CONTENTS

Introduction

PLURALIST RHETORICS FOR WRITING TEACHERS AND THEIR STUDENTS

Congratulations. You've been assigned a first-year writing (FYW) course, possibly even your first. You know you need to instruct students on the fundamentals of composing, from paragraphing to organizing, to revision, to editing and proofreading. However, as first-year writing instructors, dare we say composition specialists, we sincerely hope our book takes you far beyond this. For many of your students, completion of your course assignments is the roadmap for their journey to and through a new place and in a new culture. The place is college and the new culture is academic life and language, rhetorical work, and the art of persuasion in multiracial settings of unequal power relations.

This book is an exception to the majority of rhetorics on the market. First, it is intended to help all composition instructors, regardless of previous experience, become better teachers in the highly racial setting that has become the first-year writing course. Specialists know that, historically, composition has been taught by novices and those lacking training in the field (TAs, adjunct faculty trained in literary studies, retirees, former high-school teachers, faculty spouses). Beginning teachers rarely have developed a philosophy of teaching; they teach the way they were taught. Until we develop a teaching philosophy, we teach by trial and error. Most faculty still come from white, middle-class backgrounds, are second- or third-generation college graduates, and earned advanced degrees with the mistaken notion that they would land a tenure-track appointment at a research university. Rarely have such folks interacted with students whose demographics do not reflect their own. Yet, they are members of the demographic that is statistically becoming the minority at US colleges. In this way US higher education is beginning to reflect South African apartheid: an empowered minority holding all the cards over the soon-to-be racial majority. Consider this reminder from Asao Inoue and Mya Poe:

> Across the U.S., the educational system is undergoing a major demographic shift. For example, this year in Texas, 52% of entering first-year

students are students of color. . . . According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 47% of children under the age of 5 in the U.S. are children of color with 25% of those children being Hispanic (U.S. Census, 2009, para.1). Overall, 44% of children under the age of 18 in the U.S. are "minorities." Among college-age students, the National Center for Educational Statistics (2009) estimates that by 2018, the enrollment of traditionally underrepresented minorities in higher education will include a 26% increase in black students, a 38% increase in Hispanic students, a 29% increase in Asian Pacific Islander students, a 32% increase in American Indian students, while only a 4% increase in white students. (2012, 1)

These racial trends are speeding up, leading to the United States as a color-majority country in approximately twenty-five years. Our book, and future editions of it, can become a leader in helping teachers, students, and administrators navigate the real challenges and wonderful opportunities of multiracial learning spaces, multiracial workplaces, and multiracial hiring committees in the present and more so in the near future.

THE DEFINITIONS WE WILL USE

Rhetoric: the art of persuasion in multiracial settings of unequal power relations.

Ideology: a set of strongly held beliefs and values, a world-view, especially dealing with governance of society. Ideology includes beliefs that influence us through language and image to see things in a way that is only truly rational to those in power. It is the majority group's hustle, which they claim is natural and inevitable.

Racism: a political-economic reality of discrimination, segregation, and exploitation based on membership in a racialized group that leads to vastly different life chances. Many folks of color define systemic racism as systemic white privilege. Many white folks define and understand racism as individual acts of insult or attack, thus denying or ignoring the systemic and institutional realities of racism. A powerful and constructive anonymous reviewer of this book during the prepublication review stages defines racism as "a complex, intersecting, institutionalized, and *strategic* system of advantage and violence based on race."

White privilege: unearned, more or less unconscious and automatic racialized preference, power, and comfort of being the norm possessed by all white-phenotype people regardless of their relative wealth, status, and reputation. Yes, wealthy and connected whites have more white privilege than other whites, but all whites have serious and sustained white privilege. White privilege is the last power, and it is a crucial asset of otherwise powerless, poor whites, an asset

that can open doors to training, jobs, housing, and public assistance ahead of people of color in a racist system whose safety net for the poor of any color is threadbare. Many experts, educators, and activists describe white privilege as the other side, the opposite side, and the enabling side of racial discrimination. On one hand, white privilege is a huge political-economic benefit for white people. On the other hand, it is personally and spiritually damaging to everyone and is especially destructive to the humanity of white people. It has deformed the white psyche, and the white elite have used it to separate working-class whites and people of color in a classic divide-and-conquer strategy. It must be eliminated for there to be human liberation in this country and the chance for coconstructing multiracial equality.

Culture: ways of living, especially behaviors and beliefs over generations, of people in any human group: a nation, race, religion, profession, club, sport, or any other human group. Cultures are complex, historically contingent, and not essentialized except by detractors or outright enemies or by fundamentalists within the culture who essentialize their own group. When a culture essentializes itself and thereby becomes fundamentalist, thinking it has 100 percent of the truth, as in religious or political extremist cultures, it thereby declares at least rhetorical war on all other groups, if not literal war. It is the slowly changing stories of identity and purpose, which appear more or less unchanging, that lead cultures to pluralism or fundamentalism, to coalitions and cooperation, or to contestation and war.

Democracy (in academia): an exciting reality in many FYW courses in which the multiple student and teacher voices explore, dialogue, encourage, critique, and develop individual and group arguments about evidence and persuasion in common readings and multiple class members' texts. On the political-economic and structural levels, democracy in academia is more often a goal and an ideal than a current reality. The ideal of democracy is that all voices are structurally equal. In such democratic equality, the relative value of particular texts and of all academic work is collaboratively determined based exclusively on verifiable evidence and convincing argumentation that includes careful listening to naysayers and dissonant voices of disrespected outsiders in the shifting centers of power and openness. Among contemporary college faculty overall, democracy is sadly lacking in an era of mostly contingent, underpaid, underinsured, non-tenure-track faculty positions in the corporate university run by an increasing number of corporate administrators using the venture-capitalist model. Among college students, the exponential growth of student-loan debt is indentured servitude and is the opposite of democracy. Democracy in academia is a currently receding but worthy ideal that must not be romanticized nor seen as part of a distant future but must be fought for in the present, made real and viable, and opened to constant review by all interested individuals and groups.

WHO BENEFITS FROM THIS BOOK

A significant percentage of graduate-student teaching assistants and early-career teachers are assigned first-year writing classes and are often in need of support when working dynamically and spontaneously in multiracial classrooms. This text was written by two teachers who wish to teach other teachers, regardless of their years of experience, how to more fully use both home and academic cultures to teach writing. Writing program directors and instructors with more experience will find the book appealing for a number of reasons. First, these teachers often don't want to be confined by the material in a textbook. Traditionally, composition rhetorics are designed to include rhetorical modes, paragraph development, theses, and so forth. Experienced teachers often tell us they prefer to go without a book than be forced to use those that continue to suggest effective writing is merely the sum of its parts.

Second, experienced teachers rarely use an entire textbook because textbooks try to cover too much. Our book remains focused consistently on a writing model developed by Robert Eddy called the Eddy Model of Intercultural Experience in academic writing, and we provide examples of student-produced sequenced writing using the model. This text is designed to allow experienced instructors to take multiple approaches to teaching writing about culture and race and is designed to mentor newer teachers in enabling successful student negotiation of the academic terrain that is college.

KEY TERMS AND THE EDDY MODEL

As college campuses become ever more multiracial, our book's key concept, namely the Eddy Model of Intercultural Experience, is increasingly needed. The realities of a mainly white teaching staff and an increasingly multiracial student body mean that authentic cross-racial communication is crucial. Our text is unique in that its primary focus is helping students become engaged members of a new culture, namely the discourse community of college/academia.

There are three key terms we use throughout this text. They are *metaculture*, *polyculture*, and *interculture*. Many compositionists are familiar with metacognition, or the act of thinking about how we think. Borrowing from that definition, we use *metaculture* to suggest the act of thinking about how our thoughts construct the ways in which we adopt certain cultural behaviors or values. Similarly, we understand that the prefix *poly* suggests many, as in *polyglot*. We explore, using the Eddy Model of

Intercultural Experience, the concept that culture is rarely uniform; we acquire not just a culture of origin during our lives but many others that intertwine to make up our personal world-view. We leave behind the duality of biculturalism and purposefully reject the politically loaded term *multiculturalism*. Intercultural experiences ultimately result in a metacultural being able to actively consider the origins of their values, beliefs, and key behavioral operating concepts and express them in ways that respect difference and foster polycultural understanding.

AIMS AND UNIQUE FEATURES

There are three unique aims to this book. The first is that we intend this text to be seen more as a conversation among colleagues about how best to enculturate first-year students to college and academic discourse than as a lecture. Second, it remains true that the vast majority of incoming students are inexperienced about academic culture. We intend that this unique conversation challenge our profession about how it has, or has not, gone about teaching collegians how to negotiate multiple boundaries and audiences in self-conscious ways. As instructors with several decades of teaching experience, we have spent years engaging our students and colleagues in this often uncomfortable but creative conversation. We ask them to compare a first-year student's exposure to academic culture to visiting another country or to living in that new place for nine months to four or five years. Living in is very different from visiting or imagining a place. As travelers who choose to become residents of the subtle, complex culture called *college*, which uses the foreign language called *academic discourse*, students will be changed by the experience. This new culture especially requires a student to conceptualize how their home culture creates their sense of who they are and how the world works.

These concepts did not occur to us overnight. Here is a little about our own experiences with teaching writing and immersion in other cultures. Amanda and Robert have each taught college writing for a number of decades and are Americans; Robert began his college teaching career at an eastern US college, then lived outside the United States for more than a decade, where he taught for about an equal number of years in England, China, and Egypt. Since returning to the United States, he has taught at a historically black university in the Southeast and is currently teaching at a large research university that is predominantly white on the West Coast. Amanda's career has included appointments at one private and several public US universities and two-year colleges located

in nearly every geographic region of the United States: the Pacific Northwest, the West, the Midwest, the Northeast, and the Southeast. These schools use both open and exclusive admissions policies, ensuring that Amanda has worked with students from a wide range of racial, ethnic, religious, socioeconomic, immigrant, linguistic, gender, and age backgrounds. The methods this book employs apply equally well to the different cultures within the United States or the cultures of other countries. To come to college is to enter a new culture and to be required to learn a new language, no matter where you come from.

Another key feature of our text is that it uses student samples, not professionally authored ones, to demonstrate in action the framework of the Eddy Model of Intercultural Experience. Our book springs from the conviction that most first-year students have a limited idea or misinformed ideas about the customs, language, expectations, and nuances of university life. Some will live in residence halls and have to negotiate that culture as well as the academic one. Some will be in a new city, state, or country and will have to negotiate that culture as compared to the one left at home. Our book's strength lies in highlighting this awkward, often painful, yet rewarding journey. As students learn to negotiate their real-world adaptation to their new culture(s), they must also learn skills for coping with academic culture. We follow several students from prewriting and brainstorming through drafting, revising, and editing a final draft. The entire sequence is presented not as perfect examples but as real examples, warts and all, of how several students struggled to adapt to the culture of academic writing by using the Eddy Model of Intercultural Experience. The focus on real-world cross-cultural experience and the foregrounding of student texts make our novel approach worthwhile and productive.

The other unique quality of this text, and the competitive advantage to this framework, is its simplicity. Instead of being an unwieldy and bloated textbook, this one utilizes a streamlined, classroom, and interculturally tested method of introducing students to academic writing via sequenced assignments that aren't confined by traditional and static approaches such as modes, templates, and genres often found in competing texts. Since our book presents information without the more lock-step features of an FYW textbook, it focuses just on the stages necessary for a student to experience becoming a fully functional member of academia and user of its discourses. Although some of this text discusses best practices for teaching the fundamentals of writing processes, we believe we write as people trying to reach other people and that students benefit most from seeing composing as an act of engaged communication, not just detached processes.

AN OVERVIEW OF THIS BOOK

Most of the chapters demonstrate the Eddy Model in action. Before we get into the specifics of the model, we provide some context. In chapter 1 ("Home Culture(s), Academic Discourse, Critical Reading, and the Eddy Model of Intercultural Experience"), we discuss how one's identity is shaped and changed after engaging new cultures. We introduce the major theme of this text, namely that entering college is akin to visiting a foreign land for the first time. Then the chapter examines the concepts of how home language and academic language differ and why including practice in critical reading is essential for teaching students audience awareness, which enables them to be able to re-view their own and others' writing. Learning to read critically trains students to see they must make thoughtful choices in their language and adapt it for different audiences, such as home and school. The chapter ends by fleshing out Eddy Model of Intercultural Experience, which is an innovative way of meshing the study of writing with the study of other cultures. The objective is explaining the chart outlining the method, which is the driving force behind the pedagogy that follows.

In chapter 2 ("Entrance to the Preliminary Stage: Brainstorming about Culture"), we discuss a parallel model, borrowed from anthropology, called the Kluckhohn Model. The Eddy Model was directly influenced by this highly regarded chart and is an adaptation of it. This chapter demonstrates how to use the Kluckhohn Model to teach invention methods, such as brainstorming about one's key cultural assumptions, and shows student samples of some Kluckhohn Model-inspired freewrites. These samples demonstrate students examining how their values shape their culture and vice versa. While the Kluckhohn Model can be an effective tool in helping us understand other cultures and our own, we ultimately suggest that the Eddy Model goes further in its ability to create intercultural, metacultural, and polycultural awareness. The chapter concludes by demonstrating how to use the Eddy Model to teach a wide range of invention techniques. It demonstrates both individual and group prewriting techniques based on the Eddy Model, notably focusing on one Eddy used while teaching FYW in China and in Egypt.

Chapter 3 ("The Preliminary Stage, Part 2: Prewriting Using the Eddy Method") demonstrates how to incorporate the invention techniques from the previous chapter along with the Eddy method to create brainstorming drafts that ask students to reflect on their observations. After examining some student samples of freewriting, we present the analogy that compares essay writing to travel.

By the time chapter 4 ("The Spectator Stage: First Draft") begins, students and their instructors already understand the parts of the Eddy method and have used their freewrite essays and other prewriting techniques to get a grasp of the origins of their home cultures. This chapter challenges students to move from mere observation to active engagement or interaction with their new collegiate culture. This engagement happens when students interact with others by planning and eventually sharing their thoughts via a working draft that may be full of false starts. Two student samples are presented that demonstrate the journey from planning to drafting, or the preliminary and spectator stages.

The focus shifts next to talking with students about critical reading, evaluation, feedback and revision. Chapter 5 ("The Increasing-Participation Stage: Working Drafts and Revision") focuses exclusively on the concept of revision being tied to the concept that as changes occur in the writer, those changes are reflected back in the writing. While many writing textbooks look at revision as merely a linguistic exercise—moving ideas, cutting paragraphs, adding more detail—this chapter suggests change happens organically. As authors interact with more people in the new culture, this interaction alone enables writers to more fully comprehend what compels their readers. We suggest that genuine revision can only occur when writers are so fully engaged with their new culture that they can actively solicit feedback from readers. Writers must become dual ambassadors, knowing when to talk and share and when to listen and keep silent. Ultimately, revision is viewed as openness to change and not just moving or cutting sentences. This approach creates polycultural authors who can navigate between their home culture and others with ever-growing fluency.

Experienced instructors know most novice college writers are reluctant to change anything they have written. Chapter 6 ("The Shock Stage: Writer's Block and Fear of Change") takes this on. Many people fear any change, and many students resist making changes to initial drafts. Often these fears result in writer's block. This chapter helps students work through these fears by demonstrating various techniques for guiding students to specific and global places in their draft on which to focus their revision. Student samples of exercises to alleviate writer's block are also discussed.

Chapter 7 ("Convincing the Audience by Using Edited American English") covers supposed best practices in teaching fundamental EAE composing skills, source citation, mechanics, and even grammar and usage. This chapter focuses on why the fundamentals continue to hold a false binary opposition. This binary is perpetuated by those whose

language prejudice leads them to believe that imprecision with EAE affects readers, usually negatively; thus, for students who choose to code switch, or who feel forced to code switch by teachers or institutional or other audience requirements, attention to usage and the like must be learned and valued just as they are by professionals, regardless of background. Amanda asserts that such code switching promotes a language of power instead of the power of language prejudice. Amanda does not want her first-generation students, especially of color, to be victims of routine white-power language prejudice, so she endorses code switching. Robert believes in and practices code meshing. Robert agrees with Kim Brian Lovejoy's reading of Suresh A. Canagarajah: "Code-meshers 'don't expect commonalities in form or convention' (p. 18) and what allows them 'to communicate across difference is that they instantaneously construct the norms and conventions. . . . For them meanings and grammars are always emergent' (Canagarajah 2009, 18)" (Young et al. 2014, 134). Likewise, Robert affirms that successful code meshing must be "intelligible, purposeful, and effective" (Young et al. 2014, 144). This chapter revises our initial metaphor of culture as a backpack that needs repacking to one of a culture's similarity to a computer operating system.

Chapter 6 looks at ways of using feedback to rework an essay to overcome writer's block. Chapter 8 ("The Adaptation Stage: Final Drafts and Congruence") returns to the Eddy Model to look at how to create final drafts by defining congruence and identifying and removing the three major congruence blocks that occur in many final drafts: undefined abstractions, logical fallacies, and unexamined alternative explanations. We look at student attempts at incorporating these revisions and end the chapter by presenting the final draft of one of the student essays that has been examined throughout the book.

Serving mostly as a theoretical conclusion, Chapter 9 ("The Reentry Stage: Future Compositions and Dissonant Voices") examines return shock and dissonant voices. The dissonant voice sees knowledge as a continual process, not as an individual commodity loaned by experts who retain ownership. Knowledge is always contested ground. Students who are developing their own dissonant voices add new points to the existing conversations that produce knowledge, making knowledge construction more open and fair. Return shock, the lack of harmony with one's original culture, happens when the dissonant voice tries to impose its values on the home culture. The greater the degree of adaptation to one's new college or geographical culture, the greater the degree of return shock one will experience. Since dissonant voices

utilize polycultural and pluralist rhetorics, a dissonant voice will have significant to extensive inharmony with its new culture of college, especially college's white-supremacist attitudes toward language and power. Dissonant voices, which are polycultural and pluralist, do not perfectly fit anywhere and need to seek coalitions for freedom, openness, and degrees of community as alternatives to white supremacy, which is why dissonant voices tend to choose code meshing.

In chapter 10 ("Cultural Meshing or Switching in Poly- or Intercultural Writing Classes"), we revisit the major points of each coauthor. Amanda argues that the Eddy Model makes possible for all students, but especially students of color, linguistic agency and independence. Robert claims that a writer's decision to code mesh or code switch is rhetorical, ideological, and involved with the politics of representation—how we are, whether we like it or not, a representative of our race, religion, sexuality, nationality, or immigration status.

The Eddy Model ensures that first-year writing teachers are able to develop tools to do academic and cultural work. One way we do this is by providing a section titled "Context-Building Writing Activity" at the end of each chapter in the book. These activities are written for students and are meant as a built-in teaching manual for practicing the Eddy Model. They utilize the same terminology and order as the model, providing everything from revision-workshop guidelines to classroom writing prompts to brainstorming exercises to extended essay assignments. We don't expect anyone will use all these activities in preparing or even teaching their individual courses. However, those in bold font are intended to map out for instructors an entire semester's use of the Eddy Model.

You might be asking, What does all this culture stuff have to do with writing courses and with academic writing processes? We believe it has everything to do with them. One could say that the only means we humans have of sharing our values, beliefs, and even identities is through language. Just as they must learn to navigate the cultural assumptions unique to their home and school lives, our students must develop the ability to choose language appropriate to reach or affect the audiences in each culture they inhabit or to code mesh those language choices so they can speak with the fullness of their being and knowledge-making ways. This book is designed to help you teach your students how to develop the language skills necessary to move effectively from one environment to the next or to mesh them all and to be consciously intentional in choosing code meshing or code switching. This book suggests that one's personal power and one's ability to use language are effectively interchangeable. Those students who increasingly become

intercultural, metacultural, and polycultural thinkers will understand that their control over language impacts their life choices politically, economically, racially, and academically. But—our students need to be consciously intentional about choosing code switching or code meshing.

Since academic discourse is steeped in the ideology of white power as systemic racism, which in our definition of ideology we describe as the "majority group's hustle," student internalizing of new college values is highly conflicted in an oppressive and racist American system. Can students, as they internalize academic discourse, be changed in only positive ways by learning systematic analysis and taking naysayers seriously without also internalizing racist language and power values? Patricia Bizzell foregrounds the difficult and perplexing challenge FYW teachers face: "In short, our dilemma is that we want to empower students to succeed in the dominant culture so that they can transform it from within; but we fear that if they do succeed, their thinking will be changed in such a way that they will no longer want to transform it" (1992, 228). Given the adaptability of systemic racism in this country, Bizzell's dilemma is or should be recognized as the dilemma of all FYW teachers and students except those who want to try to assimilate and accept the status quo. Any students, but especially first-gen students of color who do not seek to assimilate but who intend to construct a position somewhere along the continuum of resistance, separation, and pluralism, must deal with the ideology of white power, privilege, and values. Here is how Jason B. Esters, a black academic specializing in writing center work, accurately dramatizes the enormity of the rhetorical and analytical work that must be done to interrupt the power of systemic racism over our students and over all of us in our racial expectations. Here a student—Cecil—reflects on the visit of Esters to the student's class to do a writing center workshop. How do racial expectations function in academic writing settings?

> I guess it may seem odd for a student to want to write a reaction on a regular presentation. I wanted to bring to light a part of Systemic Racism that is instilled on us as students, (particularly black students) from when we are young. Beverly Daniel Tatum poses a great question in her book, *Why are All the Black Kids sitting Together in the Cafeteria?* "How did academic achievement become defined as exclusively white behavior?" (Tatum, 65). From when we are young we develop these racial notions that to be successful is white and to be a failure is black. Rarely is being black associated with academic success, "Racist arguments about contemporary intelligence levels are grounded in nearly four hundred years of viewing blacks as having intelligence inferior to that of whites" (Feagin, 95).
>
> Now you may still ask yourself, so what? Why this paper. Even now as I become a more learned individual than I had been merely four weeks

ago, I find a century of Systemic Racism acting on my subconscious. When Professor Taylor initially spoke to the class about a Jason Esters coming to the class to talk to us from a writing center, I had no assumptions of who he was and what he looked like. Yet, as Professor Taylor kept mentioning this man's name and how smart this man was, I then began to build up an image of this "writing genius." White, tall thin man; well dressed (suit, business casual); nice dress shoes; golden blonde hair; blue eyes; and well-spoken. Ah-ha! The joke is on me. Yes Jason is well spoken, oh and yes he did seem to be the "writing genius" Professor Taylor made him out to be, but I was happily mistaken. As he walked toward our classroom, I watched him, and thought, "Look at this guy, what week are we in at school, and he still doesn't know where his class is?" He didn't know because he was our guest. A short black man with dreadlocks and Timberland boots. Was it because the color of his skin and the freeness of his hair why I asked myself that question? Honestly, I don't know.

This incident served as a basic reminder to me, that I am still at the beginning of my journey in knowing not only who I am, but who my people are. In erasing all of the negative stereotypes imbedded in my head of this evil black man that is me. If I were to walk down the street with another black man and we are looked upon by a white stranger, we are just two black men. What ever stereotype they make of that black man, they will be making of me. So if can look at a fellow brother who shares a similar history as me, and share the same thoughts of an ignorant white man, then I am still bound in slavery of the mind, with the white man's ideas/beliefs. (2011, 293–94)

POLYCULTURALISM, LANGUAGE, AND POWER

This book is based on the conviction that writing faculty are joining multiracial political-economic forces that are changing Edited American English. We are collectively changing the nature of available rhetorics, opening up conservative white privileged conditions, and creating possibilities for the constructing of knowledge by extending, complicating, and making multiracial what historically white universities in particular, and what a white United States in general, understand EAE to be. Polycultural rhetorics include interpersonal difference, but the complex contexts for personal identity issues are the collective ideologies and practices constituted in and by systems of power. On the matter of intersectionality, this book insists on the following: the intersecting of social identities of race, class, gender, sexuality, and the others constructs the specifics of systemic oppression experienced by individuals. The power culture of college does not exist, as it claims, in a nonideological space. Colleges and universities serve to perpetuate the political economies of white power. Immersion in college culture is immersion in white dominance, patriarchy, capitalism, and all directly related power forces. This

book intends to make cross-cultural rhetorical exercises and activities equally empowering for students of color and white students, as difficult as that necessary goal is in a national setting of uninterrupted and unacknowledged white privilege, which is often racial privilege flowing through the teacher.

An anonymous external reviewer of an earlier draft of this book challenged us with two strong questions. "How can immersing oneself in 'white dominance, patriarchy, and capitalism' be empowering? What exactly does it mean to cross cultures with oppression?" Here is where Bizzell's dilemma and the black student's—Cecil's—response to Esters and to his own internalized racism illuminate the challenge for FYW teachers at every phase of our careers—early, middle, late.

White teachers unpracticed in multiracial teaching and living tend to deploy an unconscious white-privileged maneuvering to control language and curriculum and control the responses of students of color to language and to the white teacher's authority. A deep responsibility for all of us involved in the challenge of equitable and effective college writing classes for both students of color and white students is the central matter of not only a student's right to their own language but also their right to ideologically position themselves as they wish on a continuum of assimilation, resistance, separation, or pluralism. Eddy has argued elsewhere, along with Carmen Kynard, that "our idea(l)s have been shaped within very specific rewritings of race, access, and educational equality that HBCUs have attained while Historically White Colleges and Universities (HWCUs) still struggle to participate in such a practice of social justice and shared fate" (2009, W25). When Eddy and Kynard insist that "HWCUs tend to be competitive, independent and isolating, and HBCUs are typically noncompetitive, interpersonal and interactive," they are thinking, for example, of the following:

> Our first address [was] from Sista Prez Johnetta B. Cole. . . . As is characteristic of speeches to incoming first-year students, she instructed us to look to our right and to our left. We dutifully gazed upon each other's brown faces. She spoke: "other schools will tell you one of these students will not be here in four years when you are graduating. At Spelman we say we will all see to it: your sister *better* be at your side when you *all* graduate in four years!" Loud cheers erupted—we were our sisters' keepers. (Jamila 2002, 387)

To repeat, because of its central importance: not only do students have a right to their own language, they have the right to ideologically position themselves as they wish on a continuum of assimilation, resistance, separation, or pluralism. Young, Barrett, Young-Rivera, and Lovejoy construct a compelling case for code meshing as liberatory and

integrative, as acknowledging our wholeness, complexities, and person-hood, and, by contrast, view code switching as "separating languages according to context" and as "acting White." Writing teachers at HBCUs, HSIs, tribal colleges, and HWCUs must acknowledge that it is students who decide where and how to position themselves ideologically, linguistically, and rhetorically. When Robert Eddy, who is in deep support of code meshing, taught for ten years at an HBCU in North Carolina, he had to accept that most conservative black students chose to code switch. These students did not consider code switching as "linguistic segregation" or as involving their "racial self-concept," (Young et al. 2014, 3) and neither does coauthor Amanda. Throughout her career, Espinosa-Aguilar has encouraged code switching to help all students, especially those from underrepresented backgrounds, successfully navigate higher education and its norms. Unlike white coauthor Eddy, she too experiences the systemic racism students of color face and believes teaching students to use the master's tools, especially his language, will always provide a path toward the power that traditionally and recurrently has been denied people of color. Like Robert's HBCU students, Amanda regards code switching as a common-sense and rhetorically sophisticated way of acknowledging how white power and privilege operate not only in white communities but also for most members of the current professional class of color and for the next generation in training. Robert did not agree with his students' choice, but he had to completely acknowledge their right to decide for themselves.

The anonymous reviewer's two challenging questions—"How can immersing oneself in 'white dominance, patriarchy, and capitalism' be empowering? What exactly does it mean to cross cultures with oppression?"—must be answered by the coauthors of this book in terms of student language and ideology rights. We claim that the continuum of ideological positions from which students can choose an ideological commitment within the cross-currents, complexities, and challenges of the politics of representation are assimilation, resistance, separation, and pluralism. For students who try to assimilate, especially first-gen students of color and first-gen white students who to varying degrees accept and/or ignore "white dominance, patriarchy, and capitalism" and instead focus on trying to become successful and rich in the prevailing racist system, immersion in college culture is the credentialing they believe they require for upward mobility. Such students often have vague, distant-future commitments as self-justification for addressing "social problems" after they become super rich and members of the 1 percent. For students who choose ideological placing along the

continuum of separation, whether through isolating themselves as much as possible with their own community within the borders of this country or by ancestral relocating to Africa, or other continents, immersion in college—white dominance, patriarchy, and capitalism—is empowering because it helps them decide that, yes, the situation is hopeless and they need to isolate themselves or leave what they regard as this national, nonnegotiable nightmare. For students who choose resistance by joining Black Lives Matter, aligning with other protest and countercultural groups and certain hip-hop figures and older icons like Malcolm X, immersion in college white dominance, patriarchy, and capitalism is deeply empowering, not only because it makes political-economic realities much clearer and more comprehensively understood but because such immersion begins or further develops informed commitments to alternative ways of organizing justice work for individual and collective lives and makes beginning that work possible even before graduation. For students who choose pluralism, like those who choose resistance work (the two are closely connected), they use college immersion in crossing "cultures with oppression" to clarify world-views as ontological and epistemological commitments. Students who choose pluralism commit to engagement across key lines of difference in the midst of real social action work around current injustices. One good site that includes resources to help FYW teachers contextualize/problematize student ideological possibilities is the Pluralism Project (Eck 2006).

The black students Eddy worked with in North Carolina, who chose resistance or pluralism as their ideological commitment, code meshed, and often dynamically so. His students who chose separation rather than resistance, pluralism, or attempts at assimilation, often by joining the Nation of Islam (NOI), were nearly all working class, on public assistance, or in the drug trade. These students who chose separation were divided into two roughly equal groups in terms of their language choices. One group chose to communicate orally and in writing exclusively in African American English. They quickly ran up against the middle-class or above black administrators who allowed only code switching, especially in formal writing in course work, but the students also were disciplined severely by many, probably most, black faculty. These committed-to-AAE-only students tended to get grades that eliminated them from the university through teachers committed to code switching only who would not accept meshing and graded it as error, or these students withdrew from the school, tired of struggling with switching-only instructors, or rethought their ideology and language choices. The other group of students who chose separation were committed strongly

to code switching. Often formally imitating Malcolm X in his NOI days, they tried to outdo users of EAE in rhetorical use of the standard dialect and often got honor grades.

To be sure, there is tension here between Robert's assertion that students should be given choice between meshing and switching and the anecdotes offered. These brief narratives about one HBCU during Robert's ten years there certainly seem to show that code switching was, ultimately, the more practical choice or that is was at least firmly endorsed by perhaps all black administrators and most black faculty. Students who chose to use their own languages or to code mesh in formal work were effectively filtered out of the university. So how was choosing between meshing or switching a real choice? It was a real choice in Robert's classes and in a small number of other classes. Among Robert's own students, about 75 percent chose to switch because, in the words of one student, "That is what the white world and the leaders of the black world require of us, and what we have practiced in school." Among the 25 percent or so who meshed, more than one or two individuals on their own (with no suggestions from Robert) handed in two versions of the main research writing of the semester: one meshed and one switched and asked Robert either to "choose the stronger one" or to suggest whether "freedom or safety is better." It is the case that none of his students who meshed would agree to let Robert use their texts in this book, a reluctance having to do with naming, including a student who handed in both a switched and a meshed text. This person would not agree to have her name changed if used in this book, nor did she want her real name used, which could have resulted in her "be[ing] exposed to the network of black leaders who would feel ignored and hurt by my meshing; a generation thing, Prof Eddy. Meshing is clearly the future." To see one example of a meshed text by one of Robert's black students at the HWCU where he works now, see Tyrone Aire Justin's "Raps: Sweet Brown and Black" (2014, 34–40). This writer describes his experience of writing multiple drafts of his text, which presents his desire to replace brown on black and black on brown violence both within incarcerated spaces and outside them with friendship or even brotherhood, as an "empowering conscious choice and success on my terms and in my language."

In addition to individual students ideologically and rhetorically positioning themselves in meshing or switching, Eddy, as a white professor and WPA at an HBCU, had black department, college, and university supervisors who all demanded code switching and regarded meshing as error construction. But more than race and social class was at work in the complexity of the context involving white-phenotype Eddy and

black administrators in their respective politics of language and power differences. Essential elements of contestation that interpolate race and class at HBCUs are Christianity and Islam. The black administrators were Christian in theory and practice and Eddy is Muslim in theory and practice. Moreover, the one-quarter to one-third of students who were Muslim—either orthodox Islam or Nation of Islam (all local African Americans, not international students) were usually close to Eddy and normally addressed him as Dr. Salah Al-Din, his Muslim name. Students also recognized Eddy as working class when nearly all the black administrators were middle class or above. Also, in a post-9/11 United States, Eddy experiences Islamophobia often and intensely when the race and name privileges he has get seriously complicated by his being Muslim.

One of the student-government leaders, who is Muslim—a traditionally aged undergraduate and local black student who became Muslim in prison—had a meeting with the college dean, a black middle-class woman who was leader of the largest local black church. The meeting—as later related to Eddy by both the dean and the student—was a polite but seriously dissonant talk about code switching and code meshing. The dean continued to insist that code meshing is a fancy name for error construction or "misplaced black pride" and that white professors and white WPAs should not get involved in this crucial aspect of black educational policy. The student responded strongly by saying, "Dr. Salah Al-Din has drunk the milk of mother Africa; you have not; he is working class like nearly all of our students; you come from class privilege, and he is a Muslim leader and an expert on Malcolm X. All your references to Islam are oblique and never complimentary. All Dr. Salah's references to Christianity are appreciative and supportive. We are close to him and trust his teaching and his intentions toward us." When Robert met with the dean in her office about her meeting with the student leader, she did not mention religion but asked Robert about social-class matters and how he got the highest student-evaluation numbers and strongest student written responses among all faculty at the university as a white person at a HBCU. Robert's answer was "mainly three reasons: 1. The power of white privilege; 2. My having lived in Africa, being Muslim, an expert on Malcolm X, and a former undefeated amateur boxer is a big deal to many of our students; 3. As a working-class intellectual worker I love teaching academic writing, and our 99% poor or working-class students recognize our instant class solidarity." The dean asked Eddy his opinion about which of the three was strongest in influencing the positive student-evaluation numbers and comments. Eddy replied, "The first, white privilege, which should outrage all of us; we must eliminate

unearned white privilege." But the dean's main purpose in the meeting was to insist on code switching as the policy of the university administration and that it must be strongly enforced by the WPA.

What was Robert's response to this clear black supervisory directive to teach and to (WPA) program code switching? He did what this book advises all writing teachers to do: teach both the rhetoric of code switching and the rhetoric of code meshing and acknowledge student rights to their own language and to ideologically position themselves as they wish on a continuum of assimilation, resistance, separation, and pluralism and thus to consciously choose switching or meshing. Writing instructors are teachers of and for freedom, not enforcers of indoctrination of the Left or Right. College students choose to mesh or switch.

CONTEXT-BUILDING WRITING ACTIVITY 1

Welcome to English 101. As a way of becoming familiar with each other, all of us, including your instructor, will share a brief story from our educational journey. Just give us the summary or basics. Please do not put your name on your story. Instead, put your ID number to receive credit.

    After we spend ten minutes writing, your instructor will collect the stories. The teacher will read them out loud asking everyone to write down one question to ask the author about what the student wrote. Everyone will be invited to share their questions with the group. Then, the author will be invited to choose some of them to answer briefly, if they wish to give up being anonymous.

CONTEXT-BUILDING WRITING ACTIVITY 2

This survey is designed to help your writing teacher measure your confidence as a reader and as a writer of research. The following activity is available as a pdf file in our class LMS/Connect course site that should be downloaded and printed to make it easier to turn in. It is reproduced here because we will discuss the survey in class as well.

Confidence Survey

Please rate your ability to do the kinds of assignments listed below. Circle your answer.

Assignments	*Confidence in your ability to do them*			
1. Summarize essential information from a text	None	Low	Medium	High
2. Find the central argument in an essay	None	Low	Medium	High
3. State & support your own argument	None	Low	Medium	High

4. Select a research project or approach	None	Low	Medium	High
5. Do independent research at a college library	None	Low	Medium	High
6. Cite a source (quotation) in your essay	None	Low	Medium	High
7. Cite a source (paraphrase) in your essay	None	Low	Medium	High
8. Cite a source (summary) in your essay	None	Low	Medium	High
9. Revise & edit your own essays	None	Low	Medium	High
10. Suggest effective revision feedback to peers	None	Low	Medium	High
11. Give an oral presentation of your research	None	Low	Medium	High
12. Compile an annotated bibliography	None	Low	Medium	High
13. Compile a "Works Cited" page	None	Low	Medium	High

Adapted from Jennifer Rene Young (2002)

CODE-MESHING ACTIVITY 1

Building Community Using Home Language(s)

If you might code mesh any of the writing in this course, whether formal papers, informal writing tasks responding to readings, responses to multimedia texts, or creative or speculative writing, then as at-home writing you will bring to the next class session, share an anecdote you want other students who may code mesh and the teacher to associate with you as a key to your character or aspirations. This brief story could be code meshed using your home language(s) meshed with Standard English. This anecdote can be brief, a paragraph, but it must have an opening, middle, and ending. Your teacher will also bring a brief story about his own home languages meshed as he uses them in daily life. We will share either with the whole class if everyone produces one or in groups of three people considering meshing while students not considering meshing meet a second time about Context-Building Writing Activity 1.