of nonstandard English. “If a new doctor or minister says ‘you was,’ confidence in him is lowered. Educated people should talk like educated people, no matter who is listening or what the occasion may be” (Ives 154). In his 1952 “Preparing the Teacher of Composition and Communication—A Report,” based on his visit to forty-seven different colleges and universities, where he interviewed department heads, graduate deans, full- and part-time faculty, and graduate students, Harold Allen argued strongly that writing teachers should possess linguistic knowledge and sophistication. In vir-

tually the same breath, however, he also advocated that instructors should “help students to substitute one set of language practices for another set” (11). This is essentially a philosophy of subtractive bilingualism and is exactly the kind of contradictory position that Erneece B. Kelly would lambaste the entire CCC organization for in her 1968 “Murder of the American Dream” speech. Even Lloyd, often considered a linguistic radical, acknowledged that instructors would find that they had to make a “change” in their students, although, in contrast to his contemporaries, he argues for an additive bilingualism:

If we find anything that we have to change—and we do—we know that we are touching something that goes deep into [a given student's] past and spreads wide in his personal life. We will seek not to dislodge one habit in favor of another but to provide alternative choices for freer social mobility. We seek to enrich, not to correct. . . . By respecting their traditions and the people from whom they come, we teach them to respect and to hold tight to what they have as they reach for more. (“English Composition” 42)

By 1962, as evidenced in his “On Not Sitting Like a Toad,” Lloyd had refined his pedagogy for using “New Grammar” concepts (for example, pattern practice drills) to teach language habits while simultaneously promoting retention of the mother tongue. In a class all by himself in those early years in the history of CCC, Lloyd anticipated the thinking that would lead to the “Students' Right” resolution two decades later.

“Murder of the American Dream”

One major result of the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s was the creation of educational policies to redress the academic exclusion of and past injustices inflicted upon Blacks, Browns, women, and other historically marginalized groups. Programs and policies such as Upward Bound, open enrollment, Educational

Opportunity Programs, and preferential/affirmative action admissions and the development of special academic courses ("basic writing") brought a new and different brand of student to the college composition classroom. Unlike returning military veterans and other working class White students of the 1950s, this new student spoke a language that reflected not only a different class but also a different race, culture, and historical experience.

The symbolic turning point was 1968. The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., which occurred during the annual CCCC Convention in Minneapolis, brought the organization "shockingly to an awareness of one of its major responsibilities" (Irmscher 105). In his memorial to King in the May 1968 issue of CCC, editor William F. Irmscher indicated that the organization now had a "new demand" placed upon it. Although he did not put it in these terms, for the first time, race/Color as a central component of linguistic difference became an in-yo-face issue that the organization could no longer ignore. It was not that race/Color was a new issue that had somehow just fallen from the sky; rather, the organization had heretofore simply proceeded as if racial differences did not exist and as if race did not need to be taken into account in the life of CCCC. In a sense, Irmscher's half-page homage to King symbolizes CCCC's loss of innocence.

Ernece Kelly's speech, "Murder of the American Dream," was delivered at the annual meeting in Minneapolis after the announcement of King's assassination and was reprinted in the May 1968 issue of CCC. In this brief but powerful work, Kelly reproached CCCC for the lack of Black representation in the program, rebuked the organization for the exclusion of Black intellectual and literary products in anthologies, and took it to task for the way it was dealing with Black Language. Kelly states:

Here we meet to discuss the dialects of Black students and how we can upgrade or, if we're really successful, just plain *replace* them. . . . Why aren't there Blacks here who will talk about the emergence of an image among Blacks which does not permit them to even bother with the question of

whether or not the white man understands their dialect? . . . Why aren't there Blacks . . . [dealing] with the richness and values of the language of the Black ghetto? . . . Such ideas have been dealt with and their complexities examined. Why weren't these papers presented here? (107)

Subsequently, and as a direct response to her "Murder of the American Dream" speech, Kelly was invited to coedit an issue of CCC, which appeared later that year, in December 1968. That issue includes articles by four African American writers, a first for CCC. Several of the articles in this special issue, by both Black and non-Black scholars, touch on the question of language (as well as other cultural issues). Sarah Webster Fabio, for instance, poses the question, "What is Black Language?" Indicating that this and other culturally toned questions were frequently being asked during that time, she defines Black Language as

direct, creative, intelligent communication between black [sic] people based on a shared reality, awareness, understanding which generates interaction; it is a rhetoric which places premium on imagistic renderings and concretizations of abstractions, poetic usages of language, idiosyncrasies—those individualized stylistic nuances . . . which . . . hit "home" and evoke truth. (286)

James A. Banks's "Profile of the Black American" deals with a range of cultural issues, asserts the legitimacy of Black students' language, and downplays the need to master "standard English":

When evaluating their compositions, the teacher must realize that these students emanate from a different culture . . . which possesses a language with a different structure and grammar, but nevertheless a valid structure and grammar. Thus the teacher must concentrate on the quality of ideas in the composition rather than on the student's use or misuse of standard American English grammar. Our mission is

to teach these students how to think, to describe their environment, and to encourage their creativity. . . . Grammar is incidental; the student will later pick up standard English grammar if he sees a need for it and if we have succeeded in developing his reflective and problem solving skills. (296)

In the same issue, Leonard Greenbaum's "Prejudice and Purpose in Compensatory Programs" predicts an Orwellian nightmare for those seeking to suppress African American speech and other language varieties.

Dialect has positive aspects . . . that are not part of standardized English. . . . The desire to eliminate dialect is an egocentric solution proposed out of power and out of traditional modes of education that have always shunned the experimental in favor of the pragmatic. This was how the "system" dealt with immigrants at the turn of the century and just prior to and during World War II, and it is how, similarly, some propose it should deal with rural or inner-city dialects in the 1960's. This desire, no doubt, will win out. I can predict what lies in our future—a uniform society, most likely in uniform. . . . [W]e are hastening to our meeting with Orwell. (305)

Elisabeth McPherson's brilliant, thoughtful piece, "Hats Off—Or On—to the Junior College," employs, as a point of departure, a controversy about male students wearing their hats inside a community college building. "There was more involved than a possibly out-of-date, middle-class custom. There was a racial issue, too; it was only the Negro students for whom the hats, very narrow brimmed and often very expensive, were a badge and a symbol" (317). In the course of her discussion, she touches on the matter of language as a mark of identity and culture, citing the work of linguist Benjamin Whorf, and invokes the hat metaphor to address the question of dialects:

The question of usage . . . is very much like the question of hats. Which is the more important status symbol for the student: leaving his hat on—and keeping his own identity? Taking it off and learning to be an imitation WASP? This is a decision only the student can make. . . . If changing his dialect is not the student's own idea . . . we have no right to insist on it simply because we prefer the sound of our own. If we are a college, and not just defenders of the status quo, we've more important business than worrying about dialect changes. (322)

Three years after the publication of this essay, McPherson would become a crucial member of the "Students' Right to Their Own Language" Committee. Nearly two decades later, in 1987, she accepted appointment to the Language Policy Committee, on which she continued to serve despite a lingering and debilitating illness.

Students' Right to Their Own Language

We affirm the students' right to their own patterns and varieties of language—the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style. Language scholars long ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another. Such a claim leads to false advice for speakers and writers, and immoral advice for humans. A nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language. (*Students' Right*, inside front cover)

The "Students' Right" resolution followed logically on the heels of the dramatic 1968 annual meeting of CCCC and the subsequent December 1968 special issue of CCC, which were themselves affected

by the social movements, political events, and assassinations in the world beyond academe. The resolution is grounded in the sociolinguistic branch of linguistics, a natural affinity for CCCC. When the 1970s split in linguistics occurred, dividing the Cartesian/ formal school of linguistics (associated with Noam Chomsky) from the socially constituted school (associated with Joshua Fishman), CCCC followed the latter. As an organizational position, the "Students' Right" resolution represented a critical mechanism for CCCC to address its own internal contradictions at the same time as marching, fist-raising, loud-talking protesters, spearheaded by the Black Liberation Movement, marred the social landscape of "America the beautiful."

Some language scholars had begun to question bidialectalism as a goal for the linguistically marginalized.² They argued that the bidialectalism philosophy was being promoted only for those on the margins. Further, since linguistic research had demonstrated the linguistic adequacy of "nonstandard" dialects, why wouldn't the "system" accept them? To reject them was tantamount to making difference into deficiency all over again. From this viewpoint, 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, wherever 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. It was this line of thinking that moved me to get involved in CCCC and the "Students' Right" struggle; it also moved many of my peers in other fields to become involved in their respective professional organizations. Most of us had been baptized in the fire of social protest and street activism. No romantic idealists, we knew the roadblocks and limitations involved in trying to effectuate change within the system. But we also knew that without "vision, the people perish." Besides, as I commented to a fellow comrade (a psychologist, who was one of the founders of the Association of Black Psychologists), what else was we gon do while we was waitin for the Revolution to come?

In this sociohistorical climate, in the fall of 1971, CCCC officers

appointed a small committee to draft a policy resolution on students' dialects. I was a member of that committee and, by the time of the 1972 vote, also a member of the CCCC Executive Committee. In March 1972, we presented the CCCC Executive Committee with the "Students' Right" position statement, a fairly terse but highly controversial (some said "explosive") paragraph. The CCCC Executive Committee passed the resolution at its November 1972 meeting, promptly enlarged the committee, and charged it with developing a background document to elaborate on the meaning and implications of the "Students' Right" policy. The Executive Committee realized that this resolution would stir up controversy and that many language arts professionals, including those teaching composition, held a variety of myths and misconceptions about language and dialects. Our job was to amass the latest scholarship and research on language diversity and on language matters relevant to the teaching of composition. The document we produced would be distributed to the membership in preparation for a vote. At the annual meeting in Anaheim, California, in April 1974, the "Students' Right to Their Own Language" was passed by a wide margin and subsequently became organizational policy. That fall, the resolution and supporting background document were published as a special issue of *CCC*.

CCCC was not merely being trendy, nor politically correct, in passing the "Students' Right" resolution. Rather, the organization was responding to a developing crisis in college composition classrooms, a crisis caused by the cultural and linguistic mismatch between higher education and the nontraditional (by virtue of Color and class) students who were making their imprint upon the academic landscape for the first time in history. In its quest to level the playing field, U.S. society was making it possible for these students from the margins to enter colleges and universities. Most of these students, however bright, did not have command of the grammar and conventions of academic discourse/"standardized English." Yet they often had other communicative strengths—creative ideas, logical and persuasive reasoning powers, innovative ways of talking

about the ordinary and mundane. How was this contradiction to be resolved? What professional advice could CCCC provide to frustrated composition instructors charged with teaching this new and different student clientele how to write? What could be done to help these students succeed in the composition classroom? And in the long view, how could the composition classroom, as part of the higher education of these students, prepare them for life beyond academe? The introduction to the "Students' Right" indicates that CCCC was sharply and painfully cognizant of these issues:

Through their representatives on Boards of Education and Boards of Regents, businessmen, politicians, parents, and the students themselves insist that the values taught by the schools must reflect the prejudices held by the public. 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? (1)

In the "Students' Right" resolution and in the subsequent background document, we 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 their nontraditional students—and ultimately all students—more effectively. In pursuit of these goals, the introduction of the background document posed questions that composition professionals might ask themselves:

We need to discover whether our attitudes toward "educated English" are based on some inherent superiority of the dialect itself or on the social prestige of those who use

it. We need to ask ourselves whether our rejection of students who do not adopt the dialect most familiar to us is based on any real merit in our dialect or whether we are actually rejecting the students themselves, rejecting them because of their racial, social, and cultural origins. . . . Our major emphasis has been on uniformity, in both speech and writing; would we accomplish more, both educationally and ethically, if we shifted that emphasis to precise, effective, and appropriate communication in diverse ways, whatever the dialect? (2)

To convey facts and information about the latest research on language and language diversity, the background document was structured in the form of fifteen discussion sections, each beginning with a question implicit in the resolution. All of the fifteen questions were similar in content, if not form, to areas of concern about which members of the profession were agonizing as they sought to understand what it means, in practice, to advocate, in theory, that students have a right to their own language. The questions were:

1. What do we mean by dialect?
2. Why and how do dialects differ?
3. How do we acquire our dialects?
4. Why do some dialects have more prestige than others?
5. How can concepts from modern linguistics help clarify the question of dialects?
6. Does dialect affect the ability to read?
7. Does dialect affect the ability to write?
8. Does dialect limit the ability to think?
9. What is the background for teaching one "grammar"?
10. What do we do about handbooks?
11. How can students be offered dialect options?
12. What do we do about standardized tests?
13. What are the implications of this resolution for students' work in courses other than English?

14. How does dialect affect employability?
 15. What sort of knowledge about language do English teachers need?

Finally, the background document concluded with an annotated bibliography of 129 entries keyed to the answers to the fifteen questions.

Behind the Scenes

Both supporters and detractors have assumed that the "Students' Right" Committee was comprised of like-minded individuals. Although all of us were committed to addressing the language crisis facing the new wave of students in composition classrooms and to helping resolve this crisis, there was a wide range of personal styles and great diversity in political ideologies among us. On one level, one might have considered us "progressives," but we clearly had our own internal contradictions. And so in the production of the resolution and the supporting monograph, our long hours of scholarly work were accompanied virtually every step of the way by intense political and ideological struggle.

One of our early debates occurred over the use of "his." "The Student's Right to His Own Language" was the wording of the original resolution. While a couple of the women in the group put forth strong objections to the masculinist tone, one of the men thought the whole argument was silly and a waste of time because the generic "he" had been used for centuries, and everybody knew it included women too. He then began to quote several historical examples, going way back to the Bible. One of the women interrupted this filibuster-like strategy and suggested that we should call it "Student's Right to Her Own Language," since "her" was just as generic as "he." Then we tried "his or her," but someone objected to this on grounds of verbosity. We even tried using "people," but someone remarked that we were dealing with "students," not "people," whereupon a lengthy debate ensued over whether or not the labels "people" and "students" could be used interchangeably. At the time,

my Womanist consciousness was just developing, and so I was not very vocal in this hours-long debate, for which I was soundly blessed out by one of the women when we took a bathroom break. She wanted to know what kind of linguist I was who was "afraid" to challenge male hegemony. The debate was finally resolved when Elisabeth McPherson, genius that my girl was, proposed that we cast the wording in the third-person plural. We had all been so locked into our linguistic prisons that we hadn't even thought of this quite simple solution to the problem. While this issue seems old hat now in the New Millennium, lest we forget, concerns about sexism in language did not always exist—even among many women.

Nor were we of identical persuasion on the issue of America's linguistic ills and the solutions to them. Hey, some members were even opposed to the use of four-letter words among us—not just the big, bad ones, but even the little ones like "damn" and "hell." (I report with pride that I was the first to introduce "cussing" into committee discourse, to the relief of one of my male comrades.) The debates that were going on in the society, in the profession, and in CCCC about how to address America's social and sociolinguistic problems went on among us, filtered through the prism of language. Why should linguistic minorities have to learn two languages and majority members of society get by on one? That's linguistic domination. Why not accept a student paper with "nonstandard" surface features of language if the message was clear and the argument well-supported? That's what the "right" to their own language means. No, giving two grades, one for content, one for grammar, is a cop-out; you are still saying there is something "wrong" with the writer. Let's make the medium the message and write this monograph in a combination of Black English, Spanglish, and standard English. And so it went. Then, as now, for some of us, the final document is seen as equivocating; it doesn't go far enough. For others, then as now, it is perceived as too permissive.

It has been said that politics is the art of compromise. And compromise we did. After the lengthy debates and verbal duels, we finally produced a document that we all felt we could live with. Credit for blending the multiple writing styles into a readable document

goes to the talented editorial hand of Richard (Jix) Lloyd-Jones and the skillful diplomacy of Melvin Butler, linguist and committee chair, whose untimely death prevented him from witnessing the fruits of his labor.³

Reactions to "Students' Right"

The fallout was tremendous. Stringent, vociferous objections were put forth. There were calls for the resolution to be rescinded and the background document recalled. Some blasted CCCC for abdicating its responsibility and pandering to "wide-eyed" liberals in the field. Others accused CCCC of a "sinister plot" to doom speakers of "divergent" dialects to failure in higher education by telling them that their stigmatized language was acceptable. A few simply said that CCCC had done lost they cotton-pickin' minds.

On the other hand, there were many who embraced the spirit of the resolution. They thanked CCCC for the supporting document, which many found extremely helpful, even as they acknowledged its flaws. Some complimented the organization for its "moral and professional courage." Others stepped to the challenge of developing writing assignments to "tap the potential" of their marginalized students. A few simply asked CCCC why it took yall so long.

Ideas about student-centered approaches to composition instruction and about sensitivity to students' language/dialects have by now become fairly commonplace in the discourse community of composition and in the language arts profession generally—which is not to say that everyone subscribes to these ideas today, just that talk about them is no longer perceived as "weird." However, in the context of the 1970s, to promulgate ideas about students' right to *anything* was a bold, new style of pedagogy. Such ideas elicited strong reactions among CCCC professionals (irrespective of whether they supported the resolution or not) and moved the intellectual production of knowledge in the field to a whole nother level. Articles and commentaries on the "Students' Right," written in the years immediately following the resolution's passage, contain some of the most creative teaching ideas and are some of the most innovatively written essays published in CCC to date. David W. Cole

employed the story of the Gileadites versus the Ephraimites as a metaphor to argue against the resolution. In the biblical account, the Ephraimites couldn't pronounce the word "shibboleth" in the correct Gileadite accent and could thus be prevented from crossing over the Jordan River. Similarly, Cole argued that nonmainstream dialect speakers will be prevented from crossing into the mainstream. Lawrence D. Freeman examined constitutional amendments and court cases that provide legal justification for students' right to their own language. Citing such cases as *Wisconsin v. Yoder* and *Griggs v. Duke Power*, Freeman argued that language rights can be seen as protected by custom and that there is a legal basis for hiring instructors who are skilled in the dialect/language of the students they will instruct. Seeking to devise teaching assignments grounded in the legitimacy of the students' language, Lou Kelly devised a method of "copyreading," which emphasizes clarity of meaning and expressiveness rather than grammatical correctness. Students can discover for themselves places where their writing should be edited for clarity and power, thus demonstrating, according to Kelly, that a composition instructor can facilitate students' competency in standardized English while simultaneously respecting their own idioms. Allen N. Smith argued that "no one has a right to his own language" (155), that the resolution is a contradiction in terms, for language is a social act. William G. Clark critiqued the background document for what he deemed hypocrisy in its recommendation that teachers inform students preparing for certain occupations about the necessity of Edited American English (EAE). Clark asserted that this undermines "the resolution's claim about all dialects being equally valuable, implicitly valorizes Standardized English, and is a cop-out on the part of CCCC" (217).

The organization held its ground. It did not revoke the resolution, nor did it recall the background document. (In fact, that twenty-nine-year-old document is still in print and can be ordered from NCTE.) Some folk, ever resistant to change, continued to rail against the policy. However, the initial hysteria faded, and fewer articles and commentary about the resolution appeared in CCC after about 1977. Instead, many in the field, fully cognizant that marginalized students were in higher education to stay—and would, in

a matter of years, become the majority of the student population—began to direct their energies to creative and pedagogically responsible ways of implementing a “Students’ Right” philosophy in their composition and language arts classes. As Donald Stewart would put it a few years later, the challenge is “how to respect the dialect the student brings to school yet not avoid the responsibility of teaching him or her alternative dialects and editing skills for coping with different language situations” (330).

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. Language arts professionals across the nation and on all levels were encountering the new brand of students and experiencing classroom crises similar to those of composition instructors. This organizational language policy opened up a national dialogue about language diversity and professional responsibility. As Richard Lloyd-Jones, longtime CCCC leader and member of both the “Students’ Right” Committee and the Language Policy Committee, stated:

The statement had an intellectual base in sociolinguistics, but its energy came from support of social diversity. It forced a reconsideration of “correctness.” It implied a model of language as “transactional” rather than as artifact. Behind the anger of the political oratory was acceptance of a thesis about the nature of language. (490)

In due course, other language arts organizations adopted policies reflecting the research and scholarship on language diversity coming out of sociolinguistics. But lest we forget, CCCC was the pioneer.

CCCC During the “Second Reconstruction”

Although many compositionists and other language arts professionals greeted the “Students’ Right” policy with high enthusiasm, still

a great degree of lingering confusion existed: “Well, then, if I don’t correct the grammatical errors, what do I do?” one well-meaning instructor queried. It seemed that the “Students’ Right” background document was welcomed because it was informative in terms of theory; however, it did not go far enough in praxis. CCCC leadership acknowledged the need for something more in the form of explicit teaching materials, sample lesson plans, and a more practically oriented pedagogy. In 1976, the Executive Committee thus appointed the Selection and Editorial Committee for Activities Supporting “Students’ Right to Their Own Language,” on which three of the original “Students’ Right” Committee members—Elisabeth McPherson, Jix Lloyd-Jones, and I—served. This new committee was charged with assembling, for publication, practical classroom assignments, activities, lectures, and teaching units that would show and tell how to apply the philosophy of the “Students’ Right” resolution to the day-to-day experience of teaching and learning. By 1980, our committee had more than enough material for what we felt would be a valuable sequel to the “Students’ Right” document. However, despite having spent nearly four years compiling and editing some excellent material, solicited from practitioners at all levels of language arts education, we were informed that CCCC had “reluctantly decided” not to publish the collection. What had happened since the passage of the original “Students’ Right” resolution by CCCC Executive Committee (in 1972) and CCCC membership (in 1974) is attributable in great measure to the changed national climate of the 1980s.

Owing to the sociopolitical, educational, and economic decline in Black and other historically disenfranchised communities during the 1980s, political theorists such as Ronald W. Walters have dubbed the years from 1980 to 1992 the “Second Reconstruction.” The “first” Reconstruction had been launched in the late 1870s, with the federal government’s abandonment of ex-slaves to Southern governments, which promptly rolled back the freedmen’s political gains and ushered in an era of lynchings and brutal assaults against Blacks that would not be redressed until the Black Freedom Struggle of the 1960s. After the promise and some fulfillment of the

social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the United States moved to a more conservative climate on the social, political, and educational fronts—a move solidified in 1980 by the election of Ronald Reagan. By that time, the mood of CCCC, like the mood of America, seemed to have shifted from change and promise to stagnation and dreams deferred.

It was within the climate of the Second Reconstruction that Thomas J. Farrell's 1983 bombshell, "IQ and Standard English," appeared in CCC. Farrell re-raised the old linguistic-cognitive deficiency theory about speakers of what was then still being called "Black English." (Although the term "Ebonics" was coined in 1973, it didn't catch on until the Oakland School Board's December 1996 resolution.) Even though Farrell asserted that "mean IQ difference" between "black ghetto children" and speakers of "standard English" has "nothing to do with genetics or race, per se" (481), still he contended that

[t]he non-standard forms of the verb "to be" in . . . Black English may affect the thinking of the users. . . . Black ghetto children do not use the standard forms of the verb "to be." . . . Many of those same black ghetto children have difficulty learning to read, and they do not score highly on measures of abstract thinking. . . . I am hypothesizing that learning the full standard deployment of the verb "to be" is integral to developing Level II thinking because the deployment of that verb played a part in the development of abstract thinking in ancient Greece. (477, 479)

As shocking as it was to see Farrell's article in CCC, it has played a crucial role in the language rights debate for two reasons. First, it is a reminder that old arguments, assumed to be dead and long since buried, can resurface in new and potentially more dangerous forms that distort current research for "supporting" evidence. Second, despite my Lloydian reaction to this article's appearance in CCC, and notwithstanding my disillusionment about CCCC's rejection of the 1980 "Students' Right" follow-up publication, it is

significant to note that by 1983 there had emerged a critical mass of compositionists who could and did provide solid, valuable rebuttals to Farrell, relying on research from sociolinguistics. And further, it is significant that CCC allowed the publication of four very lengthy "Counterstatement" essays in its December 1984 issue. One was from Karen Greenberg, who argued in her brilliant response that "be" verb constructions are simply applied according to different but identifiable rules of African American Language and that Farrell's terminology, such as "paratactic" and "hypotactic," was "pseudo-scientific," adding only the "gloss of respectability" (458).

National Language Policy

In the 1998 celebration of African American History Month, a television commercial for Mickey D's (Ebonics for McDonald's) featured a White father and his young son browsing through a gallery with paintings of African American heroes and she-ros. The father pointed to the work of Jacob Lawrence and told his kid, "That's Jacob Lawrence, a famous painter." Next, they come upon a painting of Harriet Tubman, and the father says, "That's Harriet Tubman, a leader in the Underground Railroad." The kid exclaims, "Wow, that's cool," as a voice-over says, "It's not just Black history, it's American history" (emphasis Mickey D's).

Much like the theme of the McDonald's commercial, and the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., CCCC's National Language Policy is a linguistic imperative for all groups—not just Blacks, Browns, the poor, and others on the margins. While addressed to and for all citizens, the National Language Policy is not a repudiation of the "Students' Right" resolution. That policy was the right move for that historical period, and it filled a deep pedagogical void. The National Language Policy symbolizes the evolution of CCCC sociolinguistic consciousness and was the next logical stage after the "Students' Right" campaign.

In the fall of 1986, California passed its English Language Amendment to the state constitution, making it the first state in contemporary times to establish, by law, a policy of "English Only." S. I.

Hayakawa, at the time a member of the U.S. Senate, had introduced the first constitutional amendment on this issue in 1981, but it had stagnated in congressional committees. The proponents of English Only had thus decided to take their campaign to various states with the goal of securing the requisite number of state language amendments to give English Only the status of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution. California, with its large number of Spanish speakers and Asian and Mexican immigrants, had been selected as the test case.

A number of organizations and caucuses opposed California's measure and the growing formation of an English Only movement. Within CCCC, the opposition came during the 1987 convention from the Progressive Composition Caucus (PCC). The caucus described itself as a group of

composition instructors who view writing as a potentially liberating activity and teach from a socialist-feminist perspective. Our curriculum often emphasizes non-canonical literature and exposes sexist, racist, homophobic and corrupt manipulation of language. (*PCC Newsletter*)

Although PCC wanted CCCC to take a stand against English Only, there was also sharp tension at the time between PCC and the CCCC Executive Committee and leadership over the issue of conducting the convention in a hotel involved in a labor action. Uncertain if they could trust CCCC to do the right thing, PCC decided that their sense-of-the-house motion not only should call for concerted opposition against English Only but also should include the name of someone they trusted to carry out the mandated opposition. The day before the annual meeting, PCC asked me if I would accept the charge and if I would allow my name to be included in their resolution. As I listened to their arguments, all I could think about was the dissin and doggin I had endured during the "Students' Right" years, and I kept saying "no way."

At the annual meeting in 1987, PCC submitted the following sense-of-the-house motion:

Preamble: As the leading professional organization dealing with language and literacy, the CCCC should be in the forefront of the effort to decide issues of language policy.
Resolved: That the CCCC support the NCTE resolution opposing English-only legislation by appointing a well funded task force, chaired by Geneva Smitherman, to articulate the issues and formulate and implement strategies to educate the public, educational policy-makers, and legislators; further, that this issue receive major emphasis in the 1988 Conference theme, "Language, Self, and Society." (CCCC Minutes, 21 March 1987, 5)

The motion passed. The task force that was appointed was called the Language Policy Committee (LPC).⁴ Its charge was to develop a proactive response to the English Only movement for consideration by the CCCC Executive Committee, to compile information on English Only, and to network with other professional organizations and groups mounting English Only opposition campaigns. CCCC kept its part of the bargain. The organization provided funding, full support, and resources for the LPC to carry out its charge. Our committee met over the summer of 1987 and developed the National Language Policy and a strategic implementation plan. We presented our work to the CCCC Executive Committee meeting and at the annual business meeting in March 1988, and the following resolution passed unanimously:

Background

The National Language Policy is a response to efforts to make English the "official" language of the United States. This policy recognizes the historical reality that, even though English has become the language of wider communication, we are a multilingual society. All people in a

democratic society have the right to education, to employment, to social services, and to equal protection under the law. No one should be denied these or any civil rights because of linguistic differences. This policy would enable 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 National Language Policy

Be it resolved that CCCC members promote the National Language Policy adopted at the Executive Committee meeting on March 16, 1988. This policy has three inseparable parts:

1. To provide resources to enable native and nonnative speakers to achieve oral and literate competence in English, the language of wider communication.
2. To support programs that assert the legitimacy of native languages and dialects to ensure that proficiency in one's mother tongue will not be lost.
3. To foster the teaching of languages other than English so that native speakers of English can rediscover the language of their heritage or learn a second language.

(CCCC, *National Language Policy*)

The National Language Policy stresses the need not just for marginalized Americans but for all Americans to be bi/multilingual in order to be prepared for citizenship in a global, multicultural society. More than a policy for students of one particular Color or class, the National Language Policy recognizes that the ability to speak many tongues is a necessity for everybody.

This time, the motion of history was on our side. Negative reaction to the National Language Policy has been minimal. Further, this organizational policy has not had to undergo the agonizing argumentation, contestation, debate—and denial—that the "Students' Right" resolution endured. By no stretch am I saying that compo-

tionists have all been doing the right thing since the passage of the National Language Policy. What we are witnessing, though, is a developing sociolinguistic sophistication and political maturity about language rights issues. As the field of composition/rhetoric has evolved, so too has the language consciousness of CCCC professionals. Further, theorists now recognize the need to address realities relative to students' native language/dialect in the comp context, a posture that has, unfortunately, not always been the case.

Contributions from CCCC members in the period since 1988 clearly reflect a long overdue recognition of the linguistic-cultural complexity of the composition classroom and of the writing instructor's task in that classroom. Terry Dean wrote of the pedagogical difficulties facing a "monocultural teacher" in a multicultural/multilingual composition classroom and proposed strategies for creative instruction in such a classroom. Drawing on her own multivocal competence across several linguistic and cultural traditions, CCCC leader Jacqueline Jones Royster challenged us to "construct paradigms that permit us to engage in better practices in cross-boundary discourse, whether we are teaching, researching, writing, or talking with Others, whoever those Others happen to be" (37–38). Analyzing the language and literacy practices of White students, Margaret J. Marshall makes a compelling argument for a broadened notion of "diversity" and contends that "we need a way of thinking about difference in student writing as more than a simple match between a set of predetermined divisions and uses of language" (232). In sum, then, the spirit of this organizational language policy is a broad-based challenge to address linguistic diversity throughout the body politic, not just among those who have historically been on the margins.

If it is true, as CCCC leader Anne Ruggles Gere has asserted, that changing language attitudes is tantamount to changing a worldview, then there may not be a lot that a policy from a professional organization can do about the myths and misconceptions about language that continue to plague the struggle for language rights. One cannot erase long-held attitudes and deeply entrenched biases and stereo-

types with the stroke of a pen—you know, go henceforth and sin linguistically no more. On the other hand, those who (whether consciously or unconsciously) display the negative effects of linguicism are products of the school (and the college, though in fewer numbers) because everybody goes through school. The classroom, then, is a major player in shaping language attitudes, and those classrooms that are particularly crucial for the formation of ideas about language are those on the K-12 level. And here is where CCCC, as a postsecondary organization, has, unfortunately, had very limited influence.

In 1971, after the formation of what was to become the "Students' Right" Committee, CCCC leadership and members began working within NCTE to promote the concept of the students' right to their own language. For three subsequent years, there was a concerted effort by CCCC to persuade NCTE to endorse CCCC language policy. However, this did not come to pass. Instead, at the 1974 NCTE Convention, NCTE membership passed a weak version of a language rights resolution, which distinguished spoken from written language. NCTE Resolution 74.2 "accept[s] the linguistic premise that all these dialects are equally efficient as systems of communication." However, it goes on to "affirm" that students need to learn the "conventions of what has been called written edited American English." This was a posture that CCCC deliberately and consciously sought to avoid in its policy resolution because usage, spelling, punctuation, and other "conventions" of "written edited American English" were typically the only aspects of the writing process that teachers focused on. Thus, the "Students' Right" background document had asserted that

[d]ialect . . . plays little if any part in determining whether a child will ultimately acquire the ability to write EAE. . . . Since the issue is not the capacity of the dialect itself, the teacher can concentrate on building up the students' confidence in their ability to write. . . . If we can convince our students that spelling, punctuation, and usage are less

important than content, we have removed a major obstacle in their developing the ability to write. (8)

Many people in the language arts field (and, I would wager, most of those outside the field) erroneously credit NCTE with the "Students' Right" resolution. In a review published in the very pages of CCCC in May 1997, Gary A. Olson stated: "While the essays in this collection touch on a number of issues, the two pervasive concerns are bidialectalism, especially in relation to NCTE's 'Students' Right to Their Own Language'" (298). In the *Journal of English Linguistics* special issue on Ebonics, linguist Walt Wolfram bemoaned the persistence of negative language attitudes despite the efforts of professional organizations:

Furthermore, the adoption of strong position statements on dialect diversity by professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English (namely, the statement on Students' Right to Their Own Language) . . . barely made a dent on entrenched attitudes and practices with respect to language differences. (109)

Let the record be clear: despite the Faulknerian agony and sweat of the human spirit of many CCCC language warriors, the bitter irony is that NCTE never passed the CCCC "Students' Right to Their Own Language" resolution.

CCCC has had a significant historical impact as a language pioneer, initiating, way back in 1951, a national conversation on issues of dialect and language diversity. It is crucial to have organizational policies as weapons that language rights warriors can wield against the opponents of linguistic democratization. Since intellectuals provide the ideological rationale for public policy, it was and is important for an organization like CCCC to go on record as supporting language rights, for these policies can and do have influence and impact. Case in point: There was a time, up until around the mid-1970s, that speech tests were required to qualify for entry into

university teacher education programs. People like me flunked these linguistically, culturally, and gender-biased tests and got forced into speech therapy. These tests have now been eradicated. This is a direct result of the intellectual and activist wings of the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, manifested in the academy in research that came out of sociolinguistics and in professional organizational positions like the CCCC "Students' Right to Their Own Language." The documented spirit of resistance in the "Students' Right" and National Language Policy is an important symbol that change is possible—even within the system.

Nonetheless, CCCC cannot rest on its past accomplishments. The results of the recent national membership survey (see Richardson in this volume) indicating that only slightly more than one-third of NCTE and CCCC members were familiar with CCCC's organizational language policies mean there is work to be done, right at home. As the 1990s Oakland Ebonics controversy demonstrated, and as the mounting campaigns against bilingual education show, attacks on linguistic "minorities" are continuing right on into the New Millennium. There is a need for CCCC's continued assertion of leadership in the cause for language rights, because the struggle does indeed continue.

Notes

1. I would like to express my gratitude and special thanks to Dr. David Sheridan (Ph.D., English, Michigan State University), for his most capable assistance and archival work. A shout out also to David Kirkland, my student research assistant for six years and now a Ph.D. candidate in education at Michigan State University, for his efforts to make me computer literate. Any shortcomings are entirely my own doing.

2. Donald J. Lloyd, who taught for years at Detroit's Wayne State University, was a major figure in the early years of composition studies and linguistics. His Ph.D. in literature from Yale University hardly equipped him to teach literacy and language, and he notes that he learned, through trial and error over the years with his students, how to teach writing. He is coauthor of *American English in Its Cultural Setting* (1962) and is credited with coining the phrase "national mania for correctness." On a personal note, while doing the research for this article, I remembered that Lloyd had taught me introductory linguistics

at Wayne State. At the time, his ideas about language were profoundly shocking to most of his students—including me, who at the time was an untutored, fresh-from-the-ghetto, very young teenager. Being the first of my family to go beyond the seventh grade—much less college—and the one on whom the family hopes for educational success were riding, I recall being highly attracted to—but at the same time fearful of—Lloyd's "heretical" challenge to mainstream language standards.

2. See Sledd's 1969 "Bi-Dialectalism."

3. The other "Students' Right" Committee members were Adam Casmier, Ninfa Flores, Jenefer Giannasi, Myrna Harrison, Richard Lloyd-Jones (who synthesized and edited our individually written sections), Richard A. Long, Elizabeth Martin, the late Elisabeth McPherson, and Ross Winterowd. The late Robert E. Hogan and Nancy S. Pritchard served as NCTE *ex officio* members.

4. The other IPC members were Elizabeth McFiernan Auleta, Ana Celia Zentella, Thomas Kochman, Jeffery Youdelman, Guadalupe Valdes, and Elisabeth McPherson. Of the original group, Ana Celia Zentella and I are still on the (now reconstituted) Language Policy Committee. Other current members are Victoria Chiet, Kim Brian Lovejoy, Rashidah Muhammad, Gail Okawa, Elaine Richardson, Jan Swearingen, Denise Troutman, Victor Villanueva, and Tracy Wensing.

Works Cited

- Allen, Harold B. "Linguistic Research Needed in Composition and Communication." *CCC 5* (1954): 55-60.
- . "Preparing the Teacher of Composition and Communication—A Report." *CCC 3* (1952): 3-13.
- Banks, James A. "A Profile of the Black American: Implications for Teaching." *CCC 19* (1968): 288-96.
- Carroll, John B. "Psycholinguistics and the Teaching of English Composition." *CCC 7* (1956): 188-93.
- CCCC Language Policy Committee. *The National Language Policy*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1991 (brochure).
- Clark, William G. "in Responses to 'Students' Right to Their Own Language.'" *CCC 27* (1975): 217.
- Cole, David W. "An Ephraimite Perspective on Bilingualism." *CCC 23* (1972): 371-72.
- Dean, Terry. "Multicultural Classrooms, Monocultural Teachers." *CCC 40* (1989): 23-37.
- Fabio, Sarah Webster. "What Is Black?" *CCC 19* (1968): 286-87.
- Farrell, Thomas J. "IQ and Standard English." *CCC 34* (1983): 470-84.
- Fowler, Mary Elizabeth. "Using Semantic Concepts in the Teaching of Composition." *CCC 7* (1956): 193-97.

- Freeman, Lawrence D. "Students' Right to Their Own Language: Its Legal Basis." CCC 26 (1975): 25-29.
- Fries, Charles Carpenter. *American English Grammar*. New York: Appleton, 1940.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles, and Eugene Smith. *Attitudes, Language, and Change*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1979.
- Greenbaum, Leonard. "Prejudice and Purpose in Compensatory Programs." CCC 19 (1968): 305-11.
- Greenberg, Karen. "Responses to Thomas J. Farrell 'IQ and Standard English.'" CCC 35 (1984): 455-60.
- Hartung, Charles V. "Doctrines of English Usage." CCC 8 (1957): 55-63.
- Irmischer, William F. "In Memoriam: Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. 1929-1968." CCC 19 (1968): 105.
- Ives, Sumner. "Grammatical Assumptions." CCC 5 (1954): 149-55.
- Kelly, Erneece B. "Murder of the American Dream." CCC 19 (1968): 106-8.
- Kelly, Lou. "Is Competent Copyreading a Violation of the 'Students' Right to Their Own Language?'" CCC 25 (1974): 254-58.
- Knickerbocker, Kenneth L. "The Freshman Is King: Or, Who Teaches Who?" CCC 1 (1950): 11-15.
- Lloyd, Donald J. *American English in Its Cultural Setting*. New York: Knopf, 1962.
- _____. "Darkness Is King: A Reply to Professor Knickerbocker." CCC 2 (1951): 10-12.
- _____. "An English Composition Course Built Around Linguistics." CCC 4 (1953): 40-43.
- _____. "On Not Sitting Like a Toad." CCC 13 (1962): 9-13.
- Lloyd-Jones, Richard. "Who We Were, Who We Should Become." CCC 43 (1992): 486-96.
- Long, Ralph B. "Grammarians Still Have Funerals." CCC 9 (1958): 211-16.
- Marshall, Margaret J. "Marking the Unmarked: Reading Student Diversity and Preparing Teachers." CCC 48 (1997): 231-48.
- McPherson, Elisabeth. "Hats Off—or On—to the Junior College." CCC 19 (1968): 316-22.
- NCTE. Resolution 74.2. Nov. 1974. NCTE Archives, Urbana, IL <<http://www.ncte.org/hrmls>>.
- Olson, Gary A. "Critical Pedagogy and Composition Scholarship." CCC 48 (1997): 297-303.
- PCC Newsletter. April 1987.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones. "When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own." CCC 47 (1996): 29-40.
- Sheridan, David. Unpublished essay, 1998.
- Sledd, James. "Bi-Dialectalism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy." *English Journal* 58 (1969): 1307-15.

- _____. "Coordination (Faulty) and Subordination (Upside-Down)." CCC 7 (1956): 181-87.
- Smith, Allen N. "No One Has a Right to His Own Language." CCC 27 (1976): 155-59.
- Steinmann, Martin, Jr. "Darkness Is Still King: A Reply to Professor Lloyd." CCC 2 (1951): 9-12.
- Stewart, Donald. "Acting on the CCCC Language Resolution and Related Matters." CCC 31 (1980): 330-32.
- Students' Right to Their Own Language. Spec. issue of CCC 25 (1974): 1-32.
- Walters, Ronald W. *Pan-Africanism in the African Diaspora*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1993.
- Wolfram, Walt. "Language Ideology and Dialect: Understanding the Oakland Ebonics Controversy." *Journal of English Linguistics* 26 (1998): 108-21.

2 / Race, Class(es), Gender, and Age

The Making of Knowledge about Language Diversity

Elaine Richardson

As a student of language, I am ever amazed at the rhetorical strategies of government authorities. I became particularly interested in the U.S. presidential election of 2000, the Florida ballots, and the apparent silence of Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas. According to a *New York Times* article by Neil A. Lewis, one of the reasons he gave to high school students for not speaking much during the oral arguments of the Supreme Court hearings on the presidential vote was that when he was a youth, people used to make fun of the Gullah that he spoke. He explained that this caused him to develop the habit of listening. It could be said, then, that justice Thomas has been silenced, even though his vote spoke volumes. When he did finally "speak" on the matter of the election, he voted against a Florida recount that could have swayed the election in favor of then vice president Al Gore. He told high school students that politics did not enter into his vote, saying, "I plead with you that whatever you do, don't try to apply the rules of the political world to this institution [the Supreme Court]" (Lewis).

But of course, Thomas's vote and his silence were political. Both can be seen as attempts to achieve a racelessness, to appear to be apolitical, to transform the ways that his audience thought about him as a Black male who is conservative and a Republican. Histories of Black struggle for inclusion influence our reading of Thomas's silence and voting/actions. To read Thomas without noticing his silence and voting patterns is to misread the way he summons these for political purposes.

Like most Black people who grew up during the era of legal racial segregation, Thomas's "race" and Gullah language were devalued

and stigmatized in nearly all mainstream environments, especially school. Researchers continue to identify various ways that African American students cope with their general devaluation in school, among them impression management (Gilyard), disidentification with achievement (Steele), oppositional resistance behaviors (Ogbu, Fine), acting White (Fordham), and attempting racelessness (Fordham). Among the survival and rhetorical strategies that Thomas adopted to overcome racial and linguistic devaluation were racelessness and silence. An uncritical reading of Thomas's actions would interpret his strategies as successful, since they led him to achieve a position in a powerful mainstream institution. However, upon closer examination, Thomas's situatedness can be read as self-defeating or powerless. From a historical perspective, Black people and their allies fought to change oppressive public policies. Thomas is the product of a consciousness that has Black people working their way into the system, adopting or adapting dominant cultural values, gaining education and training that elevates them to positions inside of government where they can affect change, and carrying out policies to benefit Black people as a group. Yet Thomas's silence does not allow him to fulfill this role. He appears to many to have forgotten the lessons of struggle and history, suppressing his non-institutionally sanctioned Gullah (and the values of cultural equality that it represents) for institutionally sanctioned silence and the voting behavior of an arch-conservative.

As a member of several discourse communities—the Black American, the scholarly, and the language educator, among them—I found Justice Thomas's remarks on language and politics especially significant because his personal attitudes toward language, his understanding of the relationship of ideology to language and public policy, his (in)actions, and the source of his attitudes affect us all insofar as he holds a powerful position in our country's highest court. The general societal devaluation of Black people's language and culture helped to shape Thomas's language attitudes. As language educators and scholars in this increasingly complex society, we must stay abreast of the source of our own language attitudes, as

they may help us to revise our pedagogical approaches and influence the language attitudes and policies of future justices of the Supreme Court.

Language Knowledge and Awareness Survey

This essay summarizes and speculates about the findings of the Language Knowledge and Awareness Survey, commissioned by the Conference on College Composition and Communication and the National Council of Teachers of English to assess the language attitudes and concerns of the profession. Leading organizations in language arts passed two language policies, "Students' Right to Their Own Language" (CCCC, 1974) and the "National Language Policy" (CCCC, 1988, NCTE, 1998). These organizational language policies were designed to set the tone for policy and pedagogy development to support linguistic diversity in the classroom.

Despite such policies, experienced professionals in both organizations have expressed concern about the teaching practices and lack of academic preparation in sociolinguistic issues of today's college composition and secondary English teachers. Accordingly, the Language Policy Committee of CCCC conducted a study from 1996 to 1998 to survey the state of knowledge, training, and attitudes about linguistic diversity of the membership of the leading organizations of language arts professionals.

Related Work

The work most closely related to the survey reported here has been on language attitudes among the general public and on teachers' perceptions of students' linguistic abilities. Research suggests that one's attitude toward a language or language variety affects one's attitude toward entire groups of people associated with that language or language variety.

Teachers generally possess a greater range of language attitudes than the general public. Sledd, for instance, identified teacher

attitudes ranging from denial of all standards to reverence for past linguistic traditions (qtd. in Gere and Smith). In a study of teachers in a national sample, Taylor concluded that the majority had either positive or neutral attitudes toward what he termed "Black Language."

In numerous studies, Williams and his associates found that teachers not only evaluated students on the basis of language cues but also consistently judged students along a two-dimensional model: confidence-eagerness and ethnicity-nonstandardness. By comparison with White children, Black American and Latino and Latina children were ranked low in both dimensions, and the teachers' academic expectations correlated with the rankings of the children's speech.¹ More recently, Bowie posed the question of current teacher attitudes toward "Black English." She surveyed seventy-five preservice teachers at a large urban university, 86 percent of whom were White. A majority of the responses to survey questions concerning attitudes about Black English were negative, although only 63 percent reported even minimal exposure to the subject, that exposure typically having been in a single class discussion about research on Black Language. Bowie proposed new strategies for sociolinguistic change, such as requiring preservice teachers to spend time in racially diverse schools.

Byrnes and Kiger sought to validate their Language Attitudes of Teachers Scale (LATS) by surveying teachers enrolled in university courses in Arizona, Utah, and Virginia. The researchers addressed two critical questions, only indirectly related to language: whether teachers would be willing to have a Limited English Proficient (LEP) child in their classroom, and whether teachers think LEP children are detrimental to the learning of other students. Teachers who had negative attitudes about the language abilities of the LEP children thought the presence of these children in the classroom would negatively influence the learning of other students. Based on this work and an early study, the researchers concluded that teachers' negative language attitudes are a barrier to positive learning experiences of LEP children.

Issues in the CCCC Language Policy Committee Study

The CCCC, with assistance from the NCTE Research Foundation, commissioned a study that sought to answer six broad research questions relative to matters of language diversity:

1. What academic training in language diversity have NCTE and CCCC members had? And what percentage of the membership has had such training?
2. What percentage of NCTE and CCCC members believes that academic training in language diversity is needed? What kind and to what degree?
3. What are the attitudes of NCTE and CCCC members toward language variation and bi/multilingualism?
4. What are the attitudes of CCCC and NCTE members toward their own language? What are the sources of these attitudes?
5. To what extent do members' teaching practices reflect language diversity? What kinds of practices reflect awareness of language diversity?
6. To what extent do NCTE and CCCC members support organizational positions on language diversity (for example, the "Students' Right" resolution and the "National Language Policy")?

The Questionnaire

In the fall of 1996, based on input from other English professionals in literature, language, and composition, the LPC developed a questionnaire. In the spring of 1997, we conducted a pilot study to pretest the questionnaire and ascertain its reliability. The pilot involved approximately two hundred randomly selected English professionals at college, community college, and secondary school levels and English Education majors in teacher preparation programs. All three aspects of the English curriculum—language, literature,

and composition—were reflected in the areas of concentration of the pilot subjects.

In the subsequent study, after establishing the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, a random, stratified probability sample was drawn from the membership lists of CCCC and the Secondary Section of NCTE, provided by NCTE headquarters, with the total sample reflecting the larger membership of NCTE. For the Secondary Section membership list, only those members teaching in grades 9–12 were included in the sample universe. Both random samples reflect stratification along the variables available in the membership profile: ethnicity, gender, region, and number of years teaching. The sample total was 2,970; approximately 67 percent of that was from the NCTE Secondary Section and 33 percent from CCCC. (However, slightly more CCCC members returned their questionnaires than did NCTE members.) The total number of completed, returned surveys was 983. These respondents comprised the sample population for the study.

Findings of the Survey

Some of the study's most interesting findings are in the demographic categorization of responses to questions about the language attitudes of educators toward language and dialect diversity. One of the study's key bases for ascertaining attitudes about language variation and bi/multilingualism were responses to statements 1–7 of the survey, which were derived from the pilot study.

To summarize:

Statement 1: A student whose primary language is not English should be taught solely in English.
33.2% agreed; 66.8% disagreed

Statement 2: Students need to master standard English for upward mobility.
96.1% agreed; 3.9% disagreed

Statement 3: In the home, students should be exposed to standard English only.

13.2% agreed; 86.8% disagreed

Statement 4: Students who use nonstandard dialects should be taught in standard English.

89.5% agreed; 10.5% disagreed

Statement 5: There are valid reasons for using nonstandard dialects.

80.1% agreed; 19.9% disagreed

Statement 6: There are valid reasons for using languages other than English.

92.6% agreed; 7.4% disagreed

Statement 7: Students should learn grammar rules to improve their ability to understand and communicate concepts and information.

78.4% agreed; 21.6% disagreed

Attitudes Toward Language Diversity

Statement 1, "A student whose primary language is not English should be taught solely in English," resulted in 33.2 percent agreeing with the teaching of nonprimary English speakers solely in English; this group tended to be White high school teachers. Conversely, from a statistically significant standpoint, those language arts educators who tended to disagree more with the teaching of nonprimary English speakers solely in English tended to be college professors of Color. (See tables 2.1 and 2.2; here and throughout, the Pearson chi-square statistical procedure was used to measure significance, with a value of .05 or lower required for statistical significance.) Table 2.1 shows the data with regard to significant correlations.

The literature in sociolinguistics has long established the interconnectedness of ethnic or racial identities to primary languages and cultures in spite of these being in flux. Nevertheless, people

Table 2.1. Significant Demographic Categories by Agreement and Disagreement with Statement 1: "A student whose primary . . ."

Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Sig.
White	People of Color (POC)	.002
Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
NCTE	CCCC	.001
High school teacher (HS)	University teacher (Univ.)	.000

Note: Statistically significant at .05 or lower.

Table 2.2. Demographic Groups' Attitudes Toward Language Variation, Grammar, and Bi- or Multilingualism

Statement	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Sig.
1. A student whose primary language is not English should be taught solely in English.	White	POC	.002
	Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
	NCTE	CCCC	.001
	HS	Univ.	.000
2. Students need to master standard English for upward mobility.	Females	Males	.03
	White	POC	.01
	41-60 yrs. old	21-40	.03
	Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
3. In the home, students should be exposed to standard English only.	NCTE	CCCC	.000
	15 yrs. teaching	1-6 yrs.	.02
	HS	Univ.	.000
	White	POC	.01
4. Students who use nonstandard dialects should be taught in standard English.	Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
	NCTE	CCCC	.000
	HS	Univ.	.000
	White	POC	.001
Students who use nonstandard dialects should be taught in standard English.	60+ yrs. old	21-40	.002
	Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
	NCTE	CCCC	.000
	1-14 yrs. teaching	15 yrs.	.001
	HS	Univ.	.000

Table 2.2. Continued

Statement	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Sig.
5. There are valid reasons for using nonstandard dialects.	Males	Females	.008
	POC	White	.000
	21-40 yrs. old	60+	.01
	CCCC	NCTE	.000
	Community college (CC) & Univ.	HS	.000
6. There are valid reasons for using languages other than English.	Doctorate	Bachelor's	.000
	Males	Females	.04
	POC	White	.007
	Doctorate	Bachelor's	.000
	CCCC	and master's	
7. Students should learn grammar rules to improve their ability to understand and communicate concepts and information.	Univ. and CC	NCTE	.000
		HS	.000
	Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
	NCTE	CCCC	.000
	HS	Univ.	.000

Note: Statistically significant at .05 or lower.

the belief that it is not normal for citizens to be bilingual or multilingual and that once one learns English, it should be spoken all the time, given the superpower status of English worldwide (Shannon). Such a view is shortsighted.

Within a global scheme, even the idea of World English is misguided, insofar as there are many Englishes, so that those who already have skills in more than one language are those who are more prepared to enter a global market than those who are confined to a single variety of a single language.² What we refer to as "English" in the United States is something different in Britain, in Zimbabwe, in Japan, or in India, for example (see Cliett in this volume for a fuller discussion of World Englishes).

I suspect that members of our profession who espouse the ideology of monolingualism do so because they view English as the carrier of cultural and economic capital, and they believe that it is in the best interest of students to know it, if nothing else. Another reason that many language educators may support the ideology of English monolingualism is that they may see themselves as guiding school-age adolescents or traditional college students (young adults) into financially secure and more profitable areas of the labor market (the "American dream factor"). As discussed by Horner and Trimbur, however, this view is contradictory, as both those for and against English Only use this assumption in their arguments. Those for English Only legislation cite the "American dream factor," saying that the English language is needed to achieve the American dream. This is a very popular American myth. On the other hand, those against English Only cite the "American dream factor" when seeking increased funding for ESL classrooms.

Another possible explanation for the preference for English Only classrooms among one-third of the respondents in this study is that many educators may be concerned about the lack of one-to-one transfer of ideas in various languages. In this view, communication and social meaning are not the same in students' native languages, causing students not to grasp the conventional English meaning of an idea or concept (Widdowson). Educators may deem English monolingualism as more effective for student learning. Yet

strategically, even if at times unconsciously, privilege certain cultural practices and languages. Furthermore, critical language and literacy theorists (Fairclough, Gee, Rampton, Canagarajah, Heath, Lee, Giroux, Villanueva), multicultural education scholars (Banks, Delpit, Ladson-Billings, Sleeter), linguists (Labov, Kachru, Rickford, Smitherman), and bilingual education scholars (Cummins, Crawford, Faltis, Hakuta and Snow, Krashen, Macedo) have long argued that incorporating the language practices of language minority groups into their formal education is ethical and promotes socio-cognitive development and academic achievement. Yet roughly one-third of our professional organization does not appear to be in accordance with these policies and principles. This might be due to the dominance of the ideology of English monolingualism in America,

restricting languages other than English from the classroom limits access to literacy by limiting students' ability to construct meaning and knowledge from other discourse, culture, and language communities of which they may be a part.

While statement 2 could have been understood as gleaned at attitudes about North American-born students who have acquired nonstandard varieties of English or nonstandard varieties of ESL, our hope was that it would also get at attitudes toward ESL learned abroad. In either case, multilingual or bilingual students may acquire varieties of English very different from middle-class White students who may acquire standardized varieties in the home.

With regard to statement 2—"Students need to master standard English for upward mobility"—96.1 percent of members agreed with this statement and 3.9 percent disagreed. At first glance, this finding seems unproblematic, since one of the charges of the language educator is to help students use standardized English as a tool for personal empowerment (see tables 2.2 and 2.3). Table 2.3 shows the data with regard to statistically significant correlations.

Respondents in the 41–60 age range tended to agree more than did those professionals in the 21–40 age group. I'd like to focus on the age-graded difference concerning the value of standardized English for careers and occupations. I wonder if the more mature members of our organizations lost their optimism for the equitable society that they worked for in the 1960s. On the other hand, will this trend continue? That is, will those in the younger category become less optimistic or conservative with age on this particular issue? It could be that with experience, those who will have been teaching longer will realize that upward mobility involves much more than the acquisition of language mastery. It could be argued just as well that the privilege of white skin, among other factors, plays a role in determining upward mobility. I think it is also important to note that more females than males agreed with the idea of standardized English for upward mobility. It has long been thought that females use more standardized forms than males.

Statements 3, 4, and 5 sought to get at attitudes regarding nonstandard varieties of English or "dialects." A large percentage, 86.8,

Table 2.3. Significant Demographic Categories by Agreement and Disagreement with Statement 2

Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Sig.
Female	Male	.03
White	POC	.01
41–60 yrs. old	21–40 yrs. old	.03
Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
NCTE	CCCC	.000
1–6 yrs. teaching	1–6 yrs. teaching	.02
HS	Univ.	.000

Note: Statistically significant at .05 or lower.

Table 2.4. Significant Demographic Categories by Agreement and Disagreement with Statement 3

Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Sig.
White	POC	.01
Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
NCTE	CCCC	.000
HS	Univ.	.000

Note: Statistically significant at .05 or lower.

disagreed with statement 3, "In the home, students should be exposed to standard English only," while 13.2 percent agreed with it. Those in agreement tended to be White high school teachers; those who disagreed were, significantly, university professors of Color (see tables 2.2 and 2.4).

An overwhelming 89.5 percent agreed with statement 4, "Students who use nonstandard dialects should be taught in standard English," while 10.5 percent disagreed. Table 2.5 shows the demographic breakdown of respondents in terms of significant agreement and disagreement on this statement (see table 2.2 also).

Responses to this statement break down along racial lines with Whites agreeing significantly more than people of Color. The age-graded difference is interesting. Educators over 60 years old agree significantly more than educators in the 21–40 age group. People with bachelor's degrees agree significantly more than those with

Table 2.5. Significant Demographic Categories by Agreement and Disagreement with Statement 4

Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Sig.
White	POC	.001
60+ yrs. old	21-40 yrs. old	.002
Bachelor's	Doctorate	.000
NCIE	CCCC	.000
1-14 yrs. teaching	15+ yrs. teaching	.001
HS	Univ.	.000

Note: Statistically significant at .05 or lower.

doctorates. NCIE members agree more than CCCC members, and high school teachers agree more than college professors. What does seem odd is that those teaching fewer years—1-14—agree significantly more than those teaching 15 years or more. This doesn't jibe with the finding that those 60 and over agreed more. This leads me to speculate that those respondents in the 60-plus category did not necessarily teach 15 years or more, since those who taught longer tended to disagree with this statement.

It is interesting to juxtapose responses to statements 3 and 4 against responses to statement 1. Recall that roughly two-thirds of the respondents supported the use of languages other than English in the classroom, and they tended to be university professors of Color. Several inferences can be drawn from these data. It appears that language and dialect are not equally valued. Generally, in this study, White high school teachers value second languages more than what they view as nonstandard dialects in the classroom. This view, however, is uncritical because it reproduces rather than questions relations between dominant and subordinate groups in society. James Milroy's discussion of the "consequences of standardisation" sheds light on the importance of examining ideologies, which inform language policies and attitudes toward language use:

In debates about language use and language teaching, language experts seem often to have played into the hands of those who support narrowly "correct" usage by giving too

little attention to the fact that what is involved is only superficially a debate about language and is more fundamentally a debate about ideologies. (23)

Ideologies that follow from and support people in positions of power, wealth, and status, consciously or unconsciously, uphold systems of inequity. Arguments such as "students need access to the mainstream" and "students need access to standardized varieties of English" do more to uphold the idea of a monolithic "correct" English and the system that it supports than they do to benefit the subordinated, stigmatized, or least preferred social groups.

The differing responses to statements 5, "There are valid reasons for using nonstandard dialects," and 6, "There are valid reasons for using languages other than English," are also revealing. Only 7.4 percent believed that there are no valid reasons for using other languages; however, more than twice as many, nearly 20 percent of the respondents, did not believe there were valid reasons for using nonstandard dialects. Stated differently, only 80 percent of respondents espouse ideologies of bi/multilingualism as far as nonstandard language varieties are concerned. Significantly, more males, people of Color, and university and community college professors agreed that "there are valid reasons for using languages other than English" than did females, Whites, and high school teachers.

Statement 7 reads: "Students should learn grammar rules to improve their ability to understand and communicate concepts and information." Over three-fourths, or 78.4 percent, of educators agreed, while 21.6 percent disagreed (see tables 2.2 and 2.6).

This statement was designed to get at instructors' thinking about the utility of teaching grammar as rules that represent one-to-one correspondences between referents and their symbolic representation and interpretation. I think it is interesting that this statement did not break down along the lines of race, gender, or age. Rather, the tendency was that high school teachers and university professors responded to the statement differently. It is safe to say that there are beliefs and schools of thought among college teachers that are not held by high school teachers. Some of these differences are

Table 2.6. Significant Demographic Categories by Agreement and Disagreement with Statement 7

	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Sig.
Bachelor's		Doctorate	.000
NCTE		CCCC	.000
HS		Univ.	.000

Note: Statistically significant at .05 or lower.

no doubt related to training. I am hesitant to speculate beyond this point, since it is difficult to be sure of the pedagogical contexts that those in agreement with the statement had in mind. To look at it from the perspective of those who answered affirmatively, it is true that understanding sentence-level standardized grammar rules can help one to discern a one-dimensional level of meaning, but grammar is probably best investigated in the context of discourse to move students to critical language awareness and the multiple possibilities for meaning. From a critical perspective, then, students should be led to investigate grammatical rules as choices for specific rhetorical purposes.

Training in Concepts of Language and Language Diversity

The survey was also concerned with academic training in language diversity. Based on the pilot survey data, a list of the most common college courses in language was compiled. We defined "training" as completion of these particular college courses: African American English, American Dialects, Introduction to the English Language, and Linguistics for Teachers. We defined "no training" as having had none of the aforementioned courses. There was no statistically significant difference between training in language and any of the seven demographic groups in the survey: race, age, gender, educational level, membership in CCCC or NCTE, and number of years of teaching. In fact, nearly one-third of all demographic groups had had no college course in language. Yet training in language and language diversity was recognized as necessary for anyone preparing to be a language arts teacher today.

The study's prediction was that those who had themselves undergone such training would be more likely to recommend training for others, but there was no statistically significant difference between those who had had training and those who had none. Over a fourth of the respondents had had no course in language diversity in college, yet 95.5 percent agreed that such a course was necessary for teacher preparation today. Both groups recognized the need for such training, and both groups overwhelmingly recommended that those in language arts teacher preparation programs today take a course in language. What this says to me is that most of the profession realizes that training in language diversity is an important requirement and may enhance their teaching.

Respondents were asked to rank the recommended courses in order of importance. The courses were ranked as follows (the lower the mean score, the higher, or more important, the ranking):

Introduction to the English Language 1.60
Linguistics for Teachers 2.04
American Dialects 2.42
African American English 3.49

Since one goal of the study was concerned with the type of training in language diversity necessary to prepare language arts teachers, it is worth examining this aspect of the survey's results in greater detail. Statistical significance was found in terms of responses to statements 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Significantly more language educators, 34.8 percent, who had taken an African American English (AAE) course strongly disagreed with statement 1 than those who had not taken an AAE course and who strongly disagreed, 18.7 percent (sig. 007*). (See Language Policy Committee 20.)

A similar pattern appears with responses to statement 3. Again, AAE proved statistically significant in terms of responses to this statement. None—not one—of those who had taken an African American English course strongly agreed with this statement, and 49.2 percent of this group strongly disagreed, whereas only 32.1 percent strongly disagreed among those who had not taken Afri-

can American English (sig. 01*). (See Language Policy Committee 20.)

Those educators who had taken both African American English and American Dialects responded in significantly different ways to statement 4 from those who had taken Introduction to the English Language and Linguistics for Teachers. Of those who took a course in African American English, 7.6 percent strongly disagreed with the statement "Students who use nonstandard dialects should be taught in standard English," compared with only 1.8 percent of those who had not taken a course in African American English. In the case of the American Dialects course group, 5.1 percent strongly disagreed with the statement, compared with only 1.6 percent among those who had not taken an American Dialects course.

Again, both the African American English and the American Dialects (AD) course groups differed significantly from the Introduction to the English Language and Linguistics for Teachers course groups with respect to statement 5. Significantly, more of the AAE course group strongly agreed with the statement (49.3 percent) than those in the non-AAE course group (24.3 percent). Furthermore, among the AAE course group, none—not one—strongly disagreed with the statement, compared to 6.7 percent of the non-AAE group. Among those who did not have an AD course, the percentage of those disagreeing with the statement (14.9 percent) was twice that of those who took an AD course (7.1 percent).

Among those who took AAE, 62.7 percent agreed with statement 6. Only 39.1 percent agreed among those who did not take AAE, while none of the AAE course group strongly disagreed. Results seem to suggest that research and information on dialect/language variation and bi/multilingualism are being conveyed in courses dealing with African American English and American Dialects, and this information has had an impact on some language arts teachers who have taken such courses. However, the same knowledge and impact were not found among those language arts professionals who took Introduction to the English Language and Linguistics for Teachers courses.

Members' Descriptions of Their Own Language Use

Four categories for describing respondents' language now and in the past were derived from the pilot study. These were: multilingual, multidialectal, Standard American English most of the time, and nonstandard American English. Comparisons were made within demographic groups to ascertain which particular group within a demographic set tended to select a category more than another group within that set. Using this kind of comparison, several statistically significant results were found.

Language now multilingual: people of Color (POC), doctorates.
Language now multidialectal: POC; males; doctorates; CCCC members; university teachers.

Language now Standard American English most of the time:

Whites; respondents 41–60 years old; bachelor's degrees; NCIE members; high school teachers; respondents teaching 1.5-plus years.

Language now nonstandard American English: POC.

Past language multilingual: POC; community college teachers.

Past language multidialectal: males; POC; holders of doctorates; CCCC members; university teachers.

Past language Standard American English most of the time:

Whites; respondents 60-plus years old; bachelor's degrees; NCIE members; respondents teaching 1.5-plus years; high school teachers.

Past language nonstandard American English: males; POC.

These results show a general pattern that educators of Color (POC) identify their language use in the present and past as multilingual and multidialectal, including the use of nonstandard varieties of American English. We can be reasonably certain that educators of Color know and use standardized English, but they understand themselves to use it in specific contexts as opposed to most of the time, and they are multilingual and multidialectal. Generally, male educators and educators of Color were the only groups to describe

their past language use as nonstandardized varieties of American English. Another general pattern that emerges is that Ph.D.'s tended to describe their language along the same lines as people of Color. Generally, White educators described their language use in the present and past as Standard American English most of the time. This group tends to be members of NCTE, bachelor's degree holders, high school teachers, and teachers for more than 15 years.

Knowledge of and Support for CCCC/NCTE Language Policies

The survey sought to uncover the membership's knowledge of and support for the CCCC/NCTE language policies "Students' Right to Their Own Language" and the National Language Policy. About two-thirds of the members of NCTE and CCCC as represented in this sample were not familiar with these two organizational policies. The difference between those who had no knowledge of the two organizational language policies and those who were familiar with the policies can be accounted for in terms of the seven demographic characteristics, all of which proved to be statistically significant. These results parallel findings in other areas of the survey relative to differences in response between demographic groups. Generally, people of Color tended to be more familiar with "Students' Right" and "English Plus," a recommendation within the National Language Policy, than Whites (see table 2.7); respondents with doctorates more familiar than those with bachelor's degrees; members of CCCC more familiar than NCTE members; university teachers more familiar than high school teachers; males generally more familiar than females. Those who had been teaching fifteen years or more were more likely to have knowledge of the policies than those who had been teaching 1-6 years. In terms of age, the trend was that the older the member, the greater the likelihood of familiarity with the policies. (However, the same does not hold true in terms of support or opposition to the policies.)

While language educators of Color are divided surprisingly equally among those who are familiar with both organizational policies and those who are not, slightly favoring the knowledgeable, over twice as many White language educators are unfamiliar with both

policies. Perhaps the knowledge of these policies among language educators of Color can be attributed in part to vested interest and personal experience with the issues, revealing the importance of cultural experiences in knowledge making. This is not to say that White language educators have no interest or experience in these issues. Clearly, they do. However, the principles, ideas, and practices represented by these policies should be known throughout the profession.

Of those educators who were familiar with the two policies—some 35 percent in each case—there was considerably more support for English Plus than for "Students' Right" (82.3 percent and 67.9 percent, respectively). In great measure, this may be attributable to the tremendous controversy stemming from passage of the "Students' Right" resolution a generation ago, a language policy formulated during the tumultuous social changes of the 1960s and 1970s. I am reminded by Bruch and Marback that many teachers who know of "Students' Right" resolution interpret it to mean that they are obligated to promote standardized English in public official spaces and teach the appropriateness of other language varieties in the home or community settings. If Bruch and Marback are correct, this explains why many would feel it unnecessary to implement linguistically diverse teaching methods in their curricula. By contrast, there was little opposition to the English Plus policy passed in 1988. The discrepancy between levels of support of the two policies in the 1990s may also be attributed to lack of practical preparation, that is, in the case of "Students' Right," preparation for including various nonstandard dialects as a central aspect of the classroom language education experience. As for English Plus, perhaps the sentiment is that there is less concern about practical implementation of language activities since ESL teachers, not general language arts educators, will be responsible for teaching second language speakers.

Pedagogical Approaches to Language Diversity

Another area that the survey sought to uncover was the membership's teaching practices with regard to language diversity in speech and writing. Virtually all the respondents indicated that they dis-

Table 2.7. Familiarity with "Students' Right to Their Own Language" and "English Plus" by Demographic Group

Characteristic	Familiar with "Students' Right"		Sig.	Familiar with "English Plus"		Sig.
	Yes	No		Yes	No	
Race						
POC	51.1	48.9	.000	54.9	45.1	.000
White	31.9	68.1		30.0	70.0	
Educational level						
Bachelor's	16.5	83.5	.000	25.0	75.0	.000
Master's	24.4	75.9		27.5	72.5	
Doctorate	59.3	40.7		48.1	51.9	
Membership						
NCTE	20.7	79.3	.000	27.7	72.3	.000
CCCC	58.4	41.6		44.4	55.6	
Teaching level						
High school	16.5	83.5	.000	24.4	75.6	.000
Community college	44.4	55.6		37.7	62.3	
University	61.5	38.5		47.6	52.4	
Gender						
Female	30.3	69.7	.000			
Male	48.5	51.5				
Age						
21-40	23.8	76.2	.000			
41-60	36.9	63.1				
60+	48.5	51.5				
Years teaching						
1-6	23.2	76.8	.000			
7-14	28.1	71.9				
15+	39.1	60.9				

Note: Statistically significant at .05 or lower.

cuss language diversity, at least to some extent, with their students. Only 4.8 percent do not engage in any such discussions.

Respondents use a variety of approaches to discuss language diversity: readings on language matters, analysis of language use in literature and other creative forms, affirmations by the teacher that all languages and language varieties are equal. An overwhelming

majority of members (82.4 percent) say their students raise issues and topics about language diversity. The students' concerns include differences between dialect and language, differences between dialect and slang, differences in the ways people speak, status and appropriateness of languages, and language varieties other than standardized English.

To get at the kinds of approaches that educators use with non-standardized English speakers, the survey posed the question (to which multiple responses were allowed), What approaches do you use with students who use nonstandard dialect features in their speech?

44.4% correct students' writing, not their speech

13.0% tell students that for an English class, only standard

English is appropriate

100% use private conferences to discuss issues of correctness

24% might say nothing

82.4% discuss the importance of knowing both standard and nonstandard English and the contexts of appropriate use for each

In terms of the same question applied to students who use non-standard dialect features in their writing, members gave the following responses (again, multiple responses were allowed):

19.9% instruct students that for an English class, only standard English is appropriate in writing

53.4% use private conferences

84.3% discuss the importance of standard and nonstandard

English and contexts of appropriate use for each

11.2% might say nothing

It is interesting to note the difference between the strategies used for speech and those used for writing. The most striking is that 100 percent of respondents used private conferences to discuss matters of oral speech variation, whereas only 53.4 percent used private conferences for written language variation. In spoken or written contexts, though, there is still a significant percentage of educators

who do not value nonstandard language variation in the classroom setting.

A Clear Need for Further Training of English Teachers

The data from this study show that, overall, we language educators have a complex mix of attitudes about not only our students' language but also our own, which is influenced, in part, by race, classes or training, gender, where we teach, how long we've taught, and our ages. Overwhelmingly in this study, educators of Color supported the maintenance of diverse dialects and languages in the classroom more than White language educators. Our data also show that Whites identified themselves as standardized English speakers most of the time in the past and present, as opposed to educators of Color, who identified their language use as multilingual or multidialectal, including present nonstandardized usage. These findings taken together imply that some White instructors need more meaningful experiences with linguistically diverse speakers in their everyday lives. More facility is needed with nonstandardized dialects. This may account for the reason that more White instructors did not support the usage of nonstandardized dialects and languages other than English in the classroom as much as educators of Color did. Although most of the language educators surveyed want to foster language diversity, some don't feel they have the training to provide it. Our data also revealed that classes such as African American English and American Dialects proved significant in distinguishing those teachers knowledgeable and open to language diversity in the classroom from those who were not.

Significantly, the majority of those surveyed, while believing in the need for training in linguistic diversity, were unaware of the published positions of their professional organizations, namely the 1974 resolution, "Students' Right to Their Own Language," and the 1988 "National Language Policy." Those who were aware could be distinguished along the lines of race, education, teaching level, and organizational affiliation. The survey also revealed a split between high school teachers and college/university teachers on a several issues.

We can see a rich array of variables and issues that deserve deeper reflection as we consider what we as a profession can do to improve the delivery of services to the diverse students (including White ones) who enter our classes. "The Language Knowledge and Awareness Survey Final Research Report," available through the CCCC website, contains a list of recommendations. Those recommendations could be summed up in this way: Our theories and practices must keep pace with the diversity in our classrooms, with research, and with social change.

I began this essay by discussing the rhetorical training of Justice Clarence Thomas. Nurtured in this society and its classrooms, Thomas was indoctrinated into the ideology of English monolingualism and monodialectalism. He was taught to devalue the Black cultural aspects of his identity, including his language use and the voices that struggled to create a space for his on the Supreme Court. By virtue of his status, some would consider him a success, although he is not known for progressive thinking or action. Our profession must continue to struggle against traditional concepts of literacy education and remain observant that literacy education is always political, subjective, and ever shifting according to societal needs. Right now, we have a surplus of Clarence Thomases.

Notes

All data are reported from the *Language Knowledge and Awareness Survey* final research report, submitted by the CCCC Language Policy Committee to NCTE, January 2000, available on-line at <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/langsurvey.pdf>.

1. See, for example, Williams, *Language and Poverty* and "Psychological Correlates," and Williams and Whitehead.
2. See Warschauer for a helpful discussion of global economy and the future of English teaching.

Works Cited

- Banks, James. *Teaching Strategies For Ethnic Studies*. Boston: Allyn, 1991.
 Bowie, Carole. "Influencing Future Teachers' Attitudes Toward Black English.

- Are We Making a Difference?" *Journal of Teacher Education* 3.1 (1994): 112-18.
- Bruch, Patrick, and Richard Marback. "Race, Literacy, and the Value of Rights Rhetoric in Composition Studies." *CCC* 53 (2002): 651-74.
- Byrnes, Deborah A., and Gary Kiger. "Language Attitudes of Teachers Scale (LATS)." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 54.1 (1994): 227-31.
- . "Teachers Attitudes about Language Differences." 1991. ERIC Document ED340232.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
- CCCC Language Policy Committee. *Language Knowledge and Awareness Survey*. Final Report (corrected copy). Jan. 2000 <<http://www.ncte.org/cccc/languagev.pdf>>.
- Crawford, James. *Hold Your Tongue: Bilingualism and the Politics of English Only*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1992.
- Cummins, James. *Bilingualism and Minority-Language Children*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1981.
- Delpit, Lisa. *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: New, 1995.
- Edelsky, Carole. *With Literacy and Justice for All: Rethinking the Social in Language and Education*. New York: Falmer, 1991.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman, 1995.
- Faltis, Christine. "Bilingual Education in the United States." *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Ed. Jim Cummins and D. Lortsen. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic, 1997. 189-97.
- Fine, Michelle. "Silencing and Literacy." *Literacy among African American Youth: Issues in Learning, Teaching, and Schooling*. Ed. Vivian Gadsden and Daniel A. Wagner. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton P, 1995. 201-22.
- Fordham, Signithia. *Blacked Out: Dilemmas of Race, Identity, and Success at Capital High*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.
- . "Racelessness as a Factor in Black Students' School Success: Pragmatic Strategy or Pyrrhic Victory?" *Harvard Educational Review* 58.1 (1988): 54-84.
- Gee, James. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. London: Taylor, 1996.
- Gere, Anne R., and Eugene Smith. *Attitudes, Language, and Change*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1979.
- Gilyard, Keith. *Voices of the Self*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1991.
- Giroux, Henry. "Introduction: Literacy, Difference, and the Politics of Border Crossing." *Rewriting Literacy: Culture and Discourse of the Other*. Ed. Candace Mitchell and Kathleen Weiler. New York: Bergin, 1991. ix-xvi.
- Hakuta, Kenji, and Catherine Snow. "The Role of Research in Policy Decisions about Bilingual Education." *NABE News* 9.3 (Spring) 1986: 1, 18-21.
- Heath, Shirley Brice. *Ways with Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *CCC* 53 (2002): 594-630.
- Kachru, Yamuna. "Cultural Meaning and Contrastive Rhetoric in English Education." *World Englishes* 16.3 (1997): 337-50.
- Krashen, Stephen. *Under Attack: The Case Against Bilingual Education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Assn., 1996.
- Labov, William. "Can Reading Failure Be Reversed? A Linguistic Approach to the Question." *Literacy among African American Youth: Issues in Learning, Teaching, and Schooling*. Ed. Vivian Gadsden and Daniel A. Wagner. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 1995. 39-68.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. "Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy." *American Educational Research Journal* 32.3 (1995): 465-91.
- Lambert, Wallace E., et al. "Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Language." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60.1 (1960): 44-51.
- Lee, Carol D. *Signifying as a Scaffold to Literary Interpretation: The Pedagogical Implications of an African American Discourse Genre*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1993.
- Lewis, Neil A. "The 43rd President: The Justice; Justice Thomas Speaks Out on a Timely Topic, Several of Them, in Fact." *New York Times Online Archives* 14 December 2000.
- Macedo, Donald. *Literacies of Power: What Americans Are Not Allowed to Know*. Boulder: Westview, 1994.
- Milroy, James. "Standardisation in Descriptive Linguistics." *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. Ed. Tony Bex and Richard Watts. New York: Routledge, 1999. 16-39.
- Ogbu, John. "Adaptation to Minority Status and Impact on School Success." *Theory into Practice* 31.4 (1992): 287-95.
- Rampton, Ben. "Returning in Applied Linguistics." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7.1 (1997): 3-25.
- Rickford, John. *African American Vernacular English: Features, Evolution, Educational Implications*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999.
- Shannon, Sheila. "The Debate on Bilingual Education in the U.S.: Language Ideology as Reflected in the Practice of Bilingual Teachers." *Language Ideological Debates*. Ed. Jan Blommaert. Berlin: Mouton, 1999. 171-99.
- Sledd, James. "Bidialectalism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy." *English Journal* 58.9 (1969): 1307-15.
- Sleeter, Christine. Introduction. *Dancing with Bigotry: Beyond the Politics of Tolerance*. By Donald Macedo and Lilia I. Bartolome. New York: St. Martin's, 1999. vii-xv.
- Smitherman, Geneva. "Students' Right to Their Own Language: A Retrospective." *English Journal* 84.1 (1995): 21-27.
- Steele, Claude. "Race and the Schooling of Black Americans." *Atlantic Monthly* 269.4 (1992): 68-78.

- Taylor, Orlando. "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Black and Nonstandard English as Measured by the Language Attitude Scale." *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*. Ed. Roger Shuy and Ralph Fasold. Washington, DC: Georgetown UP, 1973. 174-201.
- Villanueva, Victor. *Bootstraps: From an American Academic of Color*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1993.
- Warschauer, Mark. "The Changing Global Economy and the Future of English Teaching." *TESOL Quarterly* 34.3 (2000): 511-35.
- Widdowson, Henry George. "Communication, Community, and the Problem of Appropriate Use." *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics* (1992): 305-15.
- Williams, Frederick, ed. *Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme*. Chicago: Markham, 1970.
- . "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics: On Sounding Disadvantaged." *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 13 (1970): 472-88.
- Williams, Frederick, and Jack Whitehead. "Language in the Classroom: Studies of the Pygmalion Effect." *Language, Society, and Education*. Ed. Johanna S. DeStefano. Worthington, OH: Jones, 1973. 169-76.

3 / The Expanding Frontier of World Englishes

A New Perspective for Teachers of English

Victoria Clift

English teachers have the opportunity to expand on new pedagogical in the face of the changing global landscape. The first frontier of global expansion is negative attitudes toward languages other than English and varieties other than "standard." In the future, English teachers will not be able to avoid the national issue of language rights. So we must educate ourselves about language diversity in this country and around the world. We will have to mediate national policy as schools face increasing pressure to prepare all students for democratic participation as citizens. To focus on a solely domestic concept of "standard English" would be to teachers' disadvantage in the changing cultural and global landscape. We will all have to deal with World Englishes. Thus, the concept of "standard English" is more complex than the English teacher's traditional notion of "correct" and "incorrect" language. The challenge to language scholars is to delineate how standard English is codified in different global contexts.

Ryuko Kubota and Lori Ward define the term "World Englishes" (WE) in relationship to the great diversity of varieties of standard English around the globe (Kubota and Ward). The concept of WE dates to the early 1960s, although there was no forum to discuss the international development of English until 1978 (Kachru). At that time, two organizations held conferences three months apart to discuss international and intranational developments in English: the East-West Culture Learning Institute in Honolulu, Hawaii, and the Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America, held on the University of Illinois-Urbana campus. Both conferences considered questions that addressed the sociolinguistic and political

contexts of countries where English is nonnative, the retention of English after colonization, and the sociolinguistic and linguistic profiles of the several standard varieties of English.

The Honolulu conference produced a formal statement on behalf of conference participants that affirmed the need to continue inquiry into the development of English as an international language and that the relationship between "standard" and "international" English needed further discussion. The Honolulu conference also asserted that there was a distinction between international and intranational uses of English. "International" refers to the use of English around the world, though the label is inaccurate insofar as it assumes a use of English that is unproblematic in "acceptance, proficiency, functions, norms, and creativity" (Kachru 215). "Intranational" refers to the unique uses of English within a country, official versus unofficial languages and local varieties, for example. Furthermore, the Honolulu statement outlined new practices in research and methodologies that were "consistent with the identities and functions of World Englishes" (210).

The statements coming from the conferences convened at Urbana during this period are significant in a discussion of World Englishes because they reflect a movement toward a more contextual and cultural discussion of English beyond functional use: literatures, sociolinguistic profiles, and local varieties of English (Kachru 211). The goals of the Urbana conferences were discussed at a subsequent colloquium in Honolulu in 1986. Focus was on the "concept of the linguistic 'power' of English with a cross-cultural perspective"; the goal was to assemble data from various English-using countries for the "study of such 'power' in the domains of literature and the media (film and journalism)" (211). Participants at this colloquium also identified theoretical and research areas for countries where English is not the native language; for example, in-depth studies on the national uses of English, identifying the main characteristics of English as it is used on international levels, comparing various contexts and methods of teaching in different cultural settings, and supporting classroom and literary critical study of literatures of English around the world (211).

Kachru has categorized World Englishes into three basic groupings, depending on the linguistic history of a particular country: (1) an Inner Circle, referring to countries where English is the mother tongue; (2) an Outer Circle, denoting countries where English is an additional, institutionalized language; and (3) an Expanding Circle, consisting of countries where English is a foreign language (213). The Inner Circle would include the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, and Australia. The Outer Circle includes former and current British and American colonies such as Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Malaysia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and other Caribbean countries. The Expanding Circle includes China, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Korea, Nepal, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, and various South American countries.

Anne Pakir asserts that the "flourishing of world Englishes naturally leads to the idea of standards and codification . . . with a move to saleability in the linguistic marketplace" (171). However, the process of codifying standard English is far from simple. Owners of English in the Outer Circle are "players" of English in the Inner Circle, making and introducing their own rules. In the Outer Circle, English has "plurocentricity" rather than "duo-centricity," that is, British and American English no longer reign as the centers of language variation and change. As John Norris indicates, it is unrealistic to expect that Inner Circle countries can claim sole ownership of English. In fact, citizens of Australia may eventually consider their language "Australian," for instance, and Americans may come to think of theirs as "American" rather than "English." The lesson to be learned in the United States is that what teachers perceive as "nonstandard" English plays a significant role in daily language use around the globe.

According to Pakir and other scholars, the commercial value of English as a spoken language has cemented its widespread global use. In Singapore, for example, the national airport employs electronic signboards in English as well as Chinese, Malay, Tamil, Bahasa, Indonesia, Thai, Bangladeshi, and the Myanmar language (Pakir 170). Singapore also uses English in street signs and for public

information. However, the huge influx of international workers and visitors who bring economic capital required Singapore to accommodate alternatives to standard English (171).

The economic and cultural capital of English opens the door for varieties other than standard to become accepted through the codification process. Of course, with standardization comes reduced tolerance of language varieties. Pakir identifies five primary problems with codification:

1. Prescriptivism vs. descriptivism: the codification of World Englishes does not necessarily happen before or after standardization; the codification of World English is contextual.
2. Choice of standards: conflicts between external and internal English language practices in a country.
3. Participatory vs. separatist: should there be mutual collaboration or "us" vs. "them"?
4. Content of standards: tailoring the codification of the language to represent the "distinctive cultural identity" of the native population.
5. Acceptance of standards: approval of the codified language by professionals, the population, and institutions (175-76).

Yet in a country such as Singapore, there exists several legitimate reasons for the codification of its English (called "SingE"). This codified variety could be used in schools as an appropriate model for the teaching and learning of English, thereby bridging the gap between children who speak English and teachers whose first language is not English but who must nevertheless teach in English. As well, SingE can be used to demonstrate a "prevention" against the "degeneration" of this variety of English so as to fend it an international status (Pakir 177). In many countries outside the Inner Circle, English is encouraged in and outside of the classroom (although not in the home). The classroom is not the sole influence on language use, as too many U.S. teachers seem to assume. In Outer and Expanding Circle countries, English language use is negotiated

and relearned frequently outside of the classroom, and new varieties emerge from the seemingly insignificant interactions of everyday life. Furthermore, while the political and cultural climate concerning language varieties in the United States has often been turbulent, in other countries, consideration of national language diversity has become imperative in the political arena.

South Africa is a case in point. South Africa has undergone many changes in the last few years, including winning independence from apartheid and from European colonialism. With the new political changes, South Africa has restructured its language use. In the past, South Africa's linguistic diversity was used for a "divide-and-rule" strategy by the White ruling elite (Smitherman). At the inception of apartheid, the African majority was divided into distinct groups, according to language, with indigenous languages devalued. However, since becoming a democracy, South Africa has adopted a policy of "English Plus" (while the United States continues to adopt policies of "English Only," despite—or because of—the huge constituency of linguistic minorities in the country). The new South Africa has adopted a constitutional provision that recognizes eleven official languages, with English being only one of the eleven. The constitution promotes multilingualism, prohibits the use of language to exploit and divide, and requires that all eleven languages be recognized equally in all areas of public administration. Of course, as Smitherman notes, it remains to be seen whether South Africa will be able to fully realize its constitutional "dream" of official multilingualism.

In the United States, English teachers must come to grips with the reality that linguistic diversity is here to stay and, in fact, will become even more widespread during this new century. For example, over the past decade, the population of citizens of Color, in particular, Blacks and Latinos, has increased significantly. According to the 2000 census, Black non-Hispanic citizens and those of Hispanic origin now combine to represent nearly 25 percent of the U.S. population. It is clear that language diversity will remain relevant in political and academic agendas of the twenty-first century.

What will English teachers do to accommodate these popula-

tion changes? Given global linguistic diversity and the concomitant emergence of World Englishes, how will twenty-first-century language arts and composition teachers juggle the demands of cultural diversity and the pedagogical needs of the classroom? Now is the time for teacher education to change, to toss out the old ideas about a uniform, monolithic standard English. Teaching educators about global varieties of standard English can help educators design new theoretical and pedagogical models for the changing landscape of English.

Brown and Peterson conducted a study to assess the effect of knowledge about World Englishes on attitudes toward and perceptions about World Englishes and "nonnative" speakers of English. The "subjects" were students enrolled in a master's level program in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The researchers compiled a list of twenty-seven concepts (for example, ideological concepts, concepts about varieties of English) utilized by scholars in discussions and analyses of the World English paradigm. These concepts formed the basis of judgments about World Englishes and their millions of speakers, including those whose first language is not English.

The student-subjects were divided into two groups and given different amounts of instruction in World English concepts. One group received only the TESOL program's four-hour introductory instructional module in World Englishes. The other group received the same introductory instruction plus an additional three-credit course in World Englishes, for a total of thirty-four hours of instructional time. The students who received more instructional time not only had developed a more complex knowledge base and more highly differentiated conceptual categories about the English language and its speakers but also displayed more sophisticated and complex classifications and descriptions about speakers of English. For example, whereas the four-hour instructional group of students classified English speakers into the simplistic dichotomy of "native-nonnative," the student group who had been exposed to more hours of instruction described English speakers in terms of sociolinguistic norms and language policies.

The concept of World Englishes allows for a variety of standard Englishes, many of which, as stated earlier, are comprised of forms and patterns that problematize the traditional notion of "non-standard English" in the United States. In the face of this global recognition of language diversity, it is imperative that English teachers address the pedagogical and curricular changes that multilingual and multialectal classrooms demand. To be sure, lack of exposure to the study of language variation has had a negative impact on teachers' attitudes and responses toward language diversity. As has been noted in Richardson's chapter in this volume, in the CCCC Language Policy Committee's survey of NCTE and CCCC members, 28.4 percent of the respondents had had no course in language diversity in their college training (although, encouragingly, 95.5 percent of the respondents agreed that such training was necessary for teacher education).

In pedagogy, there are several competing theories on the role English education should take, theories that have intersected with postcolonial and cultural studies. For the most part, most theorists in composition, World Englishes, and postcolonial theory agree that teachers of English, especially on the international front, will be intermediaries between the hegemonic and global standard English and the local and marginal varieties of English. Wimal Dissanayake asserts that any interrogation of World Englishes requires consideration of the global and the local. Writing produced by nonnative speakers of English is metaphorical in nature (137). Hence, the teaching of writing in standard English engages some reorientation of classroom knowledge that must serve the larger agenda of standard English.

Alastair Pennycook considers a liberal and conservative polarity in the international use of a standard English in asking if its dominance is the result of being imposed or its being accepted (73-74). Pennycook takes the position that critical pedagogy must dismantle language norms and discourses. The relationship of teacher and student in the standard English classroom can be problematized when considering that teachers can be foreigners to students in ways that do not necessarily follow nationalist discourse (302). One of the

prominent gaps in English is that between a still male academy and the female teaching practitioner (303). Education by nature is political, so standard English cannot be considered the exception, the apolitical. The means of production that the teaching of English serves must be considered. The teaching of English must also be self-reflexive, never assuming that one particular worldview is capable of working in all classrooms (305).

For teachers of English, there are several implications that arise from global English expansion. New and innovative teaching strategies for a linguistically diverse population will need to be acquired. This multidimensional pedagogy will have to address the social and political history of English and other languages. Standard English will have to be taught as only one of several appropriate varieties, depending on context and situation. New media of learning will require acceptance and tolerance of new languages. Effective teaching encompasses a global, rather than a local, method of teaching. The teacher-training curriculum must include study and examination of language systems and teaching methods in other parts of the world.

The good news is that trends show that the new generation of college English teachers have opened themselves up to new language pedagogies and have expressed interest in workshops that will enable them to overcome language barriers in the classrooms. These new attitudes must become the standard in language arts instruction for the twenty-first century.

Works Cited

- Brown, Kimberley, and Jay Peterson. "Exploring Conceptual Frameworks: Framing a World Englishes Paradigm." Smith and Forman 32-47.
- CCCC Language Policy Committee. *Language Knowledge and Awareness Survey*. Final Report. Jan. 2000. 3 Mar. 2003 <<http://www.ncte.org/cccc/langsurvey.pdf>>.
- Dissanayake, Wimal. "Cultural Studies and World Englishes: Some Topics for Further Exploration." Smith and Forman 126-45.
- Kachru, Braj B. "World Englishes 2000: Resources for Research and Teaching." Smith and Forman 209-51.

- Kubota, Ryuko, and Lori Ward. "Exploring Linguistic Diversity Through World Englishes." *English Journal* 89.6 (2000): 80-86.
- Linguistic Society of America. *Statement on Language Rights*. June 1996. 3 Mar. 2003 <<http://www.lsadc.org/langrite.html>>.
- Norris, John. "English or English? Attitudes, Local Varieties and English Language Teaching." *Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL-EJ)* 3.1 (1997). 12 Jan. 2001 <<http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej09/a2.html>>.
- Pakir, Anne. "Standards and Codification for World Englishes." Smith and Forman 169-81.
- Pennycook, Alastair. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. New York: Longman, 1994.
- Smith, Larry E., and Michael L. Forman, eds. *World Englishes 2000*. Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 1997.
- Smitherman, Geneva. "Language and Democracy in the United States of America and South Africa." *Language and Institutions in Africa*. Ed. Sinfree B. Makoni and Nkonko Kamwagamalu. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society, 2000. 65-92.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. *Policy Statement of the TESOL Board on Language Varieties*. Oct. 1996. 3 Mar. 2003 <<http://www.tesol.org/assoc/statements/languagevarieties.html>>.