

FROM STANDARD ENGLISH TO SYNERGISTIC ENGLISH WORK:
UNCOVERING WRITING INSTRUCTORS' NEGOTIATIONS OF THE STANDARD
ENGLISH DILEMMA AND PARADOX IN THEIR WRITING ASSESSMENT
PRACTICES

by

Sarah Johnson
A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
English

Committee:

_____ Director

_____ Department Chairperson

_____ Program Director

_____ Dean, College of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Date: _____ Spring Semester 2021
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

From Standard English to Synergistic English Work: Uncovering Writing
Instructors' Negotiations of the Standard English Dilemma and Paradox in their Writing
Assessment Practices

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy at George Mason University

by

Sarah Johnson
Master of Fine Arts
American University, 2016
Bachelor of Arts
University of Missouri-Columbia, 2013

Director: Michelle LaFrance, Professor
Department of English

Spring Semester 2021
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Copyright 2021 Sarah Johnson
All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

To Trace, my partner in all things.

And for my Saipan students—you inspired every word I wrote, the passion that pushed my language, and the life that I live.

Si Yu'os Ma'åse', Salamat, 감사합니다, Arigato gozaimasu, Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The words that made it to this page and that comprise this dissertation can hardly begin to capture the pain, excitement, suffering, energy, fear, pressure, and obsession I experienced while navigating and journeying through this dissertation project and process. In making these feelings and dispositions explicit, I acknowledge first the person who endured them with me, who suffered as I suffered, who pained as I pained, and who joyed as I joyed. Trace, my husband and partner in all things, thank you for standing, sitting, watching, waiting, and for being with me as I wrote, cried, smiled, shouted, dreamed, talked, and wrote some more. I firmly believe that no dissertation is written alone, and you, my love, are testament to that belief.

To Michelle, my chair, thank you for guiding, encouraging, and standing with me as I tried to make sense of this project. Thank you for your words—they became my mantras as I navigated this journey. Thank you, especially, for that moment during my comprehensive exams defense when you so clearly and succinctly stated what would become this project's primary research question. To Susan and Dr. Wooten, thank you for supporting me as the rest of what I believe is not just a dissertation committee but an academic triumvirate—a collective of female scholars from whom I consider myself truly fortunate to learn. Your support, both on and off the pages of this dissertation, led me to this point and, more important, guided me through this journey.

To my colleagues, thank you for listening, for guiding, and for leaning in when I needed it. Anna, thank you for being my writing center person, the kindness that kept me in check, the scholar who gave my thoughts back to me, but better. Courtney, thank you for sharing your journey with me and for listening to me as I tried to make sense of my own. Beth, thank you for being there as I typed the final words of my first full draft and for being my synergy life raft when I needed it most—you helped me see the move from Standard English to Synergistic English Work. Roni, thank you for always saying just what I need to hear.

To my family, thank you for listening to and supporting me as I ranted in excitement as well as anger about my writing. To my mothers—my mother-in-law-mom, and my mom—thank you for your questions, your interest, and your love. You kept my passion going and my heart beating when I wasn't sure I could feel either anymore. To my dad, thank you for your intellect, your passion for education and for asking questions. To Matt, Emily, and Joe, you're my siblings, but you're also my support, the tough and soft

love I need and want. And no, you don't have to call me doctor. Although I still might ask you to (at least once. Please).

Stephanie, my professor-turned-mentor-turned-best friend, you know this pain, this joy, this journey. Thank you for journeying with me, for teaching me the power, stretch, and strength of language, and for being you. I can't and don't want to imagine my life, or this world, without you.

This project would not exist without the instructors I interviewed, who gave me their time, their passion, their reflections, and their words. Thank you for trusting me and for giving so much.

Finally, this project would not exist without the teachers and students I met at Mount Carmel School in Saipan, Northern Marianas Islands, who taught me, I'm sure, far more than I taught them. Dr. G.—thank you for listening to and guiding me through all of my (many) learning moments. Ms. Bobbi, you are kind and wise and I thank you for teaching me. Francis, you light up Mt. Carmel, and the students you coach are lucky to have you. Leanni, what can I say? You are a friend, a colleague, and a confidante—thank you for being there for me from the start. Amanda, Akemi, Criselda, Rebekah, JC, John, John B., Priscilla, Rosiky, Toby, Vir, and all the faculty—you inspire me and I'm so glad to have met you. Thank you for being part of my Standard English workshop—you deconstructed SE right with me, and you inspired this project.

To my Saipan students, I can't name all of you because there are just over a hundred of you, but I owe so much to you. I gave you all I had, and you gave that back a hundredfold (plus some more). These words are for you in the hopes that I can teach with kindness, with respect, with empathy, with grace, with knowing, and with passion, the same way you taught you me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	x
List of Abbreviations	xi
Abstract	xii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
From Grappling to Gaps to Synergy	1
Standard, Myth, Paradox	4
(Re)Working Definition	6
Historicizing an Invisible Paradox	10
Overt Codification	11
From Overt to Covert	12
Operationalizing Control	14
Hidden Paradox	18
Irony and Invisibility	20
Language as a Local Practice	22
Exigence & Argument.....	25
From Research Gaps to Research Goals.....	27
From SE to SEW	29
On Justice & Equity	31
Chapter Outline	33
Final Words	36
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	38
Introduction: Debate, Dilemma, Dearth	38
Students' Rights & Standard English.....	42
SE: A Dilemma.....	45
Translingualism	48
Antiracist Writing Assessment.....	51
Fairness, Justice, Antiracist Writing Assessment	52
Antiracist Writing Assessment, Translingualism, and SE.....	56

Rubrics & SE: The Final Gap	61
Respect, Reject, Uphold Expect, Promote, Uphold.....	64
Beyond Dichotomy	66
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS & METHODOLOGY	68
Introduction	68
Laying the Methodological Ground	70
Methodology & Positionality	74
Methods	81
Participants & Site	84
Funding.....	88
Interviews & Notes	88
Data Analysis & Coding	92
Coding	94
Drafting.....	98
CHAPTER FOUR: NAVIGATIONS & NEGOTIATIONS	100
Introduction	100
Profile 1: Erin	104
Profile 2: Cynthia	111
Profile 3: Michael.....	117
Profile 4: L. Baldwin	123
Profile 5: Sophia.....	129
Profile 6: Susan	135
Persist Resist.....	143
Synergies	147
From SE to SEW	149
CHAPTER FIVE: INVISIBLE VALUE	150
Introduction	150
Erin: Highly Visible, Most Persistence, Low Resistance.....	154
Cynthia: Somewhat Visible, Some Persistence, High Resistance	160
Michael: Barely Visible, Little Persistence, Unconscious Resistance	167
L. Baldwin: Somewhat Visible, High Persistence, Some Resistance	173
Sophia: Least Visible, Least Persistence, Most Resistance	180

Susan: Subtle Visibility, Some Persistence, High Resistance	189
Invisible Value: Visibility Persistence Resistance	197
Attention, Potential, Value	200
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION	202
From SE to SEW	202
Opportunity: Faculty, Rubrics, Assessment.....	206
Need: Policy, Field, Synergy.....	210
SEW-ing	215
Appendix A: RECRUITMENT EMAIL.....	219
Appendix B: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS	221
WORKS CITED	227

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1 Instructors' Backgrounds	86
Table 2 Erin's Perspective on Standard English	106
Table 3 Erin's Grading Negotiations	110
Table 4 Cynthia's Perspective on Standard English	114
Table 5 Cynthia's Grading Negotiations	116
Table 6 Michael's Perspective on Standard English.....	119
Table 7 Michael's Grading Negotiations	122
Table 8 L. Baldwin's Perspective on Standard English.....	125
Table 9 L. Baldwin's Grading Negotiations	128
Table 10 Sophia's Perspective on Standard English.....	131
Table 11 Sophia's Grading Negotiations	134
Table 12 Susan's Perspective on Standard English	138
Table 13 Susan's Grading Negotiations	142
Table 14 Erin's Perspective and Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error	155
Table 15 Erin's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language.....	158
Table 16 Cynthia's Perspective & Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error	162
Table 17 Cynthia's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language	165
Table 18 Michael's Perspective & Relationship between his Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error	169
Table 19 Michael's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language	171
Table 20 L. Baldwin's Perspective & Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error	175
Table 21 L. Baldwin's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language.....	178
Table 22 Sophia's Perspective & Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error	182
Table 23 Sophia's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language	186
Table 24 Susan's Perspective & Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error	192
Table 25 Susan's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language	195

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Erin’s sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI... ..	156
Figure 2 Cynthia’s sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI	164
Figure 3 Michael’s sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI	171
Figure 4 L. Baldwin’s sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI	177
Figure 5 Sophia’s sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI	185
Figure 6 Susan’s sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI.....	194

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Synergistic English Work	SEW
Standard English	SE
Standard American English	SAE
Standard edited American English.....	SEAE
Standard Academic English	SAE
Standard Written American English	SWAE
Standardized Edited American English	SEAE
White Mainstream English	WME
Discourse-based interview	DBI
Conference on College Composition and Communication	CCCC
First-year composition	FYC
English for academic purposes	EAP
Writing Across the Curriculum.....	WAC
Writing Program Administrator	WPA
Students' Right to Their Own Language	SRTOL

ABSTRACT

FROM STANDARD ENGLISH TO SYNERGISTIC ENGLISH WORK: UNCOVERING WRITING INSTRUCTORS' NEGOTIATIONS OF THE STANDARD ENGLISH DILEMMA AND PARADOX IN THEIR WRITING ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

Sarah Johnson, PhD

George Mason University, 2021

Dissertation Director: Dr. Michelle LaFrance

In response to the extensive work surrounding Standard English (SE), translingualism, and antiracist writing assessment in the field of writing studies, this study shifts the focus from theoretical calls about combatting SE to an empirical understanding of how SE is already being negotiated and navigated by writing instructors in the context of their writing assessment practices. Taking language scholar Alastair Pennycook's view of language as a local practice and an activity intimately connected to speakers, places, and ideologies, this study was conducted via two sets of semi-structured interviews with six writing instructors in a large composition program at a large public research university in the US in order to uncover their definitions, understandings, and negotiations of the SE paradox and dilemma in their writing assessment practices. Writing instructors' unique and complex negotiations of this SE dilemma, including expectations surrounding SE,

revealed the ways they resisted, re-made, and challenged SE as well as the ways SE nonetheless persisted in primarily invisible ways in their rubrics. These findings also revealed the antiracist and translingual approaches to SE and language instruction that instructors extended and engaged in both tacitly and explicitly, revealing the already existing synergy between those approaches. Instructors' engagement with translingual/antiracist scholarship also marked a need for that scholarship to more explicitly deal with the material concerns and constraints many of these instructors raised surrounding their work with international students as well as the connections between rubrics, SE, and grading.

Based on these findings, I advocate for, reveal, and perform a shift from Standard English (SE) to Synergistic English Work (SEW), which means making a paradigmatic shift informed by the synergy between not only theory and praxis but also between theoretical and empirical work. In advocating for and performing a shift from SE to SEW, I am not advocating for a new pedagogy, praxis, or theory but rather building on the theoretical work that has been done surrounding SE in writing studies and weaving that work together with the empirical work this study has done. The acronym SEW works as an extended metaphor for this work since I am, in fact, SEW-ing these translingual and antiracist threads together with the translingual and antiracist work these six writing instructors are already doing to navigate and negotiate this SE dilemma. The nature and practice of this SEW-ing is a means of remaking, a call to action, and a synergistic push to bring all of this SE-related work together so that writing instructors, scholars, and administrators might move from SE-ing to SEW-ing.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

“[W]riting programs and writing program administrators (WPAs) are caught in a dilemma... We want to honor (and if possible, preserve) students’ home languages and cultures, but we are expected to teach them ‘Standard Academic English’” (122).

Susan K. Miller-Cochran, “Language Diversity and the Responsibility of the WPA”

“Against the common argument that students must learn ‘the standards’ to meet demands by the dominant, a translingual approach recognizes that, to survive and thrive as active writers, students must understand how such demands are contingent and negotiable” (305).

Horner et al, “Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach”

“We **DEMAND** that...teachers STOP telling Black students that they have to ‘learn standard English to be successful because that’s just the way it is in the real world.’ No, that’s not just the way it is; that’s anti-Black linguistic racism... Will using White Mainstream English prevent Black students from being judged and treated unfairly based solely on the color of their skin? Make it make sense.”

2020 CCCC Special Committee on Composing a CCCC Statement on Anti-Black Racism and Black Linguistic Justice, Or, Why We Cain’t Breathe! “This Ain’t Another Statement! This is a Demand for Black Linguistic Justice!”

“I mostly feel pressure when I’m working with international students, because I’m really trying to figure out how to balance my ideological stance on this whole issue [Standard English] with the sort of practical expectations that they have, and the sort of demands of the culture of [their] program.”

Sophia, director of writing program for multilingual writers, Interview #1

From Grappling to Gaps to Synergy

I begin this dissertation with four epigraphs because this project is one of synergy, of bringing conversations from scholars grappling with Standard English together with the grappling the six writing instructors in this study were doing with Standard English (SE). As the title of this dissertation as well as Miller-Cochran reveal, that grappling is

more specifically centered on the dilemma writing instructors, programs, and administrators face between teaching SE while trying to honor and respect students' home languages. Further explaining this point, writing studies scholar Kate Mangelsdorf states that due to the widespread belief of a standard written language, "writing professionals generally feel obliged to go along with this notion because of the assumption that so-called standard language can help students succeed in the mainstream culture" (113).

As the next two epigraphs further reveal, scholars in the field of writing studies have grappled with this SE dilemma in conversations centered on translanguaging and antiracist writing assessment, both of which offer approaches that seek to combat, challenge, and dismantle SE, albeit in slightly different ways. That is, while Horner et al state that a translanguaging approach recognizes the need for students to understand the contingent nature of SE, the CCCC Special Committee's antiracist approach demands that instructors stop teaching SE as a tool for success when Black students will be judged based on how they look and sound before they can be understood. The CCCC Committee also demands that instructors and researchers recognize that SE is false and entrenched in white supremacist notions that perpetuate anti-Black linguistic racism.

While these approaches offer instructors different ways of challenging the dominant, socially constructed term Standard English, thereby potentially addressing the SE dilemma, this scholarship has not yet empirically uncovered how writing instructors are actually dealing with, negotiating, and navigating this SE dilemma. This dissertation steps into that empirical gap, examining the ways six writing instructors, all with

experience teaching multilingual students at a diverse university, negotiated that SE dilemma in their courses and assessment practices. In putting conversations surrounding translanguaging and antiracist writing assessment together, this dissertation also steps into a more invisible gap, one left by the ways these conversations have happened alongside each other but whose similar yet different approaches to combatting SE have not been explicitly examined and synthesized. In stepping into these gaps, this dissertation synergizes the grappling writing studies scholars as well as the six instructors in this study have done with the SE dilemma in order to identify, advocate for, and perform a shift from Standard English (SE) to what I call Synergistic English Work (SEW).

Synergizing Sophia's articulation of the conflict and pressure she feels between her ideological stance on SE and her international students' expectations with translanguaging and antiracist approaches to the SE dilemma marks one example of SEW that happens in this dissertation and, more specifically, in Chapter Four. This chapter, however, marks the beginning of this shift from SE to SEW, examining, first, the entrenchment of SE outside of and then within writing studies. I then offer a working definition of SE produced through the synthesis and thus synergy of instructors' reflections on SE paired with scholars' definitions of SE, revealing SE as a paradox. As I argue, synergizing the history of SE with a brief history of SE in writing studies not only marks SE as an invisible paradox but also reveals the more visible terms SE operates around, through, and with. Next, I outline this project's theoretical framework followed by a preview of this dissertation's ultimate argument. Finally, I conclude this chapter by sketching a brief outline of this dissertation's remaining chapters.

Standard, Myth, Paradox

To say that SE is complicated hardly captures the features that comprise its messy, troubled complexity. The mere existence of SE has been debated, as exemplified in the title of linguists Tony Bex and Richard J. Watts' book *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. Look up the words Standard English or standard in most dictionaries (as I have many times), and some version of descriptors like variety, correct, acceptable, educated, generally considered, and spoken and written will appear. Synthesizing these definitions reveals a valuation of SE as the correct, unchanging, superior form of English both for speaking and for writing. As numerous scholars in writing studies and sociolinguistics have pointed out, however, this valuation of SE marks an ideologically based reality. In other words, as writing studies scholar A. Suresh Canagarajah explains in *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*, this means that the values and assumptions (ideologies) people hold “shape what counts as language, grammatical, and meaningful” so that mobile semiotic resources “get organized (one might say arbitrarily) into fixed grammars and languages,” thus explaining “the reality of notions such as standard language, language purity, and grammatical systems” (29).

Taking this point further, sociolinguist Rosina Lippi-Green likens defining standard American English (SAE) to describing a unicorn (57), identifying SAE as a “mythical beast” and adapting the practice of using “an asterisk to mark utterances which are judged grammatically inauthentic” (62) when discussing *SAE. Put more precisely, and in terms reiterated by a number of writing studies scholars (Horner and Trimbur; Horner; Matsuda; Greenfield; Canagarajah, “Theorizing Translingual Practice”; Davila,

“Indexicality and ‘Standard’”; Baker-Bell, *Linguistic Justice*), she calls *SAE a myth because it is perpetuated through standard language ideology:

The myth of a standard language persists because it is carefully tended and propagated, with huge, almost universal success, so that language, the most fundamental of human socialization tools, becomes a commodity. This is the core of an ideology of standardization which empowers certain individuals and institutions to make these decisions and impose them on others (61).

Marking SE or *SAE as a myth is a means of visibilizing its ideological nature and thus calling attention to the ways individuals and institutions in power decide what and whose language gets counted as correct, acceptable, and educated. Those notions of correctness are also embedded in notions of whiteness and white supremacy that further explain the entrenchment of this SE myth.

In this project, I take up that SE myth by offering below a (re)working definition of SE in which I synergize the ways instructors from this study defined SE with the ways scholars in writing studies and sociolinguistics have defined and examined SE. This synergized definition marks the first contribution of this study and project by establishing SE not just as a myth but also as a paradox that reveals an extra layer of complication these instructors were dealing with as they navigated this SE dilemma. In the rest of this chapter, I build on this (re)working definition by uncovering the overt and covert entrenchment of this SE paradox outside of and then within writing studies. In re-making SE in this chapter, I establish SE as a local practice, a term whose meaning, shape, and

use is tied to and dependent on instructors, administrators, and scholars and their local, material realities.

(Re)Working Definition

SE is subject to definitional and terminological change. As term assistant professor Cynthia put it in her first interview, SE is the thing you need the terms to define, but there is no perfect definition, so everyone defines it differently. Local writing program director L. Baldwin, in her first interview, also said that the definition of SE has gotten wider or not as standard. This variability is reflected in writing studies scholarship as well—since Students’ Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) was published in 1974, a number of scholars have used a number of terms to refer to and re-name SE. First, in SRTOL it was referred to as Edited American English (EAE), edited written English (EWE), and “standard English”. Then, in 2011 Laura Greenfield relabeled Standard English as standardized Englishes; in 2012 Peter Elbow called it Edited Written English (EWE); in 2014 Asao Inoue identified it as Standardized Edited American Academic English (SEAAE) and in 2015 as Standard Edited American English (SEAE); in 2016 Bethany Davila also used the term SEAE while Jerry Won Lee called it Standard Edited English (SEE); and in 2020 April Baker-Bell referred to SE as White Mainstream English (WME). This variability in naming alone points to the inherently changing and evolutionary nature of SE.

SE is slick and grammatically contingent. As adjunct professor Michael said in his first interview, SE depends on for whom (or who) it is correct. Pairing Michael’s ironic positioning of SE with Asao Inoue’s remark in his article “Theorizing Failure in

US Writing Assessments” that SE is a slick eel reveals the one consistency surrounding SE: inconsistency. In his book *American English: An Introduction*, linguist Zoltan Kövecses remarks that, although the standard can be defined in a number of ways, each definition depends on “what the preferred language habits of people are who happen to be in a position to define it” (84). Thus, while the meaning of SE is subject to change, it is also important to recognize that these meanings occur through locally and socially enacted prescriptions. In other words, the correctness of SE is contingent.

SE is an invisibly constructed, arbitrary qualifier perpetuated by, through, and as privileged white discourse. In their first interviews, term assistant professor Susan and term associate professor Sophia both identified SE as a problematic term while explaining that there is no Standard English. As Susan put it, what we consider standard American English is the language spoken by a particular class of people, which ties to race and socioeconomic status. Taking this point further, Sophia identified SE as an arbitrary standard that has been perpetuated through “systemic racist institutionalized structures.” Laura Greenfield and April Baker-Bell, prominent voices in the field of writing studies’ critiques of Standard English, echo both Sophia’s and Susan’s points in their identifications of SE as privileged white discourse. In her 2011 chapter “The ‘Standard English’ Fairy Tale,” Greenfield puts it this way:

‘Standard English’ is not a quantifiable dialect with a finite set of rules and features; in contrast, I argue, ‘Standard English’ is a qualifier ascribed to many ways of speaking (and, by extension, though differently, writing) by privileged

white people or, perhaps more accurately, any variety of English that has not been associated historically with resistance by communities of color (43).

In other words, the beliefs and ideologies of privileged white people determine what counts as Standard English, thereby setting up a “hypothetical ideal for all people which, for people of color, can never in reality be attained” (Greenfield 57-58). In her 2020 book *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy*, Baker-Bell takes this identification a step further and uses the term White Mainstream English (WME) “in place of standard English to emphasize how white ways of speaking become the invisible—or better—inaudible norm” (3). Taken together, these voices problematize SE as an arbitrary, hypothetical ideal perpetuated and fueled in invisible ways through privileged white discourse.

Finally, SE is thus a paradox, complicating the dilemma writing instructors in this study faced between promoting and resisting even further. To make this final point, some definitions—taken critically—are needed. Nearly halfway through the range of definitions listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, a paradox is defined as a “proposition or statement that is (taken to be) actually self-contradictory, absurd, or intrinsically unreasonable.” Although I recognize the irony in using a dictionary definition to identify and problematize SE (when I am problematizing definitions of SE that come from those dictionaries), I do not take this definition uncritically. I recognize, as Lippi-Green does, the embedded layers of authority in it; as she explains, there is “nothing objective” about the practice of choosing, for example, the order and inclusion of pronunciations in these dictionaries as it is the “ordering of social groups in terms of

who has authority to determine how language is best used” (58). Thus, I use this definition of a paradox as a starting point for the final quality comprising what this study takes as a working definition of SE, namely, that SE is a paradox further complicating the dilemma instructors already face between promoting or resisting SE in the context of their writing assessment practices.

Identifying SE as a paradox makes its self-contradictory nature visible while at the same time problematizing the presumptions of normalcy, correctness, and privilege often embedded in dictionary-based definitions of it. In its extensive list of definitions for the word “standard,” the *OED Online* defines a standard as that which is “applied to that variety of a spoken or written language of a country or other linguistic area which is generally considered the most correct and acceptable form, as Standard English, Standard American, etc.” In other words, SE can be understood as an example of what is considered the most correct and acceptable version of English, whether written or spoken. While most of the instructors in the first set of interviews from this study recognized the ways in which SE is understood as a linguistic norm, similar to the way SE is normalized in the definition above, they all problematized that norm. Sophia and Susan, as I noted above, both stated that there is no such thing as Standard English because, as Sophia explained, people unconsciously believe and subscribe to it, not taking into account linguistic reality, like that there is no standard but rather that it is a standardized version of English and was constructed. Furthering this point, Lippi-Green describes five linguistic facts of life that directly contradict the idea of a singular, definable standard of language. Of these facts, the first is that all “language changes over time, in all linguistic

subsystems: sounds (phonetics, phonology); the structure of words (morphology, lexicon), the way sentences are put together (syntax), and meaning (semantics)” (Lippi-Green 7). Herein lies the paradox: SE is defined as the most correct and acceptable norm of English, but that definition directly contradicts the very nature of language.

The word standard itself also reveals this contradiction in its connotations of certainty. In its list of definitions for standard, *OED Online* offers the following: “An authoritative or recognized exemplar of correctness, perfection, or some definite degree of any quality.” If language is constantly changing, however, how can a singular, definable standard of the English language exist? The words Standard English, then, not only reveal a paradox but also are themselves a paradox. While this paradox is a problem (by virtue of it being a paradox), this study does not and cannot solve this problem; rather, this project seeks to make that paradox visible and reveal the extra layer of complication that paradox adds for instructors navigating this SE dilemma. As I describe the history of SE in the next section, I synergize this (re)working definition with that history in order to show how SE operates as an invisible paradox, becoming entrenched through ideological notions of correctness, citizenship, power, control, and error. This synergy also reveals the many terms SE operates with, through, and around, from American to written, correct to error, and grammar to punctuation.

Historicizing an Invisible Paradox

The propagation of this SE paradox means that there are, first, two misconceptions surrounding SE: that “there is a uniform standard English that has been reduced to a set of consistent rules” and that these “‘correct,’ consistent rules should be

followed by all American English speakers” (Ball and Muhammad 77). As Lippi-Green adds, these “rules” are anything but consistent or uniform; describing SE is, in her words, like describing a unicorn because “the concept of a unicorn is part of our shared cultural heritage” (57). Despite these points, the SE paradox continues to exist today, perpetuated by public education (Zoltan); dictionaries and characters on popular television shows (Lippi-Green); manuals of usage (Hickey); handbooks (Bex and Watts); and the general public (Milroy).

Overt Codification

The roots of this paradox can be traced as far back as the fifteenth century, although the term itself did not become operational until the nineteenth century. As Shondel J. Nero explains, efforts to standardize the English language, including its use and structure, “are by no means novel” (143) and began in the late fifteenth century with the invention of the printing press, a point in the SE timeline that other scholars and researchers recognize (Lippi-Green) but also identify more broadly, stemming from, for example, the “need for widespread communication in written form” (Milroy 37). From this point, another milestone occurred: the creation of Samuel Johnson’s Dictionary of the English Language in 1755 and the publication of Webster’s American Dictionary in the United States (Nero; Lippi-Green; Hickey). What these texts did was overtly codify (Hickey) both norms and a means of standardization for English, although the term Standard English was not actually used until 1836, listed in the *OED Online* as coming from John Murray in *The Quarterly Review*. Paired with the operationalization of the term SE, these dictionaries, then, “provided a space for explaining the language in terms

of rules and exceptions” (Nero 143) that saw SE as the “variety associated with power, prestige, and education” (Nero 143).

From Overt to Covert

The codification of the English language in the US, paired with the operationalization of the term SE, then created a cycle of commodification in which SE became, and remains, the most correct form of English. As Lippi-Green explains, linguistic commodification is what “empowers certain individuals and institutions to make these decisions and impose them on others” (Lippi-Green 61). In other words, commodifying language creates control, and that control is enacted through these dictionaries and the operationalization of the term SE. Dictionaries, in particular, enact that control quietly and invisibly through presumed and thus embedded notions of authority. As Lippi-Green explains, the dictionary

is regarded as the highest authority in matters of language. Few people ever stop to ask how it is that the dictionary has taken—or has been given—such absolute authority. For the most part, individuals feel entitled to make pronouncements about language and to base those assertions on dictionaries or vague, never defined authorities (16-17).

Those who edit and produce dictionaries, like Noah Webster in the eighteenth century (Hickey), not only have a presumed authority (since it remains unquestioned) but also continue to commodify the English language in the form of Standard English. SE is then sold—literally and figuratively—as the best, most correct form of English by its proponents—dictionaries and non-linguists (Lippi-Green)—alike. This commodification

of SE, however, occurs invisibly: these dictionaries are not called “Standard English” dictionaries but rather, simply, English dictionaries.

These assumptions of obvious correctness are, in addition, a form of prescriptivism that overrules its rejection of linguistic evidence by connecting meaning with correctness and good citizenship. As Tony Bex and Richard J. Watts explain in the introduction to their edited collection *Standard English: The Widening Debate*, notions of correctness in handbooks often align with prescriptivism. Prescriptivists, they explain,

Tend to start from the premise that there are certain forms which are correct because they best express the meanings intended. These forms represent the best English and are therefore to be encouraged. Generally, prescriptivists blur the distinction between syntax, meaning and social identity. So, syntactic (i.e. formal) deviation from the ‘correct’ usage leads to imprecision of meaning which, in turn, leads to social chaos. Prescriptivists, therefore, represent an ideological force which equates language use with social behaviour and correct usage with good citizenship. The extent to which they may be regarded as promulgators of standard forms is an open question, but they undoubtedly contribute to the debate over the existence of ‘Standard English’ in that they equate their notions of correctness with the standard language (7).

What this means is that prescriptive works, like dictionaries and manuals, further “serve to engender a consciousness of the standard as a variety above what was found in vernacular speech and that this variety was logical, consistent and essentially correct” (Hickey 11). This elevation of SE as logical, consistent, and correct imbues SE with

power; in this cycle of commodification, perpetuating SE becomes intertwined and saturated with notions of power, meaning, and good citizenship.

Operationalizing Control

The elevation and propagation of SE as correct, logical, and consistent are even further strengthened by the English Only movement. As Zoltan Kövecses explains, English is not, nor has it ever been, the official language of the United States; the English Only movement was created to change that fact. In 1983, he states,

an organization called ‘US English’ was established under the leadership of the linguist Senator Hayakawa to make English the official language in the United States. The U.S. Constitution does not state that English is the official language of the country. This causes fear among members of the group. They are concerned that languages other than English (e.g., Spanish) might overtake the role of English as the virtual official language in some areas. The pressure group has been relatively successful. As a result of their efforts, English was made the official language in several states (85).

In other words, this English Only movement is fueled by fear and linguistic insecurity. Putting it more directly, Kövecses states that this kind of movement is one centered on control and conformity; as he explains, “there have been very conscious attempts in the United States to change the language habits of people who do not conform to the norm of standard as envisioned by the powerful ‘language’ experts of the white middle class” (85). SE becomes not only a form of good citizenship in this cycle of commodification but also a form of control that itself is fueled by fear and insecurity in, again, invisible

ways (since the word “standard” is missing from the English Only movement) but also unfair, discriminatory ways since, as Greenfield points out, that ideal becomes a hypothetical that can never in reality be attained for people of color.

These desires for control and conformity, however, occur despite the inherently multilingual nature of American English. As Richard Bailey explains in his chapter “American English: Its History and Origins,” American colonies were incredibly multilingual, and there was no way to know which words would endure (like *moccasin*) and which would not (like *mangummenauk* (an edible acorn)) (2). What happened with language, then—and what happens with language now—is change; as he explains, “many new American English expressions emerged at the very center of speaking” (2). These words were selected to name new things, adapted from Amerindian languages at their source, and applied or combined from old words. What happens with different categories, like mixed language and *lingua franca*, he explains, is an attempt to “make sense of what is quite normal: variety. We all speak ‘English’ but no two of us speak it in the same way” (2). Despite the inherent multilingualism of American English, however, movements like English Only continue because of fear and because, after WWI, multilingualism became “unpatriotic” (Bailey 1). If SE is a form of good citizenship, then that citizenship becomes a denial of and means of control over American English’s inherent multilingualism.

The word grammar in particular both concretizes and operationalizes this control, acting in conjunction with terms like correct and correctness but in more visible ways than Standard English itself. As Lippi-Green explains, approaching grammar in an error-

driven way stems from socially constructed grammar, which “is what your parents or teachers were targeting when they corrected your language use” (12). The rules violated in this understanding of grammar are not linguistic in nature but rather stem from “socially constructed concepts of proper English and good language” (13). For example, Lippi-Green states, if “Susie loudly announces ‘I gotta pee’ during religious services, or if she says ‘I ain’t got none,’ when she is asked about pets, some adult nearby may correct her, as you were possibly corrected (so long as the first language you acquired was English)” (12). Correcting these “grammar” issues becomes important not only because they are seen as deviations from what is “grammatically correct” but also because they reveal social markers. What is proper, correct, educated language is not linguistic but rather socially constructed by the very nature of deeming that language proper, correct, and educated. Using and practicing grammar in this way then becomes a means of perpetuating SE while not having to use the term SE itself.

In conjunction with socially constructed grammar, SE operates through other terms and concepts, like written, American, error, and mistake. Retired English professor Phillip J. Skerry, for example, published a book in 2019 titled *The Rules of the Game: A Guide to Writing in Standard English* that represents an ideological approach to English and grammar. Explaining the exigence for this book, he claims that in teaching what he calls Standard Written American English (SWAE), “we never bother to explain what this is and why we require students to use it. Consequently, the major goal of this book is to introduce SWAE not only to students but to the general public as well in the hope that

knowing the rules can help one to win the game!” (x).¹ In acknowledging that his goal is to introduce SWAE to students and the general public, however, he contradicts the very goal of his book by claiming, simultaneously, that professional writers do occasionally break the rules of SWAE and that there “is no ‘official’ rulebook for SWAE” (4). If there is no official rulebook for SWAE, then how can Skerry make the claim that professional writers break the rules of SWAE? Although Skerry’s book appears to be an attempt to offer that rulebook for SWAE, his goals are directly undercut by Lippi-Green’s claim that, while message content is judged differently, “every native speaker produces utterances which are by definition grammatical” (13). Skerry’s book, however, conflates grammaticality with effectiveness, thereby eliding the significant ways language is judged in very social, powerful, and rhetorical ways and further concretizing the connection between grammar and SE.

In conjunction with these elisions, Skerry uses a number of words that reveal additional terms around which SE operates. For example, his use of the words “written” and “American” in SWAE reveals additional terms that can operate in conjunction with SE. Furthermore, his use of the word mistake in his book’s preface—that is, when he points out “This is a mistake that my remedial English students make” (ix)—reveals the connection between a word like mistake and SE. In addition, he directly connects the

¹ While I do not address this final exclamatory statement Skerry makes here, I do want to acknowledge its problematic assumptions and, ultimately, elisions of race and class. As Lippi-Green explains, speakers will be judged not on the “basis of language itself, but with the social circumstances and identities attached to that language” (335). Skerry makes little, if any, room for the social contexts surrounding language and discrimination; instead, he assumes that if one can “master” SWAE, then one can “win” the game. As Lippi-Green reminds us, though, judgments of language are made based on how people sound and look. Language subordination is the game, and Skerry’s book is proof of that game.

word error with SE when, for example, he notes “I’ve proofread my text in order not to make common errors in SWAE” (108). Finally, his chapter titles contain a number of “grammatical” terms, like clause patterns, pronouns, punctuation, and subjects and verbs, that perpetuate the connection between SE and grammar but with more specific terms. These terms are also not only indicative of a prescriptivist approach to English grammar but also representative of an ideological approach to language. For example, punctuation, as Lippi-Green explains, “is irrelevant to the kind of work sociolinguists do, and has nothing to do with grammaticality. And yet, arguments about punctuation and the written word rage on” (16). In other words, Skerry’s inclusion of punctuation as a part of SE (or SWAE) represents a conflation of punctuation with meaning and an ideological approach to English writing and grammar.

In short, and in synthesizing this history of SE with the working definition of it, SE can operate in conjunction with a number of terms, depending on how those terms are used. Those terms include: Edited, proofread, written, American, academic, grammar, error, correct, and mistake, as well as more specific terms like clause patterns, pronouns, punctuation, and subjects and verbs. When prescriptive, ideological approaches are taken, these terms can further perpetuate the existence and entrenchment of SE in the US as well as in classrooms.

Hidden Paradox

In short, the SE paradox exists in complicated, embedded, and invisible ways, perpetuated through a prescriptive ideology centered on fossilizing language change. As it is positioned within this study, however, this paradox is also a slick and grammatically

contingent qualifier that is perpetuated through privileged white discourse. SE itself is also subject to change, whether via its terminology or its definition. Taking this history of SE—its ties with good citizenship, with power, and with control—with this study’s positioning of SE reveals, I argue, that the history of SE is the history of not just a complicated, ideologically-charged paradox but also a hidden paradox. In other words, the history of SE is the history of a hidden paradox, one that is embedded, perpetuated, and commodified in ways that mark its significant entrenchment among English users. This history also reveals the terms and concepts used to operationalize SE, such as power, citizenship, correctness, and error.

In writing studies, the history of SE has a similarly tacit, paradoxical quality. In examining the inevitability of college-level writing instruction in English, Bruce Horner and John Trimbur unpack the ways in which the history and cultural logic of a “tacit language policy of unidirectional monolingualism” (595) have remained largely unexamined in writing studies and continue to influence the field in powerful ways. While the assumptions embedded in this tacit policy are also unsurprisingly reflected in arguments for English Only² legislation, what is more troubling, they argue, is that these assumptions are also “prevalent in arguments *against* English Only and *for* the interests of beginning college writing students” (597). Proponents of English Only, Horner and Trimbur explain, overlap in their assumptions of language as a fixed entity and a

²To be clear, English is not, nor has it ever been, the official language of the United States (Horner and Trimbur; Nunberg; Zoltan). Second, as Horner and Trimbur put it, “English Only legislation has arisen as a response to immigration in the U.S., and much of the support for English Only has been fueled by xenophobia” (608).

“monolingual, reified English as the norm” (617) as well as their deemphasis of the costs and benefits “associated with pursuit of an actively bi- or multilingual policy” (618).

In addition, as Bruce Horner and John Trimbur and later Paul Kei Matsuda have shown, SE is seen as the norm, which then perpetuates its mythical existence. These scholars have all examined and critiqued writing studies’ “tacit policy of unidirectional monolingualism” (Matsuda 81) that privileges SE as the dominant variety of English. In addition, as Matsuda argues, U.S. composition’s³ inability to recognize second language writers and issues of language difference stems from the “myth of linguistic homogeneity—the tacit and widespread acceptance of the dominant image of composition students as native speakers of a privileged variety of English” (82). This myth of linguistic homogeneity is what has allowed SE to exist quietly in writing studies—SE is seen as the norm, and it is assumed that students are native speakers—and writers—of it.

Irony and Invisibility

Synthesizing this tacit norm with pronouncements of SE outside of writing studies reveals both the irony and invisibility of its entrenchment. While some of these segments of society outside of the field, like dictionaries and their editors, establish linguistic standards in ostensibly factual ways, other segments, as Lippi-Green and Hickey explain, are more outspoken about those standards and the corresponding maintenance of

³ While I do not mean to create slippage between composition and writing studies, I want to recognize the terms that scholars in writing studies use to refer to this field. In the next chapter, I contextualize my choice to use writing studies within the field’s ethos of debate.

correctness in not only writing but also—and more often—in speech.⁴ With speech, for example, pronouncements such as “Don’t end your sentences in a preposition” (Hickey 22) are common. When pairing the existence of SE in writing studies with its existence in other segments of society, an ironic picture, I argue, begins to emerge. While different segments of society make written and spoken pronouncements about SE, in places of writing instruction, SE continues to exist quietly via the embedded myth of linguistic homogeneity. Put another way, in the place where writing is discussed, examined, and taught, SE is perhaps the most quiet; ironically, it is in places where this instruction does not ostensibly take place that pronouncements of SE are loudest.

In addition, the existence and entrenchment of the SE paradox is invisible: in pronouncements focused on correcting speech, like the one above, for example, the words Standard English are absent because those pronouncements are based on attitudes, beliefs, and feelings (in other words, ideologies) about what the English language should look and sound like. The term error can also be used as a means of marking deviations from SE or, put differently, as a way of marking the use of multiple Englishes (Kynard). As Chris M. Anson argues, “we must begin to see teacher response to error in the context of what is—and what is thought to be—the existing ‘code’ of language rules and norms of correctness” (11). This is not to say, however, that error is and always should be connected with SE; rather, the point I am making in contextualizing error within the ideology and paradox of SE is that error can be connected to SE depending on how it is

⁴ Though I acknowledge the differences (as well as the relationship) between speech and writing, the focus of this dissertation prevents a fuller examination of those differences.

used and practiced. In addition, because correctness has come to be associated with SE but operates in more visible ways than SE, that notion as well as the term error serve to operationalize SE in ways that allow it to move and exist invisibly. In short, while the term SE is not always explicitly visible in corrections of speech, the English Only movement, or the writing classroom, its ideology is present and its paradox is practiced.

Language as a Local Practice

I have adopted language scholar Alastair Pennycook's view of language as a local practice as this project's theoretical framework because it not only makes room for the entrenchment and practice of the SE paradox but also potentializes SE as a site of study. In addition, as I will explain, this sociolinguistic framework has influenced nearly every aspect of writing this dissertation and has made the argument of this project—that is, advocating for a shift from SE to SEW—possible.

As Pennycook explains in his book *Language as a Local Practice*, we will not be able to understand language and what it means “unless we can grasp the locatedness of those languages and their speakers, the ways in which language use is part of everyday activity and the meanings given to those activities” (6). In addition, he explains, the ways that languages are defined, described, and taught “have major effects on people” and so “we need to appreciate that language cannot be dealt with separately from speakers, histories, cultures, places, ideologies” (6). In other words, language is a local practice that is intimately connected to the everyday activities and work of its speakers. What this means is that, as Pennycook puts it, “languages are a product of the deeply social and cultural activities in which people engage” (1). Language, then, is derived from action—

adding practice to our understanding of language shows, Pennycook explains, how our language use stems from our interpretation of a place as well as how those language practices reinforce that interpretation. Whether we are standing and singing, annotating a text, or offering instruction in a classroom, he says, “we remake the language, and the space in which this happens” (2).

These points—that language cannot be dealt with separately from speakers and ideologies and that in our practice we remake language every time we do it—are both realized in this study. The (re)working definition of SE in this chapter is an example of SE being remade from the ways the six instructors in this study remade it in their interviews. Examining SE as a social and raciolinguistic ideology—as I do in this chapter and the next—builds on Pennycook’s point that language cannot be dealt with separate from its ideologies, histories, and speakers. Finally, the synergistic work of this dissertation—the work that is happening right now, in fact—is language derived from action and language that then seeks to spur on action.

Language practice, however, is not quite the same as language use—it is important to make this distinction because, as Pennycook explains, “language is a product of social action, not a tool to be used” (8). Language practices also “prefigure activities, so it is the ways in which language practices are moulded by social, cultural, discursive and historical precedents and concurrent contexts that become central to any understanding of language” (9). In other words, language is a “product of the embodied social practices that bring it about” (9). Language is what occurs when speakers—embodied actors—enact it through social practices. Investigating language practice, then,

means investigating “the doing of language as social activity” (9). The focus when uncovering language practice is on language as doing rather than language as using. In addition, this focus reverses what Pennycook explains has been privileged in language studies, which is an emphasis on “language structure over social activity” (9). Language as practice means that language structures come from repeated activity rather than those activities coming from structures. Put another way still, repeated activities create language structures rather than structures creating activities. This emphasis on activity as doing rather than using both justifies and orients this study’s focus not on the issues surrounding SE but rather on the writing instructors who negotiate, navigate, and understand SE in their writing assessment practices. In short, this framework makes space for the complications of SE as a local language practice.

Language as practice, as a product of repeated activity, also makes the variations of SE I referenced earlier in the (re)working definition a product of their repeated utterances. First, in their variety, these terms enable metalinguistic reflection on themselves—Standard English, as one term, reflected on itself, creates questions of language about language. What does it mean, for example, for a term like Standard English not only to exist but also to be written and defined? What kind of language is used to write about Standard English? What’s more, what does it mean when Standard English takes on its own forms of linguistic variety in the terms used to describe and name it? If Standard English takes on different names and forms, how do these forms affect meaning? Is it possible to define or understand Standard English if it is understood in a variety of ways?

As Pennycook explains, viewing language as practice may “open up for consideration a way of thinking about language that has far more space for people, for diversity, for other modes of language use, for desire and action” (10). In an ironic linguistic move, this variation of terms and forms for SE may actually point to the linguistic reality of language, which is that it changes and varies all the time (Lippi-Green). As Pennycook states, when we do language, we remake it and the space in which it happens. When scholars do SE, they remake it and the space in which it happens—in this case, when it is read—every time they do SE, every time they write SE. When I asked instructors about how they understood and negotiated SE in their assessment practices, they remade SE. In this chapter, SE is remade through synergistic work that then reveals SE as a hidden paradox fueled by ideology, by correctness, and by error. In this dissertation, I reveal, advocate for, and perform a shift from SE to SEW, offering a theory-praxis synergy that complicates the SE dilemma while at the same time offering a way through this dilemma that has not been articulated before.

Exigence & Argument

This study builds on two gaps and one dilemma. That dilemma, as stated earlier, is the pressure writing instructors face between teaching SE and trying to honor and value their students’ languages. That is, even though SE may be a creation, an ideologically-based myth and paradox, instructors and scholars who strive to resist SE, Bethany Davila explains, “often feel conflicted because of the strong possibility that other classes and

contexts will expect mastery of this dialect,” feeling “compelled to demand SEAE⁵ for that very reason” (“Indexicality and ‘Standard,’” 181). What’s more, if English is still the “communicative ether” (Brown 600) of the writing classroom, and if SE continues to be both resisted (Greenfield; Mangelsdorf; CCCC, “This Ain’t Another Statement!”) and promoted by scholars themselves (Delpit; Wheeler and Thomas; Smith) or by instructors (Skerry), students (Lu; Gevers), and external contexts (see Hickey; Zoltan; Bex and Watts; Milroy; Johnson and VanBrackle; and Lippi-Green), instructors face a significant dilemma between promoting or resisting SE the context of their assessment practices. As Susan Miller-Cochran and Shondel J. Nero each put it in their chapters in the edited collection *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, writing programs, administrators, and instructors are caught between trying to validate and respect students’ languages while being expected to teach them Standard English.

Although these scholars do not explicitly identify assessment as the context in which this conflict surrounding SE takes place, that is precisely the context and dilemma this dissertation study takes up. A number of writing studies scholars have examined SE, recognizing it as both reality (Johnson and VanBrackle) and racist pedagogy (Greenfield); identifying it as a gatekeeper (Bizzell, “Cognition, Convention, and Certainty,” “The Intellectual Works”; Fox; Canagarajah, *Translingual Practice, Critical Academic Writing*; Courts); linking it to the field’s monolingual paradigm (Lee; Horner and Trimbur; Canagarajah, “Place of World Englishes”); and calling it out as part of the

⁵ Davila refers to Standard English as “standard” edited American English (181), using quotations to question the standardness of SE and adding additional terms to emphasize its written, constructed, and contextual nature.

myth of linguistic homogeneity in first-year composition (FYC) (Matsuda). SE has also been the focus of research investigating perceptions of language varieties, particularly undergraduates' views of dialects unlike their own (Karstadt) and writing instructors' views of non-standard dialects (Davila, "The Inevitability of 'Standard'"; Ochsner and Fowler) and the myth of SE (Bacon).

In addition, scholarship on translingual approaches to language instruction and SE (Canagarajah, *Translingual Practice*; Cushman; Donahue; Gallagher and Noonan; Horner et al; Inoue, "Writing Assessment as the Conditions") and on antiracist writing assessment practices (Ball; Brannon and Knoblauch; Poe et al; Davila) and pedagogies (Banks et al; Huot; Inoue, *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies*; Anson) have offered instructors approaches for potentially dealing with this SE dilemma. Despite this work, few, if any, studies have been conducted to empirically uncover and unpack the dilemma surrounding SE writing instructors face in the context of their assessment practices. As I explain in Chapter Two, the tension, debate, and dilemma between promoting and resisting SE has been articulated; uncovering how instructors are navigating that dilemma as well as providing more empirically-based support for that work has not. In addition, scholars' translingual and antiracist approaches to this SE dilemma have not been clearly synthesized and have also not been analyzed alongside the ways writing instructors are actually dealing with and negotiating the SE dilemma.

From Research Gaps to Research Goals

Taking Pennycook's view of language as a local practice and an activity intimately connected to speakers, places, and ideologies, I conducted this study to

examine how Standard English is defined, understood, and negotiated by writing instructors in a large composition program at a large public research university in the United States. Drawing on a feminist understanding of qualitative interviewing, this study used semi-structured concept clarification and discourse-based interviews to uncover six writing instructors' definitions, understandings, and negotiations of SE in their writing assessment practices.

In uncovering these negotiations and navigations, I sought to make the tacit about SE explicit or, recalling the way Asao Inoue metaphorized SE in his article "Theorizing Failure in US Writing Assessments," I wanted to see if I could uncover and even capture what was going on with the "slick eel" (335) of SE in these six writing instructors' assessment practices, understood in this study as the acts, texts, and practices surrounding grading. In making the tacit explicit, I am also building on what Chris M. Anson et al found in their article "Big Rubrics and Weird Genres" that examined their work with faculty and rubrics: "faculty within academic disciplines act on often tacit knowledge about what makes student writing successful in their courses and curricula" (10). By asking instructors about the role of SE in their rubrics and grading practices, I sought to make the tacit about SE explicit. Put more precisely, I used the following questions to guide my inquiry: In what ways does Standard English traffic in a particular writing program among writing instructors assessing student writing? How do these instructors use, understand, define, and negotiate SE in the context and practice of writing assessment in their courses? What do instructors' rhetorical choices surrounding SE, grammar, correctness, and language in their rubrics reveal? Finally, how might these

movements, definitions, uses, and choices surrounding SE speak back to the field of writing studies' translingual and antiracist approaches to SE and language instruction?

From SE to SEW

In asking these questions, I found that, while these instructors re-made SE, resisted and challenged SE, and articulated a number of dilemmas, struggles, or disconnects related to SE, for some instructors, SE also persisted in their courses and rubrics in both visible and invisible ways. I also found that these instructors took up antiracist and translingual approaches to SE and language instruction in tacit and explicit ways that revealed the already existing synergy between those approaches as well as the need for those approaches to more explicitly deal with and take up the material concerns and constraints many of these instructors raised surrounding their work with international students and their programs as well as the faculty who would be teaching those students.

Based on these findings, I argue, advocate for, reveal, and perform a shift from Standard English (SE) to Synergistic English Work (SEW). First, I argue that these findings reveal an opportunity to more visibly and explicitly synergize translingual and antiracist approaches to better reflect the ways these six instructors are already tacitly and explicitly taking up and extending these approaches together. These findings also reveal, I argue, the need for these synergized approaches to take up the material concerns and constraints many of these instructors raised surrounding their work with international students. Finally, I argue that these findings reveal the synergistic work that can still be done surrounding rubrics and the grammar-related language on those rubrics in order to challenge and deconstruct SE using translingual and antiracist approaches. In making

these arguments, I am advocating for and performing a shift from SE to SEW by calling attention to the already existing synergies between translingual/antiracist approaches and these six writing instructors' translingual/antiracist navigations, negotiations, and approaches to the SE dilemma; by advocating for more synergistic work between translingual and antiracist approaches to SE and language instruction; and by performing the beginning of that synergistic work in these chapters.

Moving from SE to SEW means making a paradigmatic shift informed by the synergy between not only theory and praxis but also between theoretical and empirical work. That is, in advocating for and performing a shift from SE to SEW, I am not advocating for a new pedagogy, praxis, or theory. Instead, I am building on the theoretical work that has been done surrounding SE in writing studies and weaving that work together with the empirical work this study has done. The acronym SEW works as an extended metaphor for this work since I am, in fact, SEW-ing these translingual and antiracist threads together with the translingual and antiracist work these six writing instructors are already doing to navigate and negotiate this SE dilemma.

The nature and practice of this SEW-ing is a means of remaking, a call to action, and a synergistic push to bring all of this SE-related work together so that writing instructors, scholars, and administrators might move from SE-ing to SEW-ing and begin to push their way forward through this SE dilemma together, through a number of many steps taken in a number of place and spaces. SEW-ing is about collaboration, about taking small steps in classrooms, in policies, in research, about staying in the complicated, in the grey space of this SE dilemma. SEW-ing means there is not one

simple answer to this dilemma but that there are many places and spaces to start somewhere in actually dealing with this dilemma and sustaining that difficult, messy, but necessary work.

On Justice & Equity

In attempting to keep the focus on these six writing instructors' negotiations of this SE paradox and dilemma in their writing assessment practices, this study nonetheless touches on a number of issues currently comprising larger conversations in the field of writing studies surrounding translingualism, anti-racist writing assessment praxis and theory, and increasing calls for linguistic justice and equity. These conversations are the broader context surrounding this study and, while I examine them more closely in Chapter Two, I identify them here in order to frame this study as one contribution to these conversations' calls for linguistic justice and equity. In particular, this study follows Rosina Lippi-Green's orientation toward achieving social and linguistic justice; as she puts it, in order to achieve these larger aims, a "realistic goal must be a much smaller one: to make people aware of the process of language subordination" (334). This study touches on that goal by advocating for and performing a shift from SE to SEW so that writing instructors, scholars, and administrators might generate more support for writing instructors' negotiations of language subordination (as one part of the SE dilemma), although meeting that goal alone does not make this project a linguistic justice one. Instead, I situate this study as one that touches on, contributes to, and complicates calls for linguistic justice and equity in the field of writing studies. In doing so, I advocate for bringing translingual and antiracist approaches together to create a theoretical and

empirical synergy that can help support writing instructors' navigations and negotiations of the SE dilemma so that those instructors can then support, uplift, value, and navigate their students' language goals.

To be clear, the justice this project aims for and touches on is within the context of writing assessment, understood as the acts, texts, and practices surrounding grading. More broadly, I understand assessment as “the judgments we make about student writing ability, the form these judgments can take, and the context within which these judgments are made” (Huot 7). For this study, I narrow the broad swath of assessment practices to the act of grading as well as the use of a rubric or grading tool, which Bob Broad problematized nearly two decades ago in his book *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing*. As he puts it, before we, the field, “make a knowledge claim (for example, Here is how writing is valued in our program) that carries with it serious consequences for students, faculty, and society, we need to conduct the best inquiry we can” (3). Broad identifies rubrics as part of this problem because they “make substantial knowledge claims based on inadequate research” (3) and therefore “prevent us from telling the truth about what we believe, what we teach, and what we value in composition courses and programs” (2). I take this problematization of rubrics as a starting point of inquiry for this study. How is it, for example, that rubrics make substantial knowledge claims? What kind of knowledge claim might rubrics make about SE? More specific to the purposes of this study, I ask: What do instructors' rubrics reveal about SE? In addition, what might instructors' negotiations and navigations of SE reveal?

In asking these questions, I sought to uncover how instructors navigated SE in their rubrics as well as how they negotiated, resisted, or promoted SE in those texts.

Finally, I am also building on a point Jerry Won Lee raises in his 2016 article “Beyond Translingual Writing” in which he focuses on the ways research on writing assessment has not lived up its promise of a translingual approach because it still promotes a monolingual ideal in its assumption of SE as the standard. Although I reveal in Chapter Two the ways the antiracist writing assessment movement has provided an answer to this assumption (and has worked to challenge it directly), I take a point Lee makes at the beginning of his article as motivation for this study’s context of assessment. As he puts it, “teaching standardized English is not solely an either/or proposition, but the assessment of student writing often puts us in a position where we must make such decisions” (page 175). Because grading—as one form of assessment—is a material condition that many, if not all, writing instructors must deal with in some way, I have focused on grading as well as rubrics as the context for this SE dilemma instructors face. In addition, as Lee points out, the assessment of student often puts instructors in a position where they feel they must make an either/or decision between teaching SE or upholding and valuing their students’ languages. Taking that point, this study directly examined how instructors dealt with and navigated that decision.

Chapter Outline

Ultimately, this study shifts the focus from theoretical calls about combatting SE to an empirical understanding of how SE is already being negotiated and navigated in order to better understand that dilemma, uncover its complexities, and offer empirically-

grounded steps forward for writing instructors and administrators. In this Introduction, I have briefly articulated this study's empirical entry into the field of writing studies, outlining the methods, framework, and goals of this project. I also historicized and examined the SE paradox, synergizing that history with this project's (re)working definition of SE.

Chapter Two continues the work of this Introduction by reviewing and examining the extensive work surrounding SE and linguistic equity scholars have contributed to the field of writing studies. In this literature review, I argue that there are three issues that remain both despite and due to the expansive and growing amount of scholarship surrounding SE, the theory and praxis of linguistic equity, and antiracist writing assessment practices. In examining these issues, I ultimately argue that writing instructors face a dilemma that has been clearly articulated but not yet empirically uncovered.

Building on Peter Smagorinsky's call for repositioning the methods section as the "conceptual epicenter" of research in writing studies (390), Chapter Three outlines the context, methods, and epistemological points of entry to this study. As I explain, this study's focus on uncovering the ways writing instructors identified, negotiated, and navigated the dilemma between resisting and promoting SE in their assessment practices at a large, public university led me to use qualitative interviewing as my method and a feminist line of inquiry grounded in a sociolinguistic epistemology as my methodology. While Chapters One and Two both examined the paradox and dilemma surrounding SE more closely and established the justification for this study's empirical examination of SE, this chapter extends that justification by explaining in detail the processes and

methodological underpinnings involved in doing this study. In this chapter, I aim to show readers how I “did” my analysis in order to come to my study’s findings and argument as a contribution to the field of writing studies. In other words, I create epistemological transparency.

Chapters Four and Five present and analyze the interview and document data that focuses on uncovering writing instructors’ understandings and negotiations of SE in their writing assessment practices. Chapter Four examines the first set of concept clarification interviews, uncovering the unique ways this study’s six writing instructors identified, navigated, and negotiated the SE paradox and dilemma. Chapter Five then examines the ways instructors dealt with SE in their rubrics by analyzing instructors’ reflections in their second interview, the discourse-based interview (DBI). In these chapters, I synergize translingual and antiracist scholarship with these instructors’ navigations and negotiations of the SE paradox and dilemma, revealing the ways they resisted, re-made, and challenged SE as well as the ways SE nonetheless persisted in primarily invisible ways in their rubrics. I also show the ways these instructors engaged with and extended antiracist and translingual approaches to SE and language instruction both tacitly and explicitly, revealing the already existing synergy between those approaches. Finally, I argue that instructors’ engagement with translingual/antiracist scholarship also marks a need for that scholarship to more explicitly deal with the material concerns and constraints many of these instructors raised surrounding their work with international students as well as the connections between rubrics, SE, and grading.

Chapter Six, the conclusion, is part-argument, part-call to the field of writing studies about this SE paradox and dilemma facing writing instructors and their assessment practices. In this final chapter, I advocate for, reveal, and perform a shift from Standard English (SE) to Synergistic English Work (SEW), which means making a paradigmatic shift informed by the synergy between not only theory and praxis but also between theoretical and empirical work. In short, I argue that the nature and practice of this SEW-ing is a means of remaking, a call to action, and a synergistic push to bring all of this SE-related work together so that writing instructors, scholars, and administrators might move from SE-ing to SEW-ing.

Final Words

The sheer linguistic difficulty of understanding, defining, and grasping SE and its complicated history is precisely what makes it such a rich term for exploration in my field of study. As Tony Bex and Richard J. Watts put it in their co-edited book *Standard English: The Widening Debate*, the contradiction created by different orthographical (that is, spelling) uses of Standard English is “inevitable since if there were no disagreement there would be no debate” (9). I enter this study directly into this debate—in choosing to orthographically represent the term in this debate both as Standard English and SE; in choosing to metaphorize SE as *mortuus et vivus*; in choosing to re-frame SE as a linguistic practice; in choosing to enumerate the issues with existing representations of SE; and in choosing to examine and trace this complicated, ideologically-charged paradox, I identify SE as a paradoxical concept in need of further investigation from the perspectives of writing instructors who must navigate and negotiate its paradoxicality in

their writing assessment practices. In short, I begin the work I advocate for, that is, a shift from SE to SEW.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

“[I]nstructors and scholars who want to resist SEAE [‘standard’ edited American English] and its gatekeeping function often feel conflicted because of the strong possibility that other classes and contexts will expect mastery of this dialect. Indeed, many instructors feel compelled to demand SEAE for that very reason” (181).

Bethany Davila, “Indexicality and ‘Standard’ Edited American English: Examining the Link Between Conceptions of Standardness and Perceived Authorial Identity”

Introduction: Debate, Dilemma, Dearth

Framing the ways writing instructors in this study navigated and negotiated promoting or resisting Standard English as a dilemma echoes not only the language writing studies scholars have used to examine SE but also, more broadly, the language of the field. Framing topics through the lens of dilemma or debate is a move intrinsic to the field (see Deborah H. Holstein’s “From the Editor”) as even its name⁶ and definition have been contested and debated (Brown). The word debate (or dilemma) itself has also been used in a number of published articles, often featured in their titles, to describe and examine the various issues facing scholars, researchers, instructors, and students in the field (House and House; Roemer et al). This notion of debate is so intrinsic to the field that metaphors like “trap” (Horner, “Traditions and Professionalization” 367), “obstacles” (Tardy 635) “turf wars” (Berkenkotter 152), “battle lines” (Wheeler and Thomas 365), “plot” (Adler-Kassner 322), and “waves” (Swearingen 239) have been

⁶ In recognition of this debate, I have used the term writing studies in this dissertation as a way to refer to the field, taking my cue from Michelle LaFrance and Melissa Nicolas (who also echo Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle), because it reflects and points to the broad reaches of the work done in the field and, I would add, the understanding of writing as both action and product. I occasionally use terms like composition and compositionists when paraphrasing other scholars, writers, and thinkers whose voices I want to maintain and also echo.

used. These metaphors have been operating for decades, evident in moves like using the abbreviation *vs.* in article titles as far back as 1956 (Tuttle) to, more recently, examining the dilemma the phrase “academic bullshit” presents compositionists with (Eubanks and Schaeffer 374). These strands of debate have also taken numerous forms and included a range of topics, from debates between scholars (like Peter Elbow and David Bartholomae—see “‘Response’ (to Elbow)” and “‘Response’ (to Bartholomae)”) to arguments surrounding the field’s value in the context of larger debates about the value of higher education (Bollig).

The dilemma instructors face between resisting or promoting SE in their courses has also taken a number of forms, from the status of language in composition and whether academic discourse can be taught (Lancaster “Do Academics Really Write”) to the struggle for students’ language rights (Smitherman), rooted in the seminal Students’ Right to Their Own Language resolution published by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in 1974. Davila summarizes this dilemma pointedly above, revealing the conflict writing instructors feel between resisting SE and teaching SE due to their concerns that other contexts might require mastery of SE. It is this dilemma—between promoting or resisting SE—that has permeated the field for decades, so much so that in 2020 scholars Asao Inoue and Erec Smith held a dialogue about this dilemma, offering their perspectives on a range of concepts and issues, from language and identity, empowerment and pedagogy, to grading and teacher responsibility. In offering these perspectives, these scholars revealed the many layers underpinning this dilemma as well as the approaches they take to SE in their classrooms,

with Inoue taking a structuralist approach that focuses on changing the system in which students have been linguistically disempowered by SE and Smith taking a pragmatist approach that seeks to empower students by teaching them SE.

These approaches to this SE dilemma that Inoue and Smith discussed are a sort of microcosm of two larger conversations in the field surrounding translingualism and antiracist writing assessment. A translingual approach to language instruction, for example, offers opportunities for directly confronting SE in the writing classroom, such as deconstructing SE with students (Canagarajah, “Clarifying the Relationship”) or having students determine the portion of their grade that comes from grammar or standardized language (Lee). Focusing on antiracist writing assessment practices, however, Inoue advocates for labor-based grading contracts as an approach that assesses students on their efforts rather than their writing products since he argues that using SE as the only standard to judge student writing against is not only unfair but also racist (*Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies*). Inoue’s antiracist assessment focus thus offers an approach around SE that recognizes the racism embedded in using SE while Canagarajah’s and Lee’s translingual approach offers more direct ways of confronting and dealing with SE not only in the classroom but also in assessment practices, although this approach does not fully grapple with issues of race and class.

In this literature review, I examine not only the origins of the dilemma between resisting and promoting SE but also the field’s conversations surrounding translingualism and antiracist writing assessment in order to make the following three-part argument. First, despite the work scholars have done, from SRTOL to the recent CCCC’s Demand,

the dilemma between promoting or resisting SE continues to exist because of the ideological entrenchment of SE, whereby instructors feel pressure from other contexts and classes that may expect mastery of SE. Second, while there are a number of critiques of SE as well as an emerging number of approaches to combatting SE, there is a dearth of empirical research not only on how writing instructors are navigating and negotiating this dilemma (that is, how they are dealing with this norm) but also on how they are doing so within the context of their writing assessment practices—including their rubrics. Finally, in examining the translingual turn and antiracist writing assessment movement and their approaches to SE, I both reveal how these approaches complement, extend, and diverge from each other and also advocate for the possibility of putting these larger movements in closer conversation with each other. That is, I reveal that while this scholarship offers opportunities for instructors to combat and resist SE in their courses, it has yet to examine how they might already be doing so, particularly when the myth of SE continues to persist.

As I explain in the conclusion of this review, this project not only uncovers how instructors are navigating this dilemma but also, in doing so, advocates for uncovering the potential nexus of translingual and antiracist writing assessment approaches to SE. Taking Christine Pearson Casanave's warning about the false dichotomization of a dilemma like promoting or resisting SE that, as she puts it, gives "novice teachers in particular the message that they should make either-or decisions in their teaching" (1), I situate this project as one that not only examines this dilemma but also moves beyond and complicates it, revealing a synergistic shift from SE to SEW.

In this literature review, I make the above three-part argument by examining scholars' critiques of SE as well as the positioning of SE within existing conversations on students' language rights, translingualism, and fair and antiracist writing assessment practices. Using SRTOL as a touchstone, I establish the dilemma surrounding students' language rights and academic discourse, revealing the approaches, frameworks, and focuses scholars have used to contribute to and also complicate that dilemma. I then briefly examine the translingual turn and its approaches to confronting SE, after which I focus on tracing the antiracist writing assessment movement and its approaches to SE. Finally, I briefly examine the ways translingual and antiracist assessment approaches to SE complement and extend each other in ways that this project then takes up in later chapters. Ultimately, I make the case that, both despite and through the expansive and growing amount of scholarship surrounding SE, translingualism, and antiracist writing assessment practices, writing instructors face a dilemma that has been clearly articulated but not yet empirically uncovered.

Students' Rights & Standard English

While Standard English has played a number of roles and functions in debates centered on teaching academic discourse while valuing students' language rights, STROL played a significant role in not only galvanizing those conversations but also establishing a clear stance on rejecting the myth of a standard American dialect while arguing for writing instructors' need to respect students' language varieties. Although the resolution itself is one paragraph, the 1974 special issue of *College Composition and Communication* containing that paragraph also included over twenty pages of background

information that qualified CCCC's position and rationale for the resolution, all of which was written by the Committee on CCCC Language Statement. Comprised of thirteen writers, researchers, and scholars (including Melvin A. Butler, Chairman, Adam Casmier, Ninfa Flores, Jenefer Giannasi, Myrna Harrison, Robert F. Hogan, Richard Lloyd-Jones, Richard A. Long, Elizabeth Martin, Elisabeth McPherson, Nancy S. Prichard, Geneva Smitherman, and W. Ross Winterowd) the Committee produced the following:

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.

In these six sentences, the Committee affirmed, strongly, students' right to their own varieties of language while placing the onus on instructors to respect and uphold that right.

Contextualizing and historicizing this resolution, Geneva Smitherman, member of that SRTOL Committee and Chair of the thirteen-member Language Policy Committee (LPC) that in 2006 updated the annotated bibliography that was part of SRTOL, explains

in her chapter “The Historical Struggle for Language Rights in CCCC” that SRTOL was responding to a developing crisis in First Year Writing (FYC) classrooms. As she explains, this crisis meant students from the margins “did not have command of the grammar and conventions of academic discourse/’standardized English’” but yet did have a number of communicative strengths (19). In responding to that crisis, Smitherman explains, the resolution and its background

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 (20).

As Chair of the 2006 LPC, Smitherman also recognized that, while the work of that resolution and its creators has “borne fruit,” the language struggle nonetheless continues in, for example, the standardized English-only mandate of educational policies like “No Child Left Behind.” Indeed, while a number of writing studies scholars have continued to promote and value SRTOL in various ways (Mangelsdorf; Bruch and Marback; Kinloch), from devoting an entire book to better understand its richness (Wible) to positioning it as a threshold concept (Brown), Laura Greenfield points out that its rejection of a standard American dialect is “almost summarily overlooked by its contemporary readers and proponents” (47). Adding to this problem, as Kate Mangelsdorf explains in her chapter “Spanglish as Alternative Discourse: Working against Language Demarcation,” is that attempts to acknowledge and promote students’

languages in the writing classroom have been less than successful (114). In other words, while SRTOL has accomplished a great deal, both inspiring pedagogies and pioneering the field's work toward respecting students' linguistic diversity, concerns surrounding Standard English and the actualization of this resolution in the writing classroom remain unresolved.

SE: A Dilemma

While SE as well as SRTOL have been examined, articulated, and critiqued in a number of ways, the relationship between SE and the goal of honoring, respecting, and validating students' home languages and cultures has been examined and characterized as a dilemma. In her chapter "Discourse Tensions, Englishes, and the Composition Classroom" from the edited collection *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, Shondel J. Nero explains that this relationship and, in particular, the debate surrounding hybrid language and alternative discourse "has been couched in terms of dilemmas, conflicting goals, or tensions" and that these tensions "have to do with how to validate students' vernaculars and teach them academic discourse at the same time" (142). In her chapter from that same collection, Susan K. Miller-Cochran echoes and adds to Nero's explanation by stating that writing programs and writing program administrators (WPAs) are caught in what she also calls a dilemma between wanting to honor students' languages while being expected to teach them SE (212). This language echoes not only the way I positioned the conflict between promoting and resisting SE as a dilemma in Chapter One but also the language of instructors in this study and the ways they articulated and negotiated the pressures they experience surrounding grading (see Chapter

Four). Taking this identification further, Miller-Cochran also calls this dilemma a paradox that she believes is “a step on the way toward developing a better approach to teaching writing and structuring writing programs” by acknowledging it as such and “realizing that our classes are much more linguistically diverse spaces than we might have previously recognized” (212).

Taken together, these articulations not only reveal a slightly different approach to this SE dilemma but also point to the primary gap this study enters into. Though Miller-Cochran identifies the potential in identifying and acknowledging this dilemma/paradox, Mangelsdorf focuses on the danger of not challenging SE within that dilemma. As Mangelsdorf puts it:

Because the belief in a standard written language is so widespread, writing professionals generally feel obliged to go along with this notion because of the assumption that so-called standard language can help students succeed in the mainstream culture. But by not challenging the notion of a standard language, we are passing along a naïve and even damaging view of language to our students (113).

In other words, if writing professionals let SE, as widespread as beliefs in it are, go unchallenged, they risk passing a damaging, inaccurate view of language to their students. While I see Miller-Cochran focusing on the potential in acknowledging this dilemma/paradox between honoring students’ languages and teaching them SE, I see Mangelsdorf identifying an additional problem surrounding SE within this dilemma, which is the issue created by failing to challenge SE and thereby transferring inaccurate

and damaging views of language to students. Similar to the approaches to SE that Inoue and Smith revealed in their dialogue, these scholars' articulations of this SE dilemma reveal different approaches to discussing and thinking about that dilemma. What these approaches miss, however, is what is actually happening with instructors who are dealing with and negotiating this dilemma in their courses and assessment practices. That is, while it might be useful for instructors to reflect on the SE paradox or to challenge SE, I also argue for the value in asking: how they might be navigating that paradox already, particularly in their assessment practices? In addition, what might those navigations add to these conversations in the field about the SE dilemma/paradox? This project steps directly into those questions, uncovering how these instructors navigated this dilemma and advocating for the value of including instructors' unique, complicated grapplings with SE in current conversations in the field surrounding the SE dilemma and paradox.

This study also builds on the number of other ways scholars have approached examining this dilemma surrounding SE. In the field, this focus on SE has taken a variety of forms, from identifying SE as a myth (Horner and Trimbur; Horner; Matsuda; Greenfield; Canagarajah, "Theorizing Translingual Practice"; Davila, "Indexicality and 'Standard'"; Baker-Bell, *Linguistic Justice*) and gatekeeper (Bizzell, "Cognition, Convention, and Certainty," "The Intellectual Works"; Fox; Canagarajah, *Translingual Practice, Critical Academic Writing*; Courts) to linking it to the field's monolingual paradigm (Lee; Horner and Trimbur; Canagarajah, "Place of World Englishes") and calling it out as part of the myth of linguistic homogeneity in first-year composition (FYC) (Matsuda). In addition, SE has been critiqued both as contributing to a racist

pedagogy (Greenfield) and as a marker of racism when used as the single standard to judge all student writing against (Inoue, *Writing Assessment Ecologies*). Put more concisely, the ways scholars like Miller-Cochran, Mangelsdorf, Inoue, and Smith approach and frame the SE dilemma have been echoed and taken up in a number of ways by other scholars, from problematizing the identification of a dilemma (Casanave) to examining and criticizing the role of SE in writing studies pedagogy and history. Thus, while the dilemma surrounding SE has been clearly articulated and unpacked, it has not yet been empirically uncovered. This study, then, takes an empirical approach to that dilemma by uncovering how instructors are actually navigating and negotiating that dilemma in the context of their writing assessment practices.

Translingualism

This project also recognizes more broadly that these critiques, identifications, and articulations of SE have been occurring in a number of conversations in the field of writing studies, such as those centered on translingualism and antiracist writing assessment, that approach the SE myth in similar ways but have yet to fully converge. For example, A. Suresh Canagarajah, Bruce Horner, John Trimbur, Min-Zhan Lu, and Jacqueline Jones Royster have all advocated for a translingual orientation to language in writing programs and classes, leading to what some scholars have deemed the translingual turn in the field (see Jeroen Gevers' "Translingualism Revisited"). Horner et al.'s 2011 "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach" is often cited as a seminal document (Hall) that both establishes and advocates for a paradigmatic re-visioning of a translingual approach to writing instruction. In positioning their

translingual call as building “most obviously” (304) on SRTOL, Horner et al add “recognition that the formation and definition of languages and language varieties are fluid” (304) and advocate for preserving and utilizing language differences as resources. Confronting SE directly, they argue that notions of “‘Standard Written English’” as well as a “‘standard English speaker’” are in fact “bankrupt concepts” (305) because all English speakers employ and use a number of variations of English, each of which is subject to change, and because written norms are also subject to change and are “neither uniform nor fixed” (305). Put more directly, they claim that a translingual approach “directly addresses the gap between actual language practices and myths about language spread through” the textbook industry and pundits “in order to combat the political realities those myths perpetrate” (305). In other words, translingualism, as an approach to language and writing instruction, can be said to directly confront and resist the linguistic realities SE-centric myths continue to corroborate and uphold.

While this confrontation of SE-centric myths via a translingual approach creates potential ways for instructors to combat those myths in their classrooms, these conversations surrounding translingualism have yet to fully converge and deal with conversations surrounding assessment, even though both are centered on language and fairness. As Jeroen Gevers cautions in his 2018 article “Translingualism Revisited: Language Difference and Hybridity in L2 Writing,” L2 writing instructors adopting translingualism should do so critically in order to avoid valuing difference for the sake of difference. In addition, he claims: “it appears that translingualism still needs to grapple with the broader question of assessment and the role of standards and norms in granting

legitimacy to writing instruction more generally” (76). There are two conversation strands that Gevers identifies as connected to translingualism: those surrounding L2 writing instruction and those concerned with writing assessment, equity, and norms. These conversation strands have not yet fully converged with conversations surrounding translingualism, however, even though these conversations are all centered on language to some degree and also touch on SE or linguistic norms in some way. This project not only recognizes the potential alignment of these conversations in this chapter but also attempts to bring these conversations together through this study’s interviews of instructors with experience teaching multilingual and international students as well as its focus on their negotiations of SE in their assessment practices.

Considering the translingual turn more specifically, this project recognizes and builds on some of the work that turn has contributed to the field of writing studies. As Jonathan Hall puts it in his article “The Translingual Challenge: Boundary Work in Rhetoric & Composition, Second Language Writing, and WAC/WID,” translingualism is not

an either/or matter of choosing whether to follow or to defy the rules of a standardized language, but rather of finding strategies for situating oneself, as a writer, within the already shifting and already malleable repetitions and deviations that constitute the network of differences that form what we call language(s) or dialect(s) or variet(ies)—or subsets such as registers or disciplines (31).

In other words, translingualism is not about making either/or choices in regards to standardized language use but rather about seeing the ways language is always already

changing and then strategically situating oneself within those changes and differences. In some ways, the larger argument this project makes about SE as both...and is echoed in Hall's point, although the focus in this project is being placed more directly and acutely on uncovering instructors' understandings of SE as well as the potential that uncovering has for opening and expanding conversations in the field surrounding the SE dilemma and paradox. A translingual approach to language and writing instruction also aligns with this study's working definition of SE as being subject to change. As Horner et al put it, a translingual approach means recognizing the "variability of standards, which change over time, vary across genres, disciplines, and cultures, and are always subject to negotiation (and hence, change)" (311). In the same way, this project recognizes the contingent nature of SE while also making room for additional understandings of SE, critically attending to the ways some of those understandings potentially reify the mythical and paradoxical status of SE as a singular, correct, and superior form of language.

Antiracist Writing Assessment

In uncovering how instructors are navigating and negotiating this dilemma, this study's focus on writing assessment practices as the context of that dilemma attempts to put scholarship surrounding translingualism (and its focus on deconstructing and demystifying SE) into further conversation with the field's increasing movement toward antiracist writing assessment theory and praxis. Asao Inoue, in fact, has already argued that translingual conditions in the classroom can be created by cultivating a degree of fair conditions in writing assessments. As he explains in his article "Writing Assessment and the Conditions for Translingual Approaches: An Argument for Fairer Assessment," at the

heart of a translingual approach to language is a deep level of respect and faith that says to students “‘You use language differently than me. Let me listen to you because I respect and can learn from you so we can do our mutual work, then you’ll do the same with me. Let’s negotiate this work and the judgments of your writing together” (130). For Inoue, a translingual approach creates space for instructors and students not only to navigate language difference together but also to negotiate judgments of that language together.

This translingual approach to assessment is also very similar to the question Geneva Smitherman claims the right in SRTOL is asking, which is “Why not accept a paper with ‘nonstandard’ surface features of language if the message was clear and argument well-supported?” (23). While Smitherman’s question connects the context of grading to the goal of honoring and respecting students’ languages, Inoue’s article more explicitly connects writing assessment with a translingual orientation to language. In addition, both scholars touch on issues of respect, judgment, and acceptance, all of which reveal the ways these conversations about assessment and translingualism may already be in contact with each other. In order to reveal this potential nexus further, in this section I briefly examine the antiracist writing assessment movement and its evolution, after which I connect that movement more explicitly with the translingual turn. Finally, I examine the remaining gap this study enters into, which is the relationship between instructors, their rubrics, and SE.

Fairness, Justice, Antiracist Writing Assessment

Since SRTOL, the field has grappled with ways to carry out SRTOL’s call in designing and implementing fair, just, and equitable assessment practices. For example,

writing studies scholars have argued for more equitable assessment practices, like by focusing on what constitutes an error when assessing writing (Anson; Ball; Ferris) or what writing instructors actually assess (Brannon and Knoblauch) and value (Faigley) when they judge student texts. Numerous others, like Peter Elbow, have focused on assessment itself and argued against the value of grading. Other scholars have taken an explicitly social justice focus and examined writing assessment's colonialist legacy (Harms), elision of race in writing prompts and racist interpretation of students (Kynard), unintentional discrimination against black and Hispanic students (Poe et al), and current and future state in relation to its ability to advance social justice (Banks et al). Taken holistically, research on writing assessment is marked by the field's response to the increasing linguistic diversity⁷ of students and concern for the practice, consequences, and fairness of writing assessment, both of which itself can be traced back to SRTOL.

With the statements CCCCs has published since 2014, however, the field has been moving toward more explicit and visible calls not only for fair writing assessment practices but also Black Linguistic Justice. In 2014, CCCC reaffirmed their "Statement on Writing Assessment" and also published their "Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers." Both statements make recommendations for writing instructors to assess student texts in ways that respect students' linguistic variety and diversity and consider the rhetorically effective moments in student writing. In addition, the former statement explains that it is "crucial that assessment practices be guided by sound

⁷ In using this phrase, I am aware of its redundancy—as Laura Greenfield points out in her chapter "The 'Standard English' Fairy Tale", "the term *language diversity* is in itself a redundancy, for language is by nature diverse" (42).

principles to insure [sic]⁸ that they are valid, fair, and appropriate to the context and purpose for which they were designed.” Though not explicitly focused on assessment, CCCC’s recently published “This Ain’t Another Statement! This is a Demand for Black Linguistic Justice!” makes five explicit demands for instructors and researchers, from demands to center Black dispositions in teaching Black language to demands to stop using SE as the accepted communicative norm. As the Special Committee on Composing a CCCC Statement on Anti-Black Racism and Black Linguistic Justice, Or, Why We Cain’t Breathe! explain, this is a demand “for you to do much better in your own self-work that must challenge the multiple institutional structures of anti-Black racism you have used to shape language politics.” Taken with SRTOL, these statements and Demand put the onus on the field and its practitioners not only to create fair assessment practices that ensure writing instructors are assessing student texts in ways that respect students’ linguistic variety but also meet demands for Black Linguistic Justice.

There are also several key texts that have made more explicit connections between antiracism and writing assessment, all of which have been published in the last

⁸ I marked this word with [sic] to indicate that this is how that word appears in the original text of CCCC’s second language statement. However, I trouble that marking—should I have, in fact, added [sic] after the word insure? When I read that original line, I immediately thought that CCCCs may have meant to write ensure, which means to make sure that something happens, versus insure, which has a financial connotation; thus, for me, using [sic] marks insure as an error. In fact, according to Merriam Webster’s Usage Notes article “Showing Off Your [Sic] Moves,” [sic] “signals that a quote appears as originally found, *without edits* (emphasis mine).” As this article also points out, however, using [sic] comes with etiquette issues as some commentators “see it as a means of needlessly making a value judgment on someone else’s language habits.” My use of [sic] is a discursive enactment of my own value judgment on CCCC’s language, which is even more ironic considering that the sentence I quote makes explicit mention of fairness in its advice that assessment practices be guided by fair and valid principles. Perhaps more important is the very practice I enacted of using [sic]—for, taking language as a local practice, my use of [sic] has re-made [sic] and the space in which happens, which is, in part, this marginal, meta-linguistic reflection on that very discursive move.

six years. For example, in his 2015 book *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future*, Asao Inoue both argues for seeing writing assessments as antiracist projects, “which means they are ecological projects, ones about sustainability and fairness, about antiracist practices and effects” and offers a “usable theory of writing assessment that helps teachers design and implement writing assessments that are socially just for everyone” (4). Continuing this work, Inoue collaborated with Maya Poe and Norbert Elliot to publish the edited collection *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity* in 2018. As the authors explain, this collection seeks to answer how “we [can] ensure that writing assessment leads to the advancement of opportunity” (4) and covers a range of topics, from history to outcomes, as both editors and contributors “have worked hard to identify bigotry in its intentional and unwitting forms and chart a new future” as they “aim to get in the way of injustice” (5).

Adding to this work, the Council of Writing Program Administrators published a list of “Antiracist Initiatives” on their website in 2020, one of which is to revise their WPA Outcomes Statement to support antiracist pedagogy. More specifically, in their “Statement on Racial Injustice and Systemic Racism,” they stipulate that WPAs “have a responsibility to implement antiracist practices in their writing programs and actively work to dismantle structures of white privilege.” In addition, WPA-GO (Writing Program Administrators—Graduate Organization) published their “Statement on Anti-Racist Assessment” in 2020 that provides resources on antiracist assessment and pedagogy. Finally, April Baker-Bell’s recently published (2020) book *Linguistic Justice: Black*

Language, Literacy, Identify, and Pedagogy operates at the intersection of theory and praxis and calls for radically imagining and creating “a world free of anti-blackness” as well as creating “an education system where Black students, their language, their literacies, their culture, their creativity, their joy, their imagination, their brilliance, their freedom, their existence, their resistance MATTERS” (3).

Antiracist Writing Assessment, Translingualism, and SE

While all of these sources comprise what I understand as the field’s engagement with, move toward, and calls for antiracist writing assessment practices and pedagogies, I also see their engagement with SE creating a potential nexus with translingual approaches to SE. As I have briefly established, although both approaches stem from and respond to SRTOL, they converge more specifically in their goal to challenge SE. Within this antiracist writing assessment movement, for example, scholars have identified the role of SE in writing assessment as a white, hegemonic, and racist standard. WPA-GO’s “Statement on Anti-Racist Assessment,” for example, includes SE in their fourth point, stating that they advocate for “[c]ombating and making visible hegemonic writing standards and deficit language ideologies...that center White Standard English in academic writing.” Explicitly connecting SE with writing assessment, Asao Inoue explains that using SEAE (Standardized Edited American English) as the single standard to judge student writing against is not fair and is, in fact, racist because we “define ‘good’ writing in standard ways that have historically been informed by a white discourse, even though we are working from a premise that attempts fairness” (*Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies* 18). In addition, he explains, judging student writing against SEAE

is more problematic given that this judgment takes place with “populations of people who do not use that discourse on a daily basis—judging apples by the standards of oranges” (Inoue 6). What he advocates for, instead, is a focus on assessing students’ writing efforts rather than their written products by using labor-based contract grading.

When these antiracist articulations of SE are paired with translingual approaches to SE, I argue, they both converge and, as I eventually explain, diverge. While WPA-GO’s statement advocates for combatting writing standards and ideologies that center White Standard English in academic writing, Horner et al explain that a translingual approach “directly counters demands that writers must conform to fixed, uniform standards” (305). Canagarajah also adds that “what translingual pedagogies favor is deconstructing Standard English to make students aware that it is a social construct” (425). What these approaches have in common is their focus on confronting and combatting the SE myth, but where they complement each other is in the specificity of that focus. For example, while WPA-GO advocates for combatting SE-based ideologies, a translingual approach extends how that work might happen by countering demands and requests for SE as well as advocating for instructors to deconstruct SE with students in the classroom. In addition, while Inoue positions using SEAE (Standardized Edited American English) as the single standard to judge student writing against as unfair and racist and advocates for labor-based grading contracts, Jerry Won Lee concludes his translingualism article by suggesting instructors let students dictate the portion of their grade that comes from grammar/standardized language use or use reflective essays to assess students less on proficiency and more on development. While Inoue’s antiracist

approach both labels SE as unfair and re-focuses attention on labor rather than product, Lee's translingual approach provides an opportunity for dealing with SE and grading more directly.

This nexus, however, also reveals an important divergence surrounding the context of language difference. Introducing Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy that aims to dismantle Anti-Black Linguistic Racism, Baker-Bell argues in her *Linguistic Justice* book that

Telling children that White Mainstream English is needed for survival can no longer be the answer, especially as we are witnessing Black people being mishandled, discriminated against, and murdered while using White Mainstream English, and in some cases, before they even open their mouths (7).

Adding to her point, Nelson Flores and Jonathan Rosa reveal in their article "Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education" that the typically separated SE learners, long-term English learners, and heritage language learners "can be understood to inhabit a shared position as raciolinguistic Others" through the white listening subject (151). This means, they argue, that "the ideological construction and value of standardized language practices are anchored in what we term raciolinguistic ideologies that conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices" In other words, teaching SE as an additional objective, linguistic skill for students to learn is anchored in raciolinguistic ideologies wherein "language minoritized students" are expected to "model their linguistic practices after the white speaking subject despite the fact that the white

listening subject continues to perceive these students' language use in racialized ways" (151). As both Baker-Bell and Flores and Rosa make clear, teaching or promoting SE as a skill or means of survival neglects the ways in which standardized language is anchored in raciolinguistic ideologies wherein students will be judged based on how they look and sound long before their words may even be understood or heard.

When compared to a translingual approach to SE, these points intersect but also diverge in important ways. A translingual approach to language instruction, for example, favors deconstructing and confronting the SE myth, positioning SE as a construct that can be changed, un-made, and re-made (Hall), so that student writers can be empowered to make their own rhetorical choices. An antiracist approach, however, seeks to dismantle Anti-Black Linguistic Racism and would argue that teaching SE as an additive skill, or one that students could master to succeed, is no longer the answer because of the ways those students will be judged based on how they look and sound long before their words may even be understood. In other words, while these approaches intersect because they both confront and combat the SE myth, they diverge in both their methods of confrontation as well as the ultimate goal they seek to accomplish. That is, a translingual approach seeks to deconstruct the SE myth in order to empower students, but an antiracist approach seeks to stop treating and teaching SE as a linguistic norm and skill in order to change the system that disempowers students. Put differently still, a translingual approach says to students: language always changes, but you are all part of that changing and can be empowered. An antiracist approach says: let us change the system that

disempowers you, language minoritized students, so that you can have the same kinds of linguistic freedom and liberties given to white students.

In short, while the nexus of these approaches reveals the ways they complement and also extend each other, this intersection also reveals an important departure in the ways they see, approach, and use the concepts of change and empowerment in relation to SE. Putting this difference another way, Keith Gilyard points to the issue created with the “tendency to flatten language differences in some theorizing about translanguaging” (286). As he explains, while translanguagists make it clear that all language users differ from each other and “in relation to a perceived standard,” what gets elided is the “recognition that we don’t all differ from said standard in the same way” and that “not all translanguaging writers are stigmatized in the same manner” (286). As he argues, in order to appeal to the widest range of those who are invested in fighting problematic language instruction, like the “linguistics of white supremacy,” what translanguaging has to be sure to promote is “analyses of language, diversity, and power that steer clear of any formulation that might be interpreted as a sameness-of-difference model” (286). In other words, the departure I identified above points to the ways translanguaging potentially risks eliding issues of race and class in its approach to empowerment and confronting SE.

In conjunction with this nexus and what it reveals, this SE dilemma continues to exist for two reasons. First, the myth of SE continues to be perpetuated, not just by external contexts and handbooks (see Skerry) but also by students who request SE (Lu; Matsuda) and by some scholars, like Erec Smith, who advocates for a pragmatist approach in teaching students SE. Second, coupled with critiques of, resistance to, and

approaches surrounding SE in writing studies (not to mention sociolinguistic) scholarship, these requests and promotions of SE continue to create a dilemma for writing instructors in their courses and in their assessment practices. Thus, just as I revealed the ways the dilemma between resisting and promoting SE has been articulated in the previous section, I argue in this section that both the translingualism and antiracist writing assessment movements reveal criticisms and potential approaches to SE but have not yet examined what instructors are actually doing with SE in the context of their writing assessment practices. What these forms of resistance and persistence toward SE necessitate, I argue, is empirical attention to the ways instructors are actually navigating this dilemma in their courses and assessment practices. That is, while this scholarship offers opportunities for instructors to combat and resist SE in their courses, it has yet to examine how they might already be doing so, particularly when the myth of SE continues to persist.

Rubrics & SE: The Final Gap

A more particular gap this study fills is its examination of the relationship between instructors, their rubrics, and SE. As of the publication of this dissertation, little work, if any, has been done to examine how writing instructors are navigating and negotiating SE in their grading rubrics as part of their assessment practices. To be clear, this study is not promoting or critiquing the use or implementation of rubrics; those critiques and examinations have been made by a number of scholars, from arguing against the use of generic rubrics (Anson et al) to rethinking rubrics and exploring their potential to violate writing process complexities (Wilson). Problematizing rubrics further,

Inoue explains in his book *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies* that they “are usually designed to label and categorize student performances in uniform ways, which means they identify sameness, not surprise or difference” (69). In focusing on instructors’ rubrics and their rhetorical choices surrounding SE, however, this study aims to make the tacit about SE explicit by analyzing the discursive moves and rhetorical choices made in those texts. In other words, rather than problematizing rubrics, this study focuses on them in order to examine and uncover how instructors navigate this SE dilemma in those texts. These rubrics are an important site for making the tacit about SE explicit, especially since Anson et al identified the ways in which faculty they worked with acted on tacit knowledge about what “makes student writing successful in their courses and curricula” (10). This study builds on that finding by directly asking writing instructors about the role of SE as well as their rhetorical choices surrounding language, grammar, and correctness in their rubrics.

In addition to building on Anson et al’s findings, this study also recognizes and builds on the pressure surrounding instructors’ assessment practices. As Joseph Williams points out in his article “Phenomenology of Error,” those who are asked to decide on or judge language use will realize “that they have been invested with an institutional responsibility that will require them to judge usage by the standards they think they are supposed to uphold” (154). Although this article was published forty years ago, the responsibility and pressure that Williams identifies are still relevant to writing instructors today, as Inoue rearticulates them in his book *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies*. Throughout his book, he points to this pressure when he acknowledges instructors who

“must still grade based on a local SEAE and set of academic discursive conventions, say ones found in the popular first-year writing textbook, *They Say/I Say*” (109). In addition, he recognizes the automatic response to grading that writing instructors can have: “If you assign writing, you have to collect it and evaluate it, grade it. That’s what teachers do with writing. It’s almost a knee-jerk reaction on the part of teachers” (135). This study takes both Williams’ identification of instructors’ institutional responsibility as well as Inoue’s acknowledgment of the pressure facing instructors to grade using a single standard as justification for its focus on the context of writing assessment practices. That is, as Williams and Inoue put it, judging student writing performance is what writing instructors do with writing—these judgments and the responsibility instructors feel create a sense of pressure that this study recognizes, builds on, and investigates as part of the dilemma instructors navigate between promoting and resisting SE.

In taking an explicit and narrow focus on SE and instructors’ relationships, understandings, and navigations of it in their writing assessment practices, this study builds on Chris K. Bacon’s 2017 study, which is one of the few that explicitly asks writing instructors to reflect on SE. Titled “Dichotomies, Dialects, and Deficits: Confronting the ‘Standard English’ Myth in Literacy and Teacher Education,” Bacon’s study directly asked beginning teachers, all enrolled in a university-level sheltered English immersion (SEI) course, to reflect on Standard English before, during, and after their participation in an intervention module centered on discussing and problematizing SE. Of his survey results, one change was quite significant; when asking instructors if student writing that did not conform to the conventions of SE should receive lower grades

than student writing that did, 76 percent of participants before the module expressed either agreement or uncertainty while after the module that percentage dropped to 21. Instructors' written reflections also demonstrated significant changes; as Bacon explains, instructors defined SE before the module through terms like proper, correct, and academic and focused on structural features of English to further shape SE. After the module, however, instructors began to acknowledge race and class in their reflections on SE as well as question its very existence.

Although this study is not an intervention as Bacon's was, it does seek to extend the work he did by not just surveying beginning instructors but rather interviewing six writing instructors well-established in their teaching careers who all had significant experience teaching multilingual writers. In addition, this study adds the context of instructors' writing assessment practices—including their rubrics—in order to uncover not only instructors' understandings of SE but also the ways they are navigating and negotiating the dilemma between promoting or resisting SE in that context.

Respect, Reject, Uphold | Expect, Promote, Uphold

As the verbs in this section title reveal, the dilemma surrounding SE has been approached, framed, discussed, and debated in a number of ways. Since SRTOL firmly rejected the validity of the SE myth and affirmed the need for instructors to have the training to respect and uphold the right of students to their own language, scholars in writing studies have taken up that work, from mounting critiques of SE to taking up the issue of accurate and fair assessment of student writing. As Bacon identifies at the end of his study, however, the myth of SE persists, and so he calls on the field to work to

“disrupt the underlying deficit ideologies that endure across labeling systems and within the act of labeling itself” (352). Echoing Bacon, Valerie Kinloch argues that, regardless of the extent to which this myth operates, “composition and literacy scholars must ask ourselves: What are we to do to combat such language myths and how are we to engage in this work in the space of our classrooms?” (Kinloch 84). Building on these calls, this study reorients attention from what writing instructors can do to combat this myth to how they are navigating the dilemma between resisting and promoting SE in their writing assessment practices. Put differently, this study shifts the focus from theoretical calls about combatting SE to an empirical understanding of how SE is already being negotiated and navigated in order to better understand that dilemma, uncover its complexities, and offer empirically-grounded steps forward for writing instructors and administrators.

In focusing on how and what writing instructors are doing to navigate and negotiate this dilemma, this study also shifts attention to the kinds of support instructors need as they deal with SE in their assessment practices. The amount of scholarship on SE as well as the theory and praxis of linguistic equity (Canagarajah, *Translingual Practice*; Cushman; Donahue; Gallagher and Noonan; Horner et al; Inoue, “Writing Assessment as the Conditions”) and antiracist writing assessment practices (Ball; Brannon and Knoblauch; Poe et al; Davila) and pedagogies (Banks et al; Huot; Inoue, *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies*; Anson) is expansive and continues to increase. In addition, the field’s translingual turn and antiracist writing assessment movement offer approaches for confronting and combatting SE in the classroom that instructors can take.

However, if English is still the “communicative ether” (Brown 600) of the writing classroom, and if SE continues to be both resisted (Greenfield; Mangelsdorf; CCCC, “This Ain’t Another Statement!”) and promoted by scholars themselves (Delpit; Wheeler and Thomas; Smith) or by instructors (Skerry), students (Lu; Gevers), and external contexts (see Hickey; Zoltan; Bex and Watts; Milroy; Johnson and VanBrackle; and Lippi-Green), instructors still face a dilemma between promoting or resisting SE the context of their assessment practices. Indeed, what writing studies scholars have acknowledged, both empirically and anecdotally, is the preference for writing that is academically organized (Ball), grammatically correct (Shaughnessy; Elbow; MacNeil and Cran), and that, thus, conforms to Standard English (Raines and Miller-Cochran; Davila). Recalling Susan Miller-Cochran and Shondel J. Nero, writing programs, administrators, and instructors are still caught between trying to validate and respect students’ languages while being expected to teach them Standard English. In other words, as the section title above reads, they can respect, reject, and ultimately uphold or expect, promote, and ultimately uphold. The tension, debate, and dilemma between those has been articulated; uncovering how instructors are navigating that dilemma as well as providing more empirically-based support for that work has not.

Beyond Dichotomy

Finally, in making these shifts and in approaching language as a local practice (Pennycook—see Introduction), this project is itself a complication and an opportunity. This study is focused not on solving the issues surrounding SE but rather on these six writing instructors and the ways they negotiate, navigate, and understand SE in their

writing assessment practices. In uncovering these negotiations and understandings, this study uses this framework of language as a local practice to make space for the complications of SE as a local language practice. In recognizing the paradoxical nature of SE, of the ways it persists and is promoted—despite the ways it contradicts the very nature of language and is resisted as an unfair, racist standard—this study operates within and takes on these complications. In other words, this project understands SE as both...and, using this understanding to extend articulations and debates surrounding the SE dilemma by escaping, in some ways, the dichotomization of it and, instead, offering a complex view of it. In this way, instructors' navigations, negotiations, and understandings of SE become sites, as I argue in Chapters Four and Five, of resistance and promotion, of remaking and reaffirming, of possibility and need, and, finally, of a shift from SE to SEW.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS & METHODOLOGY

“The feminist researcher who takes the work of active listening for granted risks producing data, writing up her or his findings, and responding in ways that are colonizing rather than liberating because they reproduce dominant perspectives.” (182)

Marjorie L. DeVault and Glenda Gross, “Feminist Interviewing: Experience, Talk, and Knowledge”

Introduction

This study’s focus on uncovering the unique identifications, negotiations, and navigations of the dilemma surrounding Standard English by a particular group of writing instructors in the context of their assessment practices at a mid-Atlantic university led me to use qualitative interviewing as my method and a feminist line of inquiry grounded in a sociolinguistic epistemology as my methodology. As a feminist researcher, I applied DeVault and Gross’s warning above to every stage of my research process, particularly because I did not want to reproduce SE as a standard of writing assessment. As stated in the previous two chapters, the goal of this study is to shift the focus from theoretical calls about combatting SE to an empirical understanding of how SE is already being negotiated and navigated in order to better understand that dilemma, uncover its complexities, and offer empirically-grounded steps forward for writing instructors and administrators. While the previous two chapters examined the problem with SE more closely and established the justification for this study’s empirical examination of SE, this chapter aims to extend that justification by explaining in detail the processes and methodological underpinnings involved in doing this study. In other words, while

Chapters Two explains the exigence—the why—of this study, this chapter outlines the methods and methodology—the how, where, and when—of this study.

In using qualitative interview methods, I set out to uncover the shape, movement, and function of SE among writing instructors and their assessment practices. In addition, I maintained a feminist approach to interviewing in conjunction with linguist Alastair Pennycook's theoretical orientation to language as a local practice as this study's methodology. As I explain in this chapter, the methods most aligned with my research questions and methodological approach were concept clarification interviews and discourse-based interviews (DBIs). My coding, drafting, and revising journey both reflected and were driven by my methodological choices and frameworks. As I show and explain in this chapter, my feminist and sociolinguist methodology drove my interview methods which in turn affected the data I collected and eventually analyzed that became the words, paragraphs, and ideas comprising this dissertation and, more particularly, Chapters Four and Five. In short, the choices, methods, and processes involved in this research process recursively affected and informed each other. In this chapter, then, I aim to show readers how I did my analysis in order to come to my study's findings and argument as a contribution to the field of writing studies. In other words, I hope to create epistemological transparency.

In creating this epistemological point of transparency, I critically attend to Peter Smagorinsky's advocacy for the methods section as conceptual epicenter of scholarly research papers. Throughout this chapter, I describe my methods in detail as a kind of research recipe, echoing Smagorinsky's culinary metaphor (393), so that writing studies

researchers, scholars, and instructors could follow my study as well as replicate it. In my attempt for transparency, I first clarify what I mean by methods, methodology, epistemology, and empiricism by opening this chapter with brief definitions of these terms. I then outline my methodological approach, including an examination of how a feminist understanding of interviewing, paired with a sociolinguistic view of language as a local practice, creates an epistemological inroad to my study. Next, I outline my interview methods, followed by an explanation of my data coding and analysis. Finally, I conclude this chapter by reflecting on my drafting and revising journey, examining how that journey, paired with my methodological choices and data journey, generated the ultimate argument of this dissertation as a project that makes the tacit about SE explicit, that opens up the dichotomized dilemma between resisting and promoting SE in the context of assessment, and that advocates, performs, and argues for a shift from SE to SEW.

Laying the Methodological Ground

In making the detailed explanation of this study's method and methodology the focal point of this chapter, I am following Peter Smagorinsky's call to expand the method section in academic projects and articles. As Smagorinsky puts it in his article "The Method Section as Conceptual Epicenter in Constructing Social Science Research Reports", the "Method" section in a research article is supposed to explain how "data become results" (394), but he has found that this section often lacks enough detail for readers to follow the study itself. Metaphorizing the Method section as a recipe, he argues that, as a reader of a research article or manuscript, he needs to know "what the author is

doing with the data in order to render it into results” (393), which includes naming categories for data, explaining how those categories evolved into codes, outlining how those codes relate to the author’s framing theory, and, ultimately, explaining how “they are reduced from a ‘raw’ state to ‘cooked’” (393). In this chapter, I attempt to explain my study’s methods as though they were a recipe, carefully explaining and naming the ingredients I used as well as the processes and “temperatures” I used to arrive at my results. In explaining these methods in detail, I aim to position my study as one that writing studies researchers could replicate so that they can continue this study’s goal of providing steps forward for writing instructors navigating this SE dilemma and paradox.

Extending Smagorinsky’s method metaphor in this chapter, I also want to make the distinction between methods and methodology clear. While Smagorinsky refers to methodology as theoretical framework, Sondra Harding’s use of the term methodology clarifies the relationship between methods and methodology. As she explains, a research method is “a technique for (or way of proceeding in) gathering evidence” (2). A methodology, then, is “a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed” (3). As Harding continues to explain, however, both social scientists and philosophers mistakenly mix and substitute these terms for each other when scholars themselves discursively refer to methodological issues as methods of inquiry or when they say scientific method when they really mean issues of methodology (2). Methods and methodology, then, are not the same, but the issue in using the term method arises when method comes to stand for theory or vice versa. In explaining my research tools in detail in this chapter, I respond to Smagorinsky’s call for producing a more detailed method

section; however, I critically attend to his positioning of the method section as epicenter by recognizing the interconnectedness and yet distinctness of methods and methodology. In other words, I agree with Smagorinsky's point that the methods section ought to be more robust in published research projects, but I also recognize the importance of methodology in this dissertation study. In titling this chapter Methods & Methodology, I acknowledge the distinctness of these two components of research by naming each term while using the ampersand to recognize their interconnectedness.

I also recognize the ways in which my positioning of my research techniques (method) relate to my epistemological stance. As Harding explains, an epistemology "is a theory of knowledge" that answers questions like "who can be a knower," and "what kinds of things can be known" (3). As she explains, feminists have argued that traditional epistemologies "systematically exclude the possibility that women could be 'knowers' or agents of knowledge" and have instead "proposed alternative theories of knowledge that legitimate women as knowers" (3). Epistemological issues, then, have implications for research techniques, but Harding explains that "it is misleading and confusing to refer to these, too, as issues about method" (3). Method, methodology, and epistemology are distinct, interconnected issues, and the terms used to refer to these issues matter because the terms themselves indicate epistemological choices. My research techniques, then, speak back to my feminist methodology, and that methodology points to epistemological issues about language and power. My decision to use qualitative interviewing methods speaks back to my positionality as a researcher and, ultimately, my adoption of a feminist

approach to research that then speaks back to the production of knowledge, language, and power.

In adopting this feminist approach that points to knowledge production, I position my project as an empirical one but do so skeptically. I understand empirical projects as Marjorie L. DeVault and Glenda Gross do in their chapter “Feminist Interviewing: Experience, Talk, and Knowledge”, that is, as “projects in which researchers engage with others (in the flesh, or less directly) to produce new knowledge” (176). This project’s engagement with writing instructors is, I believe, a means of producing new knowledge about SE that can further enable researchers and teachers in the field of writing studies to combat, challenge, and deconstruct SE by shifting from SE to SEW. My positioning of this project as an empirical one, however, is not simple because, following Dana Lynn Driscoll, I approach empiricism skeptically. In her article “Composition Studies, Professional Writing, and Empirical Research: A Skeptical View,” Driscoll explains that the term empiricism has been criticized for its links to positivism as well as its omission in writing studies. In acknowledging these critiques, however, she offers a solution to the problem with empiricism:

If one accepts a skeptical understanding of empirical research, the problematic issue of positivism is negated—researchers are not concerned with proving anything as ‘Truth’ but instead use their own observations to construct a better understanding of the world around them. They do this while always maintaining a healthy dose of skepticism in all areas of knowledge building—most especially in their own work (203).

In understanding this study as an empirical project, then, I see my engagement with participants as the means by which knowledge is produced. In addition, in adopting a skeptical view of empiricism, I critically attend to my own observations and positionality to better understand writing instructors' understandings of SE.

Methodology & Positionality

This study's goal of empirically uncovering the SE dilemma and paradox from the perspective of instructors who are assessing students as well as its understanding of SE as a local practice, one that is shaped and re-shaped by those who use and do it and whose meaning is derived from those practices, aligned best with a qualitative interview approach. As Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin explain in their book *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, the goal for qualitative research "is not simply learning about a topic, but also learning what is important to those being studied" (13). Because this study is interested in discovering what SE means for writing instructors and their assessment practices, this vision of qualitative research makes room for a more flexible approach to talking about SE with instructors that has the potential to uncover what, if anything, about SE is important to them. It was thus crucial to interview instructors themselves not only because the ways they navigated the SE dilemma had not been empirically examined in writing studies scholarship but also because their understandings and navigations had the potential of contributing much-needed insights about the SE dilemma and paradox. In addition, I borrow Rubin and Rubin's term conversation partner to emphasize "the active role of the interviewee in shaping the discussion and in guiding what paths the research should take" (12). As a researcher, I

aimed to be open to other terms, phrases, and gestures writing instructors had that would surround, complicate, or replace SE and thus re-shape research discussions and provide different paths for my project's direction. In short, qualitative interviewing prioritizes an organic, flexible approach that allowed me to uncover what SE means not simply as a concrete, definable concept but rather as an active term whose potential shape depends on the meaning instructors give it.

I then performed this kind of qualitative interviewing from a feminist understanding of interviewing in order to create an epistemological inroad to understanding how SE traffics within a writing program. As Cynthia L. Selfe and Gail E. Hawisher explain in their chapter "Exceeding the Bounds of the Interview: Feminism, Mediation, Narrative, and Conversations about Digital Literacy," the kind of "richly situated" and intimate knowledge that comes from "the perspective of individuals in their experiences and lives" arises most productively from semi-structured or structured interviews that are framed as conversations "in which all participants—researchers *and* informants—understand that they are engaged in mutually shaping meaning and that such meaning necessarily is local, fragmentary, and contingent" (36). A feminist understanding of interviewing, then, provides a way in to understanding how SE traffics in a specific writing program by foregrounding writing instructors' perceptions of SE and positioning the shape, definition, and identity of SE as reciprocally created and understood by researcher and participants. As articulated in the Introduction, I generated a working definition of SE for this study based on the ways the six writing instructors I interviewed understood, navigated, and negotiated it.

Feminist interviewing also parallels my project's epistemological goals. As DeVault and Gross explain, the kind of listening a researcher does deeply affects the data and knowledge she or he produces. The feminist researcher who takes the work of active listening for granted risks producing data, writing up her or his findings, and responding in ways that are colonizing rather than liberating because they reproduce dominant perspectives”(182).

Because SE has been identified and critiqued as a gatekeeper in FYC that perpetuates problematic assumptions about students as native speakers of SE, it is vital that this project critically examine SE while maintaining a sharp awareness of its gatekeeping function. Feminist interviewing, with its postpositivist approach (DeVault and Gross), makes critically attending to SE's dominant position and ideology possible. That is, in rejecting “the idea that social realities are simply ‘there’ for researchers to find” and instead understanding “the research process itself as an integral aspect of the construction of knowledge about society” (DeVault and Gross 176), I did my best as a researcher not to make assumptions about what instructors did or did not know about SE. In addition, this study, as I have discussed, does not seek to uncover or position SE as a well-defined, concrete term; rather, this study aims to discover what shape, definition, and understanding SE has for writing instructors in their assessment practices as well as how those instructors negotiate and navigate the dilemma between resisting and promoting SE.

This study's theoretical understanding of language as a local practice also strengthens its feminist line of inquiry. A feminist approach to research maintains a

reflexive awareness of the ways research relations are “shaped by cultural constructions of similarity, difference, and significance” (DeVault and Gross 181) as well as the ways in which research participants mutually shape knowledge that is “local, fragmentary, and contingent” (Selfe and Hawisher 36). This critical attention to the local, contingent knowledge created by research participants whose relationships are also shaped by cultural constructions of sameness and difference parallels linguist Alastair Pennycook’s focus on the locatedness of language. As I explained in Chapter One, I adopted Pennycook’s understanding of language as a product of social action because I aimed to open up different considerations of SE as well as new ways of thinking about it. I understand that instructors’ understandings of SE are local and contingent, and I also see the very language instructors use to describe, shape, and remake SE as a product of social action. SE is part of their embodied social practices which themselves are intimately connected to instructors’ changing, local, and embodied positions. Adopting Pennycook’s understanding of language positions this study’s data and results as products whose located, contingent nature is changed each time they are consumed. Pairing this understanding of language with a feminist approach to research is also what opens this study to examining the complexities not only of instructors’ understandings of SE but also their negotiations of the already complex dilemma between resisting and promoting SE.

In maintaining a flexible approach to discussing SE with writing instructors, this study also seeks to uphold a strong sense of ethics borrowed from feminist principles in the data it collects. As Gesa E. Kirsch and Joy S. Ritchie explain in their chapter “Beyond

the Personal: Theorizing a Politics of Location in Composition Research,” writing studies research often “concerns groups who have less power and fewer resources than the researchers, such as students, basic writers, K-12 teachers, minorities, and women” (534). Moreover, the authors explain, “[i]f we work from an ethic of care, we cannot ignore the political and cultural conditions that place us in unequal power relationships with the participants of our research” (541). Because this project directly engages with writing instructors who, especially in the recent global pandemic, must navigate a variety of significant material conditions, I made sure in each set of interviews to thank each instructor for the time, effort, and energy they offered me. In addition, as I explain in my Methods section, I offered each instructor a small Amazon gift card as a way to thank them for their participation. In maintaining my awareness of both the time constraints of this study and instructors’ material conditions, I decided to collect only instructors’ grading rubrics⁹ in order to avoid adding additional material demands to their increasing workload. In addition, as I explained in Chapter One, I see these rubrics as a site for making the tacit about SE explicit, which is one of the goals of this study.

Finally, I am acutely aware of my positionality as I do the work of this project. As Sondra Harding explains, the best feminist analysis “insists that the inquirer her/himself be placed in the same critical plane as the over subject matter, thereby recovering the entire research process for scrutiny in the results of the research” (9). Harding goes on to explain that this means readers of scholarship are often told by the researcher what their

⁹ Although I call these rubrics, I refer to them as grading tools and matrixes later to allow for other ways of naming these grading tools that instructors themselves have.

gender, race, and class are; thus, the researcher “appears to us not as an invisible, anonymous voice of authority, but as a real, historical individual with concrete, specific desires and interests” (9). As I briefly pointed out in Chapter One, I am a young, white, middle-class-emergent educated woman on the cusp of finishing my PhD program. By acknowledging the identities I embody throughout this dissertation and this chapter, I aim to acknowledge their intersections—I am a white, middle-class-emerging English speaker and thus have racial and linguistic privilege, although I am also a young woman navigating my way through the academy. In acknowledging these intersecting identities, I also hope to produce, as Harding puts it, “understandings and explanations which are free (or, at least, more free) from the unexamined beliefs and behaviours of social scientists themselves” so that my beliefs and behaviors become part of “the empirical evidence for (or against) the claims advanced in the results of research” (9). In short, I hope to open the beliefs and experiences emanating from my positionality to analysis alongside the empirical evidence I gather and generate in this study.

I also recognize the ways my positionality intersects with this project in recognizing the ways SE is racialized. I am a young, white, educated, middle-class-emerging woman who grew up speaking American English, took Latin classes in high school and college, and learned to correct not only my speech and writing but also others’ whose linguistic practices may not have aligned with mine. In recognizing my positionality, I follow the theoretical framework Walton et al establish for situating myself, which they explain as: “Reflecting upon your positionality within relevant contexts and your own positions of privilege to identify the power you have to take

action” (5). Like Lippi-Green, I also recognize that “because I belong to the social (and hence, to the language) mainstream which isolates me from the process of subordination,” I am “allowed the consolation of my mother tongue” and am “free from the shadow of language, and subject only to the standards that I accept for myself” (335). If I feel guilt about the way I speak or write, I recognize that that guilt is internally constructed and externally prescribed based on the standards I accept for myself. I am thus careful to interrogate the linguistic, privileged experiences I bring to this study, especially my analyses of instructors’ understandings and negotiations of the SE paradox and dilemma. The last thing I want this study to do is reproduce the very linguistic norms I aim to interrogate.

It is impossible for me to be objective and detached from the data I have collected because my experiences, race, and even gender affect that data, from recruiting participants to transcribing interviews to coding. My whiteness stands out perhaps most in relation to my data because of the ways it permeates my body, mind, and experiences. As Ira Shor puts it, “being white is a spectacular advantage in America,” and whiteness itself often remains unacknowledged and unmarked because “domination works best when less is said about it and because dominance confers protection from scrutiny” (379). Because whiteness, as the color of domination, can create such discomfort when it is mentioned, Shor argues that “whiteness must be distinctly made visible” (379). I admit that, even while I acknowledge my whiteness here, that work has not always been easy. During the end of an interview, an instructor asked me about race and the makeup of my committee and other participants. In that moment, I recognized two things: first, my

participants and dissertation committee are mostly white; second, in that moment of recognition, I felt uncomfortable. I admitted to that instructor that talking about race is difficult—even writing this, now, is uncomfortable, but that is part of the point of this work. That is, I felt and feel uncomfortable because, as a white woman, I often do not have to account for my race as people of color do. In addition, I recognize the need to confront these sorts of blind spots or gaps that remain in my research because of my own and my participants' whiteness. In short, I hope to avoid the issue with this kind of feminist-oriented research that DeVault and Gross identify in this chapter's epigraph, which is taking the work of active listening for granted and thereby producing data and writing that reproduces dominant perspectives. In Chapter Six, I take up this work more visibly as I call for making the invisibly entrenched role of whiteness in SE—itsself an entrenched ideology—more explicit in research, in assessment, in the classroom, and in the field.

Methods

This study used two semi-structured interview methods to uncover instructors' deeper knowledge and understanding of SE in their assessment practices. The first interview method, concept clarification interviews, allowed for a more focused exploration about what meaning SE may have for writing instructors in the context of writing assessment. As Rubin and Rubin explain, exploring a particular term and its meaning describes what they call a concept clarification interview, whose goal is to “explore the meaning of [a set of] special, shared terms” (5). In this kind of interview, the researcher might probe what a particular word or phrase means as participants use or

understand it. This method has also been used in nursing education; as Maeona K. Kramer explains in her article “Concept Clarification and Critical Thinking: Integrated Processes” in the *Journal of Nursing Education*, concept clarification is essentially “a search for meaning” and “seeks to make conceptual meaning as explicit as possible in language” (4). For Kramer, concept clarification is also a means of critical thinking because it can uncover biases, expose the limitations of language, prioritize the importance of context and creating meaning, and, ultimately, “give[s] learners an appreciation for how meanings reflect throughout interconnected networks of theory and knowledge and determine the use to which knowledge is put” (6).

While Kramer acknowledges concept clarification’s role in the development of theory, particularly nursing theory, I find her exploration of this method as a means of critical thinking integral to my study because I was interested in having an open, critical conversation with writing instructors about what SE is and what it means in the context of writing assessment. In addition, I take Kramer’s identification of this method as a “highly creative, rigorous, and intuitive process that can generate multiple useful meanings for a single concept” (2) to potentialize my study’s organic, flexible approach to uncovering what SE means as a concept. While I have analyzed SE as a paradox and dilemma in the previous two chapters, I position SE more concretely as a concept in the first set of interviews in order to discover the multiple meanings, definitions, negotiations, and understandings writing instructors may have of SE. In short, I made room for each conversation with each instructor to be a creative, rigorous process in which we discovered, together, what SE is. The primary goal of the first interview

method in this study, then, was to clarify and uncover what SE—as a shared term in writing studies—meant to writing instructors in their assessment practices as well as how those instructors navigated and negotiated the dilemma between promoting and resisting SE.

The second interview method, discourse-based interviews (DBIs), used text-based conversations to examine instructors' linguistic and rhetorical choices surrounding SE on their rubrics and grading tools. First developed and mentioned by Lee Odell and Dixie Goswami in their 1981 report "Writing in Non-Academic Settings," DBIs are a procedure that "enables a researcher to formulate generalizations about the kind of knowledge and strategies that are used by writers when they compose in occupational contexts" (5-6). In addition, as Zak Lancaster explains, "by encouraging participants to account for textual details, DBIs can assist researchers and participants to probe the rhetorical bases of writing performances and judgments" ("Using Corpus Results" 121). In their study, Odell and Goswami presented writers with alternative language in texts those writers had composed and, when asking writers about their reasons for accepting or rejecting the alternatives, found in one instance that the writer wanted to "maintain a rather delicate writer/audience relationship: he wanted to acknowledge a personal relationship with the reader, yet he still wanted to convey that he was the superior in the professional relationship" (10). In the same way, I presented instructors with alternative language (that I composed) to the phrases and words on their rubrics surrounding language, grammar, and SE in order to uncover the rhetorical choices behind their original language, which made the tacit about SE explicit.

In addition to asking instructors about the ways they see or do not see SE playing a role in their rubrics, I also asked instructors about their language choices surrounding terms like error, correct, edit, and proofread because of SE's connection to those terms. As I explained in the Introduction, the concepts of correctness and error play crucial roles in fueling SE's paradoxical existence; in these DBIs, I set out to understand the role and function of those terms in relation to SE in instructors' rubrics and tools. The goal of these DBIs, then, was to make the tacit about SE explicit by presenting instructors with probing questions and alternative language about SE and terms like error and correct on their rubrics and tools.

Participants & Site

In this study, I conducted a total of 12 interviews with 6 writing instructors at a large and diverse university in the United States. To protect and maintain the anonymity of these instructors, I identify this university more broadly, but I will add that its faculty and student population is large and diverse, representing a range of socioeconomic, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds. The composition program at this university is also quite large, serving students both within and outside the United States; in addition to its location in the U.S., the program also has a location in South Korea that contains its own writing program connected to the U.S.-based one. In recruiting participants, I communicated and worked with the director of the writing program to generate a list of instructors in the program who would be teaching one of the program's introductory or first-year writing courses and who might also be interested in SE or in examining SE. The director and I decided that sending an individual email to each instructor, rather than a

mass email via the writing program's listserv, would be more appropriate for this study because my goal was to have conversations with instructors who might already be interested in my study's topic. I wanted to talk with instructors who already had potentially given SE some thought because I was interested in having conversations that would or could push back on conversations scholars were having in the field of writing studies surrounding SE. After I generated that list of instructors, I drafted the documents I would need to submit to IRB and received approval for my study in June 2020.

Having emailed a total of 18 emails to instructors in the writing program who were teaching for the university in the United States or South Korea, I received a total of 6 emails signaling those instructors' willingness to participate via the signed consent form I had sent to them in the recruitment email (see Appendix A for the redacted email). These instructors had a range of teaching experience in the program, with some explaining in the first interview that they had taught a version of first-year writing for a few years while others stated that they had taught those courses for over a decade. Altogether, the instructors I interviewed had nearly 60 years of experience teaching first-year writing. To protect these instructors' anonymity, I asked each of them if they had a pseudonym they would like me to use in this study; three out of six came up with their own pseudonyms, and I created pseudonyms for the other three. These pseudonyms, which I use throughout this dissertation but more often in Chapters Four and Five, are L. Baldwin, Michael, Erin, Cynthia, Sophia, and Susan.

In addition to asking instructors about their level of experience teaching first-year writing in the first set of interviews, I also asked them about their language backgrounds

and positions in the university. Half the instructors I interviewed identified as speaking and writing English only while the other half identified as speaking additional languages or being multilingual or trilingual. In addition, these instructors held a range of positions within the university, from assistant professors to directors of other writing programs to adjuncts. Two instructors I interviewed—Erin and Cynthia—were teaching writing in South Korea while the rest were teaching in the United States. Every instructor was also teaching remotely due to the pandemic. What every instructor also had in common was that they were all teaching at least one introductory or first-year writing course for the university. Table 1 below lists the language and teaching backgrounds of each instructor from the first interview, including their position within the university, language background, experience teaching multilingual students, and their familiarity with research on translanguaging and language diversity.

Table 1 Instructors' Backgrounds

Background from Interview #1	Years teaching university writing; courses¹⁰ teaching fall 2020	Language background	Experience teaching multilingual students	Familiarity with research on translanguaging and language diversity
Cynthia, [term] assistant professor, in Korea	3-4 years; FYC for multilingual writers	English only; knows a few Korean words; former background with Spanish; does not consider	Writing center training; currently teaching all multilingual students	Familiar with terms but not a lot of knowledge in general

¹⁰ These courses, unless specified, are first-year composition (FYC) courses that are three credits each. The FYC courses, however, are four credits, and the EAP (English for Academic Purposes) course is for graduate students. I have not identified the number of sections each instructor teaches but rather identified the types of composition courses they were teaching at the time of our interview to maintain confidentiality.

		herself multilingual		
Erin, [term] assistant professor, in Korea	14 years; FYC and FYC for multilingual writers	English only	All teaching has been with multilingual students	Familiar with language diversity research but not translingualism
Michael, adjunct instructor, in United States	2-3 years; FYC for multilingual writers	English; studied German for 12- 13 years; speaks a little bit of Spanish and a “little tiny bit” of French; studied Latin; considers himself multilingual	Has taught English language learners “across the spectrum”; ESL specialist for a writing center	Familiar with research on both
Sophia, term associate professor and associate director of composition for multilingual writers, in United States	16 years; FYC for multilingual writers	English, Arabic, and French; considers herself trilingual; knows Greek but says she is losing it.	Significant experience; has designed and re- designed courses for multilingual students	“Very, very, very familiar” with research; considers herself a translingualist
Susan, term assistant professor; assistant coordinator for international program, in United States	14-15 years; FYC, intermediate composition, EAP	English and “a little bit of Spanish.” Studied Chinese and Latin; does not consider herself multilingual.	Spent most of her career teaching classes designed for multilingual students	“A little” familiar with research; has studied critical race theory
L. Baldwin, instructor and writing project	15 years; FYC	English; took 16 years of French; does not	A lot of experience at current university	Some familiarity with both—is “getting there”

director, in United States		consider herself multilingual		
---	--	----------------------------------	--	--

Funding

In May 2020, I received a \$7,000 fellowship aimed to help me complete my study and draft my dissertation. Having talked to my committee and other mentors at my university about this funding, I decided to offer participants in my study a \$25 Amazon gift card to thank them for their time, effort, and participation. In both the consent form and recruitment email, I explained that participants would receive this gift card after all interviews with all participants had been completed, even if they had consented to the study but did not complete an interview. To be eligible for a gift card, however, participants needed at least to consent to the study; each instructor who consented to be interviewed in this study completed both sets of interviews. When I finished all the interviews in September 2020, I emailed each instructor a \$25 Amazon gift card and also sent a short note thanking them for the generous offering of their time to me.

Interviews & Notes

In the recruitment email and consent form, I explained that both interviews with each instructor would be conducted and recorded via WebEx and that the interview data as well as my notes would be stored on a password-protected, university created Microsoft OneDrive account. I then scheduled the first set of interviews with each instructor; each interview lasted 40-75 minutes. In these concept clarification interviews, I had planned to ask instructors a total of 14 questions, but at the end of the first

interview, I added a question (about whether they actually used the words Standard English explicitly) that I then posed to the other instructors because it seemed like an important question to ask (see Appendix B for full list of questions). The first 6 questions, then, focused on instructors' language and teaching backgrounds while the remaining 9 focused on concepts like grammatical correctness, error, Standard English, grading, and language diversity research.

By asking these questions, I sought to uncover and clarify what SE, as a shared term in writing studies, meant to these instructors in their writing assessment practices. Because SE is associated with concepts like grammar, error, and correctness, I asked instructors about what those concepts meant to them as well as how they would define them. In addition, I grounded those questions in the context of grading; for example, in question 7, I asked "How would you define grammar and grammatical correctness?" My follow-up to that question then focused on grading: "When you grade a student's essay, what role, if any, do grammar and grammatical correctness play as you grade that essay?" After these questions, I asked instructors to discuss what pressures, if any, they felt while grading, after which I asked them what it meant to grade student writing fairly and equitably. Finally, I asked instructors about their familiarity with research on translingualism and language diversity, followed by questions about SE and their understanding of it. I focused the final four questions on SE because I wanted to uncover how instructors negotiated and understood concepts like grammar, error, and correctness in relation to their negotiations of SE. This progression, from teaching and language background to grammar and eventually SE, made room for instructors' complex

negotiations and varied understandings of SE as well as their identifications and navigations of the dilemma between resisting and promoting SE.

After conducting the first set of interviews, I scheduled the second and final interview—the DBI—and asked each instructor to email me a copy of one of their grading rubrics or tools that was representative of their approach to grading. Before each DBI, I briefly analyzed each rubric or tool and generated the majority of the DBI questions from those artifacts. In conducting these DBIs, I verbally presented instructors with the alternative language I had created based on what they had written in their rubrics and tools surrounding language, grammar, and formatting. I completed the final DBI in September 2020; each interview lasted 20-50 minutes and contained a total of 10-11 questions.

This second set of interview questions built on the first set by focusing explicitly on instructors' grading rubrics and the ways instructors negotiated and understood SE as well as the dilemma surrounding SE in those rubrics. In narrowing this focus to the text of these rubrics, I sought to make the tacit about SE explicit. Although the questions for each instructor varied (see Appendix B for 2 examples (based on Erin's and Michael's rubrics) of the 6 versions of these questions) depending on the content of their rubrics, the first three questions focused on the explicit role of grammar, correctness, and SE in those rubrics and thus were the same for each instructor. The second question, for example, asked "Do you see any parts of your rubric/grading tool that might require students to write their essays in Standard English? What parts are those? Could you walk me through them?" Although only one instructor, Erin, had the words Standard English on their

rubric, I asked this question to make the potentially tacit role and presence of SE in instructors' rubrics explicit.

Questions 4 through 11 then offered instructors alternative language to words and phrases on their rubrics related to grammar, language, and format. For each instructor, however, I asked them to tell me about their choice to include or not include the words Standard English, after which I showed them what including those words in their rubric could look like and asked them to talk through the choices behind their original language. Michael, for example, had not included SE on his rubric, so I said: "I noticed the statement 'your friend cares only about language issues' under the Readability section description. You could also say 'cares only about grammar' or 'cares only about Standard English.' Could you talk about why you said 'language issues'?" In asking instructors to talk through their original language, I sought to uncover the potential ways SE was operating in instructors' rubrics even when it was not explicitly (textually) present. In addition, I wanted to understand how instructors were navigating the dilemma between resisting and promoting SE in their rubrics.

While conducting both sets of interviews, I took interview notes and started a coding journal. After each interview, I briefly noted what stood out to me in each interview in my notes. In addition, I kept a coding journal to keep track of my thoughts about the interviews and my initial analyses of them. I used the interview notes at the beginning and middle of the coding process and continued to write in my coding journal throughout the coding process. In addition, I wrote in my journal as I listen to each

interview and added or changed text in the transcriptions that WebEx's recording function automatically generated.

Data Analysis & Coding

Due to this study's narrow focus on SE in the context of writing assessment but also its openness towards uncovering how instructors navigated that SE dilemma and paradox, I used first an inductive and then deductive approach to analyzing the interview data from the first set of interviews, paired with In Vivo coding. This combination reflects what Anselm L. Strauss and Juliet M. Corbin describe as the heart of theorizing in their book *Basics of Qualitative Research*. As they put it, at the heart of this work "lies the interplay of making inductions (deriving concepts, their properties, and dimensions from data) and deductions (hypothesizing about the relationship between concepts [wherein] the relationships also are derived from data, but data that have been abstracted by the analyst from the raw data)" (22). When I first began analyzing the interview data, I coded deductively, looking for anything that could pertain to SE, but I also coded more inductively, looking for other issues, patterns, or themes that were arising from instructors' reflections on the interview questions. Throughout the coding and drafting process, I maintained a balance between these two approaches, eventually prioritizing a deductive approach as I began to theorize about the relationship between what was happening in the interviews and what had been established in the field's conversations surrounding the SE dilemma and paradox.

With the DBIs, I used primarily a deductive approach, especially in the design of those interviews. As Lancaster explains, in DBIs that use a deductive approach, the

researcher “designs the study around a specific area of language use she or he deems important” (“Using Corpus Results” 121). In this study’s DBIs I only focused on specific language related to SE (like grammar, correctness, and error) in each instructor’s rubric in the interviews themselves and then analyzed each instructor’s response, coding for themes and patterns that related to SE as well as this study’s research questions. Having identified the dilemma surrounding SE in writing studies scholarship, I wanted to see how instructors themselves understood and navigated that dilemma in their assessment practices and, more particularly, their rubrics. In other words, I was interested in the relationship between their understandings and navigations and the ways scholars in the field have critiqued SE.

As I analyzed and coded the interview data, I also sought to maintain a critical, reflexive stance, being careful to keep my own experiences with and assumptions about SE in check. As Joyce Magnotto Neff puts it, since all research “is based on assumptions,” what becomes critical to grounded theory “is the researcher’s obligation to closely examine those assumptions as the research progresses” (128). To be clear, I did not use a grounded theory approach in this study, but I did apply Neff’s articulation of the researcher’s obligation to examine their assumptions to my work. Because I have a few years’ experience teaching first-year writing as well as working with multilingual writers and have actively thought about the role of SE in that work for the last two years, I maintained a critical and reflexive awareness of the ways my experiences might influence the ways I not only interviewed participants but also read, analyzed, and interpreted the data. I examine these assumptions more in depth in the upcoming sections.

Coding

The process of getting from my raw, transcribed interview data to the paragraphs I wrote in Chapters Four and Five involved what Smagorinsky refers to as data reduction (397), required three rounds of coding in both sets of interviews, and took three months. As I edited the automated WebEx transcriptions, being careful not to change or edit the grammar of instructors' responses (this editing would have been somewhat antithetical to this study's articulation of correctness, as it is tied to SE, as construct), I created a document containing my initial thoughts as well as my study's research questions to keep my analyses on track. To guide my actual coding, I followed Johnny Saldana's book *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* and determined that manual and In Vivo coding best fit my study's feminist and sociolinguistic line of inquiry into Standard English. As Saldana explains, In Vivo coding involves a code in which a participant's words are taken directly from what that participant has said and placed in quotation marks (3). I chose to do this In Vivo coding because it was important to me to use instructors' exact words because those instructors were reflecting on their own language. In addition, I believed that In Vivo coding could help preserve what instructors were saying word-for-word and potentially reduce the amount of data reduction I would need to do which I worried risked eliding the discursive moves instructors were making.

In manually coding these interviews, I first focused on examining and coding the first set of interviews, generating a rough draft of Chapter Four, and then beginning to code the second set of interviews. I did three rounds of coding for each interview in each set of interviews, performing first what Saldana identifies as pre-coding in which I

highlighted, bolded, and annotated portions of the interview transcriptions that struck me. Borrowing from Saldana's reference to Sunstein and Chiseri-Strater, I asked three questions that I highlighted in different colors in the texts of the transcriptions themselves: What surprised me [green]? What intrigued me [blue]? What disturbed me [red]? After highlighting what I felt were answers to these questions in the transcripts, I went back and added two more questions in different-colored highlights to maintain my accountability as I began to transfer the highlighted text to a new set of data notes and eventually tables: What still interests me [teal]? What quotes do I need to come back to[purple]?

The additional rounds of coding I did were what Saldana refers to as Eclectic Coding, which is meant to refine the highlights and choices I made in my pre-coding and initial rounds of coding. As I created and added to my data notes and tables, I made sure to ground my codes—comprised primarily of instructors' own words—in both my research questions and this study's sociolinguistic framework of language as a local practice. That is, in addition to focusing on what surprised me, I began to look for how instructors were re-making SE, what elements they were negotiating surrounding SE and grading, and what dilemma or dilemmas they had identified surrounding SE or grading. What I began to see as I started drafting Chapter Four was the ways in which instructors were resisting SE and yet also revealing how SE persisted in their courses. Based on this persistence/resistance interplay, I then added tables in Chapter Four that summarized instructors' definitions of SE as well as the pressures they felt surrounding grading in order to then discuss how these responses revealed layers of resistance, persistence, and

dilemmas surrounding SE. As I revised that chapter, I also began to see how some instructors were engaging with, extending, and taking up translingual and antiracist approaches to SE through their resistance to SE as well as their navigations of the SE dilemma. As I revised Chapter Five, I then began to see how SE was operating in these instructors' rubrics—even when the words Standard English were absent—through my analyses of tables that summarized instructors' reflections on error, grammar, correctness, and the role of SE in their courses.

Grounding my analyses using these tables in both chapters meant I could show the complexities of each instructors' responses and illuminate what was actually going on, which was the ways instructors uniquely identified, navigated, and negotiated the dilemma between promoting and resisting SE. As I explain in Chapters Four and Five, I used what I identify as a sort of case study/profile hybrid to structure each chapter since the case study quality captures the messiness of these responses while the profile quality creates a sense of structure to contain that complexity and allow readers to navigate it more easily. For example, the case-study element of the discussion, which includes “the need to be centrally focused on defining a ‘case’” (Yin 65) and generating “knowledge of the particular” (Schwandt 28), captures that messiness. Each chapter, then, contains six sections representing each instructors' unique understandings, negotiations, and navigations of the SE paradox and dilemma in the context of their writing assessment practices.

Finally, as I coded, highlighted, outlined, and coded again, I remembered the advice Saldana offers about coding that I repeat here because of its reminder about my assumptions and positionality:

For the individual researcher, assigning symbolic meanings (i.e., codes) to data is an act of personal signature. And since we each most likely perceive the social world differently, we will therefore experience it differently, interpret it differently, document it differently, code it differently, analyze it differently, and write about it differently (36).

Having recognized my positionality earlier, I acknowledge it again here because my perceptions of the world, affected by and shaping my intersecting identities, led me to code and analyze the data of these interviews in ways unique to those experiences and identities. For example, I sometimes struggled with the Laura Greenfield's claim that Standard English does not exist because it ran contrary to my decades-long belief that the grammar I produced in my own writing was correct. When interviewing instructors, however, I had to be open to their experiences with Standard English and correct grammar, some of which were different from what I had been taught by English teachers and professors in my own education. For example, when Sophia said that grammatical errors do not exist because they are a construct, I found myself drifting into the mire of extreme linguistic relativity—that is, I found myself wondering about whether the absence of error meant the absence of grammatical rules, which then led me to a place of linguistic anarchy. However, I had to remind myself that that space and its black-and-white, all-or-nothing orientation to language was not the focus of this study, nor was it

productive to my ability to code my data and write this dissertation. In addition, as I revised my literature review in Chapter Two, I generated a better grasp of how the field of writing studies has grappled with SE, which then gave clarity to my own understanding of SE.

As Saldana implies in the quote above, coding is not perfect, but it is not meant to be because the world and our experiences in it and the data we collect from researching it are not perfect. All of these are messy processes, and my coding and writing journey were reflections of that messiness.

Drafting

As I conclude this chapter, I reflect on my journey of drafting, writing, and revising because it was a messy one that kept me humble as a writer but also led me to generate this dissertation's ultimate argument. My experiences drafting Chapters Four and Five, in particular, were entirely different, so much so that writing Chapter Five was like the antonym of writing Chapter Four. As I told my committee members, drafting Chapter Four, in its first iteration, felt like a natural, organic process fueled by a steady stream of words that seemed to flow uninterrupted from my data codes and analyses. However, after I wrote Chapter Five, I realized a number of issues in that draft, primary among them my failure to treat the data from the DBIs differently from that of the concept clarification interviews. Re-working Chapter Five, however, led me to hone my last two research questions and more fully realize this dissertation's purpose and contribution, which is to shift the focus from theoretical calls about combatting SE to an empirical understanding of how SE is already being negotiated and navigated in order to

better understand that dilemma, uncover its complexities, and offer empirically-grounded steps forward for writing instructors and administrators.

As I have hoped to show in this chapter, the methodological frameworks I adopted as well as the choices I made in studying this SE problem guided all of the processed involved in writing this dissertation, from the submission of my IRB documents, the collection of my interview data, the difficult revision of these chapters, to the very words filling the final sentences of this chapter. This chapter, this dissertation, these very words filling this page are a contribution to the field of writing studies, but they are also a subtle and yet critical reflection of my experiences and interests as a young, educated white woman at the end of my PhD program but at the beginning of devoting my professional and personal life to uncovering instructors' unique negotiations of Standard English, advocating for more support as they navigate that dilemma, and advocating for, revealing, and performing a shift from SE to SEW that marks a paradigmatic way forward and through the SE dilemma.

CHAPTER FOUR: NAVIGATIONS & NEGOTIATIONS

“So, if you have not taught a student the grammar of the English language inside and out, I don't think it's fair to require them to master that, which has to be qualified, that statement has to be qualified, because I don't think it's fair to hold them to a standard that you haven't introduced in instruction. At the same time, I don't think it's fair to say I'm going to be so permissive that I'm not going to tell you that your writing is really not going to be effective for most of the things that you wanna do with your life.”

Michael, adjunct instructor, Interview #1

“I can appreciate a student's, you know, linguistic differences or whatever. But bottom line is when they write a letter of interest, they have to consider who's reading it and they have to put their best foot forward. So again, I feel like right now, the way things are, there are expectations and so I have to recognize those and honor them while honoring the student's own language. So, it can be tricky, I think.”

L. Baldwin, writing project director, Interview #1

Introduction

As adjunct instructor Michael puts it, he does not believe it is fair to hold students to a standard they have not been taught, but he also does not believe it is fair to be so permissive that students are not given feedback on where their writing stands. For writing project director L. Baldwin, this dilemma is one centered on expectations: while she wants to honor a student's own language, she also feels the need to recognize and honor other expectations, like the ones that same student may face when submitting a letter of interest. These two perspectives on this “tricky” dilemma are representative of the unique ways writing instructors in this study both identified and navigated the dilemma between promoting and resisting SE in the context of their writing assessment practices in this first set of concept clarification interviews.

In these interviews, I set out to understand SE and meet the challenge in concept clarification, which is to clarify what SE means as a concept and to “understand how

words create things” (Kramer 1). In other words, I sought to understand how instructors’ reflections on and relationships with SE might give insight to this already established dilemma in writing studies between resisting and promoting SE. In examining instructors’ negotiations and navigations of this dilemma as well as the ways they defined and understood SE, I sought, ultimately, to make the tacit about SE explicit. I also addressed this study’s first two research questions, which are: In what ways does Standard English traffic in a particular writing program among writing instructors assessing student writing? How do these instructors understand, define, and navigate SE in the context and practice of writing assessment in their courses?

As Michael’s and L. Baldwin’s reflections above exemplify, each instructor’s navigation, understanding, and negotiation of SE and the dilemma surrounding it was situated and articulated in slightly different and unique ways. While each instructor navigated, negotiated, and identified this dilemma differently, however, there were certain points and approaches they had in common. For example, every writing instructor had heard of SE and also made moves to resist SE, although they did so in various ways and to various degrees. In addition, each instructor’s reflections on SE and its meaning pointed back to the paradoxical nature of SE, with some instructors, like L. Baldwin, calling SE out as an oxymoron or problematic term. Each instructor also identified at least one dilemma surrounding or related to SE.

Altogether, these instructors re-made SE, resisted and challenged SE, and articulated a number of dilemmas, struggles, or disconnects surrounding or related to SE. For some instructors, SE also persisted in ways that were tied to their definitions of it. In

addition, whether instructors were familiar with research on translingualism or not, their engagement with SE reflected, echoed, complicated, or extended not only translingual approaches to SE but also antiracist approaches to SE and language instruction. The levels and degrees of translingual and antiracist work taking place also show the ways these instructors are taking up and engaging with these approaches tacitly and explicitly, although that work also reveals the need for these approaches to more explicitly deal with and take up the material concerns and constraints surrounding international students and their international programs.

Based on these findings, I argue that there is an opportunity to more visibly and explicitly take translingual and antiracist approaches up in combination with each other to better reflect the ways these instructors are already tacitly and explicitly taking up and extending these approaches together. In addition, I also argue that there is a need for conversations surrounding translingualism and antiracist writing assessment to take up the concerns surrounding international students and SE that many of these instructors raised. In making this argument, I am calling attention to the synergy between the translingual and antiracist work scholars have done in writing studies and the translingual/antiracist work these six writing instructors are already doing to navigate and negotiate the SE dilemma and paradox. In calling attention to that synergy and in arguing for the opportunity and need in taking up that synergistic work, I am, in short, advocating for a paradigmatic shift from Standard English to Synergistic English Work.

To capture these unique and complex negotiations, I have divided each instructor's responses to the questions I posed about SE and the ways they understand

what it means to grading fairly into separate sections. These sections, starting with Erin and ending with Susan, are a sort of case study/profile hybrid; the case study quality captures the messiness of these responses while the profile quality creates a sense of structure to contain that complexity. There are two tables for each instructor per section, the first of which includes their unique, complex relationship with SE. The second, and final, table reveals each instructor's response to the questions I asked them about the pressures they feel when grading, the source of those pressures, and the ways they understand and define grading fairly and equitably. Each table is also comprised of two columns: the left column includes a brief label of a particular aspect of SE or grading while the right includes a summary of each instructor's response to that category.

Following an In Vivo approach, I have tried to use instructors' words as much as possible in the summaries; although I did not use quotations in these summaries, I have instead paraphrased instructors' words, borrowing from their language as much as possible.

The final section of this chapter contains a brief comparison of these instructors' unique navigations and negotiations of SE in the context of their writing assessment practices. In comparing these unique navigations and negotiations, I make the argument that there is synergistic work happening in the unique ways instructors identified and negotiated this SE dilemma. Drawing on both instructors' words as well as the voices of writing studies researchers and writers from Chapter Two, I both reveal and advocate for a shift from Standard English to Synergistic English Work, or, from SE to SEW.

Profile 1: Erin

Erin, one of the two term assistant professors teaching in South Korea I interviewed, has taught university-level writing for 14 years, speaks English only, and does not consider herself multilingual. All of her teaching has been with multilingual students, and she is familiar with research on language diversity but not translanguaging. The two sets of tables below reveal that she defined SE as correct English, although she acknowledged that identifying SE in that way could be a problem. These tables also reveal that she defines grading fairly through her rubrics but also feels the desire to be consistent with her grading and expectations.

In making the tacit about SE explicit, these tables reveal that Erin both resisted and upheld SE, defining SE as correct English while recognizing the potential problem in those identifications because, as she recognized, there are a lot of varieties of English. These tables also reveal the ways SE persisted in invisible ways through Erin's identification of SE as correct English, her comparison of SE to Konglish, and her acknowledgment that her students themselves want SE. In addition, what these tables show, paired with a final point and series of questions she posed at the end of the interview, is the way she identified a dilemma surrounding SE as well as the ways she navigated that dilemma. In short, she compared the benefits of not penalizing her students' nonstandard language usage to the ways they were actually benefitting from the course if they want their writing to be suitable in other contexts. As the analyses below reveal, she navigated this dilemma by acknowledging that her students want SE, by focusing on how they will leave the program, and by connecting the value of FYC to

helping students develop their writing so that it is suitable in a different context. As I will explain, however, these navigations of this dilemma both echo and are complicated by a translingual approach to SE and language instruction. In addition, there is potential for an antiracist approach to writing assessment and SE to align with the questions about race and language Erin brought up at the end of the interview.

In the table below, Erin's definition of SE as well as her relationship with it reveal the way she gently resisted SE as well as the ways SE nonetheless persisted. What is made explicit is that she defines SE as correct English, although she does not use SE in her course. More important, however, is that her recognition of SE as correct English was immediately followed by an acknowledgment of the potential problem with that connection that, as I will explain, reveals a gentle resistance to SE wherein SE nonetheless persists. As she put it, "I know I'm not supposed to say that I know there is so many different variations. I mean, here, the issue isn't that there's like, another common form of English, it's that there's, like, Konglish in Korea so it's a conflation of grammar and vocabulary." Explaining Konglish further, she said

So, in China, there's Chinglish, in Korea there's Konglish, and it's just like, aspects of Korean, mixed with English, and it's not a language. It's just students will use phrases, and they won't be standard English [Laughs], they'll be Konglish and now just be used by every Korean, because they will have appeared in a poorly written or edited language book at some point that, you know, was in their high school textbook or something, and so everyone will use these phrases that will be not familiar to native speakers.

While Erin gently resists SE by acknowledging that she is not supposed to say SE is correct English because there are many variations of English, she then identifies Konglish as aspects of Korean mixed with English but does not include Konglish as a variety of English. In addition, she seems to position Konglish against SE by saying that students will use phrases that are not SE but rather Konglish.

In these ways, SE persists as correct English and, even though it is slightly resisted, it seems to be promoted against Konglish, which is not seen as a variety of English. In addition, because the term SE is not used explicitly but correct grammar and sentence structure are, SE may persist as and through these terms in her assessment practices. Finally, Erin's recollection of being told her English is very good for an Australian reveals how she herself has been positioned as a speaker of nonstandard English. Given that a translingual approach to language instruction creates and focuses on opportunities to confront SE in the classroom and given that Erin is not familiar with research on translingualism, it is perhaps not surprising that SE persists in these ways. However, as explained below, this persistence is also connected to her perception of her students' needs.

Table 2 Erin's Perspective on Standard English

Familiarity & associations	Yes, has heard of SE; knows it compared to Ebonics; British English, American English
Definition	Correct English; commonly accepted language form
Presence in course	Konglish (aspects of Korean mixed with English) is recognized informally in her classroom; doesn't say standard but does say correct grammar and sentence structure in her rubrics/writing prompts

Elaborations	Has been told her English is very good for an Australian but said that feels like a backhanded compliment since she only speaks one language; says she doesn't "speak maybe standard English" and doesn't expect that her students "all speak a standard English"
---------------------	---

As shown in Table 3 below, the pressures Erin feels surrounding grading, such as consistency, timeliness, and feedback, relate to SE less directly since neither SE nor correct English came up in them. However, she raised a point at the end of the interview that pointed to an additional way SE persists in her course and assessment practices. After she had asked me for my definition of SE, she said:

Like, our students want to be able to write so that their writing would be good in a professional context. They don't want us saying, oh, your writing, like, I don't want to correct your Konglish, I understand it. That's enough. They actually want their writing to be closer to closer to a native English like standard English, that's what they want. They want standard.

Put this way, if her students want SE, then her concern about giving them meaningful feedback may mean giving them feedback related to SE. In addition, her point above reveals that while SE persists through terms and concepts like correct English and grammar, SE may also persist through her students themselves. This identification of her students' desire for SE reflects what writing studies scholar Min-Zhan Lu acknowledges in her article "Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone": the anxiety of her students to "reproduce the conventions of 'education' English" (446)

poses a challenge for her and her research. For Erin, however, it does not seem that her students' desire for SE creates a challenge for her as it does for Lu. In addition, it is not clear how Erin knows that her students want SE.

As Erin expanded on this point about her students' desire for SE, she posed a series of questions that both identified a dilemma surrounding SE as well as the ways she was navigating it. As she put it, her students don't just want her to say:

Oh, you can communicate. That's enough. They want to get to a point where they can write professional business letters and things. So, yeah, I mean, I think not, like, taking points off or something for nonstandard English, like, not penalizing a student in the process is helpful. But at the end of the day, how does this student want to leave the program? Do they want to leave with the same level they came in with though? Or do they want to leave so that their writing will be, I don't know what the word is, not appreciated, but suitable in a different context. Like, how are we really benefiting the student? Like, what's the point of them coming to university and taking a writing course if we're like just keep reading the way you are? I don't want to offend you.

These questions reveal both the way Erin identifies this dilemma between promoting and resisting SE as well as the ways she navigates that dilemma: while she recognizes it can be helpful not to penalize students for "nonstandard" language usage, she also wonders how helpful it really is to value students' writing as it is, especially when they want SE. In other words, she values their usage, but she questions the value of valuing that language in the context of her students' writing goals and desires. Put more directly, she

navigates this dilemma in the following ways: by acknowledging that her students want SE, by focusing on how they will leave the program, and by connecting the value of FYC to helping students develop their writing so that it is suitable in a different context.

The questions Erin raises also point back to translingual approaches to SE and language instruction. First, her recognition of valuing students' writing and not penalizing their nonstandard language echoes both SRTOL and translingual approaches to language instruction since both advocate for valuing language difference. However, her point that her students want SE seems to echo what Gevers articulates in his response article about the complexities of linguistic social justice. As he puts it,

If we are concerned about student agency, we should ask student writers about their learning goals and aspirations, even if this means accepting that they may have internalized standard language ideologies and are therefore not (yet) prepared to challenge the status quo (99).

Erin's point—that her students want SE—is not only echoed in Gevers' point about students wanting SE but is also complicated by Gevers' addition of standard language ideology. That is, while Erin states that her students want SE, as Gevers suggests might be possible, that desire might also mean that they have internalized standard language ideologies. While a translingual approach might work to dismantle and deconstruct those ideologies, Erin's point that her students want SE, combined with the absence of an explicitly translingual approach, may make that work difficult to accomplish.

Finally, there is potential for an antiracist approach to writing assessment and SE to align with Erin's questions about race and language. Grading contracts, for example,

could provide a way for Erin to comment on her students' nonstandard language usage without penalizing them for it. An antiracist approach might also open up space to talk about the relationship between race and language, like the ways in which "language minoritized students" are expected to model their language after "the white speaking subject despite the fact that the white listening subject continues to perceive these students' language use in racialized ways" (Rosa and Flores 151). The subject of race, however, did not come up in our interview until the very end when Erin mentioned value and asked "how much do we value one type of English and then that goes, like, if that's connected to class or race? Like, why are we devaluing another?" Rosa and Flores' examination of raciolinguistic ideologies marks a potential response to Erin's question about why varieties of English get devalued, although Erin stated in response to her questions that she would "just like to have a standard English to grade to" as that "would be easier," but then said "that's definitely outside" her "area of knowledge." While what she meant by "that" is not entirely clear, her questions about class, race, and devaluing English varieties point to the potential for antiracist approaches to SE to align with and respond to those questions.

Table 3 Erin's Grading Negotiations

Pressures being felt	To be consistent between students in class; to be able to justify grade for any student between all sections; to be consistent with grading and expectations for all classes; to give feedback in a timely manner; to give students meaningful, actionable feedback
Source(s) of pressure(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency: small student body • Timeliness: university • Actionable feedback: students

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaningful feedback: feels like it's her job to give students meaningful feedback and not just say "good job" so that they can improve their writing
What it means to grade fairly & equitably	Points out from the start that she uses a rubric, shows students the rubric, creates a checklist for the final assignment draft based on rubric; bases students' peer review around rubric
Elements being negotiated	Grading students with a very low English ability and then using the same rubric for mainstream students; praising students based on effort vs. quality; assessing effort but not over-rewarding for it

Profile 2: Cynthia

Cynthia, the second term assistant professor teaching in South Korea, has taught university-level writing for 3-4 years, speaks English only, and does not consider herself multilingual, although she knows some Korean and has a former background with Spanish. She is currently teaching multilingual students and has a writing center background; she is also familiar with the terms translingualism and language diversity, although she does not have a lot of knowledge in general on them. As the two sets of tables below reveal, she defined SE as what has been dubbed correct but that she believes is unfair and needs to be challenged, especially in academia. While she does not use the terms Standard English in her course, she sees potential in using them to break them down. In her grading practices, timing is the biggest pressure she negotiates, and she has found that there is a disconnect surrounding expectations between her job and what her students need.

In making the tacit explicit, these tables reveal that Cynthia primarily resisted SE as she identified how she felt uncomfortable with it and explained that it should be broken down in academic settings. These tables also reveal, however, that SE persisted as

a paradox and in invisible ways, both through her own definition of it as well as through her own and external expectations for what she was supposed to teach in her course.

Finally, these tables reveal at least two dilemmas related to and surrounding SE that she was navigating: the tension between not being able to define SE and yet feeling like she is expected to teach it; and the expectations from her job and herself vs. what her students need. As the analyses below reveal, she navigated this dilemma by positioning SE as a tool that could be discussed and thus broken down in class, which reflects a translingual approach to SE. In addition, as I discuss, she navigated the above dilemmas in ways that complicate not only translingual approaches to SE but also antiracist approaches to SE.

Table 4 below reveals the ways Cynthia primarily resisted SE, critiquing it as being associated with intelligence in a way that is unfair and inappropriate. She also resisted SE by explaining that she believes SE is what needs to be broken down in academia. In defining SE, however, she explained that it was more of a concept than a term and that it was, paradoxically, the thing you need the terms to define but there is no perfect definition and so everyone defines it differently. In this way, SE may persist in her course as a paradoxical, arbitrary standard that, while she uses it and teaches it in class, she is ultimately uncomfortable with.

SE may also persist in her course due to her own as well as external expectations. While she stated during the interview that she does not use the term explicitly in her course, she explained that she is expected to use it. As she put it:

I feel like it's something that a lot of people would think they know how to define but then when we're actually asked as I stumbled through it a few minutes ago it's

something that I don't know that I've ever had to define or like think about in that way and yet we're kind of expected to teach it or like there's sort of at least an idea that that's what we are teaching in our, like, in the back of your mind when you're teaching it.

This point reveals the ways SE may persist in her course due to her own expectations as well as external ones and also points to a possible dilemma between defining SE and teaching it. In other words, the belief that she is expected to teach SE creates tension with her acknowledgment that she has not had to define it. This dilemma is one that has not been acknowledged or articulated in scholarship surrounding the SE dilemma, so Cynthia's reflection adds another layer of complication to the existing dilemma between resisting and promoting SE.

Finally, Cynthia's point about using SE as a tool reveals one way she could navigate this dilemma, although she has not put that tool into practice in her course. As she put it:

Now that I'm thinking about it, it could be a useful tool though to discuss and to break down what that means and why there are potentially problems with it, especially, I think, with my Korean students who largely have just sort of accepted it as like as the thing that they're striving to achieve. So, I could see it being really useful to actually break that down, to think about it.

In other words, there could be potential in explicitly using and problematizing the term SE with her Korean students since they have largely accepted it as what they are striving to achieve. Breaking SE down in this way aligns with a translingual approach to

deconstructing the SE myth, although Cynthia adds the term “tool” as a way to specify that approach.

Table 4 Cynthia’s Perspective on Standard English

Familiarity & associations	Has heard of it; associated with intelligence in a way that’s unfair and inappropriate
Definition	Agreed-upon form of English; at some point it was decided that a particular dialect of English was going to be called Standard English; has been dubbed the correct form to use in various contexts; in academia it’s agreed upon as how you’re supposed to write to sound academic or formal; more of a concept than a term; the thing you need the terms to define but there’s no perfect definition so everyone defines it differently
Presence in course	Has never used terms in course; thinks it could be a useful tool to discuss and break down; tool to discuss why there are problems with it; she uses it and teaches it in class but thinks there are problems with it
Elaborations	Is uncomfortable with how standardized English is; keeps people out and builds boundaries; believes we need to be breaking that down especially in academia instead of upholding a particular, random standard

Table 5 below reveals two additional dilemmas Cynthia identified surrounding SE. As she explained, the pressures she feels surrounding grading stem from her desire to keep her job as well as meeting her students’ needs and wants, although, as she explained, those two are not always aligned. Elaborating on this point further, she said:

I was working with the expectations of what I was hearing from the other people in our department and then that wasn’t quite what they were looking for previously. And we also discovered after having some conversations and talking with the main campus that we do think it was a bit of a disconnect for our students

too. Apparently, our students are not writing academic papers anywhere except in our classes, nothing like a research, academic research paper, and so anyway there's like a lot of pressure to teach them the right way while, also, I don't always necessarily ascribe to the same right way as the people around me do, if that makes sense.

These misalignments reveal at least two additional dilemmas related to SE. Since she already identified that she believes she is expected to teach her students SE, this "right way" may include SE, especially because, as explained in Chapter Five, she added grammar and formatting to her rubric based on a suggestion she received from within the program. At least one dilemma, then, is between outside pressure to teach students the "right way" vs. the ways Cynthia does not necessarily ascribe to that same "right way." There is also a dilemma between giving her students what they need vs. navigating misaligned expectations for the course itself.

Cynthia seems to navigate these dilemmas in at least two ways. First, since she is concerned about wanting to keep her job and understands that as a source of pressure, that concern may influence how she navigates (and has already navigated) the dilemma surrounding teaching the "right way." In line with her thoughts about using SE as a tool above, however, she reflected on how she might incorporate valuing students' languages with her assessment practices as an additional way she could navigate some of these dilemmas. Although her program requires her composition course to be taught in English, she said:

I would think that, my instinct is to say I think it can be really valuable if a student is trying to get ideas out for the student to use whichever language the ideas are flowing in, especially when you're doing something like a freewriting exercise, but as an instructor I wouldn't know how to assess, and so that would be fine in general exercises, but I don't know how I would implement it in any kind of fair kind of universality beyond notetaking, freewriting, those types of exercises. But, again, I don't even really know if that's what you're talking about so [Laughs] so that's all I have to offer about I think.

In addition to thinking about using SE as a tool to break down in class in order to resist it, Cynthia's reflection above reveals another translingual and SRTOL orientation to language as a means of resisting SE. However, she points out that she is not sure how she would assess valuing her students' languages in that way, particularly when they speak Korean but she does not. This point raises a question that I believe speaks directly to SRTOL: is valuing students' languages, such as other varieties of English or, more particularly, other languages, something that is possible to assess? While translingual and antiracist approaches—as extensions of SRTOL—both seek to combat and confront SE-centric myths, offering different assessment practices as a means of challenging SE, I have not seen conversations surrounding these approaches grapple with this question in particular.

Table 5 Cynthia's Grading Negotiations

Pressures being felt	A lot of pressures in general; timing is biggest; grading in a timely manner and getting students to understand what a timely
-----------------------------	---

	manner is; trying to find a way to say things so that students will read through, understand comments, and implement comments; tries to limit herself to no more than one comment per paragraph; challenge of students working in different fields and guiding them to the right sources; wants to go deeper with her comments; disconnect between home and Korea campuses
Source(s) of pressure(s)	Wanting to keep her job; giving students what they need; not sure those two things always line up; different expectations or focus between campuses; what do her students really need; worries about creating more stress for them by focusing on grammar, formatting, or correctness but maybe losing rhetorical arguments
What it means to grade fairly & equitably	Part of why rubrics are emphasized; trying to make sure she's giving fair grades and not unintentionally inflating grades; making sure she can see they have done their best with concepts and learned something about process writing; seeing how students build each assignment; based on objectives of particular course; rubric is really important because she needs it to be flexible but also represent main content she's looking for; this way she can apply the same general criteria; rubric is as base to challenge herself on and level playing field; wants all students to succeed and do well; really need rubrics on her campus because students will compare grades/comments line by line; rubric also helps justify her response and check point what students did
Elements being negotiated	Has to be careful for students doing topics she's not familiar with; not assume knowledge she has that isn't in their paper; careful not to apply knowledge students haven't given her, like do students actually understand or does she just know that thing already vs. was something really unclear or does she just not know about it; tries to grade essays all at once to avoid getting into a different groove

Profile 3: Michael

Michael, an adjunct instructor in the United States, has taught university-level writing for 2-3 years, and is multilingual: he speaks English, has studied German for 12-13 years, speaks a little bit of Spanish and French, and has also studied Latin. He has

taught English language learners across the spectrum, with a background as an ESL specialist for a writing center, and is familiar with research on both translingualism and language diversity. As the two sets of tables below reveal, he identified SE as what is considered both a norm and ideal form of language in educational settings that is used to devalue other forms of language. Finally, he identified the pressure he feels surrounding his expectations for student progress and said there was an unquestioned value in writing that looks polished and meets SE.

In making the tacit explicit, these tables reveal that Michael resisted SE in visible ways, both by problematizing it himself and reflecting on the linguistic equity spiel he gives to his students, and in invisible ways, by not including it on his rubric but by explaining in the interview why he would not intentionally put SE on his rubrics. In explaining the ways SE can be upheld by stating that it is not a term people usually hear and is also a creation, he also revealed how SE continues to persist in academia. As I explain, these forms of resistance also reflect translingual and antiracist approaches to language instruction. Finally, these tables reveal that, for Michael, there is a specific dilemma surrounding SE and international students. As he put it, there is a tension in the work he does with international students between his linguistic equity spiel and their desires to write well. As the analyses below reveal, that tension complicates antiracist approaches to language instruction. In addition, the way Michael navigated that tension—by articulating that there was a grey area teachers could get into where it does become okay to give those students an indication of where their writing stands—extends translingual approaches to language instruction.

Table 6 below reveals the ways Michael problematized and thus resisted SE, defining it as a variety of English that is a norm but also a perception of a norm that has some kind of valuation in it. Problematizing SE further, he explained that SE is not a term that is visible or even used explicitly because it is a creation. Considering his familiarity with translingualism, his resistance to SE makes sense since translingualists in writing studies have identified SE as a myth. His point that SE can be used as a measure against which other forms of English are devalued, however, reflects more of an antiracist approach to language wherein SE's power and anchoring in raciolinguistic ideologies are recognized and pushed against. His resistance to SE, then, reflects both translingual and antiracist approaches to language instruction.

Table 6 Michael's Perspective on Standard English

Familiarity & associations	Has heard of SE; register, grammar, vocabulary, accent sometimes but not really, correctness; he associates it with grumpy teachers who secretly delight in delivering a paper covered in red ink to a student not thinking how harmful that can be; people who would have grammar as 50% of a paper's grade
Definition	A variety of English that's generally considered the norm; represents the ideal language used in educational settings; often used as a measure against which other forms of English are compared and devalued; a perception of the norm that is used in educational purposes to potentially devalue or discriminate among other norms of language; usually some kind of valuation in it
Presence in course	At some point it may have been on a rubric, but luckily the people he works with recognize that as potentially problematic; would not intentionally put SE on a rubric now
Elaborations	Said people could reasonably go a lifetime without hearing about SE because it's a creation and because what people speak and communicate with every day for the most part is not SE but just speaking and communicating a language

Complicating this resistance to SE, Table 7 shows Michael's grapplings with a dilemma surrounding SE and his work with international students. As a precursor to that dilemma, he makes the point that there is an often unquestioned core belief that writing needs to look a certain way, such that it is in compliance with SE, which is partly what fuels the pressure he feels to provide his students feedback so that they can make significant leaps to where he perceives they would need to be in order to be an effective writer. As he reflected on what it means to grade fairly and equitably, he identified the dilemma he experiences that more specifically addresses that pressure he feels surrounding feedback:

So, if you talked to most international students and you tell them I respect your dialect, I respect the errors that you make, and I accept them. And people who tell you that you need to be writing, according to a standard, are people who are trying to consolidate power and people who are unjustly wielding power and who are contributing to societal inequities. You can tell that to international student all day. And they're gonna come back to you and say, I don't care. I need to be able to write well enough so that I can publish this when I go back to China. If I can't publish this when I go back to China, I don't eat, or if I go back to Korea and I can't figure out a way to get a job, because I can write well enough in English, which is why I'm here, by the way, I literally am going to have to go do a job that I don't want to talk about. It's not a pretty thing. I've heard this. I've had these conversations before and I worked with people from seventeen-year-olds to forty-

five-year-olds many, many times, telling me the same thing when I kinda go off on the linguistic equity spiel.

In other words, there is almost a disconnect between what his international students need and what he articulates in his linguistic equity spiel, which itself seems inspired by an antiracist approach to language. This disconnect, then, appears to add a point of complication to an antiracist approach that says to students: let us change the system that disempowers you so that you can have the same kinds of linguistic freedom and liberties given to white students. If Michael's work with international students shows their concerns not for linguistic equity but for socioeconomic opportunities, then I would ask: does an antiracist approach make room for international students, like Michael's, who are concerned about writing well enough in English so that they can get a job and eat?

As Michael continued to reflect on this disconnect, he revealed one way that he potentially navigates this disconnect that reflects but also extends a translingual approach to writing instruction and assessment. Continuing the point he made above about his linguistic equity spiel, he said:

...So, there's also something in in grading where I think it's reasonable to—and we can't always do it—but it's reasonable to tell a student where they are based on where they wanna be. And so, based on their goal, then you get into this kind of weird grey area where you are saying, look, this is an English class. You have one semester. I can't teach you all of the English grammar, but I can teach you how to learn stuff and I can point you toward the places where you can figure that stuff

out so that, based on whatever the audiences in the future you have, at least, the initial tools where you can start to figure that out.

This grey area of telling a student where they are based on where they want to be reveals one way Michael navigates this disconnect between his linguistic equity spiel and his international students' needs. This grey area also echoes a translingual approach to SE and assessment wherein, for example, Lee suggests letting students dictate the portion of their grade that comes from grammar. Michael's use of the phrase grey area as well as his acknowledgment of the limitations of a one-semester English writing course, however, slightly extend that translingual approach by adding a way of naming the space wherein that approach occurs and by acknowledging the material constraints of FYC courses.

Table 7 Michael's Grading Negotiations

Pressures being felt	Working with students with low language proficiency, he feels pressure to bump a student's paper from where it is to where he perceives it should be; feels pressure to provide feedback and instruction that will allow students to make ridiculous leaps from where they currently are to where he perceives they would need to be in order to be a really effective writer
Source(s) of pressure(s)	Said there's an underlying value motivating that desire: if an essay is polished, error-free, smartly written, and has a good argument, there's a value that says there is a point at which an essay is in compliance with the variety of English normally understood to be hallmark of academic or educated writing; there's an often unquestioned core belief that writing needs to look a certain way; not sure where exactly those values come from, but looking at the history of higher education shows teachers complaining about students not writing the way they should be.
What it means to grade fairly & equitably	If Standard English is the norm but way more people speak English as a second language, technically the norm is what we would see with second language; equity requires us to recognize first that it's very difficult to define a norm; second,

	if we are going to define a norm equitably, it's going to skew more towards accepting and really trying to understand second language writing; grading fairly means only grading students based on what you have taught them; however, it also isn't fair to be so permissive that you're not going to tell students their writing isn't going to be effective for what they want to do in life.
Elements being negotiated	With international students, you can say you respect their dialect and accept their errors and that people who uphold a writing standard are trying to consolidate power and unjustly wielding it while contributing to societal inequities, but those students will say they don't care because they need to be able to write well enough to publish when they go back to China; he's seen this and says it's not a pretty thing; he's had students tell him if they can't publish that writing, they won't be able to eat or get a job; says it's reasonable in grading to tell a student where they are based on where they want to be; based on their goal, you can get into a gray area where you can't teach them everything but you can teach them how to learn and point them to the tools where they can start to figure those things out, like, you can hire an editor.

Profile 4: L. Baldwin

L. Baldwin, director of a state-wide writing project in the United States, has taught university-level writing for 15 years and does not consider herself multilingual although she took 16 years of French. She has explained in the first interview that she gained a lot of experience teaching multilingual students since her current university is so diverse, and while she is familiar with research on translingualism as well as language diversity, she is working on becoming more familiar with that research. As the two sets of tables below reveal, she defined SE as both an oxymoron but also guiding rules for writing and speaking in English; she explained that she does not use the terms Standard English in her course and believes that she assumes the English she teaches is SE.

Finally, she explained that she worries most about hurting a student's confidence and feels additional pressure that comes from her own expectations about teaching.

In making the tacit explicit, these tables reveal that L. Baldwin resisted SE by defining it as an oxymoron but also an anachronistic term that is becoming less standard. However, her reflection on the ways she assumes SE is being taught in her course reveal one way SE may persist invisibly in her course. These tables also reveal two areas of tension surrounding SE: first, there is a tension between her desire to reward her students' efforts and her desire to apply the same standards to everyone. The second tension is one she identified between trying to honor students' language while recognizing that students have to consider their audience and put their best foot forward. As the analyses below reveal, her resistance to SE echoes a translingual approach but does not put that approach into practice. In addition, the second tension she identifies surrounding SE both reveals one way she may navigate the SE dilemma and also offers a re-articulation of the dilemma between resisting and promoting SE.

Table 8 below reveals the ways SE was both resisted by L. Baldwin herself and yet persistent in her course. Defining SE as guiding rules for speaking and writing in English and yet identifying it as an oxymoron, L. Baldwin resisted SE. However, since she said SE may still apply in certain genres and reflected on the way she assumes SE is what is taught in her course, SE may persist in her course as an assumption and in connection with basic expectations for English communication, specific genres, and readers' ability to understand what gets written. Since she is working on becoming more familiar with translingualism, this persistence/resistance combination may reflect that

work since a translingual orientation to language would recognize SE as a myth and paradox. However, a translingual approach would also allow for deconstructing SE in the classroom, which does not appear to yet be put into practice, although L. Baldwin's reflection about the way she assumes SE is taught may be working towards that practice.

Table 8 L. Baldwin's Perspective on Standard English

Familiarity & associations	Has heard of SE; is a basic term she doesn't recognize it as standing for much, which she says is her fault; maybe frames it in terms of business writing; puts it in genre; basic English but says that's stupid-sounding too
Definition	Kind of an oxymoron, like who makes up the rules; it's guiding rules for the way you speak and write in English; however, words can shift, like a new word that might appear in the New York Times, which isn't necessarily grammar; doesn't believe there's a king up there who's saying you must do this or off with your head; predicts her grandchildren if not sooner will not use apostrophes, but she tells her students about these things because they are part of SE but that's going to change; the definition has gotten wider or not as standard
Presence in course	Doesn't use SE in her course or with her students and doesn't know why; SE sounds off-putting, like the title of a grammar book; assumes that the English we teach is standard, although she said maybe she's fooling herself instead of a list of rules; she's never had a student come up and say what's Standard English? If you're writing a journal entry, SE doesn't apply so much, but if you're writing a lab report, it kind of does even though some of the conventions are different; if there's not attention to the basic expectations for English communication you're not gonna be able to get your audience to understand
Elaborations	SE is almost like an anachronistic term; said it would be interesting to look at other people's syllabi and see if the words even come up; she's guessing the words don't come up; said her views on writing she's been able to develop without competition from administrators; she's taught in situations where she's been in control of what she's taught and recognizes most teachers are not in that position; she doesn't want to disparage teachers who have use things they're handed or have to use rubrics; she wishes that we would come to a consensus

	about this teaching of writing, and she's sorry we don't because it's crucial to a democracy, especially the critical thinking that comes through it
--	--

Table 9 touches on this connection between language, SE, and meaning, revealing L. Baldwin's critiques of grading as well as, ultimately, two points of tension that surround SE. First, while she makes the connection between working or using language in order to communicate clearly, she also voices concern about grades and criticizes their amorphous nature. This criticism echoes what some writing studies scholars, like Peter Elbow, have argued about the unfair nature of grades. When combined with her point about wanting to reward students' efforts, L. Baldwin's critique of grades touches on Inoue's push for grading contracts, which reward students for their labor and effort rather than grading them against SE. A grading contract, however, is still a means of assigning grades (albeit contractually), so L. Baldwin's critique of grades as amorphous and concern about her students not even looking at their grades remain unresolved.

Second, building on this concern about grades, L. Baldwin identified two points of tension that related to but did not explicitly use the term SE. Emphasizing the unique, contextual nature of grading and teaching writing, she said that she does not "think you can cookie-cutter the process of teaching writing with students." Adding to this point, she said she wants to make sure she is looking at the things in her student's writing that were intended to be looked at while at the same time trying to apply the same standards to everyone. Herein lies the first tension: her desire to reward students' efforts and look at the things in her students' writing that were intended to be looked at vs. her desire to

apply the same standards to everyone. Although she does not use the term SE, her use of the word standards invokes SE, particularly because of her previous reflection on the way she assumes SE is what is being taught in her course.

Adding to this tension, she articulated a dilemma surrounding SE that, while it appears in this chapter's epigraph, bears repeating here:

I can appreciate a student's, you know, linguistic differences or whatever. But bottom line is when they write a letter of interest, they have to consider who's reading it and they have to put their best foot forward. So again, I feel like right now, the way things are, there are expectations and so I have to recognize those and honor them while honoring the student's own language. So, it can be tricky, I think.

This dilemma centered on expectations reflects the way some writing studies scholars, such as Susan K. Miller-Cochran, have articulated this dilemma. As stated in Chapter Three, Miller-Cochran says writing programs and writing program administrators (WPAs) are caught in the following dilemma: "We want to honor (and if possible, preserve) students' home languages and cultures, but we are expected to teach them 'Standard American English'" (212). For L. Baldwin, SE seems to be wrapped up in audience expectations and different genres, which may be one way she navigates this dilemma. In addition, her point about honoring these expectations as well as her students' own languages offers one way of rearticulating the SE dilemma as not just one between resisting or promoting SE but rather as one between honoring genre and reader expectations and honoring her students' own languages.

Table 9 L. Baldwin's Grading Negotiations

Pressures being felt	Greatest anxiety is that she will knock down a student's confidence; says grades are an amorphous kind of thing, and it feels wrong quantifying writing with a number or letter; says 9 times out of 10, she looks at the paper or article and says according to our standards this is about a B+, and then she rigs numbers; says that's all the student ends up seeing; worries that labeling prevents students from really looking at the writing and seeing how it's going
Source(s) of pressure(s)	Doesn't come from the people who evaluate her, although she's been in that situation before; pressure comes from her and her expectations for what her teaching should be; tries to make assignments relevant to what students might be doing; doesn't have a barrage of students knocking on her door and complaining about their grades; thinks students sometimes don't even look at their grades although she will make them look if they are meeting
What it means to grade fairly & equitably	It's maybe counterintuitive, but looking at the writing of each student in the context of that student's work; that's not to give leeway if that's not the student's first language but to look behind the thinking and then help the student be able to express the quality of his thought; you can pick up grammar and solve that yourself, but if there's not an understanding of how you can work language to communicate clearly, that's hard to mess with
Elements being negotiated	Wants to make sure she's looking at the things in writing that were intended to be looked at across the board; wants to make sure she's applying the same kind of standards to everybody; if you see nice improvement and progress, it's hard not to reward that; if a student has put in an enormous amount of the right kind of effort, like asking questions, coming to conferences, and revising, that needs to be rewarded as well; while one paper may be brilliant, that other student can still achieve something and that has to be recognized

Profile 5: Sophia

Sophia, a term associate professor and associate director of composition for multilingual writers in the United States, has taught university-level writing for 16 years and considers herself trilingual: she speaks English, Arabic, and French, and she knows Greek but says she is losing it. She has significant experience teaching multilingual writers, having designed and re-designed courses for multilingual students. She is very familiar with research on translingualism and language diversity and considers herself a translingualist. As the two tables below reveal, she took an explicit stance on SE by identifying it as an arbitrary, racist standard and advocating for facilitating a translingual and language justice approach to composition. Finally, she explained that her main goal for students is rhetorical flexibility, although her students struggle with developing that; she also explained that she feels pressure with her international students and the expectations they are navigating in their own program.

In making the tacit explicit, these tables reveal the ways Sophia actively resisted SE by calling it out as a racist standard and advocating for a translingual and language justice approach to composition, although the role of SE in that resistance may be less visible since she does not use those words in her course. Her resistance to SE, however, points to the ways in which she navigates the dilemma surrounding SE and, more particularly, the entrenchment of the SE myth. These tables also reveal the conflict and pressure Sophia feels surrounding her international students' grappling with English and her own ideological stance on SE. The analyses below suggest that there are limitations to translingual and antiracist approaches to language instruction, particularly surrounding

the conflict Sophia feels regarding her international students. In addition, while these approaches offer ways to confront and combat SE in the classroom, they may still not quite account for the material conditions that faculty like Sophia are dealing with when teaching international students who have yet not matriculated.

Table 10 below reveals a number of points related to SE, translanguaging, and antiracist writing assessment. Identifying herself as a translanguager, Sophia took an explicit stance on challenging SE and not only argued that there is no standard but also stated that our job in composition is to wake people up to this ideology that we are perpetuating a racist system that needs to be challenged. These challenges against SE reflect both translanguaging and antiracist approaches since she not only discusses monolingual ideology with her students but also argues for challenging the larger system that perpetuates SE as an arbitrary standard. The words Standard English, however, have played a slightly less visible role in that challenging since she acknowledged that she talks with her students about SE without necessarily naming it. Her point that she wants to include or name SE in her discussions with students, however, is an interesting point when considering translanguaging approaches to SE. That is, while translanguaging approaches to SE might advocate for deconstructing SE with students in the classroom, the role of naming and naming and using the words Standard English is perhaps not as clear. Thus, while Sophia is very familiar with research on translanguaging and language diversity, it is interesting that she has not used the term SE explicitly in her classroom.

Another point raised in the table below concerns antiracist writing assessment and SE. For example, Sophia explained that because of her associate director position, she

changed one of the composition program's learning goals that still contained SE so that it would then reflect linguistic noticing and enable students to critically read and meet genre expectations. Removing SE from this learning goal reflects an antiracist approach to SE since, for example, CCCC's recent Demand made clear that SE should stop being used and treated as the communicative norm in writing instruction. In addition, her push to remove SE reveals one way she has worked to navigate the dilemma surrounding SE and, more particularly, the entrenchment of the SE myth. However, when it comes to assessment, the approach Sophia mentions is labor-based contract grading, but there does not seem to be program-wide guidance on the role of SE in assessment.

Table 10 Sophia's Perspective on Standard English

Familiarity & associations	Is familiar with SE; racist, imperialist, constructed; pragmatism, access, fair equitable, teaching everybody that language; common language or baseline language; lingua franca of English
Definition	An arbitrary standard that has been perpetuated through systemic racist institutionalized structures; is so entrenched in our society that people unconsciously believe and subscribe to it not realizing the five linguistic myths, like that there is no standard but that it's a standardized version of English and was constructed
Presence in course	Not as much as she wants to now that she's more in a language justice frame of mind; those words are not in her materials; talks about SE in activities where she has students translate a title to academic English from their native language; they talk about how some terms can't be translated and then discuss what that says about power and English monolingual ideology; talks about it without necessarily naming it
Elaborations	Said that last year she changed the composition program's first-year learning goals because the language one still said something about following SE or the conventions of standard edited American English and grammar and mechanics; she said that wasn't okay and wanted to change it because of her position as associate director of composition for multilingual writers;

	<p>changed it to linguistic noticing and enabling students to critically read and meet genre expectations; our job in composition is to wake people up to this idea that we're just perpetuating a racist ideology; we should challenge the system; there are a lot of ways to do that in the writing class, like through language noticing activities, labor-based contract grading, and critical language awareness; these facilitate a translingual and language justice approach to composition</p>
--	---

Table 11 pushes on this point about assessment by revealing the conflict Sophia feels surrounding SE, her international students, and her grading feedback. As Sophia explains, she feels pressure surrounding her work with international students because she is trying to figure out how to balance her ideological stance on SE with the practical expectations of those students as well as those of the program they are in. In addition, she feels pressure when those students have very low levels of English proficiency because they are learning that language, and so she feels like there is an imperative to help them with that grappling and learning. When she grades their writing, then, she does comment on their language and feels inner conflict about it. This balance as well as the conflict Sophia experiences surrounding her international students' grappling with the English language reveal at least two points that translingual and antiracist approaches to SE and assessment have yet to address. For example, while labor-based grading contracts re-focus instructors' assessment energies on students' writing efforts rather than their products, the points Sophia is grappling with may not be solved or addressed by using those contracts. In addition, while a translingual approach might entail letting students dictate the portion of their grade that comes from grammar or even SE, that approach might create conflict with Sophia's ideological stance wherein she focuses on

dismantling and challenging monolingual ideology with her students. In short, Sophia's attempt to balance her ideological stance on SE with her international students' grappling with the English language is something that neither a translingual nor an antiracist approach to SE and assessment can yet fully address.

Finally, the point Sophia makes about the demands of the culture of the program her international students are in raises a final issue about material conditions and constraints. While translingual and antiracist approaches to SE and assessment both provide ways for instructors to dismantle and combat SE in their classrooms, these approaches may not yet make room for the material constraints and conditions that Sophia's international students, as well as Sophia, are in. For example, Sophia revealed that there are political and interdepartmental tensions that fall on the faculty who are trying to prepare these international students for matriculation. While writing studies scholar Jonathan Hall advocates for the need of a translingual approach to emphasize the contingent quality of SE in other disciplines since that conception is still not widely shared in those disciplines (42), that point does not quite account for the material conditions that faculty like Sophia are dealing with when teaching international students who have yet not matriculated. In addition, as Sophia made clear, these tensions that fall on faculty stem from systematized, racist language ideology, but that ideology is, as Sophia put it, such a huge beast and is so entrenched in these international programs. Thus, even when Sophia focuses on increasing her students' rhetorical flexibility as one way of navigating these tensions, the points she made about the entrenchment of racist

language ideology and the material conditions and constraints of these international programs remain unresolved.

Table 11 Sophia's Grading Negotiations

Pressures being felt	Mostly feels pressure when working with international students because she's trying to figure out how to balance her ideological stance on this issue with the practical expectations they have and the demands of the culture of the program they're in; like, when international students at very low levels of proficiency of English, where you really have trouble understanding what they're trying to communicate in English, she feels like there's an imperative to help them learn and grapple with the English language because they're learning a new language; it's not like they're using a language that's just a different code; in that situation, she does comment on language sometimes and feels inner conflict; when not working with English language learners, she focuses on helping them achieve their communicative goals; negotiating with a linguist in the co-taught course also adds a layer of complexity
Source(s) of pressure(s)	Expectations from joint venture program that they're teaching students proper English; these students are not matriculated yet; they need to meet a certain level of language proficiency in order to be admitted to the university; this program uses a European framework of reference for its language scale, so students need to meet a certain benchmark according to that scale; departments are also expecting a certain level of fluency; if faculty who are not woke with regards to language ideology and standard edited American English see deviations from that standard, they get angry and blame the program for not adequately preparing the students; there are political and inter-departmental tensions that fall on the faculty trying to prepare students for matriculation; there's confusion there and talk about how to navigate that knowing what they know of language and pressure students feel to reach that language level; it's all because of systematized, racist language ideology, really, but it's such a huge beast and so entrenched, especially in these international programs; in their program, they focus on complexity and strategic competence and tell faculty outside of program that they might get inaccurate writing but the students

	are aware of how to use complex structures and when to use them appropriately
What it means to grade fairly & equitably	Doesn't believe we should grade on any standards, not just standard edited English; is a big proponent of labor-based contract grading; that approach is equitable because we're grading students on their effort and their process rather than their final product; otherwise it's like we've created these arbitrary criteria that they somehow have to meet but if you have a student with a broken literacy background, there's no way they're gonna be able to get this level; at the same time, if you have a student who's coming from the best private schools in the area and they're in the same classroom and have to meet the same criteria that's not equitable; wants to create a labor-based contract or version of English but not for the international students
Elements being negotiated	Main goal is rhetorical flexibility and making sure students are rhetorically competent; when assessing their work she's looking at how aware they are of the rhetorical situation they're writing in and the genre; says her students struggle with that all the time; it's that they have this language, code, or style but they need to learn how to shape it for the context they're in

Profile 6: Susan

Susan, a term assistant professor and assistant program coordinator for an international program in the United States, has taught university-level writing for 14-15 years and does not consider herself multilingual, although she studied Chinese and Latin. She has spent most of her career teaching classes designed for multilingual students and is a little familiar with research on translingualism and language diversity, explaining that she has also studied critical race theory. As the two sets of tables below reveal, she questioned SE and called it a problematic term while explaining that it is tied to race and socioeconomic status. In her course, if she uses the terms Standard English, she would put air quotes around them. Finally, she explained that time is a big pressure she feels in

her grading practices, especially when she is trying to understand what her students are trying to say in their writing.

In making the tacit explicit, these tables reveal how Susan resisted SE by questioning it, identifying it with race and socioeconomic class, and calling it an anxiety-provoking term. SE may also play a more visible role in that resistance since she explained that she probably does use those words in her classroom when challenging them. As the analyses below reveal, her resistance to SE reflects a combination of translingual and antiracist approaches to language, particularly through her proposal of the term linguistic etiquette as a more useful way of thinking about SE. That term also reveals one way in which Susan navigates the SE dilemma. In addition, the SE-related dilemma she identified between form and content and her approach to that dilemma revealed some limitations to translingual approaches to language instruction.

Table 12 below reveals a combination of antiracist and translingual approaches to language in Susan's definition of and resistance to SE. Her definition of SE began with a series of questions in which she asked what kind of English and what kind of standard SE could be referring to. She also said SE was a problematic term and explicitly stated that there is no Standard English but that there are a lot of different Englishes, which is important to respect. She also tied SE to race and socioeconomic status, explaining that SE is this idea that we are supposed to be measuring ourselves against a standard, which is anxiety-provoking. These questions and challenges of SE mark Susan's resistance to SE while also revealing the more visible role SE plays in that resistance. As she explained, she probably does use the words Standard American English in her class and

would put air quotes around them when saying them out loud. In addition, she stated that when using that term she would want to problematize it.

These questions and challenges of SE also reflect both a translingual and antiracist approach to language since she directly stated that there is no such thing as Standard English, which reflects translingualism's challenge to the SE myth. In addition, her identification of the role race and socioeconomic status play in conceptions and propagations of SE echoes an antiracist recognition of the ways in which SE is anchored in raciolinguistic ideologies. Her questions and challenges of SE, then, may reflect one of the ways in which translingual and antiracist approaches to SE intersect since, as I explained in Chapter Two, both approaches share the same goal of combatting and challenging SE, which is what her questions and challenges do. In addition, this intersection makes sense considering that she is familiar with research on translingualism and critical race theory.

Further challenging and then re-making SE, Susan proposed a term in the table below that reflected another possible translingual/antiracist combination approach to SE. After stating that SE was not a useful term, she proposed the term linguistic etiquette, which she explained as not about meeting a standard but rather about seeing language as a tool for communication. Expanding her point, she said:

And we know, like, etiquette is different at home and with your friends in a more formal situation. So, you know, you see your friend and you might give them a big hug, or just wave and you're meeting somebody for a job interview and you're gonna shake their hand, so, yeah, I think that does make a lot more sense in terms

of just thinking about, you know, what are the different forms that are appropriate for different situations, and students can all recognize that too because everybody writes, you know, you text your friend differently from your parent differently from your teacher, right? If you don't you need to start now [Laughs], so I think that's an easy lesson for them to understand.

Susan's proposal of the term linguistic etiquette reveals one way she navigates this SE dilemma by re-making SE. Her claim that SE is not a useful term also reflects, in some ways, CCCC's Demand that SE not be used or treated as a communicative norm. By directly stating that SE is not useful and then using the term linguistic etiquette, she is, in some ways, meeting that demand by not treating SE as the norm. Her treatment of language as a tool for communication also reflects a translingual approach since she explained that everybody writes differently, which echoes a translingual acknowledgment of the ways in which every writer writes differently and is, in fact, multilingual. However, what is not clear is whether SE could be considered one form of linguistic etiquette and therefore still persist as a norm but not the only norm.

Table 12 Susan's Perspective on Standard English

Familiarity & associations	Yes, is familiar with it; standards; standards of correctness; people will usually say standard American English or standard British English
Definition	Even if you say Standard English, then what kind of standard? What kind of English are we talking about? American? British? It's a really problematic term; there is no Standard English; there are a lot of different Englishes and it's important to respect that; what we consider standard American English is the language spoken by a particular class of people, which ties to socioeconomic status and race for the most part; it's this

	whole idea that there is some standard we're all supposed to be measuring ourselves against, which is anxiety-provoking
Presence in course	Probably does use it, and if she does she would use air quotes, or she might say what's considered to be standard American English; if she uses that term she would want to problematize it, like it's just really English spoken by particular people, which is not what's considered to be correct; she tends to talk more about grammatical accuracy, although she's not sure that's better
Elaborations	SE isn't a useful term; it's important to problematize it and point out that that's really about class and race and people that have received a particular kind of education and training; we need to focus more on communication and listening and understanding each other rather than correcting and policing each other; she thinks of linguistic etiquette, like you would distinguish linguistic etiquette or grammatical accuracy from content and your ability to communicate; it's not about meeting a standard; language is a tool you have for communication, and there are aspects of it considered to be correct according to the standard and there are different ones that exist for different language groups; those things that are not about meaning we would consider to be linguistic etiquette because it helps to think about different forms that are expected but also certain things that can be played with or broken

As Table 13 below reveals, Susan articulated concerns about self-awareness, student load, and time surrounding grading that point back to the potential limitations of a translingual approach to language instruction. As she explained, there is pressure to think about the whole student and what they are learning, which is a huge challenge for assessment. She then explained that time plays a part in that challenge because when a student's writing is not skillful, it takes time to figure out what that student is saying. In addition, she explained that composition courses are gatekeeping courses, so there are concerns about matriculation as well as ramifications for not passing those courses. These

concerns about time and matriculation reveal the material conditions and constraints that may still not be accounted for in taking a translingual approach. For example, while a translingual approach advocates for dismantling SE with students in the classroom or letting students choose the portion of their grade that comes from grammar/SE, that work takes time, especially with students who may still be grappling with the English language and who also may not have yet matriculated. In addition, when instructors have a teaching load of 80 students, like some of Susan's colleagues, the feasibility of a translingual approach under those conditions seems more limited.

Finally, Table 13 reveals an SE-related dilemma and one way in which Susan navigates that dilemma. As she explained, one set of elements she negotiates when grading is best captured in the form vs. content struggle. As she put it, part of the challenge occurs with papers where students are working hard but the paper may be a "mess," and so

it really takes our time to focus on them, and think about the student and really try to see what they're trying to do. And then value that as opposed to just seeing, like, well, you know, you don't have topic sentences and you know, you don't have a clear conclusion. And I'm not sure what you're trying to do with all of this. Like, well, the students aren't sure either. But there's all this really good work that's happening and we all will say that critical thinking is the work that we really want most to see, but those formal elements are really distracting. And it's a challenge too, because our students are going on into these degree programs where we do have faculty that will complain about their grammar, because they

think, oh, they can't write, you know, and if you ask them about it, it's usually always about grammar.

In her approach to grading and helping students navigate what they want to say in this form vs. content struggle, she explained that she is more directive, especially because the students that have the most trouble articulating themselves in more of a Standard English, academic manner need that time to sit down and hear from her that they might mean one thing and that they can write that in this way. This more directive approach, then, reveals one way she navigates the dilemma between this form vs. content struggle. However, this approach also reveals one way SE may persist in her course. That is, her acknowledgment that some students have trouble articulating themselves in more of a Standard English or academic manner seems to support the idea that there is a Standard or at least academic form of English, even though Susan herself problematizes SE.

More important, perhaps, is that Susan's point about the challenge of those distracting formal elements in students' papers reveals, again, the limitations of a translingual/antiracist approach to language instruction. As she explained, faculty who will go on to teach her students may equate grammar with writing and meaning, so her emphasis on critical thinking and antiracist/translingual approaches to problematizing SE may be challenged by faculty in other degree programs. Although Hall makes the case for translingualism in writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in the disciplines (WID) "to evolve from an insurgent pedagogical movement, and toward a research agenda located at the intersection of languages, and crossing the boundaries of disciplines" (43), this evolution from movement to research agenda may be moving too

quickly to address Susan's concern. That is, this push for translanguaging in WAC/WID to evolve may still not solve or address the ways that the SE myth gets perpetuated by faculty in other disciplines. In addition, while an antiracist approach to SE, like that explained in WPA-GO's Statement on Anti-Racist Assessment, might prioritize combatting SE-centric myths and making those ideologies visible, the translation of that work to other disciplines and faculty is not as clear. In short, while translanguaging/antiracist approaches to SE may both work to combat and confront SE-centric myths in language instruction, Susan's point about faculty still equating grammar with writing reveals the limitations of that work as well as the dilemma that still exists between promoting and resisting SE.

Table 13 Susan's Grading Negotiations

Pressures being felt	Time is a big issue; if their writing is not as skillful it takes a lot of time to understand what they're trying to say and what's happening; the reason people teach 5 paragraph essays is because we're doing too much grading and have too many students and don't have time to sit there and try to figure out what you're saying; time is important for when writing is not skillful but you're trying to understand the content or when the writing is skillful but the content isn't good; composition courses are gatekeeping classes; in this program, there are concerns about matriculation and ramifications for not passing; pressure to think about the whole student and what they're learning, which is a big challenge for assessment, like looking at how far students have come, have they learned that mistakes are part of learning and that they can move on; has her own personal issues with being an overachiever and it used to be hard for her to give students anything below a B; has gotten used to accepting that students don't always pass; she still wants to develop what she believes they can vs. be realistic about what's really right for the students
-----------------------------	---

Source(s) of pressure(s)	Definitely the institution and the faculty that complain about students, which is not a lot actually; she's been super lucky with her student load, but for those teaching four sections of composition that's a huge load; best practice in terms of number of students for composition instruction is 60-something, and she won't be much over that, but most of her colleagues are teaching 80 students, so that's a huge issue
What it means to grade fairly & equitably	There's a lot of self-awareness of the complexity of issues in terms of language skills and preparation and conflicts between form and content; we need to be aware of these issues and be self-aware of our issues and prejudices about grammar; trying to figure out how to have conversations with students about global Englishes and getting them to think about correctness as well as the loss of languages since English is becoming more dominant; there's more interest in talking about race too and being aware of ramifications of teaching English
Elements being negotiated	Captured in form vs. content struggle; one of the best ways to address that is to call the student out and be like, I'm having a hard time understanding, talk to me about what's going on here; her approach is more directive so she'll ask students questions and write down what their point is based on what she's hearing; student load is a huge access and equity issue because the students that have the most trouble articulating themselves in more of a standard English, academic manner really need that time to sit down, talk it through, and hear, okay, this is what you mean and you can write it in this way

Persist | Resist

These case study/profile hybrids reveal the similar and yet unique, complex ways these six instructors understood, navigated, and negotiated SE in their courses and grading practices. Every instructor, for example, was familiar with SE and recognized that it can be defined/understood as a norm or ideal form of language. However, the descriptors they used for SE differed, from identifying SE directly as correct English as well as guiding rules for writing and speaking English, to calling it an agreed-upon form or variety of English as well as an arbitrary standard perpetuated through racist structures.

In addition, while instructors re-made SE, they did so differently, calling it an anachronistic and problematic term, an oxymoron, an arbitrary standard, a standardized version of English, and a perception of the norm as well as more of a concept than a term. Other terms for SE were also brought up, like Standard American English and Standard Edited American English. Finally, every instructor also explained that they do not use the terms Standard English in their classrooms, except for Susan, who said that if she used those terms she would probably put them in air quotes. L. Baldwin also reflected on the absence of those terms, concluding that she assumes the English she teaches is SE. In short, while the ways instructors defined and understood SE sometimes converged, they more often diverged, revealing similar and yet unique definitions and understandings of SE.

Taken together, these descriptions, identifications, and understandings of SE do four things: first, they reveal the range of terms and descriptors instructors used to define SE, which is not surprising given the range of terms scholars in writing studies use to refer to SE. Second, the identifications and recognitions of SE as a norm or correct form of English uncover the ways SE can still be upheld and thus persist, even when those same instructors resisted those identifications. Third, these identifications reveal that instructors do not use the terms Standard English in their classrooms explicitly, although Cynthia and Sophia pointed out that the terms could be used in order to break them down. Finally, these identifications reveal the ways instructors added new descriptors and ways of understanding SE, like by calling it an oxymoron, an anachronistic term, an arbitrary standard, a concept, and a perception.

In identifying these four points, I am calling attention to the ways I believe SE both is resisted but also persistent. For example, the range of ways instructors defined and problematized SE created, when synthesized, a working definition of SE—as described in Chapter One—that clarifies SE as a concept. This working definition is also another form of resistance of SE to its positioning of SE as a paradox. In the definitions instructors each gave, they themselves also resisted SE in some way, even if the degree of that resistance differed. For example, Cynthia and Michael both tied SE to educational and academic settings and critiqued it as a form of building boundaries and discriminating against other forms of language. In addition, Cynthia and Sophia both stated that SE needed to be broken down and resisted. While Susan and Sophia both tied SE to race, explaining that there is no SE, L. Baldwin stated that the definition is changing and, ironically, is not as standard.

At the same time, these definitions and understandings also reveal the ways SE persists even while it is resisted. For example, Erin defined SE as correct English even though she said she knows she is not supposed to say that. Each instructor's acknowledgment of the ways SE can be understood as a linguistic norm or ideal also reveals the ways SE can persist as a norm because those instructors are nonetheless acknowledging the ways it can be identified as one. Finally, L. Baldwin's reflection on SE as an assumed standard reveals how SE may have persisted in her classroom as an assumption.

The dilemmas instructors identified surrounding SE in these case studies/profiles also reveal additional sites of persistence and resistance. While there were multiple

dilemmas instructors identified, navigated, and negotiated surrounding SE and their grading practices and pressures, at least one dilemma instructors identified was centered on or related to instructors' work with their multilingual or international students and the tension that created in relation to SE. In each of these dilemmas, SE either persists, is resisted, or both persists and is resisted. For Erin, that dilemma was between not penalizing her students' language vs. asking how she was really benefiting her students (since she said they want standard)—in asking about benefitting her students, she resisted SE while simultaneously upholding it by identifying that her students want standard. For Cynthia, this dilemma was between the value of having students working in their own languages vs. thinking about how she would assess that—in this dilemma, SE is primarily resisted, although Cynthia's question of assessment complicates that resistance. For Michael, this dilemma was between his linguistic equity spiel (that is, telling students he respects their errors and that standards are unjust) vs. his students' desire to write well—his identification of that desire reveals how SE persists while his linguistic equity spiel works to resist SE.

For L. Baldwin, this dilemma was between honoring students' languages vs. recognizing that students have to consider their audience and put their best foot forward (tying into her point that SE might matter depending on the genre)—her desire to honor her students' languages is a means of resisting SE but her point about the potential need for SE reveals the persistence of SE. For Sophia, this dilemma was between her ideological stance on SE vs. the imperative to help her students grapple with and learn English—while her ideological stance is a form of resistance of SE, the imperative she

feels reveals one way SE may potentially persist. Finally, for Susan, this dilemma was comprised of the tension between form and content and the time it takes for her as the instructor to help her students who have the most trouble articulating themselves in more of a standard English, academic manner. Her focus on content is a means of resisting SE, but her point about students trying to articulate themselves in SE reveals one way SE persists. In short, these dilemmas reveal SE as a norm that is resisted but that also persists in both visible and invisible ways.

Synergies

While most instructors resisted and challenged the myth of SE, they also identified a number of dilemmas surrounding SE that they navigated in ways that synergistically echoed, extended, and engaged with translingual and antiracist approaches to SE and language instruction even if they were not familiar with those approaches. Erin, for example, was not familiar with translingualism, but her recognition of valuing students' writing and not penalizing their nonstandard language echoes both SRTOL and translingual approaches to language instruction since both advocate for valuing language difference. However, there was also potential for an antiracist approach to writing assessment and SE to align with and even respond to the questions about race and language Erin brought up at the end of the interview. For Erin, then, there are what I call translingual and antiracist synergies that reveal both a translingual echo in her reflections but also the possibility an antiracist approach could bring to Erin's SE-related questions.

As Sophia, who considers herself a translingualist, discussed the ways she has worked to challenge SE, both with her students and within the writing program, she

revealed what I would identify as a translingual/antiracist synergistic approach to combatting the entrenchment of the SE myth. Susan similarly revealed a translingual/antiracist synergistic approach to challenging SE in her proposal of the term linguistic etiquette and identification of SE as race-and class-based. What these synergies mark, I argue, is a shift from Standard English to Synergistic English Work that identifies the translingual/antiracist approaches instructors are already engaging with and, in doing so, brings writing studies scholars' and writing instructors' negotiations and navigations of the SE dilemma together in order to mark those synergies and push that synergistic work forward.

In pushing that work forward, I have also synthesized the concerns a number of instructors raised surrounding their international students. The conflict Sophia identified, for example, surrounding her international students' grappling with English revealed the need for translingual and antiracist approaches to better account for and grapple with the material conditions and constraints surrounding international students and their programs. Susan and Michael voiced similar concerns, with Michael noting the disconnect between his international students' material concerns for job prospects and his own linguistic equity spiel. Susan noted similar material concerns about time and matriculation surrounding the international students she teaches as well as the international programs they are in and the faculty who may go on to teach them. These material concerns further reveal the need for antiracist and translingual approaches to better grapple with the material concerns and constraints surrounding international students, their programs, and the faculty who may go on to teach them. In pointing out this need, I am not only

revealing the synergy between what these instructors are grappling with but also the synergy between these instructors' work to identify these concerns and the work translingual/antiracist approaches can do to address those concerns. In short, I am pushing this synergistic work forward.

From SE to SEW

This chapter marks one synergistic point in the synergistic work of this dissertation. In bringing instructors' navigations and negotiations of the SE dilemma and paradox together with scholarship on translingualism and antiracist writing assessment that offers approaches to that dilemma, I have created synergy. In examining how instructors are already taking up, engaging with, and echoing translingual/antiracist approaches, I have shown the synergistic work already taking place. In putting all of that work together in this chapter and, more broadly, in this dissertation, I am not only marking but also advocating for a shift from Standard English to Synergistic English Work, or from SE to SEW.

CHAPTER FIVE: INVISIBLE VALUE

“[Sarah Johnson:] I still wonder, like, is standard English still lurking and dark. That's weird. I don't know.

[Sophia:] No, it's not. It's not weird. It is lurking in the dark. It is lurking in the hidden spaces because it's an entrenched language ideology. And so, even if the rubric isn't privileging standard English in any way, the lived experience that our students have and that is surrounding them in terms of like, language politics and ideology privileges standard English, so it's almost like a cognitive dissonance for them.”

Sophia, Interview #2

“I don't think the words standard English are used, but in the assignment itself, I think the language is something like appropriate to the genre and that kind of thing, which I'm not sure covers what you're talking about. [laughs] At all...I think I'm just assuming it's gonna be there, especially at college level. So, if anything it will be like a language kind of issue, which is another thing to deal with, I think, but it's funny, I just assume a certain level. And I assume they would be in a different class if they could not reach that level.”

L. Baldwin, Interview #2

Introduction

In discussing whether SE could be lurking in the dark during our conversation at the end of interview two, Sophia concluded that SE is indeed lurking in quiet ways because, even if a rubric is not privileging SE, the lived experiences students have reveal the ways SE is privileged. L. Baldwin's point in her interview seems to confirm this lurking—as she puts it, she just assumes SE is there, especially at the college level. Paired with this chapter's title, these responses mark the ways SE trafficked in invisible ways in the sample rubrics these six writing instructors provided and that we discussed in the second interview, the DBI.

Unlike the first set of concept clarification interviews, which set out to uncover how instructors understand, define, and talk about using SE in the context of their

assessment practices, this second set of discourse-based interviews (DBIs) is grounded in a more specific context, focusing on the ways SE traffics in the specific text of instructors' own rubrics and grading tools. As Zak Lancaster explains, this method seeks to make the tacit explicit and "can assist researchers and participants to probe the rhetorical bases of writing performances and judgments" by encouraging participants to talk through their reasons for specific textual choices in their writing ("Using Corpus Results" 121). This probing happens in the presentation of choices, that is, the researcher offers participants alternative language and asks participants to talk through their rationale for their language in the original text. After clarifying what SE meant to instructors in the first set of interviews, in these DBIs I presented instructors with alternative language, some of which specifically included the words Standard English, to their rubrics and tools in order to make the tacit about SE explicit by uncovering the rhetorical choices and strategies underlying their original language related to grammar and language.

In uncovering these rhetorical choices and strategies, I set out to understand how SE was or could be operating, particularly because most instructors had omitted SE from their rubrics and tools. In addition, I also sought to answer this study's third research question: what do instructors' rhetorical choices surrounding SE, grammar, correctness, and language in their rubrics reveal? With this question as my starting point, I asked instructors questions about the potential presence of SE on their rubrics as well as in their minds. I then offered instructors alternative language, including terms like SE, error,

mistake, edit, and grammar, to language in their rubrics see how those SE- related terms were operating.

As I found, SE trafficked primarily in a number of ways, with a range of visibility and subtlety. SE was also resisted and yet persisted to different degrees in those sample rubrics; while it was resisted most visibly by almost every instructor's decision to not include SE on their rubric, it also persisted in some way on almost every rubric. The ways the instructors defined, understood, and positioned terms like SE, error, grammar, and correctness affected whether and how SE trafficked in their rubrics. In addition, using Chapter One's identification of possible terms SE can operate in conjunction with, I found that SE persisted in some instructors' rubrics depending on how they approached and understood those terms. As a reminder, those terms include: edited, proofread, written, American, academic, grammar, error, correct, and mistake, as well as more specific terms like clause patterns, pronouns, punctuation, and subjects and verbs.

SE was thus invisibly present in a variety of ways, sometimes in terms that were explicitly on those rubrics and other times through assumptions or internal conflicts surrounding these instructors' rubrics and their grading practices. That is, I will show, although SE was not explicitly present on most instructors' rubrics, SE can still be operative in those rubrics. SE was at work in Erin's rubric, for example, not only through the word standard but also through words like grammar and formal language since she defined grammar and grammatical correctness as Standard English. SE was also at work in Cynthia's rubric through the inclusion of terms like grammar and error since those terms can both be tied to SE.

In revealing the ways SE can still be operative on rubrics that do not include the term SE, I perform synergistic work by examining how instructors' definitions of SE, grammar, correctness, and error paired with the language on their rubrics. I also synergize the terms that can be used as a means of perpetuating SE, from edited to grammar, error to correct, and punctuation to verbs, with these instructors' rubrics as well as those instructors' definitions of grammar, error, correct, and SE in order to see how, exactly, SE may be resisted but also persistent in those rubrics. Finally, I synergize the visibility, persistence, and resistance of SE in each instructor's rubric in order to reveal the overall persistence and invisibility of SE. In doing this synergistic work, I argue that more attention can be paid to rubrics and the grammar-related language on those rubrics in both translingual and antiracist scholarship beyond advocating for grading contracts or letting students choose the amount of their grade that comes from grammar. In addition, I advocate for a synergized translingual/antiracist approach to dealing with SE in rubrics that might deconstruct and challenge SE on rubrics themselves.

In examining the ways SE traffics in these rubrics, I have structured this chapter like the previous one, continuing the set of profile/case study hybrids in order to show each instructor's identifications and navigations of SE in their sample rubrics. There are two tables per section, with the first table outlining the role of SE in that particular instructor's rubric as well as their perspective on grammar, error, and correctness. Like the tables in Chapter Four, the tables in each section are divided into two columns, although between each table is an image of each instructor's sample rubric/tool. The final table contains selected explanations of each instructor's responses to SE-related language

in their rubric, with the left column containing the original language and options based on their rubric's language and the right containing direct quotes representing instructors' explanations of that language. While the information in these tables primarily comes from the DBI, there is also information from the first interview throughout each section, particularly in the first set of tables, because both sets of interviews set about to make the tacit about SE explicit. Finally, after these sections I conclude with syntheses of these case study/profile hybrids, advocating for more attention to rubrics and offering the start of some pedagogical implications based on these mostly invisible valuations of SE in instructors' rubrics.

Erin: Highly Visible, Most Persistence, Low Resistance

For Erin, one of the two instructors teaching in South Korea, SE was something she identified as correct English and grammatical correctness in the first interview but that, in this DBI centered on her rubric, she connected with a feeling as well as her own experiences with grammar. In addition, while her sample rubric was the only one that included the words Standard English, she indicated her desire to omit the word standard from that rubric during the DBI. As I will show, what her perspectives on grammar, SE, and her rubric from her two interviews, paired with the probing about SE from this DBI, reveal is that SE persists in and on her rubric in both visible and invisible ways through terms like grammar and language. At the same time, however, there is tension in that persistence since she also recognized that there are other varieties of English and stated that she did not intend to privilege one variety over another.

As Table 14 reveals, SE persisted in a number of ways. While Erin has used rubrics for 8 years, she added a formatting and language component to them; that language component is in her sample rubric because it is tied to a previous lesson including subject-verb agreement. As she noted, any potential errors or language issues she identifies do not affect students' grades in their final drafts significantly, and in her sample rubric language and formatting comprise 10 percent of the final essay grade. The words Standard English are also explicitly on her rubric, as Image 1 below reveals, so SE persists on her rubric in that way. In addition, she defined grammar and grammatical correctness as Standard English, which is tied to the definition she gave of SE in Chapter Four as correct English. SE did not seem to persist, however, through a term like mistake, although it could persist through a term like error since she defined error as incorrect but did not offer any additional context for that definition. Taking these two definitions together reveals an additional way SE may persist in her rubric through a term like grammar.

Table 14 Erin's Perspective and Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error

Use of rubrics	Used rubrics for 8 years; "very detailed," added a language and formatting component to a template from program; added language component to rubric example because she wants students to take care of their language when they're writing; did a lesson on subject-verb agreement in class and then included subject-verb agreement on rubric example
Role of SE in sample rubric	Says you use standard US English grammar, spelling, and sentence structure; her students might look at that phrase and wonder what that is; does not think anyone has asked her what she means by standard; primarily is there to differentiate from

	British spelling; is not trying to force one regional American English over another
Role of grammar, correctness or sentence-level issues in rubric/grading	Less in English 101 than 100; language only affects grade in final draft but never significantly; language and formatting make up 10% of grade in sample rubric
Definition of grammar & grammatical correctness	Defined both as standard English
Definition of error	Mistake or incorrect

Analytical Summary Rubric					
Criteria	Exemplary (95–100%)	Proficient (90–95%)	Needs Work (80–90%)	Below Par (70–80%)	Unacceptable (0–69%)
Part 1: Summarizing the Project Weight 30%	You introduce the article. You correctly and effectively describe the major rhetorical elements of this article, including the object of study, exigence, purpose, new offering, and relevance. You present these rhetorical elements in a logical sequence.				
Part 2: Analyzing a Key Concept Weight 30%	You introduce the key concept you will write about. You demonstrate an understanding of this key concept and the complexity associated with it in this article. You present the author's definition or description of this concept and explore how the author limited this concept for their project. You identify the examples of information the author(s) used to describe or clarify this concept and you explore the evidence from other sources that the author includes. Finally, you explain how the use of other forwarded information adds information to this concept.				
Part 3: Making Connections Weight 30%	You clearly and specifically respond to our course question with a clear topic sentence and support from our two course texts. The connections you make demonstrate a thorough understanding of both sources, and your discussion of those sources is relevant to our course question and help to advance our thinking.				
Language & Formatting Weight 10%	You use standard US English grammar (incl. subject-verb agreement), spelling, and sentence structure. You use formal language. You title the paper using the article's title. You format your paper as per the assignment prompt.				

Figure 1. Erin's sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI...

In the rest of the DBI, I asked Erin questions to probe her reasons for including SE in her rubric. As she explained, while she knows there are different types of English

and world Englishes, she wants her students to be prepared to enter campus in the US.

Expanding on this point, she said that meant:

to go to a campus in the United States, where they may have some professors who don't understand or are not accepting of other Englishes whether it's like a Konglish or, you know, a non-US English born. Even British English, I mentioned last time that I have been penalized in Australian universities for using Americans spellings and I am just trying to prepare my students for a situation like that where they're expected to use American English.

In other words, SE is present because she wants to prepare her students for a US context in which they are expected to use American English. In addition, she does not want her students to be penalized like she has been.

When I asked her about whether she found herself thinking about SE in any way while using her rubric, she made the following point:

Well, again I'm not really sure I know what is standard as much as I know what feels correct or is deemed correct from what maybe I learned in school. I studied traditional grammar through school and then functional through college, but I'm not like a grammar expert and I definitely am not honing in. Because I have primarily non-native English speakers, I'm just looking for, again, what I think is correct English grammar, not subject-verb agreement and preposition and, you know, other commonly made mistakes by non-native English speakers, or by multilingual speakers I guess.

SE, then, seems to be less about what is standard and more about what she feels is correct based on what she has learned in the course of her education. This feeling reflects the ideological underpinnings of SE I identified in Chapter One, particularly Lippi-Green's point that the "rules" of SE are anything but logical or consistent. Taken with Erin's definition and identification of SE as correct English, as well as her slight resistance to that identification in Chapter Four, her point above reveals the way SE traffics as correct English grammar and less visibly as an ideology.

Table 15 below details the reasons Erin offered when I probed her using alternative language based on the use of terms like standard US English grammar in her rubric. As I explain after this table, these explanations reveal the ways SE traffics in her rubric in both visible and invisible ways.

Table 15 Erin's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language

Original & alternative text	Erin's explanations
Original: "use standard US English grammar" Option 1: use Standard English Option 2: use English grammar	"I mean, looking at it now...I should rephrase it. I should maybe take out standard and just say US English spelling...my intention was to have students use US spelling of words, so, yeah, I don't find that that my phrasing necessarily reflects my intent, which may well be confusing for some students if they, for example, tried to search what is standard US, standard English grammar at times."
Original: "use formal language" Option 1: use formal, edited language Option 2: use formal, proofread language	"...we've looked at formal language by this point, so I ask them not to use contractions and then not to use slang. I mean, some of my students will write me emails and they'll use conversational phrasing in their written writing. So, it's really about just pointing out the differences, like they'll write wanna, WANNA, which is perfectly acceptable in conversation to say it,

	<p>but I don't wanna see that...these are academic assignments, academic writing assignments. So, they're not writing like a blog post or something they're writing an essay...So, I'm just distinguishing between that casual language. And in fact, I give them some examples of Australian language that's very casual that I would never put on paper [Laughs]. And then we look at, you know, other words, or phrases, and how you would write them in a formal way. So, use of formal language I'm typically looking for them to not use contractions and a few other things. “</p>
<p>Original: “grammar (incl. subject-verb agreement), spelling, and sentence structure” Option 1: grammar, spelling, and punctuation Option 2: language, grammar, and sentence structure</p>	<p>“...I think I'm really just trying to distinguish like the grammar points from the focus on how they're building their sentences....I think that could easily come under grammar...and maybe we should change it to, I'm not sure how I would change it, I'd have to think about it...maybe structures do not work, construction?...so I'm really looking for complete sentences there when I say sentence structure and a variety of sentence types. So, maybe I need to think of a better way to indicate that's what I'm looking for, if you're asking what do I mean, maybe I need to think what do I mean?”</p>
<p>Original: “including subject-verb agreement” Option 1: such as subject-verb agreement Option 2: for example, subject-verb agreement</p>	<p>“I think I had at one point had IE, which was such as and then I'm not sure why, because I did see that in a previous version. I'm not sure why I changed it to including...I think that's another point like, such as would have worked there as well...I would have a longer list of grammar points at the end, just reminding students these are the points we covered. So, I will particularly be looking at these language points.”</p>

The explanation Erin offered for SE reveals that she would omit the word standard from her rubric because it might be confusing for students and also does not reflect her intent. Her explanations of other language, like her grammar points and use of formal language, reveal that she is looking for students to use complete sentences, avoid

contractions, and use subjects and verbs that agree. Overall, what her DBI reveals is that SE persists on her rubric in both visible and invisible ways, most visibly in her use of the words standard and English in her Language & Formatting criteria. Less visibly, SE persists as correct English and is included as a means of preparing students for US-based contexts that may expect it. In addition, SE is tied with grammar as well as formal language and complete sentences. Since the Language & Formatting criteria is worth 10 percent of the final essay grade, SE could also persist in that 10 percent.

Cynthia: Somewhat Visible, Some Persistence, High Resistance

For Cynthia, the other instructor teaching in South Korea, SE was something she identified as a problem as well as something she was uncomfortable with in the first interview and that, in this DBI, she resisted putting in her rubric. Since the video and transcript of her DBI were lost, however, the tables in this section are less detailed. However, based on her reflections on rubrics from the first interview and the notes I took from the second, what is clear is that Erin resists SE as well as terms like correctness and error. Nonetheless, SE persists through both her students' desire to be correct as well as her addition of the grammar and formatting criteria she was pressured to add to her sample rubric.

Table 16 below reveals that SE is resisted by Cynthia but yet persists through her students. As she explained, she has used rubrics since the beginning of her teaching but does not focus on perfect correctness when grading her students' essays, so grammar and correctness play a minimal role in her rubric as well as her grading. In addition, her definitions of grammar, grammatical correctness, and error reflect the ways she troubled

the term SE in Chapter Four. With grammar and grammatical correctness, for example, she said that while there are agreed-upon standards, she then stated that those rules do not hold true half the time. In relation to those rules, she defined error as something that does not make sense in the context of what students are saying in general. However, she then said that she does not like that term because it may not be a good word for what she does in actual practice, which is to look at the context of what students are saying, which may mean that something needs to be clarified (rather than, perhaps, corrected). While she thus resists the word error, that word is still present on her rubric which reveals one way SE may be present on her rubric since error can be tied to SE, as I revealed in Chapter One.

In regards to her students, however, correctness is something that they do focus on. As she put it,

I'm not really focused on perfect correctness. Students sometimes are here though, which I think is very true of a lot of our Korean students. They want to be correct and it's difficult to kind of get them away from—I had one today who stayed after class and said it took me five hours to do the homework because I wanted to be right. And I was like if you do it you get full credit if I can see that you tried [Laughs], don't stay up all night anymore, and it was a very minor assignment it was worth like point zero one percent of the grade. So, there is a lot of desire from students to be correct here so I feel like I end up doing a little bit more but it's almost always individual and it's rarely something that is particularly significant

in terms of grading unless there are grammar issues or sentence structure issues that severely interfere with understanding of their ideas and content.

In other words, while she resists correctness and focuses on effort, her students nonetheless have a desire to be correct which then pushes her to do more with correctness and, potentially, SE. Thus, while Erin resists SE, her students' desire to be correct allows SE to persist in her grading practices, although not necessarily on her rubric.

Table 16 Cynthia's Perspective & Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error

Use of rubrics & sample rubric	Used them since the beginning of her teaching; rubric now is a universal one but tells students what they need to do really well; checks off rubric based on how successfully students have done and then makes comments specific to their papers; adopted sample rubric from honors college; she originally had just one column on language but it was suggested she add grammar/formatting
Role of SE in sample rubric	SE is not there because she did not put it there
Role of grammar, correctness or sentence-level issues in rubric/grading/sample rubric	Pretty minimal; not technically one of her objectives for the course even though it's expected there will be a little bit of extra language help; they make up about 10% total; students almost always do well on that category; does not focus on perfect correctness but rather whether she can understand what students are saying; rarely comments on grammar unless it's a major or repeated issue or interferes with meaning; has a focus on paragraphs in sample rubric because she would get papers with sentences not divided into paragraphs
Definition of grammar & grammatical correctness	A difficult question; grammar as official rules of the language; there's agreed-upon standards, but none of the rules hold true half the time in English; students are sometimes so focused on being correct that it's to the detriment of their writing; correctness is looking at the specifics or rules of grammar; would not differentiate the two much

Definition of error	<p>Something that doesn't make sense in the context of what students are saying in general; error may not be a good word for this because she's usually looking at the context and because it's possible that something else needs to be clarified; unintentionally misrepresenting the meaning of what they're trying to say; she asks students to clarify what they mean so that they can adjust their language; can have a negative connotation for students; doesn't like the word</p>
----------------------------	--

F	D	C	B	A	Grading Criteria	
					Introduction and Conclusion: Includes a well-developed introduction that creates interest. The thesis clearly states the topic and the claim the author will make. The introduction includes only information essential to understanding the thesis and content of the essay. Conclusion effectively wraps up and restresses the importance of the thesis in a new way. The introduction and conclusion are both individual paragraphs that use concise language.	15
					Analysis and Evidence: Provides a specific, well-thought out thesis statement with plan of development and consistently connects all evidence and claims back to the thesis through detailed analysis. Each body paragraph includes supporting evidence from at least three relevant sources. For each piece of evidence, the author provides clear explanation that shows the reader the significance of the source. Evidence is relevant and carefully matched to claims and analysis. Writer successfully puts sources into conversation with one another to create logical support for their claim without over-relying on evidence from the text, so that there is an appropriate balance between the author's voice and information from their sources.	25
					Organization: Each paragraph begins with a strong topic sentence that makes a claim and represents the main idea of the paragraph. Each paragraph reflects a logical order based on the plan of development in the thesis statement. The final body paragraph is either a counterargument or solution paragraph. Employs intentional transitions and organizational cues. All body paragraphs include relevant evidence and discussion of that evidence. Paragraphs end with closing sentences that wrap-up the paragraph and transition between ideas.	15
					Citation: Uses perfect APA format for both in-text citations and reference entries. Each piece of evidence in the text of the essay, whether summarized, paraphrased, or quoted includes an appropriate in-text citation. All sources are listed in the reference list in alphabetical order with complete bibliographic information. Any paraphrased or summarized evidence is fully in the author's own words with any words or phrases from the original source in quotation marks.	15
					Source Quality: Includes at least 5 sources. At least 2 of the chosen sources are peer-reviewed journal articles. All sources are high quality and reliable.	10
					Grammar/Mechanics: Generally applies the basic rules of grammar usage, and mechanics. Only minor mechanical/grammatical errors that do not interfere significantly with meaning.	10
					Formatting Requirements: Meets the minimum length requirements (1500-2000 words, not including reference list). Carefully adheres to all formatting guidelines listed in the syllabus (12pt Times New Roman font, 1-inch margins, double-spaced, APA format compliant including title page).	10

Figure 2 Cynthia's sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI

Although the video and transcript of Cynthia's DBI were lost, I generated a summary of her response to the question I asked after I had offered her options for

including SE explicitly in her sample rubric in Table 17. As I will explain, paired with her reflections on SE from the first interview, SE persists in ways largely out of her control but is also resisted in ways she clearly articulates.

Table 17 Cynthia's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language

Original text & alternative Language	Cynthia's explanations
Original: "applies the basic rules of grammar usage, and mechanics" Option 1: basic rules of Standard English Option 2: basic rules of Standard English , grammar usage, and mechanics	If she had added SE to her rubric, she is not sure her students would know what that meant; mentioned that her students don't always read the whole rubric

As revealed above, Cynthia resists SE because she is not sure her students would know what that term meant if she were to add it to her sample rubric. However, as she explained in Table 16, it was suggested that she add grammar and formatting criteria, so SE may persist due to the pressure she received to add those criteria, especially since grammar (that is, socially constructed grammar) can be associated with SE. That pressure then creates tension with her concern about the disservice she feels students may be getting with too much of a focus on grammatical correctness and rules. As she put it in her first interview,

I don't think that those rules apply nearly as much and we are going to be sending them to the States to study and so I think for me there's a lot of pressure of, like, what do my students really need, like, am I creating more stress for them by

seeming like I'm focusing on formatting or on grammar or on correctness?

Because I have found that in the past when I have done more with those things what happens is that's all that students look at and then you lose like the rhetorical arguments and they stop looking at like the rhetoric piece of it, which is so important, and they stop looking at their larger ideas and their content.

While SE persists through her students as well as external pressures to include grammar and formatting criteria on her rubric, that persistence may create more stress for her students in addition to directing their focus away from their content, ideas, and rhetorical arguments.

Finally, while SE persists in ways Cynthia largely cannot control, she nonetheless resists it. In the first interview, she explained that her writing program in Korea “made the decision a while ago that students when they are in the classroom they are speaking English, they are writing in English, everything has to happen in English. So, that's sort of the rule here.” However, even though this constraint may reveal another way SE persists, Cynthia reflected on the possibility of resisting SE in the following way:

I think that there's a lot of value in letting students work in whatever language that they're most comfortable in especially for things like taking notes and drafting...my instinct is to say I think it can be really valuable if a student is trying to get ideas out for the student to use whichever language the ideas are flowing in, especially when you're doing something like a freewriting exercise...

Even though SE persists in her rubric and classroom in ways she largely cannot control, Cynthia nonetheless attempts to resist SE by articulating her belief about the value in

letting students work in their own languages. In addition, she points to the potential of bringing that work to bear on her assessment practices even though she is not sure how she would go about assessing students' work in their languages. In short, while SE persists in her rubric and course due to student desires and material constraints, she nonetheless resists SE by resisting SE itself, troubling the terms error and correctness, and articulating the possibility of resisting SE in her assessment practices.

Michael: Barely Visible, Little Persistence, Unconscious Resistance

For Michael, who has taught multilingual writers across the spectrum and who resisted SE by calling it a creation and a means of devaluing other languages, SE was something in this DBI that he continued to resist but that also could be implied. Although he did not include the term SE on his rubric, he explained that omission as an unconscious choice; in his DBI, he similarly explained some of his other choices as unintentional. As I will show, what his perspectives on grammar, SE, correctness, and his rubric from his two interviews reveal is that he resists SE in visible and yet unconscious, unintentional ways; however, as he pointed out, SE could be implied in his rubric based on language he included in his assignment before his actual rubric. SE is thus given little value, although it could be valued by his students because of their shared, codified understanding of grammatical correctness.

As Table 18 below reveals, Michael resisted SE in a number of ways. First, as he explained, while his rubrics may have a language component (like looking for linguistic transformations or clausal complexity) worth a small percentage of a student's grade, that component will be directly tied to what students have learned in the course; in that way,

SE should not be implied or expected. In separating grammar from correctness, he resisted the connection between those two and stated that correctness is neither easily defined nor does it matter because for him there are only rhetorical situations. In addition, he explained that he sometimes asks students to do things that are ungrammatical, which represents a more creative resistance of SE. Finally, he made it clear that an error will never affect a student's grade; rather, error becomes an issue when a student does not make the effort to figure out what was going on with their language.

Despite these forms of resistance, however, SE was present in unconscious and potentially implied ways. For example, he pointed out on his assignment language that was tied to his sample rubric that could be read by students as the need to write clearly or in a certain way. Since he recognized that the students he works with have a codified, agreed-upon definition of grammatical correctness based on what they have been taught, this possible interpretation of writing a certain way could mean writing according to SE. When discussing the term error, Michael also brought SE into his definition of that term, stating that an error represents an instance in writing that does not conform to the generally accepted norms of English in relation to form. In that definition, SE is present, although Michael does not penalize his students for making errors. Finally, while he explained that he does not expect the traditional conception of SE from his students since his course is built for multilingual students, he also stated that SE is not really on his mind anymore. Thus, even though he did not put SE on his rubric, his resistance of SE may potentially be unconscious.

Table 18 Michael's Perspective & Relationship between his Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error

Use of rubrics & sample rubric	Used for years; always attaches rubric to any major writing assignment; usually has four or more categories assessing student performance based on what they've learned in course; if students have learned about clauses, he might look at whether students are taking risks building complexity into clauses; usually a language component worth a small percentage of grade; usually rhetoric component; usually category about source use, like looking for linguistic transformations in paraphrases; also have an organizational component; usually have a readability component; sample rubric is first writing assignment for students; emphasizes rhetoric in this assignment because it feels like it could be a real rhetorical situation a student might get into; forces students to apply ethos, pathos, and logos and hold them responsible for it
Role of SE in sample rubric	Pointed out that the phrase "please note, your friend is not going to care about little language and grammar issues unless they prevent your ideas from coming across" could be taken in a way that students need to write in a certain way or write clearly; however, he's trying to emphasize that the writing doesn't need to be perfect; he doesn't expect the traditional conception of SE from his students since the course is built for multilingual writers; did not include SE on his rubric, but he's not sure that was a conscious choice; SE is not on his mind anymore these days
Role of grammar, correctness or sentence-level issues in rubric/grading/sample rubric	Depends on audience; for scholarly audience, polished prose is more expected; those rubrics will say it's clear you have looked for sentence-level errors or have made the language as clear or as polished as possible based on what you've learned. Looks at different grammar points depending on what they've learned and talked about, like how their clauses were looking or cohesion and coherence later in the semester; tries to emphasize idea of readability in sample rubric and set the tone that he's here for students' ideas, not necessarily grammar
Definition of grammar & grammatical correctness	Grammar: how the parts of the language make meaning; how parts of speech fit together or how a noun phrase fits with a verb phrase; how sentences fit together; different levels of grammar. Correctness: contingent; it depends on correct for whom; always an

	<p>exception to a grammatical rule; for students he works with there's a codified, agreed-upon definition of grammatical correctness based on what they've been taught like what they would find in grammar books; correctness is not easily defined and also doesn't matter because for him there are only rhetorical situations; if the language you use fits with that situation, that's all that matters; he sometimes requires students to do things that aren't grammatical</p>
Definition of error	<p>Said we would be getting into Standard English with defining this term but that an error is an instance in writing that does not conform to the generally accepted norms of English writing in terms of form; said that a student will never lose points because of an error; error becomes an issue when a student did not try to figure out what was going on, not in terms of their ability to correct their mistake.</p>

Finally, since this is informal writing, you can choose how you would like to structure the information you are sending. With that said, please use Microsoft Word, and please do not include any lists or bullet points. **And please note: Your friend is not going to care about little language and grammar issues unless they prevent your ideas from coming across.**

Step 3

Read the rubric on the following pages. It will help you understand exactly how your friend will evaluate this piece of writing.

Rubric

The audience for this piece of writing is a friend. As a result, the feedback (and grade) you receive will be determined by how well you meet the expectations of this audience. Your friend will give you feedback on readability (in other words, language), persuasiveness (also called “rhetoric”), usability (in other words, how easy it is to use your advice), and source use (see below).

1. Readability (language) (10%)

“Readability” has to do with how easy it is for your friend to understand your meaning. **Hence, your friend cares about language issues only when they prevent your meaning from coming through.**

Your friend had difficulty understanding the ideas in your email because of word choice and sentence structure issues.	Your friend could understand almost everything in your email although there were a few places where language issues got in the way.	Your friend understood everything and was impressed by the email. In other words, the sentence structures and vocabulary you used made for a very enjoyable read.
0 – 3 points	3.25 - 3.75 points	4 – 5 points

Figure 3 Michael’s sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI

As I discuss after Table 19, this resistance to but also potential implication of SE was further confirmed in the explanations Michael offered during the rest of the DBI.

Table 19 Michael’s Explanations of Select SE-Related Language

Original & alternative text	Michael’s explanations
-----------------------------	------------------------

<p>Original: “your friend cares only about language issues”</p> <p>Option 1: your friend cares only about grammar</p> <p>Option 2: you friend cares only about Standard English</p>	<p>“I think the term language issues to me is less intimidating than something like your friend only cares about grammar mostly because...there are language issues kind of, outside of the realm of what we would traditionally consider grammar...I don't know, again, when I wrote this stuff like this is a new prompt...as much as possible, I wanna deemphasize correctness and emphasize the use of language in its most intuitive way, in the most intuitive sense possible, which is just you're trying to communicate something with someone...And just as much as you can communicate successfully or unsuccessfully in writing because of language issues.”</p>
<p>Original: “language issues got in the way”</p> <p>Option 1: language mistakes got in the way</p> <p>Option 2: language errors got in the way</p>	<p>“Again, I, I can't, I can't lie to you and tell you [laughs] this is done with intention...I'm trying to, essentially, using the language that I had put in the kind of blurb under the readability heading and trying to maintain some kind of some kind of coherence in terms of what the focus is and that would probably be better if I kept it language issues maybe throughout, but yeah, so I think that was also unintentional and just kind of recycling what I said before.”</p>
<p>Original: “Readability (language)”</p> <p>Option 1: Readability (grammar)</p> <p>Option 2: Readability (mechanics)</p>	<p>“The term readability is not familiar to most of the students who are taking this class...for me, readability is not really about grammar at all because you could have a unpunctuated paragraph that is not so much about grammar or mechanics [and] is either not following a lot of the rules of grammar, or is punctuated so poorly, to the point where it's basically not punctuated...and you have to figure out where the spaces are, where the divisions are between the words and stuff like that and so, yeah, I think that's why I would use something like language rather than grammar because, at this point, it's language in its common sense form...”</p>

Michael's explanations above further confirm his resistance of SE as well as his recognition that his students could read SE into the phrase he pointed out earlier in his sample rubric. He uses language issues because the term language is less intimidating than grammar, so in that way he resists SE; however, because the phrase "little language and grammar issues" is on his assignment right before his rubric starts, then it is possible for his students to find that language intimidating. In addition, as he pointed out that he should have kept the phrase language issues throughout his entire assignment, he said the use of that phrase in his rubric was unintentional. This point echoes his earlier reflection about SE not being on his mind, so the use of language issues may have been an unintentional, unconscious form of resistance of SE.

As for his use of the category readability, he explains that that term is not connected to grammar; however, since he used the word grammar earlier in his assignment in conjunction with the phrase language issues, it could be possible for his students to interpret readability as including grammar. In short, while Michael resists SE in visible ways by not including it on his sample rubric, that resistance is primarily unconscious; however, his inclusion of the phrase grammar issues before his rubric could create less cohesion for his students, which could lead them to read his rubric as potentially looking for SE.

L. Baldwin: Somewhat Visible, High Persistence, Some Resistance

L. Baldwin, director of a state-wide writing program, originally identified SE as an oxymoron but also guiding rules for the English language in Chapter Four. In this DBI, she reflected on the ways she assumes SE is taught and that what she's looking for

is SE. As I will show, SE trafficked and thus persisted in broad and yet specific ways, through concepts like genre and intelligence but also through specific terms like punctuation, spelling, and capitalization. While she resisted SE through her recognition that SE as well as grammar change and through her resistance to using the word correct in her sample rubric, SE nonetheless persisted, tied to her identification and definition of SE, grammar, and error.

As Table 20 reveals, SE traffics and persists through a number of assumed ways in L. Baldwin's sample rubric. For example, while she did not include the term SE on her rubric, she said that she assumes what students write will be a standard English; in this way, SE could represent the essay in its entirety. In addition, L. Baldwin identified SE as a language kind of issue, so SE may traffic in her rubric as terms related or connected to language issues. For example, she explained in her first interview that she deals with grammar on a case-by-case basis, such as when she finds a consistent error in student writing that creates issues in the understanding, like sentence fragments. Since grammar, issues, and consistent errors are connected, SE may traffic visibly or invisibly in her rubric as any of these terms. Similar to her definition of SE, though, she stated that there is always an exception to every grammatical rule and that grammar itself is constantly changing, along with expectations for it. In this way, she may be resisting the identification of SE as a concrete, unchanging set of standards.

Finally, she has decreased the number of points related to grammar, so SE may traffic as fewer points, but SE may also traffic as more specific terms. For example, she defined error as a misstep that would make the writing ineffective, like capitalization and

punctuation; since SE may traffic as consistent errors, some of those errors may specifically be included in language like capitalization and punctuation on her rubric, as seen in Image 4 below.

Table 20 L. Baldwin's Perspective & Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error

Use of rubrics & sample rubric	Has been an evolution; doesn't like rubrics because it's hard to distinguish what an A paper means; would prefer students themselves grasp what makes good or effective writing; with a rubric, all students do is look at the numbers and check them off; she uses a grading tool as well as the description of an A paper in her syllabus
Role of SE in sample rubric	Thinks SE is assumed; assumes SE is going to be there, especially at the college level; she just assumes a certain level and assumes students would be in a different class if they could not reach that level; assumes what students will write will be a standard English; also considers what she looks for should be a part of SE, but she doesn't use those terms; said that's some kind of prejudice or assumption she makes; if anything, SE will be a language kind of issue
Role of grammar, correctness or sentence-level issues in rubric/grading/sample rubric	Teaches grammar when it interferes with students' communication or clarity of their writing; with a consistent error, like sentence fragments, that creates issues in the understanding, we (she and the student) deal with that; there are some things she anticipates so she gets those things out of the way right away; she might underline a consistent error and say watch out for this; she doesn't harp on editing errors; in her final comment she might indicate problems that should be addressed in order to preserve clarity; all of this happens on a case-by-case basis; has decreased the number of points for grammar since most students don't have an issue with grammatical stuff; in sample rubric, grammar can be important if it interferes with clarity but is not the focus generally
Definition of grammar & grammatical correctness	What it's not is quizzes that ask you to find errors in sentences or correct errors; it is having a good sense of how the English language works; having clarity in the writing so that reading and understanding aren't

	interrupted; there's always an exception to every rule; grammar is also constantly changing along with expectations for it
Definition of error	A misstep that's making the writing ineffective, like capitalization, comma use, punctuation marks; tells her students to think about what punctuation marks tell their readers to do; says they (students) can control the reading

Specification Sheet	
Title:	_____
Writer:	_____
Opening (engages reader? prepares reader?)	_____ (15 max)
Development (presents ideas and evidence clearly? Uses transitions to connect ideas and evidence? Uses analysis to build argument?)	_____ (25 max)
Closing (Sums up major points for the reader? Jives with opening? Leaves reader with something to think about?)	_____ (15 max)
Style (Presents ideas clearly using: well-crafted sentence structure, specific word choice, sentence combination to vary structures, concise paragraphing that develops ideas, maintaining focus by avoiding repetition and compromising grammatical structures)	_____ (30 max)
Mechanics (follows genre form specifics, avoid grammatical structures that get in the way of clarity, uses punctuation properly and effectively, cites sources according to MLA expectations, spells and capitalizes words correctly, follows manuscript format: double-spaced, 12 pt font, New Times Roman font, paragraphs indented, no extra space between paragraphs, pages numbered, title, writer's name on each page).	_____ (15 max)

Figure 4 L. Baldwin's sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI

As I will explain after Table 21 below, the remainder of this DBI confirmed the ways SE trafficked as specific and more general terms, but it also revealed the way SE is resisted through the concept of correctness that L. Baldwin challenged.

Table 21 L. Baldwin's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language

Original & alternative text	L. Baldwin's explanations
<p>L. Baldwin Original: "follows genre form specifics" Option 1: follows genre form specifics and Standard English Option 2: follows Standard English</p>	<p>"Well, that's a good question. Some genres would not require standard English, per se, you know, if they were writing a letter, if they were writing a, a narrative argument, if they were writing some creative nonfiction...But that's--I'm just making an excuse for myself. Again, I have to admit, I've never used those two words in my instruction. I just never have and it'll be interesting to see if other people do."</p>
<p>Original: "avoid grammatical structures that get in the way of clarity" Option 1: avoid grammatical errors that get in the way of clarity Option 2: avoid grammatical mistakes that get in the way of clarity</p>	<p>"I think what I'm trying to do is try to get students not to see grammar as something you, you know, take quizzes on from a textbook and that it's—has to do with the way language works. So rather than say, you know, go to page fifty three to find out, you know, how to use quotation marks, I want them to be—I know they can't all the time—kind of reason it out...I guess I'm trying to change what I think might be their idea that there's grammar over here, then there's writing over here and the twain shall never meet, you know, so that's my reasoning. And I'm not sure the students would even know what you meant by standard English, or they would know you meant by errors."</p>
<p>Original: "uses punctuation properly and effectively" Option 1: uses punctuation correctly Option 2: uses punctuation appropriately</p>	<p>..."Part of my teaching and writing...would concern having the control in the writer's hands to determine the reading speed to determine what the reader focuses on. And again, I would probably review what the stop marks are for, you know, what the punctuation is for. But I, again, try to connect that all up with what you're trying to do when you're writing...I mean, I could I could say correct but then, they would, they--it seems to me they would worry more about the correctness than when they're writing and that's not, you can look something up...."</p>
<p>L. Baldwin Original: "spells and capitalizes words correctly"</p>	<p>"Yes, because that seems to be a major, um, lack in their education, I mean, they, they punctuate everything and, I mean, they capitalize everything and they don't even</p>

Option 1: uses correct spelling and capitalization Option 2: uses proper spelling and capitalization	think about it...You know, not that they would worry about it that much, but also the spell check thing will screw around all kinds of ways. So, again, it's semantics, more than anything, it's just the words...when you say correct there's a right and wrong, but the English language is so screwy that, you know, my mom is not capitalized, but mom is capitalized. You know, we use it as a name. So, I want them to have to think through these things or else, you know, they're gonna not be able to look as intelligent as they are, I guess, or may confuse the reader..."
---	---

First, these explanations confirm the way SE traffics and persists as specific terms like punctuation and capitalization. Related to those terms, however, SE also traffics less visibly as intelligence since L. Baldwin explains that she wants her students to think through things like capitalizing certain words; while the word intelligence is not on her rubric, terms like capitalization and spelling are, so SE is implied in those as a form of intelligence. SE also traffics as genre since L. Baldwin stated that some genres might not require SE but then explained in her first interview that for other genres, like lab reports, SE might matter. Connecting SE, genre, and the genres her students write in her course, she explained:

[I]f you are writing an article that's headed for, say, Atlantic monthly, or the New Yorker, [chuckles] I'm aiming high here, using sentence fragments, or using run-on sentences, which is the really common area that I see, is going to make your reader focus on the error rather than what you're trying to communicate.

So...we'll talk about it as a group and those are, again, I've done this so long I kinda know what to anticipate. At least I think I do [laughs] there's always

something new coming around the corner, but...if you if you say, yeah, but this is not a legal use of the comma, that doesn't stay with anything. But I think if students are helped to realize that certain grammatical errors and spelling errors are gonna make you look a lot stupider than you are, and you want to, as a writer, you want to present your best [...] all the time.

In other words, SE is implied in making grammatical and spelling errors and is also associated with intelligence and the writer's ethos.

Finally, while SE traffics and persists in these broad and yet specific ways, it is also resisted. When explaining why she used the adverbs properly and effectively instead of correctly in her sample rubric in relation to punctuation, L. Baldwin said that the idea of correctness could make students focus less on their writing and more on the correctness of their writing. She also resisted the word correct since she said that word implied the existence of right and wrong. However, since she used the adverb correctly in relation to spelling and capitalization, that word still traffics in her rubric. In short, SE trafficked in visible but also implied ways in L. Baldwin's rubric, from broader concepts like genre and intelligence to more specific terms like capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. This persistence of SE is tied to her recognition that she assumes SE is what she is looking for in students' writing, and it is also connected to her definition of SE in Chapter Four as an oxymoron but also as guiding rules for the English language.

Sophia: Least Visible, Least Persistence, Most Resistance

Sophia, associate director of the composition program for multilingual writers in the US, resisted SE in her first interview and continued that resistance in this DBI. As I

will explain, SE is resisted in a number of ways in this DBI, from her re-articulation of error as communicative glitch to her focus on linguistic accuracy versus correctness.

While SE itself does not persist in any way on her rubric, SE does seem to traffic more in her mind as she grades rather than on her rubric itself. In addition, by connecting SE with error, she expanded on the conflict she felt in her first interview surrounding SE and her international students.

As Table 22 reveals, Sophia resists SE in a number of ways. While her work with rubrics has evolved, she usually has three categories on them but does not look at grammar or mechanics, like SE, since her teaching is not accuracy-focused. Her rubrics also assess students on their revision decisions as well as their uptake of her comments, but for traditional (not international) students, she will not mark on grammar and mechanics while doing the same language noticing activities she does with her international students. In her course and her rubrics, then, she resists SE by not marking on grammar and by doing linguistic noticing as a way of problematizing SE. Her definitions of grammatical correctness and error also revealed those terms as additional sites of resistance since she defined them both as constructs. Marking a phrase like “I ain’t gonna go to the store” as error, as she explained, is a means of perpetuating racist linguistic ideology. Finally, in reflecting on error, she creatively resisted it, re-naming it as a communicative glitch that can make it difficult to succeed in a given genre.

The conflict she mentioned surrounding SE, error, and her international students, however, reveals the way SE traffics in her mind but not on her rubrics. In acknowledging that not marking her students on errors in SE is complicated, she

explained that she struggles with international students because she knows they are paying a lot of money for tuition and want to learn English, but she also wants them to have a critical language awareness. What this means is that when she grades, she feels conflicted as she reads about whether to write comments letting them know that, if they want to be more fluent in standardized English, they are making a pattern of error in SEE (standard edited English). Thus, while the term error as it is connected to SE or SEE does not traffic on her rubric, it does traffic in her mind, creating conflict not only with her ideological stance on SE/SEE but also her desire to be in alignment with her department's and program's philosophy on language usage (i.e., linguistic noticing).

Table 22 Sophia's Perspective & Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error

Use of rubrics & sample rubric	Work with rubrics has evolved over time; used to grade holistically, like criteria basically not a formal rubric; for international students, rubrics fold in language and composition; usually has three categories, like exceeds or meets expectations; criteria depend on assignment; sample rubric is for class designed for domestic multilingual students; doesn't want to overprioritize certain type of language or discourse over another; is still torn about value of or space for grammar, usage, and sentence-level things with international students but not multilingual resident student population; this rubric is looking for language moves but not accuracy; evaluation based on their ability to manipulate those moves and be rhetorically agile
Role of SE in sample rubric	Does not see parts of rubric that ask for SE; hopes that SE is not in this rubric; does have a conflict when reading if she sees a lot of errors in SE usage about whether she wants to write comments, like, maybe they could use an independent clause here or there; feels conflicted about reading past those errors and not letting them know that if they want to be fluent in more standardized English that that happens to be a pattern of

	error they're making; is not going to evaluate students on SEE (standard edited English) and will not include it in her rubrics; also wants to be in alignment with department's and program's philosophy on language usage (linguistic noticing)
Role of grammar, correctness or sentence-level issues in rubric/grading/sample rubric	Doesn't look at grammar or mechanics; approach to teaching language is not accuracy focused and doesn't look at use of standard edited American English, which is complicated; more of a language noticing approach, like the moves that enable and enact the larger rhetorical moves (for example, the verbs used to introduce the author's exigence); looks at micro and macro linguistic moves and asking students to make sure they are following the moves that they've just been taught for that genre; students might revise a first draft based on rhetorical things with feedback based on that rubric; the rubric is a revision-focused rubric; assessing revision decisions students made and their uptake of the comments; students also go through something with the linguist [for specific English courses that are co-taught] where they are taught a grammatical rule, have their "errors" highlighted, and then students self-correct based on lessons they've learned; for traditional and not international students, she will not mark on grammar and mechanics but does the same language noticing activities; she doesn't mark them on errors or misuses of standard edited American English; doesn't take points off for grammatical errors in sample rubric
Definition of grammar & grammatical correctness	A rule or code of language to help govern the way language works; there's grammar in black vernacular English because it's code-based; grammar isn't tied to correctness; correctness is just a construct; with domestic multilingual writers, she doesn't want them to feel like they're not meeting the standard because she wants them to get the relationship between politics and language and that their language usage is just as valid; however, with international students she's struggling because she knows they're paying a lot for tuition and want to learn English but she wants them to have a critical language awareness
Definition of error	Classically, a deviation from the rule-based structure of the grammatical usage of standard edited American English; doesn't really think there are errors; errors don't really exist because there isn't a standard because a standard is a construct, so error is also a construct;

	<p>mentioned Laura Greenfield and her article about the Standard English Fairy Tale in which the phrase “I ain’t gonna go to the store” is marked as an error when really it’s like it has its own language governance, so it’s not an error but we want to mark it as one; that’s just perpetuating racist linguistic ideology; re-named error as communicative glitch based on past research she has done with error and faculty perceptions of error; errors are like communicative glitches that make it difficult to succeed in the genre</p>
--	--

So, what's a **strong** Feature Magazine Article??

First and foremost, your article **responds to a very clear social exigence (problem), surveys the existing solutions to this problem, and offers a promising way forward (let's end on a hopeful note!)**

Most importantly, your piece shows a sophisticated understanding of audience, purpose and genre, and how each of these rhetorical elements influences the other. This is accomplished through a series of strategic linguistic and composition choices:

- 1) You have a **clear purpose that is responding to an explicit exigence**. You don't write out your purpose like "The purpose of this project....", but you imply it through a thesis statement, a question that is going to be answered, or a main idea statement in the introduction.
- 2) The **introduction follows the three moves** (social exigence, gap/need, purpose) in a **tone and style that is appropriate to the audience and genre** (i.e. this could be a narrative or a specific case that hooks the reader and helps them appreciate the depth of the issue; it could be a description of the problem through the use of statistics or other data that helps us understand the issue and recognize that its pressing; it could be the explanation of your central concept and how it's being discussed by experts... up to you, but it should somehow get at the problem you're exploring).
- 3) You use **at least 8 sources** to help show the complexity of the issue you are exploring. 4) **When appropriate, paragraphs include diverse relevant sources that are clearly connected to your purpose/research question/driving question. You show connections between the sources and use interpretive commentary to explain how the outside ideas/source help you answer your research question and driving questions** (You do not say "These sources help me answer my questions or address my purpose because...") In other words, **you follow the moves we learned about in class that show synthesis.**
- 5) Your use of **integrated and non-integrated citations demonstrate that you understand how and when each type of citation is used**. You decide which approach makes the most sense for your audience and purpose.
- 6) You show effort and intention to apply our **writing hacks. These include:** coherence and cohesion within paragraphs and between paragraphs, integrated and non-integrated references, strategic quoting/paraphrasing, synthesis and analysis.
- 7) **Your tone and style is appropriate for your particular magazine's audience. It's evident that you've looked at the magazine you're imagining and that you are adapting your writing to fit the audience and style of that magazine. **Please list the magazine you're writing for at the top of the first page, in the left hand corner, with your name, date, etc.****
- 8) You incorporate **APA in-text citation and the reference page accurately.**
- 9) Your **final draft shows that you were careful to edit and polish your final draft to the best of your ability before submission.**

Even though I've listed a range of moves and strategies to apply in your article, **my biggest hope is that you show that you're not just following the moves mechanically...** You're engaged in your content! You're thinking about the big ideas! **You're grappling with complicated concepts in thoughtful and interesting ways!** There doesn't have to be a pro/con, black/white, good/bad, yes/no approach. The best articles are the ones that actually dig into the complexity---explore the grey areas. You can think about moves like "This is complicated because...." or "There is no easy solution.." or "Where do we go from here? Is there really one way?" and then explain why it's complicated... **A good writer is a writer who shows genuine engagement and grappling with big ideas, not somebody who tries to squeeze complicated ideas into a neat little box. You can have a paper that does ALL OF THE MOVES above, but is empty in terms of thought. Show the messiness of thinking. That's life. That's real. That's what matters.**

Figure 5 Sophia's sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI

As Image 5 reveals, SE does not traffic on Sophia's sample rubric. As I explain after Table 23, the themes of resistance and conflict above are further reflected in the rest of her DBI.

Table 23 Sophia's Explanations of Select SE-Related Language

Original & alternative text	Sophia's explanations
<p>Original: "grappling with complicated concepts in thoughtful and interesting ways"</p> <p>Option 1: grappling with complicated concepts, like Standard English</p> <p>Option 2: grappling with complicated concepts (such as Standard English)</p>	<p>"...in that particular phrase I was, or sentence, I was really just trying to emphasize the ideas because I feel like, especially first year writers coming out of high school are so nervous about taking intellectual risk and they're so used to writing in a very standard and boxed way, constrained way that they don't recognize that they should be breaking out of that box and they are afraid to do that. And that's what I wanted to focus on here and I don't think standard English matters all in that situation...Because we're talking about ideas here we're not talking about language."</p>
<p>Original: "careful to edit and polish your final draft"</p> <p>Option 1: careful to edit and proofread</p> <p>Option 2: careful to edit and correct</p>	<p>"I was conflicted about that language, but...proofread is basically what I mean, really, when I say polish...Like I want them to go through and make sure that they are not having typos or like formatting issues and you can tell that they just rushed through it. There's no title or page or, you know, citation. That's what I mean and...I want to encourage that final stage of writing and kind of help them understand that they can't just do this at the last minute and submit it [laughs] which many first year students do. So, that's what I mean there and I don't mean that they're gonna go back and like try to find their own grammatical errors and edit those. It's more like polish like cleanup but really what I mean is proofread... So, why did I choose the word polished? I don't know exactly. I think it just came to me, because I say, like, I'd like you to turn in a polished draft. And...I don't know that students know what I mean by that [Laughs], but they know that I don't mean grammar because I haven't taught grammar and I'm explicit about saying, I don't care if you have some grammar mistakes....And it doesn't make sense to assess them on editing and correcting if I haven't taught grammar, if I haven't taught any strategies. So, even putting my like, philosophical ideas about language and politics, and, like, standard English language and ideology...at the very basic level, the rubric should be reflecting the instructional content."</p>

	<p>And so if I haven't done that, then I'm not gonna put it in my rubric, which I think is a common problem for a lot of faculty. Not necessarily writing faculty, but across the curriculum, who often include grammar editing but have never taught it so how are students, they shouldn't be evaluated on it.”</p>
<p>Original: “Your tone and style is appropriate.” Option 1: Your tone, style, and mechanics is appropriate Option 2: Your tone, style, and grammar is appropriate</p>	<p>“...this is true for all students, but in particular, I feel like the biggest challenge for students is recognizing how to adapt their writing and their communication for different audiences....Because again, it doesn't matter if you're like, making errors in your standard English usage. That's whatever. What matters is that you're able to understand how to adapt your tone for a specific audience and so I really want them to understand that....Just, like, when you boil it all down is rhetorical awareness....So when that comes on the rubric, and it says your tone and style are appropriate. Oh, I should say your tone and style are appropriate.... [Laughs] So that's funny. [Laughs] But anyways, so they should understand what I mean...”</p>
<p>Original: “to fit the audience and style of that magazine” Option 1: the audience, style, and grammar Option 2: audience, style, and language.</p>	<p>“I guess it's just because, I mean, it is just because of what I said before, I don't want them to get caught up or just embroiled and like worrying about their language...as much as possible I don't want to include that language in my course materials, because I really focus on what matters, which is the rhetorical and genre, scale and not be caught up and, like, oh, she said like language here, or she said grammar shoot shoot. Shoot, I need to focus on that. And then everything else is just like you know, just sort of at the back burner and I don't that's not-the whole point of these courses is to learn rhetoric, rhetorical awareness. And I'm afraid that if I use language like that in the rubric, that's all they'll focus on.”</p>

SE is further resisted above through the use of terms like style instead of grammar. Sophia further resists SE by explaining that SE does not matter at all in the

context of her students grappling with complicated concepts in interesting ways—as she puts it, that work is about ideas not language. She also resisted terms like grammar and language on her rubric because she was worried that those terms would cause her students to worry and focus solely on their language and grammar rather than the rhetorical and the genre. As she explained, what matters is rhetorical awareness, not the ways that her students may be making mistakes in their SE usage. Finally, she revealed a way other (not necessarily writing) faculty are not resisting SE, which is when they include grammar and editing on their rubrics but have not taught either of those in their courses.

While SE does not traffic on her rubric, however, it does seem to traffic in her mind. For example, when reflecting on the phrase “your tone and style is appropriate” on her sample rubric, she appeared to edit or self-correct that phrase to “your tone and style are appropriate” so that her subject and verb agreed in number. While this could be identified as a communicative glitch that Sophia had recognized, it could also be a form of editing in relation to SE as a target, even though neither of us identified this change as linked to SE. In addition, Sophia’s reflection on her use of the word polish reveals that she means proofread since she wants her students to make sure they do not have any typos or formatting issues. However, she is still conflicted about that language because while she knows her students are not reading that word as grammar, she is also not sure about whether they know what that word means. More interesting, perhaps, is that while her conflict surrounding that word remains unsolved, she seemed to practice that polishing as she noted her own communicative glitch in her rubric.

At the end of the DBI, however, Sophia and I talked about other parts of her rubric she wanted to point out, which revealed two final means by which SE trafficked. Solidifying her resistance of SE even further, she said that in number six, her pedagogical approach is perhaps most visible: “Like, instead of putting you use a correct standard edited English, I’m saying, you show effort and intention to apply our writing hacks. Effort and intention doesn’t mean you’re doing it correctly, but I can see you’re trying.” In other words, she included words like effort and intention instead of correct SEE because she is assessing her students’ effort, not their ability to meet SEE. Finally, she articulated one way SE persists after I wondered out loud in the interview if SE could somehow be lurking in the dark. As she put it in the epigraph as a response to my question, SE is lurking in these hidden spaces because it is an entrenched language ideology that students see through their lived experiences as what gets privileged. Thus, while SE may not explicitly be present or privileged in rubrics, it is present as a form of cognitive dissonance for students. In short, then, while SE does not traffic in Sophia’s rubric, it does traffic and persist in her mind as she feels conflict about reading past errors in SE, deals with her own potential error in SE, and recognizes the entrenched language ideology of SE.

Susan: Subtle Visibility, Some Persistence, High Resistance

Susan, assistant coordinator for an international program in the US, continued to identify SE as a problematic term by linking it to prejudice. In this DBI, as I will explain, SE was resisted in informal ways and did not traffic in visible ways on her rubric. However, since SE was connected both to her speech as well as to grammatical errors

that interfere with meaning, it could persist in the revisions she made to her rubric in the course of the DBI.

As Table 24 reveals, SE trafficked on Susan's rubric in less visible ways, although SE was identified as a tool but also connected to prejudice. In her rubrics, for example, she emphasizes content more, although she recognizes that the role of grammar and correctness in rubrics is a debate that she gets into with her students. As she explained, she once asked her students if grammar was important, and while they said it was, she said it is not important but that it is useful because it is a tool. Thus, while she resisted SE, her students nonetheless promoted it by promoting the belief that grammar was important. She also seemed to identify SE as a tool since she explained that while it helps to have the tool to be able to speak using SE, what is important is that you are understood and that you recognize prejudice causes people to think there is a correct, right way to speak. In this identification of SE as a tool, SE could persist; however, SE is also resisted as Susan identifies the connection between correctness and prejudice.

While SE does not persist in very visible ways on her rubrics, it is tied to her speech as well as the term grammatical error. After stating that her language is standard American English (SAE), Susan then explained that she sometimes helps her international students figure out how to say things in SAE. Thus, SE persists in more informal ways, like through conversations she might have with those students as they are working on their writing. SE/SAE, however, is not tied to correcting students but rather helping them see what is considered correct in different cultures and contexts. Finally,

SE/SAE traffics as grammatical correctness, potentially persisting in the change she made to her sample rubric. As she explained in the DBI:

I feel like, we probably would say, at some point, according to standard American English in class, not on the rubric, but then, like, the main point being that grammatical errors don't interfere with meaning and so we would focus on being able to use grammar in order to help you be clear about what you wanna say right? And then...what's considered to be errors can be distracting, right? And so, you know, sometimes their professors get concerned about it. And so, therefore, we try to teach them how to correct these things. So, I think we try to give them some context about the reason why we teach it, which again has to do with audience.

Although she might use air quotes when saying the term SAE/SE in her class, those terms seem to be equated with grammatical errors that interfere with meaning. Because she added the latter phrase to her rubric as she revised it during the DBI, SE may traffic through that phrase. In other words, SE may traffic as SE/SAE in her class, but it may also traffic as grammatical errors that interfere with meaning on her rubric.

Finally, as Susan's original rubric below reveals, SE may persist through the inclusion of grammar-related terms. In Figure 6 below, words like punctuation and verb are used, both of which can be connected to SE. Since Susan's students seem to promote a potentially prescriptive view of grammar, those terms may allow SE to operate on her rubric.

Table 24 Susan's Perspective & Relationship between her Rubric, SE, Grammar, & Error

<p>Use of rubrics & sample rubric</p>	<p>Feels like she's always used them; learned about rubrics in grad school; probably adopted her first rubrics from someone when teaching at a previous college; got really interested in having students make their own rubrics; hers have changed a lot from single-point rubrics; might go back to single point, though; it's like the descriptors vs. the single point; rubric depends on assignment and course; tries to emphasize content more; likes having things spelled out with space to write comments, like reason for score and what to work on; language is more important in the sample rubric because since language was one of the learning objectives for that class; mechanics would be maybe 10% of total grade; this course was co-taught with a linguist; Susan would grade A through F while the linguist would grade G through J; final draft grade would be based largely on first 5-6 categories and mechanics would nudge grade on way or another; said her students used to help write the rubrics and always included grammar; however, asking students about what kind of grammar, whose grammar, and whose language would be a good way to have a conversation about grammatical correctness and how that relates to audience; wants to do grammar exercises with her undergrad students and have that kind of conversation about working on grammatical accuracy (like, if you want to learn grammar and accuracy, these things are available to you) while also discussing whose language and why that is considered standard</p>
<p>Role of SE in sample rubric</p>	<p>Sample rubric is from 2012, so that course was teaching SE, but it's being debated more and more; now they don't explicitly grade grammar anymore; said her language is standard American English; part of her job is to help her students figure out how to say things; sometimes her international students need help in how to say things, so she might say you could say this or this and that is going to be SAE that's appropriate for an academic audience because that's what she's teaching her graduate students; this is not an effort to correct them but to help them figure out their ideas in that particular way; when using the terms SAE or SE, would have said that is what's considered correct in different in different cultures</p>

Role of grammar, correctness or sentence-level issues in rubric/grading/sample rubric	<p>It's an ongoing debate; thinks composition people are more inclined to not worry about it; depending on course, grammar can make up 10% of grade through rubric, like mechanics, citation, formal structural elements; grammatical correctness plays no role when she grades; it's only whether or not they convey their meaning that can affect the grade; tries to take into consideration the cognitive load that they're under; there's a push and pull between the form and content she finds because of the cognitive load; there can be conflict where there are students with clear writing but that is boring or isn't interesting vs. diving into the research but the writing doesn't look like it's meeting criteria of having much clear to say but the student was thinking deeply; in sample rubric, said she would revise the mechanical points on the language and then did those edits in the interview on source integration and citation mechanics, adding in key concepts, synthesis, coherence, audience appropriateness/awareness, and grammatical errors do not interfere with meaning</p>
Definition of grammar & grammatical correctness	<p>How to define them is already an issue; gets into this debate with students because some are like, I want to write correctly; these debates take place in different areas; one of the things that comes up is research, which is a non-count noun, but she noticed an international journal published in India that used researches, plural, and that was correct in that context; English exists in many places and there are different varieties of it; as long as people can understand your English, it's correct, but the focus needs to be on being understood not what's correct; we need to value different written and oral accents; once asked her students at a previous college if grammar was important, and they said yes, but she said grammar is not important but is useful; you'll have certain audiences that will judge you based on whether or not they can see what they consider to be correct grammar; it helps if you can have that tool to be able to speak using standard American English grammar; but what's important is that you're understood and that you recognize it's prejudice that causes people to think that this is correct and the right way to speak; tries to teach this in graduate classes</p>
Definition of error	<p>Focuses more on errors of thinking, not grammatical accuracy; doesn't use the word error; if students have a</p>

	more polished paper, she might make small comments on usage; that would be her triage for the ideas and content, like is the support in the paper there, the structure, are there grammatical issues that might impede meaning; it's not that this is incorrect but rather what's appropriate for audiences; she corrects students on their comprehension of different concepts, like on a what a particular source in their paper is saying
--	--

Student's Name: _____		ENGH 111/ Summary 1		
Date: _____		Section: _____		
Evaluation System				
7 = Exceptional/thought-provoking/original 6 = Experienced/effective/consistent 5 = Experienced/effective 4 = Capable/usually consistent (Passing) 3 = Shows criteria with some consistency 2 = Developing/Beginning to show criteria 1 = Emerging				
Criteria	Draft 1 Prof. A	Draft 2 Prof. B	Final Draft Student	Final Draft Instructors
a. Intro is logically arranged and contains author's name, article title and article's main/central idea	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
b. Body covers significant main points from original text	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
c. Body clearly and accurately defines key concepts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
d. Body connects the points logically and in your own words	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
e. Key terms and/or concepts are repeated for emphasis	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
f. Tone is neutral and objective	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
g. Reporting verbs accurately reflect original author's tone and purpose	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
h. Word forms, including verb structures, are correct	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
i. Spelling, punctuation, and capitalization are correct	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
j. Includes full reference at the end	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
OVERALL:				

Figure 6 Susan's sample rubric with highlighted text focus of DBI

Susan's sample rubric above underwent changes throughout the DBI, but the alternative language offered to her was based on how her rubric looked before those changes. Thus, while she omitted one reference to correctness, she kept the other while also adding the phrase grammatical errors do not interfere with meaning. As I explain

below, Table 25 uncovers the ways SE persists and is resisted in additional informal ways.

Table 25 Susan’s Explanations of Select SE-Related Language

Original & alternative text	Susan’s explanations
<p>Original: “connects the points logically and in your own words”</p> <p>Option 1: connects the points logically and in your own words using Standard English</p> <p>Option 2: connects the point logically in Standard English</p>	<p>“I feel like that would be inhibiting for them. I mean...our students tend to be really challenged to write in their own words. Like, you know, paraphrasing is a big challenge. And so if we were to also emphasize, like, and it has to be correct, I think that they would actually be more likely to copy [laughs] from something else, rather than write in their own words. So, I feel like that would actually detract from what we want them to do, which is, you know, to practice coming up with their own words...so that's why it's separated from the grammar. Because the point is for us, that, like I said, these first, the first parts of the rubric are the most important thing, but they're like, you know, they're getting the content....You know, they're trying. They're figuring out how to say things in their own words, and then coming up with a structure that makes sense...all that is more important than the grammar being correct. You know, again, like, to the extent that the grammar doesn't interfere with the meaning, then we have to go in and help them figure out how to say it.”</p>
<p>Original: “word forms, including verb structures, are correct”</p> <p>Option 1: word forms, including verb structures, are accurate</p> <p>Option 2: word forms, including verb structures, are proper</p>	<p>“I’m trying to think, this was a while ago. I mean, clearly, we’re clearly teaching from this idea that this is what’s considered correct grammar. I mean, if we’re going accurate, the word proper just sounds weird [Laughs]...And it was like, a whole class dynamic, but, uh, accurate also sounds weird to me in this context. Word forms are accurate. Yeah, I mean...we’re teaching a particular form of English as being, those structures as being correct. So, I think within that context, I think that does make sense. Yeah, is within context what’s correct.”</p>

Original: “spelling, punctuation, and capitalization are correct ” Option 1: spelling, punctuation, and capitalization have been proofread Option 2: spelling, punctuation, and capitalization have been edited	“Yeah, I think the same reason, I mean, they can proofread it and still not get it, right, so. [Laughs]...And edit and still not get it right. I mean...it's the same sense. Like, this is how within this context, this is what's considered correct, so this is what we're looking for, not the action of proofreading or editing, because I don't know how we would, right? Like, how we see that, we would have to watch them, it doesn't seem observable to me [Laughs]. So, I can sit down and watch that you have proofread it. But that doesn't mean that you have done a good job.”
--	--

This theme of subtle resistance and persistence was continued in the rest of Susan’s DBI as she revealed, first, that the term SE on her rubric could promote plagiarism among her students. However, she also tied SE to what was correct within a specific context; thus, SE may traffic as correctness but only within a specific context, as her sample rubric reveals. She also resisted SE as tied to proofreading or editing since she explained that those acts are not observable. She confirmed SE as grammatical errors that interfere with meaning, however, so while that phrase was not on her pre-revised rubric, it was on the version she changed in the DBI, so SE/SAE could persist through that phrase via that revision. In short, while SE may traffic as grammatical errors that interfere with meaning as well as what is correct within specific contexts on her rubric, the terms Standard English are nonetheless resisted as they could promote plagiarism and are already discussed in class.

Invisible Value: Visibility | Persistence | Resistance

Taken together, what these DBIs reveal is the way SE trafficked with a range of visibility and subtlety as well as different degrees of resistance and persistence both in instructors' sample rubrics and their courses. SE was resisted most visibly by almost every instructor's decision to not include that term explicitly in their rubric; however, SE also persisted in some way on almost every instructor's rubric. Apart from those commonalities, the extent and degree of that resistance and persistence of SE varied from instructor to instructor and rubric to rubric. In addition, the ways that instructors defined, understood, and positioned terms like SE, error, grammar, and correctness affected whether and how SE trafficked in their rubrics. SE was thus valued in a variety of ways, sometimes in terms that were explicitly on instructors' rubrics and other times through assumptions or internal conflicts surrounding their rubrics and grading processes. That value, as revealed in this chapter's title, is an invisible one. That is, although SE was not explicitly present on most instructors' rubrics, the ways they understood, defined, and navigated SE as well as terms like error and grammar revealed that SE had a sort of invisible value either on or connected to those rubrics. Synthesizing each case study/profile further reveals these values since SE trafficked in three primary ways: first, SE had a range of visibility on each rubric, from being explicitly, highly visible to not visible at all. Second, SE persisted on instructors' rubrics and their courses from degrees of high persistence to low persistence. Finally, the ways instructors resisted SE also varied, from low resistance to high resistance and even unconscious resistance.

For Erin, who represented one side of this range, SE was most visible, most persistent, and least resisted. The words Standard English were on her sample rubric, and she defined SE as correct English. Even though she acknowledged the existence of other Englishes and discussed removing the word standard in a move to resist SE, SE nonetheless persisted through a number of terms on her rubric, such as grammar, language, and formatting. For L. Baldwin, SE was somewhat visible, highly persistent, and somewhat resisted. Although the term SE was not on her rubric, she explained that it was assumed to be there. SE thus persisted in a number of broad and yet specific ways, through concepts like genre as well as more specific terms on her rubric like punctuation, spelling, and capitalization. Having identified SE as an oxymoron and anachronistic term previously, L. Baldwin resisted SE to a medium degree, acknowledging in the DBI that grammar rules, like SE, change. For Cynthia, SE was somewhat visible, somewhat persistent, and highly resisted. SE persisted in her rubric in ways that were largely out of her control, both through her students' desires for correctness as well as external pressures to include grammar criteria in her rubric. Cynthia nonetheless resisted SE to a high degree, troubling the terms error and correctness, indicating her desire to let students work in their own languages, and articulating the possibility of resisting SE in her assessment practices.

For Michael, SE was barely visible, barely persistent, and yet unconsciously resisted. While SE had the potential to be implied in his rubric through his use of the word grammar in the original assignment, he explained that his choice not to include SE may not have been a conscious one. For Susan, SE was subtly visible, somewhat

persistent, and highly resisted. While Susan clearly connected SE to speakers' prejudices and explained that she did not correct her students' language use, thus resisting SE, she stated that she spoke SAE (standard American English) and connected SAE with grammatical errors that interfere with meaning. Finally, for Sophia, who represented the other side of this range, SE was least visible, the least persisted, and the most resisted. SE did not traffic on Sophia's rubric at all, and she resisted it in explicit ways, pointing out that she focuses on effort and not correct standard edited English. SE did, however, traffic in her mind as she explained the ways she feels conflict reading past and not commenting on her international students' errors in SE if those students had the desire to write in a more standardized way.

In pointing out these degrees of resistance and persistence, I would argue that SE traffics and is valued in an invisible way, whether it is implied on a rubric through terms like grammar and correct or whether it is part of an internal conflict an instructor feels as they read and grade student writing. SE also persisted in ways that were sometimes out of instructors' control, like Cynthia, Michael, Erin, and Susan pointed out, which may make it more difficult for instructors to have support in resisting SE. Even when these instructors make moves to resist SE, then, it persisted to some degree on their rubrics, in their courses, or in their minds.

However, SE was resisted in a number of ways which seemed both to be tied to instructors' definitions of SE as well as potentially connected to the extent to which SE persisted on their rubrics. For Sophia, for example, the more she resisted SE the less it seemed to persist on her rubric, so her strong stance on SE could have prevented SE not

only from being visible on her rubric but also from persisting as a standard by which she would be judging her students against. For Erin, however, since she had included SE on her rubric and defined SE as correct English, SE seemed to persist the most, although she did resist it to some degree. Finally, while Michael recognized SE as a means of devaluing other languages, his choice not to include SE on his rubric was unconscious, which could have affected the low degree to which SE did persist on his rubric.

Attention, Potential, Value

A number of implications arise from these negotiations as well as from the way SE trafficked in these rubrics, most of which I take up in the following chapter. First, while I am not advocating for or against the use of rubrics, I believe that more attention could be paid to rubrics as a potential means of both resisting SE and also examining the extent to which SE may persist on those rubrics. For example, as I explain in the next chapter, it could be possible to include not just the words Standard English but rather white Standard English (wSE) or white Mainstream English (wME) on a rubric where the language/grammar/style criteria is typically found so that the whiteness of SE can be made visible. In addition, I also believe that adding language like “you will not be judged against your ability to meet wSE/wME since that standard is unfair, mythical, and paradoxical” or “if you would like for me to comment on your grammar and language, I will do so, but I will never penalize you for your language use/practice” could be helpful as well.

Second, as Susan explained, the debate about form vs. content is one she gets into with her students, and that debate plays out on rubrics as well; thus, there may be value in

more closely examining the dynamics of that debate on rubrics with students as well as colleagues. There is also potential with the ways language about language is positioned on rubrics. Taking Susan and Sophia's introduction of terms like linguistic etiquette and communicative glitch, discussing those terms in class, and adding those terms to rubrics could initiate a means of deconstructing, challenging, or complicating SE. Finally, there may also be value in instructors asking themselves a revised version of the question I asked in each DBI: to what extent might SE be assumed or valued on this rubric or in this course?

What these implications reveal, I argue, is the need for Synergistic English Work with rubrics, translingualism, and antiracist writing assessment. While I have synergized the levels to which SE persisted in each of the above rubrics, I now advocate for synergizing those findings with the work done in translingual and antiracist scholarship surrounding rubrics and grading. That is, because SE was still operative on many of these rubrics even though that term was not used, I believe translingual and antiracist approaches to SE and grading could potentially address the role of SE on rubrics. That is, while these approaches both reveal ways of combatting SE in the classroom, I believe these approaches could also focus on ways of combatting or challenging SE in rubrics, a point on which I expand in the next chapter. In addition, I also believe there may be value in synergizing translingual and antiracist approaches to SE so that SE can be challenged in rubrics themselves, a point on which I also expand in the next chapter. In short, I advocate from SE-ing SE in rubrics to SEW-ing SE in rubrics.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

“So there's also something in grading where I think it's reasonable...to tell a student where they are based on where they wanna be. And so, based on their goal, then you get into this kind of weird grey area where... it sort of becomes okay to start at least giving indication of where that student stands. And this, it goes back to the English standards, right? It does go back English standards, whether it's happy or not. So I think it's okay to give a student an indication, and sometimes a grade. But this is where you stand, if you wanna go be a scientist, and you wanna publish papers, this is roughly where your writing is and not that that needs to be valued in any way because, yeah, maybe their writing is pretty low proficiency, for me, that means okay, so go hire an editor, like, here, you need to know the tools that you need. If you're gonna have a professor later on down the line who's gonna grade you on grammar, you need to be able to go to that professor and say, okay, I'm gonna hire an editor if you're gonna hold me accountable for this. Because I don't know how to do it and you're not teaching me. So, what do you expect from me?”

Michael, Interview #1

“You know, and for those of us who are teaching in this way, it's like, we know that they're gonna go into some school of management and they are gonna have a thing on the rubric that says grammar and correctness. And so it's like, it's everywhere and so no matter how much our philosophy is this way, they're up against this ideology everywhere else they go. And so that's why, I think at an institutional level, there has to be a language justice approach. Like, it can't just be in our program. I mean, it can start there, but it has to grow or it has to come from the top and from the bottom in order for ideologies to shift. And that has to happen at all institutions for a long-ass time before that linguistic norm is dismantled. It's something that's, like, generations I think from now. But it's like, we have to start somewhere.”

Sophia, Interview #2

From SE to SEW

This project set out to uncover the ways writing instructors understand, navigate, and negotiate the SE dilemma and paradox in the context of their assessment practices. In examining the range and variety of those negotiations, this project itself became an additional site of understanding, clarifying, and navigating that SE paradox and dilemma. Chapter One, for example, wrestled with putting that paradox, the role it plays in this SE

dilemma, and this project's goals into a single, concise chapter when SE is anything but concise. Chapter Two expanded on that work, grappling with how the dilemma surrounding SE is situated in writing studies as well as how scholarship on translingualism and antiracist writing assessment offers approaches for combatting SE but ultimately overlooks how instructors are actually dealing with SE. Chapters Three, Four, and Five presented not only the results of this study but also how those results came to be, making room for Chapters Four and Five to become sites of resistance and promotion, remaking and reaffirming, of possibility and need. In short, these chapters performed and revealed a shift from Standard English to Synergistic English Work.

This Synergistic English Work also reveals the grey space of negotiating this SE dilemma and dealing with SE. Recalling Jerry Won Lee's point in Chapter One that assessment often creates either/or choices surrounding SE for instructors, I would argue that the range of ways SE trafficked in both sets of interviews reveals not just the grey space Michael notes above but also the ways that instructors are not just making either/or choices but rather both/and choices. That is, while the debate between honoring students' languages or preparing students for SE in other contexts dichotomizes these choices as an either/or dilemma, in actuality the six writing instructors I interviewed are navigating and negotiating the grey space in the center of that dilemma. SE, then, both persists and is resisted in their rubrics in a number of ways and with a range of degrees. In those forms of resistance and persistence, I also revealed the translingual/antiracist work many of these instructors were already doing. In other words, then, I believe this dilemma is not an either/or choice but rather a both/and translingual/antiracist negotiation.

As Sophia's point makes clear, however, SE traffics in ways outside of writing instructors' control, so in some ways SE is lurking in the dark. SE also lurked in the dark, to some degree, in many instructors' rubrics themselves. Instructors' definitions of SE revealed the ways it was understood and practiced through a number of terms and concepts, from somewhat reluctant identifications of SE as correct English to strong identifications of SE as racist linguistic ideology. These identifications, synergized with other terms that can be used in place of SE (such as grammar, error, and punctuation, to name a few), reveal the ways SE can operate on rubrics even when the term SE is not used, but they also reveal the potential for translingual and antiracist scholarship to better account for rubrics and SE. That is, while these approaches both reveal ways of combatting SE in the classroom, I believe these approaches could also focus on ways of combatting or challenging SE in rubrics. Finally, because SE sometimes persisted in ways outside of instructors' control, I believe these approaches can be operationalized on a larger, more programmatic level so that writing instructors might have synergized translingual/antiracist guidance to help them deal with and navigate the SE dilemma in their assessment practices. In short, I advocate from SE-ing SE in rubrics to SEW-ing SE in rubrics.

In advocating for a shift from SE to SEW, I am also arguing for the opportunity and need in this work. That is, there is an opportunity to take translingual and antiracist approaches up together in more explicit ways in order to better reflect the translingual/antiracist work these writing instructors are already doing. In synergizing these approaches, there is also an opportunity to make SE a less tacit myth and a more

explicit, visible practice in continued need of deconstructing, challenging, and combatting. Synergizing translingual/antiracist scholarship with instructors' navigations of the SE dilemma and paradox also reveals the need for that scholarship to better account for the material conditions and constraints surrounding instructors' work with international students and the faculty who may go on to teach them. Finally, the operative value of SE in instructors' rubrics reveals both an opportunity for translingual and antiracist scholarship to take up and deal with rubrics, SE, and grading as well as the need for program and policy-based support for instructors that incorporates both translingual and antiracist approaches so that instructors can navigate and negotiate the SE dilemma with more guidance and consistency.

In this chapter, then, I argue more specifically for how this Synergistic English Work can be done, offering a series of recommendations below for shifting from SE to SEW. In making these recommendations, I hope to offer a more comprehensive vision that not only helps instructors deal with this SE dilemma but also offers concrete steps towards shifting the nature of SE's power. This vision takes antiracist and translingual language activism into account on public, institutional, program, and classroom levels, revealing the need for these sometimes isolated spaces to take up this SEW-ing work together—synergistically—so that SE, its power, its lurking, and its persistence, can be brought to light and made visible. As I hope to show, there is no singular or simple answer to this SE dilemma and the power its paradox holds. There is, however, power and possibility in staying in that complicated, grey space where this SE dilemma is not simplified but rather opened up, explored, and uncovered; where the local, material

realities of SE are acknowledged and examined; and where small steps—starting somewhere in each of these spaces where SE lurks, from the public to the classroom—can together, synergistically, begin to shift SE’s power and spur on action, SEW-ing action, that works toward realizing the ideal of respecting students’ languages and yet deals with the reality of SE ideology.

Opportunity: Faculty, Rubrics, Assessment

First, there is opportunity for faculty to take up some of this synergistic work on an individual level. For example, faculty might reflect on SE both on their own and with their students. Instructors might ask themselves, for example, the following question: How might Standard English be valued in my grading rubrics or tools? To determine the answer to this question, I suggest instructors ask one of the following two questions:

- Are the words Standard English—and/ or its related terms like academic, edited, and American—explicitly written on my grading rubrics or tools?
- If the words Standard English—and/or its related terms like academic, edited, and American—are not explicitly written on my grading rubrics or tools, are there places in those tools and rubrics where I am nonetheless asking students to write their essays in Standard English in other ways or using other terms?

If instructors answer affirmatively to the first question, I would suggest they then ask:

- Why have I included the words Standard English on my rubric/tool?
- Is the inclusion of SE fair for my students, particularly in terms of their racial and linguistic identities? What about my own raciolinguistic identity? What role might that play in my use of the words Standard English?

If instructors have not included SE on their rubrics and tools, I would suggest they ask the following questions:

- How is it that I know that my rubrics/tools are or are not asking students to write their essays in SE?
- Is either option—asking or not asking students to write their essays in SE—fair for students?
- What role might my own raciolinguistic identity play in the way my rubric and its lack of the words Standard English get read?

Asking these questions could open up space for faculty to do some translingual and antiracist work by making the role of SE in their rubrics more explicit as well as thinking explicitly about the connections between race, language, SE, rubrics, and the students who will read them.

In addition, and perhaps more important, writing instructors could then take a synergized translingual/antiracist approach in generating and having conversations with their students about SE. That is, as Cynthia explained in her first interview, SE could be a useful tool for breaking down and discussing what it means in the classroom. First, then, instructors might define SE or come up with a working definition of it with their students and then ask those students to examine whether SE is on any rubrics, grading tools, or evaluative criteria used for that course. Then, instructors might ask students about whether they themselves want SE, making room to ask about why they might want SE and what that means for those students, their writing goals, and their linguistic and racial identities. In conjunction with those conversations, instructors might also see what kinds

of conversations are generated by asking students to design their own version of a rubric for that course, or a version of a rubric that explicitly has SE on it and then one that does not include SE at all.

Working with rubrics more specifically, I believe there is possibility in resisting SE on those rubrics as well as taking a synergized translingual/antiracist approach to SE, as I mentioned at the end of Chapter Five. For example, it could be possible to include not just the words Standard English but rather white Standard English (wSE) or white Mainstream English (wME) on a rubric where the language/grammar/style criteria is typically found so that the whiteness of SE can be made visible. In addition, I also believe that adding language like “you will not be judged against your ability to meet wSE/wME since that standard is unfair, mythical, and paradoxical” or “if you would like for me to comment on your grammar and language, I will do so, but I will never penalize you for your language use/practice” could be helpful as well. In adding this language, there is also possibility in explicitly revealing the translingual/antiracist approaches instructors are taking. For example, instructors could add language to a rubric like “This rubric takes a translingual and antiracist approach to assessing your language practice but will never penalize you for mistakes, errors, or language use that would be deemed ‘incorrect’ by wSE/wME ideology.” That language could also be reflected on the syllabus itself or on other course materials in order to create more opportunities to resist SE but also to show students that their language will be valued in ways where they will not be judged against SE.

There may also be opportunity for seeing SE not as something to assess against but rather assess around, as the conversation I had with Sophia at the end of her DBI revealed. After I asked if it were possible to help students cultivate rhetorical awareness of SE and then assess that awareness, Sophia said:

But I think it can be assessed, for example, if they're writing, I don't know, like, I mean, we need to dismantle all standard English, but if they're writing something that's, like, for like a white paper, I guess. I'm just giving a random example, and they're code meshing with Spanish. But, like, the audience are only English speakers, then great that you're breaking and dismantling, like, linguistic imperialism, but it's like, they're not gonna be able to understand what you're saying in this code-meshed version. So that is not meeting the course objectives, because it's not rhetorically aware. So, you know, that the choices they make with the English they want to use are rhetorically sound, I think that can be assessed.

In other words, it may be possible to assess not against SE but rather around it, centering the assessment on the student's rhetorical awareness of SE. This rhetorical awareness of SE may be one way of operationalizing a synergized translingual/antiracist approach to SE in the context of assessment. That is, assessing students' awareness of SE represents a shift from SE to SEW since instructors can raise students' awareness of SE as a form of raciolinguistic discrimination and then assess students' rhetorical awareness of their linguistic choices rather than students' ability to meet or not meet SE.

Need: Policy, Field, Synergy

There is also, however, a need for additional programmatic, policy-based support as well as greater attention to rubrics and the role SE plays in them. Because SE trafficked in a number of ways in instructors' rubrics, their courses, and within themselves, I believe creating and continuing to implement language policies developed by writing programs, their WPAs, and their faculty could give additional guidance to instructors as they navigate and deal with SE in their assessment practices. As Sophia put it, this SE ideology is everywhere. However, if instructors have program-backed policies that take an explicit stance not only on SE but also SE's role in assessment, then the pressure they experience navigating and negotiating this dilemma might be eased.

To be clear, these kinds of policies are already being created, but I am advocating for adding an explicit focus on SE and writing assessment to them. The "Writing@Bates Statement of Commitment to Antiracist & Inclusive Writing Instruction" at Bates College, for example, states the following in their first paragraph: "We understand the demand to view the world through a lens that privileges Standard Written (White) English (SWE) that obscures the rich diversity of ethnolinguistic and sociocultural traditions, aesthetics, epistemologies, and identities of all members of our community." Following from this, they commit to "[a]cknowledge that Standard Written English, or SWE, is a historically-specific dialect that emerged from the English colonial project and has been employed to reinforce racism and to reify white privilege." While I agree with this commitment, I would also advocate for adding another commitment on behalf of writing instructors that connects Standard English and writing assessment. That language

might look something like “Actively look for and reflect on the ways in which current assessment practices, including rubrics, may invisibly promote Standard English as the single standard against which student writing is judged; facilitate open and explicit conversations with students about the linguistic expectations and standards for their writing in order to then challenge those standards, including SE, together.”

Another option might be: “While we [this writing program] recognize the ways a white Standard English (WSE) is privileged in different contexts, we will never require students to be assessed or measured against WSE unless that is their conscious, deliberate choice.” The purpose of these additions is, first, to encourage instructors, from a top-down, programmatic-level of commitment, to reflect on how their assessment practices, including their grading tools and rubrics, may be invisibly promoting SE and then to do something about that reflection by having explicit and open conversations with students about the invisible presence of SE. The second purpose is to provide explicit guidance and support for writing instructors that connects SE with their writing assessment practices and, in making it clear that no instructor should be forced to assess students against SE, ease the pressure instructors may feel to do just that. These additions also make SE, its ideology, and its connections to assessment more visible and more explicit, marking one step towards shifting the power of SE so that it no longer lurks in the dark but rather is challenged and resisted in the light.

On a larger, field-wide scale, I would also advocate for ensuring that some form of the words Standard English as well as writing assessment are added to some of the initiatives and work already taking place in the field and in the US. In August 2020, for

example, the Council of Writing Program Administrators published a list of “Antiracist Initiatives” on their website, one of which is to revise their WPA Outcomes Statement to support antiracist pedagogy. More specifically, in their “Statement on Racial Injustice and Systemic Racism,” they stipulate that WPAs “have a responsibility to implement antiracist practices in their writing programs and actively work to dismantle structures of white privilege.” I would advocate, however, for including the words Standard English on one of the items listed on WPA’s initiatives, perhaps borrowing directly from the language on the WPA-GO (Writing Program Administrators—Graduate Organization) “Statement on Anti-Racist Assessment.” In the fourth point listed under what WPA-GO endorses as part of this statement, the words Standard and English are explicitly used as they advocate for “[c]ombating and making visible hegemonic writing standards and deficit language ideologies...that center White Standard English in academic writing.” First, then, I would advocate for aligning the language from WPA-GO above to WPA’s “Statement on Racial Injustice and Systemic Racism” so that both statements include SE. Second, I would recommend adding the words writing assessment to both of these statements, perhaps identifying writing assessment as one of the contexts in which SE can be combatted and resisted. Finally, I would convert the uppercase of white to lowercase to de-center whiteness¹¹ so that WSE becomes wSE or even white Mainstream English or wME.

¹¹ In reading scholarship on race and language, I found that scholars, like Baker-Bell, oscillated between capitalizing and not capitalizing white. In her book, Baker-Bell, for example, capitalizes white in “White Mainstream English” but then lowercases it in “white linguistic hegemony” (22). I choose to lowercase white because I want to decenter it, by which I mean I want to displace it from its central, hegemonic, dominating position.

I believe there is also a need to keep thinking about and potentially re-including terms like error, correct, proofread, and grammar in these policies and in research conducted by WPAs, writing instructors, and writing studies researchers. SE often trafficked in invisible ways in instructors' rubrics in this study, persisting through terms like grammar, language, and formatting, so I believe these terms can also be included in research about SE so that those terms can be further uncovered. In including these terms in this research and in these policies, I would suggest continuing to consult sociolinguistics scholarship on grammar, language, and SE, like Rosina Lippi-Green's book *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*, or Ingrid Piller's justice-oriented book *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. Researchers and instructors might, for example, refer to SE as *SAE like Lippi-Green does (62) in order to identify SE as grammatically inauthentic and present that idea to writing instructors who are part of that research or who are implementing that programmatic policy.

I also believe there is opportunity for conducting more empirical research that extends the synergistic work of this study. For example, because there are so many terms used to identify SE, researchers could investigate these other terms by surveying and interviewing not just writing faculty but also students to uncover valuations of these terms as well as how those valuations compare across participants and their own linguistic and racial identities. Building on this study, researchers could conduct interviews with a greater number of writing faculty and ask them about the ways they identify and navigate this SE dilemma as well as recommendations those faculty might

have for the kinds of support they need in dealing with that dilemma. Another version of this study might also ask WPAs (writing program administrators) about the ways they identify this dilemma themselves, the ways they identify it based on the program and faculty they serve, and the ways they are already or would like to support faculty navigating that dilemma. Finally, I would advocate for conducting surveys in which the racial descriptor white is added to Standard English and writing faculty and students are asked to reflect on that term so that the field can better empirically gauge the effects of its movements toward antiracism and translanguaging. In that research, I would also advocate for making the choice to capitalize or not capitalize white clear and explicit for readers because, in the end, SE is language about language.

Finally, there is a need for translanguaging and antiracist scholarship to better deal with and account for the material conditions and constraints these six writing instructors mentioned as well as the relationship between rubrics, SE, and grading. First, translanguaging and antiracist scholarship might focus on how deconstructing SE with international students, for example, might work in the classroom. Would those students be open to deconstructing SE? Is there any way for writing instructors to have discussions with their students in which they both grapple with the expectations other faculty might have for those students? Finally, is it possible for writing instructors to teach international students in the grey space Michael identifies? In asking these questions, I am pushing these translanguaging and antiracist conversations to make room for the local, for the material, for, in short, reality. While this scholarship offers instructors a number of approaches for instructors to deal with and combat SE, I also believe that those approaches sometimes

create another ideal for instructors who are already dealing with their own ideals and realities in their classrooms. In taking up these questions, I believe this scholarship can also make room for these additional realities and ideals and, perhaps, further open up and complicate this SE dilemma in productive ways.

Second, translingual and antiracist scholarship might also focus on the relationship between rubrics, SE, and grading in more explicit ways. For example, would it be possible for rubrics to explicitly include language that labels SE as wSE (white Standard English) or wME (white Mainstream English), define wSE/wME, and specify that students will not be assessed on their ability to write in wSE/wME? In addition, how might a translingual approach that advocates for letting students choose the portion of their grade that comes from SE or grammar on a rubric account for the ways language minoritized students may be judged based on how they look or sound before they can be understood? Finally, how might an antiracist approach that advocates for labor-based grading contracts deal with international students, for example, who are concerned about matriculating and meeting externally-imposed standards of language accuracy?

SEW-ing

Uncovering the paradox and dilemma surrounding Standard English both in writing studies and in this study was and is a messy, arduous, and meta-linguistic task that, while difficult, is one I believe the field owes to its practitioners, theoreticians, instructors, administrators, graduate students, and undergraduate students to take on. The work I have done in this study, including the labor involved in writing the final words of this very conclusion, marks what I hope will be the beginning of that work, not only for

myself as an emerging scholar but also other scholars, writers, and instructors in this field.

In reflecting on that beginning, I cannot help but return to metaphor and, more specifically, the embedded metaphor in this study's titular pre-colon acronym. As Adrian McKerracher puts it in his book *What It Means to Write: Creativity and Metaphor*,

We speak in metaphors all the time. They tell us clues about how we see our reality. If we could learn to reflect on those metaphors and ask ourselves, is this the one I want? then maybe we could reinscribe our experience. We could leave our invisible, sonic mark on the history of language and offer up the unique and transient poetry of our daily lives (22).

While drafting and revising (and drafting and revising) this dissertation, I birthed and then buried a number of metaphors, from calling SE a key, to describing the process of researching SE as diving into murky waters, to using a Latin phrase I had so carefully composed somewhere in the middle of drafting the first two chapters of this dissertation: *mortuus et vivus*, which translates to dead¹² and alive. These metaphors eventually led me to the one embedded in SEW which, in true sewing fashion, I realized in talking with a colleague was what I was trying to say, do, and advocate for all along in this

¹² To be clear, a language which "is no longer acquired as a first language, and is no longer used in day-to-day communication by a community of persons is considered to be dead, whether or not it survives in a literary form" (Lippi-Green 23). Describing Latin as dead, however, is not so easily done (or written!); as Joseph Farrell puts it in his book *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times*, "latinity may lie dormant, but it can never die; revival is an ever-present possibility" (112). In some ways, I tried to potentially revive Latin, if only temporarily and in the pages of this dissertation where I used it. Perhaps more important, however, my choice to try to use this Latin-based metaphor, which itself ironically reflects the metaphor used to describe (perhaps inaccurately, according to Farrell) the Latin language, reflects my linguistic history, as I chose to take Latin in high school and college because of the language's influence throughout the world (Leonhardt).

dissertation. I sewed, synergized, and put together many threads in this dissertation, from translingual and antiracist ones, to theoretical and empirical ones, to chapter-based ones. All of these threads mark a move from SE-ing to SEW-ing.

The sonic mark I leave on the history of language and the words about words in the field of writing studies is a meta-metaphorical starting point, a call to keep uncovering Standard English, the terms it lives through, and the invisible ways it traffics from the writing instructors who deal with it every week, every semester, every year. It is a call for more support, a call for opportunity, a call for calling out these invisibly inscribed terms and reinscribing them on our own terms, using our own metaphors, drawing from our material realities, and building on the work writing instructors are already doing to resist this paradox and dilemma.

SEW-ing is not one step but rather a number of steps that can be taken on a number of levels in a number of spaces, from individual classrooms to field-wide statements, to help shift SE's power, to make SE's lurking ideology more visible, to sit with the complex space between ideal and reality, and to move from dichotomizing and solving the SE dilemma to actually dealing with it. SEW-ing is staying in the complicated, in the grey space, in the many small steps in the many small and large spaces so that, collectively, collaboratively, synergistically, we can find a way through this SE dilemma and sustain that work, sustain the conversation, and sustain ourselves. SEW-ing is collaboration and is a means of making that collaboration and the need for that collaboration visible. SEW-ing is for faculty, for WPAs, for the field because we already are doing some of that work. This SEW-ing has been and is even now

occurring—I am merely doing more of it, calling attention to it, and advocating for more of it.

It's time to stop SE-ing and time to start—and keep—SEW-ing.

APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Timeframe: July 2020

Dear [name],

I hope this email finds you safe and well. I am writing as a PhD candidate in Writing and Rhetoric at George Mason University to ask for your help in researching how writing instructors at [University] understand, define, and use Standard English in the context of writing assessment in their courses. In this dissertation study, I plan to interview writing instructors at [University] who will teach at least one English writing course in the fall and who both use and are willing to share either a written rubric or tool for grading student writing. I plan to conduct two interviews with each participant on WebEx; I expect each interview to last about 30-60 minutes. Before the interviews, I will also ask for each participant to share one written rubric or grading tool they use in their assessment practices. In addition, as a way to show my appreciation for your time, I will send you one \$25 Amazon gift card when all interviews with all participants have been completed.

Would you be willing to be interviewed and to share one written rubric or grading tool with me for this project? Because I will use WebEx to conduct and record each interview, the data I collect will include your name, voice, and face; however, I, the student researcher, will be the only one to know your identity. Your name, voice, and face will not be included in any published or presented material; I will change your name to a pseudonym of your choosing and will only share short transcribed interview excerpts. Your completion of each interview is voluntary, and you may decide to end each one at any time without penalty. If you decide not to complete an interview or decide not to be a part of the study, you will still receive one \$25 Amazon gift card when all interviews with all participants have been completed.

If you choose to participate in these interviews and to share a rubric or grading tool with me, please read the attached consent form and reply to this message by copying and pasting the following language:

“I, [insert your First and Last Name], agree to participate in this study, and I also agree to audio-video recording. I have read the consent form and all of my questions have been answered by the research staff.”

Please reply by [date] if you would like to participate or if you have any questions about the study. You may also contact the [University] Institutional Review Board Office at [email] if you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant in the research. If you do decide to participate, I will contact you within one week to schedule a date and time for each interview and to discuss when you will share your rubric or grading tool

with me. I hope you will consider participating in this important examination of Standard English in instructors' writing assessment practices.

Thanks so much,
Sarah Johnson

IRBNet Approval Number: #####-#
Principal Investigator: Michelle LaFrance
Student Researcher: Sarah Johnson

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

FACULTY INTERVIEW #1: Concept Clarification

Timeframe: August-September 2020

Interviewer: Before I ask you questions about language, grading, and Standard English, I'd like to talk to you briefly about the format of this interview. I would like your input on the questions I ask you, and I may ask for that feedback at different points in the interview. I'd also like to remind you that you may choose not to answer questions, stop the interview, or turn off your camera at any point. To begin our interview, then, I would like to ask you some opening questions about language and grading before we move to Standard English.

1. Is there a pseudonym you would like me to use for this study? If so, what is it?
2. What language or languages do you speak?
 - a. Do you consider yourself multilingual?
3. What is your current position at [University]?
4. How long have you been teaching writing or composition to university students?
 - a. Where have you taught writing or composition courses? What courses were those?
 - b. What writing courses do you currently teach?
 - c. How many sections of English will you teach this fall 2020 semester at [University]?
5. What experience do you have teaching multilingual students?
 - a. Have you taught classes specifically designed for multilingual students?
6. How long have you used rubrics or other tools for grading your students' writing assignments?
 - a. What do those tools or rubrics look like? How detailed are they?
 - b. Do those tools or rubrics include information about grammar, correctness, or sentence-level issues?
 - c. If so, how important are grammar, correctness, or sentence-level issues to your rubrics or tools?
7. How would you define grammar and grammatical correctness?
 - a. When you grade a student's essay, what role, if any, do grammar and grammatical correctness play as you grade that essay?
 - b. Can you offer an example of a time where an essay's grammar and grammatical correctness played a significant role in your reading process?
8. In the context of student writing, what does the term error mean to you? How would you define that term?
 - a. What are some examples of error that you have seen or marked in student writing?
9. When you grade a student's essay, what kinds of pressures, if any, do you feel?
 - a. Where do you think those pressures come from?

10. What does it mean to you to grade student writing fairly and equitably?
 - a. When you think of grading students fairly and equitably, what goes through your mind?
 - b. What elements, if any, are you negotiating?
11. Are you familiar with research on translingualism or language diversity?
 - a. Has this research played into the way you assess or grade student writing? If so, how?
12. Have you heard of the concept Standard English?
 - a. If so, what does that term mean to you? How would you define it?
 - b. If not, what do you understand that term to mean? How would you define it?
13. Have you heard other terms or words associated with Standard English?
14. [Added in first interview] Do you or have you used the words Standard English in your course? Do you use that phrase?
 - a. Do you say Standard English when it comes to your students? In the classroom, do you have conversations explicitly about Standard English?
15. Do you have any questions for me about Standard English?
 - a. Have any other questions come up for you as we have been talking?

FACULTY INTERVIEW #2: Discourse-Based Interview Example A (Erin)

Timeframe: August-September 2020

Interviewer: Before I ask you questions about the rubric you sent me, I'd like to talk to you briefly about the format of this interview. I would like your input on the questions I ask you, and I may ask for that feedback at different points in the interview. I'd also like to remind you that you may choose not to answer questions, stop the interview, or turn off your camera at any point. We will begin with questions about grammar, correctness, and Standard English and then move to some excerpts I have pulled from the Language & Formatting row of the Analytical Summary Rubric you sent me.

1. Do you find a focus on grammar, correctness, and/or sentence level issues to be important in your rubric? Why or why not?
 - a. If so, how important are any of the above to your rubric?
 - b. Do they hold a certain percentage or weight of a student's final essay grade?
2. Do you see any parts of your rubric that might require students to write their essays in Standard English?
 - a. What parts are those? Could you walk me through them?
3. When you use this rubric to assess student writing, do you think about Standard English in any way?
4. Based on the rubric you sent me, I noticed:
 - a. That you did include the words "Standard English." Can you tell me about that?
5. Speaking of Standard English, I noticed:
 - a. In the Language & Formatting row the phrase "use standard US English grammar." You could also say "Standard English" or "English grammar." Could you talk about why you said "standard US English grammar"?
6. I noticed after grammar:
 - a. The word "including" before subject-verb agreement. You could also say "such as" or "for example." Could you talk about why you said "including"?
7. I also noticed in that list:
 - a. That you said "grammar (incl. subject-verb agreement), spelling, and sentence structure." You could also say "grammar, spelling, and punctuation" or "language, grammar, and sentence structure." Could you talk about why you said "grammar (incl. subject-verb agreement), spelling, and sentence structure"?
8. I noticed in the next sentence:
 - a. That you said "use formal language." You could also say "formal, edited language" or "formal, proofread language." Could you talk about why you said "formal language"?
9. I noticed in the next sentence:

- a. That you said “title the paper using the article’s title.” You could also say “title the paper correctly” or “title the paper properly.” Could you talk about why you said “title the paper using the article’s title”?
10. Finally, I noticed:
- a. The row title Language & Formatting. You could also use the title Language, Grammar, & Formatting or Language, Formatting, & Mechanics. Could you talk about why you said Language & Formatting?
11. Are there other parts of your rubric that you would like to discuss?

FACULTY INTERVIEW #2: Discourse-Based Interview Example B (Michael)

Timeframe: August-September 2020

Interviewer: Before I ask you questions about the rubric you sent me, I'd like to talk to you briefly about the format of this interview. I would like your input on the questions I ask you, and I may ask for that feedback at different points in the interview. I'd also like to remind you that you may choose not to answer questions, stop the interview, or turn off your camera at any point. We will begin with questions about grammar, correctness, and Standard English and then move to some excerpts I have pulled from the Readability section of the rubric you sent me.

1. Do you find a focus on grammar, correctness, and/or sentence level issues to be important in your grading rubric? Why or why not?
 - a. If so, how important are any of the above to your rubric?
 - b. Do they hold a certain percentage or weight of a student's final essay grade?
2. Do you see any parts of your rubric that might require students to write their essays in Standard English?
 - a. What parts are those? Could you walk me through them?
3. When you use this rubric to assess student writing, do you think about Standard English in any way?
4. Based on the rubric you sent me, I noticed:
 - a. That you did not include the words "Standard English." Can you tell me about that?
5. Speaking of Standard English, I noticed:
 - a. The statement "your friend cares only about language issues" under the Readability section description. You could also say "cares only about grammar" or "cares only about Standard English." Could you talk about why you said "language issues"?
6. I also noticed in the first column under Readability:
 - a. That you said "because of word choice and sentence structure issues." You could also say "because of word choice and language issues" or "because of language issues." Could you explain why you said "word choice and sentence structure issues"?
7. I noticed in the second column:
 - a. That you said "language issues got in the way." You could also say "language mistakes" or "language errors." Could you talk about why you said "language issues"?
8. I noticed in the third column:
 - a. That you said "the sentence structures and vocabulary you used." You could also say "the language you used" or "the word choice, sentence structures, and vocabulary you used." Could you talk about why you said "sentence structures and vocabulary"?
9. Finally, I noticed the category title:

- a. Readability (language) in your rubric. You could also use the title Readability (grammar) or Readability (mechanics). Could you explain why you used Readability (language)?
10. Are there other parts of your rubric/tool that you would like to discuss?

WORKS CITED

- Adler-Kassner, Linda. "2017 CCCC Chair's Address: Because Writing Is Never Just Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 69, no. 2, 2017, pp. 317-340.
- Anson, Chris M. "Response and the Social Construction of Error." *Assessing Writing*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2000, pp. 5-21.
- Anson, Chris M., et al. "Big Rubrics and Weird Genres: The Futility of Using Generic Assessment Tools Across Diverse Instructional Contexts." *The Journal of Writing Assessment*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1-14.
- Bacon, Chris K. "Dichotomies, Dialects, and Deficits: Confronting the 'Standard English' Myth in Literacy and Teacher Education." *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, vol. 66, 2017, pp. 341-357.
- Bailey, Richard W. "American English: Its Origins and History," *Language in the USA: Themes for the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Edward Finegan and John R. Rickford, Cambridge UP, 2004, pp. 3-17.
- Baker-Bell, April. "Dismantling Anti-Black Linguistic Racism in English Language Arts Classrooms: Toward an Anti-Racist Black Pedagogy." *Theory into Practice*, vol. 59, no. 1, 2020, pp. 8-21.
- . *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy*. Routledge, 2020.
- Ball, Arnetha F. "Expanding the Dialogue on Culture as a Critical Component when Assessing Writing." *Assessing Writing*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1997, pp. 169-202.
- Ball, Arnetha F., and Rashidah Jaami` Muhammad. "Language Diversity in Teacher Education and in the Classroom." *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice*, edited by Geneva Smitherman and Victor Villanueva. Southern Illinois UP, 2003, pp. 76-88.
- Banks, William P., et al. "The Braid of Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity: Eighteen Assertions on Writing Assessment with Commentary." *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity*, edited by Mya Poe, Asao B. Inoue, and Norbert Elliot. The WAC Clearinghouse, 2017, pp. 379-426.

- Bartholomae, David. "Response" (to Elbow). *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 46, no. 1, 1995, pp. 84-87.
- Berkenkotter, Carol. "Paradigm Debates, Turf Wars, and the Conduct of Sociocognitive Inquiry in Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 42, no. 2, 1991, pp. 151-169.
- Bex, Tony, and Richard J. Watts. *Standard English: The Widening Debate*, Routledge, 1999.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Cognition, Convention, and Certainty: What We Need to Know about Writing." *PRE/TEXT*, vol. 3, 1982, pp. 213-243.
- . (2002). "The Intellectual Works of 'Mixed' Forms of Academic Discourses." *Alt Dis: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*, edited by Christopher L. Schroeder, Helen Fox, and Patricia Bizzell. Boynton/Cook, 2002, pp. 1-10.
- Bollig, Chase. "'Is College Worth It?' Arguing for Composition's Value with the Citizen-Worker." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 67, no. 2, 2015, pp. 150-172.
- Brannon, Lil, and C. H. Knoblauch. "On Students' Rights to Their Own Texts: A Model of Teacher Response." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 33, no. 2, 1982, pp. 157-166.
- Broad, Bob. *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Utah State UP, 2003.
- Brown, Tessa. "What Else Do We Know? Translingualism and the History of SRTOL as Threshold Concepts in Our Field." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 71, no. 4, 2020, pp. 591-619.
- Bruch, Patrick, and Richard Marback. "Race, Literacy, and the Value of Rights Rhetoric in Composition Studies." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2002, pp. 651-674.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "Clarifying the Relationship Between Translingual Practice and L2 Writing: Addressing Learner Identities." *Applied Linguistics Review*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2015, pp. 415-440.
- . *Critical Academic Writing and Multilingual Students*. U of Michigan P, 2002.
- . "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 57, no. 4, June 2006, pp. 586-619.

- . *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge, 2013.
- Casanave, Christine Pearson. *Controversies in Second Language Writing: Dilemmas and Decisions in Research and Instruction*. U of Michigan P, 2013.
- Chiseri-Strater, Elizabeth. "Turning In upon Ourselves: Positionality, Subjectivity, and Reflexivity in Case Study and Ethnographic Research." *Ethics and Representation in Qualitative Studies of Literacy*, edited by Peter Mortensen and Gesa E. Kirsch. NCTE, 1996, pp. 115-133.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. "Students' Right to Their Own Language." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 25, Fall 1974. Reprinted at <https://prod-ncte-cdn.azureedge.net/nctefiles/groups/cccc/newsrtol.pdf>
- . "CCCC Statement on Writing Assessment." *NCTE*, created Nov. 2006, reaffirmed Nov. 2014. <http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/writingassessment>
- Courts, Patricia L. *Multicultural Literacies: Dialect, Discourse, and Diversity*. Lang, 1997.
- Davila, Bethany. "Indexicality and 'Standard' Edited American English: Examining the Link Between Conceptions of Standardness and Perceived Authorial Identity." *Written Communication*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2012, pp. 180-207.
- . "The Inevitability of 'Standard' English: Discursive Constructions of Standard Language Ideologies." *Written Communication*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2016, pp. 127-148.
- Delpit, Lisa. "What Should Teachers Do? Ebonics and Culturally Responsive Instruction." *Dialects, Englishes, Creoles, and Education*, edited by Shondel J. Nero, Erlbaum, 2006, pp. 93-101.
- DeVault, Marjorie, and Glenda Gross. "Feminist Interviewing: Experience, Talk, and Knowledge." *Handbook of Feminist Research*, edited by Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber, SAGE, 2006, pp. 173-197.
- Donahue, Christiane. "The 'Trans' in Transnational-Translingual: Rhetorical and Linguistic Flexibility as New Norms." *Composition Studies* vol. 44, no. 1, 2016, pp. 147-150.
- Downs, Douglas, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to

- Writing Studies.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 58, no. 4, 2007, pp. 552-584.
- Elbow, Peter. “Response” (to Bartholomae). *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 46, no. 1, 1995, pp. 87-92.
- . *Vernacular Eloquence: What Speech Can Bring to Writing*. Oxford UP, 2012.
- . “Ranking, Evaluating, and Liking: Sorting out Three Forms of Judgment.” *College English*, vol. 55, no. 2, 1993, pp. 187-206.
- Eubanks, Philip, and John D. Schaeffer. “A Kind Word for Bullshit: The Problem of Academic Writing.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 59, no. 3, 2008, pp. 372-388.
- Farrell, Joseph. *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Ferris, Dana. “Research on Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing.” *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*, by Ferris, 2nd ed., U of Michigan P, 2011, pp. 20-56.
- Flores, Nelson, and Jonathan Rosa. “Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education.” *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 85, no. 2, 2015, pp. 149-171.
- Fox, Helen. “Being an Ally.” *Alt Dis: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*, edited by Christopher L. Schroeder, Helen Fox, and Patricia Bizzell. Boynton/Cook, 2002, pp. 57-67.
- Gallagher, Chris, and Matt Noonan. “Becoming Global: Learning to ‘Do’ Translingualism.” *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs*, edited by Bruce Horner and Laura Tetreault, Utah State UP, 2017, pp. 161-177.
- Gevers, Jeroen. “Recognizing the Complexities of Linguistic Social Justice: The Author Responds.” *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 42, 2018, pp. 98-100.
- Gilyard, Keith. “The Rhetoric of Translingualism.” *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 284-289.
- Greenfield, Laura. “The Standard English Fairy Tale: A Rhetorical Analysis of Racist Pedagogies and Commonplace Assumptions about Language Diversity.” *Writing*

Centers and the New Racism: A Call for Sustainable Dialogue and Change, edited by Laura Greenfield and Karen Rowan, Utah State UP, 2011, pp. 33-60.

Hall, Jonathan. "The Translingual Challenge: Boundary Work in Rhetoric & Composition, Second Language Writing, and WAC/WID." *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2018, pp. 28-47.

Harding, Sandra. Introduction: Is There a Feminist Method? *Feminism and Methodology*, edited by Harding, Indiana UP, 1987, pp. 1-14.

Harms, Keith L. "Assessment's Word Work: Early Twentieth Century American Imperialism and the Colonial Function of the Monolingual Writing Construct." *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity*, edited by Mya Poe, Asao B. Inoue, and Norbert Elliot. The WAC Clearinghouse, 2017, pp. 105-134.

Hickey, Raymond. "Standard English and Standards of English." *Standards of English: Codified Varieties around the World*, edited by Hickey. Cambridge UP, 2012, pp. 1-33.

Holstein, Deborah H. "From the Editor." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 177-179.

Horner, Bruce. "Traditions and Professionalization: Reconceiving Work in Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 51, no. 3, 2000, pp. 366-398.

Horner, Bruce and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2002, pp. 594-630.

Horner, Bruce, et al. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English*, vol. 73, no. 3, Jan. 2011, pp. 303-321.

House, Elizabeth B. and William J. House. "Problem-Solving: The Debates in Composition and Psychology." *Journal of Advanced Composition*, vol. 7, no. 1/2, 1987, pp. 62-75.

Huot, Brian. "(Re)Articulating Writing Assessment." *(Re)Articulating Writing Assessment for Teaching and Learning*, by Huot, Utah State UP, 2002, pp.1-20.

Inoue, Asao B. "Theorizing Failure in US Writing Assessments." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 48, no. 3, 2014, pp. 330-352.

- . *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future*, WAC Clearinghouse, 2015.
<https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/inoue/>.
- . "Racial Methodologies for Composition Studies: Reflecting on Theories of Race in Writing Assessment Research." *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies*, edited by Lee Nickoson and Mary P. Sheridan, Southern Illinois UP, 2012, pp. 125-139.
- . "Writing Assessment as the Conditions for Translingual Approaches: An Argument for Fairer Assessment." *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs*, edited by Bruce Horner and Laura Tetreault, Utah State UP, 2017, pp. 119-134.
- Johnson, David, and Lewis VanBrackle. "Linguistic Discrimination in Writing Assessment: How Raters React to African American "Errors," ESL Errors, and Standard English Errors on a State-Mandated Writing Exam." *Assessing Writing*, vol. 17, 2012, pp. 35-54.
- Karstadt, Angela. "Standard Englishes: What do American Undergraduates Think?" *English Today*, vol. 18, no. 3, July 2002, pp. 38-47.
- Kinloch, Valerie Felita. "Revisiting the Promise of *Students' Right to Their Own Language*: Pedagogical Strategies." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 57, no. 1, Sept. 2005, pp. 83-113.
- Kirsch, Gesa E., and Joy S. Ritchie. "Beyond the Personal: Theorizing a Politics of Location in Composition Research." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*, 2nd ed., edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 2003, pp. 523-546.
- Kövecses, Zoltan. *American English: An Introduction*. Peterborough, Broadview P, 2000.
- Kramer, Maeona K. "Concept Clarification and Critical Thinking: Integrated Processes." *Journal of Nursing Education*, vol. 32, no. 9, Nov. 1993, pp. 406-414.
- Kynard, Carmen. "What a Difference an Error Makes: Ongoing Challenges for 'White Innocence,' Historiography, and Disciplinary Knowledge Making." *Vernacular Insurrections: Race, Black Protest, and the New Century in Composition-Literacies Studies*, by Carmen, State University of New York P, 2013, pp. 197-232.
- LaFrance, Michelle, and Melissa Nicolas. "Institutional Ethnography as Materialist Framework for Writing Program Research and the Faculty-Staff Work

- Standpoints Project." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2012, pp. 130-150.
- Lancaster, Zak. "Do Academics Really Write This Way? A Corpus Investigation of Moves and Templates in 'They Say/I Say.'" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 67, no. 3, 2016, pp. 437-464.
- . "Using Corpus Results to Guide the Discourse-Based Interview: A Study of One Student's Awareness of Stance in Academic Writing in Philosophy." *Journal of Writing Research*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2016, pp. 119-148.
- Lee, Jerry Won. "Beyond Translingual Writing." *College English* vol. 79, no. 2, Nov. 2016, pp. 174-195.
- Leonhardt, Jürgen. *Latin: Story of a World Language*. Translated by Kenneth Kronenberg, Harvard UP, 2013.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*, Routledge, 2011.
- Locher, Miriam, and Jurg Strassler. Introduction: Standards and Norms. *Standards and Norms in the English Language*, edited by Miriam A. Locher and Jurg Strassler, Mouton de Gruyter, 2008, pp. 1-20.
- Lu, Min-Zhan. "Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone." *C College Composition and Communication*, vol. 45, no. 4, 1994, pp. 442-458.
- MacNeil, Robert, and William Cran. *Do You Speak American?* Knopf Doubleday, 2007.
- Mangelsdorf, Kate. "Spanglish as Alternative Discourse: Working against Language Demarcation." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, edited by Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda, SIUP, 2010, pp. 113-126.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, edited by Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda, SIUP, 2010, pp 81-96.
- McKerracher, Adrian. *What It Means to Write: Creativity and Metaphor*. McGill-Queen's UP, 2019.
- Miller-Cochran, Susan K. "Language Diversity and Responsibility of the WPA." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, edited by Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda, SIUP, 2010, pp. 212-220.

- Milroy, James. "The Consequences of Standardisation in Description Linguistics." *Standard English: The Widening Debate*, edited by Tony Bex and Richard J. Watts, Routledge, 1999, pp. 16-39.
- Neff, Joyce Magnotto. "Grounded Theory: A Critical Research Methodology." *Under Construction: Working at the Intersections of Composition Theory, Research, and Practice*, edited by Christine Farris and Chris M. Anson, Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 124-135.
- Nero, Shondel J. "Discourse Tensions, Englishes, and the Composition Classroom." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*, edited by Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda, SIUP, 2010, pp. 142-157.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey. Foreword, *Language in the USA: Themes for the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Edward Finegan and John R. Rickford, Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Odell, Lee, and Dixie Goswami. "Writing in Non-Academic Settings." National Institution of Education (sponsor), Report, 1981.
- Ochsner, Robert, and Judy Fowler. "Evaluating Essays Across Institutional Boundaries: Teacher Attitudes Toward Dialect, Race, and Writing." Asao. B. Inoue & Mya. Poe, editors. *Race and Writing Assessment*, Lang, 2012, pp. 111-126.
- Pennycook, Alastair. *Language as a Local Practice*. Routledge, 2010.
- Piller, Ingrid. *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. Oxford UP, 2016.
- Poe, Mya, et al. "The Legal and the Local: Using Disparate Impact Analysis to Understand the Consequences of Writing Assessment." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 65, no. 4, 2014, pp. 588-611.
- Poe, Mya, et al. *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2018.
- Raimes, Ann, and Susan Miller-Cochrain. *Keys for Writers*, 7th ed., Cengage Learning, 2014.
- Roemer, Marjorie, et al. "Reframing the Great Debate on First-Year Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 50, no. 3, 1999, pp. 377-392.
- Rubin, Herbert J., and Irene S. Rubin. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 2nd ed., SAGE, 2012.

Schwandt, Thomas A. *The Sage Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry*. 3rd ed, Thousand Oaks, 2007.

Selfe, Cynthia L., and Gail E. Hawisher. "Exceeding the Bounds of the Interview: Feminism, Mediation, Narrative, and Conversations about Digital Literacy." *Writing Studies Research: Methods and Methodologies*, edited by Lee Nickoson and Mary P. Sheridan, Southern Illinois UP, 2012, pp. 36-50.

Shaughnessy, Mina. Introduction. *Errors and Expectations*. Oxford UP, 1979, pp. 387-396.

"Showing Off Your [Sic] Moves." *Merriam-Webster*, www.merriam-webster.com/words-at-play/sic-meaning-usage-editorial-citation. Accessed 20 Oct. 2020.

Skerry, Phillip J. *The Rules of the Game: A Guide to Writing in Standard English*, Rowman & Littlefield, 2019.

Smagorinsky, Peter. "The Method Section as Conceptual Epicenter in Constructing Social Science Research Reports." *Written Communication*, vol. 25, no. 3, 2008, pp. 389-411.

Smith, Erec. Introduction: Something "More than a Negro." *A Critique of Anti-Racism in Rhetoric and Composition: The Semblance of Empowerment*. Lexington, 2020.

Smith, Erec, and Inoue, Asao, guest dialogue. Discussion of Smith's book *A Critique of Anti-Racism in Rhetoric and Composition: The Semblance of Empowerment*. Online discussion, Aug. 2020, University of Arizona.

Smitherman, Geneva. "CCCC's Role in the Struggle for Language Rights." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 349-376.

---. "The Historical Struggle for Language Rights in CCCC." *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice*, edited by Geneva Smitherman and Victor Villanueva, Southern Illinois UP, 2003, pp. 7-39.

"Standard, n. and adj." *OED Online*, Oxford UP, December 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/188962. Accessed 26 Jan. 2021.

"Statement on Racial Injustice and Systemic Racism" *wpacouncil*, Council of Writing Program Administrators, 29 Aug. 2020, wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/321287/_PARENT/layout_details/false. Accessed 28 Jan. 2021.

- Strauss, Anselm L., and Juliet M. Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research*, 2nd ed., SAGE 1998.
- Swearingen, C. Jan. "The New Literacy/Orality Debates: Ebonics and the Redefinition of Literacy in Multicultural Settings. *Crossing Borderlands: Composition and Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Andrea A. Lunsford and Lahoucine Ouzgane, U of Pittsburgh P, 2004, pp. 238-254.
- Tardy, Christine M. "Enacting and Transforming Local Language Policies." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 62, no. 4, 2011, pp. 634-661.
- Tuttle, Robert E. "Composition vs. Communication. The Wrong Debate." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1956, pp. 205-210.
- Wade, Stephanie et al. "Writing@Bates Statement of Commitment to Antiracist & Inclusive Writing Instruction." *Writing @ Bates*, Bates College, 19 June 2019, www.bates.edu/writing/2020/06/19/statement-of-commitment-to-antiracist-inclusive-writing-instruction/. Accessed 28 Jan. 2021.
- Walton, Rebecca et al. *Technical Communication after the Social Justice Turn: Building Coalitions for Action*, Routledge, 16 May 2019.
- Wible, Scott. *Shaping Language Policy in the U.S.: The Role of Composition Studies*. Southern Illinois UP, 2013.
- Williams, Joseph M. "The Phenomenology of Error." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 32, no. 2, May 1981, pp. 152-168.
- Wilson, Maja. *Rethinking Rubrics in Writing Assessment*, Heinemann, 2006.
- Wheeler, Rebecca, and Julia Thomas. "And 'Still' the Children Suffer: The Dilemma of Standard English, Social Justice, and Social Access." *Journal of Advanced Composition*, vol. 33, no. 1/2, 2013, pp. 363-396.
- "WPA Outcomes Statement Revision." *wpacouncil*, Council of Writing Program Administrators, 29 Aug. 2020, http://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/321280/_PARENT/layout_details/false. Accessed 28 Jan. 2021.
- "WPA-GO Statement on Anti-Racist Assessment." *wpacouncil*, Council of Writing Program Administrators, 17 July 2020, http://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/313021/_self/layout_details/false. Accessed 28 Jan. 2021.

Yin, Robert K. *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish*. 2nd ed., Guilford, 2016.

Zimmerman, Lynn. "Standard English in the EFL Classroom." *English Language Teachers Journal*, vol. 61, no. 2, Apr. 2007, pp. 164-166.

Zoltan, Kövescses. *American English: An Introduction*, Broadview P, 2000.

BIOGRAPHY

Sarah Johnson has been a student of language, metaphor, and writing nearly all her life, graduating from Danville High School in Danville, Illinois, in 2009 and, just over a decade later, graduating with her PhD in Writing and Rhetoric in May 2021. Within this decade, she received her BA in English from the University of Missouri-Columbia followed by her MFA in Creative Writing from American University in 2016. While working on her PhD, she moved to Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands, and spent one year teaching and learning from the most incredible students she has been privileged to meet. Her PhD is dedicated to them.